

# **Plan Change 5**

## **Peacocke Structure Plan**

### **Summary of Submissions**

16 February 2022

Sub N°	Submitters	Page	Sub N°	Submitters	Page
1	<a href="#">Glen View Club</a>	1	33	<a href="#">Shih-An Tseng</a>	21
2	<a href="#">Brendin Raymond and Mary Anne Ronke</a>	2	34	<a href="#">Dan and Sarah Franicevic</a>	21
3	<a href="#">Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group</a>	2	35	<a href="#">Kevin and Kathy Sanders</a>	22
4	<a href="#">Joshua Daniel Stannard</a>	3	36	<a href="#">Waikato Regional Council</a>	22
5	<a href="#">Living Streets Kirikiriroa (Hamilton)</a>	3	37	<a href="#">WEL Networks Limited</a>	28
6	<a href="#">George Lane</a>	3	38	<a href="#">Department of Conservation - Te Papa Atawhai</a>	29
7	<a href="#">Frankie Letford</a>	3	39	<a href="#">Ron Lockwood</a>	34
8	<a href="#">Mithrandir Enterprises Ltd</a>	4	40	<a href="#">AJ and HC Koppens</a>	35
9	<a href="#">Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</a>	4	41	<a href="#">Shortbread Limited</a>	36
10	<a href="#">Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency</a>	5	42	<a href="#">Ohaupo Land LP</a>	38
11	<a href="#">Hamilton City Council</a>	7	43	<a href="#">Golden Valley Farms</a>	38
12	<a href="#">Hodgson Trustee Management Co. Limited</a>	7	44	<a href="#">Cordyline Holdings Limited</a>	38
13	<a href="#">Jones Lands Limited</a>	8	45	<a href="#">Richard &amp; Ann Pirrit</a>	42
14	<a href="#">Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)</a>	9	46	<a href="#">Ben Inger and Rachel Inger</a>	42
15	<a href="#">Tilehurst Living Trust</a>	10	46	<a href="#">Pragma Homes Limited</a>	44
16	<a href="#">Graeme McMillan</a>	11	48	<a href="#">Gregory Alan Knight</a>	44
17	<a href="#">Findlay Family Trust</a>	11	49	<a href="#">Metlifecare Limited</a>	46
18	<a href="#">Fire and Emergency New Zealand</a>	12	50	<a href="#">Stuart &amp; Maylene Ross</a>	47
19	<a href="#">Nathan Cox, Stand Developments</a>	14	51	<a href="#">Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership</a>	49
20	<a href="#">Waikato Environmental Centre (Go Eco)</a>	14	52	<a href="#">Jacky Li &amp; Alex Zheng</a>	50
21	<a href="#">Transpower New Zealand Ltd</a>	15	53	<a href="#">The Adare Company Limited</a>	53
22	<a href="#">Woolworths New Zealand Limited</a>	15	54	<a href="#">Bike Waikato</a>	63
23	<a href="#">Broadwater Village Ltd</a>	15	55	<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>	64
24	<a href="#">Ministry of Education</a>	16	56	<a href="#">Riverlea Environment Incorporated Society (RESI)</a>	87
25	<a href="#">ID and EM Williams Ltd</a>	16	57	<a href="#">Victoria Collins &amp; Troy Radovancich</a>	88
26	<a href="#">Alan Tsai</a>	17	58	<a href="#">Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)</a>	88
27	<a href="#">Johnny Tsai</a>	17			
28	<a href="#">Richard and Elizabeth Ward</a>	17			
29	<a href="#">Jacqueline Hazel Bates</a>	17			
30	<a href="#">Andrea Graves</a>	17			
31	<a href="#">Tainui Waka Tourism Incorporated</a>	19			
32	<a href="#">Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua</a>	20			

**[Have your Say – all Submissions](#)**

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
1	Glenview Club	1.1	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	The zoning of Sport and Active Recreation, Neighbourhood Centre and Medium Density Zone	Support in Part	The zoning of Sport and Active Recreation, Neighbourhood Centre and Medium Density Zone (with high density overlay) as proposed supports the Club's current operation and long term vision for the site.	Retain these three zones.
1	Glenview Club	1.2	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	The zoning of Natural Open Space, with SNA overlay and Significant Bat Habitat	Support in Part	The zoning of Natural Open Space, with SNA overlay and Significant Bat Habitat is opposed. The Club believe that the mapping is inaccurate as the site does not contain any features that warrant such zoning or overlay.	Remove the Natural Open Space, SNA overlay from the site and amend the corresponding Significant Bat Habitat. Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
1	Glenview Club	1.3	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	The location of the proposed zoning does not reflect the Club's long term vision.	Oppose	The location of the proposed zoning does not reflect the Club's long term vision. While the Club agree with the general location of the zones, refinement is required to enable retention of existing access, retention of existing facilities required for the motorhome park and to create a more regular shape of the residential land to enable a comprehensive development with good urban design outcomes.	Amend the proposed Sport and Active Recreation, Neighbourhood Centre and Medium Density Zone (with high density overlay) as shown in the figure attached to the submission. Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
1	Glenview Club	1.4	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	The land use of Sport and Active Recreation, Neighbourhood Centre and Medium Density Zone	Support in Part	The Sport and Active Recreation, Neighbourhood Centre and Medium Density Zone (with high density overlay) land use as proposed on the Peacocke Structure Plan - Land Use supports the Club's current operation and long term vision for the site.	Retain these three land uses on the Structure Plan.
1	Glenview Club	1.5	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	The areas of Natural Open Space, with SNA overlay and Significant Bat Habitat	Support in Part	The areas of Natural Open Space, with SNA overlay and Significant Bat Habitat on the Strcuture Plan maps are opposed. The Club believe that the mapping is inaccurate as the site does not contain any features that warrant such zoning or overlay.	Remove the Natural Open Space, SNA overlay from the site and amend the corresponding Significant Bat Habitat. Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
1	Glenview Club	1.6	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	The location of the proposed landuses within the Strcuture plan maps does not reflect the Club's long term vision.	Oppose	The location of the proposed land use does not reflect the Club's long term vision. While the Club agree with the general location of the zones, refinement is required to enable retention of existing access, retention of existing facilities required for the motorhome park and to create a more regular shape of the residential land to enable a comprehensive development with good urban design outcomes.	Amend the proposed Sport and Active Recreation, Neighbourhood Centre and Medium Density Zone (with high density overlay) as shown in the figure attached to the submission. Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
1	Glenview Club	1.7	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP 'Business Centres' page 27	Support in Part	The text refers to the desired size of neighbourhood centres as being between 300m2- 800m2. This land area is too small to provide for meaningful urban design outcomes such as: outdoor dining areas, which attract people to stay for longer, and utilise the sport and active recreation land. landscaping, public art, common areas, pedestrian footpaths. Related Peacocks Objective NCZ-REC1 – PSP:03 seeks to achieve a attractive, high amenity area and encourages pedestrian focussed environments. Limiting the area of land zoned as Neighbourhood Centre does not promote this goal.	Remove text "providing approximately 2,600m2 GFA between them, ranging from 300m2 - 800m2 of GFA" Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
1	Glenview Club	1.8	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP:R21 RDIS-1 (4) Childcare Facility	Oppose	RDIS – 1 (4) states: "The activity shall have a maximum GFA...of 250m2." This is insufficient for modern day childcare activities given the demand for childcares and meeting MoE requirements.As a restricted discretionary activity, the effects of the scale and intensity of any proposed activity can be assessed for each individual site. Specific to the Glenview Club site, the location of any future childcare facility in proximity to Open Space zones means that the site could potentially accommodate a larger childcare without adverse effects. It is such site specific assessments that should determine the appropriateness of this activity. Reliance on assessment criteria is a better tool for assessing effects.	Remove RDIS-1 (4) Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
1	Glenview Club	1.9	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ –PREC1 – PSP: R22 RDIS-1 (2) Visitor Accom.	Oppose	RDIS – 1 (2) states: "The maximum occupancy for visitor accommodation shall be 12 guests." As a restricted discretionary activity, the effects of the scale and intensity of any proposed activity can be assessed for each individual site. Specific to the Glenview Club site, the location of any future visitor accommodation in proximity to Club's conference facilities, Club activities, the Neighbourhood Centre zone and also to the Hamilton Gardens means that the site could appropriately accommodate more visitors without adverse effects. Reliance on assessment criteria is a better tool for assessing effects.	Remove RDIS-1 (2) Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
1	Glenview Club	1.10	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1 – PSP: 03 Objectives	Support	The text says: "Neighbourhood Centres in the Peacocks Structure Plan Area are attractive, high amenity and pedestrian focussed environments." This objective supports good urban design outcomes for neighbourhood centres.	Retain.
1	Glenview Club	1.11	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1 – PSP: P1 through to P6	Support	The policies support good urban design outcomes.	Retain.
1	Glenview Club	1.12	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZCPREC1-PSP:Rules R1 through to R18	Support in Part	The Permitted activities as listed provide good variety for vibrant neighbourhood centres.	Retain.
1	Glenview Club	1.13	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZCPREC1- PSP: Rules R7, R8, R9, R19, R13, R17	Support in Part	R6 PER-2 – Retail states: "The GFA is less than 150m2 per tenancy." This is supported, however the "per tenancy" is not followed through to all other rules, including: R7 PER-2 – Banks; R8 PER-2 – Restaurants, cafes and licensed premises; R9 PER-2 – Food and beverage outlets; R10 PER-2 – Ground floor gymnasiums; R13 PER-2(3) – Ground floor health care; R17 PER-2 – Ground floor tertiary education. The maximum GFA should be per tenancy, to assist in clarification for the owners and future tenants.	Add "per tenancy" to each rule as listed.
1	Glenview Club	1.14	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ –PREC1 – P:R15 PER-1 - Vege. Removal	Oppose	PER – 1 does not allow for vegetation removal from Natural Open Space Zones if that vegetation is dead, diseased or if it presents a risk. The Glenview Club site has two areas of NOSZ covering it. The ability to fell and remove dead, diseased, or hazardous vegetation should be permitted to avoid the need to go through a resource consent process.	Add that the removal of vegetation that is dead, diseased, or posing a risk to person or property is permitted. Alternatively: Remove the NOPZ notation from the site. Make subsequential amendments and/or insertions to other provisions as necessary.
1	Glenview Club	1.15	Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	SARZ – PREC1-P: Policies	Support in Part	The policies of this zone do not provide for the retention of existing activities. Although the Glenview Club Operates some Activities under existing resource consent, the Club seek certainty that their existing operation aligns with the intent of the Zone. A new specific policy is sought that acknowledges the existing Glenview Club and provides for its ongoing operation and development.	Add a new policy either specific to the Glenview Club, or generally, to acknowledge existing activities on the new SARZ. Make subsequential amendments and/or insertions to other provisions as necessary.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
1	Glenview Club	1.16	Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	SARZ- PREC1- P:R15 Maintenance of existing features, including buildings, structures and grounds	Support in Part	This rule states that the maintenance of existing features, including buildings, structures and Grounds is permitted subject to SARZ R30-R35. This rule does not include existing 'activities'. So, technically, the rule as written allows for the Club buildings and grounds, but not the actual restaurant, conference facilities, motorhome park, tab, off license etc. Furthermore, there is no R30 in the provisions as notified. The Club seek a new specific rule that provides for the Glenview Club Activity and operations as a permitted activity. This new rule would trump, or displace the requirement to comply with R1-R24 where relevant. I.e, the Glenview Club would be excluded from compliance with R1-R24, where relevant. As part of this new rule, the Club also seek exclusion from all rules in SARZ (R30-R36) to allow for future growth. This is required for certainty of the Club's members, staff and management.	Clarify R30. Insert new Rule to that provides for the Glenview Club activity and operations as a permitted activity, where that activity and operation is not subject to the relevant SARZ rules (R1-R36 and any subsequential additional rules). Make subsequential amendments and/or insertions to other provisions as necessary.
1	Glenview Club	1.17	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP:R14 Design standards	Support in Part	The exceptions as written are generally supported, however the provisions should include an additional exception, to accommodate subdivision that merely seeks to create separate titles to mirror zone boundaries. That is, a new provision should read: 3) The standards of Rule Sub-PREC1- PSP: R15, R16, R17, R23 and R24 shall not apply to the subdivision of land intended solely to separate zoning. This will provide added certainty and streamlining for simple subdivisions, particularly for those existing owners who have split zoning on their land but have no intention to develop it for the intended purpose.	Insert a new provision: 3) The standards of Rule Sub- PREC1- PSP:R15,R16, R17, R23 and R24 shall not apply to the subdivision of land intended solely to separate zoning. Make subsequential amendments and/or insertions to other provisions as necessary.
2	Brendin Raymond and Mary Anne Ronke	2.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Location of proposed wetland areas	Support in Part	Move the proposed wetland areas to amalgamate with the existing wetland area already in place at the bottom of the hilly terrain. This will enhance the Proposed Community Park and Proposed Open Space areas. Two of these proposed wetland areas are placed on steep terrain and the placements are to the west of the proposed Southern Links highway. The proposed storm water wetland area on the Proposed Community Park area is flat land and is adjacent to the already fenced wetland area and we feel these areas should be included in the established wetland area. To the east of the proposed highway there is already in place a designated wetland area which has been fenced off. If the wetland areas already set out on the Peacocke Structure Plan were moved adjacent to, or combined to the already fenced wetland area it would be a great enhancement for the Proposed Community Park and Natural Open Space. Walkways and cycle ways and small bridges across the newly formed wetland area would be a fantastic feature for all citizens to enjoy. Water will naturally flow from highest to lowest point, don't waste valuable funds fighting it and work with nature.	Move proposed wetland areas "A-B-C" (Part of Lot 1 DPS 23381 and Lot 2 DPS 13668) identified on the map appended to the submission to amalgamate with the existing fenced wetland area already in place at the bottom of the hilly terrain.
2	Brendin Raymond and Mary Anne Ronke	2.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Land Locked by designation	Support in Part	The proposed Southern Links Highway will leave an area of approx 5Ha that is completely land locked (including proposed wetland areas of approx 1.9 Ha.) with no access to this area for us. In total due to the Proposed Plan Change – 5 we will lose approx 16.145 Ha of valuable farm land or future residential building sites. This land is under a long term lease for dairy farming.	Amend to provide clear access to land locked area "H" (Lot 2 13668) identified on the map appended to the submission.
2	Brendin Raymond and Mary Anne Ronke	2.3	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Location of wetland area	Support in Part	The eastern end of part Lot 1 DP 23381 shows an existing wetland area that meets up with Peacocks Road. This is not correct as it is productive farmland, please correct this error.	Remove non-existing wetland area "F" identified on the map appended to the submission (Part Lot 3 DP 23381).
2	Brendin Raymond and Mary Anne Ronke	2.4	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Location of Neighbourhood Centre.	Support in Part	To the southern boundary of Lot 2 DPS 13668, on the neighbouring property, there is a proposed local neighbourhood center, if it was moved to the Proposed Community Park on Lot 2 DPS 13668 it would be more beneficial to the users of the park.	Move proposed local neighbourhood centre to the proposed community park on Lot 2 DPS 13668.
2	Brendin Raymond and Mary Anne Ronke	2.5	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Removal of chestnut trees	Oppose	On the Northern boundary of part Lot 1 DPS 23381, many years ago we planted a small grove of Chestnut trees. These were planted as a memorial to a very special family member. We would appreciate it if this area was given the respect it deserves and be preserved.	Refrain from removing grove of Chestnut trees on Lot 1 DPS 23381.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Oppose deletion of 3.4.1.1- 3.4.1.3	Oppose	As per our submission on previous version, Mangakotukutuku Gully system has high biodiversity values that need to be recognised and protected.	Reinstate natural system as priority in DEV01-PSP.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.2	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Oppose deletion of 3.4.2.1bi b) Gully Area i. - The environmentally sensitive area.	Oppose	Oppose deletion of 3.4.2.1bi b) Gully Area i. As per our submission on previous version, Mangakotukutuku Gully system has high biodiversity values that need to be recognised and protected.	Reinstate text at appropriate place to acknowledge sensitivity of the receiving environment - "The environmentally sensitive area of the Mangakotukutuku Gully network runs through the centre of Peacocke. Because of the natural sensitivity of this area lower urban densities are appropriate".
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Vision - Amendment	Support in Part	Text needs to acknowledge the need to protect high biodiversity values, notably all species that considered threatened, including aquatic species (see DOC Threat Classification reports)	Add underlined - These features of the Peacocke area means that it is important land development occurs in such a way that takes advantage of its location, responds to, <u>respects and protects</u> the important ecological values of the area and integrates with the transport network to ensure a high level of accessibility is maintained into and throughout the area.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.4	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Amendment to DEV01-PSP: O7 Urban development	Support in Part	Text needs to acknowledge the need to protect high biodiversity values, notably all species that considered threatened, including aquatic species (see DOC Threat Classification reports)	Reword as underlined - DEV01-PSP: O7 Urban development <u>responds to the area's natural hazards, respects the natural environment and protects the ecological values.</u>
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.5	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Amendment to DEV01-PSP: O13	Support in Part	DEV01-PSP: O13 Protect and enhance identified significant habitat of indigenous fauna and significant indigenous vegetation. The word "identified" seems later to apply mainly to bats. While we support this, it is also important to protect and enhance habitat for other threatened species, including aquatic species.	Delete "identified"- Protect and enhance significant habitat of indigenous fauna and significant indigenous vegetation.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O13	Support in Part	We note from DEV01-PSP: P13 that Peacocks now includes high density housing. We are concerned this will compromise hard fought for stormwater mitigation plans in the ICMP	Confirm that changes in housing density meet the stormwater treatment requirements of the ICMP (i.e. the version last provided for public comment). It appears that the ICMP is still in draft form - it is critical that the previous stormwater treatment provisions are not watered down so the version of the ICMP referred to throughout needs to be clearly stated (see also DEV01-PSP: P60).
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.7	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P23	Support in Part	DEV01-PSP: P23 Near identified ecological corridors, ensure the design and location of buildings, infrastructure and lighting is managed throughout the Peacocke Structure Plan in order to maintain their role and function	Ensure the stream network is also identified as an ecological corridor as this is critical for fish movement/migration.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.8	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P30	Support in Part	DEV01-PSP: P30 Protect the physical integrity and ecological and stormwater function of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River margins.	Add underlined - Protect the physical integrity, <u>biodiversity</u> and ecological and stormwater function of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River margins.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.9	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Add - DEV01-PSP: P39	Oppose	Fish passage throughout the gully network needs to be maintained or enhanced	Add - DEV01-PSP: P39 Provide ecological corridors along the arms of the Mangakotukutuku Gully to enable the movement of migratory native fish.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.10	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Strongly support DEV01-PSP: P70	Support	Strongly support DEV01-PSP: P70 Manage stormwater to minimise the effect of urban development on Mangakotukutuku stream values and functions, maintain the ability of the stream to continue to provide habitat for threatened aquatic species and minimise adverse effects on the stream water quality and habitat.	Retain as notified.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.11	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Natural Environment and Open Space Network	Support in Part	Need to also recognise threatened freshwater fish species in Natural Environment and Open Space Network	Add new point b) - The Mangakotukutuku Stream and the Waikato River provide migratory pathways for native freshwater fish, including several threatened species. The structure plan identifies the stream network as a corridor to be protected and enhanced. These identified corridors will be the focus of mitigation and enhancement throughout the development of the area. In c) add bullet point to state the width of the buffer provided for to sustain fish habitat values, including around gully springs and wetlands that provide important refuges for native freshwater fish.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.12	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7 NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18	Support in Part	Natural Open Space Zone includes publicly and privately owned areas that possess natural or landscape values, so it is important to recognise the importance of gully streams for freshwater fish.	Add underlined: NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7 Natural Open Space areas in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area are identified, protected and enhanced to provide and protect habitat for long tailed bats <u>and threatened freshwater fish.</u> Add freshwater fish to NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.13	Chapter 23: Subdivision	Section 23.2.1	Support in Part	23.2.1 As well as minimising effects on water quality, subdivision also needs to minimise effects on hydrology as this is a major factor affecting aquatic biodiversity. Hydrology is different to inundation so needs to be identified separately. Sediment in urban streams can become contaminated by heavy metals from roading etc so should be mentioned in addition to water quality.	Add underlined - 23.2.1 To ensure that risk to people, the environment and property is not exacerbated by subdivision. 23.2.1a Subdivision: i. Does not result in increased risk of erosion, subsidence, slippage or inundation. ii. Minimises any adverse effects on water quality, <u>sediment quality and hydrology</u> .
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.14	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O9	Support in Part	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O9 Ensure “identified ecological corridors” include perennial stream networks	Add underlined - PREC1- PSP: O9 Subdivision responds to and restores the natural environment with a focus on those areas identified in the Peacocke Structure Plan including the creation and protection and enhancement of identified ecological corridors, <u>including stream networks</u> .
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.15	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2.25 Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan Peacocke Structure Plan	Support in part	Support 1.2.2.25 Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan Peacocke Structure Plan with additions.	Add underlined - 1.An indigenous fish management plan for any stream or wetland habitat within the site, including a summary of fish habitat and species <u>abundances</u> present, a summary of planned works, permitting requirements, procedures for dealing with pest fish, biosecurity protocols, timing of works, procedures for recovering indigenous fish prior to and during works, roles and responsibilities of parties, reporting requirements. <u>any specific mitigation measures, and monitoring plans and responsibilities</u> .
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.16	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Oppose deletion of text under Peacocke Special Character Zone - E17 & E23	Oppose	Oppose deletion of text under Peacocke Special Character Zone. E17 The extent to which provision for effluent and stormwater disposal mitigates any risk of landslip or erosion and avoids adverse effects on water quality as it relates to ground water, the Waikato River, and the Mangakotukutuku gully ecosystem. Sediment in urban streams can become contaminated by heavy metals from roading etc so should be mentioned in addition to water quality. E23 Any cumulative effects from the activity, whether on its own or in combination with other activities in the area.	Reinstate E17 and E23 at appropriate place with underlined addition: E17 The extent to which provision for effluent and stormwater disposal mitigates any risk of landslip or erosion and avoids adverse effects on water quality, <u>sediment quality, aquatic habitat and fish passage</u> as it relates to ground water, the Waikato River, and/or the Mangakotukutuku gully ecosystem.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.17	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Add new Assessment Criteria	Support in Part	Need a point to require offsetting of any impacts on native fish.	Add additional point - rr) The extent to which the proposal mitigates or off-sets the effects of development on native fish.
3	Mangakotukutuku Stream Care Group	3.18	Appendix 1.4 Design Guides	1.4.10 Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide	Support in Part	Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide should include showcasing of stormwater mitigation technologies.	Add underlined - Development within the Peacocke Local Centre will be required to: 1) Have a strong emphasis on high quality urban design. 2) Demonstrate how these principles have been applied. 3) Be in general accordance with the Peacocke Town Concept Plan. 4) Be in accordance with the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide. <u>5) Showcase stormwater treatment opportunities through the use of rain gardens, pervious pavers, swales, catchpit filters etc.</u>
4	Joshua Daniel Stannard	4.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Proposed walkway/cycleway	Oppose	The proposed walkway/cycleway that runs along the the border of several homes on Dixon Rd and Moiras Pl is a large privacy and safety concern for us. We do not feel safe having the public easily access our yard and do not feel comfortable in our own home having the public walking across/near our backyard with clear eyesight into our property.	Move or remove the walkway to ensure the continued safety and privacy of our properties. We would also like the gully to be preserved as much as possible as it is a safe haven to many birds rarely seen elsewhere in Hamilton.
5	Living Streets Kirikiriroa (Hamilton)	5.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP:05	Support	Within Chapter 4 (MRZ-PREC1-PSP:05) buildings should be limited to a maximum of 5 storeys in height. In support is this quote from world-renowned architect Jan Gehl. "I would say that anybody living over the fifth floor ought generally to be referring to the airspace authorities. You're not part of the earth anymore, because you can't see what's going on the ground and the people on the ground can't see where you are."	Retain as notified.
5	Living Streets Kirikiriroa (Hamilton)	5.2	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Appendix 1.3 p43 - a)	Support	Support Appendix 1.3 p43 - a) The extent to which subdivision is designed to create a walkable and cyclable block pattern that provides clear, direct access to commercial centres and public transport.	Retain as notified.
5	Living Streets Kirikiriroa (Hamilton)	5.3	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Appendix 1.3 p43 - j)	Support	Support Appendix 1.3 p43 - j) The extent to which cul-de-sac are minimised, and if proposed, are designed to be short and provide for pedestrian and cycle connections. routes, schools for pedestrians and people on bikes.	Retain as notified.
5	Living Streets Kirikiriroa (Hamilton)	5.4	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Bus stops	Support	Support Appendix 15 p42– ‘Bus stops are to be provided within the road to minimise delays to public transport services’.	Retain as notified.
6	George Lane	6.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R16	Support in Part	The submitter supports the overall structure plan, but recommends that the terraced dwelling type in the Medium density residential zone – Peacocke Precinct (Table MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R16) is permitted. Terraced housing is a suburban building form used throughout the world and increasingly within New Zealand to provide appropriate levels of development while retaining a suburban character. Hamilton has historically restricted this building type to high density areas only, despite large public appetite to live in such dwellings.	Permit the terraced dwelling type in Table MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R16 in the Medium density residential zone – Peacocke Precinct.
6	George Lane	6.2	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 Setbacks	Support in Part	The submitter supports the overall structure plan, but recommends that for the minimum setbacks in Table MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 Setbacks, the minimum distance on the Transport corridor boundary is changed from 3m to 1m. Clarify that verandahs, porches, decks, and access stairs/ramps for a front entrance may be built in the building setback. 1m set backs are common throughout heritage suburbs within Hamilton and we should be attempting to replicate this desirable design feature throughout the city. Smaller front setbacks allow more efficient use of small sites. For a small site with 10m street frontage, reducing the front setback may allow up to 20m2 more outdoor living space in the rear yard. Reduced setbacks also improve the relation to the street by allowing people in the front room of the house to see further along the street.	Amend the minimum distance from the Transport corridor boundary in Table MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 Setbacks from 3m to 1m. Clarify that verandahs, porches, decks, and access stairs or ramps for a front entrance may be built in the building setback.
6	George Lane	6.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R37 - Specimen Trees	Support in Part	The submitter supports the overall structure plan, but recommends that for table MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R37 the minimum requirement for specimen trees on single dwellings is changed from 1 to 2. This change would bring single dwellings in line with duplex dwellings. Developers should be required to locate 2 trees on site whether they build one house or two.	Amend the minimum requirement for specimen trees on single dwellings from 1 to 2.
6	George Lane	6.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Minimum section size	Support in Part	The submitter supports the overall structure plan, but recommends that the minimum section size in the Medium density residential zone – Peacocke Precinct is clarified.	Clarify the minimum section size in the Medium density residential zone – Peacocke Precinct in Chapter 4.
6	George Lane	6.5	Chapter 25.14 Transportation	Car Parking	Support in Part	Establish a maximum car parking requirement of 2 car parks per dwelling. The provision of on site car parking has significant adverse effects on the environment. Providing car parks encourages vehicle use, contributing to air and noise pollution, road crashes, inactivity and loneliness.	Establish a maximum car parking requirement of 2 car parks per dwelling.
6	George Lane	6.6	Chapter 25.14 Transportation	Transportation	Support	Strongly support all amendments to Chapter 25.14.	Retain as notified.
6	George Lane	6.7	General	Minimum width of pedestrian and cycle links.	Support in Part	The submitter strongly supports the provisions included but suggests that design guidance is added for the minimum width of 3.5m for pedestrian and cycle links.	Add design guidance for the minimum width of 3.5m for pedestrian and cycle links.
6	George Lane	6.7	Appendix 1.4 Design Guides	Minimum width of pedestrian and cycle links.	Support in Part	The submitter strongly supports the provisions included but suggests that design guidance is added for the minimum width of 3.5m for pedestrian and cycle links.	Add design guidance for the minimum width of 3.5m for pedestrian and cycle links.
7	Frankie Letford	7.1	General	Bus and emergency services access on narrow roads,	Support in Part	Supports most of the provisions but want to add these. This subdivision has very narrow roads, how does this fit into the future access of buses, fire engines and ambulances etc. as roads will be blocked with cars accessing the tiny sections with the duplexes planned. The narrow roads in Fitzroy/ Peacocke already make access difficult for buses and these are much wider than Aurora. What overview do you have on the safety of narrow access?	Would like all points in the submission to be actioned. Support most of the chapters but feel that there are issues ignored.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
7	Frankie Letford	7.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Recognition of Shaw Bird Park	Support in Part	The Shaw Bird Park should be recognised as it is well established and visited by many. It is a Hamilton park we should be supporting and enabling. Mr Shaw has made an extensive park worth \$millions in trees, paths etc which will benefit Peacocke enormously. 100s of families visit every month now and it is a place of wild life, water and lungs of the area. It is a Hamilton/Peacocke treasure and should be recognised as such.	The Shaw Bird Park should be recognised as it is well established and visited by many.
7	Frankie Letford	7.3	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Including large trees on plans	Support in Part	We also want as many of the large trees on the land to be developed to be saved. We have to think about the Co2 these big trees will take in and help cool and clean the air of the subdivisions with high density. Who is looking at putting these large trees in Peacocke on plans to ensure that they aren't cut down as has happened on Aurora?	Would like all points in the submission to be actioned. Support most of the chapters but feel that there are issues ignored.
7	Frankie Letford	7.4	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Significant Trees	Support in Part	As we drive past the Aurora subdivision we are concerned that the plan is not correct. The plan shows 10 significant trees when there are only 5! The neighbours spent some time alerting the council about the destruction of significant trees planted by the Rukuhia Soil Research Station as specimens, but we were told that the owner was allowed to cut them down. So it is not correct to show 10 as though they were saved from the chainsaws. One was an over 100 year native.	Amend the Structure plan to show 5 significant trees within the Aurora subdivision, rather than 10.
7	Frankie Letford	7.5	General	Solar power, living areas, community gardens, soils, land contamination, retail, parks	Support in Part	We feel that so much of the city planning has been done because few of the planners live out here and don't know where their lines on paper will effect the topography. The biggest surprise to staff we saw is the size of the bridge which will be needed to go over our gully towards Peacocke retail area. We have always been promoting Peacocke for development and really want it to be environmentally positive. So we like most of your plan. Although you should know the agents of the city want to pay us all a pittance after taking it under the PWA. What is being done to encourage solar power as has happened in St Kilda in Cambridge? How are roads and sections planned so the main part of the living areas face the sun? This land is elite soil, Horitiu sand loam and so it's sad that it will be covered by roads and houses. Maybe community gardens should be planned as well. Need to ensure that land is not polluted by arsenic as we believe the land is over in Dixon Rd as the result of the old kiwifruit orchard there. Did anyone check on that before houses were built? We are pleased to see small retail areas within walking distance are planned, and with the tiny sections, parks for kids to play on. These are so important and forgotten in the northern subdivisions.	The submitter requests that all points in the submission be actioned. The submitter supports most of the chapters but feel that there are issues ignored.
8	Mithrandir Enterprises Ltd	8.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Building Height - 5 Storeys	Oppose	Zoning allowing walk-up apartments up to 5 stories high is too high and out of keeping with the rest of Hamilton. Having lived in cities where apartment buildings of this height are allowed they create issues with noise and privacy. Because of their height noise produced in the higher units in a building of this size is transmitted and can disturb neighbours over a large area. This can be even worse in buildings where the staircase is open to air. Residents carrying things up and down the stairs also creates noise, as does the process of moving in and out. Buildings of this height also allow residents to look into the back yards of neighbouring properties which reduces privacy.	Limit residential building height to 3 stories.
8	Mithrandir Enterprises Ltd	8.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Provision of bus stops within the road.	Oppose	Provision of bus stops within the road will mean that traffic can only move as fast as the bus which will be stopping regularly. This will create restrictions to traffic flow and frustration with motorists which is a risk for silly or dangerous driving/passing maneuvers.	Provide bus stops where the bus can pull out of the stream of traffic
8	Mithrandir Enterprises Ltd	8.3	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Limit use of cul-de-sacs.	Oppose	In my opinion cul-de-sacs are some of the best places to live. They are generally quiet and safe with no through traffic. Minimising these seems counter productive with providing safe, quiet neighbourhoods.	Place no restrictions on cul-de-sac use.
8	Mithrandir Enterprises Ltd	8.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Create buildings that face the street.	Oppose	Having small front yards and minimal fencing means that houses will be close to the road and to traffic. This means that road noise will be closer to where people live and sleep. Having lived in cities like London where houses face the street and yards are in the back, this creates significant noise in bedrooms. There are well documented health consequences of living with road noise and this should be minimised.	Allow buildings to be placed further back in section so that people can build fences and have some separation from road noise.
9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	9.1	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Recognition of Maori Heritage and Kaitiaki role Objective DEV01-PSP:022 DEV01-PSP-P54 DEV01-PSP-P55	Support	HNZPT recognises and supports the proposed provisions that contribute towards Maori to be Kaitiaki of the proposed structure plan area. HNZPT is very supportive of the consideration, within these objectives and policies of the creation of protective reserves given the proposed intensity of housing. It is considered that these historic heritage sites should continue to be part of this new urbanised landscape. These provisions also will assist to give effect to sections 6 e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and 6 (f) "the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development".	That the proposed provisions: DEV01-PSP:022 and DEV01-PSP-P54 and DEV01-PSP-P55 are retained as notified.
9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	9.2	Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage	Proposed additions Schedule 8B:Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural sites, and Schedule 8A: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural sites.	Support	HNZPT supports the research undertaken by HCC that has enabled the recognition and proposed scheduling of additional historic heritage archaeological and cultural sites. The scheduling, and the protective rule framework for the Schedule 8 B-Group 1 sites gives effect to "s6 (f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development" of the RMA and assists to ensure the preservation of these sites into the future.	That the proposed additions to the following schedules; Schedule 8B:Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural sites, and Schedule 8A:Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural sites, are retained as notified.
9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	9.3	Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 - Lack of inclusion of certain archaeological site into Historic Heritage schedules.	Oppose	As part of the recent "Amberfield" subdivision HNZPT supported the recognition of archaeological site s14/318 within an historic reserve. HNZPT is concerned that this site is not proposed to be addition to Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural sites. HNZPT considers that there is sufficient scope within this plan change process to include this site as Plan Change 5 covers the entire peacocks structure plan area. These sites have sufficient historic heritage significance to be part of Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural sites. The scheduling and the protective rule framework for the Schedule 8B sites gives effect to section xx of the RMA.	Amend Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural sites to include site s14/318.
9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	9.4	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	Proposed Objective Chapter 25- Citywide 25.2 Earthworks and vegetation removal	Support	HNZPT supports proposed new Objective 25.2.2.2.2. The proposed objective, at point 2, assists to give effect to "s6 (f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development" of the RMA and assists to ensure the preservation of sites of historic and cultural value into the future.	That proposed Objective 25.2.2.2.2 is retained as notified.
9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	9.5	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Proposed amendment to SUB-PREC1-PSP-P4	Support in Part	HNZPT is concerned at the proposed amendment of this provision as follows: "Subdivision <del>avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on;</del> <u>and where possible enhances any:</u> 1. Scheduled heritage item. 2. Scheduled archaeological and cultural site. 3. Scheduled significant trees. 4. Scheduled significant natural areas. 5. The Waikato River and gullies and river banks, lakes, rivers and streams." as the amendment gives effect to a discussion that is related to the provision of habitat for long tailed bats. This proposed change will have an adverse effect on historic heritage and is also contrary to the proposed Objective 25.2.2.2.2 which seeks avoid adverse earthworks effects on historic heritage and cultural sites. HNZPT seeks that the original wording is retained. It may be that an alternative policy is developed to provide for the needs of the long tailed bat.	That the original wording is retained to ensure that the adverse effects on historic heritage including scheduled heritage items and archaeological sites are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	9.6	Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage	Furture research into the pa at the mouth of the Mangakotukutuku Stream	Support in Part	HNZPT support the research, in Appendix 1, Peacock Structure Plan: Archaeology, Warren Gumbley & Matthew Gainsford, W Gumbley Ltd Archaeologists, February 2021 that has enabled additional sites to be proposed for scheduling as part of plan change 5. However HNZPT notes that the same report had identified additional research that should be undertaken For example HNZPT notes the following comments at page 35 of the research, that states. <i>"the absence of recorded pa at the mouth of the Mangakotukutuku Stream, represents an unusual exception to an otherwise very predictable pattern in the distribution of pa along the Waikato River. Given this, the area merits further research to investigate the possibility of a pa in this location. We also have some concerns about the reliability of the recording horticultural site 514/243 in the same area and recommend that this site is further examined to assess the veracity of the sites status".</i> HNZPT seeks that this additional work is undertaken prior to decision making on the plan change to inform the location of development/location of protective reserves as required in the structure plan area.	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 on the plan change to inform the location of development and to avoid adverse effects on historic heritage.
9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	9.7	General	Consultation	Support in Part	HNZPT supports the consultation that has taken place to date with Mana Whenua as part of the development of the proposed structure plan. However HNZPT is concerned that there is a consultation deficiency that may pose a potential risk with regard ongoing consenting processes related to this structure plan area, including HNZPT Authorities. At this time HNZPT would encourage additional consultation with both representative entities of NAMTOK which include Mr Wiremu Puke and Boris Samujh, regarding this structure plan. The collective voice of NAMTOK has been active in commenting/opposing development proposals in this area in the past and has been one of the primary representatives consulted over HNZPT Archaeological Authorities over at least the last 7 years. Consultation at this time would assist to ensure consistency through the RMA and HNZPT regulatory processes.	That additional consultation is undertaken with other parties prior to the decision making on this structure plan area.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.1	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Overview and Vision	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi supports the overview and vision of the plan change but seek some amendments to provide further clarity.	Amend DEV01-PSP: Vision as follows: The Peacocke area will be developed in line with Hamilton’s vision for a 20-minute city, which seeks to provide residents access to everything they need within 20 minutes without relying on private motor vehicles. This means establishing a local centre, which will act as the central community hub, supported by a network of smaller neighbourhood centres, providing day to day convenience for residents. <u>It also means developing direct and safe routes for cyclists to the CBD, Hospital, Grey Street, Hamilton Airport and surrounding existing local centres.</u>
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Overview and Vision	Oppose	Waka Kotahi suggests removal of the statement regarding trips under 3km as most public transport trips will be longer than this and it is perceived that this conflicts with the 20 minute vision detailed in the previous paragraph.	Amend DEV01-PSP: Vision as follows: These hubs will be supported by a multi-modal transport network that provides access to frequent public transport on key routes and a direct and accessible walking and cycling network, that is safe and enjoyable to use. The network will be constructed to meet best practice principles related to safety, coherence, directness, attractiveness and amenity which will assist in encouraging mode shift, <del>in particular for shorter trips of less than 3km.</del>
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP:017 DEV01-PSP:018 DEV01-PSP:019 DEV01-PSP:020	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.4	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP:P39 DEV01-PSP:P40 DEV01-PSP:P41 DEV01-PSP:P42 DEV01-PSP:P43 DEV01-PSP:P44 DEV01-PSP:P45 DEV01-PSP:P46 DEV01-PSP:P47 DEV01-PSP:P48 DEV01-PSP:P49 DEV01-PSP:P50 DEV01-PSP:P51 DEV01-PSP:P52 DEV01-PSP:P53	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these policies. It should however be noted that, as discussed above, Waka Kotahi consider that the proposed locations of future mass transit stops do not align well with policy DEV01-PSP:P42.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.5	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP:P62	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the policy that Integrated Transport Modelling shall be undertaken for all Structure Plan areas.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP:P63	Oppose	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of this policy and agree with requiring integration of transport routes with surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned transport networks. It is however noted that this may be repetition of earlier policies, notably DEV01-PSP:39 and DEV01-PSP:P51.	Delete DEV01-PSP:P63 <del>Movement routes are integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods and existing and planned transport networks.</del>
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.7	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP:P65	Oppose	Waka Kotahi consider that the intent of this policy is adequately addressed by policies DEV01-PSP:P42, DEV01- PSP:P44, DEV01-PSP:P45, DEV01-PSP:P46, DEV01- PSP:P49 and DEV01-PSP:P50, therefore seek deletion of the duplication.	Delete DEV01-PSP:P65 <del>The transport network supports efficient passenger transport and opportunities for walking and eyeling.</del>
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.8	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP:P66	Support	Waka Kotahi supports minimisation of the environmental impacts associated with construction of new transport infrastructure.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.9	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP:P67	Oppose	Waka Kotahi consider that the intent of this policy is adequately addressed by policies DEV01-PSP:P39, DEV01-PSP:P40, DEV01-PSP:P45, DEV01-PSP:P46, DEV01-PSP:P47, DEV01-PSP:P48, DEV01-PSP:P49, DEV01-PSP:P50 and DEV01-PSP:P51.	Delete DEV01-PSP:P67 <del>Opportunities for improved safety, accessibility, connectivity and efficiency within the transportation network are provided.</del>
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.10	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01- PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Peacocke Transportation Network (Page 18)	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi supports the paragraphs detailed below, however note these are duplicated within this chapter. <i>A fundamental urban design principle is the ease of movement to ensure well connected communities. It is essential that transportation routes are designed to give priority to walking and cycling and facilitate a seamless web of direct and efficient public transport corridors that connect neighbourhoods within the structure plan area and with the rest of the city and other key destinations. In considering the final alignment of the Transport Network the alignment of transport corridors needs to be taken into account, as identified in Volume 2, Appendix 2, Figure 2-3 Peacocke Structure Plan Transport Network. The transport network (refer to Figure 3.4.4a) shown on the Structure Plan is indicative and not intended to show exact alignments. It is important that the Arterial and Collector networks are established in general accordance with the structure plan in order to deliver a well-connected network that provides a high level of service for public transport and walking and cycling. The final alignment will be largely determined as individual subdivisions are progressed.</i>	Deletion of duplication.



Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
10	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)	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi supports the provisions detailed but seeks that some minor amendments are made to promote active modes and public transport.	Amend 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 <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 <del>Public Transport</del> <u>public transport</u> and active modes, at expense of level of service (LOS) for private car. <del>if necessary.</del> • Maximise network efficiency for <del>Public Transport</del> <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, <del>such as future high-occupancy vehicles.</del>
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.12	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan a) Walkway and cycleway Key Design Principles (Page 21)	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi supports these principles subject to some minor amendments. Clarification is also sought on what is meant by ‘facilities’ as this is not defined.	Amend as follows: Key Design Principles • Separate walking and cycling <del>where possible.</del> • Provide facilities near destinations such as commercial areas, bus stops and schools. • Short block lengths to create a <del>permiable</del> <u>permeable</u> urban form that the most direct routes for cycling and • A local road network that prioritises walking and cycling and promotes safe vehicle speeds.
10	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)	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi supports these principles subject to some amendments to align more closely with ‘movement and place’ and to reflect the Network Operating Framework. Clarity is also sought on the meaning of ‘limited destination types’, with Waka Kotahi proposing a change to this language for transparency. Additionally, Waka Kotahi seeks that the first two points under Key Design Principles be reviewed, as it is not clear why a higher speed environment is indicated for the minor arterial. The minor arterial is still likely to predominate in residential urban environments and lower speeds should still form a key part of the design. It is also considered that the second point contradicts the first. Waka Kotahi proposes new wording to address this. It is noted more generally that pedestrian crossings should be provided at regular intervals if active frontage is being encouraged on these arterials. Waka Kotahi suggest changes to the wording of the final bullet point to reflect this.	Amend as follows: Minor Arterial Transport Network: The minor arterial network is characterised by high <del>traffic-</del> <u>volumes through movement</u> , with some limited <del>destination types</del> <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 <del>ensured</del> <u>prioritised</u> . Due to the high volumes of <del>traffic</del> <u>through movement along</u> <del>on</del> this network a <del>seperated-</del> <u>separated</u> cycling network <del>need to</del> <u>will</u> be provided along with <u>separate</u> pedestrian facilities. Key Design Principles - <del>Higher speed environment;—Allow for a high level of intersection density to reduce speeds-</del> • <u>Active frontages would still be considered acceptable on these routes as a means of implementing roading hierarchy and reducing vehicular speeds</u> • <u>Separated cycle facilities and pedestrian routes</u> • <u>High frequency public transport service with priority</u> • <u>Pedestrian crossings near bus stops and key land uses</u>
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.14	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi supports these principles subject to some minor amendments. It is sought to remove the design principle relating to parallel routes for local traffic and cycling, and instead perhaps a note made in general text above. A suggestion around how this will be dealt with if parallel routes	Amend as follows: This major arterial route along with the Mangkootukutuku Gully creates significant severance issues for the development of Peacocke. To minimise this impact for both vehicles and pedestrians access to and across the
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.15	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Strategic Infrastructure Required (Staging table, Page 28)	Oppose	Waka Kotahi seeks amendments be made to Stage D and Stage E to remove reference to upgrades to Hall Road/SH3 intersection. The structure plan staging table identifies the Hall Road/SH3 intersection upgrades in Stages D and E. As further detailed in the submission below on Appendix AA, Waka Kotahi does not support this intersection being formalised as part of the Structure Plan as there are a number of uncertainties which mean we are not in a position to support a new connection at this time.	Waka Kotahi seek that amendments are made to wording of Stage D and E within table titles ‘Strategic Infrastructure Required’ to remove reference to upgrades to Hall Road/SH3 intersection as this prospect is not a given. Council may want to consider some revised wording which requires developers to engage with Waka Kotahi at these stages if they seek a connection to the highway.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.16	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1- PSP:P20	Support	Waka Kotahi support minimising the number of vehicle crossings on road frontages where shared paths and separated cycle ways are located.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.17	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- SP: R3	Oppose	Waka Kotahi considers that further consideration should be given to allowing single dwellings as permitted activities within the High Density Residential Overlay. By permitting this there is the potential to undermine the intention of the overlay and risk not achieving the desired outcome of compact development that is a key value of the Peacocke Structure Plan area and supports connectivity and accessibility.	Waka Kotahi recommends that HCC considers whether the activity statuses and development standards of various dwelling types should be differentiated for the wider Medium Density Zone vs the High Density Residential Overlay, considering the suitability of single dwellings as a permitted activity in each.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.18	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ– PREC1- PSP: P5	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this policy	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.19	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1- PSP: O4	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this objective	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.20	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1- PSP: P16	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this policy	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.21	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1- PSP: P17	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi supports this policy subject to a deletion. Waka Kotahi believe that Waikato Regional Council are best placed to advise the location of public transport stops within a local centre.	Amend as follows: Incorporate public transport stops into the Local Centre. <del>where it will provide an efficient and convenient access to the network.</del>
10	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	Oppose	Waka Kotahi consider it would be more appropriate for Light Industry and Drive-through services to have a non- complying activity status. This is suggested on the basis that these activities do not encourage walkability and are ill suited to local centres due to size of parking required and circulation space.	Amend the activity status of Light Industry and Drive- through services in the Local Centre Zone to Non- Complying.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.23	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: PURPOSE	Support	Waka Kotahi support higher densities adjacent to public transport corridors and block patterns which provide for permeability to prioritise walking and cycling movements.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.24	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O8	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.25	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1- PSP:P8	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.26	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1- PSP:P9	Support	Waka Kotahi supports providing for higher density residential development in walkable distance from local centres and public transport routes. It is however noted that, as discussed above, future mass transit stops are proposed to be located in close proximity to the gully network which reduces the ability for high density development within a walkable distance.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.27	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1- PSP:P11 SUB - PREC1- PSP:P12 SUB - PREC1- PSP:P13	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these policies which prioritise the safety of footpath and cycleway users.	Retain as notified.



## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.28	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1- PSP:P16	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.29	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1- PSP:P18	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi supports limiting the length of rear lanes to promote slow vehicle speeds and safety and to make walking and cycling more attractive by minimising trip lengths. However, it does not appear that there are any rules which enforce the length of a rear lane.	Incorporate a rule in Table 15-6b which limits the length of rear lanes.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.30	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1- PSP:P22	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.31	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R18 Block Structure and roading	Support	Waka Kotahi support block length and perimeter provision which provide for permeability for active modes.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.32	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20 Provision of parking and access – (2)/ Rule 25.14.4.1a)v.	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi support requiring reasonable distance between vehicle crossings on transport corridors with separated cycle lanes, to provide for cyclist safety. However, this conflicts with the aim to create high amenity and low speeds through increasing frontage activity and access. As discussed in the general comments above, there is a disconnect between good planning outcomes and infrastructure design	Consider how appropriate this rule is based on the comments made on collector roads in the general text above.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.33	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R25 Provision of Public Transport Infrastructure	Support	Waka Kotahi support provision of public transport infrastructure on corridors identified in the structure plan.	Retain as notified.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.34	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Definition of Public Transport Station	Oppose	Waka Kotahi oppose this definition as the structure plan does not refer to ‘Public Transport Station’, rather it references Proposed Public Transport Hub, Key Public Transport Stops and Future Mass Transit Stop.	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.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.35	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Definition of Public Transport Station Catchments	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of this definition but recommends that it is amended to be in line with Section 3.1.2 of the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan which states in policy P4 that accessing public transport services in Hamilton should require a walk of 600 metres or less.	Investigate changes necessary to reduce walking distances for catchments in the Structure Plan area to 600 metres or less.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.36	Appendix 15 – Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements	Support in Part	Waka Kotahi support the requirements of ITA’s within the Peacocke Structure Plan Area. There is however a concern that only developments which generate an excess of 500 vpd are required to produce a design statement which requires an explanation of how the objectives and policies will be achieved. This means that if piecemeal development is allowed there is some potential for outcomes which lack universal design.	Investigate changes necessary in the trip generation triggers within the Peacocke Structure Plan area to ensure all development is to demonstrate compliance with principles of universal design etc.
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	10.37	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Proposed Transport Network Plans	Oppose	Waka Kotahi concur with the ITA which states that the existing Hall Road / SH3 intersection is below standard and there shall not be any increase in traffic volumes on Hall Road from either developments or by connections to the road without this being addressed. Furthermore, Waka Kotahi agree that the options presented in the ITA for the relocated Hall Road intersection treatments are sensible, however being able to support a specific option or a new intersection at all is dependent on many factors. These include consideration of if SH3 remains a state highway at the time works would occur, timeframes for Southern Links, whether the Houchens Road Structure Plan proceeds, and if SH3/Raynes Road intersection is converted to a roundabout. Until more is known around these variables it is hard to conclude the Waka Kotahi strategy for a relocated Hall Road intersection. The ITA states that “...the developer of these stages will need to investigate options and deliver the infrastructure are part of their development”, which describes that the intersection solution will need to be negotiated between the developer/s and Waka Kotahi in the future. Waka Kotahi support this approach but cannot support showing a link to State Highway 3 on the Structure Plan Maps at this time given the uncertainties around if we could practically approve this.	Waka Kotahi seek that the relocated Hall Road does not connect with State Highway 3 and that this connection is removed from the Structure Plan Transport Network Plan.
11	Hamilton City Council	11.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Amendments to PREC - R36 48	Support in Part	Hamilton City Council submits on Plan Change 5 to align the plan change with the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill once enacted. It is noted that this is a Bill and changes may occur before it comes into law. This is anticipated to occur in December 2021.	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 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.
11	Hamilton City Council	11.2	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R14 SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 SUB-PREC1-PSP: R17	Support in Part	Hamilton City Council submits on Plan Change 5 to align the plan change with the final outcomes under the passing of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill once enacted. It is noted that this is a Bill and changes may occur before it comes into law. This is anticipated to occur in December 2021.	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.
11	Hamilton City Council	11.3	General	Any additional amendments	Support in Part	The amendments set out above are contingent on the final outcomes of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill once it is passed into legislation. This submission is limited to seeking relief to reflect Hamilton City Council’s legal obligations under the Act which is to be passed.	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.
12	Hodgson Trustee Management Co. Limited	12.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Location of Neighbourhood Park	Oppose	The submitter opposes the location of the neighbourhood parks shown on the proposed structure plan. More thought needs to be given to the location of the parks including careful consideration of the land contour and adjoining green amenities to ensure a suitable outcome.	The submitter requests that HCC undertake more in-depth investigation and consultation in relation to the matters raised in this submission and that subject to any objectives, policies, rules, and provisions being amended to address the matters raised in this submission (and any consequential relief) that PCS is approved.
12	Hodgson Trustee Management Co. Limited	12.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Roading Network - connection to SH3	Support in Part	The submitter supports in principle the concept of a road connection to SH3 in the vicinity of the submitter’s property (3165 Ohaupo Rd). The location of the connection needs further consideration and submitter requests further consultation including appropriate integration with the wider context, including potential later adjoining development such as within the SL1 urban expansion area west of Ohaupo Rd.	The submitter requests that HCC undertake more in-depth investigation and consultation in relation to the matters raised in this submission and that subject to any objectives, policies, rules, and provisions being amended to address the matters raised in this submission (and any consequential relief) that PCS is approved.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
12	Hodgson Trustee Management Co. Limited	12.3	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Ecological and bat corridors	Oppose	The submitter opposes the ecological corridors as shown on the proposed structure plan. Hamilton City Council's approach to mapping these areas has been too broad- brush and the submitter seeks more specific work and studies to be undertaken including consultation with the submitter to better define the extent of the areas before finalising.	The submitter requests that HCC undertake more in-depth investigation and consultation in relation to the matters raised in this submission and that subject to any objectives, policies, rules, and provisions being amended to address the matters raised in this submission (and any consequential relief) that PCS is approved.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Hall Road from Ohaupo Rd / SH3	Support in Part	Proposed partial closure / severance of Hall Road from Ohaupo Rd / SH3 and the disestablishment of the intersection: This is currently an unsafe intersection. Further urbanisation / intensification as a result of PC5 will increase current shortcomings and the need for the intersection is made redundant by the proposed PC5 SH3 intersection just south of Hall Rd and the wider road network proposed as part of PC5. However, PC5 is not clear about who is responsible for or at what stage this road stopping will occur.	Amend PC5 to make it clear who is responsible for or at what stage the stopping of Hall Road will occur.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Proposed Ohaupo Rd Intersection location.	Support in Part	Within Appendix 2 – Structure Plans and the technical assessment in Gray Matter ITA supporting the Section 32: A new intersection and road network is proposed between the structure plan's arterial road network and State Highway 3. The submitter supports this location and a connection that aligns with the adjoining structure plan. The submitter seeks PC5 goes a step further and undertakes a draft design of the intersection (including taking into account existing or proposed access on the opposite side of the road) to provide certainty and the early ability to coordinate and better integrate the two structure plan areas and for the purpose of engagement with NZTA.	The submitter supports the proposed intersection but seeks that a draft design of the intersection is undertaken (including taking into account existing or proposed access on the opposite side of the road) to provide certainty and the early ability to coordinate and better integrate the two structure plan areas and for the purpose of engagement with NZTA.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.3	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Staging	Oppose	Opposes all references to pre-requisite staging or sequencing of strategic infrastructure being required. Should enable housing supply outside the specified sequence/staging. Certain infrastructure pre-requisites are not required and/or are poorly considered. The proposed text and map hinder potential growth opportunities and preclude developers' ability to advance certain sections of work or infrastructure and it sets only one outcome for sequential development. They also allow landowners who do not develop to prevent the implementation of subsequent stages. In usual greenfield development, it is generally accepted that not all "integration" or outcomes for transport will be achieved from day 1 – they occur over time as development continues. The combined staging and infrastructure maps and provisions set an expectation which is contrary to this and seek to achieve these outcomes from the outset. This creates significant delays in delivering development and housing. Fixed staging or phasing of infrastructure and any delays as a result would have direct negative effects on restricting housing supply and increasing cost. The rules as drafted, hinder the ability to advance certain sections of key infrastructure ahead of others (by PDA or other agreement) to help enable housing supply. Predetermined staging will restrict supply, temper market competition and ultimately have the effect of increasing holding or development costs for the delivery for housing. We submit that the sequential staging as contemplated by the structure plan contradicts the current government initiatives / policies (including the NPS-UD) and intention to increase housing supply.	Delete the chapter 3a strategic infrastructure table requirements and remove any reference or requirement within PC5 for fixed staging or sequencing of development subject to a fixed infrastructure sequence. Delete the structure plan staging map.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.4	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Ecological corridor's location and extents Rules including but not limited to: DEV01-PSP: P35 DEV01-PSP: P36 DEV01-PSP: P37	Oppose	Oppose the proposed ecological corridor's location and extent including any proposed bat corridors, reserves, Significant Natural Areas and Significant Bat Habitat Areas. HCC has adopted a somewhat broad-brush approach to mapping the green networks, reserves and the like – but has tied these broad bush concepts to key outcomes and provisions. This has largely been a desktop exercise and HCC has used a mix of Lidar data, aerial photos and other sources. The mapped areas are larger than are necessary to maintain and enhance ecological features, streams and bush and the proposed corridors have not been subject to appropriate consultation or recent assessment and do not appear to relate to or be appropriately informed by current and historic habitat. The submitter generally supports the concept of ecological corridors aligning with the natural features of the land, however PC5's approach to the definition of these areas has been unsatisfactory and in some cases the mapped areas previously had vegetation but are now cleared. The corridors do not make provision for connectivity (including road) and this needs to be clearly provided for otherwise the corridors will have the effect of severing portions of the PC5 area and causing a series of disconnected neighbourhoods.	The submitter seeks the following; A) Ground truthing, further assessment and consultation to occur prior to the corridors being fixed. B) Provision for connectively / roads to pass through the corridors with an acceptable / agreed cross section / design etc. c) Some flexibility to re-align corridors in consultation with landowners and concurrently with masterplans which are currently being developed to ensure an overall more considered and better design outcome for the area. D) The Ecological corridor following the Hall Road alignment and adjoining State Highway 3 to be removed.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.5	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Peacocke structure plan roading layout	Support in Part	Support in part the Peacocke structure plan roading layout, but seek amendments to create more logical and functional connectivity and to support proposed neighbourhood centre. Consider better integration needed with adjoining identified future growth cell.	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 connectively 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.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.6	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	The location of Neighbourhood Centre on the submitters land	Support in Part	Support in part the location of Neighbourhood Centre on the submitter's land and as identified on the Peacocke Structure plan.	Request the ability to ensure that the general location of the node remains on the submitter's land but the exact location and extent of zoning is coordinated with masterplanning work the submitter is currently undergoing. This may result in refinements to the structure plan and/or confirmation via a zoning extent as being shown on the zoning maps.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.7	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Neighbourhood Centre rules	Support	Support the Neighbourhood Centre rules in their entirety. Rules as drafted allow for appropriate scale and mix of activity which will result in a viable offering to support neighbourhood catchment(s) whilst resulting in good design outcomes.	Retain as notified.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.8	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Location of Wetlands	Support in Part	Support in part the structure plan in particular the location mapping of the stormwater wetlands or any other reference to the same within PC5. Stormwater wetlands are currently mapped on the structure plan. The submitter generally supports the indication of location but exact location needs to be defined as part of detailed design and some stormwater wetlands may not be possible where illustrated. 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.	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.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.9	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Bat Monitoring	Oppose	Submitter considers that with bat monitoring requirements HCC should be doing this over the entire area prior to the conclusion of the Peacocke structure plan. It is simply not suitable to fix ecological corridors and then to separately require monitoring by developers and this causes unnecessary delays, confusion and the process will undoubtedly frustrate the ability to deliver housing in a timely manner. This includes the associated yard setbacks from the bat corridors.	Relief sought not stated. General relief seeks bat monitoring over the entire Peacocke area prior to conclusion of the Plan Change process.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.10	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Chapter 23: Subdivision	Chapter 4A and 23A provisions	Oppose	In respect of the medium density zone (MDZ) provisions, the new Chapter 4A and 23A provisions should be updated to meet the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. This includes amendments to make residential development more enabling (and deletion of restricted discretionary activity status for duplex dwellings and terraced housing). However where the MDZ provision is more enabling these should be retained.	Amend Chapter 4A and 23A provisions to update to meet the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, and particularly to be more enabling.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Rest Home and retirement village provisions	Oppose	All provisions relating to rest homes and retirement villages should be updated to be more enabling in their provision in the Medium Density Residential Zone, 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.	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.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.12	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Provisions for dairies in Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	Submitter considers that provisions relating to 'dairies' are needed in the Medium Density Residential Zone and that should be encouraged to occur in those areas identified for a neighbourhood centre, and considers that the notified provisions undermine the viability of future neighbourhood centres.	Amend to provide for 'dairies' within neighbourhooood centres.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.13	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Childcare Facility in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The gross floor area restriction for childcare activities should be deleted as this unduly restricts the efficient use of such sites.	Delete the gross floor area restriction for childcare activities.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.14	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rear Lanes	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of rear lanes as an option to achieve the medium density outcomes, however opposes the PC5 provisions limiting the length, number of units, ownership model or any reference that they should provide for planting, walking and cycling or trip reduction, and/or large trucks and their manoeuvring are inappropriate and will have a deterrent effect on their use or will create perverse outcomes if designed to meet the PC5 provisions.	Amend rear lane provisions limiting the length, number of units, ownership model or any reference that they should provide for planting, walking and cycling or trip reduction, and/or large trucks and their manoeuvring.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.15	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Maximum lengths and minimum widths for pedestrian/cyclist access through blocks	Oppose	The provisions for maximum lengths and minimum widths for pedestrian/cyclist access through blocks should be deleted as these will encourage the use of accessways through the rear of properties rather than the primary aim of having pedestrian and cyclists form part of the transport “street” network.	Delete provisions setting maximum lengths and minimum widths for pedestrian/cyclist access through blocks.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.16	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Neighbourhood Parks	Oppose	Any provision requiring local neighbourhood parks should be deleted. This is a Council function under the Local Government Act for purchase.	Delete any provision requiring local neighbourhood parks.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.17	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Public Transport	Oppose	Any provision requiring public transport infrastructure provision or liaison/agreement with Waikato Regional Council should be deleted. These are inappropriate to be required in the District Plan when public transport is a regional council function.	Delete provisions requiring public transport infrastructure provision or liaison/agreement with Waikato Regional Council.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone Chapter 23: Subdivision	Chapter 4A and 23A provisions	Support	The new Chapter 4A and 23A provisions should be updated to meet the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. This includes amendments needed to make residential development more enabling (and deletion of restricted discretionary activity status for duplex dwellings and terraced housing). However where the Medium Density Residential Zone provision is more enabling these should be retained.	Amend Chapters 4A and 23A to align with the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill provisions to make residential development more enabling (and deletion of restricted discretionary activity status for duplex dwellings and terraced housing). Retain provisions where the Medium Density Residential Zone provision is more enabling.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Road alignment over Ohaupo / Hall Road blocks	Support	Support proposed collector road alignment over Ohaupo / Hall Road blocks (extension of current road 2 under construction in the Aurora development).The proposed structure plan seeks to re-align prior collector road over 3019 Ohaupo Road and 49 Hall Road land. The revised road location is a logical location that can be accommodated appropriately with the site contour and is an extension of a road that is currently under construction at 3019 Ohaupo Rd. The proposed alignment is supported by the submitter’s masterplan and overall, it creates an efficient and practical road link and a good urban design outcome. The submitter supports this alignment particularly as its critical to the development the balance of its landholdings in a logical / efficient manner.	Retain proposed collector road alignment over Ohaupo / Hall Road blocks (extension of current road 2 under construction in the Aurora development).
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.3	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Size & location of Neighbourhood Centre with the Aurora site	Support in Part	Support in part the location of neighbourhood centre with the Aurora development as identified on the Peacocke Structure Plan and supported by ME report. Oppose in part to extent that submitter seeks the Western side of proposed Road 3 (3109 Ohaupo Rd) to also be zoned neighbourhood centre and also the boundary extents of the eastern side to remain flexible. The location of this centre is already identified/ supported on the operative Peacocke Structure Plan however there is currently no ‘zoning’ and therefore there is ambiguity around the exact location and the process. PC5 proposes zoning to neighbourhood centre zone and the provisions of this zone are supported. Part of the PC5 zoning is proposed over a designation boundary which is likely not going to be acquired by HCC however the submitter requests that the extents of the zoning boundaries have flexibility (or be resolved through further investigation as part of PC5) and can be resolved and amended in the event the designation land is acquired. The submitter seeks that the western side of the proposed road 3 within the Aurora development (3109 Ohaupo Rd) is also zoned neighbourhood centre to allow the lower floor of a proposed apartment development to be sleeved with retail to form an appropriate frontage to the road and strengthen the node and entrance to the development. This establishes a small length of road where development on both sides contributes to an active neighbourhood centre. Community destination and streetscape.	Amend so that the western side of proposed Road 3 (3109 Ohaupo Rd) is also zoned Neighbourhood Centre and the boundary extents of the eastern side remain flexible to allow the conclusion of a land take currently in play and resolution of the extent of public works in that same area.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.4	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Chapter 6B - local Centre Zone (Ref: 6B-PREC1-P)	Support in Part	The Neighbourhood Centre Zone rules were drafted prior to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. PC5 allows for a medium density zoning however it is likely that the catchment densities need to be reconsidered in light of the recent Bill because any surrounding residential land will be now be able to support an increased density. The submitter opposes any unreasonable restrictions around the size and scale of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone located on 3019 Ohaupo Road.	The submitter opposes any unreasonable restrictions around the size and scale of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone located on 3019 Ohaupo Road.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.5	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Location of the proposed second neighbourhood park	Oppose	The submitter opposes the location of the proposed second neighbourhood park shown on the structure plan on the southeast side of the Aurora development. The submitter has undertaken a comprehensive masterplanning process for the Aurora development. Within the masterplan it has proposed a secondary neighbourhood park adjacent to the Eastern Wetland reserve. This location is more logical and accessible with proposed walkways within the wetland reserve that will provide connectivity to the wider area. The proposed location also aligns well with the proposed neighbourhood centre and the adjoining open wetland reserve which will both complement each other and provide added amenity. The proposed location is supported by commentary within chapter 3A Structure Plan of PC5: Page 17, “f) Recreational facilities for the area, including the parks and reserves network need to meet multiple functions. Thus where possible: Neighbourhood reserves will be integrated with the gullies,.”And: Where possible neighbourhood parks should incorporate existing natural features and be sited in prominent locations where there is scope for passive surveillance, outlooks and a high degree of accessibility.And: Criteria for the location of neighbourhood parks are: f. Ability to protect or enhance natural features, i. Ability to provide off-road linkages between residential neighbourhoods and facilities, and j. Ability to link areas of natural and ecological value.	Amend to reposition the second neighbourhood park to a location adjoining the east wetland reserve within Aurora (0 & 49 Hall Road, 3109 Ohaupo Road).
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Staging	Oppose	Oppose all reference to pre- requisite staging or sequencing of strategic infrastructure required. Certain infrastructure pre-requisites are not required and or are poorly considered and the proposed text and map hinder potential growth opportunities and preclude developers’ ability to advance certain sections of work or infrastructure. They also allow landowners who do not develop to prevent the implementation of subsequent stages. In addition, the proposed staging provisions hinder the ability to advance development and it sets only one outcome for sequential development. In usual greenfield development, it is generally accepted that not all “integration” or outcomes for transport will be achieved from day 1 – they occur over time as development continues. The combined staging and infrastructure maps and provisions set an expectation which is contrary to this and seek to achieve these outcomes from the outset. This creates significant delays in delivering development and housing. Fixed staging or phasing of infrastructure and any delays as a result would have direct negative effects on restricting housing supply and increasing cost. This inhibits the ability of private development to get projects off the ground and as a consequence adds to the holding costs. This contradicts the current government initiatives / policies (including the NPS-UD) and intention to increase housing supply.The proposed staging programme hinders growth within the area. Poor consideration has been given to alternative viable sequencing of development to facilitate growth in the area, or other methods to enable housing supply outside the specified sequence/staging.	Delete the chapter 3a strategic infrastructure table requirements and remove any reference or requirement within PC5 for fixed staging or sequencing of development subject to a fixed infrastructure sequence. Delete the structure plan staging map.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.7	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Ecological corridor location and extent Rules including but not limited to: DEV01-PSP: P35 DEV01-PSP: P36 DEV01-PSP: P37	Oppose	Oppose proposed ecological corridor’s location and extents including any proposed bat corridors, reserves, Significant Natural Areas and Significant Bat Habitat Area. HCC has adopted a somewhat broad-brush approach to mapping the green networks, reserves and the like – but has tied these broad bush concepts to key outcomes and provisions. This has largely been a desktop exercise and HCC has used a mix of Lidar data, aerial photos and other sources. The mapped areas are larger than are necessary to maintain and enhance ecological features, streams and bush. The submitter generally supports the concept of ecological corridors aligning with the natural features of the land, however PCS’s approach to the definition of these areas has been unsatisfactory and, in some cases, they have mapped areas which previously had vegetation but are now cleared. The corridors do not make provision for connectively (including road) and this needs to be clearly provided for. The submitter seeks the following: A) Ground truthing, further assessment and consultation to occur prior to the corridors being fixed. B) Provision for connectively / roads to pass through the corridors with an acceptable / agreed cross section / design etc. C) Some flexibility to re-align corridors in consultation with landowners and concurrently with masterplans which are currently being developed to ensure an overall more considered and better design outcome for the area.	The submitter opposes the proposed ecological corridor location and extent including any proposed bat corridors, reserves, Significant Natural Areas and Significant Bat Habitat Area. The submitter seeks: A) Ground truthing, further assessment and consultation to occur prior to the corridors being fixed. B) Provision for connectively / roads to pass through the corridors with an acceptable / agreed cross section / design etc. C) Some flexibility to re-align corridors in consultation with landowners and concurrently with masterplans which are currently being developed to ensure an overall more considered and better design outcome for the area.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.8	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Neighbourhood Centre Zone rules	Support in part	Support Neighbourhood Centre Zone rules. Rules as drafted allow for appropriate scale and mix of activity which will result in a viable offering to support neighbourhood catchment(s) whilst resulting in good design outcomes.	Support in part
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.9	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	location mapping of the Stormwater wetlands	Support in Part	The structure plan in particular the location mapping of the Stormwater wetlands or any other reference to the same within PC5. Stormwater wetlands are currently mapped on the structure plan. The submitter generally supports the indication of location but exact location needs to be defined as part of detailed design and some stormwater wetlands may not be possible where illustrated. 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.	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.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.10	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Bat Monitoring	Oppose	Oppose bat monitoring. We submit that HCC should be doing this over the entire area prior to the conclusion of the Peacocke structure plan. It’s simply not suitable to fix ecological corridors and then to separately require monitoring on to developers. This includes the associated yard setbacks from the bat corridors.	Oppose bat monitoring requirements.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Rest Home and retirement village provisions	Oppose	Provisions relating to rest homes and retirement villages should be updated to be more enabling in their provision in the Medium Density Residential Zone, 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.	Amend provisions relating to rest homes and retirement villages.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.12	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Childcare Facility in the MDZ	Oppose	Oppose all provisions relating to childcare facilities in the Medium Density Residential Zone. The gross floor area restriction for childcare activities should be deleted – this unduly restricts the efficient use of such sites.	The gross floor area restriction for childcare activities should be deleted.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.13	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rear Lanes	Oppose	Oppose all provisions relating to rear lanes. The submitter supports the inclusion of rear lanes as an option to achieve the medium density outcomes, however the PCS provisions limiting the length, number of units able to use, ownership model or any reference that they should provide for planting, walking and cycling or trip reduction, and/or large trucks and their manoeuvring, are inappropriate and will have a deterrent effect on their use or will create perverse outcomes if designed to meet the PCS provisions.	Delete/amend rear lane provisions.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.14	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Maximum lengths and minimum widths for pedestrian/cyclist access	Oppose	The provisions for maximum lengths and minimum widths for pedestrian/cyclist access through blocks should be deleted – these will encourage the use of accessways through the rear of properties rather than the primary aim of having pedestrian and cyclists form part of the transport “street” network.	The provisions for maximum lengths and minimum widths for pedestrian/cyclist access through blocks should be deleted.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.15	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Neighbourhood Parks	Oppose	Any provision requiring local neighbourhood parks should be deleted. This is a Council function under the Local Government Act for purchase.	Any provision requiring local neighbourhood parks should be deleted.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.16	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Public Transport	Oppose	Any provision requiring public transport infrastructure provision or liaison/agreement with Waikato Regional Council should be deleted. These are inappropriate to be required in the District Plan when public transport is a regional council function.	Any provision requiring public transport infrastructure provision or liaison/agreement with Waikato Regional Council should be deleted.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.1	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Zoning	Support in Part	While the Submitters are not opposed to some of the site being zoned Natural Open Space (NOS), the extent of the zoning of NOS over the site is opposed. The land over which this zone sits contains the peninsula and open paddocks. These areas of the site do not contain features that warrant NOS zoning. It is therefore requested that the area of flat land, as identified in the image below be rezoned from Natural Open Space to Medium Density Residential. Alternatively, the zoning to the extent proposed by Plan Change 5 would only be supported if Council purchased the NOS zoned land from the submitter at market value.	Refine the extent of the Natural Open Space zoning by removing it from the paddocks and peninsula area, to allow the property to be developed and used as a lifestyle property. Rezone this Land as Medium Density Residential to match the other flat area of land on the site. Make subsequential amendments / insertions to other provisions as necessary.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.2	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Features and Overlays	Support in Part	The overlay of SNA, Significant Bat Habitat and Waikato Gully Hazard Area is opposed. The Submitter believes that the mapping of the SNA and Bat Habitat is inaccurate as the site does not Contain any Features that Warrant such overlays. The gully mapping system is inaccurate as the gully areas on the land are not as extensive as shown on the maps.	Undertake a site specific survey to determine the significant natural area, and Significant Bat Habitat then refine the planning maps. Undertake a site specific survey of the site to accurately determine and plot the Gully Hazard Area and then refine the planning maps. Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.3	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Peacocke Structure Plan - Land use	Oppose	While the Submitters are not opposed to some of the site being zoned Natural Open Space (NOS), the extent of the zoning of NOS over the site is opposed. The land over which this zone sits contains the peninsula and open paddocks. These areas of the site do not contain features that warrant NOS zoning. It is therefore requested that the area of flat land, as identified in the image below be rezoned from Natural Open Space to Medium Density Residential. Alternatively, the zoning to the extent proposed by Plan Change 5 would only be supported if Council purchased the NOS zoned land from the submitter at market value.	Refine the extent of the Natural Open Space zoning by removing it from the paddocks and peninsula area, to allow the property to be developed and used as a lifestyle property. Rezone this Land as Medium Density Residential to match the other flat area of land on the site. Make subsequential amendments / insertions to other provisions as necessary.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.4	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Oppose Natural Environment and Heritage Overlay in part: SNA, Bat Habitat and Gully Hazard	Oppose	The overlay of SNA, Significant Bat Habitat and Waikato Gully Hazard Area is opposed. The Submitter believes that the mapping of the SNA and Bat Habitat is inaccurate as the site does not contain any features that warrant such overlays. The gully mapping system is inaccurate as the gully areas on the land are not as extensive as shown on the maps.	Undertake a site specific survey to determine the significant natural area, and Significant Bat Habitat then refine the planning maps. Undertake a site specific survey of the site to accurately determine and plot the Gully Hazard Area and then refine the planning maps. Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.5	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Oppose Natural Environment and Heritage Overlay in part: Esplanade Reserve.	Oppose	The Peackoes Structure Plan (Natural Environment and Heritage) shows the property as being affected in part by a proposed Esplanade Reserve. Refer excerpt below. There are no significant waterways on or adjoining the site. The Esplanade Reserve notation should be removed from the site.	Remove the proposed Esplanade Reserve notation from the property. Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.6	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ- PREC1-P: Objectives and Policies	Support in Part	Plan Change 5 proposes to zone large tracts of private land as NOS. The objectives and policies seek to protect and Enhance these areas, for the benefit of the wider natural environment and also for the benefit of the wider community. The objectives and policies do not include any Provision to encourage protection or enhancement of areas of Natural Open Space zoning areas by private owners. Building incentives, offsets, compensations, and/or exemptions need to be included in Plan Change 5 to provide encouragement for private landowners to protect and preserve the areas of privately owned NOS. While the Submitters provide no specific suggestions for such relief, they would be amenable to engaging with HCC staff on what such measures may be appropriate.	Insert new objectives and policies to encourage private landowners to protect and enhance privately owned areas of proposed Natural Open Space zoned land. Make subsequential amendments to other provisions as necessary.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.7	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – REC 1 – P: Rules	Support in Part	Following on from submission point 6 above, the proposed rules for the NOSZ do not provide any exemptions or incentives for private land owners to protect or enhance the areas of natural open space that are in private ownership. The rules as proposed place significant restriction on the for continued private use and development while also placing significant expectations with respect to weed and pest control and enhancement – and potentially public access. To offset or alleviate these restrictions and expectations, measures (rules) providing compensation, exemptions or flexibility in use should be provided in the District Plan for private landowners. While the Submitters provide no specific suggestions for such relief, they would be amenable to engaging with HCC staff on what such measures may be appropriate.	Insert new rules to encourage private landowners to protect and enhance privately owned areas of proposed Natural Open Space zoned land through provision of building, works, or financial incentives or exemptions. Make subsequent amendments to other provisions as necessary.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.8	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ –PREC1 – P:R15 PER-1 Vege. Removal	Oppose	PER – 1 does not allow for vegetation removal from Natural Open Space Zones if that vegetation is dead, diseased or if it presents a risk. The Submitter’s site has a large area of proposed NOSZ covering it. The ability to fell and remove dead, diseased, or hazardous vegetation should be permitted to avoid the need to go through a resource consent process.	Add that the removal of vegetation that is dead, diseased, or posing a risk to person or property is permitted. Alternatively: Remove the NOSZ notation from the site. Make subsequent amendments and/or insertions to other provisions as necessary.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.9	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ PREC1-P: R37 Fences and Walls	Oppose	This rule states that boundary fences shall not exceed 1.5m in height. This is opposed as some stock proof and pest proof fencing needs to exceed this height. An exception to this rule should be inserted to exclude this 1.5m height for stock proof and pest proof boundary fencing.	Add an Exception to R37 to include: b) Except that boundary fencing erected for stock and pest proofing has no maximum height limit. Make subsequent amendments and/or insertions to other provisions as necessary.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.10	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP:R14 Design standards	Support in Part	The exceptions as written are generally supported, however the provisions should include an additional exception, to accommodate subdivision that merely seeks to create separate titles to mirror zone boundaries. That is, a new provision should read: 3) The standards of Rule Sub-PREC1- PSP:R15, R16, R17, R23 and R24 shall not apply to the subdivision of land intended solely to separate zoning.This will provide added certainty and streamlining for simple subdivisions, particularly for those existing owners who have split zoning on their land.	Insert a new provision: 3) The Standards of Rule Sub- PREC1- PSP:R15, R16, R17, R23 and R24 shall not apply to the subdivision of land intended solely to separate zoning. Make subsequent amendments and/or insertions to other provisions as necessary.
16	Graeme McMillan	16.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	High density overlay	Oppose	I have several concerns about Chapter 4A Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct, in particular relating to the proposed high density overlay. I believe there is a lack of transparency showed by the Council in relation to this high density overlay, and that many people may not have known about this veiled change. Although proposed high density areas are shown on the Land Use map, there is no chapter in the list above about high density. The detail of this proposed high density area is hidden in the medium density documentation. Illustrations in the consultation booklet sent to nearby residents are also misleading. On the second to last page the illustrations show a gully profile with a 20m bat buffer or 5m setback then urban development with a 2-storey building. When you look at the Land Use map, a large proportion of the land bordering a gully or proposed bat corridor is High density, therefore the building could be 5-storey's high. Both illustrations also show a road directly against at least one side of the gully or bat corridor. While this is true in some locations, there are plenty of other locations where a road won't be directly against these areas. This means the setback of 5-storey buildings from the edge of the gully/bat corridor will be much less than what is represented in these illustrations. I feel the Council has mislead the public about the possible impact of the high density zone.	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.
16	Graeme McMillan	16.2	General	General	Support in Part	In the open days held at Te Wananga and the Glenview Club over the last couple of years, there was mention of skink protection areas, but I can't see this detail anywhere in this plan or supporting information. Can Council please elaborate on skink protection?	The submitter seeks clarification on inclusion of skink protection provisions.
16	Graeme McMillan	16.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Building height near bat habitat and open space	Oppose	I believe there is a risk that 5-storey buildings near to bat habitats will cause higher lighting and glare risks to bats from residential use - patios, windows etc. These risk elements may only be partly controlled by the design of the building. There is much less risk of affecting bats if the building height beside bat habitat is limited to 2-storeys. I also don't believe we should have taller buildings blocking the view of green spaces like gullies. I refer you to Victoria Street, where high commercial properties have blocked the river views from the person on the ground. Taller buildings also have greater foundational requirements than lower buildings. Engineering solutions can be found however I think the Land Use plan should take this into account.	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.
16	Graeme McMillan	16.4	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Impact of high density of lighting	Support in Part	25.6.2 describes how Peacocke Precinct is an important habitat for long-tail bats and that significant bat habitat areas are protected from the effects of lighting and glare but 25.6.4.4 doesn't account for the high density overlay and doesn't account for the risk of bat glare from tall buildings with patios and unshuttered windows. As written, Peacocke High Density Zone fits under section 25.6.4.5 All Other Zones, where the lux measurement is 33x higher (10 lux vs. 0.3 lux) than what applies to Peacocke Medium Density.	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.
17	Findlay Family Trust	17.1	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Roading Network /SH3	Support in Part	The submitter’s primary reason for this submission is to ensure that any future roading network, infrastructure, staging, ecological and bat corridors planned within the Peacocke Structure Plan area and any new intersection on State Highway 3 does not compromise the intended road access into the existing Houchens Road Large Lot Residential Structure Plan and does not frustrate, hinder or foreclose the identified opportunity for future urbanisation of this land through any limitation or flaw in PC5 or its implementation. Since approval of the Houchens Road Structure Plan, no circumstances have arisen that would warrant any change to the indicative future roading link on the Houchens Road Structure Plan.	Amend so that PC5 clearly provides for the existing District Plan framework that immediately adjoins the PC5 area, and further that PC5 should ensure that it is future proofed to accommodate extensions of the roading network as Hamilton City expands its urban area. Amend the objectives, policies, and rules to ensure that construction of the anticipated roading link to SH3 opposite the submitter's site does not foreclose or compromise the Houchens Road Structure Plan, or its potential urbanisation.
17	Findlay Family Trust	17.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Roading Network /SH3	Support in Part	The SH/Hall Rd intersection is considered unsafe and unsuited to residential environment. The closure of Hall Rd is considered necessary and is supported. However, the submitter is unsure whether the provisions of PC5 ensure this outcome.	The closure of Hall Rd is considered necessary and is supported.
17	Findlay Family Trust	17.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Staging & Infrastructure	Support in Part	The proposed staging programme in PC5 hinders growth within the area. Poor consideration has been given to alternative viable sequencing of development to facilitate growth in the area, or other methods to enable housing supply outside the specified sequence/staging. Certain infrastructure pre-requisites are not required and/or are poorly considered and the proposed text and structure plan map hinder potential growth opportunities and preclude developers' ability to advance certain sections of work or infrastructure.	The submitter seeks to delete the Chapter 3a strategic infrastructure table requirements and remove any reference or requirement within PC5 for fixed staging or sequencing of development subject to a fixed infrastructure sequence.
17	Findlay Family Trust	17.4	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Staging & Infrastructure	Support in Part	There is concern about the configuration, form, and sizing of infrastructure, particularly wastewater and wastewater treatment infrastructure. While an additional water reservoir is supported, the proposed location adjoining land subject to this submission is opposed and neither has consultation with affected landowners occurred.	Amend to alter the proposed location of an additional water reservoir adjoining land subject to the submission is opposed.
17	Findlay Family Trust	17.5	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Ecological Corridors	Oppose	The proposed location and extent of the ecological corridor, including bat corridors, “Significant Bat Habitat Area”, monitoring of the same, including as proposed over land relevant to this submission is opposed. Part of the land in question is not located in Hamilton City, the proposed corridor has not been subject to appropriate consultation or recent assessment and does not appear to relate to or be appropriately informed by current and historic habitat.	The proposed location and extent of the ecological corridor and bat corridors including monitoring of the proposed area is opposed.
17	Findlay Family Trust	17.6	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Oppose	The extent of the Natural Open Space Zone is not supported, including the area that runs parallel to Hall Road up to where it meets state Highway 3.	Amend the extent of the Natural Open Space Zone.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
17	Findlay Family Trust	17.7	General	Objectives, polices and Rules	Support in Part	The submitter considers that the PC5 objectives, policies and rules should be amended to ensure that construction of the anticipated roading link to State Highway 3 opposite the submitter's site does not foreclose or compromise the Houchens Road Structure Plan, or its potential urbanisation. It is considered that such provisions will assist Hamilton City Council in carrying out its functions under the RMA in that they require an integrated management of resources between adjoining jurisdictions, and within planned urban areas.	The submitter seeks that PC5 be approved, subject to the addition of, or amendments to, objectives, policies, plans and rules that ensure that any transportation network within the Peacocke Structure Plan Area and State Highway 3 upgrades, infrastructure proposed along with its configuration, sizing, staging and location, together with community infrastructure, ecological and bat corridors are fit for purpose and growth, and do not foreclose or compromise development and the anticipated roading link into any adjoining structure plan areas, and specifically the Houchens Road Large Lot Residential Structure Plan area located in Waipa District. Make any amendments and consequential amendments to give effect to the specific 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 to give effect to, support or reflect any part of it.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.1	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01- PSP: O23	Support	Fire and Emergency supports provision DEV01- PSP: O23 as it requires that new urban development is appropriately serviced and properly integrated to minimise city network impacts. This is important to Fire and Emergency from a firefighting water supply and access perspective and will ensure Fire and Emergency are able to effectively and efficiently response in an emergency, in turn protecting and providing for the communities' health, safety and wellbeing.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01- PSP: O25	Support	Fire and Emergency supports DEV01- PSP: O25 as it requires that development of the Peacocke Structure Plan area occurs in a staged manner that ensures the efficient and effective delivery of infrastructure. For Fire and Emergency, it is important that adequate infrastructure is in place before enabling the development of these large growth areas, particularly those that are intended to be serviced with a reticulated water supply network.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01- PSP: O26	Support	Fire and Emergency supports DEV01- PSP: O26 to the extent that this objective requires the timing, type and intensity of new urban development to be integrated and aligned with the planning and provision of network infrastructure. For Fire and Emergency, it is important that adequate infrastructure is in place before enabling the development of these large growth areas, particularly those that are intended to be serviced with a reticulated water supply network. Further, where the reticulated water supply network is in place, there must be sufficient water supply capacity and pressure to service the various proposed new urban developments in accordance with the Code of Practice. If there is insufficient capacity or pressures in the network, development should not progress until remedied.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.4	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P26	Support	Fire and Emergency supports DEV01-PSP: P26 to the extent that the policy intent is to ensure development manages the risks associated with natural hazards to ensure the safety of people and structures.This is consistent with Fire and Emergency's Statement of Intent to build resilient communities through reducing the risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.5	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P48	Support in Part	Fire and Emergency supports the intent of DEV01-PSP: P48 being that the transport network shall be designed to ensure access is provided to all users in a way that is safe, direct and convenient as possible. Fire and Emergency note that there is a significant focus on the prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists over vehicles, which is generally supported. However, Fire and Emergency are concerned that consideration of emergency access requirements may be overlooked in the design process and result in unintended consequences for emergency services and the community more generally. Fire and Emergency therefore consider that there needs to be policy that explicitly requires council and plan users to turn their minds to ensuring that safe and efficient access to developments is provided for emergency service vehicles in the event of an emergency. These general requirements are set out in detail on page 3.	Amend as follows: DEV01-PSP: P48 The transport network shall be designed to ensure access is provided to all users <u>(including emergency services)</u> in a way that is safe, direct and convenient as possible.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P50	Support	The design and operation of the transport system shall prioritise the movement of pedestrians and cyclists over vehicles. Fire and Emergency note that there is a significant focus on the prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists over vehicles, which is generally supported. However, Fire and Emergency are concerned that consideration of emergency access requirements may be overlooked in the design process and result in unintended consequences for emergency services and the community more generally. Fire and Emergency therefore consider that there needs to be policy that explicitly requires council and plan users to turn their minds to ensuring that safe and efficient access to developments is provided for emergency service vehicles in the event of an emergency. This is sought through an amendment to DEV01-PSP: P48 above. These general requirements are set out in detail on page 3.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.7	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: O11	Support	Fire and Emergency supports MRZ - PREC1- PSP: O11 insofar that the policy promotes that residential buildings make efficient use of water and energy resources. Water conservation measures through improved subdivision and building design, including domestic on-site water storage are supported by Fire and Emergency.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.8	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P23	Support	Fire and Emergency support provision MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P23 that requires that new residential development shall be able to be adequately serviced in terms of Three Waters infrastructure.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.9	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P24	Support	Fire and Emergency supports MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P24 to the extent that it requires that residential development shall use land and infrastructure efficiently by staging and sequencing the development as indicated by the Peacocke Structure Plan. As indicated above, the staging of development is strongly supported by Fire and Emergency to enable council to manage growth and associated demand on existing infrastructure.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.10	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P26	Support	Fire and Emergency supports MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P26 to the extent that it encourages the efficient use of water by incorporating water-sensitive techniques. Water conservation measures through improved subdivision and building design, including domestic on-site water storage are supported by Fire and Emergency.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: R23	Support	Emergency service facilities in the Medium Density Residential Zone – Peacocke Precinct are a restricted discretionary activity and are subject to standards PREC1-P R36 – R48. Further, matters of discretion are restricted to: B – Design and Layout C – Character and Amenity P – Peacocke Structure Plan New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where new developments occur, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development occurs. Restricted discretionary activity is considered acceptable to Fire and Emergency in this instance.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.12	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ – PREC1- PSP: R24	Support	Emergency service facilities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are Discretionary activities where NCZ – PREC1-PSP: R44-R51 is complied with. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where new developments occur, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development occurs. A discretionary activity is considered acceptable to Fire and Emergency in this instance given the small-scale of the zoned locations.	Retain as notified.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.13	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1- PSP: R19	Support	Emergency service facilities in the Local Centre Zone are Restricted Discretionary activities where LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R40-R49 are complied with. Matters of discretion are restricted to: B – Design and Layout C – Character and Amenity F – Hazards and Safety P – Peacocke Structure Plan New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where new developments occur, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Provisions within the rules of the district plan are therefore the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development occurs. A restricted discretionary activity is considered acceptable to Fire and Emergency in this instance.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.14	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O8	Support in Part	Fire and Emergency supports SUB – PREC1- PSP: O8 to the extent that it requires subdivision to create a transport network that is well connected and legible. However, Fire and Emergency are concerned that consideration of emergency access requirements may be overlooked in the design process and result in unintended consequences for emergency services and the community more generally. Fire and Emergency therefore consider that there needs to be an objective that explicitly requires council and plan users to turn their minds to ensuring that safe and efficient access to developments are provided for emergency service vehicles in the event of an emergency. These general requirements are set out in detail on page 3. The amendment sought is considered to support the requirements within SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20 Provision of parking and access.	Amend as follows: SUB – PREC1- PSP: O8 Subdivision creates a transport network that: Is well connected and legible. Delivers a high-quality walking and cycling experience. Manages the amenity effects associated with parking. Defines areas of public open space. Creates a safe, low speed environment Provides for a high quality public transport network. <u>Provides for emergency service vehicle access.</u>
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.15	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P3	Support	Fire and Emergency supports SUB - PREC1-PSP: P3 to the extent that it requires subdivision activities to provide an adequate level of infrastructure and services appropriate for the proposed development. Further, SUB - PREC1-PSP: P3 specifies that subdivision does not occur unless appropriate infrastructure and/or infrastructure capacity is available to service the proposed development and the capacity, efficiency, performance and sustainability of the wider infrastructure network is not compromised. For Fire and Emergency, it is important that adequate infrastructure is in place before enabling the development of these large growth areas, particularly those that are intended to be serviced with a reticulated water supply network. Further, where the reticulated water supply network is in place, there must be sufficient water supply capacity and pressure to service the various proposed new urban developments in accordance with the Code of Practice.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.16	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: RULES – GENERAL STANDARDS SUB-PREC1-PSP: R12 Telecommunication , Electricity, Gas and Computer Media	Support in Part	Fire and Emergency note that as notified, there is no servicing standards relating to water supply. It is noted that water supply infrastructure may not be in place at the time of the subdivision resource consent process, and will be extended as part of the subdivision in some instances. Further, it is noted that the information requirements for concept plans (required for any single or staged subdivision creating more than 10 additional lots) within the Peacocke Structure Plan requires the consideration of transport and servicing. However, there is no rule or standard that requires this. Fire and Emergency consider that any subdivision that results in the creation of a new lot should be required to connect to the reticulated water supply. Therefore, an amendment is sought to SUB-PREC1-PSP: R12 to ensure servicing is covered via the Peacocke Structure Plan General Standards for all subdivision.	Amend as follows: SUB-PREC1-PSP: R12 Telecommunication, Electricity, Gas, <del>and</del> Computer Media <u>and Three Waters</u> . Telecommunication, electricity, gas and ducting for computer media shall be provided at the time of subdivision, in accordance with the requirements of the relevant network utility operator and the relevant standards of the applicable zone. Telecommunication, electricity, gas and ducting for computer media shall be underground where possible. <u>Three waters shall meet the requirements of Chapter 25.13 Three Waters</u> Notes - 1. Acceptable means of compliance for the provision, design and construction of infrastructure is contained within the Waikato Local Authority Shared Services Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications (RITS). 2. Where density exceeds the outcomes anticipated by the Waikato Local Authority Shared Services Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications (RITS) development will need to be undertaken in consultation with Hamilton City Council.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.17	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: RULES – DESIGN STANDARDS SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20 Provision of parking and access	Support	Fire and Emergency support SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20 to the extent that, where on-site parking and/or access is provided: Parking, access and manoeuvring areas shall meet the requirements of Chapter 25.14 Transportation. All rear lanes shall have a minimum legal width of 7m Each rear lane shall be designed to provide access and egress for large rigid trucks such as fire, furniture removal, refuse and recycling-collection trucks.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.18	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R21 Roading and Access	Support	Fire and Emergency supports SUB-PREC1-PSP: R21 to the extent that the minimum road width of vehicle access to be formed for any local or collector road must 16.8m, 24.2m and 24.6m. This is considered adequate for fire appliances.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.19	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R23 Local Centre: Peacocke Precinct and Neighbourhood Centre Zones: Peacocke Precinct	Support	Fire and Emergency support SUB-PREC1-PSP: R23 to the extent that it requires a minimum access or private way width serving allotments to be 8m or greater, dependent on net site areas and the number of allotments being served. Fire and Emergency also supports the maximum private way gradient of 1:8, as this is acceptable for fire appliances.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.20	Chapter 25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards 25.14.4.1 Vehicle Crossings and Internal Vehicle Access	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the Design and Access Width amendments to 25.14.4.1 h) i) that requires a minimum width of 5.5m for vehicle crossings in the Peacocke Structure Plan area that are intended to serve two units. Fire and Emergency also supports the 25.14.4.1 h) vii) that requires a 7m minimum legal width of a rear lane vehicle crossing.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.21	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2.2 Subdivision 1.2.2.2.1 Additional Requirements for Concept Plans for the Peacocke Structure Plan	Support in Part	Fire and Emergency understand that a subdivision Concept Plan is required for any single or staged subdivision creating more than 10 additional lots. Proposed Plan Change 5 introduces additional 'Requirements for Concept Plans for the Peacocke Structure Plan'. The matters of interest to Fire and Emergency are set out separately below. i) Transport Network Fire and Emergency support 1.2.2.2.1 b) i) in part insofar that it requires an applicant to demonstrate how vehicle access is to be provided while maintaining on street parking and safety of the transport network. Fire and Emergency however consider that this is the opportunity for applicants to consider how emergency services will be able to access their subdivision. As such an amendment is sought to require that emergency service access is considered at the concept design phase.	Amend as follows: i) Transport Network The Concept Plan will need to:... <u>Demonstrate how emergency vehicle access can be achieved. Note: For a development where a fire appliance is not able to reach either a dwelling or the source of the firefighting water supply from a public road in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice NZS PAS 4509: 2008, this code of practice should be consulted for compliance with the accessway dimensions required for the fire appliances. This applies to the legal road, the Right of Way or the Access Lot or access leg where this provides the primary access to the lot/site.</u>
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.22	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2.2 Subdivision 1.2.2.2.1 Additional Requirements for Concept Plans for the Peacocke Structure Plan	Support	ii) Infrastructure and Servicing - Fire and Emergency supports 1.2.2.2.1 b) ii) insofar that it requires an applicant to identify the approach to the provision of infrastructure and services which is aligned with the structure plan and the wider city infrastructure development program.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.23	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2.2 Subdivision 1.2.2.2.1 Additional Requirements for Concept Plans for the Peacocke Structure Plan	Support	vii) Staging - Fire and Emergency supports 1.2.2.2.1 b) vii) insofar that it requires the applicant to identify the staging of development to demonstrate how any urban development is integrated into the overall development of Peacocke. As indicated above, it is important to Fire and Emergency from a water supply perspective that development does not proceed before water supply and transport infrastructure is in place.	Retain as notified.
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.24	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P - Peacocke Structure Plan P3 Development in the Peacocke Precinct	Support in Part	Fire and Emergency supports in part P3 h) to the extent that this assessment criteria enables consideration of the extent to which parking, manoeuvring areas and driveways have been designed and located. Fire and Emergency however consider that there is a need to provide Council the discretion to assess the extent of which a development in the Peacocke Structure Plan area has designed and located parking, manoeuvring areas and driveways as to not obstruct emergency vehicle access in an emergency.	Amend as follows: h) The extent to which parking, manoeuvring areas, driveways and outdoor service areas have been designed and located: ... vi) <u>To not obstruct access to buildings for emergency services.</u>



## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.25	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P5 Subdivision in the Peacocke Structure Plan	Support in Part	Fire and Emergency supports in part P5 g) to the extent that it provides Council the discretion to consider the extent to which a proposed rear lane provides safe access to adjoining dwellings and is designed to allow for ease of access to the transport corridor for management of rubbish and servicing. Fire and Emergency however consider that explicit consideration should be given to the access requirements of emergency services vehicles where non-compliance with access provisions are not achieved.	Amend as follows: g) Where narrow dwelling units are proposed and rear lanes are required for vehicle access, the extent to which: 1 The lane provides safe access to adjoining dwellings; 2 The lane incorporates planting/landscaping to provide on-site amenity; 3 It is designed to ensure it provides rear access only and any adjoining dwellings front a public road or a reserve where pedestrian access is provided. 4 The design allows for ease of access to the transport corridor for management of rubbish and servicing, <u>including emergency service vehicles.</u>
18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	18.26	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P5 Subdivision in the Peacocke Structure Plan	Support	Fire and Emergency supports P5 v) to the extent that it provides Council the discretion to consider whether the proposal is in accordance with the identified staging in the Peacocke Structure Plan. As indicated above, it is important to Fire and Emergency from a water supply perspective that development does not proceed before water supply and transport infrastructure is in place.	Retain as notified.
19	Nathan Cox	19.1	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	High density overlay area at 474, 476 and 490 Peacockes Rd	Support in Part	474, 476 and 490 Peacockes Rd adjoin the High Density Overlay to the North, East and West; they adjoin a proposed minor arterial road; and are located within walking distance to the proposed Local Centre Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Future Mass Transport hub, Public Transport Hub and Key Public Transport Stop Locations. These characteristics make the land appropriate for high density residential development given the accessibility to public transport and walking distance to future areas of employment. This, in combination with the surrounding High Density Overlay Area, would be consistent with the proposed objective MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: O4 and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020.	Amend Map No:64B – Peacocke Precinct in Appendix 17A to include Lot 2 DP 431937 and Lot 3 DP 431937 in the High Density Overlay Area.
19	Nathan Cox	19.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Location of Indicative Key Local Transport Network	Support in Part	An Indicative Key Local Transport Network is proposed through 474, 476 and 490 Peacockes Rd as identified in Appendix 2 Figure 2-2: Peacocke Structure Plan – Transport Network. It is requested that this indicative road follows the western boundary of the site in question. This will allow for a more integrated development as the current layout proposes a skinny section of land to the west of the proposed transport network which will restrict the development potential on the site and the opportunities to create integrated development outcomes.	Amend Figure 2-2: Peacocke Structure Plan – Transport Network found in Appendix 2 to move the proposed Indicative Key Local Transport Network west to follow the western site boundary of Lot 1 DP 423903.
20	Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	20.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	3.4.1.3b	Support in Part	We support the deletion of suggestions that large scale modification and earth should be avoided. Replace with specific legal policy. Gullies elsewhere in the city have been filled in and once the damage is done the ecosystem is wrecked forever.	Amend by replacing with specific legal policy.
20	Go Eco	20.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P27	Oppose	"The loss of significant vegetation is minimised" is unacceptable wording as minimised is relative. Change wording to creating a net increase of significant vegetation or 100% maintained.	Amend policy wording to creating a net increase of significant vegetation or 100% maintained.
20	Go Eco	20.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P31	Support in Part	Amend policy wording "Provide for revegetated gullies and river margins" to "actively restore gullies and river margins as they represent the vital eco-tone for numerous native species."	Replace policy with "actively restore gullies and river margins as they represent the vital eco-tone for numerous native species."
20	Go Eco	20.4	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P35	Support	Support policy 'Protect bat habitat adjoining the edge of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River to ensure long tailed bats are able to continue to utilise these areas'.	Retain as notified.
20	Go Eco	20.5	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P36	Support in Part	Require development adjacent to the gully network and Waikato River to meet required setbacks to support the ecological function of these areas'. The submitter's only addition here is that 5m setbacks from a Significant Natural Area is limited and should be increased where possible.	Amend policy to increase extent of setbacks from Significant Natural Area where possible.
20	Go Eco	20.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P37	Support in Part	Support these additions to the policy section of the plan as they are distinct and specific references to how pekapeka should be protected during and after the development. DEV01-PSP: P37 should include a specific minimum width, otherwise there is too much flexibility to decrease the width. Increasing the width of pekapeka habitat is fine. Finding loopholes to decrease the width would be very bad.	Amend DEV01-PSP: P37 to specify a minimum width of ecological corridor.
20	Go Eco	20.7	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Transportation network	Support in Part	There is no mention of the transportation infrastructure on a policy level in regard to mitigating the impacts on the wellbeing of the pekapeka such as maximum road width, maximum light brightness, minimum suburban tree coverage (not just in gullies), maximum street lights, commercial centre light restrictions, walking and cycle path lighting which will go through parks and gullies, and issues surrounding tree felling when a potential bat tree causes the risk to the transport system.	Specific relief sought not stated.
20	Go Eco	20.8	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Cultural Values (d)	Support	The submitter supports objective DEV01-PSP Cultural Values (d) as Mangakōtukutuku is both a cultural taonga as well as the habitat of a number of native taonga species, including and extending beyond pekapeka. The protections for this area should be strengthened in perpetuity.	Retain as notified.
20	Go Eco	20.9	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space Network	Support in Part	Support the broad statements about the importance of Mangakōtukutuku Gully and the Waikato River, but addition should be made to align with Department of Conservation's new tree felling protocol, as this now protects bat roots in any tree as a significant natural area value.	Amend broad statements to align with Department of Conservation's new tree felling protocol.
20	Go Eco	20.10	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (b) and (c)	Support in Part	Support statement in DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (b) and (c) while also encouraging enhancement focused on native foliage. Exotic pine trees have become bat roost sites across Hamilton and therefore cannot be interfered with unless there is strong evidence bats do not use the trees in question. This should follow the new Department of Conservation Tree Felling protocol.	Amend DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (c) to follow the new Department of Conservation Tree Felling protocol.
20	Go Eco	20.11	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (c) • Bat Habitat Buffer	Support in Part	This bat specific module is good news. 20m is an acceptable distance, but flexibility for what accounts for a bat significant natural area may be needed. When bats start roosting in a different area of the gully then it would become a significant natural area. The proposed style of bat corridor is 50 metres, which includes the bat buffer making habitat 30m wide which is quite limited. 0.3 lux lighting is recommended in the plan and is outlined in figures displaying habitat and road layouts. A limit on this lighting must be mandated. The number of light poles must also be mandated as if there are lots more low level lighting then benefits may be limited.	Amend to include a limit on lux lighting and a limit on the number of light poles.
20	Go Eco	20.12	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (f)	Support in Part	The statement "Sports parks may have natural areas, play lots and links to gullies." is unclear. What does links to gullies mean? Will it mean that there will be substantial vegetation clearance where deemed 'necessary'. A network of tree copses in parks will both make them nicer to be in and allow bats a further pathway over the suburb. This is important because massive open parks are not something the bats like, they prefer gullies and parks linked by corridors.	Seeks clarification on what 'links to gullies' means in DEV01-PSP.
20	Go Eco	20.13	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18	Support	The submitter supports the addition of policy NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18 to ensure that pekapeka (long-tailed bat) habitat is protected through mitigation of the effects of the development. Corridors are essential to this project.	Retain as notified.
20	Go Eco	20.14	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7	Support in Part	Objective NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7 should be enhance the habitat of pekapeka through restoration and establishment of healthy new habitats where possible	Amend objective NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7 to include enhancement of the habitat of pekapeka through restoration and establishment of healthy new habitats where possible.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
20	Go Eco	20.15	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: R16	Support in Part	Support the idea of community gardens. The restrictions of no lighting are good and the stipulation that no vegetation should be removed is essential. However, a statement on the practical way this can be enforced needs to be included here.	Amend NOSZ-PREC1-P:R16 to include a statement on the practical way the Rule can be enforced.
20	Go Eco	20.16	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: R36 Setbacks	Support in Part	Support the ruling to not allow development within 5m of a Significant Natural Area, however, for known bat roost sites this should be extended as these trees may impede properties and then landowner and council conflict is inevitable.	Amend to extend setbacks for known bat roost sites.
21	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	21.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	DEV01-PSP: P68	Support	Transpower supports that sensitive land uses should avoid adverse effects on regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain as notified.
21	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	21.2	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Oppose	Transpower opposes the Natural Open Space Zoning of the National Control Centre at 25 Hall Road, particularly given the anomaly of zoning part of the site Natural Open Space Zone given its existing use.	Remove the proposed Natural Open Space Zone and re-zone the NCC site to Business 1 – Commercial Fringe. And any consequential amendments.
21	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	21.3	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	Transpower oppose the Medium Residential Zoning – Peacocke Precinct of the National Control Centre at 25 Hall Road.	Remove the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone and re-zone the NCC site to Business 1 – Commercial Fringe. And any consequential amendments.
21	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	21.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R30 Chapter 15 Rule 15.3(II) Offices	Oppose	An enabling framework is required for Transpower activities. Transpower does not want to restrict future operations or expansion at the site.	Although not Transpower’s preference, should the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone – Peacocke Precinct not be removed from the NCC site, any expansion to existing activities, structures or buildings at the NCC has a number of permitted activity standards and an activity status no more restrictive than controlled, and the Medium Density Residential Zone – Peacocke Precinct be applied to the entire site. And any consequential amendments.
21	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	21.5	Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage	SNA 60, Hall Road Peacocke	Oppose	Transpower opposes the identification of SNA 60 at 25 Hall Road on the basis the single detection of one bat night-roosting in a Tasmanian blackwood is not sufficient of itself to distinguish the identification and mapping of the feature as a SNA.	Remove proposed significant natural areas 60 from 25 Hall Road, and any consequential amendments.
21	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	21.6	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Significant Bat Habitat Area, as it relates to 25 Hall Road	Oppose	Transpower opposes the Significant Bat Habitat Area, as it relates to 25 Hall Road. In addition to the insufficient justification/reasoning for SNA 60, Transpower has concerns with the width of the Significant Bat Habitat Area and its location on 25 Hall Road.	Remove or relocate the Significant Bat Habitat Area feature from the Transpower site at 25 Hall Road. And any consequential amendments including deletion of any lighting and vegetation works standards/rules as they apply to the site.
21	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	21.7	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Peacocke Structure Plan – Proposed Road Stopping on Hall Road.	Support in Part	Transpower is generally supportive of the proposed road stopping provided vehicular access is maintained to the Transpower site.	Ensure 24-hour vehicle access is maintained to 25 Hall Road with safe and convenient connection to the SH3. And any consequential amendments.
22	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	22.1	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone Appendix 2 – Structure Plans Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Local centre zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the extent and placement of the Local Centre Zone will not result in an optimum outcome for the Local Centre in terms of amenity and efficiency. The submitter considers that the focal point of the Local Centre should be shifted further to the west and straddle the intersection of Peacockes Road and proposed east-west minor arterial road, so that the centre can benefit from the visibility and frontage provided by the intersection of two arterial roads, the activity levels of the proposed school, and the convenience of the proposed public transport hub. This will also allow separation of retail uses so that finer-grained retail, office, and entertainment activities are focused on the eastern side of Peacockes Road and the larger format supermarket can utilise the regular-shaped and flat land at 410 Peacockes Road. This corner site will enable the supermarket to be easily accessible by heavy vehicles (for deliveries of goods) and private motor vehicles (for customers), without compromising the focus on creating a pedestrian-friendly environment with active street frontages within the core area of the Local Centre.	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.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Appendix 2 – Structure Plan, Figure 2-1 (Land Use) - Proposed Natural Open Space.	Oppose	The submitter has lodged a resource consent application (Reference 010.2021.00011373.001) for a retirement village based on the extent of the Natural Open Space Zone in the ODP. The relief sought will ensure consistency between Figure 2-1 and that application.	That the extent of the Proposed Natural Open Space Zone on Figure 2-1 in respect of Lot 1 DPS 83083 and Lot 2 DPS 46395 aligns with extent of the Natural Open Space Zone shown in the Hamilton Operative District Plan Planning Maps.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Appendix 2 - Structure Plan, Figure 2-3 (Natural Environment and Heritage) - Proposed Esplanade Reserve - Proposed Significant Natural Area - Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area	Oppose	It is not clear as to why Lot 1 DPS 83083 and Lot 2 DPS 46395 are the only parcels of land adjoining the Waikato River that are identified needing a Proposed Esplanade Reserve in Figure 2-1. This notation is unnecessary as this land is already subject to esplanade reserve requirements pursuant to Rule SUB- PREC1-PSP: R13 a). The submitter has lodged a resource consent application (Reference # 010.2021.00011373.001) for a retirement village based on the extent of the SNA (and a corresponding 20m bat buffer) in the ODP. The relief sought will ensure consistency between Figure 2-3 and that application.	That the Proposed Esplanade Reserve on Figure 2-1 in respect of Lot 1 DPS 83083 and Lot 2 DPS 46395 be deleted; That the extent of the Proposed Natural Open Space Zone on Figure 2-3 in respect of Lot 1 DPS 83083 and Lot 2 DPS 46395 aligns with extent of the Natural Open Space Zone shown in the Hamilton Operative District Plan Planning Maps; and That the extent of the Significant Bat Area on Figure 2-3 in respect of Lot 1 DPS 83083 and Lot 2 DPS 46395 aligns with a 20m setback from the outer edge of the Significant Natural Area shown in the Hamilton Operative District Plan Planning Maps.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.3	Appendix 17A – Planning Maps	Zoning - Natural Open Space Zone; Features - Significant Natural Area; Significant Bat Habitat Area; and Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area.	Support in Part	The submitter has lodged a resource consent application (Reference # 010.2021.00011373.001) for a retirement village based on the extent of zones and features in the ODP. The relief sought will ensure consistency between Figure 2-3 and that application.	That the extent of the Proposed Natural Open Space Zone in Appendix 17A in respect of Lot 1 DPS 83083 and Lot 2 DPS 46395 aligns with extent of the Natural Open Space Zone shown in the Hamilton Operative District Plan Planning Maps; That the extent of the Significant Natural Area in Appendix 17A in respect of Lot 1 DPS 83083 and Lot 2 DPS 46395 aligns with Significant Natural Area shown in the Hamilton Operative District Plan Planning Maps; That the extent of the Significant Bat Area on Figure 2-3 in respect of Lot 1 DPS 83083 and Lot 2 DPS 46395 aligns with a 20m setback from the outer edge of the Significant Natural Area shown in the Hamilton Operative District Plan Planning Maps; and That the extent of the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area in respect of Lot 1 DPS 83083 and Lot 2 DPS 46395 aligns with the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area shown in the Hamilton Operative District Plan Planning Maps.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.4	Appendix 17A – Planning Maps	Medium Density Residential Zone (High Density Overlay)	Support in Part	The proposed zoning is appropriate subject to the relief sought in respect of allowing single level buildings.	Retain the Peacocke Medium Density (High Density Overlay) in respect of Lot 1 DPS 83083, Lot 2 DPS 46395, Lot 2 DP 526398, Lot 13 DPS 10393, Lot 14 DPS 10393 subject to the relief sought in respect of MRZ-PREC- 1-PSP: 05 allowing single level buildings.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.5	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: 05 – Objectives: Land use and development.	Oppose	To ensure a range of housing typologies are provided (including those that are affordable and accessible) single storey buildings should be anticipated in the Medium Residential Zone. For example, retirement villages have a functional need for single storey buildings.	Amend as follows: Development in Peacocke provides a range of housing typologies that are consistent with the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character of <del>two to</del> <u>up to</u> three-storey buildings in the medium density zone and <del>two-up to</del> <u>up to</u> five storey buildings within the high- density area.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.6	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R26	Support in Part	Retirement Villages are an appropriate land use in the Medium Density Residential Zone. Some of the development controls however are not relevant to retirement villages which have unique design requirements including extensive communal areas.	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.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.7	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R36	Oppose	Retirement Villages are often integrated developments on a single site. It is more appropriate to consider site coverage across the entire village rather than by a house by house basis.	Amend as follows: 2) Maximum site coverage for: a) Terraced Houses (Peacocke Precinct) – 60% b) Apartment buildings (Peacocke Precinct) – 60% c) <u>Retirement Villages – 60%.</u>
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.8	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R37	Oppose	Retirement Villages are often integrated developments on a single site with dwellings fronting private roads. It is more appropriate to consider landscaping across the entire village rather than by a house-by-house basis.	R37 2) and 3) do not apply to Retirement Villages.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.9	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R38	Support	16m is an appropriate maximum height in the High Density Overlay.	Retain rule as notified.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.10	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R39	Oppose	Will clarify intent of the rule.	Clarify that the 5m setback from the Significant Bat Habit Area applies to buildings.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R41	Oppose	The proposed amendment will make the rule more suitable for retirement villages which are often single sites with private roading.	R41 should be amended to clarify that it only applies to dwellings on front sites and at the interface with a transport corridor and public open spaces.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.12	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R42	Oppose	The proposed amendment will make the rule more suitable for retirement villages which are often single sites with private roading.	R42 should be amended to clarify that it only applies to dwellings on front sites and at the interface with a transport corridor.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.13	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R44	Oppose	Amend 1) to also include retirement villages. Care facilities and rest homes are not required to meet the outdoor living standards, if the proposal is for a retirement village the rest home and care facilities within the site will not be assessed independently but as part of proposal for a retirement village, therefore would not be able to comply. Outdoor living associated with such facilities is predominantly through communal areas	Amend as follows: 1) These standards do not apply to managed care facilities, <del>or</del> rest homes <u>or retirement villages.</u>
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.14	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R48	Oppose	A managed care facility or rest home contained within a retirement village setting, is still classed as a “retirement village” and as such a small care room held within a dementia unit would be under the minimum floor area stated and therefore non-compliant with these standards. The proposed amendment would not apply to retirement villages proposals.	R48 should be amended in that the provisions should not apply to rooms/units in retirement villages.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.15	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24	Oppose	Will clarify intent of the rule.	Clarify that the Bat Corridors subject to this rule are those that are identified in the Peacocke Structure Plan Figure 2-3.
23	Broadwater Village Ltd	23.16	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	25.6.4.4.4	Support in Part	Will ensure the rule is consistent with Policies 25.6.2.2a and 25.6.2.2b.	Amend as follows: (a) 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.
24	Ministry of Education	24.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Peacocke Structure Plan - Land Use	Support in Part	The submitter supports the Structure Plan 'Land Use' Map showing education facilities, however seek the following relief: The 'Proposed Education Facilities' to be shown as 'Indicative Education Facilities' on the basis that the Ministry is continuing to identify and assess future school site locations within the plan change area, and at this point in time have yet to secure a site/s.	Amend Structure Plan 'Land Use' map to replace the notation 'Proposed Education Facilities' with ' <u>Indicative Education Facilities</u> '.
24	Ministry of Education	24.2	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP	Support in Part	Council and the Ministry have identified that there is a clear requirement for additional educational facilities within the plan change area. The Ministry submits that specific provisions should be provided within the proposed plan change to enable educational facilities, particularly within the residential zones, recognising the important role that educational facilities play within the communities that they serve. In this regard, the Ministry submits that there should be an acknowledgement of the need for educational facilities within the ‘Issues’ description of the proposed plan change, with this appropriately recognised and supported by a relevant Objective and PolicyThe changes are considered to receive support within the ‘urban environment’ objectives of Chapter 3 of the proposed plan change, particularly DEV01-PSP:062 which recognises and supports higher density residential development being established around schools to create a connected, well integrated and high amenity environment. For the avoidance of doubt, the Ministry also seeks any other additional or consequential relief to the proposed plan change, including but not limited to, the maps, issues, objectives, policies, rules, discretions, assessment criteria and explanations that will fully give effect to the matters raised in this submission.	Amend MRZ - PREC1-PSP Issues to include reference to schools as follows: 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 ( <u>including schools</u> ). 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, <u>schools</u> , and amenities and public transport.
24	Ministry of Education	24.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP Objectives	Support in Part		Amend MRZ - PREC1 - PSP Objectives to include the following objective: - <u>Development within the Peacocke Precinct is supported by schools.</u>
24	Ministry of Education	24.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP Policies; amend policy PREC1- PSP: P4	Support in Part		Amend PREC1- PSP: P4 as follows: Community facilities ( <u>including schools</u> ) and community support activities (including managed care facilities and residential centres) shall: 1. Serve a local social or cultural need, <u>or wider educational need for the community</u> . 2. Be compatible with existing and anticipated residential amenity.
25	ID and EM Williams Ltd	25.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans Chapter 23: Subdivision	High density zone- 440 Peacockes Rd	Support in Part	We support the principles outlined in the plan. We wish to see our whole block reclassified as high density. Our 8.3 ha block consists of approximately 4 ha of gully where we have re-established native trees and 4.3 ha of flat land. The block is a walkable distance from the proposed town center (approximately 1km) and 200m from a transport route. 0.3 ha of our land is currently classified high density with the rest classified as medium density. We propose that the rest of the 4.0 ha be re-classified as high density given that it meets the criteria for high density laid down in the plan.	Amend High density zone to include whole site of 440 Peacockes Road.
25	ID and EM Williams Ltd	25.2	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	Protection from sedimentation and tree removal	Support	We support the council's changes outlined in 25.2. We have spent the last 20 years planting natives in our gully. The 4ha is now covered in a wide variety of native trees and plants. Over the years we have seen the return of many native birds (tui, ruru, piwakawaka, kahu, kaka and even karearea) and native fish (esp kokopu and long fin tuna). The south branch of the Mangakotukutuku is pretty well a pristine waterway. It must be protected to the highest level and the possibility of sediment entering the stream or established trees being removed must be stopped.	Retain as notified.
25	ID and EM Williams Ltd	25.3	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Prevent excessive glare	Support	We support the council's changes outlined in 25.6. We have also planted many bat friendly trees to encourage bats into our gully. To have them frightened aware by excessive glare must also be prevented.	Retain as notified.
25	ID and EM Williams Ltd	25.4	Chapter 25.14 Transportation	Encourage public transport, walking and cycling.	Support	We support the council's changes outlined in 25.14. Discouraging the use of cars and encouraging the use of public transport, walking and cycling needs to have the highest priority	Retain as notified.
25	ID and EM Williams Ltd	25.5	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Amend Fig 2.1-2.3	Support in Part	Our land at 440 Peacockes Rd is flat, approximately 1km from the proposed town center and 200m from a transport route. It sits in both Stage E and H. It has a cycleway on it that doesn't follow the gully edge.	Amend Figure 2.1 (Land use) to classify 440 Peacockes Road as high density. Amend Figure 2.2 (Transport) to have the cycleway follow the gully edge. Amend Figure 2.3a to Include our whole block in Stage E rather than having it split across two stages.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
25	ID and EM Williams Ltd	25.6	General	Bat buffer zones	Support in Part	We are passionate about the fauna and flora of the Mangakotukutuku Gully system. We have spent days and thousands of dollars, clearing and reestablishing native trees and bat habitat (gum trees) in the 4ha of the gully we own. We have planted a wide diversity of trees and many of these trees now exceed 10m in height. However, as a result of the bat buffer zone now being imposed on our land we stand to lose a significant area of developable land.	Instead of having a 20m bat buffer zone, the Plan change should allow for a 20m, no build zone, which can be part of someone's section and can be further enhanced with more planting if the land owner so chooses. All the other protections (i.e. direction and intensity of lighting) would still need to be adhered to.
26	Alan Tsai	26.1	General	Peacocke Structure Plan	Support	I support the proposed Peacocke structure plan because the plan has best city design, environmental protection, open space reserve, modern urban house design and density planning.	Retain as notified.
26	Alan Tsai	26.2	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ-PREC1-PSP: O2.	Support	Regarding the Peacocke neighbourhood centre zone, I totally support NCZ-PREC1-PSP: O2.	Retain as notified.
27	Johnny Tsai	27.1	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	PREC1- PSP -R44 Max building height	Oppose	The maximum height limit for a neighbourhood centre is set to 12m suggesting a 3-4 storey, in the 'information booklet' of the Plan change 5, it has proposed a 5 storey walk up apartment scheme- a 15m height limit or more would be more suitable for upper apartment designs. I would suggest a higher height limit like 15m, better practice or discretionary would be higher residential density where amenity areas are located. Also with the norm of governmental permitted direction going to residential 3 storeys, also corresponding with Density (minimum number of residential units required per site) may increase. An extra level has the potential provide more affordable housing with apartments.	Amend to include a higher height limit like 15m, better practice or discretionary would be higher residential density where amenity areas are located.
27	Johnny Tsai	27.2	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R41 Apartments at ground floor	Oppose	With this i don't understand why single dwellings / duplex dwellings are discretionary but apartments on ground floor is not complying? Should these two differ?	The submitter seeks clarity on why single/duplex dwellings are discretionary but apartments on ground floor is non-complying and whether the activity status should differ.
27	Johnny Tsai	27.3	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Bat buffer and bat survey	Oppose	A 20m edge for bat buffer + 5m setback from urban development. 1. The need for bat ecological survey: - If with the decision of having a bat buffer everywhere beside gully, a 20m zone of natural open space is becoming mandated in the structure plan, and sure of being certain to mitigate bat issues, then a bat survey shouldn't this be not be required anymore in any resource consent phase or be less intense investigations needed. Unless there is a need to identify SNA and significant bat habitat (information booklet), by this and proven there is by identified location roost sites, with this evidence a buffer (natural open space) can be decreased in distance.	Remove requirement of bat surveys in resource consents (or make investigations needed less intense).
27	Johnny Tsai	27.4	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Bat buffer and set back	Oppose	A 20m edge for bat buffer + 5m setback from urban development. 2. The Setback issue: -Natural open space zone is suggested by the Bat buffer, on one side the 20m setback including a urban road of 18-24 metres, that is 38-44m+ open space + a front residential setback corridor = a rough 45-50m that's about half of a rugby field, 2 times a basketball court of open space. Just wanted to suggest like i have heard conversations with Mark Roberts, inside bat buffer of 20m a road infrastructure can be integrated into 'natural open space zone or calculated into the setback from urban development. - Simple calculation with key bat habitat 20-40m key bat habitat or so + 20m + 20m (both side buffer zone) = roughly 80m zone, and the proposed bat corridor is only 50m (bat also forage and habitat in there). If there is a maximum 'key bat habitat' that is over 50m etc that the bat buffer can be decreased rather than a mandatory 20m zoned bat buffer like 6-10m etc then road with side tree etc. With reading of Bat report supplied by the HCC, the suggestive vegetation will also be needed in the bat buffer, with the already 'Key bat habitat', trees and vegetation (gully streams etc) wouldn't this encourage not a bat buffer but increased 'Key bat habitat', its just more bat habitat rather than its bats habitat buffer purpose, for they forge food and roost there. I suggest to review this issue in the future, this won't be considered as bat buffer but just vegetation space.	Allow road infrastructure within bat buffer. Add a provision allowing for bat buffer to be decreased if the key bat habitat area has exceeded a maximum level. Suggest this is reviewed in future.
27	Johnny Tsai	27.5	Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Removal of neighbourhood park	Support in Part	Land Specific comment to our property as landowner on Lots DP35271 + 35271 at plateau drive: For the neighbourhood park suggested in the structure plan we would like propose a removal of the neighbourhood park within our property location, as there is already a very big sports park in proximity access to us within less than 500m (bike/walking etc) in our neighbourhood zone area 4 (suggested in the current structure plan) also existing neighbourhood parks in the north Peacock's reserve and Glenview club close by. With the buffer/ setback from gully there is very plentiful of amenity of green space already for residents in this area.	Removal of the neighbourhood park within our property location on Lots DP35271 + 35271 at Plateau Drive.
28	Richard and Elizabeth Ward	28.1	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Proposed Stormwater wetland	Oppose	The proposed Peacocke Structure Plan indicates that a significant portion of Lot 1 DP 316288 is intended to become a stormwater wetland. We oppose that change, and any consequential amendments, on the basis that it curtails our ability to develop our land.	Remove the stormwater wetland at Lot 1 DP 316288.
28	Richard and Elizabeth Ward	28.2	Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural sites	Oppose	Plan Change 5 proposes to include land we own in Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites referring to 'Borrow Pits' in Lot 1 DP 316288, Section 8 SO 538898, and Section 15 SO 538898 (A140). We oppose those changes, and any consequential amendments, on the basis that we disagree the sites hold sufficient heritage value after evaluation against the individual heritage criteria.	Remove 'Borrow Pits' in Lot 1 DP 316288, Section 8 SO 538898, and Section 15 SO 538898 (A140) as a heritage site.
29	Jacqueline Hazel Bates	29.1	Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural sites	Oppose	Plan Change 5 proposes to include land we own in Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites, referring to 'Borrow Pits' in Lot 1 DP 316288, Section 8 SO 538898, and Section 15 SO 538898 (A140). We oppose those changes, and any consequential amendments, on the basis that we disagree the sites hold sufficient heritage value after evaluation against the individual heritage criteria.	Remove 'Borrow Pits' in Lot 1 DP 316288, Section 8 SO 538898, and Section 15 SO 538898 (A140) as a heritage site.
30	Andrea Graves	30.1	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	The submitter supports many of the provisions made for bats, however there are a number of omissions which are set out below.	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.
30	Andrea Graves	30.2	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	There are a lack of design standards in the Plan Change to maximise bat 'hop over' habitats for any streets intruding or intersecting with bat buffer or corridor habitats (including shelterbelts).	Include design standards to maximise bat 'hop over' habitats for any streets intruding or intersecting with bat buffer or corridor habitats (including shelterbelts).
30	Andrea Graves	30.3	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	There are a lack of standards for vegetation design and maintenance requiring attenuation of light intrusion into bat habitat.	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).
30	Andrea Graves	30.4	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	There needs to be 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, as was traversed in Court. The Court also made clear that a 2,700 kelvin limit is appropriate for public roads at [66]. These limits should be a core part of the Plan Change. At present there are only vague statements in the Chapter 25 objectives and policies. Words like 'useability' (25.6.2.2a) and 'minimise' (25.6.2.2b) are easily contested and defended with difficulty. It must be made clear how these limits are to be monitored and maintained.	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.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
30	Andrea Graves	30.5	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	There is a need for screening of high-value bat habitats to outweigh and be prioritised over views, line-of-sight safety considerations, amenity and recreational use. This must be spelt out clearly and at a high-level. The priority must clearly be stated to lie with the bats. The Overview and Vision of Chapter 3 Structure Plans states that 'Subdivision is designed to respond to the gully network and areas of open space ensuring that where these are accessible to the public and they are visible and safe'. DEV01-PSP: O16 and DEV01-PSP: P5 refer to the sharing of spaces. These co-uses should be considered but should be rejected if the biodiversity values of SNAs will be undermined by requirements that come with recreational co-use. Visible and safe to people means exposed and unscreened to bats if there is any nearby lighting or vehicle lights at night.	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 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>
30	Andrea Graves	30.6	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	There is a need to implement screening planting well in advance of construction as per recommendation in the 4Sight Report.	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.
30	Andrea Graves	30.7	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	The absence of a cat ban for Peacocke in the Plan Change is an oversight that needs to be rectified.	Introduce a ban on cats in Peacocke.
30	Andrea Graves	30.8	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	Overt requirements for bat monitoring pre and post-development should be made clear to developers. The 4Sight rept recommends "Pre-development surveys should cover aspects such as light levels, habitat availability, bat activity levels, habitat use and behaviour, and occupied and potential roost identification, using methods that can be replicated in future years. Post-development monitoring should focus on studying the effectiveness of habitat enhancement measures, and include monitoring of light levels, available and newly created habitat, habitat usage, bat activity levels, and roost occupancy."	Include requirements for developers to undertake bat monitoring pre and post-development.
30	Andrea Graves	30.9	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	4Sight recommends "Early planting of new bat foraging and commuting vegetation, well ahead of development phases affecting bat habitat". This appears to be absent from the Plan Change.	Include requirement for early planting of new bat foraging and commuting vegetation, well ahead of development phases affecting bat habitat.
30	Andrea Graves	30.10	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	The submitter supports the designation of extensive SNAs. We must be aware that the land use is about to dramatically change in a way that has been shown to be aversive to bats and may drive them to local extinction: urbanisation. Therefore it is imperative that we provide some compensation for this by restoring and recreating bat habitat in these SNAs. Many of them are considerably degraded. 4Sight recommends "...recreating bat habitats during the design and impact assessment stages of development".	The submitter supports the designation of extensive SNAs. Specific relief sought not stated.
30	Andrea Graves	30.11	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	While the SNAs are protected, low-to-moderate value habitat is also present in the proposed structure plan area. It is essential that this habitat is protected. The Plan Change protects against tree-felling and vegetation clearance in SNAs but not in the lower-value habitat. Developers and landowners may clear/fell these areas before applying for resource consent to develop the land.	Extend the protections in the Plan Change that apply to SNAs to low-to-moderate value habitat.
30	Andrea Graves	30.12	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	Chapter 3 Structure Plans DEV01-PSP: P7 states 'Avoid new development 'turning its back' or privatising edges to major natural features and recreational areas'. If that means that a road rather than buildings front these areas, that is a poor choice for both amenity and ecological reasons. Roads expose biodiversity and pedestrians/micromobility users to the noise, light and particulate emissions of vehicles. Active transport paths also allow access to river and gully edges; the concept that true access is only provided by vehicles is an outdated and environmentally unsound concept.	Specific relief sought not stated. General relief seeks active non vehicular access paths to river and gully edges.
30	Andrea Graves	30.13	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	Chapter 3 Structure Plans DEV01-PSP: P13 states that higher density development may be provided along areas of natural open space including the river corridor and gully network. These are key areas where biodiversity values, particularly for bats, are the highest priority. The extra lighting associated with higher density development must be considered when deciding whether these are appropriate areas. DEV01-PSP: P23 appears to confirm this.	Specific relief sought not stated. General relief seeks that lighting standards be prioritised in higher density areas.
30	Andrea Graves	30.14	General	Bat Protection	Support in Part	Chapter 3 Structure Plans DEV01-PSP:P70: The current wording of DEV01-PSP:P70 directly contradicts cultural value D: 'The natural environment should be protected and enhanced, including the Waikato River and local waterways such as the Mangakotukutuku Gully network. The mauri, mana and quality of these waterways should be enhanced to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o te Awa Waikato'. There is a close ecological link between bats and healthy waterways. To regenerate the stream's health, a regenerated area of land around the stream's banks will be required.	Include provision for a regenerated area of land around the stream's banks and amend DEV01-PSP:P70 as follows: Manage stormwater to <u>protect and enhance the values and functions of the</u> <del>minimise the effect of urban development on</del> Mangakotukutuku stream <del>values and functions, and regenerate the stream's health</del> <del>maintain the ability of the stream to continue</del> to provide habitat for indigenous <del>threatened</del> -aquatic species and <u>to have the highest water quality</u> <del>minimise adverse effects on the stream water quality and habitat.</del>
30	Andrea Graves	30.15	General	Climate change provisions	Support in Part	The submitter supports the provisions for active and a 20-minute city, but they do not go far enough to discourage private vehicle usage or to adapt to climate change. The only way to get us out of cars is to actively discourage their use - to make it possible to use them, but more inconvenient and slower than the alternatives. If Peacocke doesn't move boldly here it will be a terrible missed opportunity ,and outdated subdivision designs will be entrenched for decades or centuries more.	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.
30	Andrea Graves	30.16	General	Climate change provisions	Support in Part	Chapter 3 Structure Plans DEV01-PSP: P41 states 'Encourage urban form that reduces dependency on the car by focusing on intensification and encouraging walking, cycling and the use of passenger transport'. Discouraging car dependence is a further vital step.	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.
30	Andrea Graves	30.17	General	Climate change provisions	Support in Part	Chapter 3 Structure Plans DEV01-PSP: P43: The inherent concept that we will continue to see and move only via vehicles on roads is a relic of when we didn't realise we were in the process of making large swathes of the planet uninhabitable by burning fossil fuels. Electric vehicles do not change this because they continue to contribute to congestion, the need for large-scale mineral mining, microplastics from tyres and brake pads, and the need for further road building.	Amend DEV01-PSP: P43 as follows: Align collector and local <u>street path</u> networks to create strong physical and visual connections between the gully network and the Waikato River.
30	Andrea Graves	30.18	General	Climate change provisions	Support in Part	Chapter 3 Structure Plans DEV01-PSP: P47 and DEV01-PSP: P48: There is no justification for placing the needs of vehicle-drivers as equal with other users. To transition to a low-carbon society, we must make active and public transport the easiest choices.	Amend DEV01-PSP: P47 and DEV01-PSP: P48 to ensure vehicle drivers are not prioritised over or equal to active and public transport.
30	Andrea Graves	30.19	General	Climate change provisions	Support in Part	Chapter 3 Structure Plans DEV01-PSP: P25 is too vague and should include specific requirements backed up by evidence.	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.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
30	Andrea Graves	30.20	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	25.6 Lighting and Glare	Support in Part	The submitter has incorporated comments into my additional information on the previous chaptgers about the vague nature of lighting and glare considerations for the bats, despite the clear evidence from experts and conclusions from the Environment Court Amberfield hearings. This relates mainly to lux limits and the need to monitor these on an ongoing basis.	Alter the bat-relevant provisions to recognise the Court's Decision for Amberfield.
31	Tainui Waka Tourism Incorporated	31.1	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Peacocke Structure Plan - mana whenua values	Oppose	<p>The submitter endorses the general koorero and principles presented in the Cultural Values Assessment Report by Te Haa o Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa titled "Nukuhau Whenua: Review of Peacocks Structure Plan", and supports the stated aspirations of Mana Whenua within that report. The Draft Peacocke Structure Plan (PSP) and supporting documents fail to effectively realize the above-stated aspirations of Mana Whenua. From the submitter's perspective, the draft PSP has a backward and historical looking focus rather than a contemporary and forward-looking focus. In addition, the realization of Mana Whenua aspirations is absolutely constrained within the ethnocentric framework of the draft PSP. The submission provides a number of amendments designed to address this oversight and weaknesses within the draft PSP. In summary, we seek greater acknowledgment of the entire Precinct as a Maaori cultural heritage site and we seek greater provision within the draft PSP to enable the realization and full expression of Mana Whenua aspirations. Of particular note, the submitter seeks amendments to the Peacocke Structure Plan and to the Policies and Rules within Chapter 15A Peacocke Natural Open Space Zone and 15B - Peacocke Sport and Active Recreation Zone. The submitter seeks greater provision within the draft PSP to support Mana Whenua aspirations including the:</p> <p>(a) Practice and presentation of Maaori visual and performing arts</p> <p>(b) Practice and presentation of Maaori waka heritage</p> <p>(c) Practice and presentation of traditional Maaori food &amp; cultivation</p> <p>(d) Development of spaces and facilities to support the delivery of maatauranga Maaori &amp; puuraakau Maaori (traditional knowledge and stories)</p> <p>(e) Development of spaces and facilities for the full expression of core Maaori cultural values such as Kaitiakitanga, Manaakitanga, Tino Rangatiratanga, Whanaungatanga &amp; Ahi Kaa.</p>	Greater acknowledgment and recognition of Mana Whenua aspirations throughout the Draft Peacocke Structure Plan (PSP) through the following mitigation effects which support the Cultural Values Assessment (CVA) by Te Haa o Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa: (a) That greater provision is made within the draft PSP for Mana Whenua to determine their own mitigation measures and the scope and scale of development on clearly identified and recognised Maaori cultural heritage sites such as Paa, Waahi Tapu, Maara Kai and Taunga Waka. (b) That a new Zone is created within the draft PSP e.g. "Mana Whenua Heritage Zone" to provide greater acknowledgment of the history of ownership and settlement of significant Maaori cultural sites and greater flexibility for Mana Whenua to determine the actual scope and scale of development on such sites in support of their cultural, social, educational, environmental and economic aspirations.
31	Tainui Waka Tourism Incorporated	31.2	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Natural Open Space Zone - mana whenua values	Oppose	<p>The submitter endorses the general koorero and principles presented in the Cultural Values Assessment Report by Te Haa o Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa titled "Nukuhau Whenua: Review of Peacocks Structure Plan", and supports the stated aspirations of Mana Whenua within that report. The Draft Peacocke Structure Plan (PSP) and supporting documents fail to effectively realize the above-stated aspirations of Mana Whenua. From the submitter's perspective, the draft PSP has a backward and historical looking focus rather than a contemporary and forward-looking focus. In addition, the realization of Mana Whenua aspirations is absolutely constrained within the ethnocentric framework of the draft PSP. The submission provides a number of amendments designed to address this oversight and weaknesses within the draft PSP. In summary, we seek greater acknowledgment of the entire Precinct as a Maaori cultural heritage site and we seek greater provision within the draft PSP to enable the realization and full expression of Mana Whenua aspirations. Of particular note, the submitter seeks amendments to the Peacocke Structure Plan and to the Policies and Rules within Chapter 15A Peacocke Natural Open Space Zone and 15B - Peacocke Sport and Active Recreation Zone. The submitter seeks greater provision within the draft PSP to support Mana Whenua aspirations including the:</p> <p>(a) Practice and presentation of Maaori visual and performing arts</p> <p>(b) Practice and presentation of Maaori waka heritage</p> <p>(c) Practice and presentation of traditional Maaori food &amp; cultivation</p> <p>(d) Development of spaces and facilities to support the delivery of maatauranga Maaori &amp; puuraakau Maaori (traditional knowledge and stories)</p> <p>(e) Development of spaces and facilities for the full expression of core Maaori cultural values such as Kaitiakitanga, Manaakitanga, Tino Rangatiratanga, Whanaungatanga &amp; Ahi Kaa.</p>	Seeking the following amendments to 15A Peacocke Natural Open Space Zone (a) NOSN - PREC1-P: That greater provision is included for new buildings, alterations and additions to buildings on clearly identified and acknowledged Maaori cultural heritage sites (e.g. paa, maara kai, taunga waka, waahi tapu) in support of the aspirations of Mana Whenua as outlined in the Cultural Values Assessment (CVA) by Te Haa o Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa, and furthermore, that such development is classified as a 'Permitted Activity' within the draft PSP. (b) That NOSZ - PREC1-P: R21, R22, R23, R24, R28, R29 and R30 be amended to better meet the aspirations of Mana Whenua with respect to clearly identified and acknowledged Maaori cultural heritage sites such as paa, maara kai, taunga waka & waahi tapu and point (a) above. (c) That the draft PSP provides Mana Whenua with the authority as "Mana Whenua" to develop and confirm the policies and rules pertaining to clearly identified and acknowledged Maaori cultural and heritage sites within the draft PSP. (d) To fully realise the mana of Mana Whenua within the draft PSP framework and ensure the protection, promotion, preservation and enhancement of Mana Whenua aspirations in relation to Maaori cultural heritage sites of significance, we seek greater flexibility within the PSP regarding rules relating to: Site Cover, Gross Floor Area, Number of Buildings, Building Height Restrictions, Setbacks & Fences Walls (NOSZ - PREC1-P: R32, 33, 34, 35 & 36. (e) We also seek greater provision for the protection and expression of cultural activities and practices including the restoration and enhancement of mahinga kai, waka heritage practices, traditional paa sites and taunga waka, including enhanced access to such sites through supporting roading, parking facilities and pedestrian infrastructure.
31	Tainui Waka Tourism Incorporated	31.3	Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Sport and Active Recreation Zone - mana whenua values	Oppose	<p>The submitter endorses the general koorero and principles presented in the Cultural Values Assessment Report by Te Haa o Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa titled "Nukuhau Whenua: Review of Peacocks Structure Plan", and supports the stated aspirations of Mana Whenua within that report. The Draft Peacocke Structure Plan (PSP) and supporting documents fail to effectively realize the above-stated aspirations of Mana Whenua. From the submitter's perspective, the draft PSP has a backward and historical looking focus rather than a contemporary and forward-looking focus. In addition, the realization of Mana Whenua aspirations is absolutely constrained within the ethnocentric framework of the draft PSP. The submission provides a number of amendments designed to address this oversight and weaknesses within the draft PSP. In summary, we seek greater acknowledgment of the entire Precinct as a Maaori cultural heritage site and we seek greater provision within the draft PSP to enable the realization and full expression of Mana Whenua aspirations. Of particular note, the submitter seeks amendments to the Peacocke Structure Plan and to the Policies and Rules within Chapter 15A Peacocke Natural Open Space Zone and 15B - Peacocke Sport and Active Recreation Zone. The submitter seeks greater provision within the draft PSP to support Mana Whenua aspirations including the:</p> <p>(a) Practice and presentation of Maaori visual and performing arts</p> <p>(b) Practice and presentation of Maaori waka heritage</p> <p>(c) Practice and presentation of traditional Maaori food &amp; cultivation</p> <p>(d) Development of spaces and facilities to support the delivery of maatauranga Maaori &amp; puuraakau Maaori (traditional knowledge and stories)</p> <p>(e) Development of spaces and facilities for the full expression of core Maaori cultural values such as Kaitiakitanga, Manaakitanga, Tino Rangatiratanga, Whanaungatanga &amp; Ahi Kaa.</p>	Seeking the following amendments to 15B - Peacocke Sport and Active Recreation Zone (a) SARZ - PREC1 - P: That greater provision is included for new buildings, alterations and additions to buildings on clearly identified and acknowledged Maaori cultural heritage sites (e.g. paa, maara kai, taunga waka, waahi tapu) in support of the aspirations of Mana Whenua as outlined in the Cultural Values Assessment (CVA) by Te Haa o Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa, and furthermore, that such development is classified as a 'Permitted Activity' within the draft PSP. (b) That SARZ - PREC1 - P: R9, R10, R11, R12 & R21 be amended to better meet the aspirations of Mana Whenua with respect to clearly identified and acknowledged Maaori cultural heritage sites such as paa, maara kai, taunga waka & waahi tapu and point (a) above. (c) That the draft PSP provide Mana Whenua with the authority as "Mana Whenua" to develop and confirm the policies and rules pertaining to clearly identified and acknowledged Maaori cultural and heritage sites within the draft PSP. (d) To fully realise the mana of Mana Whenua within the draft PSP framework and ensure the protection, promotion, preservation and enhancement of Mana Whenua aspirations in relation to Maaori cultural heritage sites of significance, we seek greater flexibility within the PSP regarding rules relating to: Site Cover, Gross Floor Area and Building Height restrictions, Setbacks and Fences Walls SARZ - PREC1-P: R31, 32, 33, 34 & 35 (e) We also seek greater provision for the protection and expression of cultural activities and practices including the restoration and enhancement of mahinga kai, waka heritage practices, traditional paa sites and taunga waka, including enhanced access to such sites through supporting roading, parking facilities and pedestrian infrastructure.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
31	Tainui Waka Tourism Incorporated	31.4	General	Alignment with other HCC & Regional Plans	Oppose	(a) The PSP needs to align with and compliment existing city and regional stakeholder plans including the: Cultural Values Assessment (CVA) by Te Haa o Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa, Waikato - Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato (Vision & Strategy for the Waikato River), Waikato Tainui Environmental Plan - Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao, Tainui Waka Tourism Inc. - He Piko He Taniwha Cultural Tourism Strategy, HCC River Plan, HCC Hamilton Gardens Management Plan, Hamilton Waikato Tourism - Tourism Opportunities Plan and HAKA Maaori Cultural Experience Concept Plan. (b) In support of the above, we seek greater acknowledgement and provision within the draft PSP for a proposed pedestrian bridge linking the Hamilton Gardens to the Korikori Paa Reserve located at 137 Peacocks Rd. (c) We also seek greater acknowledgment and provision within the draft PSP in support of a possible future waka heritage facility in the proposed wetland reserve located adjacent to the new Southern Links Bridge, to better cater for future growth and development of this cultural heritage practice and to better acknowledge the historical significance of this site as a taunga waka (traditional waka landing place). The aspirations of Mana Whenua, HCC and the wider community will be better met through the adoption of our proposed amendments. These amendments provide a more meaningful and effective platform to bring to life the proverbial saying "He Piko He Taniwha" and the sharing of the story of our region, river and city to the world.	Amendments to respond to the specific submission points, in particular (a) the PSP needs to align with and compliment existing city and regional stakeholder plans; (b) seek greater acknowledgement and provision within the draft PSP for a proposed pedestrian bridge linking the Hamilton Gardens to the Korikori Paa Reserve located at 137 Peacocks Road; (c) seek greater acknowledgment and provision within the draft PSP in support of a possible future waka heritage facility in the proposed wetland reserve located adjacent to the new Southern Links Bridge.
31	Tainui Waka Tourism Incorporated	31.5	Chapter 25.14 Transportation	Protection of waka heritage and transportation practices	Oppose	Prior to the European settlement of Kirikiriroa (and during the early colonial period) the Waikato river was the primary mode of transportation for Maaori. Numerous waka traveled up and down the awa each day given that traditional villages and gardens were located all along the riverbanks. There were many taunga waka (waka landing sites) located along the river - including sites within the draft PSP. With the above in mind and given the popularity and growth of waka culture/paddling, and our uniqueness as the largest inland river city in Aotearoa/NZ, there needs to be greater recognition and provision within the PSP and 24.14 Transportation to protect and promote our unique waka heritage, matauranga and traditional transportation practices. Participation in waka paddling is growing and future-proofing is required to better meet current and projected demand as well as Maaori population growth. In addition, this amendment will enhance the cultural attributes of Kirikiriroa and the aspirations of many local and regional stakeholders in relation to the Vision & Strategy of the Waikato River, HCC River Plan, Ngaa Kaihoe Waka O Aotearoa Strategic Plan, and the Tainui Waka Tourism He Piko He Taniwha Cultural Tourism Strategy.	Amend the PSP to provide greater acknowledgement, protection and promotion of traditional waka heritage and cultural practices through the allocation / classification of dedicated space for river-side waka heritage facilities and landscaping that enhances access to the river for waka transportation, recreation and practices. Amend PSP to include a dedicated Waka Heritage space and facility at the proposed wetland reserve located adjacent to the new Southern Links Bridge.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.1	General	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter.	That the Hamilton City Council make a decision to consult with tangata whenua Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua of the lands the Peacocks development is taking place upon and to any other developments taking place within Hamilton City's district to hear and listen to the unresolved issues from the past to today that need to be dealt with in good faith.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.2	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter.	Amend Chapter 3: Structure Plans and Section 3.4 Peacocke. Consultation to take place between Council and Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.3	Chapter 5: Special Character Zones	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter.	Amend Chapter 5: Special Character Zones such that our pre-european history that has survived its way through colonisation to this day specifically from Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and sub tribes like those of Rotokauri. Ngati Ruru (wife of Korako of Miropiko pa Built by the Ngati Hanui Our Ancestor Ngamurikaitaua is of) Ngati Koura, Ngati Waenganui and our tribal ally Ngati Ruateatea.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter.	Create a new Chapter 4A: Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct. Needs to be set out like papakainga where there is a large community garden maara kai for community and eco system self sustainability and forests of native indigenous plants rongoa maori working with Tangata whenua o Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.5	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter.	Create a new Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Needs to include a marae, a meeting house, a community centre shaped like a marae with our own medical centre and holistic well being rongoa maori practices, a place of refuge and possibly tangihanga.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.6	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter. No high rises or expensive shopping retail stores, no pubs or gambling clubs. If you are talking about climate ready structures then you really need to think about it not just say it and do not do it. With land management and activities refer to the Amberfield - Assessment of Archaeological values and Effects pages 5-6 Archaeological and cultural sites 15 of June 2018.	Create a new Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone. Would be a large kai hall built and structured as if you were going into a whare kai, having a name which relates to our paa sites within the area for example Kairokiroki pa. No high rises or expensive shopping retail stores, no pubs or gambling clubs. If you are talking about climate ready structures then you really need to think about it not just say it and do not do it. With land management and activities refer to the Amberfield - Assessment of Archaeological values and Effects pages 5-6 Archaeological and cultural sites 15 of June 2018.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.7	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter. Access to the Mangakotukutuku stream which is another cultural significant heritage site for Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua just like the Mangawaitawhiriwhiri a food and water resource for tangata whenua and needs to be showing the cultural values of what it was and what it can still be given the right care and management for restoration. pa harekeke, things that were in the area prior New Zealand militia invasion in 1863-65. Tireke/flax mills flour mills water cleansing systems so its okay to drink from the source and not from the tap all the time or having to boil it to rid of diluting chemicals. Kaitiakitanga at the forefront promoting holistic health well being and mauri a reflection of who we are with settlers within our territory and the potential we have together using matauranga maori and settler knowledge.	Create a new Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct. Access to the Mangakotukutuku stream which is another cultural significant heritage site for Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua just like the Mangawaitawhiriwhiri a food and water resource for tangata whenua and needs to be showing the cultural values of what it was and what it can still be given the right care and management for restoration. pa harekeke, things that were in the area prior New Zealand militia invasion in 1863-65. Tireke/flax mills flour mills water cleansing systems so its okay to drink from the source and not from the tap all the time or having to boil it to rid of diluting chemicals. Kaitiakitanga at the forefront promoting holistic health well being and mauri a reflection of who we are with settlers within our territory and the potential we have together using matauranga maori and settler knowledge.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.8	Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter.	Create a new Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct. This needs to include a space for kapa haka, Maori traditional performing and martial arts, a mixture of sports not just those we see on mainstream television from every other country but Aotearoa.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.9	Chapter 23: Subdivision	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter.	Amend Chapter 23: Subdivision. Policy 19.2.4a "Subdivision, use and development shall be managed to avoid damage to archaeological and cultural sites where they exist, or are likely to exist."
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.10	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Mana whenua consultation	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern with the lack of consultation between Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and Hamilton City Council, and that the iwi corporate bodies including THaWK, Te marae toopu o Kirikiriroa and Waikato-Tainui do not represent the submitter.	Create a new Chapter 23A: Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct. Kaumatua units and Flats with their own spaces to maintain Rangatiratanga have their hui to gather to express their hobbies and have whanau visits with their mokopuna.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.11	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	Earthworks and damage to cultural sites	Oppose	There are number of paa sites significant to our tangata whenua hapu Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua and what we do not need to see is another episode of what has happened to Kairikiroki paa where the bridge is now going through and destroyed our rua pits which should have been given back to us over a 100 years ago, without our free prior or informed consent the bridge is still somehow going through it.	Amend Rule 25.6 so that activities or development shall not adversely affect the physical structure and integrity of any of our paa sites. This may include: i. Inappropriate planting, ii. The removal of vegetation where it affects the stability of the site, and iii. Addition, excavation or compaction of any soil, rock or other materials.



## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.12	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Lighting and glare	Oppose	Whilst bats are a concern, so are our Ruru and Karearea. which are now more likely finding it harder to live sustainably within our territory because of over and unsustainable industrial developments and roads which include the southern links. None of us were consulted about that, neither was Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua.	Specific relief sought not stated. General relief seeks protection of Ruru and Karearea.
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.13	Chapter 25.14 Transportation	Transportation	Oppose	The submitter states "we cannot have big roads though here, there are places within this part of our territory which should remain untouched for the survival of our eco system, heritage, history, natural and native indigenous habitats".	Amend Rule 25.14 to respond to the submission point, and in particular "to reduce the southern link motorway cutting through our cultural heritage of Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua but also reduce the adverse effects and damage separating our physical and spiritual connection and access to our cultural heritage sites."
32	Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua	32.14	General	Appendices and Planning Maps	Oppose	As tangata whenua Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua need to be sitting at the table for further discussions to be had about all of the proposed arrangements for Peacockes Structure Plan Area, including the various appendices to the district plan and planning maps. Not so long ago we have had to witness a plaque almost being uncovered and a park being named after our ancestor Inuwait that we were not even considered to be consulted about. Tangata whenua Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua need to be at the table for any further decision making whether about definitions and terms or Information Requirements, Historic Heritage, Natural Environment, or Planning Maps.	Seek further consultation with tangata whenua Ngaati Ngamurikaitaua about any changes and further decision making on Appendix 1.1 – Definitions and Terms, Appendix 1.2 – Information Requirements, Appendix 1.3 – Assessment Criteria, Appendix 1.4 – Design Guides, Appendix 2 – Structure Plans, Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage, Appendix 9 – Natural Environments, Appendix 15 – Transportation and Appendix 17 – Planning Maps.
33	Shih-An Tseng	33.1	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ- PREC1- PSP -R44 Max building height	Support in Part	The maximum height limit for a neighbourhood centre is set to 12m suggesting a 3-4 storey while the PC 5 ‘information booklet’ proposes a 5 storey walk up apartment scheme. A 15m height limit or more would be more suitable for upper apartment designs. I would suggest a higher height limit like 15m, better practice or discretionary would be higher residential density where amenity areas are located. Also with the norm of governmental permitted direction going to residential 3 storeys, also corresponding with Density (minimum number of residential units required per site) may increase. An extra level has the potential provide more affordable housing with apartments.	Increase maximum building height to 15m or more.
33	Shih-An Tseng	33.2	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ– PREC1-PSP: R41 Apartments at ground floor	Oppose	With this i don’t understand why single dwellings / duplex dwellings are discretionary but apartments on ground floor is not complying? Should these two differ?	The submitter seeks clarification on why single/duplex dwellings are discretionary but apartments on ground floor is non-complying and whether the activity status should differ.
33	Shih-An Tseng	33.3	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Bat survey	Oppose	If with the decision of having a bat buffer everywhere beside gully, a 20m zone of natural open space is becoming mandated in the structure plan, and sure of being certain to mitigate bat issues, then a bat survey shouldn’t this be not be required anymore in any resource consent phase or be less intense investigations needed. Unless there is a need to identify SNA and significant bat habitat (information booklet), by this and proven there is by identified location roost sites, with this evidence a buffer (natural open space) can be decreased in distance	Remove requirement for bat surveys in resource consents (or make investigations needed less intense).
33	Shih-An Tseng	33.4	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Bat buffers	Support in Part	Natural open space zone is suggested by the Bat buffer, on one side the 20m setback including a urban road of 18-24 metres, that is 38-44m+ open space + a front residential setback corridor = a rough 45-50m that’s about half of a rugby field, 2 times a basketball court of open space. Just wanted to suggest like i have heard conversations with Mark Roberts, inside bat buffer of 20m a road infrastructure can be integrated into ‘natural open space zone or calculated into the setback from urban development. Simple calculation with key bat habitat 20-40m key bat habitat or so + 20m + 20m (both side buffer zone) = roughly 80m zone, and the proposed bat corridor is only 50m( bat also forage and habitat in there). I’m suggesting if there is a maximum ‘key bat habitat’ that is over 50m etc that the bat buffer can be decreased rather than a mandatory 20m zoned bat buffer like 6-10m etc then road with side tree etc. With reading of Bat report supplied by the HCC, the suggestive vegetation will also be needed in the bat buffer, with the already ‘Key bat habitat’, trees and vegetation (gully streams etc) wouldn’t this encourage not a bat buffer but increased ‘Key bat habitat’, its just more bat habitat rather than its bats habitat buffer purpose, for they forge food and roost there. I suggest to review this issue in the future, this won’t be considered as bat buffer but just vegetation space.	Allow road infrastructure within bat buffer. Add a provision allowing for bat buffer to be decreased if the key bat habitat area has exceeded a maximum level. Suggest this be reviewed in the future.
33	Shih-An Tseng	33.5	Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Removed neighbourhood park on Lots DP35271 + 35271	Oppose	We would like to propose removal of the neighbourhood park within our property location (Lots DP35271 + 35271 on Plateau drive), as there is already a very big sports park within less than 500m (bike/walking etc), existing neighbourhood parks in the north Peacock’s reserve and Glenview club close by. With the buffer/ setback from gully there is very plentiful of amenity of green space already for residents in this area.	Remove proposed neighbourhood park on Lots DP35271 + 35271.
34	Dan and Sarah Franicevic	34.1	General	Property Impacts	Oppose	We own and live at 89 Peacockes Lane. We oppose any and all parts of the plan that will prevent us subdividing and/or developing the whole of our property now and into the future. Our property is comprised of blocks of land, Lots 2&3, on either side of the gully. Lot 3 is destined to become accessible from the new road originating at the Dixon Road roundabout. The part of our property designated Lot 3 cannot be accessed from Lot 2 without crossing Lot 100. As such, 'betterment' cannot ever be considered as compensation for this land, which is north-facing gully aspect land capable of becoming several residential sections. In particular, we oppose the proposed top-of-the-gully setbacks and natural open spaces that are proposed for our Lot 3.	Remove the proposed top-of-the-gully setbacks and natural open spaces that are proposed for our Lot 3.
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Appendix 2 – Structure Plan, Figure 2-1 (Land Use)	Oppose	Figure 2-1 identifies features that are not identified in the map key. The features shown on Figure 2-1 make the property at 64 Peacockes Lane incapable of reasonable use and will significantly limit the future development potential of this property for residential purposes. The purpose of the Proposed Natural Open Space Zone is to mitigate the adverse effects of development in the whole of the Peacocke Structure Plan on the long-tailed bat. It is unreasonable to burden individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Natural Open Space for the mitigation of these adverse effects. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council purchases the land and compensates affected landowners. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4.	1. Remove any features from Figure 2-1 that are not identified in the map key; 2. Remove the Proposed Natural Open Space Zone from 64 Peacockes Lane. Alternatively, if the relief under 2) is not supported, the Proposed Natural Open Space Zone is only identified on privately owned land if Hamilton City Council commit to proactively acquiring the Proposed Natural Open Space Zone through purchasing affected land and taking responsibility for its creation and maintenance; and 3. Any residential land which is rendered landlocked by a Proposed Natural Open Space Zone is entitled to practical and physical access through the Proposed Natural Open Space Zone to ensure it is capable of reasonable use and development.
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Appendix 2 – Structure Plan, Figure 2-2 (Transport Network)	Oppose	The submitters are concerned that the Proposed Open Natural Space identified on 64 Peacockes Lane in conjunction with the Proposed Sports Park could likely prevent the northern end of their property from being developed for urban residential purposes. It could in effect landlock this part of the property. As it is, it appears unlikely a public road would be provided as part of the development of the Sports Park unless it is specifically identified on Figure 2-2.	Identify an Indicative Transport Network generally in the location of the Proposed Indicative Cycleway/Walkway Network in/around the Proposed Sports Park.
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.3	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Appendix 2 – Structure Plan, Figure 2-3 (Natural Environment and Heritage)	Oppose	Figure 2-3 identifies features that are not identified in the map key, although it is potentially a Proposed Esplanade Reserve. Section 229 of the RMA specifies the purpose of an esplanade reserve and Section 230 sets out the requirements for vesting an esplanade reserve. The property at 64 Peacockes Lane does not contain any stream or river with an average width greater than 3m. There is no requirement to vest an esplanade reserve. The features shown on Figure 2-3 make the property at 64 Peacockes Lane incapable of reasonable use and will significantly limit the future development potential of this property for residential purposes. The Proposed SNA, Proposed Bat Corridor and Proposed Bat Habitat is to mitigate the adverse effects of development in the whole of the Peacocke Structure Plan on the long-tailed bat. It is unreasonable to burden individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed SNA, Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area and Proposed Bat Corridor for the mitigation of these adverse effects. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council purchases the land and compensates affected landowners. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4.	1. Remove the unidentified feature from Figure 2-3 (potentially Proposed Esplanade Reserve?); 2. Remove Proposed SNA, Proposed Bat Habitat Area and Proposed Bat Corridor from 64 Peacockes Lane. Alternatively, if relief under 2) is not supported: a) Candidate areas for Proposed SNA and wetlands shown on Figure 2-3 are only confirmed after site specific surveys and research is undertaken to confirm ecological significance; and b) The Proposed SNA, Proposed Bat Corridor and Proposed Bat Habitat is only identified on privately owned land if Hamilton City Council commit to proactively acquiring these areas through purchasing affected land and taking responsibility for its creation and maintenance; and 3. Any residential land which is rendered landlocked by a proposed SNA, Proposed Bat Corridor and Proposed Bat Habitat Area is entitled to practical and physical access through these areas to ensure it is capable of reasonable use and development.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.4	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Appendix 17A – Planning Maps	Support in Part	The zoning and features in Proposed Planning Maps make the property at 64 Peacockes Lane incapable of reasonable use and will significantly limit the future development potential of this property for residential purposes. The Proposed Natural Open Space Zone, Proposed Significant Natural Area and Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Areas are to mitigate the effects of development in the whole of the Peacocke Structure Plan on the longtailed bat. It is unreasonable to burden the mitigation of these adverse effects on individual landowners who are affected by these features. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council compensates affected landowners. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4.	1. The Proposed Natural Open Space Zone, Proposed Significant Natural Area and Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Areas and Proposed Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area are removed from 64 Peacockes Lane. Alternatively, if relief under 1) is not supported: a) Proposed Natural Open Space Zone, Significant Natural Area and Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Areas and Proposed Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area are only confirmed after site specific surveys and research is undertaken to confirm ecological significance; and b) The Proposed SNA, Bat Corridor and Bat Habitat is only identified on privately owned land if Hamilton City Council commit to proactively acquiring these areas through purchasing affected land and taking responsibility for its creation and maintenance.; and 2. Any residential land which is rendered landlocked by any Proposed Natural Open Space Zone, Proposed Significant Natural Area or Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area is entitled to practical and physical access through these areas to ensure it is capable of reasonable use and development.
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.5	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Appendix 17A – Planning Maps	Support in Part	Medium Density will provide an appropriate level of development for this property given its topography and position.	Notwithstanding the landowners objection to the Proposed Open Space Zone, Proposed SNA and Proposed Significant Bat Habitat; the zoning of 64 Peacockes Lane be confirmed as Medium Density Residential.
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01–PSP – Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan	Oppose	The text as drafted is ambiguous and is not consistent with Weston Lea Limited & Director-General of Conservation v Hamilton City Council [ENV-2019-AKL308].	Notwithstanding the objection to identification of a Proposed Bat Corridor on 64 Peacockes Lane; 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 <u>of</u> corridor habitat, the most important general principle is that <u>35m wide bat corridors</u> <del>wide swathes of land</del> are required to be set aside <del>as bat corridors</del> in order to retain a permeable and functioning landscape for long-tailed bats."
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.7	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: 05 – Objectives: Land use and development.	Oppose	To ensure a range of housing typologies are provided (including those that are affordable and accessible) single storey buildings should be anticipated in the Medium Residential Zone.	Amend as follows: Development in Peacocke provides a range of housing typologies that are consistent with the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character of <del>two to</del> <u>up to</u> three-storey buildings in the medium density zone and two-five storey buildings within the high density area.
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.8	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R13	Oppose	Notwithstanding the map key is potentially wrong, Appendix 2 Figure 2-3 identifies areas that do not meet the requirements for an esplanade reserve under sections 229 and 230 of the RMA. R13 1) a) – d) ensures qualifying areas are vested at the time of subdivision.	Delete SUB-PREC1-PSP: R13 rule 1) e).
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.9	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 Provision of Ecological Areas	Oppose	The Proposed Bat Corridors can make privately owned land incapable of reasonable use and will significantly limit future development potential for residential purposes. The Proposed Bat Corridor is to mitigate the adverse effects of development in the whole of the Peacocke Structure Plan on the long-tailed bat. It is unreasonable to burden individual landowners with the mitigation of these adverse effects. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council compensates affected landowners at the time of subdivision. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4. The Proposed Bat Corridors in some places straddle property boundaries. It is therefore inappropriate to specify a minimum width as the full corridor may not be achievable. The requirement for a 35m wide Bat Corridor is consistent with Weston Lea Limited & Director -General of Conservation v Hamilton City Council [ENV-2019-AKL-308].	1. Notwithstanding the objection to identification of a Proposed Bat Corridor on 64 Peacockes Lane; Hamilton City Council commit to proactively acquiring Proposed Bat Corridors areas through purchasing affected land and taking responsibility for their creation and maintenance; and 2. Notwithstanding the objection to identification of a Proposed Bat Corridor on 64 Peacockes Lane. Amend as follows: 1) Where <u>any</u> subdivision includes areas <u>identified in the Peacocke Structure Plan (Figure 2-3) as Proposed Bat Corridors, these areas shall be vested in Hamilton City Council as Local Purpose Reserve provided in accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan and be designed to meet the following requirements:-</u> <del>a) Maintain a minimum width of 50m.</del>
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.10	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ-PREC1-P: Issues	Oppose	It is unreasonable to burden the mitigation of adverse effects associated with the development of the whole Peacocke Structure Plan on individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Bat Corridor. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council compensates affected landowners at the time of subdivision. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4.	1. Amend the issues statement as follows: "The Natural Open Space Zone in the Peacocke Structure Plan includes areas that have been identified to protect the significant habitat of long-tailed bats. These include buffers to known habitats and the creation of connections to these known habitats that will ensure bats are able to continue to access these areas for roosting and foraging without having to navigate urbanized areas. <u>Any Proposed Bat Corridors held in private ownership are intended to be purchased by Hamilton City Council and vested as Local Purpose Reserve.</u> "
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.1	General	Built Environment	Support in Part	Overall WRC supports the built environment goals and objectives of the Structure Plan and its supporting documents. It is cautioned that allowing single dwellings and duplexes as permitted activities within the High Density Residential Overlay may undermine the intention of the overlay and not guarantee the desired outcome of compact development that is a key value of the Peacocke Structure Plan area and support connectivity and accessibility. We agree that higher densities can help to support modal shift and provide for a more effective use of land, allow people to live closer to key urban areas, and help deliver more affordable housing options. WRC queries whether controls have been tested. Testing controls is beneficial and can demonstrate that the desired positive development outcomes can be achieved under the proposed development controls.	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.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.2	General	Transport Policy	Support in Part	The Peacocke growth area has long been supported by key transport partners and the Peacocke Structure Plan is generally consistent with national, regional and local strategic planning and policy documents, including transportation frameworks and policy. Southern Links is a key priority for the Waikato Regional Transport Committee as articulated in the Waikato Regional Land Transportation Plan 2021-2051. National, regional and sub-regional policy documents are seeking a radical shift to multi-modal networks that support liveable city environments. The Peacocke Structure Plan provides a unique greenfield development opportunity to enact the outcomes we are seeking through the Hamilton-Waikato Metro Spatial Plan, RLTP, WRPS, and Hamilton City's strategies and plans.	WRC oppose a watering down of the Structure Plan proposals that it has specifically commented on, should this be advocated through the submission process. WRC supports amendments to the Structure Plan to enable a mode shift from private vehicles to active transport as the preferable choice and not just an option. This includes support for the acknowledgement or identification of areas needed for future car-sharing initiatives that reduce reliance on private vehicles, as encouraged by the WRLTP.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.3	General	Biodiversity and Ecology	Support in Part	Plan Change 5 contains several key biodiversity elements which are supported. They provide for larger and connected ecological areas and identify and protect habitat of threatened species such as bats and fish. The provisions assist to control the design of any subsequent urban development in the Peacocke area to avoid or reduce effects on ecological values and habitats in terrestrial and aquatic environments which give effect to the WRPS. The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity requires active restoration and enhancement back towards key ecological thresholds. Plan Change 5 provides a significant opportunity to align biodiversity (and pending climate strategy) outcomes alongside housing and growth goals to help meet these specified biodiversity targets.	Plan Change 5 should make explicit reference to how these outcomes can be aligned. For example, restoration of the defined ecological network can incentivise permanent native forests that sequester carbon, restore lost habitat, reduce sediment run-off, and enhance natural character. Opportunities also exist to manage adverse effects of stormwater on gully systems and aquatic biodiversity by "making space for nature".
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.4	General	Assessment of Environmental Effects - Overall Document	Support	Satisfied with assessment against WRPS and support the high-level alignment with WRPS objectives and policy direction.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.5	General	Assessment of Environmental Effects - 4.7.2 Transport	Support	WRC supports the approach promulgating the integrated transport vision for Peacocke through Chapter 3 Peacocke Structure Plan Objectives and Policies, rather than through the transport provisions in Chapter 25.14 as proposed. It is agreed this approach will ensure that transport is viewed holistically and alongside other considerations such as density, amenity and open space provision.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.6	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: Overview + Vision	Support in Part	None of the principles adequately accounts for the unique ecological values of the area and their ongoing protection and restoration.	Amend provision by adding principle: <u>Ensuring the ongoing integration, protection and restoration of ecology within the urban environment, providing habitat value and a range of ecosystem services such as amenity, open space, shading and cooling, carbon sequestration, connectivity, and water retention and storage.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.7	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: Overview + Vision	Support in Part	Principles should explicitly recognise the opportunity for greenfield housing and urban growth within Peacocke to deliver other key strategic goals of HCC – such as contribution to the 10% indigenous vegetation cover of the Biodiversity Strategy and native forest planting incentives to sequester carbon as part of any Climate Strategy response.	Amend Principles to make explicit reference to meeting other key HCC strategic goals – Biodiversity and Climate Change especially.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.8	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Package of objectives and policies under DEV01-PSP	Support	Objectives and policies for Urban Environment, Natural Environment, Cultural Outcomes, Transportation Network, and Infrastructure Network all broadly align with objectives and policies of the WRPS.	Retain intent of objectives and policies for Urban Environment, Natural Environment, Cultural Outcomes, Transportation Network, and Infrastructure Network, subject to minor amendments.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.9	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	New objective	Support	Add a new Objective that addresses the important aquatic biodiversity values and functions (e.g., hydrology) of the ecological network linked to the Mangakotukutuku Gully system. The Mangakotukutuku river catchment is the most biologically diverse urban gully catchment within the Waikato region, ostensibly because it has (though this is already changing) the lowest level of impervious surface of any of the urban gully systems. These values are at risk from urbanisation, changes to hydrology, and the changing pollution profile as the catchment changes from largely rural to urban. The ability to address cumulative adverse effects in this context is critical, as is setting meaningful and measurable catchment-based targets against which to monitor.	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.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.10	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: 07	Support in Part	The objective covers two distinct matters (ecology, natural hazards) in one objective and is rather broad. The natural hazards objective should continue to manage urban development to reduce risks from natural hazards, giving effect to WRPS policy 13.2.	Provide separate objectives for ecology and for natural hazards. Amend ecology objective as follows: <u>Urban development provides for positive indigenous biodiversity outcomes when managing subdivision and land use change.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.11	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: O13	Support	This policy relates to the 58.2 ha of the Peacocke area identified as SNA in accordance with the criteria in Appendix 11-1 of the WRPS. Some areas identified as wetlands and shown on the Peacocke natural features map and on the planning maps in Appendix 17A have not been identified as SNA. These areas should also be delineated as SNA.	Retain and add any identified wetlands as SNA.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.12	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: O14	Support	This policy relates to the 143ha of the Peacocke area identified as Natural Open Space Zone. Some areas of this network are currently degraded and require restoration to improve their values. In terms of the Mangakotukutuku Gully (and the Peacocke arm of this gully system in particular) a series of existing (possibly unconsented) on-line dams are severely limiting access for migratory aquatic taxa to upper parts of the catchment and are likely to constrain potential biodiversity gains that would likely arise from broader habitat rehabilitation works as part of future development.	Retain but with addition noting that restoration is a key policy element of the ecological and open space corridor and that in relation to the gully system restoration should also address key ecological function impediments such as fish passage.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.13	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: O15	Support in Part	Adjacent development still needs to be designed and managed so that ecological functions and processes of the defined ecological network are protected and enhanced.	Reword DEV01-PSP: O15 so that any adjacent development is managed to protect and enhance <u>ecological functions and processes.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.14	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: O16	Support	This policy reflects previous comments and feedback from WRC seeking combined solutions for managing biodiversity, water management, amenity, walkability and connectivity.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.15	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: O20	Support in Part	This objective aligns with WRPS Objective 3.12, and gives effect to WRPS Policy 6.1 for development, including transport and other infrastructure, to occur in an integrated, sustainable, and planned manner. This objective could highlight an intention to regard opportunities to avoid adverse effects of development (including transport) on natural hydrological characteristics and processes, water quality and aquatic ecosystems, as set out under WRPS method 6.1.1 and development principle 6A(m). This is relevant to any stormwater management that is incorporated.	Amend to highlight intention to give effect to WRPS method 6.1.1.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.16	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Existing DEV01- PSP: O24	Support in Part	Although this section covers “traditional” infrastructure it should also highlight the considerable benefit and range of ecosystem services provided by the “green infrastructure” of the ecological network. Benefits include amenity, open space, recreation, water storage and cleansing, shading and cooling, carbon storage, and habitat protection. Such critical infrastructure that provides a range of services and benefits for Peacocke deserves high level policy direction so that future investment in restoration of the green network can be obtained through financial contributions and in situations where trade-offs are required (for example, between the green network and the roading network) the full range of values and benefits are able to be considered in decision-making.	Add to this section objective(s) that ensure key green infrastructure continues to be provided through protection and restoration of the Peacocke ecological network and that there is investment in this critical infrastructure.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.17	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P13 (1)	Support	Support provision for higher densities along public transport corridors and within a walkable distance of the Peacocke Local Centre, neighbourhood centres, adjacent to schools, parks and community facilities. It is acknowledged that this aligns with development principles of the WRPS and that higher density development supports viable and efficient passenger transport and opportunities for walking and cycling.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.18	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P13 (2)	Support in Part	Point 2. The submitter acknowledges that high density development along areas of natural open space, in particular the river corridor and gully network, can increase stormwater volumes through increased impervious surfaces and also increase contaminants directly entering waterways. As such, this provision should be amended to consider such effects. The submitter recommends strengthening the alignment of point 2 with DEV01-PSP: O15.	Seeks DEV01-PSP: O15 be re-worded so that any development adjacent to ecological areas will be managed to protect and enhance ecological functions and processes. Amend point 2. to read: May be provided along areas of natural open space including the river corridor and gully network <u>where ecological functions and processes can be protected and enhanced.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.19	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P14	Neutral	The submitter queries how the minimum overall net residential densities of P14 have been determined. Proposed Yield Ranges in Appendix R, the Residential Yield Assessment, estimate dwelling densities to meet 15 dwellings per hectare in the Medium Density Zone, and 25 dwellings per hectare in the High Density Residential Overlay area - both below the target minimum densities of P14. Further, the draft updated Future Proof Strategy sets a net target density of 30-45 dwellings per hectare to be achieved over time in Peacocke2 , and the submitter raises concerns that the estimated yields of the Structure Plan fall significantly short of this. As a Future Proof partner, it is considered that HCC should ensure it is evident, through explanations in supporting documents, that policies in the District Plan align with Future Proof intentions.	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.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.20	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P23	Support	Support the policy which controls location, design of buildings and infrastructure and lighting near ecological corridors, however, clarify that it is ecological function and processes of the ecological corridor that need to be maintained and enhanced.	Amend policy as follows: Near identified ecological corridors, ensure the design and location of buildings, infrastructure and lighting is managed throughout the Peacocke Structure Plan to maintain <u>and enhance ecological-their role and functions and processes.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.21	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P26	Support in Part	Natural hazards should not solely be managed in reference to people and property (or structures). A lack of proper focus on the environment could lead to situations where the environmental values that other parts of this proposed Structure Plan work to protect, are not taken into consideration when managing the risk associated with natural hazards.	Amend P26 to read: Ensure development manages the risks associated with natural hazards to <u>consider the environment and</u> ensure the safety of people and structures.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.22	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P27	Support in Part	It is not clear if this policy relates to significant indigenous vegetation as per S6c) RMA direction. If so, then the policy needs to be amended to reflect that such vegetation needs to be protected and that plans shall require that activities avoid the loss or degradation of such areas in preference to remediation or mitigation, consistent with WRPS Policy 11.2 and Method 11.2.2.	Amend policy to give effect to WRPS Policy 11.2 and Method 11.2.2.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.23	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P28	Support in Part	A greenfields situation provides significant ability to plan and design around natural features, retaining and enhancing them as part of critical green “infrastructure” network.	Retain policy as notified except delete the words “where practicable”.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.24	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P30	Support in Part	Protection of the physical integrity of the river and gully system in the Peacocke area and its ecological functioning is supported as giving effect to WRPS Policies 8.3 and 11.1. Reference to “stormwater” as a function of a natural system is not appropriate, natural drainage into the gully system is part of its hydrological functions which are covered more broadly by the term “ecological functions”. The policy would also benefit from broader reference to indigenous aquatic biodiversity, in addition to ecological functions, consistent with submissions above seeking addition of an Objective addressing aquatic biodiversity values and functions of the ecological network linked to the Mangakotukutuku Gully.	Amend Policy as follows: Protect the physical integrity, <del>and ecological and stormwater functions</del> <u>and aquatic biodiversity values</u> of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River margins.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.25	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P31	Support in Part	Although revegetation of gullies and river margins is an important policy direction, the scope of the policy should be expanded to include revegetation as part of ecological restoration and enhancement of the gully and river margins. Given the importance of Peacocke as critical habitat for threatened Long-Tailed Bat, species selection should also look to support requirements wherever possible.	Amend Policy as follows: <del>Provide for revegetated gullies and river margins-</del> <u>Provide for the ecological restoration and enhancement (including revegetation with appropriate native species and trees with short, medium, and long-term bat roosting potential) of gullies and river margins.</u>

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.26	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEVO-1-PSP: P35-37	Support in Part	The addition of these policies to protect the density, range, and viability of long-tailed bats, is consistent with WRPS Policies 11.1 j) and 11.2. Policy P35 should be amended to cover all defined bat habitat within the Peacocke Structure Plan area rather than being limited to “bat habitat adjoining the edge of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River”. Some key parts of bat habitat such as roost trees are unlikely to be identified so the policy should cover “potential” habitat as well. Policy P37 should be broadened to include additional habitat requirements other than “movement”, such as foraging and roosting habitat.	Retain policies P35-37 with following amendments: P35 – protection refers to defined and potential bat habitat within the Peacocke Structure Plan area. P37 – links the provision and width of ecological corridors to additional habitat requirements other than “bat movement” such as foraging and roosting habitat.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.27	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P53	Support in Part	This policy direction responds to O20 above, however will need to be amended to remain consistent with emphasis on intention to regard opportunities to avoid adverse effects on natural hydrological characteristics and processes, water quality and aquatic ecosystems, as set out under WRPS method 6.1.1 and development principle 6A(m).	Amend P53 for consistency with amended O20.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.28	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEVO-1-PSP: P60 and P61	Support in Part	The submitter supports these policies which require three waters infrastructure to be managed in accordance with development of an Integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMP). Although P61 is supported, amendments are required to provide greater consistency with requirements of the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management (NPS FM) and Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato, Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River and to maintain and enhance aquatic biodiversity values. Maintenance of pre-development catchment hydrology is a critical factor in maintaining existing biodiversity and both the NPS-FM and Te Ture Whaimana require an improvement to water quality and biodiversity values rather than maintenance of existing values. Another critical aspect that needs to be included into ICMP is the type of monitoring proposed that can demonstrate achievement of pre-development (greenfield) hydrological conditions. The frequency of climate change induced volatility (be it extended droughts or extreme rainfall events) is increasing, meaning that a much more precautionary approach to the sizing of installed infrastructure needs to be seriously considered if structures are to perform in a manner that will enable biodiversity and water quality to at least be maintained.	Amend wording of P61 as follows: Integrated Catchment Management Plans shall be developed to determine how to manage Three Waters in an effective and integrated manner including by: 3. Sustaining groundwater levels in peat soils <del>as far as practicable</del> . 4. Safeguarding and enhancing the natural functioning and ecological health of freshwater bodies and areas of indigenous vegetation, <u>riparian vegetation, aquatic biodiversity</u> , water features and habitats. 5. Retaining a hydrological cycle that meets <del>close to</del> the pre-development hydrological cycle <del>as far as practicable</del> . <u>10. Setting catchment hydrology targets and undertaking ongoing hydrological monitoring and regular model validation and response to achievement of those targets.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.29	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P70	Support in Part	Policy direction to manage adverse effects of stormwater on ecological functions, habitats, and water quality is supported as giving effect to WRPS Policies 8.3, 8.5, 11.1 and 12.2. The current wording of the policy can be amended to reduce duplication (i.e. maintain habitat and minimise effects on habitat) and improve clarity.	Amend Policy as follows: Manage stormwater to minimise the effect of urban development on the Mangakotukutuku stream values and functions, maintain <del>the ability of the stream to continue to provide habitat for threatened aquatic species and minimise adverse effects on the stream water quality and habitat.</del> <u>and enhance riparian and aquatic habitat and control adverse effects onstream water quality and habitat.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.30	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	New Policy to cover natural character	Support	Addressing natural character of wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins is an important part of achieving s6 RMA and in giving effect to WRPS Policy 12.2. Method 12.2.2 is particularly relevant for structure planning as it seeks restoration of natural character where it has been compromised. An additional policy providing direction around preservation of natural character of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River margins and direction to restore natural character where compromised would provide improved consistency with these directions.	Add new policy as part of Natural Environment policies as follows: <u>Preserve the natural character of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River margins and protect it from inappropriate development. Where natural character has been compromised utilise opportunities to restore and enhance it.</u>
36	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.	Support	Provision needs to be made for financial contributions from the subdivision and development of Peacocke to protect and restore ecological values, habitat, hydrological values and aquatic biodiversity and ecological functions provided by the defined ecological network (Natural Open Space Zone). Assessment in Appendix K is acknowledged. In addition to residual effects on bats, catchment hydrology targets need to be set up front and monitored through time and there needs to be a clear feedback mechanism and funding to address any problems should they arise. A policy is therefore required to enable financial contributions to be taken on subdivision and development to deliver these required restoration and enhancement activities. These funds can then contribute to the ongoing maintenance and enhancement of critical green infrastructure within the Peacocke Area. A specific link from this policy to chapter 24 of the plan is also required.	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.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.32	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Package of objectives and policies under MRZ-PREC1-PSP	Support	Objectives and policies all broadly align with objectives and policies of the WRPS.	Retain subject to relief sought for any specific objectives or policies set out below.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.33	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P22	Support	The submitter supports alignment with the following provisions of the WRPS: • Implementation method 4.1.13: District plans shall recognise and provide for the projected effects of climate change. • Development principle 6A(p): New development should be appropriate with respect to projected effects of climate change and be designed to allow adaptation to these changes.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.34	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P26	Support	This provision strengthens alignment with WRPS policy direction, including RPS policy 6.5 that encourages energy-efficient urban development. The WRLTP acknowledges the role that low emission transport options have in the transition towards greater energyefficiency, and sets policy and methods around progressing actions that increase their use. It is suggested that to improve alignment with these policies and methods, when infrastructure is provided across the Peacocke Structure Plan area, it should be provided in a way that facilitates the uptake of electric vehicles.	Retain and include additional policy that encourages the development of infrastructure that is electric vehicle capable. Or amend as follows: Development should encourage the efficient use of energy and water, <u>including consideration of a) the role of low emissions transport options and b) the requirements of electric vehicles in planning new infrastructure.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.35	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: R37	Support in Part	WRC technical staff note that HCC has included the proposed 80% impermeable surface standard into its hydrological assessments and hydraulic models to determine peak flows etc. This stormwater management approach relies on large, constructed wetlands to provide water quality treatment, extended detention (to help mitigate erosion and scour effects in the streams) and to attenuate peak flows to pre-development rates for the 2- and 10-year Annual Return Interval (ARI) events. HCC also proposes a 10mm retention across the catchment to maintain adequate base flow for streams. HCC proposes to over-retain on-lot to achieve the 10mm retention across developed areas. WRC does not support overretention on-lot in lieu of retention in roading corridors.	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.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.36	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: R39	Support	The additional building setbacks (including swimming pools) from river and gully margins and bat habitat area provide extra buffering of important ecological areas and gives effect to WRPS Policy 11.1.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.37	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7	Support in Part	The objective is supported with some minor amendments. The Natural Open Space network defined within the Peacocke area consists of more than bat habitat, although this is an important element. Other important areas and values include riparian areas, wetlands and gullies, and aquatic biodiversity. The objective should be broadened to include these values as well.	Amend NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7 to include riparian and gully habitats and aquatic biodiversity as well as reference to habitat for long tailed bats.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.38	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18	Support in Part	The policy needs to cover more than long tailed bat habitat. In part 1 of the policy, access to bat habitat may be inconsistent with ensuring bat habitat is protected. In part 2 of the policy, habitat connections for bats are supported, however connectivity for other threatened species such as fish is equally important. In part 3 of the policy adverse effects on long tailed bats (and other threatened species) should be avoided in preference to remediation or mitigation to give effect to WRPS Policy 11.2 and Method 11.2.2.	Amend P18 so that part 1 of the policy removes reference to access and is broadened to include riparian, wetland and gully habitats as well as identified habitat of long tailed bats. Amend part 2 of the policy so that connections are provided for aquatic biodiversity such as fish as well as for bats. Amend part 3 of the policy so that adverse effects from development on SNAs and threatened species are avoided in preference to remediation or mitigation.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.39	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ-PREC1-P: R36	Support	The minimum building setback of 5m from an SNA boundary will assist in buffering SNA values from effects of development and gives effect to WRPS Policy 11.1. Providing for a minimum building setback of 6m from boundaries with the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area aligns with implementation methods under WRPS Policy 13.2.	Retain as notified.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.40	Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	SARZ-PREC1-P: R36 Setbacks	Support	Providing for a minimum building setback of 6m from boundaries with the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area aligns with RPS implementation methods under RPS policy 13.2 that avoid new use or development in areas subject to natural hazards.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.41	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: PURPOSE	Support	Submitter support higher densities adjacent to public transport corridors.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.42	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Existing SUB-PREC1-PSP: O1	Support	This has been retained from the operative District Plan with no changes and the submitter considers it provides continued alignment with WRPS policy direction to reduce risks associated with natural hazards.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.43	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-P: O9	Support in Part	The intent of this objective is supported. Subdivision of the Peacocke area needs to support the continued functioning of the defined ecological network (Proposed Natural Open Space Zone and Proposed Stormwater Wetland Areas) and to enhance it through restoration. The objective gives effect to WRPS Policies 8.3, 8.5, 11.1, 11.2 and 12.2. However, the purpose of this objective under s6(c) RMA is not properly articulated in the s32 report for this section and the submitter raises concern that proper implementation of the WRPS may not be achieved.	Amend this chapter to include an objective aligned with s6(c) RMA and WRPS Policy 11.1 to ensure inclusion of no net loss and connectivity between habitats. Amend the Objective to account for no net loss and connectivity. Add: Subdivision responds to and restores the natural environment, ensuring no net loss of indigenous biodiversity and connectivity between habitats, with a focus on those areas identified in the Peacocke Structure Plan, including the creation and protection of identified ecological corridors.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.44	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4	Support in Part	To be consistent with subdivision objective O9, this policy needs to protect and restore elements of the natural environment and of the defined ecological network. Part 5 needs to also reflect that the margins of rivers and gullies and lakes need to be protected and managed and that reference to wetlands should be added (noting that wetlands have been identified and are contained on the planning maps in Appendix 17A). Some of these identified wetlands sit outside the defined Natural Open Space Zone. For clarity, those proposed stormwater wetland areas identified on the Peacocke Structure planning maps should also be included as they provide important ecological infrastructure to protect gully systems and aquatic habitat from the adverse effects of urbanisation. The words “where possible” are not necessary. In addition, this policy is heavily reliant on scheduling through the District Plan to protect archaeological, cultural, and built heritage. The submitter considers that this does not appropriately provide for the protection of wāhi tapu and other taonga which can often be kept in iwi private records but should still be protected. The same applies to many items listed by Heritage NZ. This provision could be amended to more accurately reflect WRPS wording, with direction from WRPS method 10.3.1 being to “protect historic and cultural heritage from inappropriate subdivision use and development.”	Amend Policy subject to recommendations provided and to incorporate the following: SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4 Subdivision <del>avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on:</del> , <u>protects and where possible enhances any:</u> 1. Scheduled heritage items. 2. Scheduled archaeological and cultural sites. 3. Scheduled significant trees. 4. Scheduled significant natural areas. 5. The Waikato River, and gullies and <del>river banks, lakes, rivers and streams</del> their margins, lakes, wetlands and their margins, including proposed stormwater wetlands identified on Peacocke Structure plan maps.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.45	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P5	Oppose	The intent of the policy should reflect adverse effects on natural features and vegetation be avoided in the first instance, as part of the mitigation hierarchy. Natural features that make up the ecological network of Peacocke provide for a range of ecosystem services which will also be lost or reduced if adverse effects are not avoided or adequately remedied, mitigated or offset.	Amend Policy SUB - PREC1-PSP: P5 Subdivision <del>protects, and where possible enhances any:</del> <u>enables development while managing effects on:</u> 1. Landforms and natural features. 2. Vegetation. Also amend policy so that subdivision is controlled to enable adverse effects on landforms, natural features and vegetation to be avoided, remedied, mitigated or offset.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.46	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P9	Support	We support higher densities adjacent to public transport corridors.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.47	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P19	Support	The term “ecological areas” could be expanded to include “infrastructure”. This would incorporate elements such as proposed stormwater wetlands that are critical to water management and aquatic biodiversity outcomes for Peacocke.	Retain and amend term as follows: “ecological areas <u>or infrastructure</u> ”. 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.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.48	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1-PSP: P20	Support in Part	The intent of this policy applies to any road proposed through an existing or proposed ecological corridor, noting that there may be some pockets of land where access can only be practically provided through a proposed ecological corridor. Although the amount of ecological corridor at risk from loss to roading is likely to be small, the submitter has submitted elsewhere to the importance of this defined “green infrastructure” to provide a range of ecosystem services and benefits to Peacocke. Where there is an identified conflict between 2 sets of important infrastructure and the ecological network may be impacted, the policy should be amended to in the first instance seek to avoid impacts as well as specifying that remediation or mitigation to other parts of the ecological network is an option. This will assist to give effect to WRPS Policy 11.1 and 11.2 in providing for positive indigenous biodiversity outcomes and providing the full mitigation hierarchy to SNAs, including avoiding adverse effects in the first instance.	Amend Policy to avoid or reduce the impact of proposed roading network on the ecological functions and connectivity of the defined ecological network. Where effects cannot be avoided, they are remedied, (including by the existing policy elements 1-3) or mitigated in other parts of the ecological network through active restoration measures.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.49	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	R8 Activity Status for Subdivision to accommodate a transport corridor in Peacocke Precinct	Support in Part	Currently the matters of discretion do not include any reference to ecological or biodiversity matters which will limit the effectiveness and scope of any assessment. In addition, this rule requires compliance with matters SUB-PREC1-PSP: R12-R25. Of these matters R13 (in relation to provision of Esplanade Reserves) and R24 (in relation to provision of ecological areas) provide for assessment of impact of roading network on ecological networks. The current R24 design standard is constrained to identified bat corridors only. This is a sub-set of the overall green network which also includes SNAs, gullies, wetlands, and aquatic biodiversity and should include the proposed stormwater wetlands. The current assessment criteria do not provide an adequate framework within which to assess the ecological impacts of activities on the defined ecological network.	Retain Restricted Discretionary Activity Status. Amend by adding as a matter of discretion: <u>Ecology and Biodiversity</u> Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 by increasing its scope to include any subdivision where it intersects with any part of the defined ecological network.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.50	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	R9 Activity Status for subdivision of allotment containing an Significant Natural Area.	Support	WRC supports the discretionary activity status applied to subdivision which affects sites containing a significant natural area. Discretionary status will allow for the range of matters outlined in Appendix 1.3 of the district plan to be applied to maintain and enhance biodiversity values. The relief sought to general standard SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 applies to this provision also, as do comments around and relief sought in response to Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria.	Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 by increasing its scope to include any subdivision where it intersects with any part of the defined ecological network.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.51	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	R13 General Standard Provision of Esplanade reserves	Support	Part e) as defined on the plan maps will provide for protection of conservation values, mitigate natural hazards, and enable public access and recreation where compatible with conservation values. Bringing these areas into the public reserves network will enable HCC to manage them as a key part of its ecological infrastructure and as an important component of meeting its Nature in the City Strategy.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.52	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24	Support in Part	This rule provides one of the measures to protect and enhance habitat for bats and helps to implement the ecological objectives and policies in the subdivision, Open Space Zone and Peacocke Structure Plan sections of the district plan. Extending its scope to include the defined ecological network will assist in giving effect to WRPS Policy 11.1 and 11.2.	Amend to increase scope to include any subdivision where it intersects with any part of the defined ecological network.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.53	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R25	Support	The submitter supports provision of public transport infrastructure on corridors identified in the structure plan.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.54	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	Objective 25.2.2.2 (2)	Support in Part	The objective gives effect to WRPS Policy 11.2 and highlights that in some situations minimising effects from earthworks (as in Objective 25.2.2.1) is not stringent enough. The objective should be extended in scope to clarify that earthworks and vegetation clearance should also avoid modification to ecological corridors and buffers and riparian vegetation which are a key part of the defined Peacocke ecological network. In addition, a key part of potential bat habitat within Peacocke are roost trees. Technical advice from WRC staff notes that roost trees identified to date will likely be a proportion of the total – especially for maternity roosts. There needs to be specific policy direction to enable assessment of potential roost trees before vegetation is cleared.	Amend Objective to include reference to ecological corridors and buffers and riparian vegetation and to known and potential bat roost trees.

**Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan**  
**Summary of Submissions**

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.55	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	Objective 25.2.2.2	Support in Part	The enabled activities should include those that avoid creating the need or demand for new structural protection works. This is part of the direction in WRPS Policy 13.2 and its intention is to avoid the creation of new risk. This is particularly important for the parts of the Structure Plan area that are next to the river and other areas subject to natural hazards.	Amend Objective 25.2.2.2 to include the following additional point: 24. <u>Avoid the creation of new risks or do not exacerbate existing risks from natural hazards, and do not create the need or demand for new structural protection works.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.56	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	Policy 25.2.2.1a(iii)	Support	This policy broadly aligns with WRPS policies 13.1 and 13.2 for natural hazard risk management, and recognises WRPS Objective 3.16 that seeks to manage riparian areas and wetlands to maintain or enhance natural hazard risk reduction.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.57	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	Policy 25.2.2. 2a	Support in Part	The intent of this policy is supported as it helps to address concerns around retaining a hydrological cycle that meets the predevelopment hydrological cycle. The policy should be extended (or new policy added) to cover the impacts from earthworks and vegetation clearance on natural character of gully and river/stream margins and riparian areas, wetland areas identified on the Peacocke plan maps, and aquatic biodiversity values.	Amend policy (or add new policy) to address impacts on: • Natural character of gully system and riparian margins • Identified wetland areas • Aquatic biodiversity values.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.58	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	Policy 25.2.3j	Support in Part	This policy should include consideration of natural hazards, in line with the level of consideration outlined above, as part of the matters of discretion.	Amend Objective 25.2.2.2 to include the following additional point: 24. <u>Avoid the creation of new risks or do not exacerbate existing risks from natural hazards, and do not create the need or demand for new structural protection works.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.59	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Objective 25.6.2.2	Support in Part	The design and management of lighting is one of the key factors in protecting the habitat of NZ long-tailed bat. This section notes that bats are particularly sensitive to light, which has the potential to inhibit their movement and feeding habits. The objective could be reworded to clarify that the outcome required is to protect bats from the adverse effects of lighting. The Objective gives effect to WRPS policy 11.1 i) and Policy 11.2.	Reword Objective as follows: <u>Identified bat habitat in Peacocke is protected from the adverse effects of lighting and glare.</u>
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.60	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Policies 25.6.2.2a and 25.6.2.2b	Support	These policies provide more detailed guidance around design, light spill, and glare in relation to boundary of bat habitat and fixed lighting.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.61	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	25.6.4.4 Specific standards Peacocke Medium Density Zone.	Support in Part	Appendix Q supporting the Peacocke Structure Plan Change provides the basis and rationale for informing bat sensitive lighting rules. This standard has been set at 0.3 lux. At the recent Amberfield Subdivision Environment Court hearing it was discovered that, while 2700K luminaires are obtainable for commercial luminaires (e.g., roadway lights), residential outdoor luminaires are invariably available with a minimum of 3000K colour temperature. The report notes that the rationale for 2700K emanates from a desire to minimise the 'blue' content and there are only a few percentagepoints difference in that regard between 2700K and 3000K. Therefore, the 'permitted activity' for residential lots mandates 3000K, but the report notes to include a preference for 2700K in the Guidance notes.	Amend the lighting standard to reflect the preference for 0.27 lux OR Amend the lighting standard to differentiate between commercial lighting standard = 0.27 lux and residential lighting standard = 0.3 lux.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.62	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	New definition for Public Transport Station	Oppose	The purpose of defining a 'Public Transport Station' is not clear, as no reference to the terminology appears to be made in the proposed Structure Plan documents. Further, the terminology is not commonly used, and it is cautioned that it could be confused with rail services / mass transit stops.	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.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.63	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	New definition for Public Transport Station Catchments	Support in Part	Alignment with the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan (WRPTP) could be strengthened here. Section 3.1.2 of the WRPTP sets policy (P4), that accessing public transport services in Hamilton should require a walk of 600 metres or less.	Investigate changes necessary to reduce walking distances for catchments in the Structure Plan area to 600 metres or less.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.64	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Section 1.2.2.2 iii) Natural Environment Network	Support	This provision is supported as it identifies that the concept plan will need to identify natural and ecological systems and demonstrate how these have been integrated into the urban design or how they have been protected.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.65	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Section 1.2.2.25 Ecological Rehabilitation Plan Peacocke Structure Plan.	Support in Part	The intent of this provision is supported as it provides the ability to integrate aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity values as part of urban development and protect them as well as avoiding adverse effects and identifying opportunities to enhance and restore degraded values as part of mitigation and off-setting. While parts i) to iv) of the Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan are supported, WRC technical advice suggests that it requires additional detail to be included, especially around the intended purpose of the ecological corridors, the type or range of habitat types the corridors are connecting, the type of species and their threat status that the ecological corridors will support and the relevant needs of those species. For example, how will ecological corridors accommodate dispersal, foraging and breeding for each of the relevant species identified, and what are the key impediments to dispersal? Providing for appropriate monitoring protocols and methods for each species is also required, as is specific detail around pest control and alignment with Southern Links Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan which also includes requirements for pest control.	Retain this provision but extend its scope to cover: • intended purpose of the ecological corridors • the type or range of habitat types the corridors are connecting • the type of species and their threat status that the ecological corridors will support and • the relevant needs of those species • opportunities to undertake pest control to protect indigenous species and alignment with other existing pest control requirements • provision of appropriate and species-specific monitoring protocols and methods.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.66	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Section 1.2.2.27 Bat Management Plan	Support	The intent of this provision is supported. Roost trees that have yet to be identified through other studies can be identified and necessary measures undertaken to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects. Given the threat status of long-tailed bats, adverse effects should be avoided in preference to remediation or mitigation. This is also consistent with the latest directions from DOC (Bat Recovery Group Bat Roost Protocols). This protocol provides a step-by-step decision tool for tree removal in bat areas and could either be referred to in this provision or could be incorporated into the provision.	Amend to incorporate step-by-step decision support tool from DOC Bat Protocol (2021) into this provision.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.67	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Existing provision E20 for the Peacocke Special Character Zone	Oppose	WRC recommends that HCC incorporates the existing E20 provision into 1.3.3 as we consider that the most appropriate way to manage the risk of natural hazards is to avoid placing subdivision in areas of known natural hazards and risk (avoidance of natural hazards).	Amend 1.3.3 by incorporating the existing E20 provision for the Peacocke Special Character Zone.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.68	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 F5 Earthworks	Support in Part	This provision should have a wider scope in considering natural hazards, beyond the effects of sediment release. WRC considers that the Structure Plan's whole package of provisions should work to avoid the creation of new risks or not exacerbate existing risks from natural hazards, and not create the need or demand for new structural protection works.	Amend to the same effect as sought by suggested amendments to objective 25.2.2.2 and policy 25.2.3j.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.69	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 F6 Hazardous Facilities	Support in Part	This provision should also work to avoid placing hazardous facilities in areas of known natural hazards that might increase the chance of accidental release, or loss of control, of hazardous substances.	Amend F6 to include an additional point: <u>a) Avoid placing hazardous facilities in areas of known natural hazards that might increase the chance of accidental release, or loss of control, of hazardous substances.</u>

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
36	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	Support in Part	The assessment of activities that fail to meet standards as restricted discretionary or discretionary activities is supported. However, the criteria within Appendix 1.3 require further detail to provide an adequate framework within which to assess the ecological impacts of activities on the defined ecological network (Natural Open Space Zone) of Peacocke. P1 Earthworks provides no assessment criteria with which to assess potential ecological impact. P3 parts (e) and (i) provide some useful guidance for assessment and are supported as is P5 parts (g) and (r). WRPS Method 11.1.2 provides direction as to the types of adverse effects on biodiversity that plans should recognise.	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 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.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.71	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P3(f) Development in the Peacocke Precinct and P5(s) Subdivision	Support	Aligns with the following provisions of WRPS: • Implementation method 4.1.13: District plans shall recognise and provide for the projected effects of climate change. • Development principle 6A(p): New development should be appropriate with respect to projected effects of climate change and be designed to allow adaptation to these changes	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.72	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P3(g) and P5(u) Development in the Peacocke Precinct where located within the Seismic Setback Line	Support	These provisions align with WRPS policies 13.1 and 13.2 for natural hazard risk management.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.73	Appendix 1.4 Design Guides	1.4.10 Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide	Support	We particularly support emphasis on connectivity to public transport corridors and access to local centre.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.74	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-3 Natural Environment and Heritage Map	Support	The preliminary AEE report notes that completion of a full wetland inventory was deferred (due to lack of data) and consenting processes to give effect to the NPS Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) would pick this up. Any additional wetland areas identified through this process would also need to be added to the plan maps.	Retain Map 2-3. Note that additional wetlands will likely be identified as part of assessments to give effect to NPS-FM requirements.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.75	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Transport Network figure on page 2-5	Support in Part	A number of additional bus stop locations need to be defined to ensure connectivity and maximise access to the public transport network. It is considered that bus stops on public transport corridors should be spaced 400-600 metres apart.	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.
36	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.	Support	The assessment of SNAs using the WRPS criteria and their identification on planning maps is supported. The SNAs as identified provide for improved protection of landscape scale ecological connectivity and for delineating critical habitat for threatened species. This gives effect to the WRPS Policy 11.2 and methods (including Table 11-1). Some of the wetlands that have been identified (Peacocke Features Map, Planning Maps in 17a) sit outside of the defined Natural Open Space Zone and do not have an SNA delineation. Any wetland identified is likely to trigger criterion 4 of the WRPS and therefore warrants identification as SNA.	Retain extent of SNA as mapped and add any wetlands identified on the Peacocke Features Map and on Maps in 17A.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.77	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Requirement for Integrated Transport Assessments	Support	It is considered that developers must demonstrate how the design of their developments prioritise walking as the fundamental unit of movement within the Structure Plan area as well as demonstrating how they will cater for cycling, the provision of bus stops and the general safety of pedestrians, cyclists and residents. It will also be important to protect the function of the regionally significant Southern Links corridor (key WRPS and RLTP policy requirements), meaning that developers will be required to assess and manage the transportation and land use effects on the main transportation arterials running through the Structure Plan area.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.78	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15-6b: Criteria for the form of Transport Corridors in the Peacocke Structure Plan for Collector – PT Route	Support	The proposed cross sections are satisfactory, and there is support for no minimum parking standards. The emphasis on an integrated and holistic approach to positive safety outcomes in the Peacocke Structure Plan is strongly supported. Safety perceptions are a key barrier to the uptake of active mode trips, particularly by bike. The proposed design speeds for different environments within the Peacocke Structure Plan are strongly supported – particularly the design speed environment of 30km/hr for local roads. Developing an environment that is designed to be survivable for all road users is strongly commended and is consistent with national and regional Vision Zero safety policy. We note that DEV01-PSP: COMPONENTS OF THE PEACOCKE STRUCTURE PLAN describes the characteristics and principles for Peacocke's transportation network, however, it would be beneficial to offer greater guidance around how development and maintenance of the prescribed environments will be enforced to ensure the continued achievement of their intended outcomes.	Amend supporting documents to strengthen guidance on how various design speed environments, particularly that of 30km/hr for local roads, are to be achieved and enforced.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.79	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Transport corridor hierarchy plans	Support	The priority given to public transport on the proposed minor arterial network is strongly supported, as is the identification of possible future mass transit public transport routes eventually connecting Hamilton Airport with Hamilton City centre.	Retain as notified.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.80	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Peacocke zoning and features maps in the National Planning Standards. Identification of Significant Bat Habitat Areas.	Support	This provides a more detailed view of zoning and features notations. Wetlands are more easily identified on these maps. Maps 57B and 64B identify Waikato River and Gully Hazard Areas that are not part of the Natural Open Space Zone. Such areas could provide opportunities to enhance and restore gullies as part of the overall ecological network and provide for remediation or mitigation for areas of the ecological network that are adversely impacted from other development such as road networks (outside of the Southern Links designation). They could also provide additional mitigation for hydrological effects given uncertainty around climate variability.	Retain plan maps. Assess opportunity to delineate additional ecological restoration or enhancement areas (or ecological and hydrological mitigation areas) on the maps aligned to gully hazard areas. These areas already have some hazard constraint to development.
36	Waikato Regional Council	36.81	General	Appendix H - Peacocke Structure Plan Urban Design Report- General framework	Support	The Peacocke Structure Plan supports the national and regional vision for a mode shift in transport, setting up a framework for an integrated land use and transport network that prioritises walking and cycling active modes, reduces car dependency and provides a safe and accessible urban environment with well-planned public transport services. For these reasons, we generally support the framework set out, in particular, encouraging high-density development around the suburban and neighbourhood centres and along key transport routes to support a high-frequency public transport service. Density and amenity standards that focus on ensuring pedestrian and cyclist safety and that support a walkable environment with separated cycleways are also supported.	Retain as notified.
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Objective DEV01 – PSP: O25	Support	WEL supports Objective DEV01 – PSP: O25 which provides for staged development of the Peacocke area, allowing appropriately planned deployment of infrastructure, in particular network utilities that are required.	Retain as notified.
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.2	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Objective DEV01 – PSP: O26	Support	WEL supports Objective DEV01 – PSP: O26 which supports the objective of urban typologies with integrated planning of network infrastructure.	Retain as notified.



## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Chapter 4A: MRZ PREC1 PSP: P22	Support	WEL supports MRZ PREC1 PSP: P22 which requires residential development to consider and responds to the future effects of climate change.	Retain as notified.
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Chapter 4A: MRZ PREC1 PSP: P26	Support in Part	WEL supports in part Policy MRZ PREC1 PSP: P26 which encourages efficient energy use including solar energy, electric bikes and other charging networks. However, WEL would like to see this Policy amended to delete the reference to reducing the use of reticulated electricity as it conflicts with electric reticulation to enable electric transport and the generation of electricity through solar to power communities. WEL also requests that the words 'electric vehicle' be included in policy 4 and that a new point is included which requires developers to consider installing an electric vehicle charging point within new dwellings.	Amend as follows: "Development should encourage the efficient use of energy and water, by: 1. Incorporating water-sensitive techniques. <del>2. Reducing the use of reticulated electricity.</del> 3. Utilizing solar energy. 4. Providing for electric bikes and <u>electric vehicle</u> charging network throughout the area. <u>5. Providing for electric vehicle charging connection points within dwellings.</u> "
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.5	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1-PSP: P16	Support in Part	WEL supports in part Policy PREC1 PSP: P16 which aims to create high amenity streets via transport corridor design. However, WEL requests amendments to this Policy to include sufficient space within the berm to enable utility infrastructure and that the Policy includes the provision for electric charging station points.	Amend as follows: "Create high amenity streets by designing the transport corridor to: 1. Provide for high quality pedestrian and cycling facilities. 2. Provide for public transport and associated stops on identified routes. 3. Provide for on-street parking in recessed parking bays to ensure carriageways are kept clear from parked cars. 4. Including planting and landscaping and stormwater management devices. 5. Create a low-speed environment. <u>6. Provide sufficient space in the berm for infrastructure, free from landscaping.</u> <u>7. Provide for electric bikes and electric vehicle charging stations.</u> "
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.6	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP R12: Telecommunications, Electricity, Gas, and Computer Media	Support	WEL supports Rule PREC1 PSP: Rule 12 which requires electricity services to be provided at the time of subdivision to the requirements of relevant utility operator and that services are undergrounded where possible.	Retain as notified
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.7	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R14 Design standards	Support	WEL supports Rule SUB-PREC1 PSP: Rule 14 which allows subdivision of land for utility network services to be exempt from SUB – PREC1-PSP: R12-R21 (above).	Retain as notified
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.8	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R16 Subdivision Suitability	Support	WEL supports Rule SUB-PREC1 PSP: Rule 16 which exempts subdivision for utility services requirement to comply with size and shape expectations of the subject zone.	Retain as notified.
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.9	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.5 Rules – Specific Activities – 25.2.5.1	Support in Part	WEL supports in part 25.2.5 Rules – Specific Activities – 25.2.5.1 which states the maximum volume of earthworks in the Peacocke Structure Plan area. However, this Rule does not provide exemption for the provision of necessary utility services which usually consist of linear trenches and are necessary to install underground cables in new development areas.	Amend as follows: " Earthworks in the Peacocke Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct a) Earthworks within the Peacocke Structure Plan shall be no more than 600m3 in area, unless: i. It is in conjunction with an associated subdivision consent; or ii. It is associated with works authorised by an existing resource consent or requiring building consent. <u>Provided that:</u> <u>iii. Earthworks undertaken by a Network Utility Operator are exempt from i to ii above."</u>
37	WEL Networks Ltd	37.10	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15-6b: Criteria for the form of Transport Corridors in the Peacock Structure Plan	Support in Part	WEL supports in part "Table 15-6b: Criteria for the form of Transport Corridors in the Peacock Structure Plan" which states the required berm area to be set aside as a service corridor. However, WEL requests that the word 'desirable' is removed from the service corridor berm requirement and replaced with 'required'.	Amend as follows: "Service corridor (min <u>required</u> desirable)."
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Terminology relating to bat habitat.	Support in Part	The Director-General submits there needs to be consistency between the Environment Court decision and conditions of consent for the Amberfield subdivision and the Structure Plan. In particular, there is a disconnect between what are referred to as 'Bat Priority Areas' in Amberfield and the terminology used in the Structure Plan. In Amberfield Bat Priority Areas cover ecological corridors for the movement of bats, including Significant Natural Areas (SNAs), development setbacks to buffer ecological corridors along with roost trees and their respective buffers or development setbacks. The Structure Plan refers to the Natural Environment and Open Space Network at a high level, or at a more granular level to ecological corridors and identified significant bat habitat. This only includes bat corridors identified on the zoning map but does not include roost trees or other areas of habitat outside of these corridors or SNAs. For consistency with Amberfield and to address the full range of bat habitat within the PSPA the Structure Plan should use the term 'Bat Priority Area/s' where appropriate.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.2	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Mapping	Support in Part	The Director-General submits that the Peacocke Precinct Land-use, Features and Zoning Maps omit areas of bat habitat that require protection. Of the 720 hectare Structure Plan Area there will be the loss of c.500 ha of habitat that has been classified as low and medium value habitat as well as c.3.09 ha of high value habitat. The Director-General is willing to work with the Council and other submitters to resolve mapping issues and secure appropriate protection for long-tailed bats and their habitat.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.3	General	Bat habitat outside of Identified habitat	Support in Part	The Director-General is cognisant that Bats will continue to use areas that will not be identified for protection through this plan review. This might include areas of pasture, potential roost trees and flight paths throughout the PSPA. As a result, the design of land development needs to respond to bat activity across PSPA not just at the margins of Bat Priority Areas.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.4	General	Walking /Cycleways	Support in Part	The Director-General is concerned that the location of walking/cycleways within and at the margins of Bat Priority Areas may require the removal of actual and potential roost trees due to health and safety requirements. The Director General wishes to ensure that walking/cycle ways are designed to avoid the removal bat roosts and other habitat.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.5	General	Density of housing in proximity to Bat habitat	Support in Part	The Director-General asks Council to consider the impact of high and medium density housing adjacent to Bat Priority Areas as will be enabled through the Structure Plan. Further, there should be consideration of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill that will enable multiple houses of up to three storeys on most residential sites. This level of intensification adjoining or adjacent to Bat Habitat is likely to fragment airspace that bats would otherwise use to access their habitat and have an overall adverse impact on bats.	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 or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.6	General	Restoration and enhancement	Support in Part	The Director-General notes there is a focus throughout the Structure plan on management of adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity but considers there needs to be a shift towards restoration and enhancement to better have regard to Section 6(c) In addition, the Structure Plan lacks clear guidance for plan users on biodiversity offsetting in terms of bat habitat and other significant biodiversity such as wetland and wetland fauna. This should be provided.	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.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.7	General	Bat and Habitat and Enhancement Review Panel ('The Panel')	Support in Part	Given the difficulty associated with ensuring consistency, communication and efficiencies across multiple developments and time frames within the area, it is suggested the formation of an overarching panel be considered for the PSPA as per condition 80 of the Amberfield subdivision resource consent. The panel would be notified of any resource consents within the area and seek to ensure consistency of effects management, be responsible for ensuring a net gain in biodiversity is achieved at the conclusion of development in the area and review management plans, monitoring results and enhancement reports submitted by developers.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.8	General	Monitoring	Support in Part	There is no directive to monitor and report on the effectiveness of measures to avoid, remedy and mitigate (or offset and compensate). The absence of such a directive compromises the efficacy of the plan in carrying out its functions under Part 2 of the RMA.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.9	General	Domestic cats	Support in Part	The plan is silent on domestic cats, other predators and pest control. This is inconsistent with Amberfield and inadequate to protect the critically endangered long-tailed bat and other indigenous fauna.	Amend the structure plan to include objectives, policies and rules prohibiting domestic cats within the PSPA. Provide further information on how the Structure Plan will minimise the impact of predation on long-tailed bats and other indigenous fauna. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.10	General	Roads	Support in Part	The Director-General is concerned that Bat Priority Areas will adjoin or intersect with sections of the roading network in the PSPA. This is likely to have an adverse impact on longtailed bats and their habitat if roads are inappropriately designed and located.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.11	General	Kauri Dieback	Support in Part	Kauri Dieback is caused by a pathogen that is easily spread through soil movements, including when it is carried on footwear, equipment and vehicles. The disease is threatening Kauri with functional extinction and requires collaborative work to manage the disease and control any further spread. Council. The Director-General considers that provisions of Thames Coromandel District Plan, as they relate to the management of Kauri Dieback disease, should be adopted into the Proposed Plan, where appropriate.	Include provisions to address the management of kauri dieback, particularly around earthworks and measures to prevent spread of the disease. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.12	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O7	Oppose	The Director-General considers this objective is inconsistent with Section 6(c) of the RMA. Urban development should 'protect' rather than respond to the area's natural environment and ecological values.	Change wording to: Urban development <del>responds to</del> <u>protects</u> the area's natural environment and ecological values <u>and responds to</u> natural hazards. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.13	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O8	Oppose	The Director-General submits that Business Centres should not adversely impact the form and function of long-tailed bats and their habitat just as other development needs to respond to the presence of long-tailed bats.	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</u> integrate with surrounding neighbourhoods, 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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.14	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O11	Oppose	The Director-General considers the earthworks objective should aim to protect ecological values.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.15	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O13	Oppose	The Director-General considers all significant habitat of indigenous fauna and significant indigenous vegetation needs to be protected or otherwise addressed by the mitigation hierarchy. It is also unclear how the structure plan will achieve this for bat habitat, not protected through an SNA, corridor or buffer. For example, the 4Sight longtailed bat report identifies long-tailed bat habitat north of the sports field that is not carried over to the Zoning Map for the Peacocke Structure Plan Area Of further concern to the Director-General is the fact that monitoring has mainly occurred in the south, west and east of the Peacocke area (particularly through the Southern links Road project) so there will be roosting trees that have not been identified within the PSPA.	Change the wording to: Protect and enhance <del>identified significant the</del> habitat of indigenous fauna and significant indigenous vegetation. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.16	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Additional Objective	Oppose	The Director-General suggests adding an objective that specifically protects and enhances the actual and potential habitat of long-tailed bats, acknowledging that they are critically endangered fauna with little tolerance for the actual, potential and/or residual effects of land development. The Director-General notes that in its current form it is unclear how the structure plan will achieve protection and enhancement of bat habitat, not protected through an SNA, corridor, or buffer. For example, the 4Sight long-tailed bat report identifies long-tailed bat habitat north of the sports field that is not carried over to the zoning map for the Structure Plan Area. Of further concern is the fact that longtailed bat monitoring has mainly occurred in the south, west and east of the Peacocke area (particularly through the Southern Links Road project) but not in Peacocke so there will be roosting trees that have not been identified within the PSPA. These areas, both known and unknown, need to be protected and enhanced or otherwise addressed through the mitigation hierarchy.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.17	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O14	Oppose	The Director-General suggests adding an objective that specifically protects and enhances the actual and potential habitat of long-tailed bats, acknowledging that they are critically endangered fauna with little tolerance for the actual, potential and/or residual effects of land development. The Director-General notes that in its current form it is unclear how the structure plan will achieve protection and enhancement of bat habitat, not protected through an SNA, corridor, or buffer. For example, the 4Sight long-tailed bat report identifies long-tailed bat habitat north of the sports field that is not carried over to the zoning map for the Structure Plan Area. Of further concern is the fact that longtailed bat monitoring has mainly occurred in the south, west and east of the Peacocke area (particularly through the Southern Links Road project) but not in Peacocke so there will be roosting trees that have not been identified within the PSPA. These areas, both known and unknown, need to be protected and enhanced or otherwise addressed through the mitigation hierarchy.	Change the wording to: Create and protect <del>identified Bat Priority Areas ecological and open space corridors for the purpose of protecting and</del> <u>enhancing the habitat of long-tailed bats.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.18	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O15	Oppose	The objective needs to acknowledge that 'ecological areas' are home to New Zealand's critically endangered longtailed bats and that development should effectively apply the mitigation hierarchy by practicing avoidance of adverse effects in the first instance.	Change the wording to: Enable development adjacent to <del>ecological areas</del> <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> where it is designed to <del>manage</del> <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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.19	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O16	Oppose	The Director-General considers these objectives need to enable New Zealand's critically endangered long-tailed bat to thrive.	Change the wording to: Establish a network of open space, and <del>ecological corridors</del> <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> that support ecological values <u>such as, protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat</u> of the <del>Peacocke Area</del> 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.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.20	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Additional Objective	Oppose	The Director-General submits that more could be done to provide for the connectivity of bat habitat within the PSPA. For instance, the 4Sight long-tailed bat report identifies 'low', 'moderate' and 'high' value bat habitat throughout the PSPA while the proposed Structure Plan Zoning Map only identifies 'high value' areas for protection. More of the 'moderate habitat' could be added to the network of ecological corridors to better provide for the movement of bats. In particular, bat habitat north of the sports field could be added to connect the rest of the network with the bat corridor at the northern margin of the PSPA.	Add Objective: <u>The identified ecological and open space corridors 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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.21	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P5	Oppose	The Director-General considers co-location of recreational activities with bat priority areas would be inappropriate. It is suggested the policy is revised to require avoidance of the actual or potential adverse effects of these activities on long-tailed bat habitat.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.22	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P6	Oppose	This policy should give consideration to the protection of long-tailed bat habitat.	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> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.23	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P13	Oppose	The Director-General is concerned that part 2 of P13 may conflict with the protection and enhancement of long-tailed bats and their habitat.	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. <u>May be provided along areas of natural open space including the river corridor and gully network.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.24	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P23	Oppose	The Director-General considers P23 should be revised to specifically include protection of long-tailed bats.	Change the wording to: Near identified <del>ecological corridors</del> <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> , ensure the design and location of buildings, infrastructure and lighting is managed throughout the Peacocke Structure Plan in order to maintain the ecological role and function of those corridors, <u>including protection for long-tailed bats.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.25	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P27	Oppose	The Director-General supports the intent of Policy DEV01-PSP: P27, however requests amendments to ensure the policy gives effect to the WRPS.	Change the wording to: The loss of significant vegetation is <del>minimised</del> <u>avoided in the first instance.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.26	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P30	Oppose	The Director-General requests amendments to Policy DEV01-PSP: P30 to provide clear protection of long-tailed bats.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.27	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P31	Oppose	The Director-General generally supports Policy DEV01-PSP:P31 but requests amendments to direct that revegetated gullies and river margins provide for the protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.28	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P35	Oppose	The Director-General supports the intent of this policy but considers significant long-tailed bat habitat is not restricted to the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River. The Director-General requests the policy be amended to include all significant long-tailed bat habitat such as, Significant Natural Areas, ecological corridors, bat habitat buffers and all actual and potential bat roosts.	Change the wording to: Protect <del>bat habitat</del> <u>Bat Priority Areas within the Peacocke Structure Plan Area including Significant Natural Areas, ecological corridors, bat habitat buffers and actual and potential bat roosts adjoining the edge of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River</u> to ensure long tailed bats are able to continue to utilise <del>these areas</del> <u>their habitat.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.29	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P36	Oppose	The Director-General generally supports Policy DEV01-PSP:P36 but requests the policy be amended to include all development adjacent to long-tailed bat habitat including but not limited to, significant natural areas, ecological corridors, bat habitat buffers and actual and potential bat roosts. P36 should include a directive requiring development meet performance standards, such as lighting standards as setbacks alone are insufficient to support the ecological function of bat habitat.	Change the wording to: Require development adjacent to <del>the gully network and Waikato River</del> <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> to meet required setbacks <u>and performance standards</u> to support the ecological function of these areas. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.30	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P37	Oppose	The Director-General requests amendments to Policy DEV01-PSP: P37 to ensure connectivity is provided between significant areas of bat habitat across the PSPA. Bat habitat is not restricted to the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River.	Change the wording to: Provide ecological corridors between <del>the major arms of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River</del> <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> of sufficient width that enables the movement of long tailed bats <del>between the two areas.</del> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.31	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Additional Policy addressing the prohibition of cats.	Oppose	The Director-General considers there needs to be consistency between the Amberfield subdivision and the Peacocke Structure Plan. For example, if there is not a cat ban in the Peacocke Structure Plan, the efficacy of the cat ban in Amberfield will be compromised. Peacocke Structure Plan aims to incorporate 8000 homes into the area. Cat occupancy in urban areas is around 35% meaning if there is no cat ban there will be an influx of c.2800 cats to the area. Cats are known to be predators of long-tailed bats so an increase of thousands of cats is liable to have a significant adverse effect on bats.	Add policy: <u>Exclude cats and other predators from the Peacocke Structure Plan Area in order to protect long-tailed bats from predation.</u> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.32	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Additional Policy to address monitoring of long-tailed bats	Oppose	The Director-General considers that to protect, enhance and restore long-tailed bat habitat and to enable bats to thrive stakeholders will need to have a more complete understanding of the long-tailed bat population within the PSPA. This will require bat surveys and other monitoring by appropriately qualified person/s to be undertaken prior to the granting of resource consents. Further, there will need to be on-going reporting on the efficacy of measures to avoid, remedy, mitigate or offset and compensate for the adverse effects of development on bats. Consequently, the Director-General submits there should be a policy directive to enable sustained monitoring of long-tailed bats within the PSPA.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.33	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Additional Policy to address connectivity of bat habitat	Oppose	The Director-General requests a further transportation policy directing that the transport network will be designed to avoid adverse effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat by using such methods as a 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. The Director-General notes that design of the transportation network needs to integrate with and account for the effects mitigation and offsetting measures being undertaken as part of the Southern Links project. In planning for the Peacocke transport network it should be acknowledged that together with the Southern Links Road there will be cumulative effect on long-tailed bats that needs to be minimised.	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.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.34	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P70	Support	The Director-General supports Policy DEV01-PSP:P70.	Retain as notified.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.35	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan - Natural Environment	Support in Part	While these paragraphs provide a reasonably comprehensive discussion on long-tailed bat habitat, it should be noted that the Zone Plan does not show as much bat habitat as the paragraph suggests – the long-tailed bat habitat erroneously referred to in the 4Sight’s long tailed bat report as medium to low value habitat has been largely omitted from the zoning map.	Amend the Natural Environment component to address protection of and avoidance of adverse effects, areas of potential bat habitat. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.36	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	5m buffer	Oppose	The Director-General considers there needs to be consistency between the Amberfield subdivision and the Peacocke Structure Plan. To achieve this consistency the 5-metre setback area would have no buildings minimal external lighting within it.	Amend the bullet point addressing Development setback. Change the wording to: Along with the <del>Bat Habitat Area</del> <u>Bat Priority Area</u> a 5m development setback is proposed along the interface with the <del>Bat Habitat Area</del> <u>Bat Priority Area</u> . The setback aims to <del>avoid the location of control</del> any buildings <u>and minimise the spill of external lighting</u> and associated effects on the adjoining bat habitat areas. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.37	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Lighting controls	Oppose	The Director-General considers there needs to be consistency between the Amberfield subdivision and the Peacocke Structure Plan. The maximum light level applying in the Amberfield subdivision consent is 0.1 lux 3 metres inside the boundary of Bat Priority Areas. The DirectorGeneral requests that the paragraph dealing with lighting controls be amended to refer to standards to avoid artificial light spill from buildings and roads, including maximum lux levels and colour temperatures, and buffer planting for light screening.	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</u> . <del>managing the impact lighting may have on the ability for the so that Bat Habitat Areas Bat Priority Areas to</del> 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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.38	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Additional components of Long-tailed bat habitat not discussed.	Oppose	The Director-General requests that consideration be given to other long-tailed bat protection measures not discussed in this component. 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.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.39	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Sports park	Oppose	It is unclear in this discussion how the operation of the major sports park will be compatible with the protection of long-tailed bats if night lighting is used at the park.	Change the wording to: Include discussion of how operation of the major sports park will be compatible with the protection of long-tailed bats if night lighting is used at the park. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.40	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Local Business Centre	Oppose	The local centre identified on the zoning map abuts Bat Priority Area. There is no discussion on how the local centre will be developed in a way that recognises this and ensures protection for Long-tailed bats and their habitat.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.41	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP:ISSUES	Oppose	The Director-General submits Hamilton is one of the few cities that long-tailed bats can be observed in peri-urban areas. How medium density housing will protect long-tailed bats and their habitat needs to addressin the issues section.	Include discussion of New Zealand’s critically endangered long-tailed bats, with a focus on how medium density housing will provide for the form and function of their habitat. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.42	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP Rules	Oppose	The rules generally provide for permitted activities that comply with the standards set out in the rules R36 to R48. These standards do not provide adequately for protection of long-tailed bats and their habitats, including no restriction on the removal of actual and potential roost trees, no prohibition on external lights within the 5-metre building setback, and no rule on the keeping of domestic cats. The Director-General considers these rules should apply across all zones in the PSPA. It is noted that a lighting standard has been added to the City-Wide Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare. The Director-General considers this should be referenced within the rule’s framework in Chapters 4A and 23A for clarity.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.43	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Additional Objective	Oppose	The Director-General requests including an objective to ensure residential development is compatible with protection and enhancement of long-tailed bats and their habitat.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.44	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP:P13	Oppose	The Director-General requests the intent of Policy MRZPREC1 – PSP: P13 specifically includes preservation of actual and potential bat roosting trees. This will require restrictions on the removal of any tree which has a breast height diameter greater than 15 cm.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.45	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P21	Support in Part	The Director-General requests Policy MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P21 be amended to protect long-tailed bats and their habitat from the effects of lighting.	Change the wording to: Residential development is designed to <del>manage</del> avoid <del>adverse lighting</del> effects on adjacent areas of <del>Natural Open Space- long-tailed bat habitat by requiring measures such as, a ban on domestic cats, controls on the removal of actual and potential roost trees, and buffer planting.</del> Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.46	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1-PSP: RULES – Activity Status	Oppose	These rules do not provide adequately for protection of long-tailed bats and their habitats, including no restriction on the removal of actual and potential roost trees, no prohibition on external lights within the 5-metre building setback, and no rule on the keeping of domestic cats. The Director-General considers these rules should apply across all zones in the PSPA. It is noted that a lighting standard has been added to the City-Wide Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare. The Director-General considers this should be referenced within the rule’s framework in Chapters 4A and 23A for clarity.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.47	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7	Support	The Director-General supports Objective NOSZ – PREC1- P:O7.	Retain as notified.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.48	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18	Oppose	The Director-General is generally supportive of Policy NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18 but considers it could be strengthened by amending clause 2 to provide for enhancement of habitat as well as extending clause 3 by listing the important adverse effects to avoid. It is also unclear how ensuring access to long-tailed bat habitat is necessary for their protection as appears to be inferred in clause 1).	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</u> <del>and access to, of</del> 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.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.49	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P:RULES	Oppose	These rules do not provide adequately for protection of long-tailed bats and their habitats, including no restriction on the removal of actual and potential roost trees, no prohibition on external lights within the 5-metre building setback, and no rule on the keeping of domestic cats. The Director-General considers these rules should apply across all zones in the PSPA. It is noted that a lighting standard has been added to the City-Wide Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare. The Director-General considers this should be referenced within the Rules framework in Chapters 4A and 23A for clarity.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.50	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Issues	Oppose	The Director-General appreciates that Neighbourhood Centres are being located near open space to act as walkable nodes for these areas. That said, several proposed Neighbourhood Centres will abut Bat Priority Areas and one will be contained within a Bat Priority Area. Consequently, there should be a thorough discussion of how Neighbourhood Centres will be designed and located to avoid and minimise their impact on long-tailed bats.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.51	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: Objectives	Support in Part	There is no objective to address the compatibility of Local Neighbourhood Centres with long-tailed bats, their habitat and other significant ecological values.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.52	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: Policy	Support in Part	There is no policy directive to address the compatibility of Local Neighbourhood Centres with long-tailed bats, their habitat and other significant ecological values.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.53	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: ISSUES	Oppose	The Director-General appreciates that a suburban area as large as the PSPA will require a centre for retailing, offices, business and the like. That said, the proposed Local Centre will abut a Bat Priority Area, a fact that has not been considered in the 'issues' paragraph, or the entirety of Chapter 6B. It is considered there should be a thorough discussion of how Neighbourhood Centres will be designed and located to avoid and minimise the impact on long-tailed bats.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.54	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: OBJECTIVES	Oppose	There is no objective to address the compatibility of the Local Centre with long-tailed bats, their habitat and other ecological values.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.55	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: POLICES	Oppose	There is no policy directive to address the compatibility of the Local Centre with long-tailed bats, their habitat and other significant ecological values.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.56	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: O8	Oppose	The Director-General submits that subdivision should create a transport network that protects and enhances the physical and functional connectivity of bat habitat.	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. 7. <u>Protects and enhances the physical and functional connectivity of bat habitat.</u>
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.57	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O9	Support in Part	The Director-General is generally supportive of Objective SUB – PREC1- PSP: O9 but considers it could be strengthened with the addition of a protection directive.	Change the wording to: Subdivision responds to <u>protects</u> , and restores the natural environment with a focus on those areas identified in the Peacocke Structure Plan including the creation and protection and enhancement of identified ecological corridors. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.58	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: P19	Support in Part	The Director-General considers this policy should be amended to include an enhancement directive.	Change the wording to: Require subdivision to be designed to provide ecological areas where they are identified within the Peacocke Structure Plan and ensure that the role, function and connectivity of ecological areas is maintained Require subdivision to be designed to provide ecological areas where they are identified within the Peacocke Structure Plan and ensure that the role, function and connectivity of ecological areas is <del>maintained-protected and enhanced</del> . Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.59	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: P20	Support	Support.	Retain as notified.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.60	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1-PSP: RULES	Oppose	These rules do not provide adequately for protection of long-tailed bats and their habitats, including no restriction on the removal of actual and potential roost trees, no prohibition on external lights within the 5-metre building setback, and no rule on the keeping of domestic cats. The Director-General considers these rules should apply across all zones in the PSPA. It is noted that a lighting standard has been added to the City-Wide Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare. The Director-General considers this should be referenced within the rule's framework in Chapters 4A and 23A for clarity.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.61	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.2.1a	Oppose	The Director-General submits Policy 25.2.2.1a should consider the effects of earthworks and vegetation removal specifically on indigenous biodiversity given the significance of the PSPA and other peri-urban areas in Hamilton City to New Zealand's indigenous biodiversity. For example, the PSPA contains habitat for significant indigenous vegetation, herpetology and avifauna such as New Zealand's critically endangered long-tailed bats.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.62	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Objective 25.6.2.2	Support		Amend as follows: Lighting in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area is managed to ensure areas identified as <del>Significant Bat Habitat</del> <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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.63	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Policy 25.6.2.2a	Oppose		Amend as follows: Manage light spill and glare of fixed lighting at the boundary of the <del>Significant Bat Habitat</del> <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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.64	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Policy 25.6.2.2b	Oppose		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.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.65	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Additional standards	Oppose	The Director-General submits that additional lighting standards should be added to create a bat-sensitive road lighting regime adjacent to Bat Priority Areas to minimise spill into Bat Priority Areas.	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 <del>my</del> <b>the submitter's</b> concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.66	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	25.6.4.4 Peacocke Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Oppose	The Director-General submits there should be consistency between the Amberfield subdivision and the Peacocke Structure Plan. Residential lighting within the Amberfield subdivision is restricted to a bat friendly 0.1 lux 3 meters from the inside of the Bat Priority Area boundary. The agreed maximum lighting colour temperature for Amberfield was 2700k. 25.6.4.4 lighting standard should also apply to subdivision occurring in the wider Peacocke Precinct, not just those areas zoned for medium density development.	Ensure consistency between the Amberfield subdivision lighting requirements and the Peacocks 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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.67	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.1(h)(iii)	Oppose	The Director General requests that guidance on ecological offsetting and compensation to achieve no net loss be added, along with a bullet point addressing ecological effects with a focus on long-tailed bats.	Change the wording to: The AEE should identify how any adverse environmental effects are to be avoided, remedied, <del>or</del> 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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.68	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2.2	Oppose	The Director General requests that guidance on the development of management plans be more detailed.	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, 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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.69	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2.1(b)	Oppose	The Director General requests that guidance on the development of management plans be more detailed and that guidance on ecological offsetting and compensation to achieve no net loss be added.	Change the wording to: Reports and management plans demonstrating how adverse environmental effects associated with the proposed activity are to be avoided, remedied, mitigated <u>or otherwise offset and compensated for</u> 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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.70	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2.1 Note	Support in Part	The Director-General requests an additional note that any offset, compensation or biobanking 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.	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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.71	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2.25	Support in Part	The Director-General considers the Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan (ERMP) should address herpetofauna and avifauna where values are affected, including with areas outside of any open space zone and less than 2ha.	Make amendments to: Address herpetofauna and avifauna where values are affected, including with areas outside of any open space zone and less than 2ha. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.72	Appendix 1.2 Information	1.2.2.27	Support in Part	The Director-General considers the Bat Management Plan (BMP) should be amended with clear objectives and measures to avoid and remedy as well as mitigate the effects of development on long-tailed bats.	Make amendments to the BMP to provide clear objectives for management of longtailed bats across the PSPA, these should aim:
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.73	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria P3 (e)	Oppose	The Director-General submits that the extent to which ecological function is enhanced should be a matter of discretion.	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 <del>maintain</del> <u>enhance</u> the ecological function of these corridors; including the management of lighting and building location.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.74	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria P3 (i)	Oppose	The Director-General submits that the extent to which light has been designed and located to protect and enhance adverse effects on the function and quality of long-tailed bat habitat should be a matter of discretion. This will better align with the mitigation hierarchy as set out in the WRPS and give effect to Section 6(c) of the RMA.	Change the wording to: P3 (i) The extent to which lighting has been designed and located to <del>maintain</del> <u>protect and enhance the</u> function and quality of longtailed bat habitat. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.75	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria P5 (p)	Oppose	The Director-General submits that the extent to which a proposed subdivision protects, enhances and restores populations of at-risk, threatened or critically endangered flora and fauna should be a matter of discretion.	The extent to which the proposal: 1. Restores, protects and enhances aquatic and terrestrial ecological values associated with springs, streams, waterways, wetlands and their margins in Peacocke. 2. Protects <del>or and</del> enhances the natural character and ecological, cultural, heritage and amenity values of 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.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.76	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria P5 (q)	Oppose	The Director-General submits the matter of discretion P5 (q) should address the extent to which the proposal has been designed to avoid the adverse effects of development and subdivision on the role and function of Significant Bat Habitat. This will better align with the mitigation hierarchy as set out in the WRPS and give effect to Section 5(2)(c) of the RMA. It is also considered the matter of discretion outlined in P5 (r) will adequately contemplate mitigation.	Change the wording to: P5 (q) The extent to which subdivision has been designed to <del>manage</del> <u>avoid</u> the <u>adverse</u> effects of development and subdivision on the role and function of <del>Significant Bat Habitat</del> <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> . Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.77	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria P5 (r)	Oppose	The Director-General submits the matter of discretion P5 (r) should address the extent to which the proposal mitigates, remedies, or otherwise compensates for Significant Bat Habitat. It is considered the full mitigation hierarchy should be considered where avoidance is not achieved. Further, measures to remedy, mitigate, offset or compensate effects need to be considered beyond the provision of ecological corridors.	Change the wording: The extent to which the proposal mitigates, <u>remedies, or otherwise offsets or compensates for</u> the effects of development on <del>Significant Bat Habitat through the provision and enhancement of ecological corridors</del> <u>Bat Priority Areas</u> . Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.

**Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan**  
**Summary of Submissions**

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.78	Appendix 1.4 Design Guides	1.4.10 Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide	Oppose	The local centre identified on the zoning map will abut a Bat Priority Area which adjoins an ecological corridor. There is no discussion on how the local centre will be developed in a way that recognises this and ensures protection of long tailed bat habitat.	Amend Appendix 1.4 Design Guidelines by including guidance on location and design of the Local Centre to protect and enhance longtailed bat habitat. As a minimum, guidance should include the performance standards for design and locations of buildings, lighting and roads within the Amberfield subdivision, such as: a) A suitable Bat Habitat Buffer. b) Buildings in the Local Centre are designed and located appropriately to avoid disruption of bat habitat in terms of commuting, foraging and socialisation. c) A planting plan which outlines the restoration and enhancement areas, and suitable vegetation. d) How vegetation design will minimise light intrusion to the acceptable standard. e) Appropriate lux lighting and colouration levels. f) Appropriate location of lighting. g) Use of artificial bat roosts. h) Use of barriers to prevent predators accessing known and potential roost trees) Additional standards for the treatment and design of the road corridor in the area of the Local Centre so as to avoid disrupting the physical and functional connectivity of bat habitat. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address the submitter's concerns.
39	Ron Lockwood	39.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Appendix 2 – Structure Plan, Figure 2-1 (Land Use)	Oppose	The Natural Open Space Zone shown on Figure 2-1 makes approximately 4000m2 of 362 Peacockes Road incapable of reasonable use and will significantly limit development potential that would otherwise be anticipated. The Natural Open Space identified at 362 Peacockes Road will also restrict access potential from the south and encompasses some of the best quality elevated land for development owned by the submitter. The Proposed Natural Open Space Zone is to mitigate for the adverse effects of development in the whole of the Peacocke Structure Plan on the longtailed bat. It is an unreasonable to burden individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Natural Open Space for the mitigation of these adverse effects. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council purchases the land and compensates affected landowners. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4.	The Natural Open Space Zone is only identified on privately owned land if Hamilton City Council commit to proactively acquiring the Natural Open Space Zone through purchasing affected land and taking responsibility for its creation and maintenance. Practical and physical access through the Natural Open Space Zone is allowed if necessary to allow land to be capable of reasonable use and development; and If a Bat Corridor is identified on 362 Peacockes Road, it is in the location shown in Figure 2-3.
39	Ron Lockwood	39.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Appendix 2 – Structure Plan, Figure 2-3 (Natural Environment and Heritage)	Oppose	The Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area and Proposed Bat Corridor shown on Figure 2-1 makes approximately 4000m2 of 362 Peacockes Road incapable of reasonable use and will significantly limit development potential that would otherwise be anticipated. The Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area and Proposed Bat Corridor identified at 362 Peacockes Road will also restrict access potential from the south and encompasses some of the best quality elevated land for development owned by the submitter. The proposed Bat Corridor and Bat Habitat is to mitigate the adverse effects of development in the whole of the Peacocke Structure Plan on the longtailed bat. It is an unreasonable to burden individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area and Bat Corridor for the mitigation of these adverse effects. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council purchases the land and compensates affected landowners. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4.	The proposed Bat Corridor and Bat Habitat is only identified on privately owned land if Hamilton City Council commit to proactively acquiring these areas through purchasing affected land and taking responsibility for its creation and maintenance. Practical and physical access through the Natural Open Space Zone is allowed if necessary to allow land to be capable of reasonable use and development. If a Bat Corridor and Significant Bat Habitat Area is identified on 362 Peacockes Road, it is in the location shown in Figure 2-3.
39	Ron Lockwood	39.3	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Appendix 17A – Planning Maps	Support in Part	The Zoning Maps makes approximately 4000m2 of 362 Peacockes Road incapable of reasonable use and will significantly limit development potential that would otherwise be anticipated. The Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area and Proposed Bat Corridor identified at 362 Peacockes Road will also restrict access potential from the south and encompasses some of the best quality elevated land for development owned by the submitter. The Natural Open Space Zone and Significant Bat Habitat Areas are to mitigate for the effects of development in the whole of the Peacocke Structure Plan on the long-tailed bat. It is an unreasonable to burden the mitigation of these adverse effects on individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Natural Open Space. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council compensates affected landowners. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4. Referring to the Bat Habitat areas as significant would suggest these areas are to be created and distinguished from existing Significant Natural Areas elsewhere in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area.	The Natural Open Space Zone and Significant Bat Habitat Areas are only identified on privately owned land if Hamilton City Council commit to them proactively acquiring these areas through purchasing affected land and taking responsibility for their creation and maintenance. That the Significant Bat Habitat Area be amended to Bat Habitat Area on the Planning Maps. If a Natural Open Space Zone and Significant Bat Habitat Area is identified on 362 Peacockes Road, it is in the location shown in Figure 2-3.
39	Ron Lockwood	39.4	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Appendix 17A – Planning Maps	Support in Part	Medium Density will provide an appropriate level of development for this property given its topography and position.	Notwithstanding the submitters relief sought in respect of the extent of the Natural Open Space Zone, that 362 Peacockes Road be confirmed as Medium Density Residential.
39	Ron Lockwood	39.5	Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01–PSP – Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan	Oppose	The text as drafted is ambiguous and is not consistent with Weston Lea Limited & Director-General of Conservation v Hamilton City Council [ENV-2019-AKL308].	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> <del>wide swathes of land</del> are required to be set aside <del>as bat corridors</del> in order to retain a permeable and functioning landscape for long-tailed bats."
39	Ron Lockwood	39.6	Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: 05 – Objectives: Land use and development.	Oppose	To ensure a range of housing typologies are provided (including those that are affordable and accessible) single storey buildings should be anticipated in the Medium Residential Zone.	Amend as follows: "Development in Peacocke provides a range of housing typologies that are consistent with the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character of <del>two to</del> <u>up to</u> three-storey buildings in the medium density zone and two-five storey buildings within the high-density area."
39	Ron Lockwood	39.7	Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R39 Setbacks	Oppose	Referring to the Bat Habitat areas as “significant” suggests these areas already have ecological value. Removing the word significant will distinguish these areas from existing SNA.	That the reference to Significant Bat Habitat Area be amended to Bat Habitat Area.
39	Ron Lockwood	39.8	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 Provision of Ecological Areas	Oppose	The Proposed Bat Corridors can make privately owned land incapable of reasonable use and will significantly limit development potential. The Proposed Bat Corridor is to mitigate and the effects of development in the whole of the Peacocke Structure Plan on the long-tailed bat. It is an unreasonable to burden individual landowners with the mitigation of these adverse effects. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council compensates affected landowners at the time of subdivision. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4. The Proposed Bat Corridors shown at 362 Peacockes Road straddle the property boundary. It is therefore inappropriate to specify a minimum width as the full corridor may not be achievable. The requirement for a 35m wide Bat Corridor is consistent with Weston Lea Limited & Director -General of Conservation v Hamilton City Council [ENV-2019-AKL-308].	Hamilton City Council commit to proactively acquiring Bat Corridors areas through purchasing affected land and taking responsibility for their creation and maintenance; and Amend as follows: 1) Where <u>any</u> subdivision includes areas <u>identified in the Peacocke Structure Plan (Figure 2-3) as Proposed Bat Corridors, these areas shall be vested in Hamilton City Council as Local Purpose Reserve provided in accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan and be designed to meet the following requirements:</u> <del>a) Maintain a minimum width of 50m.</del>
39	Ron Lockwood	39.1	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ-PREC1-P: Issues	Oppose	It is an unreasonable to burden the mitigation of adverse effects associated with the development of the whole Peacocke Structure Plan on individual landowners who are affected by the proposed Bat Corridor. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council compensates affected landowners at the time of subdivision. The “significant cost” to individual property owners is identified as a cost in the s32 analysis in respect of SUB-PREC1-PSP: P4.	Amend the issues statement as follows: "The Natural Open Space Zone in the Peacocke Structure Plan includes areas that have been identified to protect the significant habitat of long -tailed bats. These include buffers to known habitats and the creation of connections to these known habitats that will ensure bats are able to continue to access these areas for roosting and foraging without having to navigate urbanized areas. <u>Any Proposed Bat Corridors held in private ownership are intended to be purchased by Hamilton City Council and vested as Local Purpose Reserve.</u> "



## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
40	AJ and HC Koppens	40.1	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	High density zone- 20 Peacocks Lane	Support in Part	Support the proposed High Density Residential zoning for 20 Peacocks Lane. However there appear to be discrepancies in the various plans. On the Peacocke Structure Plan: Land Use and Peacocke Precinct – Features Maps the site is located in the High Density Zoning. However, on the Proposed Zoning Map in Appendix 17A all sites are identified as Medium Density Housing. It is assumed that this is meant to be general residential notation rather than differentiating between the different densities.	Retain High Density Residential zoning for the site. Clarify discrepancies between the plans.
40	AJ and HC Koppens	40.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Stormwater wetland location	Oppose	The location of the stormwater wetland is opposed. It is considered that a more appropriate location for the wetland (identified in Figure 1 of the submission) is in the Open Space zoned land to the north and for it to be combined with the wetland proposed by Council on the southern side of Peacocks Road. This is because the size of the wetland is disproportionate to the contributing catchment served. The combined wetland is a considerably more efficient use of land, would be more easily accessible for maintenance, and more consistent with Council's desire to minimise the number of stormwater devices in the network. An additional positive effect would be the potential for the wetland surrounds to be extensively landscaped to improve this entrance to both the Park and the High Density Housing area. The proposed wetland location will make the most of what would otherwise be a surplus area of the park that is not large enough for any other purpose and free up additional space at 20 Peacocks Lane for residential development. If the detailed design demonstrates the area within the park is not big enough then the submitters would be open to discussions on potentially shifting the access road south slightly to accommodate the wetland device.	Amend the proposed location of the stormwater wetland identified in Figure 1 of the submission to the north of the proposed sports park access road and amalgamate it into the proposed Council wetland on Peacocks Road.
40	AJ and HC Koppens	40.3	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps Peacocke Precinct - Features Map	Seismic setback line	Oppose	The area is not steep and is a maximum of 2m deep (with the exception of the western corner). Secondly, the submitters consider that this line is too arbitrary and is misleading for these sites. It is acknowledged that works should not be undertaken on those sites unless they can be supported by a geotechnical assessment, however, for that line to be in one of these maps is considered to be detrimental to potential residents. Given it is on a map it would make it difficult for such a line to be removed even if sites were developed, under geotechnical supervision, in the future. Instead, it is more appropriate for the requirement for geotechnical testing to be included on a title and when the study is undertaken, that owner could apply to have the tag removed from the title.	Remove seismic setback line.
40	AJ and HC Koppens	40.4	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps Peacocke Precinct - Features Map	Significant Natural Area location	Support	Support the location of the Significant Natural Area at 20 Peacocks Lane shown on the Peacocke Precinct – Features Map. Furthermore, there is the potential that that Significant Natural Area could be extended into the western corner of the site at 20 Peacocks Lane where in the incised gully.	Retain significant natural area overlay on 20 Peacocks Lane as notified or extend to the northeast (with associated planting) to enable piping of the stream and filling of the gully.
40	AJ and HC Koppens	40.5	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps Peacocke Precinct - Features Map	Peat lakes and wetlands	Oppose	There is no ecological basis for the area at 20 Peacocks Lane being identified as Peat Lakes and Wetlands on Peacocke Precinct- Features Map. AJ and HC Koppens seek that that notation be removed. AJ and HC Koppens will provide an ecological / geotechnical assessment that will outline the ecological qualities of that part of the site. It is noted that that part of the site is proposed, by Council, to be roading access to the adjacent park to the northwest. Filling a gully and putting an access over it seems to be at odds with the Peat Lakes and Wetlands notation.	Remove Peat lakes and Wetlands area from site at 20 Peacocks Lane identified on Map 57B.
40	AJ and HC Koppens	40.6	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps Peacocke Precinct - Features Map	Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area	Oppose	The Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area notation on Map No: 57B is opposed. That area does not represent a gully of significance but could more appropriately be described as depressed farmland. The western corner of the site is appropriate for that notation as it is an incised gully. Given that there is no justifiable reason for the gully (with the exception of this corner) to be protected this notation should be removed as it will unfairly inhibit AJ and HC Koppens' land from reaching its developable potential. AJ and HC Koppens propose that the gully is filled in to provide additional buildable area on the site. It is noted that, for the Council access to the park to be installed, an approximately 50m length of culvert will be required. The filling of the gully will merely represent an additional length of piping. To compensate this it is proposed that the SNA be extended to the north of the Bat corridor Waikato River Gully and Hazard Area current location and slightly into the western corner of the site at 20 Peacocks Lane.	Remove Waikato River and Gully Hazard area from 20 Peacocks Lane identified on Map 57B.
40	AJ and HC Koppens	40.7	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Significant Bat Habitat Area	Oppose	Oppose provisions related to the protection of the Bat corridor as it applies to 20 Peacocks Lane, specifically its inclusion on Map 57B: Natural Features Map and the related DEV01- PSP. The submitter opposes the 50m bat corridor as it applies to the identified area given bats are not expected to pass through or reside here due to highly urbanised environment , nearby bypass, highly modified rural pasture and few existing established trees. In light of this, the Link appear highly unlikely to achieve its purpose and instead appears to be an unnecessary restriction on land identified for residential development, the main purpose of the plan change.	Amend Map 57B to alter the extent of the bat corridor
40	AJ and HC Koppens	40.8	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP	Oppose	Can the purpose of and additional 5m building setback over and above the 20m buffer be clarified? This appears to be a 'double dipping'with regard setback requirements. The site at 20 Peacocks Lane is to be zoned for High Density Housing however, this setback will further reduce the buildable area on this block of land.	Clarify purpose behind 5m building setback from bat buffer.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.1	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O14	Oppose	The submitter opposes DEV01-PSP: O14 – the ecological and open space corridors identified on 66 & 76A Peacocks Lane. The submitter opposes DEV01-PSP: O14, DEV01-PSP: P35-37, – the ecological and open space corridors identified on 66 & 76A Peacocks Lane, Peacocke ('area of interest') and the proposed 20m buffer and the 5m development setback on the area of interest. Contours should be used as opposed to high level mapping. The shaded areas on planning maps do not follow gully areas, and are only generally indicative. Bats do not generally mix with high density residential development and major arterial traffic routes. These objectives and policies will take away significant buildable areas and makes most peninsula areas with gully on both sides unable to be used at all – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential medium density. It is unreasonable to burden individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Natural Open Space for the mitigation and compensation of these adverse effects of development. It is appropriate that HCC purchases the land and compensates affected landowners, and takes responsibility for its creation/planting and maintenance.	Delete the open space corridors on the area of interest or alternatively, they should be limited to the top of the bank to top of the bank, or 1m below the highest contour on the gully bank.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP components (a) and (c) of the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Oppose	The submitter opposes the DEV01-PSP components (a) and (c) of the Peacocke Structure Plan. (a) The Mangakotukutuku Gully ('the Gully') should be utilised for open space purposes, but not solely for bats. It is not clear why a nominal 20m buffer/corridor from the top of the bank be reserved for bats to come up from the gully and into a residential environment. Once this area is developed in medium and high density residential it is unlikely that any bats will be present. (c) SNA: The submitter opposes a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully.The submitter opposes the nominal 20m buffer amd 5m development setback. If the bat habitat is to be applied, it should be limited to the top of the bank. Upper terraces should be used for residential development only.	The submitter opposes a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully. The submitter opposes the nominal 20m buffer. It is submitted that bat habitat (if applied) should be limited to top of bank to top of bank. Upper terraces should be used for residential development only being the predominant purpose of the plan change.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R15	Oppose	A duplex is not considered to be a high -density form of residential development within a Medium Density area. The amendment will reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements. Non -compliance with a rule would more than likely default the activity status to restricted discretionary.	Amend the activity status for Rule 15 is amended from restricted discretionary to a controlled activity.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R16	Support in Part	The submitter generally supports the extent of Rule 16 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the MDZ. The submitter seeks that Rule 16 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 16 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.5	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R17 Apartment Building	Support	The submitter generally supports the extent of Rule 17 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the Medium Density Residential Zone. Higher density apartment dwellings are suitable outcomes for Peacocke MDZ. The submitter seeks that Rule 17 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 17 is retained as currently worded.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
41	Shortbread Limited	41.6	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R36 Maximum site coverage	Support in Part	The submitter considers that more clarity is provided in regard to coverage. This needs to be more specific – site coverage of what area? Left over area after 20m buffer or overall site?	Amend to provide more clarity as to what is included in 'site coverage'
41	Shortbread Limited	41.7	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R37 Permeable surfaces and landscaping	Support in Part	The submitter opposes Rule (1) and (2). It is submitted that 20% permeable surface / 50%, 40% & 30% landscaping are overly prescriptive and not every situation will meet these %. We would argue that there are other types of permeable finishes that are not catered for in this rule. Examples being rock gardens, mulch cover, permeable pavers. We suggest landscaping is to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	Amend so that landscaping is assessed on a case-by-case basis.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.8	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R38 Building height	Support	It is considered 12m is appropriate for the development in Peacocke Precinct generally. The submitter seeks that Rule 38 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 38 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.9	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 Setbacks	Oppose	In consideration of the matters raised for DEV01-PSP Components (c), the submitter considers that a 5m setback to a nominal 20m corridor width is too restrictive and poorly defined. MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 will unnecessarily take away further buildable areas and makes certain areas (such as peninsulas with gullies either side) unable to be used at all. It defeats the purpose of re-zoning the land to residential medium density. Hence, the submitter seeks that the 5m setback from significant bat habitat area boundary to be removed.	Delete the 5m setback from significant bat habitat area boundary.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.10	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R40 Height in relation to boundary	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate. The submitter seeks that Rule 40 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 40 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R41 Public interface	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate. The submitter seeks that Rule 41 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 41 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.12	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R42 Accessory buildings and Parking	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 42 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 42 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.13	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R43 Outlook Space	Support	Although private agreement has no bearing on District Plan wording stronger design outcomes should or could provide more robust options for ensuring external outlook is not the driving force behind the sterilisation of future development rights.	None stated.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.14	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R44 Outdoor living area	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate. The submitter seeks that Rule 44 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 44 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.15	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R45 Service Areas	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 45 is retained as currently worded	The submitter seeks that Rule 45 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.16	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R46 Fences and Walls	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 46 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 46 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.17	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R47 Separation and Privacy	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 47 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 47 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.18	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R48 Residnetial Unit Size	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 48 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 48 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.19	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: Objectives and Policies	Oppose	The submitter considers that the open space areas are inaccurately mapped and hence are too restrictive in balancing residential land availability. The major arterial road from Southern Links will sit within / alongside the Gully, so unlikely to attract or retain bats in locality. Better justification for Peacocke Precinct the natural open space is green open gully areas / stormwater functions / recreation.	The submitter seeks a change from the natural open space to green open gully areas / stormwater functions / recreation, as the presence of bats is negligible.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.20	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: R36 Setbacks	Oppose	It is not clear how council defined the significant natural area boundary. This should be limited to top of bank to top of bank. Vague lines at high scale do not define boundaries very well and cause confusion and/or areas to be considered as SNA that are not, at consent stage. Contours should be used as opposed to high level mapping, or a descriptive wording as to how the area is to be defined – ie: 1m below the upper contour of the gully bank. It is submitted that the gully hazard area already identifies land that may be subject to instability due to proximity to gully edge. The purpose of the additional 6m buffer is a further unnecessary constraint on residential development. Oppose additional 6m buffer. This 5m setback requirement from the SNA seems to be superfluous, with no practical purpose other than to further restrict development area for no purpose.	Contours should be used as opposed to high level mapping, or a descriptive wording as to how the area is to be defined – ie: 1m below the upper contour of the gully bank. Also opposes additional 6m buffer. Delete the proposed seismic setback line that might affect 66 & 76A Peacocks Lane as lateral land movement is never observed on site. Amend to provide a more balanced account of ecological preservation and residential land availability is provided.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.21	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R13 Provision of Esplanade Reserves and Strips	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed esplanade reserve identified on 66 & 76A Peacocks Lane. As evidenced from the photos attached, there is no watercourse observed on the site.	Delete proposed esplanade reserve on 66 & 76A Peacocks Lane.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.22	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R14 Design Standards	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 14 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 14 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.23	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 Minimum allotment size for vacant sites	Support	Agreed with the intention of the rule being to stimulate growth in higher density areas. The submitter seeks that Rule 15 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 15 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.24	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R16 Subdivision Suitability	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 16 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 16 is retained as currently worded.

**Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan**  
**Summary of Submissions**

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
41	Shortbread Limited	41.25	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R17 Allotment shape	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 17 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 17 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.26	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R18 Block Structure and roading	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 18 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 18 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.27	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R19 Culs de sac	Oppose	The Submitter opposes Rule 19. A maximum 150m is restrictive. Cul de sac can function at lengths greater than 150m.	Delete/amend Rule 19.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.28	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20 Provision of parking and access	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 20 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 20 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.29	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R21 Roading and Access	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 21 is retained as currently worded.	The submitter seeks that Rule 21 is retained as currently worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.30	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 Provision of Ecological Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the 50m bat corridor as it applies to the identified area, given that bats are not expected to come into or remain within a high / medium density residential area, with the main gully adjoining the proposed major arterial roading link to the Southern Links bypass motorway. Furthermore, based on the site inspection the proposed bat corridor adjacent Peacocks Lane linking to Waikato River is highly modified rural pasture and over a hill, with limited or no trees between Peacocks Lane and the Waikato River. Link unlikely to function, and extremely restrictive on residential development being the main purpose of the plan change.	Amend in response to submission point.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.31	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.5 Rules – Specific Activities	Support in Part	This rule is incorrectly worded – 600 m3 in area?? Does Council mean 600 m3 in volume or 600 m2 in area. What is the purpose of this rule?	Amend provision as incorrectly worded.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.32	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-1: Peacocke Structure Plan – Land Use	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed stormwater wetland location in SC-7 and delineation on the identified area due to the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is located on the upper terraced area where residential development should occur.</li> <li>• Discharge from upper terraced area into gullies will be a significant drop and likely require significant energy dissipation features to be constructed down the gully banks.</li> <li>• The indicative stormwater device is significantly oversized</li> <li>• Stormwater wetlands will be required to be constructed at a level lower than the surrounding flat terrace to be utilised for residential development, this will enable stormwater to enter the wetland by gravity. Having wetlands on upper terraces will require significant excavation to lower wetlands to enable all residential area with the catchment to drain to the wetland. As such it is considered that the wetland stormwater pond needs to be located at the head of the gully areas that have no major ecological value (such as that photographed below) to enable logical discharge and to allow stormwater from developed terraced areas to be able to discharge by gravity to wetlands.</li> </ul>	The submitter seeks that the location and declination of the proposed stormwater wetland is amended as indicated in the attached stormwater assessment.
41	Shortbread Limited	41.33	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15 – 6b	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate. The submitter seeks that Table 15 – 6b is retained as currently indicated.	The submitter seeks that Table 15 – 6b is retained as currently indicated.
42	Ohaupo Land LP	42.1	General	Ecology (Bat Corridor)	Support in Part	We seek to understand the intention of extending the proposed bat corridor westwards out of the Peacocke Structure Plan Area. As identified Figure 3 and 4 (within Appendix j) there are no known roosting sites or identified and/or assumed linkages between important habitat features for the long-tailed bat within the SL1 land area. Similarly, the ecology report outlines that 'There is currently no indication that isolated trees within open pasture (including single line shelterbelts) had been utilised as bat roost trees.' This being the predominant landscape features within the SL1 eastern area. There are also ambiguities and inconsistencies within Appendix J which we seek further clarification on. This includes the understanding of the long-tailed bats home range; 'Individual long-tailed bat homes ranges are an average of circa 700–1600 ha... Hamilton long-tailed bat population makes use of exotic and indigenous vegetation across a large homerange, perhaps extending over an extent of 5-10 km.' (Appendix J, pg. 5). This interpretation of the long-tailed bats home range is relatively ambiguous, i.e., 5km vs 10km. Which could have potential implication for the development opportunities within the SL1 land area.	We seek to understand the intention of extending the proposed bat corridor westwards out of the Peacocke Structure Plan Area. There is a link westward indicating a 'proposed bat corridor' as shown below that could limit development potential. Buffers either side of these corridors are proposed. We do not sight a strong evidence basis to enable a 'proposed bat corridor' rather we seek Council to protect, maintain and enhance existing corridors and not propose new ones over highways towards our land which holds little to no vegetation.
42	Ohaupo Land LP	42.2	General	Density	Support in Part	Medium Density Residential Standards Bill needs to be accounted for and align with future PC5 urban outcomes. Lot size and density supported but needs to align with NPSUD and MDRS Bill.	Alignment with national direction is required. Seek the on lot outcomes to align with the Medium Density Residential Standards and NPS Urban Development outcomes.
42	Ohaupo Land LP	42.3	General	Water Reservoir	Support in Part	A second reservoir is shown on the infrastructure staging plan (south of the existing Hamilton South reservoir). We seek clarification on the establishment of this reservoir and its development capacity to service the wider catchment to meet the development capacity expectations of the region.	Enablement of the second reservoir in the infrastructure chapters and structure plan to cater for strategic growth over the medium term and long term; and responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.
42	Ohaupo Land LP	42.4	General	Infrastructure Staging (servicing)	Support in Part	Restricts growth and is not enabling. See NPS UD directives below: Objective 2: Planning decisions <u>improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets.</u> Objective 6: Local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are: <u>integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions; and strategic over the medium term and long term; and responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.</u>	Alignment with national direction is required. Flexibility in infrastructure provision so different stages can come on line as and when urban environments are able to be developed to contribute to sufficient capacity.
42	Ohaupo Land LP	42.5	General	Transport Network	Support in Part	Realignment of Hall Road. We support the stopping of current Hall Road as safety issues are present. However, question the new connection point at State Highway 3 which abuts several smaller lots. Seek a location south below the proposed reservoir locations.	We seek further consideration to move the road further south to take advantage of roading efficiencies with the land owned by Ohaupo Land LP. We seek to slow the speed limit by promoting an signalised intersection or roundabout.
43	Golden Valley Farms	43.1	General	Ecology (Bat Corridor)	Support in Part	We seek to understand the intention of extending the proposed bat corridor westwards out of the Peacocke Structure Plan Area. As identified Figure 3 and 4 (within Appendix j) there are no known roosting sites or identified and/or assumed linkages between important habitat features for the long-tailed bat within the SL1 land area. Similarly, the ecology report outlines that 'There is currently no indication that isolated trees within open pasture (including single line shelterbelts) had been utilised as bat roost trees.' This being the predominant landscape features within the SL1 eastern area. There are also ambiguities and inconsistencies within Appendix J which we seek further clarification on. This includes the understanding of the long-tailed bats home range; 'Individual long-tailed bat homes ranges are an average of circa 700–1600 ha... Hamilton long-tailed bat population makes use of exotic and indigenous vegetation across a large homerange, perhaps extending over an extent of 5-10 km.' (Appendix J, pg. 5). This interpretation of the long-tailed bats home range is relatively ambiguous, i.e., 5km vs 10km. Which could have potential implication for the development opportunities within the SL1 land area.	We seek to understand the intention of extending the proposed bat corridor westwards out of the Peacocke Structure Plan Area. There is a link westward indicating a 'proposed bat corridor' as shown below that could limit development potential. Buffers either side of these corridors are proposed. We do not sight a strong evidence basis to enable a 'proposed bat corridor' rather we seek Council to protect, maintain and enhance existing corridors and not propose new ones over highways towards our land which holds little to no vegetation.
43	Golden Valley Farms	43.2	General	Density	Support in Part	Medium Density Residential Standards Bill needs to be accounted for and align with future PC5 urban outcomes. Lot size and density supported but needs to align with NPS Urban Development and Medium Density Residential Standards Bill.	Alignment with national direction is required. Seek the on lot outcomes to align with the MDRS and NPS UD outcomes.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
43	Golden Valley Farms	43.3	General	Water Reservoir	Support in Part	A second reservoir is shown on the infrastructure staging plan (south of the existing Hamilton South reservoir). We seek clarification on the establishment of this reservoir and its development capacity to service the wider catchment to meet the development capacity expectations of the region.	Enablement of the second reservoir in the infrastructure chapters and structure plan to cater for strategic growth over the medium term and long term; and responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.
43	Golden Valley Farms	43.4	General	Infrastructure Staging (servicing)	Support in Part	Restricts growth and is not enabling. See NPS UD directives below: Objective 2: Planning decisions improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets. Objective 6: Local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are: integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions; and strategic over the medium term and long term; and responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.	Alignment with national direction is required. Flexibility in infrastructure provision so different stages can come on line as and when urban environments are able to be developed to contribute to sufficient capacity.
43	Golden Valley Farms	43.5	General	Transport Network	Support in Part	Realignment of Hall Road. We support the stopping of current Hall Road as safety issues are present. However, question the new connection point at State Highway 3 which abuts several smaller lots. Seek a location south below the proposed reservoir locations.	We seek further consideration to move the road further south to take advantage of roading efficiencies with the land owned by Ohaupo Land LP. We seek to slow the speed limit by promoting a signalised intersection or roundabout.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.1	General	Whole Plan Change (including Planning Maps and Structure Plan Maps)	Support in Part	Cordylne Holdings supports the proposed plan change in part insofar as it will enable up to 8400 residential units, supported by a commercial centre, open space and includes a structure plan to guide development.	Approve the plan change, subject to: a) Amendments to enable appropriate development of high density residential on the land held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002; b) The amendments set out in the submissions below; c) Further, consequential or alternative relief as may be necessary, desirable, or appropriate to give effect to the concerns set out in this submission.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.2	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-1: Peacocke Structure Plan – Land Use	Support in Part	Cordylne Holdings seeks that the Proposed Neighbourhood Park annotation on the map is deleted from the land held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002 and relocated to the south to the position shown on Figure 2-3: Peacock Structure Plan – Natural Environment and Heritage. The plan in Figure 2-1 makes provision for a substantial area of Proposed Natural Open Space for the Whatukoruru Reserve and 16 Proposed Neighbourhood Parks within the structure plan. Locating the Proposed Neighbourhood Park shown on the land held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002 further to the south will achieve a better distribution of open space within the High Density Overlay Area in the structure plan area. Cordylne Holdings seeks that the Proposed Stormwater Wetland annotation on the map is deleted from the land held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002. The supporting technical assessment does not provide an assessment of the number, size and distribution of Proposed Stormwater Wetlands. Flexibility is provided for in the ICMP in relation to the sizing of stormwater management devices and therefore it is not appropriate to identify fixed locations as part of the Structure Plan. Further information on the supporting technical assessment is requested.	Make amendments to the plan in Figure 2-1 as follows: a) Delete Proposed Neighbourhood Park from the land held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002 and relocate to the south to the position shown on Figure 2-3: Peacock Structure Plan – Natural Environment and Heritage. b) Delete the Proposed Stormwater Wetlands from the land held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.3	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-2: Peacocke Structure Plan – Transport Network	Support in Part	Cordylne Holdings seeks that the Proposed Collector Roads shown on the map is deleted from the land held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002. Cordylne Holdings agrees with the explanation in Chapter 3A – Structure Plan, that the final alignment of the transport network (other than those routes that are already designated) should be determined as individual subdivisions are progressed. This will ensure that the layout of the road network achieves block lengths and depths that are able to accommodate the anticipated housing typologies.	Delete the Proposed Collector Roads shown on the land held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002. Amend the maps to clarify that the transport network is indicative only and is not intended to show exact alignments.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.4	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-3: Peacocke Structure Plan – Natural Environment and Heritage	Support in Part	Cordylne Holdings supports the location of the Proposed Bat Corridor and Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area as shown on the plan in Figure 2-3. The extent of the proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area shown on the maps is supported by a robust technical assessment and will give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. Cordylne Holdings also supports the location of the Proposed Neighbourhood Parks as shown on the plan in Figure 2-3, as it will achieve an appropriate distribution of open space within the High Density Overlay Area in the structure plan area. Cordylne Holdings seeks amendment to the plan to delete the Proposed Stormwater Wetlands from its land and part of the Proposed Esplanade Reserve on Lot 8 DP 408579 and Lot 6 DP 408579 of its land. The GIS view is inconsistent with Figure 2-3 and shows two additional small areas of Proposed Esplanade Reserve, as marked up in the attached. Cordylne Holdings seeks that these areas are also deleted and that the GIS viewer is updated to be consistent with Figure 2-3. The three areas of Proposed Esplanade Reserve shown on the image above do not relate to a watercourse and as such, no esplanade reserve should be required in these locations. Retaining the Proposed Neighbourhood Park in the location shown on Figure 2-3 will achieve a better distribution of open space within the High Density Overlay Area in the structure plan area.	Retain the plan in Figure 2-3 and the annotations shown in relation to the following: a) Proposed Bat Corridor b) Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area c) Proposed Neighbourhood Park Amend the plan in Figure 2-3 as follows: a) Delete the Proposed Esplanade Reserve shown on Lot 8 DP 408579 Lot 6 DP 408579, held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002. b) Delete the Proposed Stormwater Wetlands from the land held in Computer Freehold Register Identifier 628002. Ensure the GIS view and figures in Appendix 2 are consistent with the figures in the Peacocke Structure Plan – Natural Environment and Heritage.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.5	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-3a: Peacocke Structure Plan – Staging and Infrastructure	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the staging plan. The staging plan will assist in the sequencing and timing of development. This is supported as it provides certainty for land owners within the structure plan area.	Retain the staging plan as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.6	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-3b: Peacocke Structure Plan – Peacocke Local Centre Concept	Oppose	Cordylne Holdings opposes the extent of the Proposed Education Facility shown in Figure 2-3b. The Proposed Education Facility is shown on Figures 2-1 and 2-2 at an indicative location. While it is understood that the Ministry of Education is undertaking due diligence to designate land for two schools in the Peacocke Structure Plan area, a notice of requirement has not yet been lodged. There is no information in the Section 32 Evaluation to support the size or location of future schools, as such this diagram should be amended to clearly show any Proposed Education Facility is indicative only and will be subject to a future notice of requirement process.	Amend Figure 2-3b to reduce the extent of the Proposed Education Facility and to clearly state facility is indicative only and will be subject to a future notice of requirement process.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.7	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Seismic Setback Line	Oppose	Oppose the Seismic Setback Line and seek deletion. Cordylne Holdings opposes the identification of Seismic Setback Line on the Features maps for the Peacocke Precinct (which are shown as a Stability Sensitive Areas on the GIS viewer). The extent of the Seismic Setback Line/Stability Sensitive Areas will impose additional costs on applicants to prepare geotechnical assessments of land where no demonstrable risk exists. The section 32 evaluation does not provide any consideration of the potential increased insurance costs that this provision may give rise to. Furthermore, it is unnecessary as section 106 of the Resource Management Act enables consent authorities to refuse a subdivision consent if there is a significant risk from natural hazards. Further information is requested on the technical analysis relating to the location of the Seismic Setback Line.	Delete the Seismic Setback Line shown on the Features Maps for the Peacocke Precinct.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.8	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Maps No: 57A and 57B	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the zoning map and features map as notified. The proposed Medium Density Residential zone will assist in providing additional housing to meet the needs of Hamilton. The proposed High Density Overlay area applies to land that is in proximity to planned public transport routes and flat terrace areas that are suitable for higher density development.	Retain maps no: 57A and 57B as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.9	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Maps No: 64A and 64B	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the zoning map and features map, subject to the amendments requested in relation to the Seismic Setback Line. The proposed Medium Density Residential zone will assist in providing additional housing to meet the needs of Hamilton. The proposed High Density Overlay area applies to land that is in proximity to planned public transport routes and flat terrace areas that are suitable for higher density development. The extent of the proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area shown on the maps is supported by a robust technical assessment and will give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Retain maps no: 64A and 64B as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.10	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the Peacocke Structure Plan. In particular, it supports the description of the Peacocke Transportation Network and in particular, the text that clarifies that the transport network is indicative and not intended to show exact alignments. Cordylne Holdings agrees that the final alignment of the transport network (other than those routes that are already designated) should be determined as individual subdivisions are progressed. This will ensure that block lengths and depths are able to accommodate the anticipated housing typologies.	Retain Chapter 3A as notified and make consequential amendments to all maps in Appendix 2 to clarify that the transport network is indicative only and is not intended to show exact alignments. Amend the typical cross sections to show these at a sufficient size to ensure the legibility of the text.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: Issues	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the description of the issues for the Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.12	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP:O4	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the proposed approach to zoning which focuses the greatest density around identified activity nodes, corridors and areas of natural amenity.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.13	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: O5	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the anticipated building heights of two to three-storeys in the medium density zone and two to five storeys in the high-density overlay area, as this will enable an efficient use of land, that will enable a range of housing typologies.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.14	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: O9	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the intended outcome to create an attractive and safe urban environment, as this will achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.15	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: P5	Oppose	The policy is inconsistent with Chapter 3A, which states that the provision of the transport network and amenities such as parks are indicative only and will be determined at the time of subdivision.	Amend policy P5 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: "Ensure the efficient development of land by requiring development to demonstrate it is <u>generally</u> consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan."
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.16	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: P19	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the intent of the policy to deliver a high amenity environment, as this will achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act and give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.17	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: P24	Oppose	Clause 3 of the policy refers to 'otherwise complying with the Peacocke Structure Plan'. This is too onerous as it implies that indicative/proposed land uses shown in Appendix 2 (including the transport network and proposed parks, stormwater wetlands and other features) are to be provided in fixed locations and are final. Furthermore, this is inconsistent with Chapter 3A which states that land uses, including transport networks and parks, are indicative and not intended to show exact alignments. A degree of flexibility is required to enable amendments once detailed design and master planning takes place on a finer grain than that undertaken for the structure plan process.	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 <del>complying with</del> <u>being generally consistent with</u> the Peacocke Structure Plan."
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.18	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R3	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the permitted activity status for single dwellings that meet the prescribed development standards and restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved. Cordylne Holdings seeks amendments are made to the matters of discretion/assessment criteria to clarify that development should be generally consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Retain as notified, subject to amendments to matter of discretion P – Peacocke Structure Plan (as set out in the section of this submission that relates to Appendix 1 – District Plan Administration – Assessment Criteria).
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.19	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R15	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the restricted discretionary activity status for duplex dwellings that meet the prescribed development standards and restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved. This is appropriate as it will enable applicants to undertake a more focussed analysis of the proposal and will reduce the costs and complexity of the resource consent application process. Cordylne Holdings seeks that amendments are made to the matters of discretion/assessment criteria to clarify that development should be generally consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Retain as notified, subject to amendments to matter of discretion P – Peacocke Structure Plan (as set out in the section of this submission that relates to Appendix 1 – District Plan Administration – Assessment Criteria).
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.20	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R16	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the restricted discretionary activity status for terrace dwellings that meet the prescribed development standards and restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved. This is appropriate as it will enable applicants to undertake a more focussed analysis of the proposal and will reduce the costs and complexity of the resource consent application process. Cordylne Holdings seeks amendments are made to the matters of discretion/assessment criteria to clarify that development should be generally consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Retain as notified, subject to amendments to matter of discretion P – Peacocke Structure Plan (as set out in the section of this submission that relates to Appendix 1 – District Plan Administration – Assessment Criteria).
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.21	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R17	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the restricted discretionary activity status for apartment buildings that meet the prescribed development standards and restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved. This is appropriate as it will enable applicants to undertake a more focussed analysis of the proposal and will reduce the costs and complexity of the resource consent application process. Cordylne Holdings seeks amendments are made to the matters of discretion/assessment criteria to clarify that development should be generally consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Retain as notified, subject to amendments to matter of discretion P – Peacocke Structure Plan (as set out in the section of this submission that relates to Appendix 1 – District Plan Administration – Assessment Criteria).
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.22	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R26	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the restricted discretionary activity status for retirement villages that meet the prescribed development standards and restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved. This is appropriate as it will enable applicants to undertake a more focussed analysis of the proposal and will reduce the costs and complexity of the resource consent application process. Cordylne Holdings seeks amendments are made to the matters of discretion/assessment criteria to clarify that development should be generally consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Retain as notified, subject to amendments to matter of discretion P – Peacocke Structure Plan (as set out in the section of this submission that relates to Appendix 1 – District Plan Administration – Assessment Criteria).
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.23	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R36	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the maximum site coverage standards, as this control will enable a higher density of development while retaining sufficient space for outdoor living on sites.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.24	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R39	Oppose	Cordylne Holdings opposes clause 7, which applies a 6m setback from the Waikato Riverbank and Gully areas. This provision is not consistent with the district-wide objectives and policies.	Delete clause 7 of R39 Setbacks.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.25	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R40	Oppose	Cordylne Holdings supports the inclusion of clause 3, which provides for an alternative height in relation to boundary control for development within 20m of the transport corridor boundary. This control will enable more development close to streets, while preserving daylight and sunlight to the rear of sites. However, amendments are sought to clause 2 of the rule to clarify that the clause 2 does not apply to buildings within 20m of the transport corridor boundary.	Amend clause 2 of R40 Height in relation to boundary as follows: "For side and rear boundaries, no part of any building shall protrude through a height control plan rising at an angle of 45 degrees, <u>except that this does not apply to buildings that are within 20m of the transport corridor boundary.</u> "
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.26	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1 – PSP: R44	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports this standard and in particular, the provision for 20m <sup>2</sup> of outdoor living area where residential units are located in the High Density Overlay. The plan change provisions will enable a network of open space, parks and walking and cycling facilities that will provide a high level of amenity for residents living in the High Density Overlay area.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.27	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: O6	Support in Part	Amendments sought, this objective is inconsistent with Chapter 3A, which states that the provision of the transport network and amenities such as parks are indicative only and will be determined at the time of subdivision.	Amend objective O6 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: "Subdivision contributes to a well-designed urban environmental that is <u>generally</u> consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan."

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.28	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: O7	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the intent for subdivision to enable a range of housing typologies, as this will give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.29	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: O8	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the intent for subdivision to enable a transport network that will establish a high-quality urban environment, as this will give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.30	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: P8	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the policy intent for subdivision to enable a transport network that will establish a high-quality urban environment, as this will give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.31	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: P9	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the proposed approach to enable the efficient use of land in locations close to the Peacocke Local Centre and identified public transport routes. This policy gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.32	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: P14	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports this policy as it provides recognition that connections to adjacent sites can be provided where feasible.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.33	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: P15	Support in Part	Cordylne Holdings supports the provision of open space that is of a size and distribution commensurate to the density of anticipated development. It is concerned that the reference to Council’s Open Space Provision Policy is uncertain, as this document has not been incorporated by reference and could be changed at any time.	Amend policy P15 as follows: "Require subdivision to provide for areas of open space that are: 1. Located in areas that are accessible to pedestrians. 2. Of a size and <del>frequency</del> <u>distribution</u> suitable for the density expected in the Peacocke Structure Plan <del>and consistent with Council's Open Space Provision Policy.</del> 3. Designed to be safe and useable for people of all abilities."
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.34	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: P17	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports this policy, as it would enable super block development to facilitate the delivery of high-density development.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.35	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R4	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the restricted discretionary activity status for fee simple subdivision that meet the prescribed development standards and restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved. This is appropriate as it will enable applicants to undertake a more focussed analysis of the proposal and will reduce the costs and complexity of the resource consent application process.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.36	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R5	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the restricted discretionary activity status for unit title subdivision that meet the prescribed development standards and restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved. This is appropriate as it will enable applicants to undertake a more focussed analysis of the proposal and will reduce the costs and complexity of the resource consent application process.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.37	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R8	Support in Part	Amendments sought Cordylne Holdings supports the restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision to accommodate a network utility service that meet the prescribed development standards and restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved. This is appropriate as it will enable applicants to undertake a more focussed analysis of the proposal and will reduce the costs and complexity of the resource consent application process. Cordylne Holdings opposes the inclusion of subdivision to accommodate a transport corridor in the Peacocke Precinct. Any subdivision that results in the vesting of roads for the transport corridor will create balance lots that would be held in fee simple. As such, the inclusion of a specific rule for the transport corridor is unnecessary and would duplicate (SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R4).	Amend rule R8 as follows: "Subdivision to accommodate a network utility service <del>or transport corridor</del> in Peacocke Precinct."
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.38	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R9	Support in Part	Amendments sought Cordylne Holdings opposes the discretionary activity status of subdivision of an allotment that contains a Significant Natural Area. Where a subdivision creates allotments that are to be vested as open space and which wholly contain a Significant Natural Area, then the activity status should provide for consideration as a restricted discretionary activity, as this is consistent with objectives and policies for subdivision in the Peacocke Structure Plan area.	Amend rule R9 as follows: Activity Status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary where the following are complied with: <del>R</del> DIS-1 1. SUB-PREC1-PSP: R12-R25. <u>2. All allotments that contain a Significant Natural Area identified in Volume 2, Appendix 9, Schedule 9C are vested as open space.</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>1. C – Character and Amenity</u> <u>2. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</u> Activity Status where compliance not achieve with <del>R</del> DIS-1: Discretionary
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.39	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R13	Support in Part	Amendments sought. Cordylne Holdings supports the provision of esplanade reserves and strips, however is opposed to the provision of these in situations where the Peacocke Structure Plan identifies proposed esplanade reserves that do not relate to a watercourse with an average width of 3m or more.	Amend rule R13 as follows: An Esplanade Reserve or Esplanade Strip of not less than 20m measured from the edge of any river or lake shall be set aside and vested in Council in accordance with section 231 of the Act where any subdivision of land results in the creation of an allotment that adjoins the banks of: a) The Waikato River. b) The margins of Lake Rotoroa (Hamilton Lake). c) Any watercourse where the average width of the bed is 3m or more where the river flows through or adjoins an allotment. d) Where a reserve or road of less than 20m width already exists along the edge of any river or lake, then additional land shall be vested to increase the minimum width to 20m. <del>Or</del> <del>e) Is identified in the Peacocke Structure Plan as required to provide an Esplanade Reserve.</del> Or in the alternate, amend the Peacocke Structure Plan maps as detailed elsewhere in this submission.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.40	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R15	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports the minimum allotment sizes for vacant sites, as these standards provide certainty that a complying building can be constructed in situations where subdivision precedes resource consent for land use.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.41	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R18	Oppose	Cordylne Holdings opposes the maximum block length and maximum block perimeter standards. It is unclear whether this standard could be complied with when considered in conjunction with the proposed transport network shown in Figure 2-2 for the Peacocke Structure Plan (at Appendix 2).	Delete design standard SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R18.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.42	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R22	Support in Part	Amendments sought. Cordylne Holdings supports the provision of parks to enhance the amenity of the area for future residents, however it opposes the overly prescriptive standard requiring no dwellings to be more than 500m from a neighbourhood park. This standard lacks certainty and will be complex to administer in a situation where parks may be vested in one stage, before the design and layout of adjacent development is known.	Amend rule R22 as follows: 1) Where a Neighbourhood Park is identified as being required in the Peacocke Structure Plan, a neighbourhood park shall be provided that meets the following standards: a) Minimum area 5,000m <sup>2</sup> b) Minimum transport corridor frontage 50% of the perimeter of the total park boundary. c) Is able to accommodate a 30m x 30m square area. d) Is generally flat. <del>2) Neighbourhood parks shall be located so that no residential dwelling is more than 500m from a neighbourhood park.</del>
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.43	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1 – PSP: R24	Support	Cordylne Holdings supports this design standard as it provides certainty, will give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and will provide for the protection of significant habitats of indigenous fauna.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.44	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.5.1 Earthworks in the Peacocke Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Support in Part	Cordylne Holdings supports this rule but seeks clarification that the rule is intended to apply to earthworks 600m <sup>2</sup> in area and not a volume of 600m <sup>3</sup> .	Amend rule 25.2.5.1 to clarify that the standard allows earthworks 600m <sup>2</sup> in area.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.45	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Definition of Apartment Building (Peacocke Precinct)	Support	The definition is necessary to provide clarity to the provisions in Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.46	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Definition of Terrace Dwelling (Peacocke Precinct)	Support	The definition is necessary to provide clarity to the provisions in Chapter 4A – Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain as notified.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.47	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Definition of Urban Block	Support in Part	Amendments sought. The definition refers to lots ‘bounded by roads in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area’. This term does not appear to be used in any of the provisions in Proposed Plan Change 5 and its purpose is unclear.	Clarify the purpose of the term ‘urban block’ and where it is used in Proposed Plan Change 5. If the term would result in a change in activity status due to amendment to the location of roads shown in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area, then amend the definition to enable flexibility in the position of roads.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.48	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2.2.1	Oppose	Cordylne Holdings opposes the information requirements in 1.2.2.2.1, as they are onerous and lack clarity. The level of information required will impose significant costs on applicants preparing resource consent applications. These information requirements are unnecessary given the extensive and detailed assessment criteria in Appendix 1 – 1.3 Assessment Criteria, clause P Peacocke Structure Plan. Furthermore, the wording of the information requirement is inconsistent with Chapter 3A, which states that the provision of the transport network and amenities such as parks are indicative only and will be determined at the time of subdivision.	Delete clause 1.2.2.2.1 Additional Requirements for Concept Plans for the Peacocke Structure Plan.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.49	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P3 Development in the Peacocke Precinct	Support in Part	Amendments sought. Cordylne Holdings opposes the Seismic Setback Line, as the extent of the Seismic Setback Line/Stability Sensitive Areas will impose additional costs on applicants to prepare geotechnical assessments of land where no demonstrable risk exists. The section 32 evaluation does not provide any consideration of the potential increased insurance costs that this provision may give rise to. Furthermore, it is unnecessary as section 106 of the Resource Management Act enables consent authorities to refuse a subdivision consent if there is a significant risk from natural hazards.	Amend P3 by deleting clause (g) which relates to the Seismic Setback Line.
44	Cordylne Holdings Ltd	44.50	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P5 Subdivision in the Peacocke Structure Plan, clauses (u) and (v)	Support in Part	Cordylne Holdings generally supports the assessment criteria in clause P5, but seeks the deletion of clause (u) relating to the Seismic Setback Line for the reasons discussed above. It also seeks amendment to clause (v) to better provide for flexibility in the staging of development.	Amend clause P5 by deleting clause (u) relating to the Seismic Setback Lines and amending clause (v) as follows: (v) Whether the proposal is <u>generally</u> in accordance with the identified staging in the Peacocke Structure Plan.
45	Richard and Ann Pirrit	45.1	Appendix 8 – Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of Lots 1-3 DP 480575 as “Kairokiroki – Waahi Taonga” (A111) and Section 6 SO 538898 as “Borrow Pits” (A140) in Schedule 8C, and any consequential amendments, on the basis that they disagree the sites hold sufficient heritage value after evaluation against the individual heritage criteria.	Remove A111 and A140 from Schedule 8C and any consequential amendments
45	Richard and Ann Pirrit	45.2	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Significant Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of several trees on Lot 1-2 DP 480575 as Significant Trees on the 'Peacock Precinct- Features Map' on the basis that they disagree the trees require protection after evaluation against the 13 categories developed by the Royal New Zealand Institute of Horticulture.	Remove identification of trees on Significant Trees from trees on Lot 1-2 DP 480575 and any consequential amendments.
45	Richard and Ann Pirrit	45.3	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of Waikato River and Gully Hazard area overlay on Lots 1-3 DP 480575 on the basis that it disagrees those lots of land are sufficiently susceptible to land instability because of slope and/or soil types.	Remove Waikato River and Gully Hazard area overlay from Lots 1-3 DP 480575 and any consequential amendments.
45	Richard and Ann Pirrit	45.4	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Seismic Setback Line	Oppose	The submitter opposes the location of the seismic setback line on Lots 1-3 DP 480575 and Section 6 SO 538898 on the basis that it unreasonably interferes with their ability to develop their properties given the Council’s vision to “enable the development of an attractive and sustainable community in Peacocke”.	Remove Seismic setback line from Lots 1-3 DP 480575 and Section 6 SO 538898.
45	Richard and Ann Pirrit	45.5	General	Plan Change 5 inconsistent with RMA	Oppose	In addition to the above reasons, the submitter opposes the various changes under Plan Change 5 as they do not meet the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991, in that they do not represent the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.	Relief sought not stated. General relief seeks amendments to the Plan Change to meet the requirements of the RMA.
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.1	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Chapter 3A, DEV01-PSP:P5	Oppose	The Proposed Bat Corridor diagram on page 16 of Chapter 3A identifies that recreational activities are to be provided within Bat Habitat Areas.	Amend DEV01-PSP:P5 as follows: “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. 5. <u>Bat Habitat Areas.</u> ”
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan, Natural Environment and Open Space Network, Clause (c)	Oppose	The proposed reference to Proposed Bat Corridors is consistent with the term that is used in Figure 2-3 in Appendix 2. The proposed reference to Bat Habitat Areas is consistent with relief sought elsewhere in this submission, including proposed amendments to the Structure Plan and Planning Maps. Referring to areas which are defined on maps will improve the clarity of the provisions. The specific width of the corridors is stated in the Proposed Bat Corridor diagram so it is more appropriate to refer to the actual required width of the corridor in the statement rather than “wide swathes of land”. Reference to planting should also be added because it is intended that these areas will be planted.	Amend Chapter 3A, DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan, Natural Environment and Open Space Network, Clause (c) as follows: “ <u>Proposed</u> Bat Corridors: It is proposed that bat corridors, <u>which are identified as Bat Habitat Areas</u> , be established to retain connectivity between core habitat for bats in the Peacocke area. In terms of <u>these proposed</u> <del>corridor</del> habitats, the most important general principle is that <u>wide swathes 35m wide corridors</u> of land are required to be set aside <del>as bat corridors</del> in order to retain a permeable and functioning landscape for long-tailed bats <u>and to provide for planting.</u> ”



Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan, Natural Environment and Open Space Network, Proposed Bat Corridor Diagram	Oppose	The requirement for a 50m wide corridor is inconsistent with the Environment Court’s findings in Weston Lea Limited & Director-General of Conservation v Hamilton City Council [ENV-2019-AKL-308] where a 35m wide Bat Corridor was deemed appropriate through the Amberfield site. The Amberfield Bat Corridor forms the easternmost part of the same Bat Corridor that is proposed to pass through 29 Peacocks Lane (the ‘Northern Link’). It therefore follows that any Proposed Bat Corridor should be 35m wide rather than 50m wide along its full length.	Amend the Proposed Bat Corridor diagram on page 16 to show a 35m wide bat corridor rather than a 50m wide bat corridor.
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.4	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Chapter 15A, NOSZ – PREC1 P: ISSUES	Oppose	Although most of the Natural Open Space Zone within the Peacocke Structure Plan area is currently privately owned, the Natural Open Space Zone (including Bat Habitat Areas) should logically be public reserves so that they can be set aside for public protection and enhancement and so that they can be used for other purposes, such as public paths and playgrounds which are shown on the Proposed Bat Corridor diagram in Chapter 3A. This should be clearly stated to remove the ambiguity that currently exists. The issues statement should be clear that Bat Habitat Areas are locations where habitat is proposed to be created and that the purpose of this is to mitigate effects of urban development on the long-tailed bat within Peacocke. Recognising, however, that the long-tailed bat’s habitat home range is located across most of Hamilton City and surrounding environments and the required habitat creation will also contribute to the mitigation of existing effects of urbanisation in other parts of Hamilton City on the long-tailed bat.	Amend Chapter 15A, NOSZ – PREC1- P: ISSUES as follows: “The Natural Open Space Zone includes <del>publicly and privately owned</del> areas that possess natural or landscape values <u>or that are locations where Bat Habitat Areas are proposed to be created to mitigate potential effects of urban development within the Peacocke Structure Plan area. The Natural Open Space zoned areas will be acquired as public reserves.”</u>
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.5	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 Provision of Ecological Areas	Oppose	The “provision” of the Proposed Bat Corridors forms part of a proposed approach to mitigate and compensate the effects of development on the long-tailed bat within Peacocke as a whole for the benefit of the long-tailed bat population which inhabits Hamilton and surrounds. It is an unfair burden for the costs and responsibility for the mitigation and compensation of these effects to fall on a limited number of landowners whose land is within the Proposed Bat Corridors. The land within the Proposed Bat Corridor at 29 Peacocks Lane would otherwise be developable without any significant adverse effects. This unfairness is recognised on page 67 of the PC5 s32 Report and page 92 of the PC5 s32 Report which also relates to Proposed Bat Corridors. It is unclear what the requirement in the rule that Proposed Bat Corridors “shall be provided” means. The intent of the rule is presumably that subdividers must vest the land in HCC as local purpose reserve. This presumption is supported by the Natural Open Space zoning of the Proposed Bat Corridors, by the Proposed Bat Corridor diagram in Chapter 3A which shows multi-purpose uses, including paths and playgrounds, and by the reference in the PC5 s32 Report to the possibility of HCC purchasing the land. The Proposed Bat Corridors straddle property boundaries. The land that will be capable of being vested at subdivision stage within any single property will not necessarily be the full ultimate width of the corridor. Given the land is shown on Planning Maps (including by way of zoning) and in the Structure Plan figures, it is clear what area is required to be vested without the need to refer to a width in the rule. The ‘Long-tailed bat report’ (4Sight Consulting, June 2021) commissioned by HCC recommends that planting of new bat foraging and commuting vegetation should occur early and ahead of development. There will likely be delays and impracticalities with the vesting and planting of the Proposed Bat Corridors unless HCC takes a leadership approach by purchasing the land. The requirement for a 50m wide corridor is inconsistent with the Environment Court’s findings in Weston Lea Limited & Director-General of Conservation v Hamilton City Council [ENV-2019-AKL-308] where a 35m wide Bat Corridor was deemed appropriate through the Amberfield site. The Amberfield Bat Corridor forms the easternmost part of the same Bat Corridor that is proposed to pass through 29 Peacocks Lane (the ‘Northern Link’). It therefore follows that any Proposed Bat Corridor should be 35m wide rather than 50m wide along its full length.	That HCC proactively acquires the Proposed Bat Corridors by purchasing the affected land and by being responsible for their creation and ongoing maintenance as Bat Habitat Areas. Also that the following amended wording (or similar) to SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 Provision of Ecological Areas is sought: “Where subdivision includes <u>Natural Open Space zoned</u> areas identified in <u>the Peacocke Structure Plan (Figure 2-3)</u> as <u>Proposed</u> Bat Corridors these shall be <u>vested in Hamilton City Council as local purpose reserve, in accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan and be designed to meet the following requirements:</u> a) <u>a minimum width of 50m.”</u>
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.6	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Rule 25.6.4.4 Peacocke Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Oppose	The proposed amendments achieve consistency with Policies 25.6.2.2a and 25.6.2.2b which refer specifically to “fixed lighting”.	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 <del>Significant</del> Bat Habitat Area.”
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.7	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Appendix 1.2.2.24 Landscape Concept Plans Peacocke Structure Plan Area	Oppose	The Landscape Concept Plan should relate to landscaping within public areas only rather than within private lots. The provisions should be clear that the content of the Landscape Concept Plan should relate to open space zones and the other public infrastructure described in (i), namely streets, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater swales, wetlands, detention basins, streams and riparian margins, as relevant to the subject site. A Landscape Concept Plan should not be required where public land is not existing, proposed or required for a particular site.	Amend Appendix 1.2.2.24 Landscape Concept Plans Peacocke Structure Plan Area as follows: “ <u>A Landscape Concept Plan shall be prepared for any subdivision application in the Peacocke Structure Plan area where the subdivision site involves more than 2 hectares of land and includes any open space zone or new public roads, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater swales, wetlands, detention basins and streams or riparian margins.</u> The objectives of the Landscape Concept Plan are to identify opportunities for existing or proposed public land that is <u>within the subdivision site to protect or enhance the natural character and cultural, heritage and amenity values, to recognise and provide for tangata whenua values and relationships with Peacocke, and their aspirations for the area, and to reflect the area’s character and heritage.</u> The Landscape Concept Plan shall include: i. ...” [no suggested changes to (i) to (x)]
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.8	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Appendix 1.2.2.26 Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan Peacocke Structure Plan Area	Oppose	a) The Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan should relate to ecological rehabilitation and management within public areas only rather than within private lots. b) The provisions should be clear what public areas the Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan should apply to. The same wording that is suggested to be used in Rule 1.2.2.24 Landscape Concept Plans should be adopted (refer to submission point 7). c) An Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan should not be required where public land is not existing, proposed or required for a particular site. d) Clause (iii) in the notified PC5 provisions should be deleted. Requiring fixed lighting design to be provided for private lots near Bat Habitat Areas is impractical at subdivision stage. It is also unnecessary given there are proposed land use controls which limit light spill into these areas (Rule 25.6.4.4) and which require 5m building setbacks to the boundary of Bat Habitat Areas (Rule MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R39(8)). e) Clause (iv) in the notified PC5 provisions should be amended by adding the words “as relevant to the site”. This reflects that wetland restoration, for example, will only be relevant to sites which contain wetlands. f) Clause (v) in the notified PC5 provisions, which relates to the establishment and enhancement of identified Proposed Bat Corridors, should be deleted for the following reasons: (i) HCC should proactively acquire the Proposed Bat Corridors by purchasing the affected land and by being responsible for their creation and ongoing maintenance. (ii) It is an unreasonable burden to require the limited number of owners of land that is subject to the Proposed Bat Corridors to be responsible for their creation, which is likely to require extensive planting and other landscape improvements at significant cost under the direction of ecological and landscaping experts. (iii) The Proposed Bat Corridors are for the mitigation and compensation of effects on bats across the entire Peacocke Structure Plan area and are for the benefit of the long-tailed bat population which inhabits Hamilton and surrounds. The Proposed Bat Corridors will also have community recreation benefits. Therefore, the burden for their creation should be shared. (iv) The Proposed Bat Corridors straddle property boundaries. The purchase of the land and the creation of the Proposed Bat Corridors by HCC would ensure a coordinated approach, as well as allowing greater control over the timing of their provision and being more equitable.	Amend Appendix 1.2.2.26 Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan Peacocke Structure Plan Area as follows: “ <u>An Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan (ERMP) shall be prepared for any subdivision application in the Peacocke Structure Plan area where the subdivision site involves more than 2 hectares of land and includes any open space zone or new public roads, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater swales, wetlands, detention basins and streams or riparian margins.</u> <u>The objective of the ERMP is to identify opportunities to enhance freshwater and terrestrial ecological values within existing or proposed public land that is within the subdivision site. The ERMP shall include: i. An indigenous fish management plan for any stream or wetland habitat within the site, including a summary of fish habitat and species present, a summary of planned works, permitting requirements, procedures for dealing with pest fish, biosecurity protocols, timing of works, procedures for recovering indigenous fish prior to and during works, roles and responsibilities of parties, reporting requirements and any specific mitigation measures. ii. Planting of indigenous tree species to provide indigenous vegetation and habitat for indigenous fauna. iii. Restoration planting to include wetland restoration, habitat enhancement and riparian buffer zones, as relevant to the site. iv. Evidence of engagement with tangata whenua during preparation of the ERMP including how the outcomes of that engagement have been addressed.”</u>

