

**FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, SUBMISSIONS ON
PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PROPOSAL FOR PLAN CHANGE 5 TO THE HAMILTON CITY
DISTRICT PLAN**

under clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

To: Hamilton City Council
Municipal Building
Garden Place
HAMILTON
(by email: haveyoursay@hcc.govt.nz)

Name of submitter: The Adare Company Limited

1. The Adare Company Limited (**Adare**) makes this further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submissions on proposed Plan Change 5 (Peacocke Structure Plan) to the Hamilton City District Plan (**PC5**).
2. Adare has an interest in PC5 that is greater than the interest the general public has on the grounds that:
 - a. Adare has substantial landholdings in Peacocke (as shown in Appendix A to its original submission). Adare's ability to subdivide, use and develop its land is directly affected by PC5.
 - b. Adare holds land use and subdivision consents for part of its land known as Amberfield. PC5 may have implications for the development of Amberfield, including by enabling additional density.
 - c. Adare, its directors and shareholders (the Peacocke family) have a long-standing relationship with the wider area subject to PC5, with family ties to the Peacocke area dating back to the 1880s. Adare has an interest in seeing Peacocke developed in a way that enhances Hamilton as a place to live.

Submissions supported or opposed

3. The submissions that Adare supports or opposes are set out in the table attached as **Appendix A** to this further submission.

Reasons for further submission

4. For the submissions in **Appendix A** that Adare supports or opposes (either in full or in part) those submissions should be allowed or disallowed (either in full or in part) as sought by Adare, so as to:
 - a. promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA and to give effect to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA;
 - b. enable the social and economic well-being of the community in Hamilton City;
 - c. sustain the potential of the natural and physical resources of the Peacocke Structure Plan area to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;
 - d. enable the efficient use and development of the natural and physical resources of the Peacocke Structure Plan area;

- e. to give effect to the objectives and policies of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; and
 - f. ensure that the provisions of PC5 are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC5 and the District Plan, which are in turn the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
5. Without limiting the generality of the above, the additional reasons why Adare supports or opposes each submission are set out in **Appendix A**.

Decisions sought:

6. Adare seeks the following relief:
- a. That the submissions supported in **Appendix A** be allowed (either in full or in part).
 - b. That the submissions opposed in **Appendix A** be disallowed (either in full or in part).
 - c. Such further, alternative or other consequential amendments as may be necessary to fully address Adare's further submission.
7. Adare wishes to be heard in support of this submission.

Signed for and on behalf of Adare by:



.....
Mike Doesburg

Solicitor for **The Adare Company Limited**

Date: 16 March 2022

Address for service: Wynn Williams
Level 25, Vero Centre, 48 Shortland Street
P O Box 2401
AUCKLAND 1140

Contact person: Mike Doesburg
Email: mike.doesburg@wynnwilliams.co.nz
Telephone: 09 300 5755

Copy to: Dr Robert Makgill, Barrister – robert@robertmakgill.com

Appendix A – Submissions supported and opposed, reasons and relief

Glossary of abbreviations and terms used:

Council or **HCC** means Hamilton City Council.

PC5 means Proposed Plan Change 5 to the Hamilton District Plan.

NPS-UD means National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.

SNA means Significant Natural Area.

NOSZ means Natural Open Space Zone.

BHA means Bat Habitat Areas

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
1.	George Lane 112 Fairfield Road Fairfield, Hamilton 3214 georgelanesailing@gmail.com Submission 6	6.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R37 - Specimen Trees Amend the minimum requirement for specimen trees on single dwellings from 1 to 2.	Oppose	The existing standard requiring one specimen tree for single dwellings is appropriate.	Disallow the submission.
2.	George Lane	6.7	General Minimum width of pedestrian and cycle links. Add design guidance for the minimum width of 3.5m for pedestrian and cycle links.	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unclear from the relief sought whether the submitter is referring to cycle paths and footpaths separately or to shared paths for pedestrians and cyclists. It is also unclear whether the submitter is referring to off-road paths (i.e. within reserves) or paths within roads. 2. Table 15-6b in Appendix 15 sets out the required widths for footpaths and cycle paths within roads. 3. It is appropriate for the width of paths within reserves to be determined on a case-by-case basis at resource consent and/or detailed design stage for individual developments. This is because the appropriate path width will depend on the path's location and function. 4. The required width of shared paths for pedestrians and cyclists along the Waikato River Margin under the resource consents for Amberfield is 3m. 	Disallow the submission.
3.	Mithrandir Enterprises Ltd dr.scott.c.robinson@gmail.com Submission 8	8.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Building Height - 5 Storeys Limit residential building height to 3 stories.	Oppose	Typical building height of 2-5 storeys is appropriate in the High Density Residential Area.	Disallow the submission.
4.	Mithrandir Enterprises Ltd	8.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Create buildings that face the street. Allow buildings to be placed further back in section so that people can build fences and have some separation from road noise.	Oppose	The minimum setbacks to transport corridors are appropriate and will enable efficient use of land.	Disallow the submission.
5.	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Lower Northern Office PO Box 13339 Tauranga 3141 cmcalley@heritage.org.nz Submission 9	9.3	Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage Schedule 8B: Group 1 - Lack of inclusion of certain archaeological site into Historic Heritage schedules. Amend Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural sites to include site s14/318.	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protection of site S14/318 will be ensured through existing conditions under the Amberfield resource consents, which require the vesting of the land containing the site as a historic reserve and ongoing management of the site in accordance with an Archaeological Heritage Reserve Management Plan. 2. Scheduling the site as a Group 1 site would mean that any earthworks and new signs would require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. This is unnecessary and would be inefficient. The historic reserve status and management plan will appropriately protect the site. 3. There are very few borrow pits which are listed as Group 1 sites in Schedule 8B. 	Disallow the submission.
6.	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	9.6	Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage Future research into the pa at the mouth of the Mangakotukutuku Stream That the further research identified in Appendix 1, Peacock Structure Plan: Archaeology, Warren Gumbley & Matthew Gainsford, W Gumbley Ltd Archaeologists, February 2021 is undertaken as prior to decision making	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The relief appears to seek the addition of more protective reserves following additional work that it requests should be undertaken prior to decisions being made on PC5. 2. The relief is uncertain because the outcomes of any additional work and therefore the locations of any additional protective reserves, are unknown. 	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			on the plan change to inform the location of development and to avoid adverse effects on historic heritage.			
7.	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency PO Box 973 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton, 3240 emily.hunt@nzta.govt.nz Submission 10	10.4	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP:P39-P53 Retain as notified.	Oppose in part	Although the submission relief is in support of policies in Chapter 3A, the submission point states that Waka Kotahi considers that the proposed locations of the Future Mass Transit Stops do not align well with DEV01-PSP: P42. Adare considers that the locations of the Future Mass Transit Stops shown on the Peacocke Structure Plan are appropriate.	Disallow the submission to the extent that any changes may be sought by the submitter to the location of the Future Mass Transit Stops.
8.	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.11	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Peacocke Transportation Network (Pages 20-21) Amend as follows: The transport network will be staged as development progresses within Peacocke. The principles for the transport network are: Priorities <u>Prioritises</u> residents of Peacocke's mobility and accessibility <u>by active modes and public transport</u> to places within Peacocke and to the rest of Hamilton, including employment areas. • provide clear, safe and direct access for residents <u>by active modes and public transport</u> to community facilities, commercial areas, places of recreation and other neighbourhoods. • provides people with transport choices (is multi modal) by promoting Public Transport <u>public transport</u> and active modes, at expense of level of service (LOS) for private car. if necessary. • Maximise network efficiency for Public Transport <u>public transport, buses, High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV)</u> and active modes through design. • Flexible design to cater for evolution & steps changes in transport system, such as future high occupancy vehicles.	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritisation of public transport, walking and cycling is supported. However, the words "if necessary" should be retained to ensure that the level of service for private cars is not deliberately reduced to promote these other modes. 2. Provision for high occupancy vehicles in some locations could be appropriate and may reduce demand for private car use. References to high occupancy vehicles should be retained. 	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording including retention of "as necessary" and references to high occupancy vehicles.
9.	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.13	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan d) Minor Arterial Transport Network (Page 24) Amend as follows: Minor Arterial Transport Network: The minor arterial network is characterised by high traffic volumes through movement , with some limited destination types <u>access points</u> such as offices, shops and residences. Large volumes of mixed traffic are anticipated on these routes, including frequent public transport services. Public transport should be given priority <u>over private vehicles</u> . Safety of vulnerable users moving along and across the road should be ensured <u>prioritised</u> . Due to the high volumes of traffic through movement along <u>on</u> this network a separated <u>separated</u> cycling network need to <u>will</u> be provided along with <u>separate</u> pedestrian facilities. Key Design Principles -Higher speed environment;- Allow for a high level of intersection density to reduce speeds- <u>- Active frontages would still be considered acceptable on these routes as a means of implementing roading hierarchy and reducing vehicular speeds - Separated cycle facilities and pedestrian routes - High frequency public transport service with priority - Pedestrian crossings near bus stops and key land uses</u>	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed changes which reflect that minor arterial roads (such as Peacockes Road) should provide a limited access function with active frontages are appropriate. 2. Prioritisation of public transport is supported. However, the proposed wording "over private vehicles" should not be included. Safety for private vehicles should not be compromised nor should private vehicle efficiency be disproportionately compromised. 	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
10.	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.21	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1- PSP: P17 Amend as follows: Incorporate public transport stops into the Local Centre. where it will provide an efficient and convenient access to the network.	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The location of the proposed Public Transport Hub for the Local Centre is shown adjacent to the Local Centre on Peacockes Road in the Peacocke Structure Plan maps. That is the most appropriate location for a Public Transport Hub because it will efficiently and conveniently service the Local Centre and the proposed education facilities without the lost time of buses needing to enter and leave the centre. Given this Public Transport Hub is identified on the Structure Plan maps, this policy should be amended to refer to that location. Alternative suggested wording is <i>“Provide a public transport hub for the Local Centre in accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan.”</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Disallow the submission; or Allow the submission, subject to Adare's suggested alternative wording.
11.	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.22	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1- PSP: R24 LCZ – PREC1- PSP: R26 LCZ – PREC1- PSP: R30 Amend the activity status of Light Industry and Drive-through services in the Local Centre Zone to Non-Complying.	Oppose	Light Industrial and Drive-through Services are typical activities in a Local Centre. Discretionary Activity status is appropriate.	Disallow the submission.
12.	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.29	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct SUB - PREC1- PSP:P18 Incorporate a rule in Table 15-6b which limits the length of rear lanes.	Oppose	The detailed relief sought is unclear. However, the appropriate length of rear lanes should be determined on a case-by-case basis as part of resource consenting.	Disallow the submission.
13.	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.34	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms Definition of Public Transport Station Offer clarification as to why 'Public Transport Station' has been defined and ensure that all intended references have been made to Public Transport Stations throughout the Structure Plan and supporting documents.	Support	The definition for 'Public Transport Station' is unnecessary if it is not a term referred to in the provisions for the Peacocke Precinct.	Allow the submission and delete the definition of 'Public Transport Station'.
14.	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.35	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms Definition of Public Transport Station Catchments Investigate changes necessary to reduce walking distances for catchments in the Structure Plan area to 600 metres or less.	Oppose	It appears that the provisions for the Peacocke Precinct do not refer 'Public Transport Station Catchments'. If that is the case, the definition is unnecessary and it should be deleted.	Disallow the submission and delete the definition of 'Public Transport Station Catchments'.
15.	Hamilton City Council Private Bag 3010 Hamilton 3240 jamie.sirl@hcc.govt.nz Submission 11	11.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Amendments to PREC - R36 – 48 Amend the existing objective and policy framework set out in MRZ – PREC1-PSP: Objectives and MRZ – PREC1-P: Policies to enable the implementation of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) as required under Schedule 3A (8) of the Bill. Amend MRZ – PREC1-PSP: Rules – Activity Status i. To allow as a permitted activity the construction and use of 1, 2, or 3 residential units on a single site as set out in Schedule 3A (2) and (3). ii. Amend the activity status for 4 or more residential units on a single site as set out in Schedule 3A (3). iii. Amend the notification process to align with the	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The amendments sought to Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, subject to any changes under the enacting legislation, should give effect to the outcomes sought under Schedule 3A of the RMA 1991. Any amendments made to Chapter 4A will need to be consistent with provision for Medium Density Residential Standards under the other parts of the RMA (e.g., Part 5 RMA and Part 5 of Schedule 12). 	Allow the submission in relation to Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone to the extent that it is consistent with the RMA 1991 including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 3A; and Other relevant provisions under the RMA.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			requirements of Schedule 3A(4). Amend the following standards to align with Schedule 3A of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. MRZ – PREC1-PSP: Rules – Development Standards i. Amend the current development standards to align with the standards set out in Schedule 3A Part 2 Building Standards (9) to (15) ii. Amend the current development standards to align with the standards set out in Schedule 3A Part 2 Building Standards in relation to 4 or more residential units on a single site. Refer also to the tracked changes to Chapter 4A Medium Density Residential Zone - MRZ - PREC1-PSP: Medium Density Residential Zone Peacocke Precinct in Attachment 1 to the submission.			
16.	Hamilton City Council	11.2	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct SUB-PREC1-PSP: R14 SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 SUB-PREC1-PSP: R17 Hamilton City Councils seeks changes to Chapter 23A SUB – PREC1-PSP: Subdivision - Peacocke Precinct to align these chapters with the final outcomes under the passing of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. Refer to tracked changes to Chapter 23A SUB-PREC1-PSP: Subdivision - Peacocke Precinct in Attachment 1 to the submission.	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The amendments sought to Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, subject to any changes under the enacting legislation, should give effect to the outcomes sought under Schedule 3A of the RMA 1991. Any amendments made to Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct will need to be consistent with provision for Medium Density Residential Standards under the other parts of the RMA (e.g., Part 5 RMA and Part 5 of Schedule 12). 	Allow the submission in relation to Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct to the extent that it is consistent with the RMA 1991 including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 3A; and Other relevant provisions under the RMA.
17.	Hamilton City Council	11.3	General Any additional amendments Hamilton City Council seeks all further amendments to PC 5 that are necessary to give effect to the MDRS and the requirements of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill once the final form of the Bill is passed into law and becomes an Act of Parliament.	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Submissions 11.1 and 11.2 seek amendments in relation to Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill and Chapters 4A and 23A. The submitter anticipated that the amendments sought would be contingent on the final enacted Amendments to the RMA (HCC submission 4.2). It is appropriate to make any further changes that might be required to give effect to the amended RMA, including to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chapters 4A and 23A; or Any other Chapter or provision under PC5. 	Allow the submission to make further amendments necessary to give effect to the RMA 1991 as amended by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
18.	Jones Lands Ltd PO Box 305002 Triton Plaza Auckland 0757 tristan@jonesgroup.co.nz Submission 13	13.5	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans Peacocke structure plan roading layout Amend the structure plan roading layout. Extend the collector road proposed over the adjoining Aurora development south east toward Southern Links north-south Arterial to achieve better connectivity and support the identified neighbourhood centre; reduce classification of road marked X in attached diagram to a local road to afford a better urban design and ecological outcome; remove overbridge proposed along Peacocke Road crossing Southern Links and consider partial closure of Peacocke Road, re-routing of roads and better integration with adjoining growth cell; and provide for any changes as a result of the above, including the possible relocation of neighbourhood centre in locality.	Oppose	Removal of the overbridge and severing Peacockes Road is opposed. Instead the addition of ramps with the bridge to form a full interchange is preferred or alternatively the replacement of the bridge with a roundabout to provide all movements between the north-south arterial and Peacockes Road. Either of these options would improve accessibility to the south of the City via SH3 and SH1 from the south-eastern part of the Peacocke Precinct, including the southern area of Amberfield and the Neighbourhood Centre and residential areas that are within Adare's land holdings.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
19.	Jones Lands Ltd	13.8	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans Location of Wetlands The underlying zoning should be identified as residential and the reference on the structure plan should change to 'indicative location' or similar as a dashed line or hatch over the residential zoning.	Support	Adare understands that the underlying zoning of the wetlands is Medium Density Residential and that the final location and size of the 'Proposed Stormwater Wetlands' is to be determined at the resource consent stage. Adare supports changes which make this clearer.	Allow the submission.
20.	Jones Land Ltd	13.13	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Childcare Facility in the Medium Density Residential Zone Delete the gross floor area restriction for childcare activities.	Support	1. Childcare facilities are a Restricted Discretionary Activity whether the gross floor area is greater or less than 250m ² . Deleting the maximum gross floor area standard is therefore appropriate. 2. A gross floor area of greater than 250m ² is likely to be appropriate on larger sites in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Allow the submission.
21.	Northview Capital Ltd PO Box 305002 Triton Plaza Auckland 0757 tristan@jonesgroup.co.nz Submission 14	14.4	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Chapter 6B - local Centre Zone (Ref: 6B-PREC1-P) The submitter opposes any unreasonable restrictions around the size and scale of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone located on 3019 Ohaupo Road.	Oppose in part	It is important to control the size and scale of Neighbourhood Centres so that they serve local day-to-day needs and avoid undermining the function, vitality, viability and amenity of the Local Centre and other Neighbourhood Centres (e.g. DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan, Business Centres, LCZ – PREC1-PSP: Issues and LCZ – PREC1-PSP:P6).	Disallow the submission unless there is clear evidence that the size and scale of Neighbourhood Centres needs to be increased to meet the day-to-day needs of the neighbourhood catchment area without undermining the function, vitality, viability and amenity of other centres.
22.	Northview Capital Ltd	14.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Rest Home and retirement village provisions Amend provisions relating to rest homes and retirement villages.	Support in part	Although the specific relief sought by the submitter is unclear, Adare supports enabling retirement villages and rest homes in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
23.	Graeme McMillan 7 Moiras Lane Fitzroy Hamilton 3206 graeme@momenta.nz Submission 16	16.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Building height near bat habitat and open space Review of high-density zones in specific areas where bat habitat is bordered by proposed high-density on more than one side. Indicated areas should be zoned medium density.	Oppose	Building setback and lighting standards will manage actual and potential adverse effects at the interface between the High Density Overlay Area and BHAs.	Disallow the submission.
24.	Graeme McMillan	16.4	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare Impact of high density of lighting Add high density to 25.6.4.4. Add consideration of high density buildings on bat glare and what the appropriate controls and measures are.	Oppose in part	The High Density Overlay Area forms part of the Medium Density Residential Zone so it is already subject to Rule 25.6.4.4.	Disallow the submission.
25.	Go Eco 188 Commerce Street Frankton Hamilton 3204 manager@goeco.org.nz Submission 20 Harvey Aughton - Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre) 188 Commerce Street Frankton Hamilton 3204	20.1 58.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans 3.4.1.3b Amend by replacing with specific legal policy.	Oppose	1. The relief sought is unclear. 2. The existing policy and rules provide sufficient protection to gullies and natural areas from earthworks and should be retained, other than as sought to be amended by Adare's primary submission.	Disallow the submission

