

**FURTHER SUBMISSION ON PLAN CHANGE 5 – PEACOCKE STRUCTURE PLAN
UNDER THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

To: Hamilton City Council
Private Bag 9021
260 Anglesea Street
Hamilton 3240
Attention: Plan Change 5 Further Submission
haveyoursay@hcc.govt.nz

Name of submitter: Metlifecare Limited

Address: c/- MinterEllisonRuddWatts
PO Box 105249
Auckland 1143
Attention: Bianca Tree / Holly-Marie Noone
bianca.tree@minterellison.co.nz
holly-marie.noone@minterellison.co.nz

Scope of further submission

1. Metlifecare Limited (**Metlifecare**) is a submitter on Plan Change 5 – Peacocke Structure Plan (**PC5**).
2. This is a further submission on behalf of Metlifecare in support of, and in opposition to, primary submissions on PC5.
3. Metlifecare was established in 1984 and is a leading owner and operator of retirement villages in New Zealand. Metlifecare focuses on providing outstanding care and ensuring the comfort, happiness and wellbeing of its residents by developing and maintaining high quality housing and creating dynamic, vibrant and diverse social communities for older people throughout New Zealand.
4. Metlifecare operates using a range of different development models which generally include a variety of residential unit layouts ranging from apartments and townhouses for independent living, through to assisted living apartments and residential care homes with rest home to hospital level care.

5. Metlifecare is actively providing feedback to all councils on their district plans to recognise and provide for retirement villages in appropriate locations.
6. Metlifecare is a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has because it is a national provider of retirement villages.

Submissions supported and opposed

7. The submissions supported and opposed by Metlifecare are set out in the table **attached** as Schedule 1 to this further submission.

Reasons for further submission

8. The reasons for Metlifecare's further submission include the following.
9. In general, the submissions that Metlifecare supports:
 - (a) Promote sustainable management and are consistent with the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**);
 - (b) Assist Hamilton City Council to carry out its functions under the RMA;
 - (c) Give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020;
 - (d) Give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021;
 - (e) Are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives and policies of PC5;
 - (f) Ensure that PC5 is clear and consistent;
 - (g) Ensure that critically endangered bats and their habitats are appropriately recognised and provided for without imposing unnecessary constraints on development;
 - (h) Will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;
 - (i) Will enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being; and
 - (j) Represent good resource management practice.

10. The parts of PC5 that Metlifecare opposes are not consistent with the matters set out above.
11. Further, without derogating from the generality of the above, the specific reasons why Metlifecare supports or opposes each submission are set out in the **attached** Schedule 1.

Relief sought

12. Metlifecare seeks the following relief:
 - (a) That the submissions supported in Schedule 1 be allowed or allowed in part (as specified); and
 - (b) That the submissions opposed in Schedule 1 be disallowed.
13. Metlifecare wishes to be heard in support of its further submissions.
14. If others make a similar submission, Metlifecare will consider presenting a joint case with them at hearing.

DATED at Auckland this 16th day of March 2022

Metlifecare Limited by its solicitors and
duly authorised agents
MinterEllisonRuddWatts



Bianca Tree

Address for service of submitter:

Metlifecare Limited
c/- MinterEllisonRuddWatts
PO Box 105249
AUCKLAND 1143

Attention: Bianca Tree / Holly-Marie Noone
Telephone No: (09) 353 9700
Fax No. (09) 353 9701
Email: bianca.tree@minterellison.co.nz
holly-marie.noone@minterellison.co.nz

