

---

**Further Submission on Private Plan Change 5 to the  
Hamilton City District Plan**

---

**To:** Plan Change 5 Further Submissions  
Freepost 172189  
City Planning Unit  
Hamilton City Council  
Private Bag 3010  
Hamilton 3240  
[districtplan@hcc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@hcc.govt.nz)

---

**Introduction:**

1. This is a further submission on Private Plan Change 5 ("PC5") to the operative Hamilton City Council Operative District Plan ("HCDP") made by the Findlay Family Trust.
2. The Findlay Family Trust made submission (Submissions #17) on the notified version of PC5.
3. This further submission is made on behalf of Findlay Family Trust **in Support of of** Submissions as outlined in the table attached as Attachment A.
4. This further submission is made on behalf of Findlay Family Trust in **Opposition to** Submissions, insofar as those submissions oppose PC5 or seek that the text of PC5 be subject to substantive changes if it is approved, as outlined in the table attached as Attachment A.

**Interest in the Submission:**

5. In accordance with Schedule 1, Clause 8(1)(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA" or "Act") the Findlay Family Trust has an interest in PC5 that is greater than the interest that the general public has, in that the Findlay Family Trust has an interest in land immediately adjoining PC5.
6. The Findlay Family Trust could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this further submission.

**Request to be heard in Support of Further Submission:**

7. The Findlay Family Trust wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.
8. The Findlay Family Trust will consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others make a similar submission.

Sign



Name: Peter Findlay  
Address: PO Box 56, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240  
Email: [peter@findlay.net.nz](mailto:peter@findlay.net.nz)  
Phone: 0274717273

Findlay Family Trust – Further Submission Schedule to Peacocke Plan Change 5 ('PC5) of 16 March 2022					
Submitter Name and Address	Sub #	Submission Point	Support or Oppose	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decision sought on whole or part of submission
Glenview Club <a href="mailto:louise@feathers.co.nz">louise@feathers.co.nz</a>	1	1.2, 1.5	Support	Inaccurate mapping and overreach of Natural Open Space zoning required. Mapping must be dependable and accurate.	Amend 'Significant Bat Habitat' generally at a Structure Plan level and also consider and respond to site specific characteristics. Make consequential amendments to provisions as required following further evidence and ground-truthing prior to including these features on the planning maps.
		1.14	Support	Removal of dead, diseased, at risk, unsafe (and of useful life) vegetation should be a permitted activity.	Amend provisions accordingly.
Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group <a href="mailto:mangacare@gmail.com">mangacare@gmail.com</a>	3	3.1-3.18	Oppose	Matters raised and relief sought are inconsistent with our primary submission.	Retain PC5 as notified. Flexibility is needed with respect to enabling alignment of drains, particularly where doing so is conducive to ecological gains/improved ecological outcomes.
Joshua Daniel Stannard <a href="mailto:josh@stannard.org">josh@stannard.org</a>	4	4.1	Support	Context, location and design of walkways and cycleways should be safe, aligned to CPTED principles, provide for passive surveillance and connectivity to neighbouring land including Houchens Rd Structure Plan Area ('HRSPA').	Remove, relocate walkway/cycleway, include design and safety imperatives, and ensure integration with neighbouring land/HRSPA.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency <a href="mailto:emily.hunt@nzta.govt.nz">emily.hunt@nzta.govt.nz</a>	10	10.2	Support	Agree with rationale, better approach to sustainable management of resources.	Support amendment proposed and/or any necessary consequential amendments.
		10.11	Oppose	Amendment sought is too prescriptive and directive.	Largely revert to original submission wording, subject to amendments as follows: The transport network will be staged as development progresses within Peacocke. The principles for the transport network are: <del>Priorities</del> <u>Prioritises</u> residents of Peacocke's mobility and accessibility by <u>mode choice 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 <del>Public Transport</del> <del>public transport</del> <u>mode choice</u> <u>active modes</u> , at expense of level of service (LOS) for private car. <u>if necessary</u> . • Maximise network efficiency for <del>Public Transport</del> <del>public transport</del> , <u>buses</u> , <u>High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV)</u> and active modes through design. • Flexible design to cater for evolution & steps changes in transport system, such as <u>future high occupancy vehicles</u> .
		10.12	Oppose	Amendment sought is too prescriptive and directive.	Retain 'where possible' in PC5 and amend in response to spelling error.
		10.15	Oppose	Upgrades and closure of Hall Rd/SH3 intersection are supported as is the Structure Plan of Strategic Infrastructure Required that reflects the same. The need to integrate land use and infrastructure planning is paramount and further should respond to, support, and recognise previous land use decisions accepted by the road controlling authorities, including the Houchens Rd Structure Plan Area ('HRSPA').	Suggested amendment to wording of Stages D and E with table titles "Strategic Infrastructure Required" is opposed. The NZTA proposal 'kicks the issue to touch,' creates and promotes uncertainty concerning lead infrastructure, and does not promote the sustainable management of resources, is inconsistent with Part 2 of the RMA, is inappropriate in terms of RMA s32, and does not represent the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency <a href="mailto:emily.hunt@nzta.govt.nz">emily.hunt@nzta.govt.nz</a>	10	10.37	Oppose	Matters raised and relief sought are inconsistent with our primary submission.	Retain PC5 as notified.
Hodgson Trustee Management Co. Ltd <a href="mailto:hodgsonwm@gmail.com">hodgsonwm@gmail.com</a>	12	12.2	Support in Part	In principle acceptance of a connection to SH3 is supported. An alternative location of the proposed intersection is opposed.	Consultation is welcome and further investigation in support of the notified location is supported, noting the imperative to accommodate traffic generation from Hall Rd, PC5, HRSPA in the vicinity of the intersection/connection location proposed in PC5.
Jones Land Ltd <a href="mailto:tristan@jonesgroup.co.nz">tristan@jonesgroup.co.nz</a>	13	13.1	Support	Rationale outlined related to partial road closure/severance and disestablishment of intersection, proposed intersection location and its connection to HRSPA is supported.	Relief sought in original submission is supported.