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.9	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Appendix 2 Peacocke Structure Plan, Figure 2-1 Land Use	Oppose	<p>a) The proposal to create a Proposed Bat Corridor within the Proposed Natural Open Space area through part of 29 Peacocks Lane is part of HCC’s proposed response to mitigate and compensate the effects on the long-tailed bat associated with development of the Peacocke Structure Plan area as a whole for the benefit of the long-tailed bat population which inhabits Hamilton and surrounds. It is an unreasonable burden for the mitigation and compensation of these adverse effects on the long-tailed bat to fall on individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Natural Open Space.</p> <p>b) Identifying the land as Proposed Natural Open Space renders it incapable of reasonable use and ensures it is destined to become vested public reserve without any development potential. The land within the Proposed Natural Open Space at 29 Peacocks Lane would otherwise be developable without any significant adverse effects.</p> <p>c) It is imperative that Council compensates landowners who’s land they wish to acquire for the Proposed Natural Open Space.</p> <p>d) The requirement for a 50m wide corridor is inconsistent with the Environment Court’s findings in Weston Lea Limited &amp; Director-General of Conservation v Hamilton City Council [ENV-2019-AKL-308] where a 35m wide Bat Corridor was deemed appropriate through the Amberfield site. The Amberfield Bat Corridor forms the easternmost part of the same Bat Corridor that is proposed to pass through 29 Peacocks Lane (the ‘Northern Link’). It therefore follows that any Proposed Bat Corridor should be 35m wide rather than 50m wide along its full length.</p>	<p>a) That the Proposed Natural Open Space is only retained within 29 Peacocks Lane if HCC purchases the land and takes responsibility for its creation and maintenance as a Bat Habitat Area; and</p> <p>b) That the width of the Proposed Natural Open Space for the Proposed Bat Corridors is reduced from 50m to 35m; and</p> <p>c) If Proposed Natural Open Space is identified on 29 Peacocks Lane then it is in the location shown in Figure 2-1.</p>
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.10	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Appendix 2 Peacocke Structure Plan, Figure 2-3 Natural Environment and Heritage	Oppose	<p>a) The Proposed Bat Corridors are areas where linkages between high value habitats are proposed to be created and are not currently significant bat habitat areas. They should be referred to as Bat Habitat Area rather than Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area to distinguish the proposed corridors from existing Significant Natural Areas elsewhere in the Peacocke Structure Plan area.</p> <p>b) The proposal to create a Proposed Bat Corridor through part of 29 Peacocks Lane is part of HCC’s proposed response to mitigate and compensate the effects on the long-tailed bat associated with development of the Peacocke Structure Plan area as a whole for the benefit of the long-tailed bat population which inhabits Hamilton and surrounds. It is an unreasonable burden for the mitigation and compensation of these adverse effects on the long-tailed bat to fall on individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Bat Corridor and Bat Habitat Area.</p> <p>c) Identifying the land as Proposed Bat Corridor and Bat Habitat Area renders it incapable of reasonable use and ensures it is destined to become vested public reserve without any development potential. The land within the Proposed Bat Corridor and Bat Habitat Area at 29 Peacocks Lane would otherwise be developable without any significant adverse effects.</p> <p>d) It is imperative that Council compensates landowners who’s land they wish to acquire for the Proposed Bat Corridor and Bat Habitat Area.</p> <p>e) The requirement for a 50m wide corridor is inconsistent with the Environment Court’s findings in Weston Lea Limited &amp; Director-General of Conservation v Hamilton City Council [ENV-2019-AKL-308] where a 35m wide Bat Corridor was deemed appropriate through the Amberfield site. The Amberfield Bat Corridor forms the easternmost part of the same Bat Corridor that is proposed to pass through 29 Peacocks Lane (the ‘Northern Link’). It therefore follows that any Proposed Bat Corridor should be 35m wide rather than 50m wide along its full length.</p>	<p>a) That the reference to Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area in the Legend on Figure 2-3 is amended to Bat Habitat Area; and</p> <p>b) That the Proposed Bat Corridor and Bat Habitat Area is only retained within 29 Peacocks Lane if HCC purchases the land and takes responsibility for its creation and maintenance as a Bat Habitat Area; and</p> <p>c) That the width of the Bat Habitat Areas for the Proposed Bat Corridors is reduced from 50m to 35m; and</p> <p>d) If a Proposed Bat Corridor and Bat Habitat Area is identified on 29 Peacocks Lane then it is in the location shown in Figure 2-3.</p>
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.11	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Appendix 17A Planning Maps, Key	Oppose	The Bat Habitat Areas are currently not significant bat habitat areas. These areas should be referred to as Bat Habitat Area rather than Significant Bat Habitat Area to distinguish them from existing Significant Natural Areas elsewhere in the Peacocke Structure Plan area.	<p>a) That the Significant Bat Habitat Area be amended to Bat Habitat Area on the Planning Maps Key; and</p> <p>b) That all references in the PCS provisions to Significant Bat Habitat Area be replaced with Bat Habitat Area.</p>
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.12	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Appendix 17A Planning Maps, Maps 57A and 57B	Oppose	<p>a) The proposal to create new Natural Open Space Zone public reserves and Bat Habitat Areas is part of HCC’s response to mitigate and compensate the effects on the long-tailed bat associated with development of the Peacocke Structure Plan area as a whole for the benefit of the long-tailed bat population which inhabits Hamilton and surrounds. It is an unreasonable burden for the mitigation and compensation of these adverse effects on the long-tailed bat to fall on individual landowners who are affected by the Natural Open Space Zone and Bat Habitat Area overlay.</p> <p>b) Zoning the land Natural Open Space Zone and identifying it as Bat Habitat Area renders the land incapable of reasonable use and ensures it is destined to become public reserve without any development potential. The land within the Natural Open Space Zone at 29 Peacocks Lane would otherwise be developable without any significant adverse effects.</p> <p>c) It is imperative that Council compensates landowners who’s land they wish to acquire for Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>d) The requirement for a 50m wide corridor is inconsistent with the Environment Court’s findings in Weston Lea Limited &amp; Director-General of Conservation v Hamilton City Council [ENV-2019-AKL-308] where a 35m wide Bat Corridor was deemed appropriate through the Amberfield site. The Amberfield Bat Corridor forms the easternmost part of the same Bat Corridor that is proposed to pass through 29 Peacocks Lane (the ‘Northern Link’). It therefore follows that any Proposed Bat Corridor should be 35m wide rather than 50m wide along its full length.</p>	<p>a) That the Natural Open Space Zone (Map 57A) and Bat Habitat Area (Map 57B) is only retained within 29 Peacocks Lane if HCC purchases the land and takes responsibility for its creation and maintenance as a Bat Habitat Area; and</p> <p>b) That the width of the Natural Open Space Zone and Bat Habitat Areas for the Proposed Bat Corridors shown in Figure 2-3 is reduced from 50m to 35m; and</p> <p>c) If a Natural Open Space Zone and Bat Habitat Area is identified on 29 Peacocks Lane then it is in the location shown in Maps 57A and 57B.</p>
47	Pragma Homes Ltd	47.1	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Ecology (Storm Water Wetlands)	Support in Part	The proposed stormwater wetland as seen in the natural environment and heritage plan (Appendix 2) is indicated to be within the southern links designation. Further clarification is sought regarding the intention of this wetland and if it falls under the ‘creation of new wetlands’ to address loss or fragmentation of moderate and low value habitation as referenced in Table 2 (Section 4.2, Appendix J). If so, does the enhancement or construction of this wetland then constitute the key at habitat and bat buffer specifications i.e., 20m buffer and 0.3 lux measures at boundary.	Further clarification from Council is sought regarding the intention of the stormwater wetland that are comprised within the southern links designation.
47	Pragma Homes Ltd	47.2	General	Density	Support in Part	Medium Density Residential Standards Bill needs to be accounted for and align with future Plan Change 5 urban outcomes. Lot size and density supported but needs to align with National Policy Statement on Urban Development and Medium Density Residential Standards Bill.	Alignment with national direction is required. Seek the on lot outcomes to align with the Medium Density Residential Standards and National Policy Statement on Urban Development outcomes.
47	Pragma Homes Ltd	47.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Zoning/ Overlay	Support in Part	Support the high density overlay but question if this should be a zone rather than an overlay. The proposed zoning of our site is logical and highly accessible with the immediate locality.	Generally support but seek clarification on zoning rather than overlay.
47	Pragma Homes Ltd	47.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	PRCE1-PSP:P43 Outlook Space	Support in Part	The ‘Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill’ was released on the 19 October 2021 and amends the Resource Management Act 1991 to rapidly accelerate the supply of housing where the demand for housing is high. This includes standard medium density residential standards (the MDRS) in all tier 1 urban environments. Hamilton City Council is classified as a tier 1 Council. The proposed standards within PRCE1-PSP:P43 are not consistent with this MDRS provided by Central Government.	An amendment is sought to PRCE1-PSP:P43 to bring it to align with the Medium Density Residential Standards to provided consistency with government direction.
47	Pragma Homes Ltd	47.5	General	Infrastructure Staging	Support in Part	Restricts growth and is not enabling. See National Policy Statement on Urban Development directives: Objective 2: Planning decisions improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets. Objective 6: Local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are: integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions; and strategic over the medium term and long term; and responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.	Alignment with national direction is requested. Flexibility in infrastructure provision so different stages can come on line as and when urban environments are able to be developed to contribute to sufficient capacity. Request that infrastructure is strategic over the medium term and long term; and responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.
47	Pragma Homes Ltd	47.6	General	Transport	Support in Part	An indicative cycleway goes through the submitter's property. Seek clarification as to expectations of construction under a designation. Development may occur before southern links construction and levels need to be established for cycleway formation. Extent and costs need to be managed to ensure connectivity.	Seek realignment of cycleway south of submitter's property via roading network to limit destruction to ecological habitat and cost savings of creating a tunnel under the designated land.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Objective DEV01-PSP:O14, Policies DEV01-PSP:P35-37	Oppose	The submitter opposes DEV01-PSP: O14, DEV01-PSP: P35-37, – the ecological and open space corridors identified on 103 Peacocks Lane, Peacocke ('area of interest') and the proposed 20m buffer and the 5m development setback on the area of interest. Contours should be used as opposed to high level mapping. The shaded areas on planning maps do not follow gully areas, and are only generally indicative. Bats do not generally mix with high density residential development and major arterial traffic routes. These objectives and policies will take away significant buildable areas and makes most peninsula areas with gully on both sides unable to be used at all – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential medium density. It is unreasonable to burden individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Natural Open Space for the mitigation and compensation of the adverse effects of development. It is appropriate that HCC purchases the land and compensates affected landowners, and takes responsibility for its creation/planting and maintenance.	Delete the open space corridors on the area of interest or alternatively, they should be limited to the top of the bank to top of the bank, or 1m below the highest contour on the gully bank.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.2	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	DEVO1-PSP components (a) and (c) of the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Oppose	The submitter opposes the DEVO1-PSP components (a) and (c) of the Peacocke Structure Plan. (a) The Mangakotukutuku Gully ('the Gully') should be utilised for open space purposes, but not solely for bats. It is not clear why a nominal 20m buffer/corridor from the top of the bank be reserved for bats to come up from the gully and into a residential environment. Once this area is developed in medium and high density residential it is unlikely that any bats will be present. (c) SNA: The submitter opposes a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully.The submitter opposes the nominal 20m buffer and 5m development setback. If the bat habitat is to be applied, it should be limited to the top of the bank. Upper terraces should be used for residential development only.	The submitter opposes a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully. The submitter opposes the nominal 20m buffer. It is submitted that bat habitat (if applied) should be limited to top of the bank. Upper terraces should be used for residential development only being the predominant purpose of the plan change.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R15 Duplex Dwelling	Oppose	A duplex is not considered to be a high-density form of residential development within a Medium Density area. The amendment will reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements. Non-compliance with a rule would more than likely default the activity status to restricted discretionary.	Amend the activity status for Rule 15 from restricted discretionary to a controlled activity.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R16 Terrace Dwelling	Support	The submitter generally supports the extent of Rule 16 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the MDZ.	Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.5	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R17 Apartment Building	Support	The submitter generally supports the extent of Rule 17 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the MDZ. Higher density apartment dwellings are suitable outcomes for Peacocke MDZ.	Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.6	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R36 Maximum site coverage	Oppose in Part	The submitter considers that more clarity is needed in regard to coverage. This needs to be more specific – site coverage of what area? Left over area after 20m buffer or overall site?	Amend to provide more clarity as to what is included in 'site coverage'.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.7	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R37 Permeable surfaces and landscaping	Oppose in Part	The submitter opposes Rule (1) and (2). It is submitted that 20% permeable surface / 50%, 40% & 30% landscaping are overly prescriptive and not every situation will meet these %. There are other types of permeable finishes that are not catered for in this rule. Examples being rock gardens, mulch cover, permeable pavers.	Amend so that landscaping is to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.8	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R38 Building height	Support	It is considered 12m is appropriate for the development in Peacocke Precinct generally.	Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.9	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 Setbacks	Oppose	In consideration of the matters raised for DEV01-PSP Components (c), the submitter considers that a 5m setback to a nominal 20m corridor width is too restrictive and poorly defined. MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 will unnecessarily take away further buildable areas and makes certain areas (such as peninsulas with gullies either side) unable to be used at all. It defeats the purpose of re-zoning the land to residential medium density.	Remove the 5m setback from significant bat habitat area boundary.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.10	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R40 Height in relation to boundary	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R41 Public interface	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.12	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R42 Accessory buildings and Parking	Support		Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.13	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R43 Outlook Space	Support	Although private agreement has no bearing on District Plan wording stronger design outcomes should or could provide more robust options for ensuring external outlook is not the driving force behind the sterilisation of future development rights.	Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.14	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R44 Outdoor living area	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.15	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R45 Service Areas	Support		Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.16	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R46 Fences and Walls	Support		Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.17	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R47 Separation and Privacy	Support		Retain as notified.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.18	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R48 Residential Unit Size	Support		Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.19	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: OBJECTIVES and POLICIES	Oppose	The submitter considers that the open space areas are inaccurately mapped and hence are too restrictive in balancing residential land availability. The major arterial road from Southern Links will sit within / alongside the Gully, so unlikely to attract or retain bats in locality. Better justification for the natural open space is green open gully areas / stormwater functions / recreation.	The submitter seeks a change from the natural open space to green open gully areas / stormwater functions / recreation, as the presence of bats is negligible.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.20	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: R36 Setbacks	Oppose	It is not clear how Council defined the SNA boundary. This should be limited to TOB-TOB. Vague lines at high scale do not define boundaries very well and cause confusion and/or areas to be considered as SNA that are not, at consent stage. Contours should be used as opposed to high level mapping, or a descriptive wording as to how the area is to be defined – ie: 1m below the upper contour of the gully bank. It is submitted that the gully hazard area already identifies land that may be subject to instability due to proximity to gully edge. The purpose of the additional 6m buffer is a further unnecessary constraint on residential development. Oppose additional 6m buffer.	Delete the additional 6m buffer from the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area and the 5m setback from the SNA boundary. Delete the proposed seismic setback line on 103 Peacockes Lane as lateral land movement is never observed on site (especially the upper terrace area). Amend to provide a more balanced account of ecological preservation and ensure residential land availability is provided.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.21	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R13 Provision of Esplanade Reserves and Strips	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the proposed esplanade reserve identified on most of the affected sites.	The submitter suggests this should be discussed with individual site owners prior to imposing these reserves or strips.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.22	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R14 Design Standards	Support		Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.23	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 Minimum allotment size for vacant sites	Support	Agreed with the intention of the rule being to stimulate growth in higher density areas.	Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.24	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R16 Subdivision Suitability	Support		Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.25	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R17 Allotment shape	Support		Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.26	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R18 Block Structure and roading	Support		Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.27	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R19 Culs de sac	Oppose	A maximum 150m is restricted. Cul de sac can function at lengths greater than 150m.	The Submitter opposes Rule 19.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.28	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20 Provision of parking and access. And SUB-PREC1-PSP: R21 Roading and Access	Support		Retain as notified.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.29	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 Provision of Ecological Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the 50m bat corridor on the proposed Peacocke Structure Plan Map, given that bats are not expected to come into or remain within a high / med density residential area, with the main gully adjoining the proposed major arterial roading link to the Southern Links bypass motorway. Links are extremely restrictive on residential development being the main purpose of the plan change.	Opposed.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.30	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.5 Rules – Specific Activities	Oppose in Part	This rule is incorrectly worded. Does Council mean 600 m3 in volume or 600 m2 in area. What is the purpose of this rule?	Wording needs clarification regarding 600m3 in volume or area.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.31	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-1: Peacocke Structure Plan – Land Use	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed stormwater wetland location on 103 and 111 Peacockes Lane and delineation on the identified area. It is located on the upper terraced area where residential development should occur. Discharge from upper terraced area into gullies will be a significant drop and likely require significant energy dissipation features to be constructed down the gully banks. The indicative stormwater device is significantly oversized. Stormwater wetlands will be required to be constructed at a level lower than the surrounding flat terrace to be utilised for residential development, this will enable stormwater to enter the wetland by gravity. Having wetlands on upper terraces will require significant excavation to lower wetlands to enable all residential area with the catchment to drain to the wetland. As such it is considered that the wetland stormwater pond needs to be located at the head of the gully areas that have no major ecological value to enable logical discharge and to allow stormwater from developed terraced areas to be able to discharge by gravity to wetlands.	The submitter opposes the proposed stormwater wetland location on 103 and 111 Peacockes Lane and delineation on the identified area.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.32	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15 - 6b	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.1	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1 – PSP:P5 and MRZ-PSP:P12	Support in Part	The proposed new objectives in the Medium Density zone seek to create a high amenity medium density area and recognise the diversity required to create a residential environment. However, there is only one policy to support Objective MRZ-PREC1-PSP:05 which is “ensur[ing] the efficient development of land by requiring development to demonstrate it is consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan” (MRZ-PREC1 – PSP:P5). The purpose of the objectives and policies in relation to housing, land use and development are intended to ensure that the housing supply and diversity of housing types meets the needs of Hamilton’s communities. This should be better reflected in the policies.	<p>Amend PSP: P5 as follows: Ensure the efficient development of land <u>and enable the development of a range of housing types</u> by requiring development to demonstrate it is consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan <u>including by:</u> (i) <u>requiring large scale multi-residential unit developments to provide a variety of housing types and/or respond to a particular housing typology need in the local community;</u> and (ii) <u>recognising the functional and operational requirements of different housing types, including retirement villages.</u> (iii) <u>promoting higher intensification adjacent to the local centre.</u></p> <p>PSP: P12 - Buildings should be designed so they do not physically dominate or adversely affect the residential character of the neighbourhood. <u>This includes consideration of whether buildings are designed and located to respect the character of the neighbourhood and amenity values of adjacent properties while recognising the functional scale and form associated with certain types of development, such as retirement village premises.</u></p>

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.2	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Objective MRZPREC1-PSP:05	Support in Part	In order to recognise the diversity required to create a residential environment, Metlifecare also seeks that minor amendments be made to Objective MRZPREC1-PSP:05 to recognise that although this is a medium density zone, not all development must be 2 to 5 storeys. For example (proposed amendments underlined): “development in Peacocke 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 – five storey buildings within the high-density area”. This amendment should also be incorporated in the supporting framework including in DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Residential Environment.	Amend Objective MRZ - PREC1-PSP:05 as follows: “development in Peacocke 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 - five storey buildings within the high-density area”. This amendment should also be incorporated in the supporting framework including in DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Residential Environment.
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R36 Maximum site coverage	Support in Part	The submitter supports the provision of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity in the Medium Density Residential zone (Rule 26) because it recognises that retirement villages are compatible with and appropriate within this zone. Metlifecare also supports the provision of retirement villages as restricted discretionary activity in the Medium Density Residential zone where compliance is not achieved with RDIS-1 as the more general matters of discretion that can then be taken into account are broad enough to manage any adverse effects that arise from the non-compliance. However, it is unclear from the draft provisions how the applicable development standards are intended to apply to retirement village developments. A number of the standards apply differently depending on whether a development is identified as a single dwelling, duplex dwelling, terraced house or apartment building. Specific standards for retirement villages are appropriate where they are necessary to recognise the functional and operational requirements of this type of residential development.	Amend MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R36 Maximum site coverage as follows: <u>c) Retirement villages (Peacocke Precinct) - 60%.</u>
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R37 Permeable surfaces and landscaping	Support in Part		Amend MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R37 Permeable surfaces and landscaping (2) and (3) as follows: (2) <u>d. Retirement villages (Peacocke Precinct) - Minimum 40%;</u> and (3) Specimen trees shall be planted within the front yard landscaping area required by R39-2 at a planted size of 80L as required below: c) Terrace dwellings (Peacocke Precinct) <del>and</del> , Apartment Buildings (Peacocke Precinct) <u>and Retirement villages (Peacocke Precinct).</u>
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.5	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R41 Public interface	Support in Part		Amend MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R41 Public interface (1)b. as follows: b. For apartment buildings <u>and retirement village buildings</u> , a pedestrian access, separate from any driveway, must be provided from the transport corridor or an area of public open space to the entrance to the building.
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.6	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R43 Outlook Space	Support in Part		Amend MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R43 Outlook Space (2) as follows: The main living room of a dwelling must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of <del>6m</del> <u>3m</u> depth and <del>4m</del> <u>3m</u> width. Or alternatively amend to include the following: <u>The main living room of a dwelling must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of 6m depth and 4m width. The main living room of a dwelling within a retirement village must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of 3m depth and 3m width.</u>
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.7	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R44 Outdoor living area	Support in Part		Amend MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R44 Outdoor living area (3) and (4) as follows: "3 Communal open space for 4 or more residential units, <u>retirement villages</u> and apartment buildings..." and " 4 Outdoor living areas <u>as required under R44(2)</u> shall have minimum areas and dimensions as follows:..."
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.8	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R48 Residential unit size	Support in Part		Amend MRZ – PREC1-PSP: R48 Residential unit size to add: <u>1 These standards do not apply to dementia and care units or serviced apartment units within a retirement village.</u>
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.9	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R26	Support	Metlifecare supports the non-notification rule in MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R26 (represented by the asterisk) and seeks that it be retained because it will provide certainty and efficiently deliver the outcomes which are sought in the Peacocke Structure Plan, when a development complies with the development standards.	Retain as notified.
49	Metlifecare Limited	49.10	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	High Density Residential Overlay	Support	Metlifecare supports the application of a high-density residential overlay to parts of Peacocke where higher density development is appropriate, including within the walkable catchment of local centres and public transport stations. This approach supports the necessary growth required by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and supports the development of a range of housing typologies, as anticipated by the objectives and policies in the Medium Density Residential zone.	Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: O14 and DEV01-PSP: P35-37	Oppose	The submitter opposes DEV01-PSP: O14 and DEV01-PSP: P35-37– the ecological and open space corridors identified on 3169 Ohaupo Road, Rukuhia ('area of interest') and the proposed 20m buffer and the 5m development setback on the area of interest. Bats do not generally mix with high density residential development and major arterial traffic routes. These objectives and policies will take away significant buildable areas and makes most peninsula areas with gully on both sides unable to be used at all – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential medium density.	Delete the open space corridors on the area of interest or alternatively, supplement the high-level definitions with a description of the feature they are intended to represent e.g., top of bank or extent of wetland.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.2	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: O19	Support	The submitter supports Objective 19.	Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.3	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: P44	Oppose in Part	The submitter opposes Policy 44 (1) so far as it relates to the location of the key local transport road which bisects the area of interest and the proposed intersection location. See comments in submission on Appendix 2 Figure 2-1.	Opposes Policy 44(1).
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.4	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEVO1-PSP components (a) and (c)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the DEVO1-PSP components (a) and (c) of the Peacocke Structure Plan. (a) The Mangakotukutuku Gully ('the Gully')should be utilised for open space purposes, not solely for bats. It is not clear why a nominal 20m buffer/corridor from SNA's be reserved for bats to come up from the gully and into a residential environment. Once this area is developed in medium and high density residential it is unlikely that any bats will be present. (c) SNA: The submitter opposes a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully. The submitter opposes the nominal 20m buffer and 5m development setback. There is no research showing what the optimum width for these buffer and corridor areas should be. If is the bat habitat is applied it should be limited to the extent of the SNA's. Upper terraces and improved pasture should be used for residential development only.	The submitter opposes a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully. The submitter opposes the nominal 20m buffer. It is submitted that bat habitat (if applied) should be limited to SNA's. Upper terraces and improved pasture should be used for residential development only being the predominant purpose of the plan change.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.5	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R15 Duplex Dwelling	Oppose	A duplex is not considered to be a high -density form of residential development within a Medium Density area. The amendment will reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements. Non -compliance with a rule would more than likely default the activity status to restricted discretionary.	Amend the activity status for Rule 15 from restricted discretionary to a controlled activity.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.6	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R16 Terrace Dwelling	Support	The submitter generally supports the extent of Rule 16 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the MDZ.	Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.7	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R17 Apartment Building	Support	The submitter generally supports the extent of Rule 17 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the MDZ. Higher density apartment dwellings are suitable outcomes for Peacocke MDZ.	Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.8	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R36 Maximum Site Coverage	Support	The submitter generally supports the extent of Rule 36.	Retain as notified.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.9	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R37 Permeable Surfaces and Landscaping	Oppose in Part	The submitter opposes Rule 37 (1) and (2). 20% permeable surfaces can be hard to achieve in the MDZ. The submitter seeks a more permissive permeable surface requirement for duplex dwellings and terrace dwellings. Suggest there should be an approved plant list or mature size guideline. 80l is a fairly large specimen tree, where is the evidence requiring this size at time of planting. The requirement for a specific size could lead to sourcing issues.	Amend to provide more clarity on the definition of Specimen Trees. Opposes the 20% permeable surface.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.10	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R38 Building Height	Support	It is considered 12m is appropriate for the development in Peacocke Precinct generally.	Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R39 Setbacks	Oppose	In consideration of the matters raised for DEV01-PSP Components (c), the submitter considers that a 5m setback to a nominal 20m corridor width is too restrictive and poorly defined. MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 will unnecessarily take away further buildable areas and makes certain areas (such as peninsulas with gullies either side or with gully arm intrusions) unable to be used at all. This defeats the purpose of re-zoning the land to residential medium density.	Delete the 5m setback from significant bat habitat area boundary.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.12	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R40 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.13	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R41 Public Interface	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.14	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R42 Accessory Buildings and Parking	Support		Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.15	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R44 Outdoor Living Area	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.16	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R45 Service Area	Support		Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.17	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R46 Fences and Walls	Oppose in Part	The submitter opposes Rule 46 (1) No provision for transition from full height forward of the building line. Forces transition behind building line or abrupt height changes.	The submitter opposes Rule 46 (1).
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.18	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R47 Separation and Privacy	Support		Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.19	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R48 Residential Unit Size	Support		Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.20	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: 18	Oppose	The submitter considers that the open space areas are inaccurately mapped and hence are too restrictive in balancing residential land availability. The major arterial road from Southern Links will sit within / alongside the Gully, so unlikely to attract or retain bats in locality. Better justification for the natural open space is green open gully areas / stormwater functions / recreation.	The submitter considers that the open space areas are inaccurately mapped.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.21	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: R36 Setbacks	Oppose	It is not clear how Council defined the SNA boundary. Vague lines at high scale do not define boundaries very well and cause confusion and/or areas to be considered as SNA that are not, at consent stage without supplementary descriptive boundaries. Descriptive wording as to how the area is to be defined should be used to supplement (or in place of) high level mapping – ie: top of bank, extent of wetland, extent of canopy This 5m setback requirement from the bat habitat seems to be superfluous, with no practical purpose other than to further restrict development area for no purpose. The submitter seeks that a more balanced account of ecological preservation and residential land availability is provided.	Descriptive wording as to how the area is to be defined should be used opposed to high level mapping. Amend to provide a more balanced account of ecological preservation and residential land availability.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.22	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R13 Provision of Esplanade Reserves and Strips	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed esplanade reserve identified on 3169 Ohaupo Road. The existing duck pond as evidenced by the photos in the original submission is a stagnant pond created by damming the gully and is fed directly by the stormwater runoff from the impervious areas of the existing residential activities on site. This is not a natural formation warranting an esplanade reserve for the purposes of s229 RMA.	Delete the proposed esplanade reserve identified on 3169 Ohaupo Road.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.23	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 Minimum Allotment Size for Vacant Sites	Support		Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.24	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R17 Allotment Shape	Support		Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.25	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R21 Roading and Access	Support		Retain as notified.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.26	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 Provision of Ecological Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the 50m bat corridor as it applies to the identified area, given that bats are not expected to come into or remain within a high / med density residential area, with the main gully adjoining the proposed major arterial roading link to the Southern Links bypass motorway.	Oppose the 50m bat corridor.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.27	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.5 Rules – Specific Activities	Support in Part	This rule is incorrectly worded – 600 m3 in area? Does Council mean 600 m3 in volume or 600 m2 in area.	Clarification needed on wording regarding 600m3 of volume or area covered.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.28	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-1: Peacocke Structure Plan – Land Use	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed stormwater wetland location in SC26 and delineation on the identified area due to the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is located traversing the upper terraced area where residential development should occur.</li> <li>• The indicative stormwater device appears significantly oversized.</li> <li>• Stormwater wetlands will be required to be constructed at a level lower than the surrounding flat terrace to be utilised for residential development, this will enable stormwater to enter the wetland by gravity. Having wetlands on upper terraces will require significant excavation to lower wetlands to enable all residential area with the catchment to drain to the wetland. As such it is considered that the wetland stormwater pond needs to be located in the lower reaches of the gully areas no major ecological value to enable logical discharge and to allow stormwater from developed terraced areas to be able to discharge by gravity to wetlands.</li> </ul>	Opposes the proposed stromawater wetland location in SC26.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.29	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-2: Peacocke Structure Plan –Transport Network	Oppose	The proposed location for the intersection between the indicative Key Local Transport Network road and Ohaupo Road has significantly limited sight distances in both directions. The sight distances (without crossing over private property) are approximately 145m northward and 210m southward as evidenced in the photos below. A safer location for this intersection is the current vehicle entrance to 3165 Ohaupo Road, 80m north of the structure plan location. This location affords sight distances exceeding 300m in both directions, as evidenced by the photos below. When subdivided in 2019 a 20m corridor was preserved for future road connectivity which aligns with the proposed alternative location. To maintain effective transport connectivity to the properties to the south (including the area of interest) provision for a roading connection from the alternative Key Local Transport Network Road would need to be provided to the boundary of 3169 Ohaupo Road.	The submitter seeks to change the location of the intersection between the Key Local Transport road and Ohaupo Road.
50	Stuart and Maylene Ross	50.30	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15 – 6b	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP: O14 and DEV01-PSP: P35-37	Oppose	The submitter opposes DEV01-PSP: O14, DEV01-PSP: P35-37, – the ecological and open space corridors identified on 41 Peacockes Lane, Peacocke ('area of interest') and the proposed 20m buffer and the 5m development setback on the area of interest. Contours should be used as opposed to high level mapping. The shaded areas on planning maps do not follow gully areas, and are only generally indicative. Bats do not generally mix with high density residential development and major arterial traffic routes. These objectives and policies will take away significant buildable areas and makes most peninsula areas with gully on both sides unable to be used at all – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential medium density. It is unreasonable to burden individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Natural Open Space for the mitigation and compensation of these adverse effects of development. It is appropriate that HCC purchases the land and compensates affected landowners, and takes responsibility for its creation/planting and maintenance.	Delete the open space corridors on the area of interest or alternatively, they should be limited to the top of the bank to top of the bank, or 1m below the highest contour on the gully bank.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.2	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	DEV01-PSP components (a) and (c)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the DEV01-PSP components (a) and (c) of the Peacocke Structure Plan. (a) The Mangakotukutuku Gully ('the Gully') should be utilised for open space purposes, but not solely for bats. It is not clear why a nominal 20m buffer/corridor from the top of the bank be reserved for bats to come up from the gully and into a residential environment. Once this area is developed in medium and high density residential it is unlikely that any bats will be present. (c) SNA: The submitter opposes a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully.The submitter opposes the nominal 20m buffer amd 5m development setback. If the bat habitat is to be applied, it should be limited to the top of the bank. Upper terraces should be used for residential development only.	The submitter opposes a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully. The submitter opposes the nominal 20m buffer. It is submitted that bat habitat (if applied) should be limited to top of bank to top of bank. Upper terraces should be used for residential development only being the predominant purpose of the plan change.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.3	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R15 Duplex Dwelling	Oppose	A duplex is not considered to be a high -density form of residential development within a Medium Density area. The amendment will reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements. Non -compliance with a rule would more than likely default the activity status to restricted discretionary.	Amend the activity status for Rule 15 from restricted discretionary to a controlled activity.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R16 Terrace Dwelling	Support	The submitter generally supports the extent of Rule 16 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the MDZ.	Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.5	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R17 Apartment Building	Support	The submitter generally supports the extent of Rule 17 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the MDZ. Higher density apartment dwellings are suitable outcomes for Peacocke MDZ.	Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.6	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R36 Maximum Site Coverage	Oppose in Part	The submitter considers that more clarity is needed in regard to coverage. This needs to be more specific – site coverage of what area? Left over area after 20m buffer or overall site?	Amend to provide more clarity as to what is included in 'site coverage'.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.7	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R37 Permeable Surfaces and Landscaping	Oppose in Part	The submitter opposes Rule (1) and (2). It is submitted that 20% permeable surface / 50%, 40% & 30% landscaping are overly prescriptive and not every situation will meet these %. There are other types of permeable finishes that are not catered for in this rule. Examples being rock gardens, mulch cover, permeable pavers.	Amend so that landscaping is assessed on a case-by-case basis.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.8	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R38 Building Height	Support	It is considered 12m is appropriate for the development in Peacocke Precinct generally.	Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.9	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R39 Setbacks	Oppose	In consideration of the matters raised for DEV01-PSP Components (c), the submitter considers that a 5m setback to a nominal 20m corridor width is too restrictive and poorly defined. MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 will unnecessarily take away further buildable areas and makes certain areas (such as peninsulas with gullies either side) unable to be used at all. It defeats the purpose of re-zoning the land to residential medium density.	Delete the 5m setback from significant bat habitat area boundary.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.10	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R40 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R41 Public Interface	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate	Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.12	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R42 Accessory Buildings and Parking	Support		Retain as notified.



Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.13	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R43 Outlook Space	Support in Part	Although private agreement have no bearing on District Plan wording stronger design outcomes should or could provide more robust options for ensuring external outlook is not the driving force behind the sterilisation of future development rights.	The submitter seeks stronger design outcomes.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.14	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R44 Outdoor Living Area	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.15	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R45 Service Area	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.16	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R46 Fences and Walls	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.17	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R47 Separation and Privacy	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.18	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R48 Residential Unit Size	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.19	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: OBJECTIVES and POLICIES	Oppose	The submitter considers that the open space areas are inaccurately mapped and hence are too restrictive in balancing residential land availability. The major arterial road from Southern Links will sit within / alongside the Gully, so unlikely to attract or retain bats in locality. Better justification for the natural open space is green open gully areas / stormwater functions / recreation.	The submitter seeks a change from the natural open space to green open gully areas / stormwater functions / recreation, as the presence of bats is negligible.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.20	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: R36 Setbacks	Oppose	It is not clear how Council defined the SNA boundary. This should be limited to TOB-TOB. Vague lines at high scale do not define boundaries very well and cause confusion and/or areas to be considered as SNA that are not, at consent stage. It is submitted that the gully hazard area already identifies land that may be subject to instability due to proximity to gully edge. The purpose of the additional 6m buffer is a further unnecessary constraint on residential development. This 5m setback requirement from the SNA seems to be superfluous, with no practical purpose other than to further restrict development area for no purpose.	Contours should be used as opposed to high level mapping, or a descriptive wording as to how the area is to be defined – ie: 1m below the upper contour of the gully bank. Also opposes additional 6m buffer. Delete the proposed seismic setback line that might affect 41 Peacocks Lane as lateral land movement is never observed on site. Amend to provide a more balanced account of ecological preservation and residential land availability is provided.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.21	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R13 Provision of Esplanade Reserves and Strips	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 13.	The submitter seeks that this is discussed with individual site owners prior to imposing these reserves or strips.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.22	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R14 Design Standards	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.23	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 Minimum allotment size for vacant sites	Support	Agreed with the intention of the rule being to stimulate growth in higher density areas.	Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.24	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R16 Subdivision Suitability	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.25	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R17 Allotment shape	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.26	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R18 Block Structure and roading	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.27	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R19 Culs de sac	Oppose	A maximum 150m is restrictive. Cul de sac can function at lengths greater than 150m.	The Submitter opposes Rule 19.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.28	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20 Provision of parking and access	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.29	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R21 Roading and Access	Support		Retain as notified.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.30	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 Provision of Ecological Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the 50m bat corridor as it applies to the identified area, given that bats are not expected to come into or remain within a high / med density residential area, with the main gully adjoining the proposed major arterial roading link to the Southern Links bypass motorway. Based on the site inspection, the proposed bat corridor adjacent Peacocks Lane linking to Waikato River is highly modified rural pasture and over a hill, with limited or no trees between Peacocks Lane and the Waikato River. Link unlikely to function, and extremely restrictive on residential development being the main purpose of the plan change.	The submitter opposes the 50m bat corridor as it applies to the identified area.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.31	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.5 Rules – Specific Activities	Support in Part	Does Council mean 600 m3 in volume or 600 m2 in area. What is the purpose of this rule?	This rule is incorrectly worded – 600 m3 in area or volume.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.32	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-1: Peacocke Structure Plan – Land Use	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed stormwater wetland location in SC-7 and delineation on the identified area due to the following reasons: • it is located on the upper terraced area where residential development should occur. • Discharge from upper terraced area into gullies will be a significant drop and likely require significant energy dissipation features to be constructed down the gully banks. • The indicative stormwater device is significantly oversized • Stormwater wetlands will be required to be constructed at a level lower than the surrounding flat terrace to be utilised for residential development, this will enable stormwater to enter the wetland by gravity. Having wetlands on upper terraces will require significant excavation to lower wetlands to enable all residential area with the catchment to drain to the wetland.	The submitter opposes the proposed stormwater wetland location in SC-7 and delineation on the identified area. The submitter seeks the wetland stormwater pond needs to be located at the head of the gully areas that have no major ecological value (such as that photographed below) to enable logical discharge and to allow stormwater from developed terraced areas to be able to discharge by gravity to wetlands.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.33	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15 – 6b	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.1	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: O14	Oppose	The submitter opposes the objective regarding the ecological and open space corridors identified for 91 Peacocks Lane. The submitter seeks the deletion of the open space corridors on the property or alternatively, they should be limited to the top of the bank, or 1m below the highest contour on the gully bank. Contours should be used as opposed to high level mapping. The shaded areas on planning maps do not follow gully areas, and are only generally indicative. The area of interest and the wider area are proposed to be rezoned to medium density residential (‘MDR’) and the major arterial road from Southern Links will sit within / alongside the Gully, so it is unlikely to attract or retain bats in this locality. Bats do not generally mix with high density residential development and major arterial traffic routes. It is not clear why Council intends to create a set of rules / setbacks for an unachievable objective?	Amend/delete the objective.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P35-37	Oppose	The submitter opposes DEV01-PSP: P35-37, in particular, the proposed 20m buffer and the 5m development setback on the area of interest. These policies will take away significant buildable areas and makes most peninsula areas with gully on both sides unable to be used at all – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential medium density. The purpose of the Proposed Natural Open Space Zone is to mitigate and compensate for the adverse effects of development in the whole of the Peacocke Structure Plan on the long-tailed bat. It is unreasonable to burden individual landowners who are affected by the Proposed Natural Open Space for the mitigation and compensation of these adverse effects. In these circumstances it is appropriate that Hamilton City Council purchases the land and compensates affected landowners, and takes responsibility for its creation / planting and maintenance.	Oppose the policies, Hamilton City Council should instead purchase the land and compensate affected landowners, and takes responsibility for its creation / planting and maintenance.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEVO1-PSP components (a), (c) and (f)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the DEVO1-PSP components (a) and (c). (a) The Mangakotukutuku Gully should be utilised for open space purposes, but not solely for bats. It is not clear why a nominal 20m buffer/corridor from top of bank be reserved for bats to come up from the gully and into a residential environment. Once this area is developed in medium and high density residential it is unlikely that any bats will be present. It is an extremely ambitious expectation that bats will be attracted from the Waikato River corridor, over a hill with no vegetation other than grass and existing residential dwellings and into the arm of the Mangakotukutuku Gully which will sit alongside a major arterial route which will be a major access into Hamilton City from the south. (c) Significant natural area (SNA): The submitter opposes a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully. The submitter opposes the nominal 20m bat habitat buffer. There is no research showing what the optimum width for these buffer and corridor areas should be. It is submitted that bat habitat (if applied) should be limited to top of bank to top of bank. Upper terraces should be used for residential development only being the predominant purpose of the plan change. The submitter opposes the 5m development setback. What’s the purpose of additional 5m building setback over and above the 20m buffer? The ‘double dipping’ setback requirements will further reduce the buildable area on sits where multiple gully arms exist such as that which exists at 91 Peacocks Lane, Peacocke. The submitter opposes the DEVO1-PSP component (f), in particular the neighbourhood park identified on 91 Peacocks Lane. Also object to the neighbourhood parks location being indicated by a blob. No thought process or assessment of best location has been applied – just even distribution of blobs through Structure Plan area. By placing blob wholly contained in our title there is no onus on adjoining landowners to contribute to the design and placement of the neighbourhood park. Eliminates the development potential of subject land. Too many parks provided for especially given the significant open space area provided by gullies where it is expected walking tracks / revegetation etc will occur, resulting in significant reduction of land available for residential development which is surely the primary purpose of the plan change.	Amend/delete rule to address submission.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.4	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R15 Duplex Dwelling	Oppose	Rule 15 should be a controlled activity for compliant duplex developments in the MDZ. A duplex is not considered to be a high-density form of residential development within a Medium Density area. The amendment will reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements. Non-compliance with a rule would more than likely default the activity status to restricted discretionary. The submitter seeks that the activity status for Rule 15 is amended to a controlled activity.	The activity status for Rule 15 should be amended to a controlled activity.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.5	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R16 Terrace Dwelling	Support in Part	The submitter generally supports Rule 16 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the MDZ. The submitter seeks that Rule 16 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.6	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R17 Apartment Building	Support in Part	The submitter generally supports Rule 17 as it provides an appropriate activity status for residential density within the MDZ. Higher density apartment dwellings are suitable outcomes for Peacocke MDZ. The submitter seeks that Rule 17 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.7	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R36 Maximum Site Coverage	Support in Part	The submitter considers that more clarity is provided in regard to coverage, as needs to be more specific – site coverage of what area? Left over area after 20m buffer or overall site?	Clarify rule wording.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.8	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R37 Permeable Surfaces and Landscaping	Support in Part	The submitter opposes Rule (1) and (2) as 20% permeable surface / 50%, 40% & 30% landscaping are overly prescriptive and not every situation will meet these thresholds. We would argue that there are other types of permeable finishes that are not catered for in this rule. Examples being rock gardens, mulch cover, permeable pavers. Propose landscaping is to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	Propose landscaping is to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.9	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R38 Building Height	Support	It is considered 12m is appropriate for the development in Peacocke Precinct generally. The submitter seeks that Rule 38 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.10	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R39 Setbacks	Oppose	In consideration of the matters raised for DEV01-PSP Components (c), the submitter considers that a 5m setback to a nominal 20m corridor width is too restrictive and poorly defined. MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39 will unnecessarily take away further buildable areas and makes certain areas (such as peninsulas with gullies either side) unable to be used at all. The defeats the purpose of re-zoning the land to residential medium density.	The submitter seeks that the 5m setback from significant bat habitat area boundary to be removed.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.11	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R40 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate. The submitter seeks that Rule 40 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.12	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R41 Public Interface	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate. The submitter seeks that Rule 41 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.13	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R42 Accessory Buildings and Parking	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 42 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.14	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R43 Outlook Space	Support	Although private agreement has no bearing on District Plan wording, stronger design outcomes should or could provide more robust options for ensuring external outlook is not the driving force behind the sterilisation of future development rights.	Not stated.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.15	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R44 Outdoor Living Area	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate. The submitter seeks that Rule 44 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.16	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R45 Service Area	Support	The submitter seeks that the rule is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.17	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R46 Fences and Walls	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 46 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.18	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R47 Separation and Privacy	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 47 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.19	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1- PSP: R48 Residential Unit Size	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 48 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.20	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7	Oppose	The submitter considers that the open space areas are inaccurately mapped and hence are too restrictive in balancing residential land availability. The major arterial road from Southern Links will sit within / alongside the Gully, so unlikely to attract or retain bats in locality. Better justification for Peacocke Precinct the natural open space is green open gully areas / stormwater functions / recreation.	Oppose.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.21	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18	Oppose	The submitter considers that the open space areas are inaccurately mapped and hence are too restrictive in balancing residential land availability. The major arterial road from Southern Links will sit within / alongside the Gully, so unlikely to attract or retain bats in locality. Better justification for Peacocke Precinct the natural open space is green open gully areas / stormwater functions / recreation.	Oppose.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.22	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: R36 Setbacks	Oppose	It is not clear how Council defined the significant natural area boundary, should be limited to top of bank to top of bank. Vague lines at high scale do not define boundaries cause confusion of areas to be considered as significant natural area at consent stage. Contours should be used as opposed to high level mapping, or a descriptive wording as to how the area is to be defined – ie: 1m below the upper contour of the gully bank. It is submitted that the gully hazard area already identifies land that may be subject to instability due to proximity to gully edge. The purpose of the additional 6m buffer is a further unnecessary constraint on residential development. Oppose additional 6m buffer. This 5m setback requirement from the significant natural area seems to be superfluous, with no practical purpose other than to further restrict development area for no purpose. The submitter also seeks to delete the proposed seismic setback line on 91 Peacockes Lane as lateral land movement is never observed on site (especially the upper terrace area). The submitter seeks that a more balanced account of ecological preservation and residential land availability is provided.	Opposes setback requirements from the significant natural area and from the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area and seeks amendment/deletion. The submitter seeks to delete the proposed seismic setback line on 91 Peacockes Lane. The submitter seeks that a more balanced account of ecological preservation and residential land availability is provided.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.23	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R13 Provision of Esplanade Reserves and Strips	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed esplanade reserve identified on most of the affected sites. The submitter suggests this should be discussed with individual site owners prior to imposing these reserves or strips.	The submitter suggests this should be discussed with individual site owners prior to imposing these reserves or strips.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.24	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R14 Design Standards	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 14 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.25	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 Minimum Allotment Size for Vacant Sites	Support	Agreed with the intention of the rule being to stimulate growth in higher density areas. The submitter seeks that Rule 15 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.26	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R16 Subdivision Suitability	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 16 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.27	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R17 Allotment Shape	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 17 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.28	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R18 Block Structure and Rooding	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 18 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.29	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R19 Cul de sac	Oppose	The Submitter opposes Rule 19. A maximum 150m is restricted. Cul de sac can function at lengths greater than 150m.	Amend rule provision.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.30	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20 Provision of Parking and Access	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 20 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.31	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R21 Rooding and Access	Support	The submitter seeks that Rule 21 is retained as currently worded.	Retain as notified.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.32	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R22 Neighbourhood Parks	Oppose	The submitter opposes the minimum area - Area needs to be a range to ensure flexibility in achieving best residential design. The submitter also opposes transport corridor frontage rule unless Council would contribute 50 % to the costs of constructing road frontage to the reserve. The submitter opposes the 30 x 30 m rule as creates in flexibility in achieving a logical / workable residential design. Should have multiple options such as circles / rectangle alternate options to enable residential design.	Amend rule provision.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.33	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24 Provision of Ecological Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the 50m bat corridor on the proposed Peacocke Structure Plan Map, given that bats are not expected to come into or remain within a high / medium density residential area, with the main gully adjoining the proposed major arterial roading link to the Southern Links bypass motorway. Links are extremely restrictive on residential development being the main purpose of the plan change.	Amend rule provision.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.34	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.5 Rules – Specific Activities	Support in Part	This rule is incorrectly worded – 600 m3 in area?? Does Council mean 600 m3 in volume or 600 m2 in area. What is the purpose of this rule?	Clarity sought on the wording.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.35	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-1: Peacocke Structure Plan – Land Use	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed stormwater wetland location on the neighbours’ land at 103 and 111 Peacocks Lane and delineation on the identified area due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• it is located on the upper terraced area where residential development should occur.</li><li>• Discharge from upper terraced area into gullies will be a significant drop and likely require significant energy dissipation features to be constructed down the gully banks.</li><li>• The indicative stormwater device is significantly oversized</li></ul> <p>Stormwater wetlands will be required to be constructed at a level lower than the surrounding flat terrace to be utilised for residential development, this will enable stormwater to enter the wetland by gravity. Having wetlands on upper terraces will require significant excavation to lower wetlands to enable all residential area with the catchment to drain to the wetland. As such it is considered that the wetland stormwater pond needs to be located at the head of the gully areas that have no major ecological value (such as that photographed below) to enable logical discharge and to allow stormwater from developed terraced areas to be able to discharge by gravity to wetlands.</p>	Amend as sought in the submission.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.36	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-3: Peacocke Structure Plan – Natural Environment and Heritage	Oppose	Oppose.	Delete figure.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.37	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15 – 6b	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate. The submitter seeks that Table 15 – 6b is retained as currently indicated.	Retain as notified.
53	The Adare Company	53.1	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	General	Oppose	There is a significant amount of unnecessary repetition between Chapter 3A and other Plan Change 5 provisions, including the objectives and policies for the various precincts and the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide. Chapter 3A, which currently provides a lot of detailed information, should be consolidated to provide a more succinct summary of the high-level outcomes sought for the area, with more detailed matters addressed in the zone chapters, city-wide chapters and appendices.	Amend Chapter 3A to remove unnecessary duplication.
53	The Adare Company	53.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Terminology	Oppose	<p>Plan Change 5 should employ consistent terminology throughout its provisions and planning maps. This includes (but is not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Various references to the land within the Peacocke Structure Plan (including “Peacocke Structure Plan area”, “Peacocke Structure Plan”, “Peacocke area” and “Peacocke”) should simply be described as the “Peacocke Structure Plan area”.</li><li>• Various provisions of PC5 refer interchangeably to “Significant Bat Habitat Area” and “Bat Habitat Area”. The area should be consistently described as “Bat Habitat Area” including for 35m wide areas in the locations of the Proposed Bat Corridors.</li></ul>	Amend PC5 to use consistent terminology, including (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• using the term "Peacocke Structure Plan area" to describe all of the land shown within the Peacocke Structure Plan Boundary under Figures 2-1, 2-2 and 2-3;</li><li>• using the term "Bat Habitat Area" to describe the area shown on the Peacocke Structure Plan under Figure 2-3 and the Planning Maps, including 35m wide areas in the locations of the Proposed Bat Corridors. The Bat Habitat Area relief should be cross-referenced with submission [80] and the reasons and relief seeking reduction in the width of identified Bat Habitat Areas from 50m to 35m.</li></ul>
53	The Adare Company	53.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Overview and Vision para. [2]	Oppose	The text in second paragraph has been carried over from the deleted Chapter 3.4 Peacocke from the operative District Plan. The actions that the Structure Plan is said to guide, including the rezoning, have now occurred. Accordingly, those actions should be deleted from the paragraph.	Amend para. [2] to read: <del>“For this reason, the Peacocke Structure Plan has been prepared to provide a resource management framework to guide future use and development of the Peacocke Structure Plan area and will be used to inform future District Plan changes, develop an infrastructure programme and a basis to provide guidance to development within this Growth Cell prior to the rezoning of the area.”</del>
53	The Adare Company	53.4	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Overview and Vision: Vision para. [8]	Oppose	The Overview and Vision refer to more than one hub. It is therefore appropriate to refer to a ‘network’ of centres for Peacocke.	Amend para. [8] to read: “These hubs will be supported by areas of higher density residential development, allowing more people to live within walkable catchments of the centres and the public transport network, efficiently using land and infrastructure. This will create a vibrant <u>network of centres within the Peacocke Structure Plan area</u> that will become the heart of the community.”
53	The Adare Company	53.5	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Overview and Vision: Vision para. [10]	Support	The earthworks that will be required to make the land suitable for medium density residential development will be substantial in many places. Plan provisions which acknowledge this and enable a comprehensive approach to large scale earthworks are important and supported. This includes para [10] in the Vision statement for the Peacocke Structure Plan area.	Retain as notified.
53	The Adare Company	53.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP:O6	Support	This objective is supported because it captures the importance of the Peacocke Structure Plan area being developed to deliver required housing supply for Hamilton. Peacocke is a significant growth cell for Hamilton which will contribute important supply to meet strong demand for houses.	Retain as notified.
53	The Adare Company	53.7	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Objectives and Policies DEV01-PSP Objectives and Policies: Natural Environment – New Objective and Policies	Oppose	Plan Change 5 should include an objective that the maintenance and enhancement of the Hamilton long-tailed bat population is a city-wide issue in accordance with ecological evidence adduced and agreed during Weston Lea Limited v Hamilton City Council [2020]. Plan Change 5 should include a policy recognising that a Bat Management Committee is to be established for the maintenance and enhancement of the long-tailed bat population across Hamilton city and its surrounding environment.	<p>Amend to add new objective DEV01-PSP: O16A: <u>“Maintain and enhance a network of open space that supports the ecological values of the Peacocke Structure Plan area and contributes to the mitigation of the adverse effects of existing urbanisation and future development on the habitat of the long-tailed bat across all of Hamilton City.”</u></p> <p>Add new policy DEV01-PSP P38A: <u>“Support the mitigation of the adverse effects of development within the Peacocke Structure Plan area on ecological values.”</u></p> <p>Add new policy DEV01-PSP P38B: <u>“Recognise that the establishment of Bat Habitat Areas on public land within the Peacocke Structure Plan area contributes to the mitigation of the adverse effects of existing urbanisation on the long-tailed bat across all of Hamilton City.”</u></p> <p>Add new policy DEV01-PSP P38C: <u>“Establish a Bat Management Committee pursuant to the City’s Indigenous Biodiversity Strategy.”</u></p>
53	The Adare Company	53.8	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P3	Oppose	The policy should be amended so that it refers to the Peacocke Structure Plan rather than “the relevant structure plan”. There is no other structure plan being referred to and the policy is solely for the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Amend DEV01-PSP:P3 to read: “Interim land use and development including low density residential development should not compromise the integrity and viability of the land use pattern for the <del>relevant</del> <u>Peacocke Structure Plan area.</u> ”
53	The Adare Company	53.9	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P5	Oppose	It is clear from other provisions of the plan change that recreational activities are to be provided for within Bat Habitat Areas. If recreational activities are appropriate within Significant Natural Areas then they also must be appropriate within Bat Habitat Areas. This should be reflected in the relevant policy.	Amend DEV01-PSP:P5 to read: “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>5. Bat Habitat Areas.”</u>