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
	harvey@goeco.org.nz Submission 58					
26.	Go Eco Harvey Aughton - Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	20.2 58.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P27 Amend policy wording to creating a net increase of significant vegetation or 100% maintained.	Oppose	1. The relief sought is unclear. 2. The existing wording of DEV01-PSP: P27 is appropriate and should be retained.	Disallow the submission
27.	Go Eco Harvey Aughton - Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	20.3 58.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P31 Replace policy with "actively restore gullies and river margins as they represent the vital eco-tone for numerous native species."	Oppose	The existing wording of DEV01-PSP: P31 is appropriate and should be retained.	Disallow the submission
28.	Go Eco Harvey Aughton - Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	20.7 58.7	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Transportation network Specific relief sought not stated.	Oppose	1. The relief sought is unclear. 2. The issues raised are matters of detail appropriately addressed in the rules. It is unnecessary to provide specific policy guidance on those matters as the PC5 policy framework already establishes an appropriate rationale for the rules in PC5.	Disallow the submission
29.	Go Eco Harvey Aughton - Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	20.9 58.9	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space Network Amend broad statements to align with Department of Conservation's new tree felling protocol.	Oppose in part	While Adare supports directing plan users to the Department of Conservation's Tree Felling Protocol in appropriate places, the relief sought is unclear and it is not appropriate to include the detail of the Tree Felling Protocol in the structure plan.	Disallow the submission
30.	Go Eco Harvey Aughton - Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	20.10 58.10	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (b) and (c) Amend DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (c) to follow the new Department of Conservation Tree Felling protocol.	Oppose in part	While Adare supports directing plan users to the Department of Conservation's Tree Felling Protocol in appropriate places, the relief sought is unclear and it is not appropriate to include the detail of the Tree Felling Protocol in the structure plan's components.	Disallow the submission
31.	Go Eco Harvey Aughton - Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	20.11 58.11	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (c) · Bat Habitat Buffer Amend to include a limit on lux lighting and a limit on the number of light poles.	Oppose	1. The relief sought is unclear. 2. Provisions relating to lux limits are provided in the rules and additional standards related to the number of light poles are unnecessary. 3. It is not appropriate to include rules in DEV01-PSP: Components of The Peacocke Structure Plan.	Disallow the submission
32.	Go Eco Harvey Aughton - Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	20.16 58.16	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct NOSZ – PREC1- P: R36 Setbacks Amend to extend setbacks for known bat roost sites.	Oppose	1. Setbacks should relate to identified SNA and BHAs only. Imposing further setbacks as proposed would result in uncertainty. 2. Potential effects on individual bat roosts are more appropriately addressed by applying tree felling protocols and through assessment on individual resource consent applications. 3. The proposed relief is uncertain as it would prevent the plan being able to be read on its face.	Disallow the submission
33.	Woolworths New Zealand Ltd Campbell Brown Planning Limited PO Box 147001 Ponsonby	22.1	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone Local centre zone	Oppose	1. The most appropriate location for the Local Centre is east of Peacockes Road in the location shown on the notified Planning Maps.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
	Auckland philip@campbellbrown.co.nz Submission 22		That, subject to the amendments set out below, PC5 be confirmed. Amend the Peacocke Precinct Planning Maps to identify 410 Peacockes Road as Local Centre Zone, as illustrated in Figure 1 of the submission. Amend the Peacocke Precinct Planning Maps so that land within the Local Centre Zone (generally as shown in Figure 1 of the submission) is identified as Medium Density Residential Zone. Such other consequential amendments to the provisions of the District Plan as may be necessary to give effect to the relief sought in this submission.		2. The size of the Local Centre, as shown on the notified Planning Maps, is appropriate to provide for the required range of convenience, retail, employment and service activities, subject to the changes sought to the northern area of the centre in Adare's submission.	
34.	Andrea Graves 27 Hudson Steet Riverlea Hamilton 3216 andrea.graves@slingshot.co.nz Submission 30	30.1	General Bat Protection Alter the bat-relevant provisions to recognise the Court's Decision for Amberfield. The submitter seeks a revision and rewording of all the policies, objectives, vision and non-specific topics touched on in the submission in order to protect the environment. In some cases extra vision points, policies or objectives are needed.	Oppose	The detail of the relief sought is not clear. Adare considers that PC5 gives effect to the relevant parts of the Environment Court's decision, subject to Adare's original submission.	Disallow the submission
35.	Andrea Graves	30.2	General Bat Protection Include design standards to maximise bat 'hop over' habitats for any streets intruding or intersecting with bat buffer or corridor habitats (including shelterbelts).	Oppose in part	1. The principle of providing for bats to "hop over" streets is supported. 2. However, rather than setting design standards, this issue should be a matter considered in the context of a particular proposal and the connectivity appropriate for the particular habitat.	Disallow the submission
36.	Andrea Graves	30.3	General Bat Protection Include a minimum height and density of vegetation to be maintained in perpetuity. Include a requirement for lots to be deferred until the appropriate height and density has been maintained (1.8m height minimum, depending on the surrounding topography).	Oppose in part	Rather than blanket standards, requirements for buffer vegetation for lighting should be determined during the resource consenting process, taking into account the context of the particular site, proposal and habitat at issue.	Disallow the submission
37.	Andrea Graves	30.4	General Bat Protection Include clear direction that lighting from any building, street lighting, outdoor lighting or vehicle headlights must not exceed 0.1 lux within 3m of the edge of any high-value bat habitat. Amend the objectives and policies in Chapter 25 (25.6.2) to reflect the Environment Court observation that a 2,700 kelvin limit is appropriate for public roads. Include a requirement for quarterly inspections with developers contributing to a fund to fund inspections in perpetuity.	Oppose	1. Demonstrating compliance with a lux limit within 3m of the edge of significant habitat is a difficult task, requiring complex modelling. 2. The 0.3 lux limit at the boundary is easier to measure and enforce and is therefore a more efficient way to achieve the same environmental benefit. 3. Details regarding light limits are more appropriately included in rules, rather than objectives and policies. 4. It is more appropriate for details of maintenance and monitoring to be determined through the resource consenting process in the context of a particular proposal, rather than in a vacuum through the planning process.	Disallow the submission
38.	Andrea Graves	30.5	General Bat Protection Include requirement for screening of high-value bat habitats which take priority over views, line-of-sight safety considerations, amenity and recreational co-use. Rename the gullies and other high-value bat habitat areas 'bat priority areas'. Chapter 3 Structure Plans: Amend DEV01-PSP: COMPONENTS OF THE PEACOCKE STRUCTURE PLAN: Natural Environment and Open	Oppose	1. Adare considers that "Bat Habitat Area" is more appropriate terminology than Bat Priority Area. 2. Adare supports the NOSZ provisions as notified, subject to modifications in Adare submissions, because the assessment of environmental values is a qualitative and quantitative exercise more appropriately undertaken through environmental assessment at the time that a resource consent is sought.	Disallow the submission

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Space Network b) to include: <u>To give effect to (a) above in terms of protecting the long-tailed bat and its habitat, any conflict over use requirements will fall in favour of design choices that prioritise bats rather than recreational or transport provisions.</u> Amend DEV01-PSP: COMPONENTS OF THE PEACOCKE STRUCTURE PLAN: Natural Environment and Open Space Network c) Bat Habitat Buffer to include: <u>If there is any conflict of design choices between biodiversity values in SNAs or the buffers around them and recreational or pedestrian facilities, the choices will fall in favour of prioritising support and protection of biodiversity values.</u> Chapter 15 Open Space Zones: Amend NOSZ – PREC1- P: O4 as follows: Open spaces are used and developed in a way that <u>minimises avoids</u> adverse effects on the surrounding environment. Amend NOSZ – PREC1-P:P7 as follows: Public access, walkways and cycleways shall be maintained and enhanced within areas of open space, provided that adverse effects on the amenity, natural and heritage values of those areas are <u>minimised avoided</u> . Amend NOSZ – PREC1-P:P8 as follows: Open space shall be designed and developed to ensure a safe physical environment by: i. Providing clear sightlines that maximise visibility of public areas, <u>provided that natural values are not compromised acknowledging that in sensitive locations the requirement to prioritise biodiversity outweighs the desirability of clear sightlines.</u>			
39.	Andrea Graves	30.6	General Bat Protection Implement measures during the construction phase of urban development such as lot deferrals to ensure artificial light is not introduced adjacent to retained or re-created bat habitat until the vegetative buffers have grown sufficiently to meet the specified performance criteria.	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The detailed relief sought is unclear. 2. How development might be timed or staged to respond to effects on indigenous biodiversity is more appropriately determined as part of the resource consent process. 3. Mandating deferral of development may prevent other possible solutions being considered that may achieve the same or better environmental outcomes. 	Disallow the submission
40.	Andrea Graves	30.8	General Bat Protection Include requirements for developers to undertake bat monitoring pre and post-development.	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The detailed relief sought is unclear 2. Whether and what level of monitoring is undertaken should be determined and detailed as part of resource consent processes and be commensurate with the scale of development and its potential effects. 3. Adare supports the concept of centralised, coordinated and Council-funded monitoring to support understanding bat habitat on a landscape-wide scale. 	Disallow the submission
41.	Andrea Graves	30.9	General Bat Protection Include requirement for early planting of new bat foraging and commuting vegetation, well ahead of development phases affecting bat habitat.	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The detailed relief sought is unclear. 2. The timing of any planting (or other forms of mitigation, compensation or offsetting) should be determined and detailed as part of resource consent processes. 3. The purchase of the land and the creation of the Bat Habitat Areas by HCC would ensure a coordinated approach, allow greater control over the timing of their provision and be more equitable. 	Disallow the submission
42.	Andrea Graves	30.10	General Bat Protection The submitter supports the designation of extensive SNAs. Specific relief sought not stated.	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The detailed relief sought is unclear. 2. The SNAs under PC5 as notified are supported as making appropriate provision for long-tailed bat habitat, subject to the amendments sought in Adare's primary submission. 	Disallow the submission

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
43.	Andrea Graves	30.11	General Bat Protection Extend the protections in the Plan Change that apply to SNAs to low-to-moderate value habitat.	Oppose	1. The detailed relief sought is unclear. 2. Adare supports protecting identified SNAs with high value habitat. However, extending protection to low-to-moderate value habitat is inconsistent with the direction in section 6(c) of the RMA. Potential effects on lower value habitat is appropriately managed through other means, such as tree removal protocols.	Disallow the submission
44.	Andrea Graves	30.12	General Bat Protection Specific relief sought not stated. General relief seeks active non vehicular access paths to river and gully edges.	Oppose	The detailed relief sought is unclear.	Disallow the submission
45.	Andrea Graves	30.13	General Bat Protection Specific relief sought not stated. General relief seeks that lighting standards be prioritised in higher density areas.	Oppose	1. The detailed relief sought is unclear. 2. The provisions already provide for appropriate consideration and management of the effects of higher density development.	Disallow the submission
46.	Andrea Graves	30.14	General Bat Protection Include provision for a regenerated area of land around the stream's banks and amend DEV01-PSP:P70 as follows: Manage stormwater to protect and enhance the values and functions of the development on Mangakotukutuku stream values and functions, and regenerate the stream's health maintain the ability of the stream to continue to provide habitat for indigenous threatened aquatic species and to have the highest water quality minimise adverse effects on the stream water quality and habitat.	Oppose	1. Adare supports the concept of providing for improved stream health, 2. However, it considers the notified policy already achieves this outcome.	Allow submission subject to appropriate wording
47.	Andrea Graves	30.15	General Climate change provisions The submitter seeks a revision and rewording of all the policies, objectives, vision and non-specific topics touched on in the submission in order to protect the environment. In some cases extra vision points, policies or objectives are needed.	Oppose	The detailed relief sought is unclear. Adare supports a multi-modal transport network but considers that deliberate efforts to make travel by private car inconvenient will not achieve good transportation or urban form outcomes.	Disallow the submission
48.	Andrea Graves	30.16	General Climate change provisions Amend the Plan Change to include subdivision roading layouts with many short loop-roads and roads that are disjointed (but inconveniently accessible) for a vehicle, but fully connected by walking and cycling paths. Saved road space can be used for extra housing, green space, community gardens and parking and charging points for shared/to-hire electric vehicles.	Oppose	1. The detailed relief sought is unclear. 2. Adare supports a multi-modal transport network but considers that deliberate efforts to make travel by private car inconvenient will not achieve good transportation or urban form outcomes. 3. Subject to Adare's submission and further submission, the current transport provisions are appropriate.	Disallow the submission
49.	Andrea Graves	30.18	General Climate change provisions Amend DEV01-PSP: P43 as follows: Align collector and local street path networks to create strong physical and	Oppose	Subject to Adare's submission and further submission, DEV01-PSP: P47 and P48 are appropriate and should be retained.	Disallow the submission