		13.2	Support	Rationale outlined concerning Structure Plan underpinned by technical assessment and Gray Matter ITA in support of s32 analysis is supported along with call for draft intersection design called for.	Relief sought in original submission is supported to retain intersection location, confirmation of design, implementation triggers to provide certainty and ability to integrate and co-ordinate growth from structure plans and for engagement with road controlling authorities.
		13.3	Support	Opposition to staging and strategic infrastructure pre-requisites required is supported.	Relief sought in original submission is supported to amend/delete strategic infrastructure table and staging map requirements, along with any references to prescriptive requirements determinative of development and infrastructure sequencing.
		13.4, 13.9	Support	Opposition to proposed location and extent of ecological corridors, including bat corridors, reserves, Significant Natural Areas, Significant Bat Habitat Areas etc is supported. Inadequate and inaccurate evidence base used, areas are excessive, not refined, lacks consultation, should not extend into Waipa District, may disrupt existing and desired connectivity outcomes, lacks context with major transport routes and surrounding areas on city side of Southern Links.  HCC should assume responsibility for monitoring.	Relief sought in original submission is supported, including removal of any ecological/bat corridors shown over land outside HCC's jurisdiction.  HCC to bear responsibility for monitoring.
Northview Capital <a href="mailto:tristan@jonesgroup.co.nz">tristan@jonesgroup.co.nz</a>	14	14.6, 14.7 & 14.10	Support	Respectively, as per 13.3, 13.4 & 13.9 above.	Respectively, accept relief proposed in original submission as per 13.3, 13.4 & 13.9 above.
Waikato Environmental Centre (Go Eco) <a href="mailto:manager@goeco.co.nz">manager@goeco.co.nz</a>	20	20.2-20.16	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission.	Revert to relief sought in primary submission. In the alternative, retain PC5 wording as notified.