Schedule 1 Metlifecare Limited – specific further submissions on Plan Change 5

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
1	Mithrandir Enterprises Limited	<p>8.1: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone; Building Height – 5 Storeys</p> <p>Limit residential building height to three stories</p>	Oppose	The submission point is inconsistent with the purpose of PC5 which seeks to enable a range of housing typologies, including in medium and high-density areas. The submission point is also inconsistent with the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	The submission be disallowed.
2	Hamilton City Council	<p>11.1: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone; Amendments to PREC – 036 – 48</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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. <p>MRZ – PREC1-PSP: Rules – Development Standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Amend the current development standards to align with the standards set out in Schedule 3A Part 2 Building Standards (9) to (15) v. 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. <p>11.3: General; Any additional amendments</p> <p>All further amendments to PC 5 that are necessary to give effect to the MDRS and the requirements of the Resource Management (Enabling</p>	Support in part	Metlifecare supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act) as Hamilton is a Tier 1 urban environment and will otherwise be required to amend PC5 at a later date.	The intent of the submission be allowed.

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
		Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill once the final form of the Bill is passed into law and becomes an Act of Parliament.			
3	Jones Lands Limited Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	13.11 and 14.11: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone; rest home and retirement village provisions Amend all provisions relating to rest home and retirement village to be more enabling, and that where there are development controls that are less enabling than the outdoor living etc requirements set by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, that they be amended.	Provisionally support	The provisions relating to rest homes and retirement villages support the provision of retirement village development for elderly members of the community and should recognise the specific requirements of this type of land use. The provisions should also be consistent with the Amendment Act. The submission point is provisionally supported on the basis that limited detail has been provided about how the submitter anticipates the provisions being more enabling.	The intent of the submission be allowed.
4	Graeme McMillian	16.1: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential; High density overlay Create a new chapter specifically for high density zone. I also ask for marketing information/illustrations to reflect the proposed zoning instead of presenting a 'best-case' illustration.	Support in part	The submission point recognises that it can be difficult to identify provisions intended to apply within the overlay area. Those provisions could be separated out. However a full set of new provisions is not supported.	The intent of the submission be allowed.
5	Go Eco	20.5: Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan; DEV01-PSP: P36 Amend policy to increase extent of setbacks from Significant Natural Areas where possible.	Oppose	This submission point does not recognise the need for certainty. The policy is already broad and requires “ <i>development adjacent to the gully network and Waikato River to meet required setbacks to support the ecological function of these areas</i> ”. Metlifecare considers that there is already provision in the plan to avoid adverse impacts on Significant Natural Areas.	The submission be disallowed.
6	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.5: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential; MRZ-PREC1-PSP: 05 – Objectives: land use development Amend as follows: Development in Peacocke provides a range of housing typologies that are consistent with the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character of two <u>two to up to three</u> -storey buildings in the medium density zone and two <u>up to five</u> storey buildings within the high- density area.	Oppose	This objective seeks to recognise that housing in the medium density zone and high density overlay are two or three storeys. It does not intend to imply that taller buildings are not anticipated in these areas. Metlifecare therefore considers it more appropriate to amend the policy to suggest that the built character is typically made up of these buildings (see submission point below).	The submission be disallowed.

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
7	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.5: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential; MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R26 Retain the provision of Retirement Villages as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Amend Rules PREC1-P R36 – R48 so that they are relevant for retirement villages.	Support in part	Specific standards for retirement villages are appropriate where they are necessary to recognise the functional and operational requirements of this type of residential development.	The intent of the submission be allowed (subject to the specific amendments referred to in Metlifecare's submission).
8	Andrea Graves	30.8: General; Bat Protection Include requirements for developers to undertake bat monitoring pre and post-development.	Oppose	Where there are anticipated adverse effects on bat habitats appropriate monitoring conditions can be included in the conditions of that consent. The extent of the obligations imposed will be considered on a case-by-case basis. An onerous obligation on all consent applicants is not reasonable or appropriate.	The submission be disallowed.
9	Director-General of Conservation	38.1: Appendix 2 Structure Plans; DEV1-PSP: P53 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	The Structure Plan has identified significant bat habitats. Development should not be unnecessarily constrained (while recognising the importance of critically endangered bats). Development in any additional areas where bat habitats are identified can be managed in accordance with the objectives and policies in the Plan.	The submission be disallowed.
10	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".	Oppose		The submission be disallowed.
11	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 amendments that may be necessary to address the submitter's concerns.	Oppose in part	Insufficient information is provided to determine whether this will unnecessarily constrain development.	The submission be disallowed unless further information is provided.
12	Director-General of Conservation	38.7: General; Bat and Habitat and Enhancement Review 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,	Oppose	It is not appropriate to form and give a panel these powers within the framework of the District Plan.	The submission be disallowed.