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			visual connections between the gully network and the Waikato River.			
50.	Andrea Graves	30.19	General Climate change provisions Amend to include specific requirements. For example, mass planting on and around buildings and on any available green space to provide shade and cool the air, consider the high emissions profile of cement, the avoidance of impermeable surfaces that increase the urban heat island effect, the need to plan for the much heavier rainfall dumped by hotter air. There is a need for regenerated and riparian planting along all waterways and the available land to implement this.	Oppose	1. The detailed relief sought is unclear. 2. DEV01-PSP: P25 is appropriate as drafted and should be retained.	Disallow the submission
51.	Andrea Graves	30.20	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare 25.6 Lighting and Glare Alter the bat-relevant provisions to recognise the Court's Decision for Amberfield.	Oppose	Adare considers that PC5 gives effect to the relevant parts of the Environment Court's decision, subject to Adare's original submission.	Disallow the submission
52.	Waikato Regional Council Private Bag 3038 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton 3240 Matthew.Vare@waikatoregion.govt.nz Submission 36	36.1	General Built Environment WRC recommends that HCC considers whether the activity statuses and development standards of various dwelling types should be differentiated for the wider Medium Density Zone and its High Density Residential Overlay, paying particular attention to the suitability of single dwellings as a permitted activity in each. WRC would support amendments that work to improve the alignment of development in the Peacocke Structure Plan area with the density target provided in the Future Proof Strategy Consultation Draft. We expect for the effects and requirements of development in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area, alongside other growth in Hamilton and surrounds to be well-integrated and to acknowledge that Future Proof Three Waters programme work.	Oppose	1. The activity status for all residential activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone (including the High Density Overlay area) will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA. Clause (2)(1) in Part 1 of Schedule 3A sets out that construction or use of a building is a Permitted Activity if it complies with the density standards in the district plan. 2. The density targets in Policy DEV01-PSP:P14 for the Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Overlay Area are appropriate and should be retained.	Disallow the submission.
53.	Waikato Regional Council	36.9	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans New objective Add a new Objective to address the protection and enhancement of aquatic biodiversity values from an urbanising catchment, including cumulative adverse effects, and the ability to monitor against appropriate post development hydrological targets.	Support in part	The addition of an objective on this matter is appropriate.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
54.	Waikato Regional Council	36.11	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans DEV01-PSP: O13 Retain and add any identified wetlands as SNA.	Oppose in part	Retention of the policy is supported. However, Adare does not agree that all wetlands should be shown as SNA as: (a) This may be influenced by the NES:FW natural wetland definitions which are currently under review; and (b) The presence of an SNA should otherwise be determined as a matter of fact.	Allow the submission, but additional wetlands are not supported as SNA.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
55.	Waikato Regional Council	36.19	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans DEV01-PSP: P14 Seeks clarification as to how target densities of P14 have been determined, in the context of both the Proposed Yield Range of Appendix R and the net target density of the updated draft Future Proof Strategy.	Oppose	The density targets in Policy DEV01-PSP:P14 for the Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Overlay Area are appropriate and should be retained.	Disallow the submission.
56.	Waikato Regional Council	36.31	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans New policy to cover financial contributions to protect, restore and enhance biodiversity values and ecological network within Peacocke. Add a new policy that provides for financial contributions to deliver maintenance and enhancement (restoration) of the defined natural environment and open space network within Peacocke, to provide for appropriate biodiversity mitigation and offsetting, and to provide a precautionary approach to achieving catchment hydrology targets of the ICMP.	Support in part	Adare supports the principle of financial contributions being part of the consenting regime with funds being used to provide for coordinated activities such as bat monitoring and mitigation activities (including potential land acquisition by HCC for ecological reserves – e.g., Adare original submission 53.58) within the Peacocke Structure Plan area. It is, however, important to recognise that the bat's habitat and home range is located across the wider Hamilton City and surrounding environments and that financial contributions should not be imposed to address adverse effects caused within other parts of Hamilton City.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate policy wording.
57.	Waikato Regional Council	36.35	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1- PSP: R37 Amend the approach to require the retention of road runoff volume within the road corridor and not pass on the responsibility to compensate for this volume onto third party lot owners.	Oppose	1. The relief sought in the submission in terms of changes to MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R37 is unclear. 2. On-lot retention is appropriate.	Disallow the submission.
58.	Waikato Regional Council	36.47	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct SUB - PREC1-PSP: P19 Retain and amend term as follows: "ecological areas or infrastructure". For improved plan interpretation this policy should be moved alongside P4 and P5 as they provide a package of environmental based policy directions that give further direction to Objective O9.	Oppose	1. The change that the submitter requests to the policy inappropriately and unnecessarily conflates ecological and infrastructure matters. Infrastructure should continue to be addressed in separate policies. 2. Changes should be made to the policy in accordance with Adare's submission.	Disallow the submission.
59.	Waikato Regional Council	36.49	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct R8 Activity Status for Subdivision to accommodate a transport corridor in Peacocke Precinct Retain Restricted Discretionary Activity Status. Amend by adding as a matter of discretion: Ecology and Biodiversity Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 by increasing its scope to include any subdivision where it intersects with any part of the defined ecological network.	Oppose	1. It is unclear what the submitter is referring to by the phrase 'defined ecological network' . 2. The assessment criteria in P – Peacocke Structure Plan, which are relevant to resource consent applications under SUB-PREC1-PSP: R8, already require consideration of ecological effects.	Disallow the submission.
60.	Waikato Regional Council	36.50	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct R9 Activity Status for subdivision of allotment containing an Significant Natural Area. Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 by increasing its scope to include any subdivision where it intersects with any part of the defined ecological network.	Oppose in part	1. It is unclear what the submitter is referring to by the phrase 'defined ecological network' . 2. Adare agrees that the rule should apply to SNA and BHAs, if that is what is intended by the submitter.	Disallow the submission as currently stated.
61.	Waikato Regional Council	36.54	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal Objective 25.2.2.2 (2)	Oppose in part	It is unclear what the submitter is referring to by the phrase 'defined ecological network' .	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Amend Objective to include reference to ecological corridors and buffers and riparian vegetation and to known and potential bat roost trees.			
62.	Waikato Regional Council	36.59	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare Objective 25.6.2.2 Reword Objective as follows: <u>Identified bat habitat in Peacocke is protected from the adverse effects of lighting and glare.</u>	Support in part	The objective needs to be clearer as to the outcome sought, including what is meant by the phrase 'identified bat habitat'.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording
63.	Waikato Regional Council	36.66	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements Section 1.2.2.27 Bat Management Plan Amend to incorporate step-by-step decision support tool from DOC Bat Protocol (2021) into this provision.	Support	Agree that Protocol needs to be incorporated into provisions	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate policy wording
64.	Waikato Regional Council	36.70	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria 1.3.3 P1 Earthworks, P3(e) and (i) Development in Peacocke, P5(g) and (r) Subdivision "Retain parts P3 e) and j) and P5 parts g) and r) and amend Appendix 1.3 of the plan to enable appropriate ecological assessment of activities in the Peacocke Structure Plan area including the following: The extent to which the activity may cause: a) fragmentation and isolation of indigenous ecosystems and habitats b) reduction in the extent of indigenous ecosystems and habitats c) loss of corridors or connections linking indigenous ecosystems and habitat fragments or between ecosystems and habitats (ecological sequences from mountains to sea) d) loss or disruption to migratory pathways in water, land or air e) effects of changes to hydrological flows, water levels, and water quality on ecosystems f) loss of buffering of indigenous ecosystems g) loss of ecosystem services h) Loss, damage or disruption to ecological processes, functions and ecological integrity i) Changes resulting in an increased threat from animal and plant pests j) effects which contribute to a cumulative loss or degradation of indigenous habitats and ecosystems k) noise, visual and physical disturbance on indigenous species."	Oppose in part	To the extent that any changes are made to ecological assessment criteria in Appendix 1.3.3, the criteria should be specific to the Peacocke Precinct rather than replicating Method 11.1.2 in the WRPS verbatim.	Disallow the submission.
65.	Waikato Regional Council	36.75	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans Transport Network figure on page 2-5 Additional stops need to be included on the Arterial network as follows: 1. One pair of additional stops at the point at which the new Major Arterial severs Weston Lea Drive. 2. Two pairs of additional stops on the North-South Minor Arterial south of Peacocke Local Centre. 3. One pair of additional stops on the North-South Minor Arterial north of Peacocke Local Centre.	Oppose in part	1. The area north of the Local Centre on Peacockes Road will be well serviced by the Public Transport Hub and Public Transport Stop, as shown on the Peacocke Structure Plan. There is no need for any additional bus stops north of the Local Centre. 2. It would be appropriate to identify an additional Public Transport Stop on the Peacocke Structure Plan on Peacockes Road midway between the Public Transport Hub and the Public Transport Stop near Stubbs Road.	1. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks an additional bus stop on Peacockes Road north of the Local Centre. 2. Allow the submission to the extent that an additional Public Transport Stop should be shown on the Peacocke Structure Plan on Peacockes Road south of the Local Centre.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
					3. Adare is neutral regarding the requested additional Public Transport Stop where the Major Arterial Road severs Weston Lea Drive.	
66.	Waikato Regional Council	36.76	Appendix 9 – Natural Environments Add additional Significant Natural Areas in Peacocke: SNA 60 Hall Road, SNA 61 Mangakotukutuku gully, SNA 62 Waikato River Esplanade. Retain extent of SNA as mapped and add any wetlands identified on the Peacocke Features Map and on Maps in 17A.	Oppose	Adare does not agree that all wetlands should be shown as SNA as: (a) This may be influenced by the NES:FW natural wetland definitions which are currently under review; and (b) The presence of an SNA should otherwise be determined as a matter of fact.	Disallow the submission.
67.	Director General of Conservation Shared Service Centre Hamilton Level 3, 73 Rostrevor Street, Hamilton 3204 jgooding@doc.govt.nz Submission 38	38.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans Terminology relating to bat habitat. Amend the Structure Plan to refer to significant bat habitat such as ecological corridors for the movement of bats, Significant Natural Areas (SNAs), development setbacks to buffer ecological corridors along with roost trees and their respective buffers or development setbacks to 'Bat Priority Areas'. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.	Oppose	1. BHAs should be restricted to ecological corridors and SNAs containing significant bat habitat, not individual roost trees, which can be addressed by way of consenting processes. 2. Subject to its submissions seeking consistent use of terminology, Adare supports the reference to "Bat Habitat Areas" as per the notified PC5, not Bat Priority Areas. Bat Habitat Areas (BHA) is a more accurate description of what has been identified and mapped.	Disallow the submission.
68.	Director General of Conservation	38.2	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps Mapping Amend the Peacocke Precinct Land-use, Features and Zoning maps to include additional areas of bat habitat as 'Bat Priority Areas.' Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.	Oppose	1. BHAs should be restricted to ecological corridors and SNAs containing significant bat habitat, not individual roost trees or areas of low or moderate value habitat, which can be addressed by way of consenting processes. 2. The additional areas that the submission requests be mapped for protection of bat habitat are not identified in the submission so it is unclear what relief is being sought.	Disallow the submission.
69.	Director General of Conservation	38.3	General Bat habitat outside of identified habitat Amend Objectives, Policies and Rules so that development is designed to respond to longtailed bat activity across the Peacocke Structure Plan Area. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.	Oppose	1. The relief is too broadly expressed, such that it is unclear what amendments are sought. 2. Adare considers that PC5 satisfies the: (a) Sustainable management purpose of the RMA; (b) Protection of significant habitat of indigenous fauna required under s6(c); (c) NPS-UD; and (d) Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act.	Disallow the submission.
70.	Director General of Conservation	38.4	General Walking /Cycleways Include a directive that walking/cycleways are located and designed to avoid the removal of bat roosts and other habitat in the first instance. Where this is not possible protocols for minimising the risk of felling bat roosts must be adhered to. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.	Oppose in part	While the general principle of avoiding adverse effects on bat roosts within the identified BHAs is supported, walkways and cycleways will traverse the Peacocke NOSZ and other natural areas as part of these areas' multi-functional use. A directive as proposed by the submitter is not necessary.	Disallow the submission.
71.	Director General of Conservation	38.5	General Density of housing in proximity to Bat habitat Include consideration of, and provision for, the buffers and other measures that will be required to protect the Bat Priority Areas from housing intensification. Any other	Oppose in part	1. The detailed relief sought is unclear. 2. However, Adare agrees that regard must be given to the provisions responding to the NPS-UD and Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act, as well as bat protection measures.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.		3. PC5 already contains provisions that address interface issues between development and BHAs, including building setbacks and lighting controls.	
72.	Director General of Conservation	38.6	General Restoration and enhancement Provide clear guidance in the Structure Plan on biodiversity offsetting. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	Plan users would be assisted by the District Plan providing up to date and objective guidance on biodiversity offsetting.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
73.	Director General of Conservation	38.7	General Bat and Habitat and Enhancement Review Panel ('The Panel') Amend the Structure Plan to require the formation of a Bat and Habitat Enhancement Panel. The Panel would be similar in composition to that required by Condition 80 of the Amberfield subdivision resource consent, including representatives of the Department of Conservation. The Panel would be required to make recommendations on: (a) The initial preparation of Bat Protection Plans and subsequent reviews; (b) sub-plans for Construction Works within the Bat Priority Areas; (c) the review of monitoring and compliance reports. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose in part	1. Adare agrees that consistency in the management of development within and adjacent to BHAs is desirable. However, this is primarily a regulatory function of the Council. Adare would support the establishment of a Bat Management Committee, pursuant to the City's Indigenous Biodiversity Strategy. 2. In respect of the suggestion that any Panel or Committee should be "notified" of resource consent applications, the PC5 provisions concerning non-notification or notification are appropriate (subject to Adare's original submission). 3. Adare notes that Condition 80 of the Amberfield resource consent does not establish a panel with representatives of the Department of Conservation. Rather, the panel is comprised of qualified experts, nominated by parties and appointed by the Council.	Disallow the submission.
74.	Director General of Conservation	38.8	General Monitoring Add an Objective, Policy and guidance to ensure monitoring and reporting is required to assess the efficacy of measures to avoid, remedy and mitigate (or offset and compensate) the effects of development on significant indigenous biodiversity. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	1. The relief is too broadly expressed, such that it is unclear what amendments are sought. 2. Whether and what monitoring requirements may be imposed should be determined through resource consenting processes to ensure that requirements are commensurate with the scale of development and potential effects on BHAs. 3. There is, however, value in HCC collating information obtained from on-site monitoring to a centralised organisation (e.g., a Bat Management Committee (as per Adare's original submission)) for the purposes of establishing a management programme for the city-wide long-tailed Bat population. Adare supports the concept of centralised, coordinated and Council-funded monitoring to support understanding bat habitat on a landscape-wide scale (as sought in Adare's original submission).	Disallow the submission.
75.	Director General of Conservation	38.10	General Roads Consider relocation of roading sections that cross Bat Priority Areas and introduce Policies and Rules to avoid and minimise the effect of road lighting and light emission from vehicle headlights on Long-tailed bats and their habitat. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	1. It is not possible to relocate all roading sections so that they do not cross BHAs and simultaneously achieve the connectivity required in a modern urban environment for efficiency and safety of movement. 2. Subject to Adare's primary submission, the notified rules relating to lighting are appropriate and should be retained.	Disallow the submission.
76.	Director General of Conservation	38.12	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: 07	Oppose	The objective addresses the manner in which urban form responds to natural features, as opposed to establishing an environment threshold for urban development.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Change wording to: Urban development responds to <u>protects</u> the area's natural environment and ecological values <u>and responds to natural hazards</u> . Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.			
77.	Director General of Conservation	38.13	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O8 Change the wording to: Business Centres in the Peacocke Precinct are well designed to <u>avoid adverse effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat and integrate with surrounding neighbourhoods</u> , provide for multi-level apartment buildings and create distinctive places that are functional, safe, attractive and vibrant. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	This objective is about the design of the urban environment and achieving quality-built environment outcomes. Ecological matters are addressed in other sections of PC5 (including the Natural Environment section). It is not necessary nor appropriate to refer to ecological values in every objective and policy.	Disallow the submission.
78.	Director General of Conservation	38.14	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O11 Change wording to: Earthworks in the Peacocke Structure Plan are undertaken in a comprehensive and integrated manner, ensuring a high amenity urban environment that <u>protects ecological values such as actual and potential longtailed bat habitat and</u> is sympathetic to the areas topographical character. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The objective is about ensuring earthworks are undertaken in a comprehensive and integrated way. Ecological matters are addressed in other sections. It is not necessary nor appropriate to refer to ecological values in every objective and policy.	Disallow the submission.
79.	Director General of Conservation	38.15	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP:O13 Change the wording to: Protect and enhance identified significant <u>the</u> habitat of indigenous fauna and significant indigenous vegetation. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The approach proposed by the submitter is inconsistent with the Amberfield consent and the obligation to protect <u>significant</u> habitat of indigenous fauna, as opposed to all potential habitat. The directive to "protect and enhance" under the objective is appropriately applied to significant bat habitat (i.e., BHAs) in the notified objective.	Disallow the submission.
80.	Director General of Conservation	38.16	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Additional Objective Suggested wording: <u>Protect and enhance bat priority areas and avoid adverse effects on other areas of potential bat habitat.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The proposed new objective is repetitive of other objectives. It is not appropriate to require adverse effects on "other areas of potential bat habitat" to be avoided (e.g., pasture and other low to moderate value bat habitat).	Disallow the submission.
81.	Director General of Conservation	38.17	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O14 Change the wording to: Create and protect <u>identified Bat Priority Areas ecological and open space corridors</u> for the purpose of protecting and enhancing the habitat of long-tailed bats.	Oppose	The notified objective appropriately provides for ecological corridors throughout the Peacocke Structure Plan area.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.			
82.	Director General of Conservation	38.18	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O15 Change the wording to: Enable development adjacent to ecological areas <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> where it is designed to manage <u>avoid the adverse effects</u> of development on the function of these areas <u>in the first instance</u> . Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The policy seeks to manage effects on ecological areas which is much broader and will likely contain ecological values of less significance than within the BHA.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
83.	Director General of Conservation	38.19	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O16 Change the wording to: Establish a network of open space, and ecological corridors <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> that support ecological values such as, <u>protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat of the Peacocke Area</u> and provides passive recreation opportunities where they do not conflict with ecological values. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The objective is appropriate as drafted and reflects the need to support ecological values in open space areas, while providing for passive recreation opportunities where they do not conflict with ecological values.	Disallow the submission.
84.	Director General of Conservation	38.20	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Additional Objective Add Objective: The identified ecological and open space corridors <u>Bat Priority Areas provide a high level of connectivity within the Peacocke Structure Plan Area and to surrounding long-tailed bat habitat.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The objective conflates those areas that would qualify as BHA with areas that would not otherwise qualify as a BHA due to moderate or low habitat value.	Disallow the submission.
85.	Director General of Conservation	38.21	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P5 Change the wording to: Recreational activities are considered for co-location with: 1. Multifunctional stormwater management. 2. Walkways and cycleways. 3. Cultural and heritage sites. 4. Significant Natural Areas. <u>While avoiding actual or potential adverse effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The policy is about co-location of recreational activities and other areas. Ecological effects are addressed in other parts of PC5. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to refer to ecological matters or bat outcomes in every policy.	Disallow the submission.
86.	Director General of Conservation	38.22	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P6 Change the wording to: Promote appropriate and improved access to the Waikato River to better enable sporting, recreational, and cultural opportunities <u>while protecting long-tailed bats and their habitat.</u>	Oppose	The policy is about promoting access to the Waikato River. Ecological effects are addressed in other parts of PC5. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to refer to ecological matters or ecological outcomes for bats in every policy.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.			
87.	Director General of Conservation	38.23	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P13 Change the wording to: Higher density development in the Peacocke Structure Plan: 1. Shall be established within a walkable distance of the Peacocke Local Centre, neighbourhood centres, identified public transport routes, adjacent to schools, parks and community facilities. May be provided along areas of natural open space including the river corridor and gully network. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	PC5 contains other policies that manage the relationship between density and the natural open space including the river corridor and gully network (e.g., DEV01-PSP: P36).	Disallow the submission.
88.	Director General of Conservation	38.25	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P27 Change the wording to: The loss of significant vegetation is minimised avoided in the first instance. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	It is more appropriate to minimise the loss of vegetation within SNAs and BHA. For example, to the extent that roads and infrastructure might be required to be located in proximity to those areas and subject to protocols (e.g., tree felling protocols provided for under the <i>Weston Lea</i> Environment Court decision).	Disallow the submission.
89.	Director General of Conservation	38.26	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P30 Change the wording to: Protect the physical integrity and ecological and stormwater function of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River margins, <u>including protection for long-tailed bats and their habitat.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	This policy concerns physical integrity and ecological and stormwater function of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River margins. The proposed relief is unnecessary as it duplicates other parts of the Proposed Plan directed at protection and management of long-tailed bats (e.g., DEV01-PSP: P35).	Disallow the submission.
90.	Director General of Conservation	38.27	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P31 Change the wording to: Provide for revegetated gullies and river margins <u>to enable protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The policy addresses revegetation in gullies and river margins. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to refer to ecological matters or bat outcomes in every policy, as this undermines the principal intent of the policy in question.	Disallow the submission.
91.	Director General of Conservation	38.32	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Additional Policy to address monitoring of long-tailed bats Add a policy directing that monitoring of the PSPA long-tailed bat population must occur before and after development. Amendments to the 'Information requirements' Appendix will be required to make this policy effective. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	1. Whether and what monitoring is undertaken is more appropriately determined through the resource consenting process and any monitoring obligations need to be commensurate with / proportional to the size of the development and its potential effects. 2. There is, however, value in HCC collating information obtained from on-site monitoring to a centralised organisation (e.g., a Bat Management Committee (as per Adare's original submission)) for the purposes of establishing a management programme for the city-wide long-tailed bat population. Adare supports the concept of centralised, coordinated and Council-funded monitoring to support understanding bat	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
					habitat on a landscape-wide scale (as sought in Adare's original submission).	
92.	Director General of Conservation	38.33	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Additional Policy to address connectivity of bat habitat Add policy: <u>The transport network, including the Southern Links Road is designed to promote the physical and functional connectivity of long-tailed bat habitat.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	A policy about the transport network and connectivity of significant long-tailed bat habitat is supported in general, subject to refinement of the drafting.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
93.	Director General of Conservation	38.37	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Lighting controls Change the wording to: Controls over lighting to protect the functional attributes of the habitats in relation to surrounding land use change from rural to urban. These controls relate to <u>avoidance of artificial light spill from buildings and roads, including maximum lux levels and colour temperatures, and buffer planting for light screening managing the impact lighting may have on the ability for the so that Bat Habitat Areas Bat Priority Areas</u> to remain dark spaces allowing bats to continue to use these areas as Peacocke urbanises. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	This concerns the PSPA explanation at the commencement of the structure plan. The explanation adequately sets out the intention of lighting controls under the structure plan. It is inappropriate to pre-suppose the outcomes sought under more express provisions of the structure plan under the explanation.	Disallow the submission.
94.	Director General of Conservation	38.38	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Additional components of Long-tailed bat habitat not discussed. Change the wording to: Include discussion of the importance of actual and potential roost trees i.e., all trees greater than 15 cm diameter at breast height, the need for a prohibition on domestic cats, and of predator control. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The proposed additional drafting is unnecessary in DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan and the proposed drafting does not reflect the contents of the provisions for the Peacocke Structure Plan and Precinct.	Disallow the submission.
95.	Director General of Conservation	38.40	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Local Business Centre Include discussion on how the local centre will be developed in a way that recognises this and ensures protection for the habitat of long-tailed bats. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adare agrees that urban development in Peacocke should be designed to respond to the significant habitat of long-tailed bats. The scheme of PC5 is that objectives and policies are provided in Chapter 3A that provide guidance on how development should respond to significant habitat values. That guidance is then reflected in rules throughout PC5. 2. Given that the interface between urban development and significant habitat values is already addressed, it would be inefficient to address the interface again in the way sought by the submitter. 	Disallow the submission.
96.	Director General of Conservation	38.42	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ-PREC1-PSP Rules Add Rules: To address the removal of actual and potential roost trees, prohibition of external lights within the 5-metre building setback, and no rule on the keeping of domestic cats.	Oppose	The existing rules under PC5 are appropriate (subject to Adare's submission). It is not clear what rules are sought or what they might be intended to achieve. The submitter has not sought any specific draft relief.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.			
97.	Director General of Conservation	38.43	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Additional Objective Add Objective: <u>Residential development is designed and located to protect and enhance long-tailed bats and their habitat.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adare agrees that urban development in Peacocke must be designed to respond to the significant habitat of long-tailed bats. The scheme of PC5 is that objectives and policies are provided in Chapter 3A that provide guidance on how development should respond to significant habitat values. That guidance is then reflected in rules throughout PC5. 2. Given the interface between urban development and significant habitat values is already addressed, it would be inefficient to address the interface again in the way sought by the submitter. 	Disallow the submission.
98.	Director General of Conservation	38.44	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ-PREC1-PSP:P13 Change the wording to: <u>The removal of Significant vegetation and trees including actual and potential bat roosting trees is avoided in the first instance.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	While Adare supports appropriate management of actual or potential roost trees, it is not appropriate that an avoidance policy is applied throughout the entire Medium Density Residential zone.	Disallow the submission.
99.	Director General of Conservation	38.46	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct SUB – PREC1-PSP: RULES – Activity Status Add Rules: To address the removal of actual and potential roost trees, prohibition of external lights within the 5-metre building setback, and no rule on the keeping of domestic cats. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing rules under PC5 are appropriate (subject to Adare's submission). 2. It is not clear what rules are sought or what they might be intended to achieve. The submitter has not sought any specific draft relief. 	Disallow the submission.
100.	Director General of Conservation	38.48	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18 Change the wording to: Identify and manage areas of Natural Open Space in the Peacocke Structure Plan to: 1) Ensure the <u>protection and enhancement and access to, of</u> identified habitat of long-tailed bats; 2) Provide habitat and connections for long tailed bats; 3) <u>Avoid the adverse</u> effects of development on the habitat of long-tailed bats; <u>By:</u> <u>a) avoiding the adverse effects of lighting and noise within the Bat Priority Areas;</u> <u>b) protecting bats from predation;</u> <u>c) banning ownership of cats and mustelids within the Peacocke Structure Plan Area;</u> <u>d) protecting roosting sites within the Bat Priority Areas; and</u> <u>e) avoiding injury and/or mortality of roosting long-tailed bats during any tree removal.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The policy is appropriate as notified and should be retained.	Disallow the submission.
101.	Director General of Conservation	38.50	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Issues	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The management of the interface between urban development and the BHA is an important matter for 	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Change the wording: To include discussion of how neighbourhood centres will be designed and located to avoid and minimise their impact on long-tailed bats. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.		objectives and policies in PC5 to address. However, this is already achieved through provision for the long-tailed bat under the Peacocke Structure Pan provisions that apply to the entire Peacocke Precinct (e.g., DEV01-PSP: O13). 2. The submitter has not sought any specific draft relief.	
102.	Director General of Conservation	38.51	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NZC – PREC1-PSP: Objectives Add an objective: Addressing the compatibility of neighbourhood centres with long-tailed bats and their habitat. Such an objective should provide for the protection, enhancement and restoration of bats and their habitat to give effect to the WRPS and be in accordance with Section 6(c) of the RMA. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	1. The management of the interface between urban development and the BHA is an important matter for objectives and policies in PC5 to address. However, this is already achieved through provision for the long-tailed bat under the Peacocke Structure Pan provisions that apply to the entire Peacocke Precinct (e.g., DEV01-PSP: O13). 2. The submitter has not sought any specific draft relief.	Disallow the submission.
103.	Director General of Conservation	38.52	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NZC – PREC1-PSP: Policy Add a policy: Addressing the compatibility of neighbourhood centres with long-tailed bats and their habitat. Such an objective should require that the design and location of Local Neighbourhood Centres provides for the protection, enhancement and restoration of bats and their habitat to give effect to the WRPS and be in accordance with Section 6(c) of the RMA. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	1. The management of the interface between urban development and the BHA is an important matter for objectives and policies in PC5 to address. However, this is already achieved through provision for the long-tailed bat under the Peacocke Structure Pan provisions that apply to the entire Peacocke Precinct (e.g., DEV01-PSP: P23). 2. The submitter has not sought any specific draft relief.	Disallow the submission.
104.	Director General of Conservation	38.53	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: ISSUES Change the wording: To include discussion of how the Local Centre will be designed and located to avoid and minimise its impact on long-tailed bats. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	1. The management of the interface between urban development and the BHA is an important matter for objectives and policies in PC5 to address. However, this is already achieved through provision for the long-tailed bat under the Peacocke Structure Pan provisions that apply to the entire Peacocke Precinct (e.g., DEV01-PSP: O13). 2. The submitter has not sought any specific draft relief.	Disallow the submission
105.	Director General of Conservation	38.54	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: OBJECTIVES Add an objective: Addressing the compatibility of neighbourhood centres with long-tailed bats and their habitat. Such an objective should provide for the protection, enhancement and restoration of bats and their habitat to give effect to the WRPS and be in accordance with Section 6(c) of the RMA. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	1. The management of the interface between urban development and the BHA is an important matter for objectives and policies in PC5 to address. However, this is already achieved through provision for the long-tailed bat under the Peacocke Structure Pan provisions that apply to the entire Peacocke Precinct (e.g., DEV01-PSP: O13). 2. The submitter has not sought any specific draft relief.	Disallow the submission
106.	Director General of Conservation	38.55	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: POLICES	Oppose	1. The management of the interface between urban development and the BHA is an important matter for objectives and policies in PC5 to address. However, this is already achieved through provision for the long-	Disallow the submission