Transpower NZ Ltd <a href="mailto:environment.policy@transpower.co.nz">environment.policy@transpower.co.nz</a>	21	21.2	Support	Relevance of current use, regionally significant infrastructure, excessive, inappropriate, and not justified. Evidence base lacking, shortcomings in assessment, justification, and ground truthing. Consequential and other linkages and bat corridors are similarly opposed.	Relief sought is supported, however responsibility for open space required is not to be transferred elsewhere. Zoning and related provisions are to ensure activities undertaken on the site are 'permitted activities' while also allowing scope for growth. Further, a structure plan approach is preferred that ensure site-specific characteristics are recognised.
		21.5	Support	Inadequate assessment undertaken, evidence base lacking, minor effects even if substantiated. Insufficient assessment, evidence, and ground truthing over the site and the broader area (i.e. not just 25 Hall Rd)	Relief sought is supported subject also to the approach referred to in 21.4 above.
		21.6	Support in Part	Excessive width/area. Insufficient justification/reasoning, assessment, and evidence base. Significant lighting area in place with need to accommodate growth.	Save for the Significant Bat Habitat Area not being relocated, relief sought is supported subject also to the approach referred to in 21.4 above.
		21.7	Support	Maintaining 24-hr vehicular access to site with safe and convenient connection to SH3 is supported.	24-hr vehicular access to site required along with a safe and convenient connection to SH3 are supported.
ID & EM Williams <a href="mailto:iwilliams@genetic.co.nz">iwilliams@genetic.co.nz</a>	25	25.3	Oppose	Significance of excessive glare overstated, cannot always be mitigated, does not adequately consider lux/glare encountered and overcome in bat trips, understates adaptability of bats, cannot be allowed to render development uneconomic and be the cost burden of development.	Amend and do not retain as notified.
		25.6	Support in Part	Relevance of development economic, feasible development, and compensation principles inferred.	A flexible approach to depiction of the bat buffer zone & its dimensions is supported to assist development feasibility and reduce compensation.
Johnny Tsai <a href="mailto:johnnybrot@gmail.com">johnnybrot@gmail.com</a>	27	27.3, 27.4	Support	Bat surveys, prescriptive and inflexible buffers and setbacks are not supported, must consider biodiversity, context of	Relief needs refinement, however responsive approach that consider site- specific characteristics and other relevant matters is supported.

				land (e.g. topography and scale) and need to incorporate roads, community and other infrastructure.	
Andrea Graves <a href="mailto:andrea.graves@slingshot.co.nz">andrea.graves@slingshot.co.nz</a>	30	30.1-30.20	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission.	Do not alter Plan Change 5 as notified.
Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua <a href="mailto:deontekopa@gmail.com">deontekopa@gmail.com</a>	32	32.12	Support in part	Aim for a broader biodiversity approach is supported rather than an overly bat centric approach.	Relief sought is supported to the extent that greater biodiversity is sought and encouraged.
Shih-An Tseng <a href="mailto:bencentt@gmail.com">bencentt@gmail.com</a>	33	33.3	Support	Generally support comments but hard to follow.	Removal of bat survey and level of assessment requirement supported.
		33.4	Support	Excessive bat buffers and setbacks, particularly if road infrastructure is not allowed to be included and co-exist in the bat habitat and setback area.	Road infrastructure to be included in the bat buffer area. Circumstances that allow the buffer area to be reduced are to be defined.
Kevin and Kathy Sanders <a href="mailto:bevan.houlbrooke@ccl.co.nz">bevan.houlbrooke@ccl.co.nz</a>	35	35.3, 35.4	Support in Part	Comments related to Proposed SNA, Proposed Bat Corridor and Proposed Bat Habitat, significant costs (identified in s32 analysis) and compensation are supported.	Relief related to Proposed Natural Open Space Zone, Proposed SNA, Proposed Bat Corridor and Proposed Bat Habitat is supported.
Waikato Regional Council <a href="mailto:Matthew.Vare@waikatoregion.govt.nz">Matthew.Vare@waikatoregion.govt.nz</a>	36	36.1	Support in Part	We agree with and support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Amendments that work to improve the alignment of development in the Peacocke Structure Area with density targets provided in draft and finalised Future Proof Strategy, and</li> <li>▪ The expectation that the effects and requirements of development in the PSP Area, alongside other growth in Hamilton and surrounds to be well-integrated and to acknowledge Future Proof Three Waters Programme work.</li> </ul> The above aligns with our primary submission.	Amendments to PC5 to support, capture and action reasons outlined and the relief sought, particularly where it is consistent with relief sought in original submission.