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
		<p>including representatives of the Department of Conservation. The Panel would be required to make recommendations on:</p> <p>(a) The initial preparation of Bat Protection Plans and subsequent reviews;</p> <p>(b) sub-plans for Construction Works within the Bat Priority Areas;</p> <p>(c) the review of monitoring and compliance reports.</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.</p>			
13	Director-General of Conservation	<p>38.16: Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan; Additional objective (and a range of other submission points by this submitter which seek to “avoid” adverse effects on Bat Priority Areas).</p> <p>Suggested wording: <u>Protect and enhance bat priority areas and avoid adverse effects on other areas of potential bat habitat.</u></p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.</p>	Oppose	Widening the proposed objectives to include an objective which seeks to “avoid” adverse effects on other areas of “potential” bat habitat creates uncertainty and imposes an overly high standard on landowners.	The submission be disallowed.
14	Director-General of Conservation	<p>38.43: Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan; Additional objective</p> <p>Add Objective: <u>Residential development is designed and located to protect and enhance long-tailed bats and their habitat. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.</u></p>	Oppose	The submission point is seeking to impose an unreasonable burden on consent holders to “enhance” long-tailed bats and their habitat. That obligation should only be applicable where the development is anticipated to have adverse effects on that habitat.	The submission be disallowed.
15	Director-General of Conservation	<p>38.48: Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct; NOSZ-PREC1-P:18</p> <p><u>Change the wording to:</u></p> <p>Identify and manage areas of Natural Open Space in the Peacocke Structure Plan to:</p> <p>1) <u>Ensure the protection and enhancement and access to, of identified habitat of long-tailed bats;</u></p> <p>2) <u>Provide habitat and connections for long tailed bats;</u></p> <p>3) <u>Avoid the adverse effects of development on the habitat of long-tailed bats;</u></p> <p><u>By:</u></p> <p>a) <u>avoiding the adverse effects of lighting and noise within the Bat Priority Areas;</u></p>	Oppose in part	The submission point seeks to require the avoidance of adverse effects. It does not recognise that there may be situations where remedying or mitigating any effects is an appropriate outcome.	The submission be disallowed unless amended.

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
		<p>b) protecting bats from predation; c) <u>banning ownership of cats and mustelids within the Peacocke Structure Plan Area;</u> d) <u>protecting roosting sites within the Bat Priority Areas; and</u> e) <u>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.</p>			
16	Ron Lockwood	<p>39.5: (Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone; Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan) Amend as follows: "Bat Corridors: It is proposed that bat corridors be established to retain connectivity between core habitat for bats in the Peacocke area. In terms of corridor habitat, the most important general principle is that <u>35m wide bat corridors</u> wide swaths of land are required to be set aside as bat corridors in order to retain a permeable and functioning landscape for long-tailed bats."</p>	Support in part	The provisions in PC5 should be clear and consistent with Environment Court precedent.	The intent of the submission be allowed with the amendments proposed by the Adare Company in row 20 below.
17	Cordylina Holdings Limited	<p>44.17: (Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential zone; MRZ-PREC1-PSP: P24) Amend policy P24 to clarify that the transport network, parks, stormwater wetlands and other proposed features shown in the structure plan are indicative. This could be achieved by amending the policy to read: "Residential development shall use land and infrastructure efficiently by: 1. Delivering yields from housing development in both greenfield growth areas and intensification areas, as indicated by rules or Structure Plans. 2. Staging and sequencing the development as indicated by the Peacocke Structure Plans. 3. Otherwise complying with <u>being generally consistent with</u> the Peacocke Structure Plan."</p>	Support	Structure planning is intended to act as a guide for changes to land use, built form and public spaces and provide greater certainty for the local community. It "illustrates the proposed layout for a future development area". However, resource consents can be granted if they are generally consistent with that plan but propose alternative locations for certain features. That should be recognised in the policies supporting the Structure Plan provisions.	The submission be allowed.
18	Cordylina Holdings Limited	<p>44.22: (Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential zone; MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R26) Retain [the restricted discretionary status for retirement villages that meet the prescribed development standards and restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved] as notified, subject to amendments to matter of discretion P – Peacocke Structure Plan</p>	Support	The provision in PC5 for the development of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity in the Medium Density Residential zone in the Peacocke Precinct is appropriate because it recognises that retirement villages are compatible with and appropriate within this zone.	The submission be allowed.
19	Ohaupo Land	42.4 and 43.4: General – Infrastructure Staging (servicing)	Support in	The submission point recognises that there should be some degree of flexibility in the	The submission be