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Add a policy: Addressing the compatibility of neighbourhood centres with long-tailed bats and their habitat. Such an objective should require that the design and location of the Local Centre provides for the protection, enhancement and restoration of bats and their habitat to give effect to the WRPS and be in accordance with Section 6(c) of the RMA. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.		tailed bat under the Peacocke Structure Plan provisions that apply to the entire Peacocke Precinct (e.g., DEV01-PSP: P23). 2. The submitter has not sought any specific draft relief.	
107.	Director General of Conservation	38.56	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct SUB-PREC1-PSP: O8 Change the wording to: Subdivision creates a transport network that: 1. Is well connected and legible. 2. Delivers a high-quality walking and cycling experience. 3. Manages the amenity effects associated with parking. 4. Defines areas of public open space. 5. Creates a safe, low speed environment 6. Provides for a high-quality public transport network. <u>7. Protects and enhances the physical and functional connectivity of bat habitat.</u>	Support in part	1. Adare supports functional connectivity of bat habitat as a consideration in roading and transport design. 2. More appropriate wording would require transport network design to take into account connectivity of BHA.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
108.	Director General of Conservation	38.60	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct SUB – PREC1-PSP: RULES Add Rules: To address the removal of actual and potential roost trees, prohibition of external lights within the 5-metre building setback, and no rule on the keeping of domestic cats. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	1. The existing rules under PC5 are appropriate (subject to Adare's submission). 2. It is not clear what rules are sought or what they might be intended to achieve. The submitter has not sought any specific draft relief.	Disallow the submission.
109.	Director General of Conservation	38.61	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal 25.2.2.1a Change the rule wording by adding: <u>viii. Adopts a precautionary approach towards decisions that may result in significant adverse effects on Indigenous biodiversity and, in particular, those effects that threaten serious or irreversible damage to indigenous biodiversity.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	Adare supports consideration being given to the potential significant adverse effects of earthworks on indigenous biodiversity.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
110.	Director General of Conservation	38.62	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare Objective 25.6.2.2 Amend as follows: Lighting in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area is managed to ensure areas identified as Significant Bat Habitat <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> retain their usability and functionality for bat activity. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The objective should refer to "Bat Habitat Area" (as sought in Adare's submission) as that is a clear and appropriate term to use throughout PC5.	Disallow the submission.
111.	Director General of Conservation	38.63	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare Policy 25.6.2.2a Amend as follows: Manage light spill and glare of fixed lighting at the	Oppose	The objective should refer to "Bat Habitat Area" (as sought in Adare's submission) as that is a clear and appropriate term to use throughout PC5.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			boundary of the Significant Bat Habitat <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> to ensure that the useability of long-tailed bat habitat is maintained. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.			
112.	Director General of Conservation	38.64	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare Policy 25.6.2.2b Amend policy to replace the phrase "the Significant Bat Habitat" with the phrase "Bat Priority Areas". Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose	The objective should refer to "Bat Habitat Area" (as sought in Adare's submission) as that is a clear and appropriate term to use throughout PC5.	Disallow the submission.
113.	Director General of Conservation	38.65	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare Additional standards Add standards requiring that sections of road adjacent to Bat Priority Areas avoid adverse effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat by requiring maximum artificial light spill from street lighting, maximum colour temperature for lights of 2700 K, planting to provide 'hop-overs', and screening planting along the sides of roads to reduce the adverse impact of headlight spill-over into long-tailed bat habitat. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.	Oppose in part	1. The detailed relief sought is unclear. 2. The existing rules under PC5 are appropriate (subject to Adare's original submission).	Disallow the submission.
114.	Director General of Conservation	38.66	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare 25.6.4.4 Peacocke Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct Ensure consistency between the Amberfield subdivision lighting requirements and the Peacockes precinct. Amend the lighting standard to apply to the entire Peacocke precinct, not just areas zoned for medium density development. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	The lighting standards in PC5 are appropriate, except that Adare agrees that the standards in Rule 25.6.4.4 should apply to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone, as well as the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
115.	Director General of Conservation	38.67	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements 1.2.1(h)(iii) Change the wording to: The AEE should identify how any adverse environmental effects are to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated, <u>or otherwise offset and compensated for</u> and shall also ensure that the following matters are addressed. • <u>Ecological effects of the proposal including effects on critically endangered fauna such as longtailed bats.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	Adare supports the concept of providing guidance on ecological offsetting and compensation, subject to the detailed drafting.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
116.	Director General of Conservation	38.68	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements 1.2.2.2 Make amendments 1.2.2.2 to clarify: That management plans should be developed prior to a resource consent being granted by a suitably qualified person. Management plans should outline measures to avoid, remedy, mitigate,	Support in part	Adare supports the concept of providing guidance on the development of management plans, subject to the detailed drafting.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			offset or compensate for lost values. Management Plans should be reviewed by Council or an independent overarching body to ensure consistency across the PSPA. 1.2.2.2 should also offer guidance on the the objectives and structure of management plans such as a description of the management methods to achieve the objective, financial costs, monitoring and reporting. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.			
117.	Director General of Conservation	38.69	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements 1.2.2.1(b) Change the wording to: Reports and management plans demonstrating how adverse environmental effects associated with the proposed activity are to be avoided, remedied, mitigated or otherwise offset and compensated for with respect to: <u>V. Ecological effects of the proposal including effects on critically endangered fauna such as long-tailed bats.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	Adare supports the concept of providing guidance on ecological offsetting and compensation, subject to the detailed drafting.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
118.	Director General of Conservation	38.70	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements 1.2.2.1 Note Add a note: • <u>any offset or compensation package must account for the time delay in the creation of bat habitat. Creation of habitat should commence well in advance of any clearance works.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	Adare supports the concept of providing guidance on ecological offsetting and compensation, subject to the detailed drafting.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
119.	Director General of Conservation	38.72	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements 1.2.2.27 Make amendments to the BMP to provide clear objectives for management of longtailed bats across the PSPA, these should aim: a) To protect bat habitat and roosts by avoiding adverse effects on the function of their habitat, in terms of commuting, foraging and socialisation. b) To enhance the values and attributes of bat habitat; To achieve the objectives the following amendments are suggested: i. Vegetation removal protocols for trees with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 15cm or greater should be employed for trees located within and outside of the identified bat habitat area. ii. A BMP being required for areas outside significant bat habitat that contain potential or identified bat habitat. iii. When a BMP is required, it is submitted to HCC with the relevant resource consent application. iv. A Bat and Habitat Enhancement Panel should be consulted on the draft BMP and comments incorporated or a justification provided to Council as to why they were not incorporated. v. The BMP would link to all other areas within the PSPA to create a consistent approach. vi. While the BMP focuses on mitigation it should also outline measures to avoid and remedy bat values and	Oppose	1. Adare supports the concept of providing clear guidance as to what may be included in a bat management plan. 2. However, appropriate management measures need to be determined in response to specific locations. This detail is most appropriately left to the detailed assessment undertaken at the time a management plan is prepared for certification under resource consent conditions.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			<p>offset or compensate where this is not possible. Roost tree protection should also be included in the BMP for identified or potential roost trees.</p> <p>vii. The BMP should address residual adverse effects on bats to achieve a net biodiversity gain such as habitat enhancement and targeted predator control that achieves residual pest indices relevant to bat conservation. Notwithstanding the above recommended changes, the BMP should, as a minimum, include the same bat management protocols listed in the conditions of the Amberfield Resource Consent, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration with the planting plan which outlines the restoration and enhancement areas, management and maintenance. How vegetation design will minimise light intrusion to the acceptable standard • As per Amberfield resource consent, 0.1 lux 3 meters from the inside of the bat habitat boundary • Bat monitoring plan including before and after restoration, enhancement and pest control • Specifics for pest control, including target species and performance levels reflecting residual indices relevant to bat conservation and how it links to pest control in the wider PSPA area • Use of artificial bat roots • Use of barriers to prevent predators accessing known and potential roost trees. • Any research that may be able to be undertaken in conjunction with the development. This may be conducted by the applicant or another body. • Frequency of BMP review and update • Reporting requirements <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.</p>			
120.	Director General of Conservation	38.73	<p>Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria Assessment Criteria P3 (e)</p> <p>Change the wording to: P3 (e) The extent to which development is designed to respond to ecological corridors and habitat, and ensures they protect and maintain enhance the ecological function of these corridors; including the management of lighting and building location.</p>	Oppose	Lighting and building location should be designed to protect and maintain BHA and related ecological function.	Disallow the submission.
121.	Director General of Conservation	38.74	<p>Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria Assessment Criteria P3 (i)</p> <p>Change the wording to: P3 (i) The extent to which lighting has been designed and located to maintain protect and enhance the function and quality of longtailed bat habitat. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.</p>	Oppose	Lighting should be designed to protect and maintain BHA and related ecological function.	Disallow the submission.
122.	Director General of Conservation	38.75	<p>Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria Assessment Criteria P5 (p)</p> <p>The extent to which the proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restores, protects and enhances aquatic and terrestrial ecological values associated with springs, streams, waterways, wetlands and their margins in Peacocke. 2. Protects or and enhances the natural character and ecological, cultural, heritage and amenity values of 	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The assessment criteria should focus on maintaining and enhancing significant habitat of indigenous fauna, rather than protecting, enhancing and restoring populations of at-risk threatened or critically endangered flora and fauna (including the long-tailed bat). 2. Assessment criteria in P5 (q) and (r) specifically address BHAs. 	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Peacocke's open spaces. 3. <u>Protects, enhances and restores populations of at-risk, threatened or critically endangered flora and fauna in Peacocke.</u> 3. Provides sites for water related activities and public access to them and to and alongside waterways. 4. Recognises and provides for tangata whenua values and relationships with Peacocke and their aspirations for the area, including provision for cultural harvest, interpretation of the landscape's significance, protection, enhancement and commemoration of sites of significance, use of traditional tangata whenua names for sites, developments, street, neighbourhoods and sub-catchments and application of cultural protocols during the development process. 5. Reflects the characters and heritage. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.			
123.	Director General of Conservation	38.76	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria Assessment Criteria P5 (q) Change the wording to: P5 (q) The extent to which subdivision has been designed to manage <u>avoid the adverse</u> effects of development and subdivision on the role and function of Significant Bat Habitat <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> . Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	Adare supports the proposed amendments to the matter of discretion on BHAs: (a) provided that it does not prevent works that must take place within the BHA subject to appropriate protocols requiring minimisation of adverse effects; and (b) subject to refining the wording.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
124.	Director General of Conservation	38.77	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria Assessment Criteria P5 (r) Change the wording: The extent to which the proposal mitigates, <u>remedies, or otherwise offsets or compensates for</u> the effects of development on Significant Bat Habitat <u>through the provision and enhancement of ecological corridors</u> <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> . Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.	Support in part	Adare supports the proposed additional matter discretion on BHAs: (a) it anticipates a certain degree of effect within the BHA and the need for different approaches to mitigation; and (b) subject to refining the wording.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
125.	Cordyline Holdings Ltd Dentons Kensington Swan 18 Viaduct Harbour Avenue Auckland 1010 christina.sheard@dentons.com Submission 44	44.7	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps Seismic Setback Line Delete the Seismic Setback Line shown on the Features Maps for the Peacocke Precinct.	Support in part	1. Seismic investigations are a normal part of geotechnical assessments which accompany subdivision consent applications. The Seismic Setback Line (or Seismic Investigation Area) is therefore not strictly necessary, and it should be deleted. An assessment of natural hazard risk is already required under section 106 RMA for subdivision consent applications. 2. Adare sought in its submission that the Seismic Setback Line be renamed to Seismic Investigation Area to reflect that this is an area where specific geotechnical investigations are required. Adare supports this alternative relief if the overlay is retained.	1. Allow the submission. 2. Alternatively, if the submission is disallowed then rename the Seismic Setback Line to Seismic Investigation Area.
126.	Kainga Ora PO Box 74598, Greenlane Auckland 1546 developmentplanning@kaingaor a.govt.nz	55.1	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps High Density Overlay Delete the "High Density Overlay" and replace with a "High Density Zone" that would be controlled with the	Oppose	1. The High Density Area Overlay is a suitable tool because it reflects that there are matters of both commonality and distinctiveness between these areas and other parts of the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
	Submission 55		proposed provisions set out in Attachment 2 of Kāinga Ora submission.		<p>2. The 'Additional High Density Zone' in Attachment 3 of Kāinga Ora's submission is not suitable for high density residential development. It includes land that is within the NOSZ, BHAs and SNAs under the notified PC5 provisions, as well as other land which is steep.</p> <p>3. The density of development suggested in Attachment 2 of the submission, being predominantly 6 storeys, is too dense, is not in keeping with the character of Hamilton, is not commensurate with the planned level of commercial activities and community services and is likely to be commercially challenging.</p>	
127.	Kāinga Ora	55.2	<p>Appendix 17 – Planning Maps Local Centre</p> <p>Amend the size of the proposed Local Centre to reflect the recalculation of density targets, or change the type of centre for the Precinct.</p>	Oppose	<p>1. The density targets in Policy DEV01-PSP:P14 for the Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Overlay Area are appropriate and should be retained.</p> <p>2. The size of the Local Centre, as shown on the notified Planning Maps, is appropriate to provide for the required range of convenience, retail, employment and service activities, subject to the changes sought to the northern area of the centre in Adare's submission.</p>	Disallow the submission.
128.	Kāinga Ora	55.3	<p>Appendix 17 – Planning Maps New Layer - Earthworks overlay</p> <p>Amend and include a new "Earthworks Overlay" on the Structure Plan to indicate those areas of the Precinct where more sympathetic earthworks are required to respect the natural topography of the land.</p>	Oppose	<p>1. The introduction of an 'Earthworks Overlay' where more sympathetic earthworks are required would be unduly restrictive and inconsistent with enabling medium and high density outcomes within the areas that are subject to the overlay.</p> <p>2. It is unclear from the submission where the suggested 'Earthworks Overlay' would apply.</p>	Disallow the submission.
129.	Kāinga Ora	55.4	<p>Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Overview</p> <p>Amend as follows: The Peacocke area is a 740ha area of rural land... - Promote medium to high density development by enabling the development of a range of typologies, enabling supporting housing choice and a range of price points providing diversity in housing, catering for a range of occupants who require a range of housing sizes from one- and two-bedroom apartments to larger single dwellings. - Low density residential development is discouraged. - Create higher density walkable catchments, centred on public transport routes and activity nodes such as the local centre, neighbourhood centres and community facilities such as the sports park and schools. - Support the amenity of higher density living by enhancing connections with the proposed Open Space Zone in and around housing to borrow amenity from areas of high amenity such as the Waikato River and Mangakootukutuku gully network. - Encourage subdivision to occur concurrently with or following land development. - Require subdivision to create a connected, legible, and permeable transport network that enables access through the structure plan, particularly for active modes, allowing local trips to be undertaken without reliance on a private vehicle. Subdivision should be undertaken, (where topography allows) to maximise access to sunlight for allotments. - Promote active street frontages. The block pattern and lot</p>	Oppose	The density targets and urban form that is proposed in the notified provisions is appropriate and should be retained.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			<p>arrangement should create streets that are lined with buildings, with public frontages, directing back yards to be located to the rear of the site creating private outdoor living areas. that Ensuring road frontages are not dominated by carparking, garaging and vehicle access. - Development should be well designed and provide a high level of on-site amenity for residents, including maximising access to sunlight, and private living spaces and a high-quality outlook. - Developments use quality building materials, variation in architectural form and landscaping to contribute positively to the character of the area. Subdivision is designed to respond to - The gully network and areas of open space ensuring that where these are safe and accessible to the public and they are visible and safe</p>			
130.	Kainga Ora	55.5	<p>Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Vision</p> <p>Amend as follows: The vision for the Peacocke area Precinct is that it will become a high-quality <u>medium to high density</u> urban environment that is based on urban design best practice, social well-being, and environmental responsibility.....The Peacocke area Precinct is Hamilton's southern growth cell and is ideally located to provide house approximately 20,000[TBC] people homes with easy access to destinations such as the Central City and the University of Waikato..... These features of the Peacocke area Precinct means that it is important..... The Peacocke area Precinct will be developed in line with Hamilton's vision for a 20-minute city... This means establishing a local[TBC] centre, which will act as the central community hub, supported by a network of smaller neighbourhood centres, providing day to day convenience for residents..... The topography in Peacocke is typically undulating and earthworks will be required to achieve the densities envisaged in the area. It is important that these in identified locations of topographical / geological / cultural significance, earthworks are <u>minimised and development responds to the natural landform. earthworks are undertaken in a comprehensive manner that assists in providing a high amenity outcome. This means designing earthworks to minimise the use of retaining walls, and where these are necessary, minimising their height and locating these to be away from the road frontages. Large scale earthworks that enable development should be undertaken with a subdivision consent to ensure a well designed outcome. To guide development in the Peacocke Precinct, a Comprehensive Development Plan will need to be prepared with either a landuse or subdivision application to ensure that the vision for the Precinct is delivered. Information requirements will include concept plans for transport, infrastructure, the natural environment network, the open space network, landuse, landscape design, staging and integration, as well as a detailed development response (architecture and urban design) and an ecological rehabilitation and management plan. With respect to the [TBC] centre, a Master Plan is required and developers of the [TBC] Centre will take guidance from the non-statutory Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide.</u></p>	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The density targets and urban form that is proposed in the notified provisions is appropriate and should be retained. 2. The vision should not refer to areas of topographical significance where earthworks are to be minimised. 3. Reference to Comprehensive Development Plans (referred to as Concept Plans in the notified provisions) is not opposed but Kainga Ora's request that they must accompany land use consent applications, as well as subdivision consent applications, is opposed. All development will be preceded by subdivision of some kind. Subdivision consent applications are the most appropriate trigger for a Comprehensive Development Plan (or Concept Plan) to be required. 4. Reference to the phrase "Local Centre" should be retained because that is the language used under Table 13 of the Zone Framework Standard under the National Planning Standards. 5. Adare opposes the request for Design Guides to be non-statutory documents to enable them to be referenced in the district plan and updated without a Schedule 1 process: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) All planning documents must be included in the plan as a matter of law; (b) There would be considerable uncertainty as to the relevance of any non-statutory Design Guides to decision making for resource consents. (c) Natural justice and public participation require landowners and other stakeholders are afforded an opportunity to make a submission on any Design Guidelines under Schedule 1 of the Act. 	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
131.	Kainga Ora	55.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O1 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The objective is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
132.	Kainga Ora	55.7	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O2 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The objective is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
133.	Kainga Ora	55.8	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O3 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The objective is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
134.	Kainga Ora	55.9	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O4 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The objective is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
135.	Kainga Ora	55.10	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O5 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support in part	Support for deletion of this objective is subject to the relief sought in submission 55.17, which proposes a new objective for open space.	Allow the submission, subject to the relief sought in submission 55.17.
136.	Kainga Ora	55.11	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O6 Amend as follows: The Peacocke Structure Plan Precinct is developed to deliver required housing supply for Hamilton and creates a connected, well integrated, high amenity, medium to high density residential environment, with where areas of higher density development established is focused around commercial centres, schools, public transport corridors and areas of open space and natural amenity.	Support in part	The objective should be clear that medium and high density housing is to be delivered within the Peacocke Structure Plan area to provide housing supply for Hamilton.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
137.	Kainga Ora	55.13	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O8 Amend as follows: Business The Centres in the Peacocke Precinct are well designed, functional, safe, attractive and vibrant and provide for the commercial and community needs of the Peacocke residents, as well as high density living opportunities. integrate with surrounding neighbourhoods, provide for multi-level apartment buildings and create distinctive places that are functional, safe, attractive and vibrant.	Support	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the objective.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
138.	Kainga Ora	55.14	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O9	Support in part	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the objective. However, reference to the phrase "Local Centre" should be retained because that is the language used under Table 13 of the Zone Framework Standard under the National Planning Standards.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Amend as follows: The Peacocke Local [TBC] Centre is the primary business centre within the structure plan area and provides a range of commercial and community services, as well as high density living opportunities, to the local community			
139.	Kainga Ora	55.15	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: 10 Amend as follows: Neighbourhood centres provide small scale commercial and community services to the immediate community and are also located in close proximity to recreational areas to support and act as activity nodes for walkable catchments, providing access to smaller scale convenience activities.	Support	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the objective.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
140.	Kainga Ora	55.16	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O11 Amend as follows: Earthworks in the "Earthworks Overlay" are sympathetic to the topography of the natural landform. Peacocke Structure Plan are undertaken in a comprehensive and integrated manner, ensuring a high amenity urban environment that is sympathetic to the areas topographical character.	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction of an 'Earthworks Overlay' where more sympathetic earthworks are required would be unduly restrictive and inconsistent with enabling medium and high density outcomes within the areas that are subject to the overlay. 2. It is unclear from the submission where the suggested 'Earthworks Overlay' would apply. 3. As an alternative, to the extent that changes are more enabling of earthworks in the Peacocke Structure Plan area then this would be supported. 	Disallow the submission to the extent that an 'Earthworks Overlay' should not be introduced.
141.	Kainga Ora	55.17	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: New objective Include new objective: Sufficient, well connected, high quality open space is provided to enhance the amenity and wellbeing of the community.	Support	A new objective related to open space is appropriate if submission 55.10 is accepted (deletion of DEV01-PSP: O5).	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
142.	Kainga Ora	55.18	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O12 Amend as follows: Provide a well connected and safe public edge to the gully and Waikato River.	Support	It is important that the public edge to the gully and Waikato River is well connected and safe.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
143.	Kainga Ora	55.22	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O16 Amend as follows: Establish a well connected and safe network of open space, that supports the ecological values of the Peacocke Area and provides passive recreation opportunities where they do not conflict with ecological values.	Support	It is important that the public edge to the gully and Waikato River is well connected and safe.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
144.	Kainga Ora	55.23	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O17 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The objective is unnecessary because the matters it addresses are adequately and more appropriately covered in other parts of the district plan, such as the Transportation chapter.	Allow the submission.
145.	Kainga Ora	55.25	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O19	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Points 1-3 should be addressed in policies rather than in the objective. 2. Specifying that the mode shift sought by the objective is to walking, cycling and public transport improves the clarity of the objective. 	Allow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Amend as follows: The transport network reduces car dependency and encourages <u>a mode shift to walking, cycling and public transport</u> . by: Providing a well-connected transport network that prioritises walking and cycling. Designing the transport network to provide safe, direct and universally accessible routes for people walking and cycling throughout the structure plan area. Integrating with land use to support the provision of a frequent public transport service			
146.	Kainga Ora	55.29	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O23 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The objective is unnecessary because the matters it addresses are adequately and more appropriately covered in other parts of the district plan, such as the Infrastructure chapter.	Allow the submission.
147.	Kainga Ora	55.30	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: O24 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The objective is unnecessary because the matters it addresses are adequately and more appropriately covered in other parts of the district plan, such as the Infrastructure chapter.	Allow the submission.
148.	Kainga Ora	55.33	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P1 Amend as follows: Development should be in general accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan <u>and comprehensive development plans will be required to ensure development meets the vision of the Precinct.</u>	Support in part	Reference to Comprehensive Development Plans (referred to as Concept Plans in the notified provisions) is not opposed but Kainga Ora's request that they must accompany land use consent applications, as well as subdivision consent applications, is opposed. All development will be preceded by subdivision of some kind. Subdivision consent applications are the most appropriate trigger for a Comprehensive Development Plan (or Concept Plan) to be required.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
149.	Kainga Ora	55.34	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P2 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Oppose	The policy is important to link urban development outcomes with public transport, walking and cycling.	Disallow the submission.
150.	Kainga Ora	55.35	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P3 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary because the matter is addressed in DEV01-PSP: P15.	Allow the submission.
151.	Kainga Ora	55.36	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P4 Ensure that the Hamilton City Council Open Space Provision Policy is incorporated by reference.	Support	The policy should appropriately reference the relevant policy.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
152.	Kainga Ora	55.37	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P5 Amend as follows: Recreational activities, <u>including walkways and cycleways</u> , are considered for co-location with: 1. Multifunctional stormwater management. 2. Walkways and cycleways . Cultural and heritage sites. 3. Significant Natural Areas.	Support	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the policy.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
153.	Kainga Ora	55.38	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P6	Support	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the policy.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Amend as follows: Promote <u>Require accessible, well located and safe</u> appropriate and improved access to the Waikato River to better enable sporting, recreational, and cultural opportunities.			