		36.17, 36.46, 36.78, 36.79	Support	Matters and relief raised are supported and/or consist primary with submission.	Amend relief proposed or of similar effect.
		36.2-36.16, 36.18-36.45, 36.47-36.77, 36.80- 36.81	Oppose	Matters and relief raised are not supported and/or inconsistent with primary submission.	Retain PC5 as notified.
Department of Conservation - Te Papa Atawhai <a href="mailto:jgooding@doc.govt.nz">jgooding@doc.govt.nz</a>	38	38.1-38.78	Oppose	Matters and relief raised are not supported and/or inconsistent with our primary submission.	PC5 should be advanced without amendment particularly where these amendments would result in PC5 text or maps being inconsistent with the matters raised in our primary submission and elsewhere in our further submissions.
Ron Lockwood <a href="mailto:bevan.houlbrooke@ckl.co.nz">bevan.houlbrooke@ckl.co.nz</a>	39	39.1-39.3, 39.7-39.10	Support	Principles and approach to compensation, questions raised about whether included as Natural Open Space and/or (Significant) Bat Habitat Areas, implicit suggestion of focus on mitigation of adverse effects, inappropriate follow through and remedies on s32 analysis findings and approach to sharing of costs and mitigation of effects.	Amend objectives, policies, plans and rules (and any reference/application) related to ecological and bat corridors, including proposed buffers/setbacks for development taking a structure plan approach that recognises site-specific characteristics. Ensure a compensation and sharing approach is pursued relative to mitigation of effects related to the above.
AJ & HC Koppens <a href="mailto:hamish@novogroup.co.nz">hamish@novogroup.co.nz</a>	40	40.7	Support in Part	Principles outlined & also their application to other land areas.	Support in part as noted immediately above. A structure plan approach is preferred where site specific characteristics are recognised and applied.
Shortbread Ltd <a href="mailto:lyne@bluwallace.co.nz">lyne@bluwallace.co.nz</a>	41	41.1, 41.2, 41.19, 41.20, 41.30	Support in part	Principles and rationale outlined & application to other land areas.	Support in part as noted immediately above. A structure plan approach is preferred where site specific characteristics are recognised and applied.
Ohaupo Land LP <a href="mailto:fraserm@barker.co.nz">fraserm@barker.co.nz</a>	42	42.1	Support	Submission points are supported, including explanation, rationale, ambiguity, lack/shortcomings of evidence base referred to including reach and effects on HRSP and SL1 areas.	Amend objectives, policies, plans and rules (and any reference/application) related to ecological and bat corridors outside Peacocke Structure Plan Area, including buffers/setbacks proposed for development. Consultation to occur with landowners, stakeholders & submitters affected with an evidence base provided to identify and justify a proposed bat corridor over the land in question and help address and mitigate their concerns.

		42.2	Support	Account for and comply with Medium Density Residential Standards legislation and NPSUD in all respects.	Amend objectives, policies, plans and rules to align with MDRS legislation and NPS-UD objectives and policies.
		42.3	Support	Important to understand location, timing, triggers, scale of second reservoir and whether appropriate for growth needs of (e.g. including PC5, HRSPA, SL1).	Peacocke Structure Plan Chapters specific structure plans (e.g. infrastructure) to address, enable, and be responsive to growth and infrastructure needs of the area
		42.4	Support	As otherwise infrastructure staging proposed restricts growth, is not enabling, and is inconsistent with NPSUD objectives and directives.	Amend to align with NPS-UD and for infrastructure configuration, sizing, staging & location to be fit for purpose, flexible and able to cater for growth, to not foreclose or compromise when and where development may occur including in adjoining structure plan areas.
		42.5	Support in part/ oppose in part	<u>Support</u> realignment/ closure of Hall Rd, including for safety & efficiency reasons. <u>Oppose</u> moving the proposed intersection further south. Approved land use decisions and HRSPA, agreed by the road controlling authorities, provides for a transport link at this location.	Retain as suggested and supported by ITA.
Golden Valley Farms <a href="mailto:fraserm@barker.co.nz">fraserm@barker.co.nz</a>	43	43.1	Support	Submission points are supported, including explanation, rationale, ambiguity, lack/shortcomings of evidence base referred to including reach and effects on HRSP and SL1 areas.	Amend objectives, policies, plans and rules (and any reference/application) related to ecological and bat corridors outside Peacocke Structure Plan Area, including proposed buffers/setbacks for development. Consultation to occur with landowners, stakeholders & submitters affected, and evidence sought to address and mitigate concerns.
		43.2	Support	Account for and comply with Medium Density Residential Standards legislation and NPSUD in all respects.	Amend objectives, policies, plans and rules to align with MDRS legislation and NPS-UD objectives/directives.
		43.3	Support	Important to understand location, timing, triggers, scale of second reservoir and whether appropriate for growth needs of (e.g. including PC5, HRSPA, SL1).	Peacocke Structure Plan Chapters specific structure plans (e.g. infrastructure) to address, enable, and be responsive to growth and infrastructure needs of the area