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
	LP Golden Valley Farms	Align [Infrastructure Staging (servicing) provisions] with national direction ... Flexibility in infrastructure provision so different stages can come on line as and when urban environments are able to be developed to sufficient capacity.	part	provision of infrastructure where different stages can come on line and is supported subject to the relief sought in row 23 below.	allowed.
20	The Adare Company	53.20: Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan; DEVO1-PSP; Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Natural Environment and Open Space Network and Key Bat Habitat and Bat Buffer and Proposed Bat Corridor Diagrams See summary of submissions page 53	Support	The submission point recognises that 35m rather than 50m is the most appropriate width of Bat Habitat Areas, as that width has been supported by the Environment Court in <i>Weston Lea Limited v Hamilton City Council</i> [2020] NZEnvC 189.	The submission be allowed.
21	The Adare Company	53.23: Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan; DEVO1-PSP. Amend paragraphs 1 and 2 to read: “The majority of the Peacocke residential zone will be a medium density environment delivering a range of typologies <u>typically</u> between 2 and 3 storeys. This will provide for a range of housing typologies and densities, establishing a mix of housing tenure and a diverse community. It is anticipated that the topography of the area will influence the development of houses and the density will vary according to constraints of the site. A higher density area, which is anticipated to have a mix of terrace dwellings and apartment buildings <u>typically</u> between 2 and 5 storeys, has been identified for locations within close proximity of the identified local centre, schools, community facilities and transport routes identified for frequent public transport. The higher density will assist in supporting public transport and creating a viable and vibrant local centre.”	Support	This submission point seeks to recognise that the PC5 is promoting the provision of a range of different housing typologies. Built form outcomes of 2-3 and 2-5 storeys are typical outcomes but there may be scenarios where single storey or more than five storey buildings are considered to be appropriate to provide for the range of housing typologies required to meet the diverse needs of the community.	The submission be allowed.
22	The Adare Company	53.23: Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan; DEVO1-PSP Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Business Areas – Figure 19 Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept Amend the northern boundary of the Local Centre shown on the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram (being made to shift the northern boundary of the Local Centre to the south (a reduction of approximately 7,600m2).) 53.91: Appendix 2 – Structure Plans; Figure 2-1 Peacocke Structure Plan – Land use Support the location of the Proposed Local Centre as shown on Figure 2-1 Land Use, subject to the changes sought to the northern boundary south above.	Support	Moving the northern boundary of the Local Centre to the south will assist to create a better interface between the Local Centre and adjacent high density residential uses.	The submission be allowed.

