

Further Submissions Peacockes Plan Change5

13 March 2022

Alison Keehan 504 Peacockes road 07 843 9014 steadyas678@gmail.com

Original Submissions in Italics.

My further submission **in bold**.

I am not interested in making an oral submission.

Bus stops

*5 Living Streets Kirikiriroa (Hamilton) 5.4 Appendix 15 – Transportation Bus stops
Support Support Appendix 15 p42– ‘Bus stops are to be provided within the road to minimise delays to public transport services’. Retain as notified.*

I oppose this submission and request it is disallowed. Retention of bus stops within the road will create driver frustration and cause drivers to attempt to pass the bus using the opposing lane at every opportunity. These manoeuvres create unsafe situations particularly when people are exiting the bus and trying to cross the road. The hold up of traffic by the bus will cause stress to the bus drivers and those trying to access or leave the bus. Bus stops off road allow bus drivers space to park and sort out issues with passengers and the vehicle. Council needs to be realistic about driver behaviour and not create antipathy towards public transport users.

*8 Mithrandir Enterprises Ltd 8.2 Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Provision of bus stops within the road. **Oppose** Provision of bus stops within the road will mean that traffic can only move as fast as the bus which will be stopping regularly. This will create restrictions to traffic flow and frustration with motorists which is a risk for silly or dangerous driving/passing maneuvers. Provide bus stops where the bus can pull out of the stream of traffic.*

I support this opposing submission. The author is correct in the assessment of the problems it will cause.

Cats and Bats

30 Andrea Graves 30.7 General Bat Protection Support in Part The absence of a cat ban for Peacocke in the Plan Change is an oversight that needs to be rectified. Introduce a ban on cats in Peacocke.

I oppose this submission and request it is disallowed. A cat ban will be unworkable in practice and makes no allowance for the damage stoats, rats and ferrets can do to bat survival . A better proposal is to retain mature trees (something that Council has made no effort to do with its urban roading development so far) and to provide small entrance artificial bat roosts and metal anti climbing bands.

38 Director-General of Conservation 38.31 Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Additional Policy addressing the prohibition of cats. Oppose The Director-General considers there needs to be consistency between the Amberfield subdivision and the Peacocke Structure Plan. For example, if there is not a cat ban in the Peacocke Structure Plan, the efficacy of the cat ban in Amberfield will be compromised. Peacocke Structure Plan aims to incorporate 8000 homes into the area. Cat occupancy in urban areas is around 35% meaning if there is no cat ban there will be an influx of c.2800 cats to the area. Cats are known to be predators of long-tailed bats so an increase of thousands of cats is liable to have a significant adverse effect on bats. Add policy: Exclude cats and other predators from the Peacocke Structure Plan Area in order to protect long-tailed bats from predation. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.

I oppose this submission and request it is disallowed. A cat ban will be unworkable in practice and makes no allowance for the damage stoats, rats and ferrets can do to bat survival. A better proposal is to encourage retention of mature trees (something that Council has made no effort to do with its urban roading development so far) and to provide small entrance artificial bat roosts and metal anti climbing bands.

5 Storeys

8 Mithrandir Enterprises Ltd 8.1 Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Building Height - 5 Storeys Oppose Zoning allowing walk-up apartments up to 5 stories high is too high and out of keeping with the rest of Hamilton. Having lived in cities where apartment buildings of this height are allowed they create issues with noise and privacy. Because of their height noise produced in the higher units in a building of this size is transmitted and can disturb neighbours over a large area. This can be even worse in buildings where the staircase is open to air. Residents carrying things up and down the stairs also creates noise, as does the process of moving in and out. Buildings of this height also allow residents to look into the back yards of neighbouring properties which reduces privacy. Limit residential building height to 3 stories.

I support this opposing submission. And 5 storey apartments require more complex passive fire protection, greater structural requirements, more complex plumbing provisions. This does not make them a cheaper and desirable form of housing.

Private land rules onerous

46 Ben and Rachel Inger 46.7 Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements Appendix 1.2.2.24 Landscape Concept Plans Peacocke Structure Plan Area Oppose The Landscape Concept Plan should relate to landscaping within public areas only rather than within private lots. The provisions should be clear that the content of the Landscape Concept Plan should relate to open space zones and the other public infrastructure described in (i), namely streets, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater swales, wetlands, detention basins, streams and riparian margins, as relevant to the subject site. A Landscape Concept Plan should not be required where public land is not existing, proposed or required for a particular site. Amend Appendix 1.2.2.24 Landscape Concept Plans Peacocke Structure Plan Area as follows: "A Landscape Concept Plan shall be prepared for any subdivision application in the Peacocke Structure Plan area where the subdivision site involves more than 2 hectares of land and includes any open space zone or new public roads, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater swales, wetlands, detention basins and streams or riparian margins. The objectives of the Landscape Concept Plan are to identify opportunities for existing or proposed public land that is within the subdivision site to protect or enhance the natural character and cultural, heritage and amenity values, to recognise and provide for tangata whenua values and relationships with Peacocke, and their aspirations for the area, and to reflect the area's character and heritage. The Landscape Concept Plan shall include: i. ..." [no suggested changes to (i) to (x)]