		43.4	Support	As otherwise infrastructure staging proposed restricts growth, is not enabling, and is inconsistent with NPSUD objectives and directives.	Amend to align with NPS-UD and for infrastructure configuration, sizing, staging & location to be fit for purpose, flexible and able to cater for growth, to not foreclose or compromise when and where development may occur including in adjoining structure plan areas.
		43.5	Support in part/ oppose in part	<u>Support</u> realignment/ closure of Hall Rd, including for safety & efficiency reasons. <u>Oppose</u> moving the proposed intersection further south. Further, it contradicts land use decisions related to the HRSPA and the location of a future transport previous accepted and agreed by the road controlling authorities at this location.	Retain as per PC5 and where supported by ITA and amend as noted in the Findlay Family Trust submission.
Cordyline Holdings Ltd <a href="mailto:christina.sheard@dentons.com">christina.sheard@dentons.com</a>	44	44.4	Oppose	Oppose location & extent of Proposed Bat Corridor and Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area including rationale in support.	Retention of Figure 2-3 as notified is opposed (i.e. items (a) and (b) of Cordyline relief sought is not accepted).
		44.5	Oppose	Rationale not supported.	Oppose and amend proposed infrastructure staging plan.
Ben and Rachel Inger <a href="mailto:l_ben@hotmail.com">l_ben@hotmail.com</a>	46	46.1	Support	Suggested less prescriptive approach supported.	Suggested wording or similar is acceptable subject to relief sought not being inconsistent with that sought in the further submitters' primary submission.
		46.2, 46.3	Support	Assists clarification, consistency, accuracy.	Suggested wording or similar is acceptable subject to relief sought not being inconsistent with that sought in the further submitters' primary submission.
		46.4, 46.5	Support	Recognition of compensation approach to "provision" supported subject to final form and extent of provisions and related maps.	Suggested wording or similar is acceptable subject to relief sought not being inconsistent with that sought in the further submitters' primary submission.
		46.6	Support in Part	Addition of "fixed lighting" is pragmatic.	Suggested wording or similar is acceptable subject to relief sought not being inconsistent with that sought in the further submitters' primary submission.
		46.7	Support	Assists clarification.	Suggested wording or similar is acceptable subject to relief sought not being inconsistent with that sought in the further submitters' primary submission.