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
23	The Adare Company	53.26: Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan; DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan and Peacocke Staging and Infrastructure. (and Appendix 2 – Structure Plans; Staging) See summary of submissions page 54.	Support	The submission point recognises that there should be some degree of flexibility in the provision of infrastructure where different stages can come on line after alternative staging is approved following a resource consent process. The proposed amendments allow development to generally occur in accordance with the infrastructure staging plan which will ensure that urban environments are able to be developed to sufficient capacity when the necessary infrastructure has been provided.	The submission be allowed.
24	The Adare Company	53.26: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential zone; Objective MRZ-PREC1-PSP Amend MRZ-PREC1-PSP: 05 to read: “Development in the Peacocke Structure Plan area provides a range of housing typologies that are consistent with the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character of <u>typically</u> two to three-storey buildings in the medium density zone and <u>typically</u> two – to five storey buildings within the high-density area.”	Support	See row 21 above.	The submission be allowed.
25	The Adare Company	53.33: Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct; Policy MRZ-PREC1-PSP:P21 Amend MRZ-PREC1-PSP: P21 to read: “Residential development is designed to manage effects of <u>fixed</u> lighting on adjacent areas of <u>within</u> the Natural Open Space <u>Zone</u> .”	Support	The suggested approach would achieve consistency with policies 25.6.2.2a and 25.6.2.2b in the Lighting and Glare chapter which refer specifically to “fixed lighting”.	The submission be allowed.
26	The Adare Company	53.82: Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare; Rule 25.6.4.4 That Rule 25.6.4.4 Peacocke Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct be amended as follows: “Lighting <u>from fixed sources</u> shall not exceed 0.3 lux (horizontal and vertical) when measured at the external boundary of the Significant Bat Habitat Area.”	Support	As above.	The submission be allowed.
27	The Adare Company	53.61: Chapter 15A – Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct Add new rules in NOSZ-PREC1-P: Rules – Activity Status Table for the following activities: • <u>Stormwater management devices, ponds and wetlands. Activity Status: Permitted</u> • <u>Wastewater pump stations. Activity Status: Permitted</u>	Support	This submission point recognises the need to provide the necessary infrastructure to support growth in the area and that this infrastructure can be successfully integrated into Open Space areas.	The submission be allowed.

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
28	The Adare Company	53.64: Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct: SUB-PREC1-PSP Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP: O7 to read: "Subdivision considers the planned medium <u>and high</u> density development outcomes and enables a range of building typologies to be constructed."	Support	The submission point recognises that PC5 seeks to provide for a range of housing typologies and densities to create a mix of housing tenures and a diverse community.	The submission be allowed.
29	The Adare Company	53.90: Appendix 1.4 Design Guides: Peacocke Local Centre Guide Amend the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide in Appendix 1.4.10 to be clearer and more succinct	Support	The submission point ensures that applicants are given a clearer indication of the matters that should be given consideration when designing the local centre. It is currently repetitive, and difficult to follow and interpret.	The submission be allowed.
30	The Adare Company	53.99: Appendix 17 – Planning Maps; Planning Maps 57B, 58B, 64B and 65B Amend the mapped extent of the overlay area within the submitter's land on Planning Maps 57B, 58B, 64B and 65B so that the overlay reflects areas where significant hazards exist. The amendments should be based on the outcomes of detailed geotechnical investigations for the submitter's land, including (but not limited to) the investigations which informed the Amberfield resource consents.	Support	The Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area should only identify areas where a significant hazard exists.	The submission be allowed.
31	The Adare Company	53.104: Appendix 17 – Planning Maps; All Planning Maps Amend the Peacocke Precinct Planning Maps to change "Significant Bat Habitat Area" to "Proposed Bat Habitat Area" in the Legend.	Support	Removing the reference to "Significant Bat Habitat Area" will prevent confusion with Significant Natural Areas.	The submission be allowed.
32	Kainga Ora	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 proposed provisions set out in Attachment 2 of Kāinga Ora submission.	Oppose in part	In general, the inclusion of a zone rather than an overlay would be more consistent with the approach to other zones in the plan and would be good resource management practice. However, the zone provisions should reflect the overlay provisions in PC5 and subject to submissions, rather than the provisions this submitter has drafted.	The submission be disallowed unless amendments are made.
33	Kainga Ora	55.1: Appendix 17 – Planning Map; High Density Overlay Amend the size of the proposed Local Centre to reflect the recalculation of density targets, or change the type of centre for the Precinct.	Oppose	The submitter has not identified what size it considers to be required, therefore, Metlifecare has limited information to understand the effect of this relief and therefore opposes it due to the unknown effect on the surrounding landowners.	The submission be disallowed.

