

FORM 6: FURTHER SUBMISSION ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE UNDER CLAUSE 8 SCHEDULE 1 TO THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 (RMA)

HAMILTON CITY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 5 - PEACOCKE STRUCTURE PLAN

FURTHER SUBMISSION FORMS CAN BE:

- Posted to: Freepost 172189, Hamilton City Council, Private Bag 3010, Hamilton 3240, Attn: Plan Change 5 Further Submission.
- Delivered to: Hamilton City Council Municipal Building, Garden Place, Hamilton.
- Emailed to: haveyoursay@hcc.govt.nz

NOTE TO PERSON MAKING A FURTHER SUBMISSION:

Important: Further submissions must reach council by Wednesday 16 March 2022.

You must serve a copy of your further submission on the original submitter within five working days after it is served on the local authority.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Following the close of further submissions, a report will be prepared on the proposal and a hearing date will be set and notified to all submitters and 'further submitters' who wish to be heard.

Council will make all further submissions, including name and contact details, publicly available on Council's website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public.

Please print and do not use pencil. You can attach more pages if necessary. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your further submission.

SUBMITTER DETAILS (all fields required)

Full name:

Contact Person: (If different from above, include name and designation)

Company name: (if applicable)

Postal address for service:

(or alternative method of service under s 352 of the RMA)

Email address for service:

Phone number(s):

FURTHER SUBMITTER RELEVANCE I am: (select one)

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has.

The local authority for the relevant area.

State the reason for your selection:

DO YOU WISH TO ATTEND AND SPEAK AT THE COUNCIL HEARING IN SUPPORT OF MY FURTHER SUBMISSION?

Yes

No

IF OTHERS MAKE A SIMILAR SUBMISSION WOULD YOU BE PREPARED TO CONSIDER PRESENTING A JOINT CASE WITH THEM AT ANY HEARING?

Yes

No

SIGNATURE OF FURTHER SUBMITTER (your signature or that of the person authorised to sign on behalf of the person making this further submission)

Signature:

(A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.)

Date:

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ORIGINAL SUBMITTER/SUBMITTER NUMBER	Original Submission Point Number	Original Plan Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Hamilton City Council (11)	11.1	PREC-R36- 48	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the alignment of PC5 with the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. It is however noted that this further emphasises the importance of Council undertaking modelling so that Waka Kotahi can understand the effects of the intensified land use on the surrounding transport network, including the state highway network.	Waka Kotahi seek that an updated ITA which reflects current modelling and analyses the likelihood of achieving mode shift (based on speed and convenience) is provided to help inform our final position on this plan change.
The Adare Company (53)	53.19	DEV01-PSP:P62	Support in part	One of the main issues of concern for Waka Kotahi was that current modelling was not reflected in the ITA which did not allow Waka Kotahi to come to a decision on if the plan change achieved mode shift. Therefore, Waka Kotahi supports the requirement for Integrated Transport Modelling to be undertaken for all Structure Plan areas, however agrees with the submitter that there needs to be some clarification on who would undertake this modelling and how this is differentiated from policies such as 25.14.2.1f which require ITA's for new subdivision, use or development.	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be allowed insofar as it relates to seeking clarification on who should be undertaking the Integrated Transport Modelling required by this policy and how this differs from the requirements of Integrated Transport Assessments.
The Adare Company (53)	53.98	Table 15-6b: Criteria for the form of Transport Corridors in the Peacocke	Support in part	Waka Kotahi support this submission point insofar as it relates to requesting narrower minimum legal widths for Collector Roads. As outlined in our original submission, Waka Kotahi believes that as currently proposed,	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be allowed in part, being the narrowing of the minimum legal widths for Collector Roads but propose that the cross-section requirement for car parking provision is clarified such that the collector road design speeds can be met.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ORIGINAL SUBMITTER/SUBMITTER NUMBER	Original Submission Point Number	Original Plan Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
		Structure Plan Area (Point 4)		the form of design of Collector Roads will encourage higher speeds.	Reducing car parking will also make delivery of appropriate cycling facilities easier and less expensive to deliver.
Kāinga Ora (55)	55.94	DEV01-PSP:P62	Oppose	Waka Kotahi oppose the rewording proposed in this submission point as this creates ambiguity around who is needing to undertake modelling and what the threshold might be, therefore reducing clarity in a policy context.	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be disallowed and the policy retained as notified.
Waikato Regional Council (36)	36.1	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R3/ Built Environment	Support	Waka Kotahi agree with this submission point (as mirrored in the Waka Kotahi submission on MRZ - PREC1- PSP: R3) as single dwellings and duplexes as permitted activities within the High Density Residential Overlay may undermine the intention of the overlay and not guarantee the desired outcome of compact development.	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be allowed.
Waikato Regional Council (36)	36.46	SUB - PREC1-PSP:P9	Support	Waka Kotahi agrees with this submission point as it supports higher density development adjacent to public transport corridors	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be allowed.
WEL Networks Limited (37)	37.5	SUB - PREC1-PSP:P16	Oppose	Waka Kotahi do not support the inclusion of the additional policies proposed in this submission for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing space in the berm for infrastructure that is free from landscaping does not promote a 	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be disallowed.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ORIGINAL SUBMITTER/SUBMITTER NUMBER	Original Submission Point Number	Original Plan Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				<p>corridor width that is conducive to creating low speeds and makes the roads wider to cross.</p> <p>2. Provision for charging stations is not required within the transport corridor as it is more appropriate for these facilities to be located in town centre areas outside of the corridor.</p>	
Cordyline Holdings Limited (44)	44.41	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R18	Oppose in part	Waka Kotahi oppose this submission in part as imposing maximum block length and perimeter standards ensures permeability for active modes and therefore there is merit in this rule being retained. However, it is recognised there is value in assuring the standard could be practically applied when considered in conjunction with the transport network as indicatively shown on the Structure Plan maps.	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be disallowed but that some assurance be provided that the maximum block length and maximum block perimeters will be able to be achieved in conjunction with the proposed transport network.
The Adare Company (53)	53.76	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20	Oppose in part	Waka Kotahi do not oppose the proposed addition to clause (4) of SUB-PREC1-PSP:R20 in principle. However, Waka Kotahi would need to understand the specific context of where it is anticipated that pedestrian access is to be via an area of public open space before being able to support the submission.	Waka Kotahi seek that further information is provided to give further understanding of the type of development which would provide pedestrian access solely via a public open space and the effects this would have on the transport network.
The Adare Company (53)	53.81	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R25 Provision of Public	Oppose	Waka Kotahi are of the position that while the Waikato Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications (RITS) provides guidance on the design of bus stops, there still needs to be	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be disallowed.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ORIGINAL SUBMITTER/SUBMITTER NUMBER	Original Submission Point Number	Original Plan Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
		Transport Infrastructure		collaboration with Waikato Regional Council regarding the location of the stops (as RITS does not specify this). The location of bus stops is determined through a combination of engineering best practice and transport planning and Waka Kotahi believe that Waikato Regional Council is best placed to provide information and guidance on bus stop demand and location.	
Waikato Regional Council (36)	36.62	Appendix 1 – District Plan Administration – Definitions and Terms	Support	Waka Kotahi support this submission as it reflects the Waka Kotahi submission in identifying that the definition of a ‘Public Transport Station’ is not clear, as no reference to the terminology appears to be made in the proposed Structure Plan documents.	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be allowed.
Waikato Regional Council (36)	36.63	Appendix 1 – District Plan Administration – Definitions and Terms	Support	Waka Kotahi support this submission point in full.	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be allowed.
Ohaupo Land LP (42) Golden Valley Farms (43)	42.5/43.5	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Oppose in part	Waka Kotahi support these submission points in part as we consider that further consideration needs to be given to the location of any future intersection with the highway as a result of realigning Hall Road. Waka Kotahi are however unable to promote a signalised intersection or roundabout at this time given the uncertainties around if we could	Waka Kotahi seek that the submission be disallowed and that the relocated Hall Road does not connect with State Highway 3 and that this connection is removed from the Structure Plan Transport Network Plan. Council may want to consider some revised wording which requires developers to engage

NAME AND ADDRESS OF ORIGINAL SUBMITTER/SUBMITTER NUMBER	Original Submission Point Number	Original Plan Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				practically approve this due to lack of information to accompany such a proposal.	with Waka Kotahi at an appropriate stage if they seek a connection to the highway.