		46.8	Support in Part	Assists clarification	Suggested wording or similar is acceptable subject to relief sought not being inconsistent with that sought in the further submitters' primary submission.
Ben and Rachel Inger (continued) <a href="mailto:I_ben@hotmail.com">I_ben@hotmail.com</a>		46.9, 46.10	Support in part	The general approach is supported provided it applies to private land generally and is not site specific	As suggested or similar, subject to it being applied at a structure plan level and subject to recognition of site-specific characteristics.
		46.11	Support	Support sole reference being Bat Habitat Area	Support removal of "Significant" from all references to "Significant Bat Habitat Areas"
		46.12	Support in part	Support rationale of statements made, including in support of compensation and reduction of corridor width to <u>all land so affected</u> .	As suggested or similar, subject to it being applied at a structure plan level, with recognition given to site-specific characteristics.
Pragma Homes Ltd <a href="mailto:fraserm@barker.co.nz">fraserm@barker.co.nz</a>	47	47.2	Support	To account for and comply with Medium Density Residential Standards legislation and NPSUD in all respects.	Amend objectives, policies, plans and rules to align with MDRS legislation and NPS-UD objectives and policies.
		47.5	Support	As otherwise proposed infrastructure staging restricts growth, is not enabling, and is inconsistent with NPSUD objectives and directives.	Amend to align with NPS-UD and for infrastructure configuration, sizing, staging & location to be fit for purpose and growth, be sufficiently flexible to cater for growth, and not foreclose or compromise where and when development may occur, including in adjoining structure plan areas.
Gregory Alan Knight <a href="mailto:lynne@bluewallace.co.nz">lynne@bluewallace.co.nz</a>	48	48.1	Support in part	A specific (contours) approach is preferred to a general approach (high level mapping) as is the approach to compensation and mitigation.	General relief sought or similar is supported based on structure plan approach that recognises site-specific characteristics.
		48.2	Support in part	Shared use of open space, opposition to 20m buffer & SNA overlay, 5m setback and supported.	Relief sought or similar is supported.
Stuart and Maylene Ross <a href="mailto:lynne@bluewallace.co.nz">lynne@bluewallace.co.nz</a>	50	50.1, 50.4, 50.20	Support in part	As per 48.1, 48.2 above.	As per 48.1, 48.2 above.
Ebenezer Property Ltd Partnership <a href="mailto:lynne@bluewallace.co.nz">lynne@bluewallace.co.nz</a>	51	51.1, 51.2, 51.19	Support in part	As per 48.1, 48.2 above.	As per 48.1, 48.2 above.
Jacky Li & Alex Zheng <a href="mailto:lynne@bluewallace.co.nz">lynne@bluewallace.co.nz</a>	52	52.1-52.3, 52.20-52.21	Support	Relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Alter PC5

		52.22	Support	Relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Alter PC5
		52.33	Support	Relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Alter PC5
Adare Company Ltd <a href="mailto:mike.doesburg@wynnwilliams.co.nz">mike.doesburg@wynnwilliams.co.nz</a>	53	53.1 -53.6, 53.8-53.17, 53.19, 53.21-53.25, 53.27-53.72, 53.74=53.79 , 53.81- 53.85, 53.88- 55.105	Support	Rationale and relief sought are generally supported, and consistent with our primary submission.	Suggested wording or similar is acceptable subject to relief sought not being inconsistent with that sought in the further submitters' primary submission.
		53.7, 53.18, 53.20, 53.26, 53.80, 53.86, 53.87	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission.	Retain PC5 as notified.
		53.10	Oppose in part.	Does not reflect MDRS.	Amend PC5 to reflect new MDRS legislation.
		53.21/53.98	Support in Part	Collector Road widths requirements are too onerous and would cause in many cases excessive earthworks given topography. In many cases local roads widths can be reduced and would support more resourceful use of land and better UD outcomes. Support road widths consistent with NZS4404.	Subject to points raised being addressed, relief requested is supported.
		53.73	Support in Part	Relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Amend 53.73 to ensure waterbodies includes stormwater detention areas such that (a)-(d) does not apply
		53.80	Support in Part	Relief sought appears incomplete. Compensation is raised but not sought in relief requested.	Amend 53.80 to ensure compensation applies to land identified and/or to be vested, otherwise this submission point is opposed in its entirety.
		53.81	Oppose in Part	This should not apply to State Highways and to provision of the infrastructure as	Amend to ensure are not required to assess and provide infrastructure required on land owned by road controlling authorities or a public entity.

				the land is not privately held or controlled.	
Kainga Ora <a href="mailto:developmentplanning@kaingaora.govt.nz">developmentplanning@kaingaora.govt.nz</a>	55	55.1-55.19, 55.21, 55.23-55.24, 55.26-55.32, 55.34-55.37, 55.40-55.44, 55.49-55.55, 55.57- 55.58,55.60- 55.71-55.90, 55.92-55.93, 55.95-55.97, 55.99- 55.116, 55.118- 55.121, 55.123, 55.125, 55.127- 55.151, 55.153- 55.179, 55.181- 55.190, 55.192- 55.385, 55.387- 55.398, 55.408	Support	Relief sought is consistent with our primary submission and/or consistent with matters included in the footnote.	Retain PC5 as notified subject to amendments sought in our primary submission.
		55.20	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission.	Retain PC5 except as submitted on DEC01-PSP: 014 in primary and further submissions.