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
34	Kainga Ora	<p>55.4: 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 eEnabling 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 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>	Oppose in part	<p>PC5 seeks to provide for a range of housing typologies and densities to create a mix of housing tenures and a diverse community.</p> <p>The submission point does not recognise the importance of providing for a range of housing types to meet the needs of all communities.</p> <p>Low density residential development can be successfully integrated alongside medium and high density development while still creating a predominately medium and high density living environment.</p>	The submission be disallowed unless amendments are made.
35	Kainga Ora	<p>55.5: Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan; Vision</p> <p>55.399: Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements</p> <p>The vision for the Peacocke area area Precinct is that it will become a high-quality area <u>medium to high density</u> urban environment that is based on urban design best practice, social well-being, and environmental responsibility.</p> <p>...</p>	Oppose	<p>The submitter proposes to require resource consent applications to include a Comprehensive Development Plan 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,</p>	The submission be disallowed.

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
		<p>The Peacocke area <u>Precinct</u> is Hamilton's southern growth cell and is ideally located to <u>provide house</u> approximately 20,000[TBC] people homes with easy access to destinations such as the Central City and the University of Waikato...</p> <p>...</p> <p>These features of the Peacocke area Precinct means that it is important...The Peacocke <u>area Precinct</u> 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.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The topography in Peacocke is typically undulating and earthworks will be required to achieve the densities envisaged in the area. It is important that <u>these in identified locations of topographical / geological / cultural significance, earthworks are 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.</u></p> <p><u>To guide development in the Peacocke Precinct, a Comprehensive Development Plan will need to be prepared with either a land use 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> <p>Amend as follows: <u>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</u> Subdivision and development within the Peacocke Precinct Structure Plan shall be prepared a Comprehensive Development Plan that addresses: to</p>		<p>landuse, landscape design, staging and integration, as well as a detailed development response (architecture and urban design) and an ecological rehabilitation and management plan.</p> <p>This is not necessary as PC5 provides for a structure plan that provides sufficient guidance on these matters.</p>	

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
		comply with the requirements of 1.2.2.2 iii) and include the following additional information.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 5000m ² 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.			
36	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	PC5 seeks to provide for a range of housing typologies and densities to create a mix of housing tenures and a diverse community. The submission point does not recognise the importance of providing for a range of housing types to meet the needs of all communities. Low density residential development can be successfully integrated alongside medium and high density development while still creating a predominately medium and high density living environment.	The submission be disallowed.
37	Kainga Ora	55.105: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential zone; MRZ – PREC1-PSP: O1 Amend as follows: A range of housing types typologies and densities is available to meet the needs of all communities. 55.105: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential zone; MRZ – PREC1-PSP: O4 Amend as follows: The Peacocke Precinct is establishes a well-connected, integrated, high amenity, medium density residential environment, with areas of high density around identified activity nodes, corridors and areas of natural amenity.	Support	As above.	The submission be allowed.

#	Submitter	Specific Submission Point(s)	Support / Oppose	Reasons for support / opposition and relief sought	Decision sought
38	Kainga Ora	<p>55.117: Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential zone; New Policy MRZ - PREC1-PSP: PX</p> <p>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></p>	Oppose	As above.	The submission be disallowed.
39	Kainga Ora	<p>55.408: 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	The Design Guide is currently repetitive, and difficult to follow. It would be consistent with other councils if the guide was to sit separately from the District Plan, and it is considered that additional matters of discretion and assessment criteria on design outcomes are not required.	The submission be disallowed.