154.	Kainga Ora	55.39	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P7 Amend as follows: Avoid <u>Ensure</u> new development is <u>connected to and promotes surveillance of</u> turning its back' or privatising edges to major natural features and recreational areas open spaces.	Support	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the policy.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
155.	Kainga Ora	55.40	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P8 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
156.	Kainga Ora	55.41	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P9 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
157.	Kainga Ora	55.42	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P10 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
158.	Kainga Ora	55.43	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P11 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
159.	Kainga Ora	55.45	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P13 Amend as follows: Higher density development in the Peacocke Structure Plan: will <u>shall</u> be established within a walkable distance of the Peacocke Local Centre, neighbourhood centres, identified public transport routes, adjacent to schools, parks and community facilities, and May be provided along adjoining areas of natural open space including the river corridor and gully network.	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only some areas adjoining natural open space are identified for high density residential development. 2. Some areas, such as those which are not topographically suited or which are away from main transport routes, are not suited to high density development. 	Disallow the submission.
160.	Kainga Ora	55.46	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P14 Delete the density standards in its entirety or amend as follows: Development of the Peacocke Structure Plan achieves: 1. A minimum overall net residential density (excludes roads and open space) of 22-30 <u>50</u> dwellings per hectare within the Peacocke Medium Density Precinct <u>Zone</u> . 2. A minimum overall net residential density (excludes roads and open space) of 35-50 <u>100</u> dwellings	Oppose	The density targets in Policy DEV01-PSP:P14 for the Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Overlay Area are appropriate and should be retained.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			per hectare within the Peacock High Density Overlay Zone.			
161.	Kainga Ora	55.47	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P15 Amend as follows: Avoid compromising the future delivery of high density residential activity around the local centre and identified public transport routes with low density development. Low density residential development is avoided in the Peacocke Structure Plan area.	Oppose	Although low density development should generally be avoided, there are some locations which are unlikely to be suited to medium or high density development, particularly due to topographical constraints. Low density development in those areas would be an efficient use of the land.	Disallow the submission.
162.	Kainga Ora	55.48	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P16 Amend as follows: Require a variety of <u>medium and high density</u> housing typologies and densities to be provided throughout the structure plan area.	Oppose	Although low density development should generally be avoided, there are some locations which are unlikely to be suited to medium or high density development, particularly due to topographical constraints. Low density development in those areas would be an efficient use of the land.	Disallow the submission.
163.	Kainga Ora	55.49	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P17 Amend as follows: The Local [TBC] Centre and Neighbourhood Centres are developed in locations consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Oppose	The size of the Local Centre, as shown on the notified Planning Maps, is appropriate to provide for the required range of convenience, retail, employment and service activities, subject to the changes sought to the northern area of the centre in Adare's submission.	Disallow the submission.
164.	Kainga Ora	55.50	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P18 Amend as follows: The Local [TBC] Centre is to be developed to include a variety of community and commercial activities that establish a high quality, pedestrian focused centre.	Oppose	The size of the Local Centre, as shown on the notified Planning Maps, is appropriate to provide for the required range of convenience, retail, employment and service activities, subject to the changes sought to the northern area of the centre in Adare's submission.	Disallow the submission.
165.	Kainga Ora	55.51	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P19 Amend as follows: Incorporate infrastructure to support public transport services in the Local [TBC] Centre.	Oppose	The size of the Local Centre, as shown on the notified Planning Maps, is appropriate to provide for the required range of convenience, retail, employment and service activities, subject to the changes sought to the northern area of the centre in Adare's submission.	Disallow the submission.
166.	Kainga Ora	55.53	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P21 Amend as follows: Activities within the neighbourhood centres are of a scale and size that supports the neighbourhood catchment and do not undermine the role and function of the Peacocke Local [TBC] Centre.	Oppose	The size of the Local Centre, as shown on the notified Planning Maps, is appropriate to provide for the required range of convenience, retail, employment and service activities, subject to the changes sought to the northern area of the centre in Adare's submission.	Disallow the submission.
167.	Kainga Ora	55.54	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P22 Delete this provision.	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
168.	Kainga Ora	55.55	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P23 Amend as follows: Near identified ecological corridors, ensure the design and location of buildings, infrastructure	Support	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the policy.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			and lighting is managed throughout the Peacocke Structure Plan in order to maintain their role and function.			
169.	Kainga Ora	55.56	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P24 Amend as follows: Enable the development of a medium and high density environment in the Peacocke Structure Plan, while managing earthworks to ensure the within the "Earthworks Overlay" and promote development that responds to the landform. development of a high amenity environment by: Managing the use, size, location and style of retaining walls in the area. Requiring earthworks to be carried out in conjunction with subdivision to ensure comprehensive, cohesive outcomes are achieved. Requiring earthworks to be carried out in a way that is sympathetic to the character of the area.	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction of an 'Earthworks Overlay' where more sympathetic earthworks are required would be unduly restrictive and inconsistent with enabling medium and high density outcomes within the areas that are subject to the overlay. 2. It is unclear from the submission where the suggested 'Earthworks Overlay' would apply. 3. As an alternative, to the extent that changes are more enabling of earthworks in the Peacocke Structure Plan area then this would be supported. 	Disallow the submission to the extent that an 'Earthworks Overlay' should not be introduced.
170.	Kainga Ora	55.59	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P27 Amend as follows: The loss of significant vegetation within the Significant Natural Area and the Significant Bat Habitat Area is minimised avoided.	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adare supports the proposal to refer to vegetation in SNAs and BHAs rather than significant vegetation generally, as SNAs and BHAs are clearly defined. 2. However, it is more appropriate to minimise the loss of vegetation within SNAs and BHA, rather than avoid it. For example, to the extent that roads and infrastructure might be required to be located in proximity to those areas, subject to protocols (e.g., tree felling protocols provided for under the <i>Weston Lea</i> Environment Court decision). A further example might include the removal of invasive plant species for conservation purposes. 	Allow the submission insofar as it specifies vegetation within SNA and BHA and subject to retention of "minimising" the loss of vegetation.
171.	Kainga Ora	55.61	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P29 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
172.	Kainga Ora	55.63	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P31 Amend as follows: Provide for the revegetation of gullies and river margins.	Support	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the policy.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
173.	Kainga Ora	55.64	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P32 Amend as follows: Provide a well connected, accessible and safe green corridor along the Waikato River that provides recreational, pedestrian and cycling opportunities facilities and amenity.	Support	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the policy.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
174.	Kainga Ora	55.65	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P33 Delete this policy.	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
175.	Kainga Ora	55.66	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P34 Delete this policy.	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
176.	Kainga Ora	55.70	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P38 Relocate this policy to the Urban Environment policy section.	Support	The policy relates to the Urban Environment.	Allow the submission.
177.	Kainga Ora	55.73	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P41 Amend as follows: Encourage urban form that reduces dependency on the car by focusing on intensification and encouraging <u>prioritising</u> walking, cycling and the use of passenger transport.	Support	It is appropriate for urban form to ensure that walking, cycling and passenger transport is prioritised rather than just encouraged.	Allow the submission.
178.	Kainga Ora	55.77	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P45 Amend as follows: Development is designed to create neighbourhoods that are <u>universally accessible</u> , walkable, safe and linked by a high quality pedestrian and cycling network that incorporates the principles of CPTED.	Support in part	Adare understands that the purpose of the requested change is to ensure that neighbourhoods are accessible by all people of all abilities. Adare supports that outcome but is concerned that the term 'universally accessible' is not commonly used or understood. A consequential change may be required to include a definition for 'universally accessible' in the district plan.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
179.	Kainga Ora	55.88	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P56 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary because the matters it addresses are adequately and more appropriately covered in other parts of the district plan, such as the Infrastructure chapter.	Allow the submission.
180.	Kainga Ora	55.89	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P57 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary because the matters it addresses are adequately and more appropriately covered in other parts of the district plan, such as the Infrastructure and Transportation chapters.	Allow the submission.
181.	Kainga Ora	55.90	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P58 Delete this policy.	Support	It would be more efficient and effective to address the content of this policy through amendments to DEV01-PSP: P59, rather than having separate policies.	Allow the submission.
182.	Kainga Ora	55.91	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P59 Amend as follows: <u>To ensure co-ordination of development and infrastructure, Staging and sequencing is in general accordance with the any-stages indicated shown on the relevant Peacocke Structure Plan.</u>	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would be more efficient and effective to address the content of DEV01-PSP: P58 through amendments to this policy, rather than having separate policies. 2. The policy should refer to the Peacocke Structure Plan rather than the relevant Structure Plan. 	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
183.	Kainga Ora	55.94	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P62 Relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section and amend as follows: <u>Integrated Transport Modelling is undertaken for all Structure Plan areas for all activities that have the potential to adversely impact the transport network.</u>	Oppose	Policy DEV-PSP: P62 should be deleted for the reasons set out in Adare's submission.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
184.	Kainga Ora	55.95	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P63 Delete, or relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section and combine with P39.	Support	The duplication between policies under the Infrastructure Network heading with other policies under the Transport Network heading is a matter raised in Adare's submission.	Allow the submission and consider the requested relief as part of a wider review and consolidation of the Infrastructure Network and Transport Network policies.
185.	Kainga Ora	55.96	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P64 Delete, or relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section and combine with P39.	Support	The duplication between policies under the Infrastructure Network heading with other policies under the Transport Network heading is a matter raised in Adare's submission.	Allow the submission and consider the requested relief as part of a wider review and consolidation of the Infrastructure Network and Transport Network policies.
186.	Kainga Ora	55.97	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P65 Delete, or relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section and combine with P48.	Support	The duplication between policies under the Infrastructure Network heading with other policies under the Transport Network heading is a matter raised in Adare's submission.	Allow the submission and consider the requested relief as part of a wider review and consolidation of the Infrastructure Network and Transport Network policies.
187.	Kainga Ora	55.98	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P66 Relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section.	Support in part	The duplication between policies under the Infrastructure Network heading with other policies under the Transport Network heading is a matter raised in Adare's submission.	Allow the submission and consider the requested relief as part of a wider review and consolidation of the Infrastructure Network and Transport Network policies.
188.	Kainga Ora	55.100	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P68 Amend as follows: a) Sensitive land uses avoid adverse effects on and from regionally significant infrastructure and regionally significant industry. b) <u>Where sensitive activities are in-zone and located in close proximity to regionally significant infrastructure, the mitigation of effects will be apportioned between the infrastructure operator and the developer / landowner.</u>	Support	In many cases, the mitigation of effects associated with infrastructure is a matter to be addressed by the infrastructure provider.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
189.	Kainga Ora	55.101	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: P69 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary because the matters it addresses are adequately and more appropriately covered in other parts of the district plan, such as the Infrastructure and Transportation chapters.	Allow the submission.
190.	Kainga Ora	55.103	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Move the 'Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan' into a non-statutory Design Guide.	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The application and intent of the 'Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan' should be made clearer. 2. Important information from this section should be contained in objectives, policies, rules and appendices (including Design Guides). Adare supports preparation of a Design Guide that is suited to the medium and high density outcomes anticipated in the Peacocke Precinct. 3. Adare opposes the request for Design Guides to be non-statutory documents to enable them to be referenced in the district plan and updated without a Schedule 1 process: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) All planning documents must be included in the plan as a matter of law; (b) There would be considerable uncertainty as to the relevance of any non-statutory Design Guides to decision making for resource consents; 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow the relief to the extent that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The application and intent of the 'Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan' is made clearer; and b) Important information from this section is contained in objectives, policies, rules and appendices (including Design Guides). 2. Disallow the relief seeking a non-statutory Design Guide.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
					(c) Natural justice and public participation require landowners and other stakeholders are afforded an opportunity to make a submission on any Design Guidelines under Schedule 1 of the Act.	
191.	Kainga Ora	55.104	<p>Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ – PREC1-PSP: <u>ISSUES PURPOSE</u></p> <p>Amend as follows: The Medium Density Zone applies to identified greenfield areas that will provide for a higher density than is currently established in the General Residential Zone. Medium density development provides a number of benefits, including a more efficient use of land and infrastructure and the ability to foster walkable communities, which provide for access to services, jobs and daily needs within a walkable or cyclable distance. The Peacocke Precinct provides for increased medium to high density development across the entire structure plan with the vision to create a high quality urban neighbourhood. The precinct/development area is subject to its own planning framework due to the different outcomes that are envisaged throughout the structure plan precinct compared to Hamilton City's other Medium Density Zone higher density locations and the unique environmental features that are present in the area. The Peacocke Precinct applies in the Peacocke Development Area. It spatially identifies and manages the area, applying additional place-based provisions to refine the policy direction and standards that apply to development in the area. The policy direction for the Peacocke Precinct recognises the unique natural qualities of the Peacocke area and the ability to protect, appreciate and draw amenity from these natural qualities by need to delivering a medium to high amenity density greenfield development that focuses on the creation of a walkable and cyclable environment. Increased density supports public transport and viable commercial centres, increasing the number of people within a walkable catchment. It also provides more housing options, such as one or two person homes, smaller families and opportunities for retirees to downsize. For this reason, the Peacocke Precinct includes a high density overlay which is located within walkable distances from the suburban centre, identified public transport routes and areas of amenity including the river and gully network, parks and community facilities. This overlay enables the delivery of higher density housing and in combination with the objectives and policies of the plan, will create a walkable environment that provides ease of access to facilities and amenities and public transport. In order to ensure a pleasant living environment, it is important that higher density housing is well designed, both from an architectural and urban design perspective. This is because, when compared to lower density housing, there is less space to provide onsite amenity for individual properties and generally less flexibility to arrange smaller sites. As such, appropriate development standards are in place, as well as the need for a comprehensive development plan to be approved for all development within the precinct. For this reason, council reserves discretion over the development of multi-unit</p>	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some of the proposed changes are supported because they improve the clarity and succinctness of the issues statement. 2. Deletion of references to the High Density Overlay is opposed. The overlay is a suitable tool for enabling high density development. 3. Requiring Comprehensive Development Plans to accompany land use consent applications would be an unnecessary and overly onerous requirement. All development will be preceded by subdivision of some kind. Subdivision consent applications are the most appropriate trigger for a Comprehensive Development Plan (or Concept Plan) to be required. 4. Kainga Ora's requested reference to approval of Comprehensive Development Plans is inappropriate and unlawful. The purpose of Comprehensive Development Plans could only be as an information requirement accompanying a resource consent application. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow the submission to the extent that the changes improve the clarity and succinctness of the issues statement. 2. Disallow the submission to the extent that the changes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) delete reference to the High Density Overlay; and b) insert reference to the approval of Comprehensive Development Plans for land use consent development within the precinct.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			housing including duplex dwellings, terrace dwellings and apartments throughout the zone.			
192.	Kainga Ora	55.105	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O1 Amend as follows: A range of housing types <u>typologies and densities</u> is available to meet the needs of all <u>communities</u> .	Support in part	1. Retaining reference to a range of housing typologies is important. 2. Density outcomes are addressed in MRZ-PREC1-PSP: O4.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
193.	Kainga Ora	55.107	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1- PSP: O3 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	Adare supports deletion of this objective because the outcome that it is seeking to achieve in the context of the different zoned areas in the Peacocke Precinct is unclear.	Allow the submission.
194.	Kainga Ora	55.108	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1- PSP: O4 Amend as follows: The Peacocke Precinct is <u>establishes</u> a <u>well connected, integrated, high amenity, medium density residential environment, with areas of high density around identified activity nodes, corridors and areas of natural amenity.</u>	Oppose	References to areas of high density should be retained.	Disallow the submission.
195.	Kainga Ora	55.109	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1- PSP: O5 Amend as follows: Development in <u>the Peacocke MRZ maximises the use of land and infrastructure by providing</u> a range of housing typologies that are consistent with the neighbourhood's planned urban built character.	Oppose	The requested reference to maximising the use of land and infrastructure is unclear and could imply density outcomes which are inconsistent with other objectives and policies for the Peacocke Precinct.	Disallow the submission.
196.	Kainga Ora	55.110	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O6 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The objective is unnecessary. Amenity is appropriately addressed in MRZ-PREC1-PSP: O9.	Allow the submission.
197.	Kainga Ora	55.111	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O7 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The objective is unnecessary. Amenity is appropriately addressed in MRZ-PREC1-PSP: O9.	Allow the submission.
198.	Kainga Ora	55.114	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O10 Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Oppose	The objective addresses an important resource management issue and should be retained as a separate objective.	Disallow the submission.
199.	Kainga Ora	55.115	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O11 Amend as follows: Residential buildings <u>development make incorporates sustainable features and technologies efficient use of water and energy resources.</u>	Support	The suggested amendment will improve the clarity of the objective.	Allow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
200.	Kainga Ora	55.116	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone New Policy MRZ - PREC1-PSP: PX Include new policy as follows: <u>Promote comprehensive, integrated, high amenity development of the precinct in accordance with the Structure Plan.</u>	Oppose	Requiring Comprehensive Development Plans to accompany land use consent applications would be an unnecessary and overly onerous requirement. All development will be preceded by subdivision of some kind. Subdivision consent applications are the most appropriate trigger for a Comprehensive Development Plan (or Concept Plan) to be required.	Disallow the submission.
201.	Kainga Ora	55.117	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone New Policy MRZ - PREC1-PSP: PX Include new policy as follows: <u>Development should generally be a minimum of three-storeys to promote the efficient use of land and infrastructure.</u>	Oppose	Building height should be typically two to three storeys in the medium density areas and typically three to five storeys in the high-density areas.	Disallow the submission.
202.	Kainga Ora	55.118	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P1 Move this policy to the proposed HRZ Amend as follows: Higher-density residential development should be located within and close to the Central City, suburban the Local and Neighbourhood centres, tertiary education facilities and hospital, and in areas serviced by passenger transport, and in close proximity to zoned open space.	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The request to move the policy to a separate High Density Residential Zone chapter is opposed. High density development in the Peacocke Precinct should continue to be managed by a High Density Overlay. 2. The suggested amendments will improve the clarity of the policy. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disallow the submission to move the policy to a separate High Density Residential Zone chapter. 2. Allow the submission to make changes to the policy, subject to appropriate wording.
203.	Kainga Ora	55.123	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P6 Amend as follows: Residential land uses should <u>contribute towards mitigating</u> be managed to avoid potential the effects, such as noise, from arterial transport corridors and state highways.	Support	In many cases, the mitigation of effects associated with infrastructure is a matter to be addressed by the infrastructure provider.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
204.	Kainga Ora	55.124	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P7 Amend as follows: Residential Building design shall achieves quality on-site amenity by providing: 1. Private, useable outdoor living areas that are located to the rear of the site. 2. Access to sunlight and daylight throughout the year. 3 Adequate service areas to accommodate typical residential living requirements. 3. Insulation to minimise adverse noise effects. 4 Where offered, parking and manoeuvring areas on-site to meet the needs, safety and convenience of residents. 5 Energy-efficient and sustainable design technologies where compatible with the scale and form of residential development. 6 Principal living areas with a Sufficient outlook to create a sense of <u>visual and acoustic privacy space.</u>	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deletion of clause (4) is appropriate because that point is addressed by MRZ-PREC1-PSP: P6. 2. The requested submission amendments to clause (7) will improve the clarity of the policy. 3. However, reference should be retained to "residential" building design because not all the matters listed would be relevant to building design for non-residential activities and the predominant activities in the zone will be residential. 	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
205.	Kainga Ora	55.127	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P10 Amend as follows: Development in areas identified for medium and high density residential activities should be in general accordance with the appropriate Design Assessment Criteria. Promote comprehensive, integrated,	Support in part	Adare agrees that MRZ-PREC1-P10 should be a more encompassing policy, enabling consolidation of other policies under the Amenity heading.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			high amenity development of the precinct in accordance with the Structure Plan.			
206.	Kainga Ora	55.128	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P11 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
207.	Kainga Ora	55.129	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P12 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
208.	Kainga Ora	55.131	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P14 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
209.	Kainga Ora	55.133	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P16 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
210.	Kainga Ora	55.134	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P17 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
211.	Kainga Ora	55.135	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P18 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
212.	Kainga Ora	55.136	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P19 Amend as follows: Dwellings within the Peacocke Structure Plan are designed and constructed to provide a high amenity environment public realm by: 1. Providing passive surveillance of public spaces (including roads and areas of open space) and creating a clear delineation between public and private spaces through the use of low fence heights, landscaping, glazing and clear pedestrian entrances. 2. Encouraging buildings to be located towards the front of the site, so they front the street and enable space for private outdoor living areas that have access to sunlight. 3. Providing high quality front yard landscaping that adds amenity to the streetscape. 4. Ensuring the visual dominance of garage doors and carparking is minimised. 5. Designing the facades of dwellings to provide visual interest and engage with the street; including through the	Support in part	Adare supports changes to the policy to more clearly differentiate the matters it is seeking to address (which primarily relate to the public realm) from MRZ-PREC1-PSP: P7 (which addresses on-site amenity).	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			provision of front porches, low fences, glazing, setbacks, direct pedestrian access and the management of parking.			
213.	Kainga Ora	55.142	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P25 Amend as follows: New buildings and activities shall contribute to mitigating effects on and from regionally significant infrastructure.	Support in part	The suggested amendments will improve the clarity of the policy.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
214.	Kainga Ora	55.146	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1- PSP: R3 Amend as follows: <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: <u>PER-1</u> 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. <u>Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> 4-A – General Criteria	Support in part	Any amendments made to this rule will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
215.	Kainga Ora	55.152	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R9 Amend as follows: Show homes Activity Status: Permitted Non-complying Where the following are complied with: PER-1 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48.	Oppose	Show homes are a typical and necessary activity within greenfield growth areas. Staff numbers and duration are limited by standards.	Disallow the submission.
216.	Kainga Ora	55.158	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R15 Delete rule along with any relevant standards or provisions referencing and relating to duplex dwelling in the MRZ section entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support in part	The activity status for all residential activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone (including the High Density Overlay area) will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA. Clause (2)(1) in Part 1 of Schedule 3A sets out that construction or use of a building is a Permitted Activity if it complies with the density standards in the district plan.	Allow the submission to the extent that changes are necessary for consistency with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA.
217.	Kainga Ora	55.159	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R16 Delete rule along with any relevant standards or provisions referencing and relating to terrace dwelling in the MRZ section entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support in part	The activity status for all residential activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone (including the High Density Overlay area) will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA. Clause (2)(1) in Part 1 of Schedule 3A sets out that construction or use of a building is a Permitted Activity if it complies with the density standards in the district plan.	Allow the submission to the extent that changes are necessary for consistency with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA.
218.	Kainga Ora	55.160	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R17 Delete rule along with any relevant standards or provisions referencing and relating to apartment buildings in the MRZ section entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support in part	The activity status for all residential activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone (including the High Density Overlay area) will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA. Clause (2)(1) in Part 1 of Schedule 3A sets out that construction or use of a building is a Permitted Activity if it complies with the density standards in the district plan.	Allow the submission to the extent that changes are necessary for consistency with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA.
219.	Kainga Ora	55.163	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R20 Amend as follows: Dairy - Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u>	Oppose	Dairies should typically be located in Neighbourhood Centres or in the Local Centre. The permitted activity status sought by the submission has the potential to result in clusters of non-residential activities establishing in residential areas which could undermine the centres and have adverse amenity effects.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			<p>Where the following are complied with: RDISPER-1 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. 2. The gross floor area of retail activity on the site shall not exceed 100m². 3. The hours of operation shall be 0700- 2200 hours. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. B – Design and Layout 2. C – Character and Amenity 3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with RDISPER-1-1-3: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General 2. B – Design and Layout 3. C – Character and Amenity 4. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</p>			