		55.22	Support in part	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission.	Amend as follows: Establish a <u>well-connected and safe</u> network of open space, that supports the ecological values of the Peacocke Area and provides passive recreation opportunities. <del>where they do not conflict with ecological values.</del>
		55.25	Support in Part	Relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Alter PC5 so it reads: “The transport network reduces car dependency and encourages <u>mode choice</u> and a mode shift to walking, cycling and public transport. <u>by providing a well-connected transport network.</u>
		55.33	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission and overly directive and prescriptive.	Retain PC5 as notified.
		55.38	Support in Part	Relief sought is consistent with our primary submission, but overly prescriptive.	Substitute “promote” for “require”
		55.39	Support in Part	Relief sought is consistent with our primary submission, but overly prescriptive.	Amend so it reads <del>Avoid Ensure</del> New development should <del>is- connected to</del> and promotes surveillance of <del>‘turning its back’ or privatising edges to major natural features and recreational areas</del> open spaces.
		55.45	Support in part	Relief sought is consistent with our primary submission, but overly prescriptive.	Alter PC5 but substitute “should” for “will”
		55.46, 55.47, 55.48, 55.56 55.59	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission and/or too prescriptive.	Retain PC5 as notified.
		55.91, 55.94, 55.117, 55.122, 55.124,	Oppose	Relief sought is opposed, inconsistent with our primary submission, and/or too prescriptive.	Revert to relief sought in primary submission.

		55.126, 55.152, 55.180, 55.191, 55.386, 55.399			
		55.400-406	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission.	
		55.407			Alter PC5 to provide supportive and flexible approach to earthworks.
		55.409	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission.	Alter PC5, all parking requirements should not be abandoned.
		55.410	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission.	Alter PC5 so an ITA is not required.
		55.411	Oppose	Relief sought is inconsistent with our primary submission.	Alter PC5 so road widths are not reduced, parking strategy and service location are not limited or constrained as proposed.
Riverlea Environmental Incorporated Society <a href="mailto:riverlea.soc@gmail.com">riverlea.soc@gmail.com</a>	56	56.2-56.5	Oppose	Concerns, expectations and interpretation of imperatives and bottom lines are overstated, adaptability of long-tailed bat is understated.	Retain PC5 as notified, reject suggested amendments.
Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Cene) <a href="mailto:harvey@goeco.org.nz">harvey@goeco.org.nz</a>	58	58.5	Oppose	Greater setback from SNA's not supported.	Retain PC5 as notified, with no change in policy to increase extent of setbacks from SNAs.
		58.6	Oppose	Overly prescriptive, not evidence based.	No minimum width of ecological corridor to be specified.
		58.7	Oppose	Subjective, prescriptive, not evidence based, and does not recognise behaviour and adaptability of bats.	Retain PC5 as notified, oppose relief sought.
		58.9, 58.10, 58.11	Oppose	Overly restrictive. Oppose and not supported: tree felling protocol, SNA, bat corridor and buffer area overstated. Needs of all users (e.g. bats and people) must be considered in setting lux levels, encouraged to co-exist, while recognising adaptability of bats.	Retain PC5 as notified but provide flexibility to allow and facilitate all users to co-exist.

		58.12	Oppose	Areas referred to are distinctive, have different qualities, needs and users.	Retain PC5 as notified and do not amend.
		58.13	Oppose	Excessive.	Retain PC5 as notified but provide flexibility to allow and facilitate all users to co-exist.
		58.14	Oppose	Land and land suitable for pekapeka habitat is a finite resource, has an economic cost & should foster biodiversity and not be overly focussed on a single species.	Retain PC5 as notified but alter to avoid PC5 becoming 'Bat centric'.
		58.16	Oppose	Extension to setback from SNA and bat roost sites opposed.	No increase in setback for bat roost sites.

**Footnote**

- For all of the above, further consequential, or alternative relief is sought as may be necessary, desirable, or appropriate to give effect to, support or reflect any part of concerns raised, relief sought, including such amendments as required to the rules, objectives, policies, assessment criteria, reasons, provisions, definitions, other matters, maps, and any schedules, appendices of the proposed plan.
- Similarly, reasons given in support or opposition to submission points and relief sought includes that which promotes the sustainable management of resources, is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, is appropriate in terms of s32 of RMA, and represents efficient use and development of natural and physical resources.