I support this opposing submission. Requirements should only apply to public land

46 Ben and Rachel Inger 46.8 Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements Appendix 1.2.2.26 Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan Peacocke Structure Plan Area Oppose a) The Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan should relate to ecological rehabilitation and management within public areas only rather than within private lots. b) The provisions should be clear what public areas the Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan should apply to. The same wording that is suggested to be used in Rule 1.2.2.24 Landscape Concept Plans should be adopted (refer to submission point 7). c) An Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan should not be required where public land is not existing, proposed or required for a particular site. d) Clause (iii) in the notified PC5 provisions should be deleted. Requiring fixed lighting design to be provided for private lots near Bat Habitat Areas is impractical at subdivision stage. It is also unnecessary given there are proposed land use controls which limit light spill into these areas (Rule 25.6.4.4) and which require 5m building setbacks to the boundary of Bat Habitat Areas (Rule MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R39(8)). e) Clause (iv) in the notified PC5 provisions should be amended by adding the words "as relevant to the site". This reflects that wetland restoration, for example, will only be relevant to sites which contain wetlands. f) Clause (v) in the notified PC5 provisions, which relates to the establishment and enhancement of identified Proposed Bat Corridors, should be deleted for the following reasons: (i) HCC should proactively acquire the Proposed Bat Corridors by purchasing the affected land and by being responsible for their creation and ongoing maintenance. (ii) It is an unreasonable burden to require the limited number of owners of land that is subject to the Proposed Bat Corridors to be responsible for their creation, which is likely to require extensive planting and other landscape improvements at significant cost under the direction of ecological and landscaping experts. (iii) The Proposed Bat Corridors are for the mitigation and compensation of effects on bats across the entire Peacocke Structure Plan area and are for the benefit of the long-tailed bat population which inhabits Hamilton and surrounds. The Proposed Bat Corridors will also have community recreation benefits. Therefore, the burden for their creation should be shared. (iv) The Proposed Bat Corridors straddle property boundaries. The purchase of the land and the creation of the Proposed Bat Corridors by HCC would ensure a coordinated approach, as well as allowing greater control over the timing of their provision and being more equitable. Amend Appendix

1.2.2.26 Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan Peacocke Structure Plan Area as follows: “An Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan (ERMP) shall be prepared for any subdivision application in the Peacocke Structure Plan area where the subdivision site involves more than 2 hectares of land and includes any open space zone or new public roads, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater swales, wetlands, detention basins and streams or riparian margins. The objective of the ERMP is to identify opportunities to enhance freshwater and terrestrial ecological values within existing or proposed public land that is within the subdivision site. The ERMP shall include: i. An indigenous fish management plan for any stream or wetland habitat within the site, including a summary of fish habitat and species present, a summary of planned works, permitting requirements, procedures for dealing with pest fish, biosecurity protocols, timing of works, procedures for recovering indigenous fish prior to and during works, roles and responsibilities of parties, reporting requirements and any specific mitigation measures. ii. Planting of indigenous tree species to provide indigenous vegetation and habitat for indigenous fauna. iii. Restoration planting to include wetland restoration, habitat enhancement and riparian buffer zones, as relevant to the site. iv. Evidence of engagement with tangata whenua during preparation of the ERMP including how the outcomes of that engagement have been addressed.”

I support this opposing submission. Requirements should only apply to public land

Separated Cycleways on Collector and Arterial routes

53 The Adare Company 53.16 Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Policy DEV01-PSP:P44 Oppose Reference to “identified cycle routes” within the third clause of this Policy is unclear. It could be interpreted to mean that future Local Roads in areas subject to the “Indicative Cycleway/Walkway Network” in Figure 2-2: Peacocke Structure Plan – Transport Network must have physically separated cycleways which would be inconsistent with the cross sections and criteria for Local Roads included within Chapter 3A and Appendix 15-6b. The cross sections and criteria in Chapter 3A and Appendix 15-6b for Collector Roads and Arterial Roads do require these roads to have physically separated cycleways therefore, the third clause of the policy should specifically relate to separated cycleways on Collector Roads and Arterial Roads only. Amend Policy DEV01-PSP:P44 to read: “Require the transport network to be established in accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan by designing and locating: 1. Transport Corridors to be consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan. 2. Identified public transport routes to accommodate public transport and associated infrastructure. 3. Identified cycle routes to provide high quality separated cycleways on Collector Roads and Arterial Roads that encourage cycling.”

I support this opposing submission. High quality safe separated cycleways are required for routes with higher traffic volumes such as arterial and collector routes.