220.	Kainga Ora	55.176	<p>Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R33</p> <p>Amend as follows: Health care services Activity Status: Non-complying Discretionary</p>	Oppose	Health care services in the Peacocke Precinct should be located in Neighbourhood Centres or Local Centres.	Disallow the submission.
221.	Kainga Ora	55.180	<p>Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R38</p> <p>Amend as follows: 1. Peacocke Precinct: 12m – maximum of 3 storeys 2. Peacocke Precinct High Density Overlay: 16m</p>	Oppose	High density development in the Peacocke Precinct should continue to be managed by a High Density Overlay.	Disallow the submission.
222.	Kainga Ora	55.181	<p>Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39</p> <p>Amend as follows: 1. Transport corridor Front yard boundary: 3m <u>2.5m</u> 2. Garage door or carport facing towards a transport corridor shall be set back from the transport corridor boundary: 5m 3. Side yards: 1m 4. One side yard per site: 0m, where: a. Legal provision is made for access and maintenance; and b. Neighbours consent is obtained; and c. The opposite side yard is a minimum of 2m. OR d. It is a common/party wall; 5. Rear yard: 1m 6. Rear yard where it adjoining a lane: 0m 7. Waikato Riverbank and Gully: 6m (applies to buildings and swimming pools) 8. Significant Bat Habitat Area boundary: 5m</p>	Support in part	Any amendments made to this rule will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
223.	Kainga Ora	55.182	<p>Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R40</p> <p>Amend as follows; 1. For a transport corridor boundary: any portion of a building above 10m in height must be setback a minimum of 3m.</p>	Support in part	Any amendments made to this rule will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			<p>2. For side and rear boundaries, no part of any building shall protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 60 degrees. This angle is to be measured from 3 6m above ground level at all boundaries. Except that no height control plane shall apply:</p> <p>a. Where a boundary adjoins a rear lane.</p> <p>b. Where there is existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site.</p> <p>c. Where there is an existing or proposed common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites.</p> <p>3. As an alternative to R40(2), the following alternative height in relation to boundary may be used for development that is within 20m of the transport corridor boundary. Any buildings or parts of buildings within 20m of the site frontage must not exceed a height of 3.6m measured vertically above ground level at side and rear boundaries. Thereafter, buildings must be set back 1m and then 0.3m for every additional metre in height (73.3 degrees) up to 6.9m and then 1m for every additional metre in height (45 degrees)</p>			
224.	Kainga Ora	55.185	<p>Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R43</p> <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>1. An outlook space must be provided from the face of a building containing windows to a habitable room. If a room has two or more external faces with windows, the outlook space must be provided from the face with the largest area of glazing.</p> <p>2. The main living room of a dwelling must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of 6 3m depth and 4 3m width.</p> <p>3. The principal bedroom of a dwelling must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of 3m in depth and 3m in width.</p> <p>4. All other habitable rooms must have an outlook space of 1m in depth and 1m in width.</p> <p>5. The depth of the outlook space is measured at right angles to and horizontal from the window to which it applies.</p> <p>6. The width of the outlook space is measured from the centre point of the largest window on the building face to which it applies</p> <p>7. The height of the outlook space is the same as the floor height, measured from floor to ceiling, of the building face to which the standard applies.</p> <p>8. Outlook spaces may be within the site, over a public street, or other public open space.</p> <p>9. Outlook spaces required from different rooms within the same building may overlap.</p> <p>10. Outlook spaces may overlap where they are on the same wall plane</p> <p>11. Outlook spaces must:</p> <p>a. be clear and unobstructed by buildings;</p> <p>b. not extend over adjacent sites, except for where the outlook space is over a public street or public open space as outlined in R44-8 above; and</p> <p>c. not extend over an outlook spaces or outdoor living space required by another dwelling.</p>	Support in part	Any amendments made to this rule will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
225.	Kainga Ora	55.186	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R44 Amend as follows: 1. These standards do not apply to managed care facilities or rest homes. 2. Each residential unit, except for when a communal area is provided, shall be provided with an outdoor living area that is: a. For the exclusive use of each residential unit. b. Readily accessible from a living area inside the residential unit. c. Free of driveways, manoeuvring areas, parking spaces, accessory buildings and service areas 3. Communal open space for 4 or more residential units and apartment buildings (Peacocke Precinct) shall comply with R45-2 c) as well as being: a. For the shared use of all residents on site, and b. Readily accessible from all residential units on site. 4. Outdoor living areas shall have minimum areas and dimensions as follows: a. Single residential dwellings, Duplex dwellings, Terrace dwelling (Peacocke Precinct) At ground floor i. 35 15m2, with a minimum dimension of 3m ii. Or where located in the High Density Overlay: 20m2 No width contributing to the complying area less than 4.0m. Outside the High Density Overlay, as an alternative, the open space may be split, allowing a front courtyard of at least 8m2 with a minimum depth of 1.8m, the balance shall be provided in the rear yard with no dimension less than 4.0m. b. Apartment Building Above ground floor i. Ground floor: 20 8m2, with a minimum dimension of 1.8m ii. Where the sole outdoor living area is above ground floor: -A studio unit and one bedroom residential unit: 5m2, no dimension less than 2.5m -A residential unit with two or more bedrooms: 12m2, no dimension less than 1.8m	Support in part	1. Any amendments made to this rule will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA. 2. Adare agrees that the requirement for communal open space for residential activities other than apartment buildings should be deleted. 3. High density development in the Peacocke Precinct should continue to be managed by a High Density Overlay.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording and retention of standards for the High Density Overlay.
226.	Kainga Ora	55.188	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R46 Delete provisions and points 4 – 6.	Support in part	The standards in clauses (4)-(6) are difficult to interpret and should be reviewed.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
227.	Kainga Ora	55.189	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R47 Delete rule entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Oppose	The requirements for minimum separation of dwellings on the same site will ensure good on-site amenity.	Disallow the submission.
228.	Kainga Ora	55.190	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R48 Amend as follows: 1 The minimum floor area required in respect of each residential unit shall be: Form of Residential Unit Floor Area Studio unit Minimum 35 30m2	Oppose	The minimum residential unit areas in the notified PC5 provisions are appropriate and will ensure good amenity for occupiers.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			<p>1 or more bedroom unit Minimum 45m²</p> <p>2 bedroom unit Minimum 55m²</p> <p>3 or more bedroom unit Minimum 90m²</p>			
229.	Kainga Ora	55.191	<p>Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone NEW HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE – HRZ; HRZ – PREC1-PSP: High Density Residential Zone Peacocke Precinct</p> <p>Delete the “High Density Overlay” and replace with a “High Density Zone” that would be controlled with the proposed provisions set out in Attachment 2 of Kainga Ora submission. See Attachment 2 to the submission for the suite of HRZ provisions.</p>	Oppose	High density development in the Peacocke Precinct should continue to be managed by a High Density Overlay.	Disallow the submission.
230.	Kainga Ora	55.192	<p>Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. <u>NZC – PREC1-PSP: Issues Purpose</u></p> <p>Amend as follows: Businesses resources commonly group around a series of centres in Hamilton and include activities such as retailing, offices, business and financial services, manufacturing, warehousing and associated parking, storage and display areas. These areas and the infrastructure that serves them are significant public and private resources and influence the urban form and function of all parts of the City. The grouping of business activities into centres provides an environment that will draw in other business and facilities. This benefit from agglomeration, which results in productivity gains arising from economies of scale and efficiencies of inter-connectedness. The focus of the business centres' hierarchy is to manage existing centres to ensure they retain and enhance their function, vitality, viability and amenity as focal points for a diverse range of activities needed by the community. Ongoing public investment is a significant element in any centres-based strategy. A centre is a cohesive or integrated set (cluster) of diverse land-use (business) activities. Centres are characterised by high pedestrian levels in a high-amenity public environment and supported by efficient and accessible passenger transport, infrastructure and services. A business centres' hierarchy has been developed that comprises six tiers. The overall aim being to reestablish the primacy of the Hamilton Central City and define its relationship with the sub-regional centres and suburban centres, and other centres. The Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ) provides for small scale commercial and community activities service that service the needs of the immediate residential neighbourhood. Apartment living is anticipated in the NCZ.</p>	Oppose in part	Although minor wording improvements may be appropriate, the issues statement should continue to refer to the centres hierarchy.	Disallow the submission.
231.	Kainga Ora	55.197	<p>Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NCZ– PREC1-PSP: P2</p> <p>Amend as follows: The scale and nature of activities within neighbourhood centres shall will not detract generate significant adverse amenity effects on from the surrounding residential areas and transport networks.</p>	Oppose	The wording of the notified policy is appropriate.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
232.	Kainga Ora	55.200	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NCZ– PREC1-PSP: P5 Amend as follows: Neighbourhood Centres in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area are designed to: 1. Establish a sense of place <u>and integrate with the public realm</u> . 2. Create <u>Contribute</u> to a high amenity and safe walkable environment. 3. Provide active frontages that encourage pedestrian activity on the ground floor. 4. Ensure off street parking is not located in the street frontage. 5. Incorporate public transport stops where located adjacent to public transport routes.	Support	Adare agrees that the requested amendments to NCZ- PREC1-P5 would appropriately address the matters in NCZ-PREC1-P6, enabling the policies to be consolidated.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
233.	Kainga Ora	55.201	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NCZ– PREC1-PSP: P6 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
234.	Kainga Ora	55.204	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Nzc – PREC1-PSP: R3 Amend as follows: Demolition, removal, maintenance or repair of existing buildings...	Support in part	Adare supports the proposed amendments in principle. However, the definition for Minor Works is limited to the Business 1-7, Central City, Industrial, Ruakura Logistics and Ruakura Industrial Park Zones. A consequential amendment would be required to refer to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone in the definition for Minor Works.	Allow the submission, subject to a consequential amendment to the definition for Minor Works.
235.	Kainga Ora	55.214	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Nzc – PREC1-PSP: R13 Amend as follows: Healthcare services at ground floor ...	Support	The amendment will improve the clarity of the rule.	Allow the submission.
236.	Kainga Ora	55.222	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Nzc – PREC1-PSP: R21 Amend as follows: Ancillary residential units - Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: RDISPER-1 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. B – Design and Layout 2. C – Character and Amenity 3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with RDISPER -1-1: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General 2. B – Design and Layout 3. C – Character and Amenity 4. P – Peacocke Structure Plan	Support in part	1. Permitted Activity status is appropriate for ancillary residential units above ground floor given residential activities are anticipated in Neighbourhood Centres and all new buildings require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. 2. Restricted Discretionary Activity status should be retained for ancillary residential units at ground level.	Allow the submission to the extent that ancillary residential units above ground floor are made a Permitted Activity.
237.	Kainga Ora	55.223	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Nzc – PREC1-PSP: R22 Amend as follows: Apartments above ground floor Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u>	Support	Permitted Activity status is appropriate for apartments above ground floor given residential activities are anticipated in Neighbourhood Centres and all new buildings require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Allow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			Where the following are complied with: RDISPER-1 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. B – Design and Layout 2. C – Character and Amenity 3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with RDISPER -1-1: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General 2. B – Design and Layout 3. C – Character and Amenity 4. P – Peacocke Structure Plan			
238.	Kainga Ora	55.227	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NZN – PREC1-PSP: R26 Amend as follows: Single dwellings and duplex dwellings Activity Status: Discretionary Non-complying .	Support	Single dwellings and duplex dwellings would be an inefficient and ineffective use of the limited areas of land that are zoned Neighbourhood Centre. A Non-Complying Activity status for these activities would be appropriate.	Allow the submission.
239.	Kainga Ora	55.228	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NZN – PREC1-PSP: R28 Amend as follows: Offices - Activity Status: Discretionary Permitted Where the following are complied with: RDISPER-1 1. The GFA is less than 250m ² per site. 2. PREC1-P R36 – R48. Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with RDISPER -1-1 and 2: Non-complying Discretionary	Support	1. Permitted Activity status is appropriate for small offices given offices are anticipated in Neighbourhood Centres and all new buildings require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. 2. Adare has made a submission seeking for the gross floor area of commercial activities within each centre to be limited to avoid undermining the function, vitality, viability and amenity of the Local Centre and other Neighbourhood Centres.	Allow the submission.
240.	Kainga Ora	55.242	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NZN – PREC1-PSP: R42 Amend as follows: Visitor accommodation <u>above ground floor</u> Activity Status: Non-complying Permitted Where the following are complied with: RDISPER-1 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with RDISPER -1-1: Not applicable Discretionary	Support in part	1. Permitted Activity status is appropriate for visitor accommodation above ground floor given residential activities are anticipated in Neighbourhood Centres and all new buildings require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. 2. The standards should enable entrances/lobbies associated with visitor accommodation to be located at ground floor.	Allow the submission, subject to suitable provision being made for entrances/lobbies at ground floor.
241.	Kainga Ora	55.243	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NZN – PREC1-PSP: R44 Amend as follows: Neighbourhood Centre Zone: 42 <u>16m</u> .	Support	It would be appropriate to align the maximum building height for the Neighbourhood Centre Zone with the maximum building height for the High Density Overlay areas (which is 16m) given the High Density Overlay areas are located around Neighbourhood Centre Zones in many places.	Allow the submission.
242.	Kainga Ora	55.244	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NZN – PREC1-PSP: R45 Amend as follows: 1. Where any boundary adjoins a Medium Density Zone, no part of any building shall penetrate a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 <u>60</u> degrees beginning at an elevation of 3 <u>6m</u> above the boundary 2. ...	Support in part	Any amendments made to this rule will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
243.	Kainga Ora	55.249	<p>Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. NZC – PREC1-PSP:R50</p> <p>Amend as follows: [...] 4. Density (Minimum Number of Residential Units Required Per Site) a. Minimum densities within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone shall be 30-50 residential units per hectare based on net site area. This is to be calculated in accordance with the formula below: 0.0053 residential units per 1m² of site area Example: For a site which has an area of 4000m², the minimum number of residential units required under this rule would be 4220. This is calculated by multiplying the site area (4000m²) by 0.0035. b. Where mixed-use is provided for within a development (e.g. office or retail with residential above), the density requirements of Rule R71-4 a) shall be applied on a pro rata basis relative to the percentage of gross floor area of the development that is residential (e.g. where 40% of the gross floor area of a development is comprised of residential activities, then 40% of the total minimum number of residential units calculated under Rule R71-4 is the minimum number of residential units required to be provided. 5. Outdoor living area a. 8m², with a minimum dimension of 1.8m a. Each residential unit, except for when a communal area is provided, shall be provided with an outdoor living area that is: – For the exclusive use of each residential unit. – Readily accessible from a living area inside the residential unit. – Free of driveways, manoeuvring areas, parking spaces, accessory buildings and service areas. b. Communal open space for 4 or more residential units and apartment buildings shall comply be: – Free of driveways, manoeuvring areas, parking spaces, accessory buildings and service areas – For the shared use of all residents on the site, and – Readily accessible from all residential units on site. c. Outdoor living areas for residential units shall have areas and dimensions as follows. • Apartments and ancillary residential units: – A studio unit and one bedroom residential unit: 5m² – A residential unit with two or more bedrooms: 12m² – No dimension less than 1.8m • Communal open space for apartment buildings – 8m² per unit – Capable of containing a circle with the following diameter: • 4-7 residential units — 6m • 8 or more residential units — 8m • No dimension less than 2.5m Note 1. Communal open space is an alternative to, and not in addition to, individual outdoor living areas for each 2. residential unit. 3. The outdoor living area for an ancillary residential unit</p>	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adare opposes the requested amendments to the minimum densities and seeks that clause (4) is deleted for the reasons set out in Adare's submission. 2. Adare supports reviewing the outdoor living area requirements, including the requirement for communal outdoor living areas, and the external outlook area requirements to ensure that they are appropriate for achieving adequate on-site amenity without being overly onerous. 3. The minimum residential unit areas in the notified PC5 provisions are appropriate and will ensure good amenity for occupiers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disallow the submission insofar as it relates to density provisions in clause (4) and minimum residential unit areas. 2. Allow the submission to make changes to the outdoor living area and outlook standards, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			<p>shall be separate from the outdoor living area 4. provided for the principal residential unit. 6. [...] 7. Residential unit size a. The minimum floor area require in respect of each apartment shall be: i. Studio unit: minimum 3530m² ii. 1 or more bedrooms unit: minimum 45m² iii. 2 bedroom unit: minimum 55m² iv. 3 bedroom unit: minimum 90m² 8. [...] 9. External Outlook Area Each residential unit shall have an external outlook area that: a. 3m x 3m space from a principal living room b. From all other habitable rooms: 1m x 1m a. Is provided from the face of the building containing windows to the indoor living area, and b. Has a minimum depth of 6m, measured perpendicular from the face of the window area. c. Where an indoor living room has two or more walls containing windows, the outlook area shall be provided from the face with the greatest window area. d. The external outlook area may be over: i. The site on which the building is located; ii. The Transport Corridor Zone; or iii. Public Open Space.</p>			
244.	Kainga Ora	55.251	<p>Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone NLC – PREC1-PSP: Issues Purpose</p> <p>Amend as follows: Businesses resources commonly group around a series of centres in Hamilton and include activities such as retailing, offices, business and financial services, manufacturing, warehousing and associated parking, storage and display areas. These areas and the infrastructure that serves them are significant public and private resources and influence the urban form and function of all parts of the City. The grouping of business activities into centres provides an environment that will draw in other business and facilities. This benefit from agglomeration, which results in productivity gains arising from economies of scale and efficiencies of inter-connectedness. The focus of the business centres' hierarchy is to manage existing centres to ensure they retain and enhance their function, vitality, viability and amenity as focal points for a diverse range of activities needed by the community. Ongoing public investment is a significant element in any centres-based strategy. A centre is a cohesive or integrated set (cluster) of diverse land-use (business) activities, Centres are characterised by high pedestrian levels in a high-amenity public environment and supported by efficient and accessible passenger transport, infrastructure and services. Zoning and rule provisions provide for a range of activities, scales and formats appropriate to managing the effects of development of business centres, the principally retail role of the sub-regional centres, the community, mixed use and pedestrian focus of the suburban centres, the neighbourhood function of local facilities, the</p>	Oppose in part	Although minor wording improvements may be appropriate, the issues statement should continue to refer to the centres hierarchy.	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			supporting role of commercial fringe areas and the peak visitor demands associated with visitor facilities. The commercial and community hub of the Peacocke Precinct Structure Plan is located in the Peacocke Local Centre. It is anticipated that this centre will include a supermarket and a range of other commercial activities that provide for the needs and wellbeing of the community. It is important that the centre is easy to access on foot and on bike and is well serviced by public transport. The built environment should focus on the pedestrian and create active street frontages that are universally accessible.			
245.	Kainga Ora	55.252	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: O1 Amend as follows: A distribution of local centres that provides a mixed-use environment with health-care services, goods, services and employment at a scale appropriate to suburban catchments, while not undermining the primacy, function, vitality, amenity or viability of the Central City.	Support in part	The objective should be specific to the Local Centre that is planned within Peacocke.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
246.	Kainga Ora	55.257	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P1 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
247.	Kainga Ora	55.258	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P2 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
248.	Kainga Ora	55.259	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P3 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
249.	Kainga Ora	55.260	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P4 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
250.	Kainga Ora	55.261	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P5 Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].	Support	The policy is unnecessary.	Allow the submission.
251.	Kainga Ora	55.276	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R3 Amend as follows: Demolition, removal, maintenance or repair of existing buildings...	Support in part	Adare supports the proposed amendments in principle. However, the definition for Minor Works is limited to the Business 1-7, Central City, Industrial, Ruakura Logistics and Ruakura Industrial Park Zones. A consequential amendment would be required to refer to the Local Centre Zone in the definition for Minor Works.	Allow the submission, subject to a consequential amendment to the definition for Minor Works.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
252.	Kainga Ora	55.293	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R20 Amend as follows: Ancillary residential units - Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: RDISPER-1 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. B – Design and Layout 2. C – Character and Amenity 3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with RDISPER -1-1 : Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General 2. <u>B – Design and Layout</u> 3. <u>C – Character and Amenity</u> 4. <u>P – Peacocke Structure Plan</u>	Support in part	1. Permitted Activity status is appropriate for ancillary residential units above ground floor given residential activities are anticipated in Local Centres and all new buildings require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. 2. Restricted Discretionary Activity status should be retained for ancillary residential units at ground level.	Allow the submission to the extent that ancillary residential units above ground floor are made a Permitted Activity.
253.	Kainga Ora	55.294	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R21 Amend as follows: Apartments <u>Residential units</u> (Peacocke Structure Plan) <u>above ground floor*</u> Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: RDISPER-1 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. RDIS-2 1. Are located above ground floor Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. B – Design and Layout 2. C – Character and Amenity 3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with RDISPER -1-1 : Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General 2. <u>B – Design and Layout</u> 3. <u>C – Character and Amenity</u> 4. <u>P – Peacocke Structure Plan</u>	Oppose in part	1. Adare agrees that it would be appropriate for all residential activities above ground floor to be a Permitted Activity. 2. Apartment buildings at ground level outside of the primary and secondary frontages should be a Discretionary Activity for the reasons set out in Adare's submission.	Disallow the submission, except to the extent that all residential activities above ground level are Permitted Activities.
254.	Kainga Ora	55.301	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R28 Amend as follows: Commercial places of assembly including cinemas and bowling alleys Activity Status: Discretionary <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: DISPER-1 1. LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R40-R49. DISPER-2 1. Are located outside any active frontage. Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with DISPER-1 : <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General 2. <u>B – Design and Layout</u> 3. <u>C – Character and Amenity</u>	Support	Permitted Activity status is appropriate for Commercial places of assembly given these activities are typically located in Local Centres and given all new buildings require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Allow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			4. P – Peacocke Structure Plan Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with DISPER-2: Non-Complying-Discretionary.			
255.	Kainga Ora	55.312	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R40 Amend as follows: Local Centre Zone: 46 <u>24</u> m.	Oppose	The maximum height in the Local Centre Zone should be retained at 16m to enable buildings up to five storeys. 16m is consistent with the maximum height of buildings in the High Density Overlay and will enable a built form which reflects the suburban location of the Local Centre.	Disallow the submission.
256.	Kainga Ora	55.313	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R41 Amend as follows: 1. ... 2. Where any boundary adjoins a Medium Density Zone, no part of any building shall penetrate a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 degrees beginning at an elevation of 3m above the boundary 3. ...	Oppose in part	1. Land adjoining the centre is within the Medium Density Zone (and High Density Overlay). 2. Any amendments made to this rule will need to be consistent with Schedule 3A and other relevant provisions under the RMA.	Disallow the submission, except to the extent that the height in relation to boundary standards are amended to be consistent with Schedule 3A and any other relevant provisions under the RMA.
257.	Kainga Ora	55.318	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R46 Amend as follows: 1. Only one ancillary residential unit is allowed per site. 2. Except for providing an entrance, no residential activities shall be undertaken at ground-floor level. 3. The following standards shall apply to residential units, including apartments above ground floor and residential centres. Unless specifically noted, they do not apply to visitor accommodation. 4. Density (Minimum Number of Residential Units Required Per Site) c. Minimum densities within the Local Centre Zone shall be 30 <u>100</u> residential units per hectare based on net site area. This is to be calculated in accordance with the formula below: 0.0010 residential units per 1m ² of site area. Example: For a site which has an area of 4000m ² , the minimum number of residential units required under this rule would be 4 <u>240</u> . This is calculated by multiplying the site area (4000m ²) by 0.0010 . d. Where mixed-use is provided for within a development (e.g. office or retail with residential above), the density requirements of Rule R71-4 a) shall be applied on a pro rata basis relative to the percentage of gross floor area of the development that is residential (e.g. where 40% of the gross floor area of a development is comprised of residential activities, then 40% of the total minimum number of residential units calculated under Rule R71-4 is the minimum number of residential units required to be provided. 5. Outdoor living area b. 8m², with a minimum dimension of 1.8m d. Each residential unit, except for when a communal area is provided, shall be provided with an outdoor living area that is: – For the exclusive use of each residential unit. – Readily accessible from a living area inside the residential unit. – Free of driveways, manoeuvring areas, parking spaces,	Oppose in part	1. Adare opposes the requested amendments to the minimum densities and seeks that clause (4) is deleted for the reasons set out in Adare's submission. 2. Adare supports reviewing the outdoor living area requirements, including the requirement for communal outdoor living areas, and the external outlook area requirements to ensure that they are appropriate for achieving adequate on-site amenity without being overly onerous. 3. The minimum residential unit areas in the notified PC5 provisions are appropriate and will ensure good amenity for occupiers.	1. Disallow the submission insofar as it relates to density provisions in clause (4) and minimum residential unit areas. 2. Allow the submission to make changes to the outdoor living area and outlook standards, subject to appropriate wording.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			<p>accessory buildings and service areas.</p> <p>e. Communal open space for 4 or more residential units and apartment buildings shall comply be:</p> <p>– Free of driveways, manoeuvring areas, parking spaces, accessory buildings and service areas</p> <p>– For the shared use of all residents on the site, and</p> <p>– Readily accessible from all residential units on site.</p> <p>f. Outdoor living areas for residential units shall have areas and dimensions as follows.</p> <p>– Apartments and ancillary residential units:</p> <p>– A studio unit and one bedroom residential unit: 5m²</p> <p>– A residential unit with two or more bedrooms: 12m²</p> <p>No dimension less than 1.8m</p> <p>– Communal open space for apartment buildings</p> <p>– 8m² per unit</p> <p>– Capable of containing a circle with the following diameter:</p> <p>• 4-7 residential units — 6m</p> <p>• 8 or more residential units — 8m</p> <p>• No dimension less than 2.5m</p> <p>Note</p> <p>5. Communal open space is an alternative to, and not in addition to, individual outdoor living areas for each</p> <p>6. residential unit.</p> <p>7. The outdoor living area for an ancillary residential unit shall be separate from the outdoor living area</p> <p>8. provided for the principal residential unit.</p> <p>6. Storage Areas</p> <p>a. Each residential unit shall be provided with a storage area:</p> <p>i. Located at or below ground-floor level, readily accessible to that residential unit, secure and weatherproof.</p> <p>ii. A minimum of 1.8m long by 1m high by 1m deep.</p> <p>Note: The provision of a private, secure garage accessible only by the occupiers of the residential unit is considered to meet this requirement. (A shared parking garage is not sufficient to meet this standard).</p> <p>7. Residential unit size</p> <p>b. The minimum floor area require in respect of each apartment shall be:</p> <p>v. Studio unit: minimum 3530m²</p> <p>vi. 1 or more bedrooms unit: minimum 45m²</p> <p>vii. 2 bedroom unit: minimum 55m²</p> <p>viii. 3 bedroom unit: minimum 90m²</p> <p>8. Daylight Standards</p> <p>Residential units shall be designed to achieve the following minimum daylight standards.</p> <p>d. living rooms and living/dining areas: a total clear-glazed area of exterior wall no less than 20% of the floor area of that space.</p> <p>e. Bedrooms (excluding studio units, and any bedroom that complies with iii. below): a minimum of one bedroom with a total clear-glazed area of exterior wall no less than 20% of the floor area of that space.</p> <p>f. No more than one bedroom in any residential unit may rely on natural light borrowed from another naturally lit room provided:</p> <p>iii. The maximum distance of the bedroom from the natural light source window shall be 6m.</p> <p>iv. The minimum total clear-glazed area of the light source shall be no less than 20% of the floor area of that</p>			

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			bedroom. 9. External Outlook Area Each residential unit shall have an external outlook area that: a. 3m x 3m space from a principal living room b. From all other habitable rooms: 1m x 1m d. The external outlook area may be over: i. The site on which the building is located; ii. The Transport Corridor Zone; or iii. Public Open Space.			
258.	Kainga Ora	55.324	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct NOSZ – PREC1- P: OBJECTIVES OX Insert new objective: <u>The open space network in the Peacocke Precinct supports the amenity and liveability of the higher density living opportunities found in the Precinct.</u>	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adare supports the request for a new objective that refers to the NOSZ supporting the amenity and liveability of residential environments because it will enable multi-functional use (for recreation and protection and enhancement of its natural attributes). 2. The objective should refer to medium and high density living to reflect that Natural Open Spaced zoned areas are located near the High Density Overlay and other parts of the Medium Density Residential Zone. 	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
259.	Kainga Ora	55.326	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct NOSZ – PREC1- P: POLICY PX Insert new policy: <u>Manage the delivery of the open space network in the Peacocke Precinct to ensure that the location, quality and quantity contributes to the higher density living opportunities found in the Precinct.</u>	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The requested policy should focus on seeking benefits for medium and high density living from multi-purpose use of the NOSZ areas. 2. Unlike recreation reserves (which are not zoned Natural Open Space) the location and quantity of the NOSZ areas is dependent on natural characteristics. 	Allow the submission to the extent that a new policy is introduced but ensure that the focus of the policy is on multi-purpose use of NOSZ areas.
260.	Kainga Ora	55.336	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct SUB – PREC1- PSP: O7 Amend as follows: Subdivision considers <u>supports</u> the planned medium and high density development outcomes and enables a range of building typologies to be constructed.	Support	The amendments will improve the clarity of the objective.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
261.	Kainga Ora	55.348	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct SUB - PREC1-PSP: P9 Amend as follows: Require subdivision to efficiently use land, and to provide for support <u>higher density residential development in walkable distances from the Peacocke Local Centre and identified public transport routes throughout the Precinct by encouraging subdivision to occur concurrently with or following land development.</u>	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not all subdivision will occur concurrently with or following land development. For example, vacant lots of 300m² plus can be created. 2. The policy appropriately supports the High Density Overlay by referring to locations where higher density is planned. 	Disallow the submission.
262.	Kainga Ora	55.375	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 Amend as follows: 1. Peacocke Precinct: 300 <u>1200</u> m ² 2. Peacocke Precinct High Density Overlay 300m²	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The standard in the notified provisions enabling vacant lots of 300m² plus is appropriate and should be retained. The notified standard will assist in ensuring diversity of housing typologies. 2. Kainga Ora's proposed 1,200m² minimum lot size has the potential to worsen density outcomes by enabling the potential for lots of that size to be developed with a single dwelling. 3. Kainga Ora's proposed 1,200m² minimum lot size would unnecessarily limit opportunities for smaller lots to be created which would still be easily capable of 	Disallow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
					comprehensive development involving multiple dwellings.	
263.	Kainga Ora	55.386	<p>Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal 25.2.2 Objectives and Policies:- Earthworks and Vegetation Removal</p> <p>Amend as follows: Policy 25.2.2.2e Require earthworks <u>within the Earthworks Overlay</u> to be undertaken in a manner that is sympathetic to the character and orientation of the existing topography. Explanation: The Peacocke Structure Plan area has been identified as a medium <u>to high</u> density growth area for Hamilton. The area contains rolling topography which can be challenging to develop. The policy framework recognises the challenges to developing these areas and seeks to enable landform modification in such a way that enables development, while remaining sympathetic to the general character of the land form in the <u>"Earthworks Overlay"</u> area. This means earthworks should replicate the general orientation of topography to enable the integration of residential development within the site. The road network and block structure should be designed to work with the contour of the land and minimise the extent of retaining required. Where steeper slopes are to be developed, alternative approaches to construction should be used including mid lot development or multi-storey houses. Bulk earthworks undertaken at subdivision stage should be designed to minimise the need for secondary earthworks.</p>	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction of an 'Earthworks Overlay' where more sympathetic earthworks are required would be unduly restrictive and inconsistent with enabling medium and high density outcomes within the areas that are subject to the overlay. 2. It is unclear from the submission where the suggested 'Earthworks Overlay' would apply. 3. As an alternative, to the extent that changes are more enabling of earthworks in the Peacocke Structure Plan area then this would be supported. 	Disallow the submission to the extent that an 'Earthworks Overlay' should not be introduced.
264.	Kainga Ora	55.389	<p>Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare 25.6.2 Objectives and Policies: Lighting and Glare</p> <p>Amend as follows: 25.6.2.2a Manage light spill and glare of fixed lighting at the boundary of the Significant Bat Habitat Area to ensure that the useability of long-tailed bat habitat is maintained <u>while maintaining safety on adjoining properties.</u> 25.6.2.2b Ensure that fixed lighting in public spaces, such as parks and road corridors is designed to minimise the effects of lighting and glare on Significant Bat Habitat Area <u>while also achieving a safe public realm for the community.</u> Explanation: The Peacocke Precinct is an important habitat for long-tail bats which are a threatened native species. Due to the presence of bats in the area, it is important the effects of development are managed to ensure bats are able to continue to move and forage through the area. <u>This needs to be balanced against the safety needs of the community.</u> Bats are particularly sensitive to light, which has the potential to inhibit their movement and feeding habits. For this reason, it is important that those areas of Peacocke identified as being Significant Bat Habitat Areas are protected from the effects of <u>excessive</u> lighting and glare.</p>	Support in part	Adare agrees that public safety is a critical lighting consideration.	Allow the submission, subject to appropriate wording.
265.	Kainga Ora	55.399	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements Information Requirements	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The suggested amendments to Appendix 1.2.2.1 would improve the clarity of the information that is required to be prepared by removing cross reference to concept plan requirements for other parts of the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Allow the submission to the extent that the changes improve the clarity of the information that is required to be prepared.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			<p>Amend as follows: Additional Requirements for Concept Plans for the Peacocke Character Zone Neighbourhoods Structure Plan Comprehensive Development Plan for all subdivision and land use in the Peacocke Precinct Subdivision <u>and development</u> within the Peacocke <u>Precinct</u> Structure Plan shall be prepared a <u>Comprehensive Development Plan that addresses: to comply with the requirements of 1.2.2.2 iii) and include the following additional information:</u> a) Demonstrate how the proposal is in accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan and how the objectives and policies of the Structure Plan are able to be met. b) Provide an analysis over all adjoining sites to the subject site to ensure issues impacting on the development are understood and address the following matters: A Master Plan shall accompany subdivision applications for in the Peacocke Character Zone for Fee Simple Subdivision where lots created are less than 2ha in the Terrace Area and less than 5000m² in the Gully and Hill Areas. Master Plans shall be prepared in accordance with the neighbourhoods identified in Appendix 2-3 and the Peacocke Structure Plan (refer to Volume 1, Chapter 3: Structure Plans). A Master Plan will also be required to include a Subdivision Concept Plan (refer to Appendix 1.2.2.2d)), an analysis over all adjoining neighbourhoods to the subject site to ensure issues impacting on the development are understood and address the following matters.</p>		<p>City. Better clarity could also be achieved by deleting reference to Design Guides which are not relevant to the Peacocke Precinct and by referring to a new Design Guide for the Peacocke Precinct. For example, the Design Guides in Appendix 1.4.2 and Appendix 1.4.3 are not applicable to the Medium Density Residential Zone in the Peacocke Precinct (refer to submission 55.408) even though they are currently referred to in Appendix 1.2.2.1(vi).</p> <p>2. Requiring Comprehensive Development Plans (referred to as Concept Plans in the notified provisions) to accompany land use consent applications would be an unnecessary and overly onerous requirement. All development will be preceded by subdivision of some kind. Subdivision consent applications are the most appropriate trigger for a Comprehensive Development Plan (or Concept Plan) to be prepared.</p>	<p>3. Disallow the submission to the extent that the changes seek to require Comprehensive Development Plans to accompany land use consent applications.</p>
266.	Kainga Ora	55.400	<p>Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements Information Requirements</p> <p>Amend as follows: For any subdivision <u>or land development</u> application in the Peacocke <u>Structure Plan Precinct</u> adjoining or including any open space zone or involving more than two hectares of land, a Landscape Concept Plan shall be provided...</p>	Oppose	<p>All development will be preceded by subdivision of some kind. Subdivision consent applications are the most appropriate trigger for a Landscape Concept Plan to be prepared.</p>	Disallow the submission.
267.	Kainga Ora	55.401	<p>Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements Information Requirements</p> <p>Amend as follows: All subdivision <u>or land development</u> applications within the Peacocke <u>Structure Plan Precinct</u> adjoining or including an open space zone or involving more than two hectares of land shall include...</p>	Oppose	<p>All development will be preceded by subdivision of some kind. Subdivision consent applications are the most appropriate trigger for an Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan to be prepared.</p>	Disallow the submission.
268.	Kainga Ora	55.404	<p>Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria P1</p> <p>Amend as follows: Earthworks in the Peacocke <u>Structure Plan Precinct</u>: a. The extent to which earthworks <u>in the Earthworks Overlay</u> are sympathetic to the existing landform</p>	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction of an 'Earthworks Overlay' where more sympathetic earthworks are required would be unduly restrictive and inconsistent with enabling medium and high density outcomes within the areas that are subject to the overlay. 2. It is unclear from the submission where the suggested 'Earthworks Overlay' would apply. 3. As an alternative, to the extent that changes are more enabling of earthworks in the Peacocke Structure Plan area then this would be supported. 	Disallow the submission.
	Kainga Ora	55.405	<p>Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria P3</p>	Support	<p>The suggested amendments will improve the clarity of the matters of discretion.</p>	Allow the submission.

	Name, address and original submission number	Sub #	Chapter, subject and submitter's relief	Support or oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
			<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>a. The extent the proposal is consistent with the objectives and policies in the Peacocke Structure Plan.</p> <p>...</p> <p>d. The extent to which development contributes a range of housing typologies and densities to create a diverse neighbourhood consistent with the purpose of the Peacocke Structure Plan <u>Precinct</u>.</p>			
270.	Kainga Ora	55.408	<p>Appendix 1.4 Design Guides 1.4.10 Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks that any such guides including the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide is treated as a non-statutory document that sits outside of the District Plan and referenced in an advice note against the relevant rules and effects standard to be considered when preparing an application. Kāinga Ora seeks that it works with the Council and its consultants to formulate a list of specific matters that should be included as matters of discretion and assessment criteria on design outcomes that are to be considered and could be incorporated into the District Plan. This should be undertaken with the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide and any other proposals seeking design guides for medium to high density residential activities.</p>	Oppose in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some of the Design Guides which are referred to in Appendix 1.2.2.2.1 as needing to be considered when preparing Concept Plans for subdivision consent applications are not relevant to the Peacocke Precinct (including Appendix 1.4.2 and Appendix 1.4.3). Adare supports preparation of a Design Guide that is suited to the medium and high density outcomes anticipated in the Peacocke Precinct. 2. Adare opposes the request for Design Guides to be non-statutory documents to enable them to be referenced in the district plan and updated without a Schedule 1 process: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) All planning documents must be included in the plan as a matter of law; (b) There would be considerable uncertainty as to the relevance of any non-statutory Design Guides to decision making for resource consents. (c) Natural justice and public participation require landowners and other stakeholders are afforded an opportunity to make a submission on any Design Guidelines under Schedule 1 of the Act. 3. Design Guides for other parts of the City are statutory documents which are included in the District Plan. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks to delete reference to Design Guides which are included in the District Plan. 2. Allow the submission to the extent that a new Design Guide is prepared which is suited to the medium and high density residential outcomes anticipated in the Peacocke Precinct.
271.	Kainga Ora	55.409	<p>Appendix 15 – Transportation 15-1 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas – Tables and Figures</p> <p>Amend as follows: Single Dwellings, duplex dwellings and terrace dwellings and apartments <u>any development</u> in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area <u>Precinct</u>.</p>	Support	Adare supports the removal of minimum car parking requirements to give effect to the NPS-UD.	Allow the submission.