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
53	The Adare Company	53.10	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P14	Support	The net residential densities of 22-30 dwellings per hectare in the Medium Density Residential Zone and 35-50 dwellings per hectare in the High-Density Overlay Area respond to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. Providing a density range is important to enable density outcomes to be feasibly increased over time as new amenities and facilities for the community are established.	Retain as notified.
53	The Adare Company	53.11	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P23	Oppose	The Proposed Bat Corridors that have been identified on the Peacocke Structure Plan figures are implemented by the Bat Habitat Areas, which are zoned Natural Open Space, and related provisions. To avoid confusion about whether the Policy applies to other ecological corridors, the Policy should be amended to specifically refer to Bat Habitat Areas.	Amend DEV01-PSP:P23 to read: “ <del>Near identified ecological corridors,</del> eEnsure the design and location of buildings, infrastructure and lighting is managed <u>near Bat Habitat Areas</u> throughout the Peacocke Structure Plan <u>area</u> in order to maintain their role and function.”
53	The Adare Company	53.12	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P28	Oppose	The planning maps specifically identify the natural features in question as Bat Habitat Areas. To avoid confusion, the Policy should be amended refer to Bat Habitat Areas, not “identified natural features”.	Amend DEV01-PSP:P28 to read: “Road layouts adjacent to <del>identified natural features</del> <u>Bat Habitat Areas</u> recognise and retain their natural form where practicable.”
53	The Adare Company	53.13	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P35	Oppose	Given that Bat Habitat Areas have been defined, the Policy should refer to them rather than generally referring to bat habitat. In addition, the Policy should refer to areas “within” the Bat Habitat Areas as being the subject of protection, not just the areas “adjoining the edge”.	Amend DEV01-PSP:P35 to read: “Protect <del>Bat Habitat Areas</del> <u>Bat Habitat Areas within and</u> adjoining the edge of the Mangakootukutuku Gully and Waikato River to ensure long tailed bats are able to continue to utilise these areas.”
53	The Adare Company	53.14	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P36	Oppose	Provisions requiring setbacks all relate to the Mangakotukutuku Gully. The gully should therefore be named in the Policy, rather than referring to the “gully network”.	Amend DEV01-PSP:P36 to read: “Require development adjacent to the <u>Mangakootukutuku</u> <del>g</del> <u>Gully</u> network and Waikato River to meet required setbacks to support the ecological function of these areas.”
53	The Adare Company	53.15	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P37	Oppose	The Proposed Bat Corridors identified on the Peacocke Structure Plan figures are implemented by the Bat Habitat Areas, which are zoned Natural Open Space, and related provisions. To avoid confusion about whether the Policy applies to other ecological corridors, the Policy should be amended to specifically refer to Bat Habitat Areas.	Amend DEV01-PSP:P37 to read: “Provide <u>Bat Habitat Areas</u> <del>ecological corridors</del> between the major arms of the Mangakootukutuku Gully and Waikato River of sufficient width that enables the movement of long tailed bats between the two areas.”
53	The Adare Company	53.16	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P44	Oppose	Reference to “identified cycle routes” within the third clause of this Policy is unclear. It could be interpreted to mean that future Local Roads in areas subject to the “Indicative Cycleway/Walkway Network” in Figure 2-2: Peacocke Structure Plan – Transport Network must have physically separated cycleways which would be inconsistent with the cross sections and criteria for Local Roads included within Chapter 3A and Appendix 15-6b. The cross sections and criteria in Chapter 3A and Appendix 15-6b for Collector Roads and Arterial Roads do require these roads to have physically separated cycleways therefore, the third clause of the policy should specifically relate to separated cycleways on Collector Roads and Arterial Roads only.	Amend Policy DEV01-PSP:P44 to read: “Require the transport network to be established in accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan by designing and locating: 1. Transport Corridors to be consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan. 2. Identified public transport routes to accommodate public transport and associated infrastructure. 3. <del>Identified cycle routes to provide</del> <u>High quality separated cycleways on Collector Roads and Arterial Roads</u> that encourage cycling.”
53	The Adare Company	53.17	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Policies Infrastructure Network	Oppose	Many of the policies under the “Infrastructure Network” heading relate to transportation matters, including P62 to P67. Some of these policies duplicate existing policies under the ‘Transportation Network’ heading. For example, P63 and P64 under ‘Infrastructure Network’ address similar matters to P39 under ‘Transportation Network’.	Amend to move policies DEV01-PSP: P62 to P67, and any other transportation policies which are currently under the ‘Infrastructure Network’ heading, to the ‘Transportation Network’ heading. Delete or amend policies under the ‘Infrastructure Network’ and ‘Transportation Network’ headings to avoid unnecessary duplication.
53	The Adare Company	53.18	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P59	Oppose	The policy should be amended so that it refers to the Peacocke Structure Plan area rather than “the relevant structure plan”. There is no other structure plan being referred to and the policy is solely for the Peacocke Structure Plan area.	Amend DEV01-PSP:P59 to read: “Staging and sequencing is in general accordance with any staging indicated <del>on</del> <u>for the relevant Peacocke Structure Plan area.</u> ”
53	The Adare Company	53.19	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Policy DEV01-PSP:P62	Oppose	This policy requires Integrated Transport Modelling to be undertaken for all Structure Plan areas. It is unclear what Integrated Transport Modelling means in the context of this policy and who is required to undertake it. There are policies and rules elsewhere in the district plan (such as Policy 25.14.2) which set out when Integrated Transport Assessments are required and the level and content of such assessments. Policy DEV01-PSP:P62 is therefore both unclear and unnecessary and should be deleted. If the policy were to be retained then its intent should be clarified and it should refer to the Peacocke Structure Plan area rather than “Structure Plan areas”. There is no other structure plan being referred to and the policy is solely for the Peacocke Structure Plan area.	Delete Policy DEV01-PSP:P62.
53	The Adare Company	53.20	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Natural Environment and Open Space Network Chapter 3A Key Bat Habitat and Bat Buffer and Proposed Bat Corridor Diagrams	Oppose	1. Amendments are required to the description of proposed structure plan components to clarify its application and intent. In particular: • The Natural Open Space Zone is a specifically zoned area and should be referred to formally (rather than referring generally to natural open space); and • It is clear from Policy DEV01-PSP:P5 and other provisions of the plan change that some development, such as recreational activities, is intended for Significant Natural Areas. The description should be amended to say that urban development is generally not appropriate in these areas, but some infrastructure and community activities (e.g., recreation, stormwater infrastructure etc) are appropriate. This is more accurate than saying “no development [is] to occur”.	Amend bullet point titled Significant Natural Area on page 14: “Significant Natural Area: Where there is existing data that the vegetation or habitat can be clearly delineated by a Significant Natural Area (SNA). Key habitat SNA for bats have been determined on the basis of known roost sites and/or known clearly defined habitats regularly used by bats for foraging or moving through the landscape. These areas will be zoned <del>n</del> <u>Natural</u> <del>Open</del> <u>s</u> Space <u>Zone</u> with a SNA overlay. <del>no</del> <u>While urban</u> development <del>is to occur</del> <u>generally not appropriate</u> in these areas, <u>some infrastructure and community activities are appropriate.</u> The majority of SNAs are located within either the main body of the Mangakootukutuku Gully network or along the Waikato <del>River.</del> ”
						2. The diagram on Page 15 requires a number and title for reference purposes. The diagram uses different terms from those throughout the plan change’s provisions and maps. For example, the diagram refers to “key bat habitat” and “bat buffer”, terms which are absent from the plan change. These terms should be amended to reflect those used elsewhere in the plan change.	Give the diagram on Page 15 a number and title for reference purposes and amend the figure to refer to Significant Natural Area with associated Bat Habitat Buffer for consistency.
						3. The term “Bat Corridors” used on Page 15 is not used elsewhere in the plan change provisions and should instead refer to “Bat Habitat Areas”. The reference to “wide swathes” of land being set aside is not a precise term and suggests that landowners may be required to provide substantial areas of land beyond the areas specifically identified. It would be more appropriate for the width of these corridors to be left to the relevant rule. The provisions for the Bat Habitat Areas also contemplate that the areas will be enhanced with planting which should be reflected in the description on Page 15.	Make the following amendments to the bullet point titled Bat Corridors on Page 15: “ <u>Proposed</u> Bat Corridors: It is proposed that bat corridors, <u>which are identified as Bat Habitat Areas</u> , be established to retain connectivity between core habitat for bats in the Peacocke Structure Plan area. In terms of <del>corridor</del> these habitats, the most important general principle is that <u>corridors</u> <del>wide swathes</del> of land are required to be set aside <del>as bat corridors</del> in order to retain a permeable and functioning landscape for longtailed bats <u>and provide for planting.</u> ”
						4. As with the above submissions, it is important that the words of introductory material and the diagrams therein are consistent with other provisions for the Peacocke Structure Plan area, including the Planning Maps. For example, it is unclear what “high value bat habitats” is referring to or means. Analysis of the text suggests that “high value bat habitats” in this context means Significant Natural Areas.	Amend the final paragraph on Page 15 to read: “Public use of <u>Bat Habitat B</u> <del>uffer or corridor bat habitats</del> <u>Bat Habitat Areas</u> need not be restricted as long as the structural and functional elements of these areas for bats are maintained, and could include amenity, community and green infrastructure activities, or constructed stormwater treatment wetlands. Public uses within <u>Significant Natural Areas</u> <del>high value bat habitats</del> may require further restrictions than <u>those applied to</u> <del>for buffer zones and corridors</del> <u>Bat Habitat Buffer or Bat Habitat Areas</u> to ensure functional habitat is protected, but could also include low-impact, unlit footpaths and cycle ways, which avoid any vegetation clearance that is important for bat habitat.”
						5. The diagram on Page 16 depicting a proposed bat corridor requires a number and title for reference purposes. The minimum width of 50m is the subject of submission [80] which refers to 35m as being the most appropriate width of Bat Habitat Areas, as that width has been supported by the Environment Court in Weston Lea Limited v Hamilton City Council [2020] NZEnvC 189. The reference to Zone A and Zone B appears to be an error as those terms are not referred to anywhere else.	Give the diagram on Page 16 a number and title of Bat Habitat Area. Amend the figure to refer to Bat Habitat Area with a minimum width of 35m and delete reference to “Zone A – Bat Corridor 50m” and to “Zone B”.
						6. The diagrams in this section are an important element in understanding the spatial impact of the related development standards and are more appropriately located within an Appendix.	Move the bat diagrams to Appendix 2 to form part of the Structure Plan figures.
53	The Adare Company	53.21	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan. Peacocke Transportation Network Chapter 3A Road Cross Section Diagrams	Oppose	The minimum road cross-sections specified for Local Roads and Collector Roads do not support the objectives of the plan change related to slowing vehicular traffic and promoting walking, cycling and public transport. This submitter seeks narrower minimum road dimensions that are consistent with NZS 4404. Minimum dimensions are not specified for Minor Arterial Roads and cross sections with minimum dimensions are included in Appendix C of this submission to provide more certainty for affected parties. The alternative road cross sections will also reduce the amount of land required for roading and enable more land to remain available for residential development.	Amend the road cross sections to reflect the changes sought to Rule 25.14.4.1(h) and Appendix 15-6b (below) and to reflect the alternative Local Road, Local Road - Park Edge, Collector Road (Public Transport Route), Collector Road (Non-Public Transport Route) and Minor Arterial Road cross sections enclosed in Appendix C of this submission.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
53	The Adare Company	53.22	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan. Peacocke Transportation Network Chapter 3A Road Cross Section Diagrams	Oppose	The road cross sections currently contained in this section are an important element in understanding the related roading criteria and are more appropriately located within an Appendix.	Move the road cross sections to Appendix 15 to follow Table 15-6b which sets out the criteria for the form of transport corridors in the Peacocke Structure Plan area.
53	The Adare Company	53.23	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Residential Environment paras [1] and [2]	Support in Part	The built form outcomes of 2-3 storeys in the Medium Density Residential Zone and 2-5 storeys in the High Density Overlay Area will enable the Peacocke Structure Plan area to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement density targets and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 residential capacity requirements. However, paragraphs [1] and [2] should be amended to provide that these built form outcomes are the “typical” outcomes, to which there may be some exceptions. Examples where single storey dwellings would be appropriate include: 1. To provide for the range of housing typologies required to meet the diverse needs of the community, such as people with low mobility (including retirement villages). 2. There should be some scope for single storey dwellings on larger lots where there will be no density gain from the requirement for multi-storey dwellings (as density will be determined by the lot size). On steeply sloping lots where multi-storey dwellings may not always be economically viable.	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.”
53	The Adare Company	53.24	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV-O1-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Business Areas, <b>clause (a), para [5]</b>	Support in Part	The “key design principles” for the Local Centre are listed under the Business Areas description in Chapter 3A but would be better included within the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide in Appendix 1.4.10.	Move the key design principles in clause (a), para. [5] to the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide in Appendix 1.4.10.
53	The Adare Company	53.25	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV-O1-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Business Areas – Figure 19 Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept	Support in Part	1. The inclusion of the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept in Chapter 3A creates confusion given Figure 2-3b in Appendix 2 includes a different diagram entitled Peacocke Local Centre Concept.	Move the Local Centre diagram to Appendix 2 as a new Figure 2-3c: Peacocke Structure Plan Peacocke Local Centre Concept.
						2. The current notation of the main street as “Pedestrian Main Street” on the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram implies that the main street will be pedestrianised with no vehicles. The submitter understands that is not the intention and that the main street will be used by vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, which is a supported outcome. The importance of providing good pedestrian facilities within the main street environment can be addressed in the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide (Appendix 1.4.10).	Amend the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram to replace the term “Pedestrian Main Street” in the diagram with “Main Street”.
						3. The Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram refers to “Fine Grained Retail” which is not a term which is either defined or commonly understood. The description should be replaced with “Retail, Offices, Restaurants, Licensed Premises and Food and Beverage” which are all terms that are defined in the district plan. The size and scale of retail activities is managed by other provisions.	Amend the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram to replace the term “Fine grained retail” in the diagram with “Retail, Offices, Restaurants, Licensed Premises and Food and Beverage”.
						4. The Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram identifies unlabelled uses which are shown in yellow on the diagram. The absence of any notation for these uses creates uncertainty and ambiguity. These areas, which are on the periphery of the Local Centre, are likely to be suited for commercial and high density residential activities.	Amend the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram to notate the unlabelled uses shown in yellow south of the supermarket as “Commercial and/or high density residential”.
						5. The diagram identifies a “Food and Beverage Precinct”. Although this is one location which is well suited for food and beverage activities, rather than concentrating all food and beverage activities within a precinct, it is more appropriate that food and beverage activities are interspersed throughout the Local Centre. This should be reflected in the diagram by changing the notation so that the anticipated range of potential uses is stated.	Amend the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram to replace the term “Food and beverage precinct” with “Retail, Restaurants, Licensed Premises and Food and Beverage”.
						6. The Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram identifies “Large Format Retail” in the location where it is currently intended that a supermarket would be established. The importance of a supermarket to anchor the Local Centre Zone is addressed in LCZ-PREC1- PSP: O2. Supermarket is a defined term in the district plan so the diagram should expressly refer to the term "Supermarket" rather than "Large Format Retail".	Amend the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram to replace the term “Large format retail” in the diagram with “Supermarket”.
						7. The report entitled ‘Community Infrastructure in Peacocke’ concludes that short to medium term demand for libraries and community centres will be met by existing facilities elsewhere and that there is no funding certainty for a possible long-term library and community centre. The Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram should reflect alternative uses given uncertainty exists whether there will ever be a need for a library and community centre in Peacocke.	Amend the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram to either: (i) delete the “Community Facility (Future Library and Community Centre)” and replace it with “Retail, Restaurants, Licensed Premises and Food and Beverage”; or (ii) replace the term “Community Facility (Future Library and Community Centre)” with “Community Facility (Future Library and Community Centre) or Retail, Restaurants, Licensed Premises and Food and Beverage”.
						8. The location of the Local Centre is supported subject to amendments being made to shift the northern boundary of the Local Centre to the south (a reduction of approximately 7,600m <sup>2</sup> ). The purpose of this change is to achieve better alignment with updated plans for high density residential use that the submitter has developed for this part of the Amberfield site. The submitter plans high density residential uses for the area that currently forms the northern extent of the Local Centre. The proposed change will not affect the capacity of the Local Centre to accommodate retail, commercial and other uses at the required scale to service the local needs of the Peacocke Structure Plan area.	Amend the northern boundary of the Local Centre shown on the Peacocke Local Centre Design Concept diagram as illustrated in the submission.
53	The Adare Company	53.26	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan Peacocke Staging and Infrastructure paras [1] and [2], Table and associated asterisked notes	Oppose	1. The description provides a definitive summary about how infrastructure staging will occur. The implementation of an infrastructure programme never occurs precisely as anticipated. The District Plan description should provide an opportunity to vary or amend the programme. The requested amendments achieve this flexibility.	Amend para [2] to read: “The <u>planned</u> staging of development in Peacocke starts in the north in the vicinity of the Water Treatment Plant and then proceeds in a southerly direction along Peacocke Road and in the west from the newly completed Ohaupo Road/SH3 and East/West minor arterial roundabout. Development shall <u>generally</u> occur in accordance with the infrastructure staging plan (Appendix 2 – <del>Figure 2-3a</del> ) <u>unless alternative staging is approved through resource consents following consideration of servicing requirements and infrastructure proposals for specific developments</u> . This plan sets out the intended stages of development for Peacocke reflecting the sequenced delivery of strategic infrastructure.”
						2. The table on page 28 requires a number and title for referencing purposes.	Amend table on page 28 to include an appropriate table number and title: “Strategic Infrastructure”.
						3. There are no collector roads in Stages F and G.	Delete collector road references in Stages F and G from the table on page 29.
						4. The third note beneath the Peacocke Infrastructure and Staging table limits the delivery of the stated infrastructure to developers, whereas in practice this may be led by either Council or a developer.	Amend the third note beneath the Peacocke Infrastructure and Staging table on page 30 to read: “In addition, localised and on-lot infrastructure and connections will be required. This should generally not influence sequencing of other stages. The delivery of most strategic infrastructure is expected to be Council-led. However, some of the infrastructure identified, such as new and upgraded collector roads, stormwater infrastructure, and various pumpstations and distribution mains, <del>are expected to</del> <u>may be either Council-led or</u> developer-delivered to Council specifications.”
53	The Adare Company	53.27	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: Issues para. [2]	Oppose	The Peacocke Development Area is not an area which is defined in the Peacocke Structure Plan area diagrams or planning maps.	Amend the third sentence in para. [2] to read: “The Peacocke Precinct applies in the Peacocke <del>Development</del> <u>Structure Plan Area</u> ”.
53	The Adare Company	53.28	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ – PREC1-PSP: Issues para. [3]	Oppose	Suburban Centre is not the term that is used for the Peacocke Local Centre in the PC5 provisions.	Amend the third sentence in para. [3] to read: “For this reason, the Peacocke Precinct includes a high density overlay which is located within walkable distances from the <del>suburban centre</del> <u>Local Centre</u> , identified public transport routes and areas of amenity including the river and gully network, parks and community facilities.”

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
53	The Adare Company	53.29	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Objective MRZ-PREC1- PSP: 05	Support in Part	The built form outcomes of 2-3 storeys in the Medium Density Residential Zone and 2-5 storeys in the High Density Overlay Area will enable the Peacocke Structure Plan area to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement density targets and the NPS-UD residential capacity requirements. However, the objective should be amended to provide that the built form outcomes of 2-3 and 2-5 storeys are the “typical” outcomes, to which there may be some exceptions. Examples where single storey dwellings would be appropriate include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To provide for the range of housing typologies required to meet the diverse needs of the community, such as people with low mobility (including retirement villages).</li><li>• There should be some scope for single-storey dwellings on larger lots where there will be no density gain from the requirement for multi-storey dwellings (as density will be determined by the lot size).</li><li>• On steeply sloping lots where multi-storey dwellings may not always be economically viable.</li></ul>	Amend MRZ-PREC1-PSP: 05 to read: “Development in <u>the Peacocke Structure Plan area</u> 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.”
53	The Adare Company	53.30	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Policy MRZ-PREC1-PSP: P2	Oppose	Given the Medium Density Residential Zone rules anticipate that some non-residential activities may establish in the zone (e.g. dairies, childcare facilities, visitor accommodation, community centres, places of worship, schools, marae), this policy should be reframed more positively. It is also important that the policy refers to effects on activities within zones rather than effects on zones because the zones themselves are not physical constructs which can be adversely affected.	Amend MRZ-PREC1-PSP: P2 to read: “Non-residential activities <del>should not</del> <u>may only</u> establish in residential areas, <del>unless</del> <u>where</u> the adverse effects on <u>activities in</u> all zones are avoided, remedied or mitigated.”
53	The Adare Company	53.31	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Policy MRZ-PREC1-PSP: P21	Oppose	The policies in Chapter 25.6 Lighting make it clear that the purpose of the rule is to manage the potential effects of “fixed lighting”. This policy should be amended to be consistent with that approach and should also refer to the Natural Open Space Zone, rather than “Natural Open Space”.	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 the</u> Natural Open Space <u>Zone</u> .”
53	The Adare Company	53.32	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-notification rules (MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R15, R16, R17, R19, R26)	Support	Non-notification rules for duplex dwellings, terrace dwellings (Peacocke Precinct), apartment buildings (Peacocke Precinct), rest homes and retirement villages in the Medium Density Residential Zone are supported for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The rules will provide certainty and will efficiently deliver the outcomes which are sought in the Peacocke Structure Plan area;</li><li>• The development standards for the zone must be complied with to retain non-notified status; and</li><li>• The activities are residential activities all of which are anticipated within a residential zone.</li></ul>	Retain as notified.
53	The Adare Company	53.33	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Rule MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R36	Oppose	Amend terms referenced (and related provisions) to ensure that the defined terms are used consistently throughout PC5.	Amend MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R36 to replace ‘Terraced House (Peacocke Precinct)’ with ‘Terrace dwelling (Peacocke Precinct)’.
53	The Adare Company	53.34	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Rule MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R37 Permeable surfaces and landscaping	Oppose	Rule R37 sets the minimum permeable surface and landscaping area requirements of the zone to ensure good urban design outcomes (as well as assisting with stormwater management). However, the provisions may have an unintended consequence of limiting the ability to provide paved accessways to properties for narrow sites containing car parking within the front setback. A further unintended consequence may be that applicants will not provide a separate path but instead rely on the driveway for the route to the front door. This would result in poor legibility of the front door and safety issues with conflicts between car and pedestrian. The submitter seeks amendments that more directly state what needs to be achieved, namely generously planted front yards, while allowing for the necessary pedestrian and car access and parking. Avoiding percentages will simplify design and approval processes.	Amend clause (2) of MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R37 to read: “ <u>2) On front, corner and through sites the area forward of the front building line shall be planted in grass, shrubs and / or trees with the exception of:</u> <u>a) one footpath with a maximum width of 1.2m leading to the front door; and</u> <u>b) one car pad with a maximum width of 3m if no garage is provided; and</u> <u>c) one driveway with a maximum width of 3m if a single or tandem garage is provided or with a maximum width of 6m if a double garage is provided.</u> ”
53	The Adare Company	53.35	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Rule MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R44 Outdoor living area	Oppose	An outdoor living area of 8m <sup>2</sup> rather than 12m <sup>2</sup> is appropriate to meet amenity requirements for upstairs apartments with two or more bedrooms. This equates to 2m by 4m, which can easily accommodate a table and chairs for six people. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan which requires a minimum outdoor living area of 8m <sup>2</sup> for apartments with two or more bedrooms.	Amend MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R44 clause (4)(b) so that the outdoor living area requirement for an upstairs residential unit with two or more bedrooms within an Apartment Building is 8m <sup>2</sup> rather than 12m <sup>2</sup> .
53	The Adare Company	53.36	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	Rule MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R46 Fences and walls	Oppose	Fences up to 1.8m in height along some Open Space zone boundaries are required by conditions of the Amberfield resource consent and may be required elsewhere to reduce the spill of light into Bat Habitat Areas. Accordingly, higher fencing (up to 1.8m) should be enabled for that purpose.	Amend MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R46 to add a new row 2A as follows: <u>2A) Fences or walls adjoining the Natural Open Space Zone which are required to mitigate light spill from the Medium Density Residential Zone. Maximum height 1.8m</u>
53	The Adare Company	53.37	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	General	Support in Part	The chapter incorrectly uses the term NZC instead of NCZ.	Amend all references to “NZC” in Chapter 6A to “NCZ”.
53	The Adare Company	53.38	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Policy NCZ-PREC1-PSP: P5	Oppose	The avoidance of off-street car parking along street frontages within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone removes opportunities for convenient short duration car parking which is important for the commercial viability of Neighbourhood Centres. Although in some cases car parking will be able to be provided onstreet, the absence of any specific standards for Minor Arterials Roads results in uncertainty whether on-street car parking will be able to be provided in these locations. This is a potential issue for the Neighbourhood Centre which is located on Peacockes Road opposite Stubbs Road. A further implication if on-street car parking is not provided on Minor Arterial Roads and off-street car parking is required to be avoided between the street and buildings is that there is likely to be commercial pressure for buildings turning their backs on the street to front internal carparks, or a need to have dual frontage. This could result in the street-based frontage being secondary or inferior to the entrance facing the parking which would be a poor urban design outcome.	Amend NCZ-PREC1-PSP: P5 to read: “4) Minimise <del>Ensure</del> off street parking is <del>not located in</del> <u>along</u> the street frontage.”
53	The Adare Company	53.39	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Non-notification rules (NCZ – PREC1-PSP: R19 to R22)	Support	Non-notification rules for new buildings, accessory buildings, ancillary residential units and apartment buildings (Peacocke Precinct) above ground floor in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are supported for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The rules will provide certainty and will efficiently deliver the outcomes which are sought in the Peacocke Structure Plan;</li><li>• The development standards for the zone must be complied with to retain non-notified status; and</li><li>• The activities are all anticipated within a Neighbourhood Centre zone.</li></ul>	Retain as notified.
53	The Adare Company	53.40	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Rule NCZ-PREC1-PSP:R22	Oppose	Amend terms referenced (and related provisions) to ensure that the defined terms are used consistently throughout PC5.	Amend the reference to ‘Apartments’ to ‘Apartment building (Peacocke Precinct)’ in NCZ-PREC1-PSP:R22.
53	The Adare Company	53.41	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ – PREC1-PSP: Rules – Activity Status	Oppose	A new rule is sought requiring that commercial activities which exceed 800m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area total within each Neighbourhood Centre require resource consent as a Non- Complying Activity. The commercial activities which should be captured by this rule include the activities covered by Rules R4-R11, R13, R15-R17, R23, R25, R28-R38 and R40. The purpose of this new rule is to ensure that the scale of commercial activities within each centre is strictly limited to avoid undermining the viability, vitality and amenity of the Local Centre and other Neighbourhood Centres. The proposed rule will assist in achieving the outcomes envisaged in Chapter 3A.	Add a new rule in NCZ – PREC1-PSP: Rules – Activity Status as follows: <u>“Activity status: Permitted Maximum 800m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area total for each Neighbourhood Centre comprising activities in Rules R4- R11, R13, R15-R17, R23, R25, R28-R38 and R40.</u> <u>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non- Complying.”</u>



## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
53	The Adare Company	53.42	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Rule NCZ – PREC1-PSP: R28 Offices	Oppose	Small offices which service the local neighbourhood, such as real estate agents or professional services, are appropriate activities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The activities will service local needs;</li> <li>• The small scale of the neighbourhood centres will limit the number of these types of activities which will establish within these centres; and</li> <li>• A floor area limit ensures that offices within neighbourhood centres are limited to small scale activities, with larger offices directed to other centres.</li> </ul>	Amend the activity status for offices under R28 where the GFA is less than 250m <sup>2</sup> from Discretionary to Permitted.
53	The Adare Company	53.43	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Rule NCZ-PREC1-PSP:R41	Oppose	Amend terms referenced (and related provisions) to ensure that the defined terms are used consistently throughout PC5.	Amend the reference to ‘Apartments’ to ‘Apartment building (Peacocke Precinct)’ in NCZ-PREC1-PSP:R41.
53	The Adare Company	53.44	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Rule NCZ – PREC1-PSP: R47 Building intensity	Oppose	A Floor Area Ratio standard is unnecessary as bulk and location of buildings in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is suitably addressed through other standards such as building height. The scale of commercial development in neighbourhood centres would be more effectively addressed by a rule imposing maximum floor areas for commercial activities within the Neighbourhood Centres.	Delete Rule R47.
53	The Adare Company	53.45	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Rule NCZ – PREC1-PSP: R50 Residential development	Oppose	1. The purpose of clause (4) which relates Density (Minimum Number of Residential Units Required Per Site) is unclear and is difficult to interpret. Provision of residential units within Neighbourhood Centres should be enabled but not required. Not all centres will be suited to mixed-use development, including the Neighbourhood Centre within the Amberfield site which is prevented from being developed for residential activities under the Amberfield resource consent conditions.	Delete NCZ – PREC1-PSP: R50 clause (4).
						2. An outdoor living area of 8m <sup>2</sup> rather than 12m <sup>2</sup> is appropriate to meet amenity requirements for apartments with two or more bedrooms. This equates to 2m by 4m, which can easily accommodate a table and chairs for six people. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan which requires a minimum outdoor living area of 8m <sup>2</sup> for apartments with two or more bedrooms.	Amend NCZ – PREC1-PSP: R50 clause (5)(c) so that the outdoor living area requirement for a residential unit with two or more bedrooms within an Apartment Building is 8m <sup>2</sup> .
						3. The detail within clause (8) unnecessarily complicates the design requirements for residential units. The proposed amendments, in combination with Building Code requirements, will simplify the rule, whilst still ensuring that its purpose to ensure adequate levels of daylight for residential units will be achieved.	Amend NCZ – PREC1-PSP: R50 clause (8) to read: “Residential units shall be designed to achieve the following minimum daylight standards. a) Living rooms and living/dining areas: <del>a total clear glazed area of exterior wall no less than 20% of the floor area of that space at least one clear glazed window on an exterior wall.</del> b) Bedrooms (excluding studio units, and any bedroom that complies with iii. below): a minimum of one bedroom with <del>a total clear glazed area of exterior wall no less than 20% of the floor area of that space</del> <u>at least one clear glazed window on an exterior wall.</u> c) No more than one bedroom in any residential unit may rely on natural light borrowed from another naturally lit room provided: i. The maximum distance of the bedroom from the natural light source window shall be 6m. ii. <del>The minimum total clear glazed area of the light source shall be no less than 20% of the floor area of that bedroom.</del> ”
53	The Adare Company	53.46	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Signage	Oppose	There are no specific signage standards for the Neighbourhood Centre Zone. It appears that the absence of applicable signage standards is an oversight. It would be appropriate to adopt the existing signage standards which apply to other business zones in the City for the Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Amend the City-wide signage provisions in Chapter 25.10 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Rule 25.10.3(h) so that electronic signs in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are a Restricted Discretionary Activity where they comply with Rules 25.10.4 and 25.10.5.</li> <li>• Amend Rule 25.10.5.7 so that the standards also apply to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone (as well as the Central City, Business 1-7 and Industrial Zones).</li> <li>• Amend Rule 25.10.5.12 so that the same standards for temporary signs in the Central City, Business 1-7 and Industrial Zones also apply in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone.</li> </ul>
53	The Adare Company	53.47	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Non-notification rules (LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R17 to R21)	Support	Non-notification rules for new buildings, accessory buildings, emergency service facilities, ancillary residential units and apartment buildings (Peacocke Precinct) in the Local Centre Zone are supported for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rules will provide certainty and will efficiently deliver the outcomes which are sought in the Peacocke Structure Plan area;</li> <li>• The development standards for the zone must be complied with to retain non-notified status; and</li> <li>• The activities are all anticipated within a Local Centre Zone.</li> </ul>	Retain as notified.
53	The Adare Company	53.48	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Rule LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R21 Apartments (Peacocke Structure Plan) 4th Column	Oppose	Structure Plan Figure 2-3b identifies Primary and Secondary Frontages within the Local Centre. In these areas it is important to maintain the continuity of commercial frontage and streetscape. Outside of these areas, depending on the uptake of commercial development and design factors, it is more appropriate to maintain flexibility to have residential activity at ground level. This flexibility is better provided for by a Discretionary Activity than a Non-complying Activity Status.	Amend LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R21 to read: Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with RDIS-2: <del>NonComplying-</del> <u>Discretionary</u>
53	The Adare Company	53.49	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Rule LCZ-PREC1-PSP:R21	Oppose	Amend terms referenced (and related provisions) to ensure that the defined terms are used consistently throughout Plan Change 5.	Amend the reference to ‘Apartments (Peacocke Structure Plan)’ to ‘Apartment building (Peacocke Precinct)’ in LCZ-PREC1-PSP:R21.
53	The Adare Company	53.50	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Rule LCZ-PREC1-PSP:R37	Oppose	Amend terms referenced (and related provisions) to ensure that the defined terms are used consistently throughout Plan Change 5.	Amend the reference to Duplexes’ to ‘Duplex dwelling’ in LCZ-PREC1-PSP:R37.
53	The Adare Company	53.51	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Rule LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R38 Terrace House (Peacocke Precinct) 2nd column	Oppose	Structure Plan Figure 2-3b identifies Primary and Secondary Frontages within the Local Centre. In these areas it is important to maintain the continuity of commercial frontage and streetscape. Outside of these areas, depending on the uptake of commercial development and design factors, it is more appropriate to maintain flexibility to have residential activity at ground level. This flexibility is better provided for by a Discretionary Activity than a Non-complying Activity Status.	Amend LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R38 to read: Activity Status: Non Complying <u>Activity Status: Discretionary at ground floor and above outside of the Primary and Secondary Frontages.</u>
53	The Adare Company	53.52	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Rule LCZ-PREC1-PSP:R38	Oppose	Amend terms referenced (and related provisions) to ensure that the defined terms are used consistently throughout Plan Change 5.	Amend the reference to ‘Terraced House (Peacocke Precinct)’ to ‘Terrace dwelling (Peacocke Precinct)’ in LCZ-PREC1-PSP:R38.
53	The Adare Company	53.53	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Rule LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R43 Building intensity	Oppose	A Floor Area Ratio standard is unnecessary as bulk and location of buildings in the Local Centre Zone is suitably addressed through other standards such as building height.	Delete Rule R43.
53	The Adare Company	53.54	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Rule LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R46 Residential development	Oppose	1. The purpose of clause (4) which relates Density (Minimum Number of Residential Units Required Per Site) is unclear and the rule is difficult to interpret. Provision of residential units within sites in the Local Centre should be enabled but not required as not all sites will be suited to mixed-use development. An example is a site for a supermarket where it is not practical to require residential activities. Provision of residential activities within the Local Centre is a matter best considered through preparation of a Master Plan for the centre.	Delete NCZ – PREC1-PSP: R46 clause (4).

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
						<p>2. An outdoor living area of 8m<sup>2</sup> rather than 12m<sup>2</sup> is appropriate to meet amenity requirements for apartments with two or more bedrooms. This equates to 2m by 4m, which can easily accommodate a table and chairs for six people. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan which requires a minimum outdoor living area of 8m<sup>2</sup> for apartments with two or more bedrooms.</p> <p>3. The detail within clause (8) unnecessarily complicates the design requirements for residential units. The proposed amendments, in combination with Building Code requirements, will simplify the rule, whilst its purpose to ensure adequate levels of daylight will be achieved.</p>	<p>Amend NCZ – LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R46 clause (5)(c) so that the outdoor living area requirement for a residential unit with two or more bedrooms within an Apartment Building is 8m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Amend LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R46 clause (8) to read: “Residential units shall be designed to achieve the following minimum daylight standards. a) living rooms and living/dining areas: <del>a total clear glazed area of exterior wall no less than 20% of the floor area of that space</del> <u>at least one clear glazed window on an exterior wall.</u> b) Bedrooms (excluding studio units, and any bedroom that complies with iii. below): a minimum of one bedroom with <del>a total clear glazed area of exterior wall no less than 20% of the floor area of that space</del> <u>at least one clear glazed window on an exterior wall.</u> c) No more than one bedroom in any residential unit may rely on natural light borrowed from another naturally lit room provided: i) The maximum distance of the bedroom from the natural light source window shall be 6m. ii) <del>The minimum total clear glazed area of the light source shall be no less than 20% of the floor area of that bedroom.</del>”</p>
53	The Adare Company	53.55	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Rule LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R47 Active frontages	Oppose	The proposed amendments to this rule result in clearer requirements regarding roller doors or similar security features, including a specific requirement that they must be installed internally and enable visibility into the building. Internal security features result in a more friendly building and public realm appearance, and less opportunity for graffiti. Generally, any other security measure (be that scissor grills or permanent bars) is internal. This allows it to be built into the fitout and allows appropriate window activation at all times.	Amend LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R47 to read: “1. No roller doors, or similar <u>security features</u> , <del>which may obscure</del> <u>be installed externally over</u> windows or entranceways <del>may be installed</del> on the front of any building fronting a <del>public space</del> <u>transport corridor or public reserve</u> within the Local Centre Zone. <u>2. Any roller doors, or similar security features, shall be installed internally and shall enable visibility into the building.</u> ”
53	The Adare Company	53.56	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Rule LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R48 Primary frontages 2(c)	Oppose	The purpose of this amendment is to clarify that the requirement for a continuous verandah applies to building frontages only rather than the entire street boundary. The requirement for verandahs to extend along the entire street frontage, instead of only the building frontages as proposed, would be impractical for situations where buildings lining that street frontage are interrupted by public open spaces such as a plaza or walkway. Clarify that the requirement for a continuous verandah applies to building frontages only rather than the entire street boundary.	Amend LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R48 to read: “A continuous verandah, no less than 2.5m deep shall be provided which extends along the full <del>street</del> <u>building</u> frontage. <del>Verandahs shall be</del> <u>and is</u> designed to provide full pedestrian cover.”
53	The Adare Company	53.57	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Signage	Oppose	There are no specific signage standards for the Local Centre Zone. It appears this is likely to be an oversight. It would be appropriate to adopt the existing signage standards which apply to other business zones in the City for the Local Centre Zone.	Amend the City-wide signage provisions in Chapter 25.10 as follows: • Amend Rule 25.10.3(h) so that electronic signs in the Local Centre Zone are a Restricted Discretionary Activity where they comply with Rules 25.10.4 and 25.10.5. • Amend Rule 25.10.5.7 so that the standards also apply to the Local Centre Zone (as well as the Central City, Business 1-7 and Industrial Zones). • Amend Rule 25.10.5.12 so that the same standards for temporary signs in the Central City, Business 1-7 and Industrial Zones also apply in the Local Centre Zone.
53	The Adare Company	53.58	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: Issues	Oppose	The areas of land proposed to be zoned Natural Open Space are predominantly privately owned. The Issues section is silent on the clear intention that this land will be acquired by Hamilton City Council for public reserve and the Issues statement should make this explicit. The Issues statement should also be clear that one of the key purposes of the reserves is for the creation of new Bat Habitat Areas for mitigation of the effects of urban development on the long-tailed bat within Peacocke and elsewhere in Hamilton and surrounds recognising that the long-tailed bat’s habitat home range is located across Hamilton City and surrounding environments.	Amend NOSZ – PREC1- P: Issues to read: “The Natural Open Space Zone includes <del>publicly and privately owned</del> areas that possess natural or landscape values <u>or that are locations where Bat Habitat Areas are proposed to be created to mitigate potential effects of urban development within Peacocke and surrounding areas on the city-wide Hamilton long-tailed bat population. The Natural Open Space zoned areas will be acquired as public reserves.</u> ”
53	The Adare Company	53.59	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Objective NOSZ-PREC1-P O7	Oppose	Objective NOSZ-PREC1-P O7 should be amended to use consistent language and to refer to the Natural Open Space Zone, rather than “Natural Open Space areas” or “Natural Open Space”.	Amend NOSZ-PREC1-P O7 to refer to the Natural Open Space Zone not "Natural Open Space areas" or "Natural Open Space Space".
53	The Adare Company	53.60	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Policy NOSZ-PREC1-P P18	Oppose	Policy NOSZ-PREC1-P P18 should be amended to use consistent language and to refer to the Natural Open Space Zone, rather than “Natural Open Space areas” or “Natural Open Space”.	Amend NOSZ-PREC1-P P18 to refer to the Natural Open Space Zone not "Natural Open Space areas" or "Natural Open Space Space".
53	The Adare Company	53.61	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ-PREC1-P: Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	Stormwater management devices, ponds, wetlands and wastewater pump stations are all activities which would be appropriately located in the Natural Open Space Zones. The Natural Open Space zoned land is commonly located in areas of low topography where stormwater management devices and pump stations are normally positioned. Enabling this infrastructure to be sited in (or partially in) Natural Open Space Zones will potentially minimise loss of developable land within Medium Density Residential zoned areas.	Add new rules in NOSZ-PREC1-P: Rules – Activity Status Table for the following activities: • Stormwater management devices, ponds and wetlands. Activity Status: Permitted • Wastewater pump stations. Activity Status: Permitted
53	The Adare Company	53.62	Chapter 20 - Natural Environments	Rule 20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	Development within the Peacocke Structure Plan area may require some or all of the activities listed in the adjacent column to be undertaken within identified Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). The proposal for informal recreation and park furniture to be Permitted Activities reflects the multipurpose use of the SNAs for recreation and ecological protection. This is particularly important at ‘Knoll Park’ within the Amberfield site (SNA 62) which is planned (and consented) to accommodate a playground, basketball court, petanque area, seating and other informal recreation uses. The Environment Court confirmed in Weston Lea Limited v Hamilton City Council [2020] NZEnvC 189 that informal recreation and significant habitat areas can co-exist in this way. A Discretionary Activity status is appropriate for the activities listed as (gc) to (gg) to enable potential effects to be assessed through a resource consent process. Many of these activities are anticipated (and in some cases already consented) within the proposed SNAs. Walkways/cycleways through SNAs are also shown on the Peacocke Structure Plan and in the absence of the proposed provisions all of these activities would be Non-Complying which would be inappropriate.	Add the following new activity provisions in Rule 20.3 – Activity Status Table for the Peacocke Structure Plan <del>A</del> area: “ <u>Activities within a Significant Natural Area, Schedule 9C (Volume 2, Appendix 9) – Peacocke Structure Plan</u> <u>ga) Informal recreation- Permitted Activity</u> <u>gb) Park furniture- Permitted Activity</u> <u>gc) Walkways/cycleways- Discretionary Activity</u> <u>gd) Stormwater management devices, ponds and wetlands- Discretionary Activity</u> <u>ge) Wastewater pump stations- Discretionary Activity</u> <u>gf) Underground network utility infrastructure- Discretionary Activity</u> <u>gg) Earthworks and vegetation removal and pruning associated with gc) to gd)- Discretionary Activity</u> ”
53	The Adare Company	53.63	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB–PREC1-PSP: Purpose para. [4]	Oppose	Plan Change 5 refers to the proposed Peacocke town centre as the Local Centre. An amendment is required to para. [4] so that it refers to the Local Centre to be consistent with the terminology used elsewhere in the plan provisions.	Amend para. [4] to read: “To support the creation of a walkable environment that supports the viability and vitality of the <del>Peacocke Town Centre</del> <u>Local Centre</u> and use of public transport, the Peacocke area provides for medium and higher density housing. The Structure Plan focuses on delivering high density housing within a walkable catchment of the <u>Local Centre town-centre</u> , identified public transport routes and allows for higher density development to occur in areas of higher amenity such as the Waikato River corridor and near the Mangakootukutuku Gully.”
53	The Adare Company	53.64	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Objective SUB PREC1- PSP: O7	Oppose	The objective should be amended to reflect that the PCS provisions enable both medium <u>and</u> high density development outcomes.	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.”

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
53	The Adare Company	53.65	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Objective SUB PREC1- PSP: O10	Oppose	The concept plan is a useful starting point to guide development within the Local Centre but requiring subdivision to give effect to the concept plan is too onerous a requirement. Amendments are sought to the Objective to adopt similar wording to that used in Objective SUB–PREC1-PSP: O6 and Policy SUB–PREC1- PSP: P21.	Amend SUB–PREC1-PSP: O10 to read: “Subdivision in the Peacocke Local Centre Zone <del>gives effect to</del> <u>is generally consistent with</u> the Peacocke Local Centre Concept Plan and achieves a cohesive and integrated development pattern, creating a high amenity urban centre.”
53	The Adare Company	53.66	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Objective SUB – PREC1- PSP: O9	Oppose	Subdivision on its own is not able to ‘restore’ anything and the objective should be amended to address this. It is also the Bat Habitat Areas that identify the existing natural environment in the Structure Plan area that is important to bats and is intended to be created for future bat habitat.	Amend SUB – PREC1-PSP: O9 to read: “Subdivision responds to and <u>enables the restoration of</u> <del>restores</del> the natural environment with a focus on <del>those areas- the Bat Habitat Areas</del> identified in the Peacocke Structure Plan, <u>which provide for including</u> the creation <u>of new ecological corridors</u> and protection and enhancement of <del>identified</del> <u>existing</u> ecological corridors.”
53	The Adare Company	53.67	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Policy SUB - PREC1- PSP:P2 Clause 2.	Oppose	The policy should be amended so that it refers to the Peacocke Structure Plan rather than “the relevant structure plan”. There is no other structure plan being referred to and the policy is solely for the Peacocke Structure Plan.	Amend clause 2 of SUB - PREC1-PSP:P2 to read: “2. Is in general accordance with <del>any relevant</del> <u>the Peacocke</u> Structure Plan.”
53	The Adare Company	53.68	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Policy SUB - PREC1- PSP:P17	Oppose	The policy should be amended to be clearer and to reflect that larger lots will be important tools to provide for medium and high density development outcomes.	Amend SUB - PREC1-PSP:P17 to read: “Enable larger lots where they are to be used as a tool to provide for <u>super lots or lots for</u> future <u>medium or high-</u> density development.”
53	The Adare Company	53.69	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Policy SUB - PREC1- PSP:P19	Oppose	Provisions for the Natural Open Space Zone, Significant Natural Areas, Bat Habitat Areas and esplanade reserves are supported in principle as measures to protect and enhance and create additional habitat for the longtailed bat. However, the submitter does not accept the location and extent of all of these areas and considers that they should be based on either the existing natural environment, or created to the extent necessary to ensure that the role, function and connectivity of ecological areas is maintained.	Amend SUB - PREC1-PSP:P19 to read: “Require subdivision to be designed to provide <u>ecological areas for the vesting of Natural Open Space Zone areas</u> <del>where they are identified</del> within the Peacocke Structure Plan <u>based on the existing natural environment and to the extent necessary to</u> ensure that the role, function and connectivity of ecological areas is maintained.”
53	The Adare Company	53.70	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Policy SUB - PREC1- PSP:P20	Oppose	The intent of the Policy appears to be to refer to the corridors provided by Bat Habitat Areas, but it is not clear if other ecological corridors are also covered. The policy should be amended to provide greater certainty.	Amend SUB - PREC1-PSP:P20 to read: “Require roads that are proposed in the ecological corridors <u>provided by Bat Habitat Areas</u> to: ….”
53	The Adare Company	53.71	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Non-notification rules (SUB-PREC1-PSP: R4 and R5)	Support	Non-notification rules for fee simple subdivision and unit title subdivision in the Peacocke Precinct are supported for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The rules will provide certainty and will efficiently deliver the outcomes which are sought in the Peacocke Structure Plan area;</li><li>• The subdivision standards must be complied with to retain non-notified status; and</li><li>• Fee simple and unit title subdivision is anticipated within the Peacocke Precinct.</li></ul>	Retain as notified.
53	The Adare Company	53.72	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R8	Oppose	Being a greenfield growth cell, many subdivision consent applications in the Peacocke Structure Plan area will require vesting of network utility or transport corridor lots. The potential benefits in terms of efficiency and certainty of the non-notification provisions in SUB-PREC1-PSP: R4 and R5 will be negated if the same non-notification rules do not apply to SUB-PREC1-PSP:R8.	Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP:R8 so that subdivision to accommodate a network utility service or transport corridor is subject to non-notification rules.
53	The Adare Company	53.73	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R13 Provision of Esplanade Reserves and Strips	Oppose	The Proposed Esplanade Reserves identified on the Peacocke Structure Plan are based on the study in Appendix W Peacocke Structure Plan: Esplanade Report which states “ <i>The broad-scale approach was considered adequate for the purposes of the current study but could be insufficient for determining esplanade extent at the lot level when subdivision of individual lots takes place</i> ”. Despite this, the Structure Plan map has adopted the mapping produced by the study without amendment. As noted in the study, ‘site specific assessment’ is advised at the time of subdivision to address the statutory requirements for identifying an esplanade. On this basis the words in (e) should be deleted, with reliance placed on the standard criteria in (c) and an assessment undertaken at the time of subdivision.	Delete criteria (b) and (e) from SUB-PREC1-PSP:R13.
53	The Adare Company	53.74	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R14 Design Standards	Oppose	Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R14 sits under the heading ‘Medium Density Residential Zone – Peacocke Precinct’, however, the rule refers to R23-1 and R23-2 which apply to the Local Centre and Neighbourhood Centre Zones. This results in confusion as to which standards apply in the different zones. Rule R14 should be amended to remove this confusion. Lots for network utility services and transport corridors should also be exempt from the full range of subdivision standards. Standards such as provision of services and minimum lot area and shape are not relevant for lots to be vested as transport corridors.	Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP:R14 to read: <del>“Medium Density Residential Zone – Peacocke Precinct:</del> SUB-PREC1-PSP: R14 Design standards 1) The standards of Rule SUB – PREC1-PSP: R12- <del>R21</del> R25 shall not apply to the subdivision of land to accommodate a network utility service <u>or transport corridor</u> . 2) The standards of Rule SUB – PREC1-PSP: R15, R17 and R23- <del>1 and R23-2</del> shall not apply to <u>the following activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone</u> : a) The unit title of existing lawfully established buildings; or b) The fee simple subdivision of existing lawfully established single dwellings, duplex dwellings, or Terrace Dwellings (Peacocks Precinct) Provided that all relevant development and performance standards are met in relation to the proposed boundaries around that building or unless otherwise authorised by resource consent. <del>3) The standards of Rule SUB – PREC1-PSP: R15, R17 and R23 shall not apply to the following activities in the Local Centre Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone:</del> <del>a) The unit title of existing lawfully established buildings; or</del> <del>b) The fee simple subdivision of existing lawfully established buildings. Provided that all relevant development and performance standards are met in relation to the proposed boundaries around that building or unless otherwise authorised by resource consent.”</del>
53	The Adare Company	53.75	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 Minimum allotment size for vacant sites	Oppose	With the observation that the minimum net site area is the same in all locations within the Medium Density Residential Zone (i.e. both within and outside of the High Density Overlay), the rule should be simplified by deleting Clause 2. Reference to the Medium Density Residential Zone in clause 1 will assist in clarifying that this rule is not relevant to subdivision in other zones, including the Local Centre Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15 minimum net site area to read: <u>Medium Density Residential Zone - Peacocke Precinct - 300m<sup>2</sup></u> <del>Peacocke Precinct High-Density Overlay –300m<sup>2</sup>————</del>
53	The Adare Company	53.76	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R20 Provision of parking and access clauses 2, 3B(iv) and 4	Oppose	1. Clause (2), which requires vehicle crossings to be separated by a minimum of 50m on transport corridors with a physically separated cycle lane, is not conducive to achieving medium and high-density residential outcomes. It would be especially difficult to achieve in topographically constrained areas where access via a rear lane may not be a viable alternative.	Delete clause (2) in SUB-PREC1-PSP:R20.
						2. An amendment is sought to clause (3B) so that rear lanes may also be created as jointly owned access lots held in fee simple title where a resident’s society must be formed to manage the access. This achieves a similar outcome to common property under a unit title arrangement by ensuring that there would be a suitable legal mechanism for the management of the access in perpetuity. It would allow more subdivisions to occur with fee simple title which is often a preferred form of land tenure.	Amend clause (3B) to read: “iv) Common property under the Unit Titles Act <u>or a jointly owned access lot held in fee simple title where a resident’s society must be formed to manage the access</u> , when it serves more than 9 residential units.”
						3. The proposed amendment to clause (4) will ensure consistency with Rule MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R41 which enables pedestrian access to either a transport corridor or an area of public open space. The amendment will achieve good urban design outcomes by ensuring that each dwelling will have a ‘public front’, whilst also providing greater flexibility.	Amend clause (4) to read: “Where vehicle access is provided by a rear lane, each dwelling shall have a separate pedestrian access from the primary transport corridor boundary <u>or an area of public open space</u> .”
53	The Adare Company	53.77	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R21 Roading and access	Oppose	1. SUB-PREC1-PSP:R21 relates to road widths and widths and lengths of pedestrian and cycle accessways. An amendment is proposed to the heading of the rule to “Roading and <u>pedestrian/cycle</u> access” so that it is distinguished from SUB-PREC1-PSP:R20 “Provision of parking and access” which relates to parking and vehicular access to sites.	Amend the heading of SUB-PREC1-PSP:R21 to “Roading and <u>pedestrian/cycle</u> access”.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
						2. The submitter proposes amendments to clause (1) to reflect the alternative cross sections for Local Roads and Collector Roads enclosed with the submission which are more appropriate minimum roading standards.	Amend clause (1) to read: “Minimum road width of vehicle access to be formed and vested as public road: a) Local Road: <del>16.4m</del> <del>16.8m</del> (see note 1) b) <u>Local Road – Park Edge: 12.8m (see note 1)</u> b) Collector Road - no Public transport: <del>22.8m</del> <del>24.2m</del> (see note 1) c) Collector Road – Public transport Route: <del>23.2m</del> <del>24.6m</del> (see note 1) Note 1: This width does not provide for swales or stormwater management. Additional width may be required for these features, if present, and may be required to accommodate any other features or activities.”
						3. The submitter proposes an amendment to clause (3) to correct a minor error due to the missing words “access way”.	Amend clause (3) to read “Minimum width for pedestrian/cyclist <u>access way</u> through a block:”.
53	The Adare Company	53.78	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R22 Neighbourhood parks	Oppose	The requirement for Neighbourhood Parks to be generally flat is subjective and not appropriate as a standard. This requirement would be more appropriately addressed as an assessment criterion, recognising that in some cases the topography of the Peacocke Structure Plan area may also constrain the ability for flat sites to be provided. Clause (2) is also unnecessary and should be deleted because clause (1) requires Neighbourhood Parks the location of the parks is shown in the Peacocke Structure Plan. This requirement may be more appropriately addressed as an assessment criterion.	Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP:R22 to read: “1) Where a Neighbourhood Park is identified as being required in the Peacocke Structure Plan, a neighbourhood park <del>shall be provided</del> that meets the following standards <u>shall be vested in Hamilton City Council as local purpose reserve</u> : a) Minimum area- 5,000m <sup>2</sup> b) Minimum transport corridor frontage- 50% of the perimeter of the total park boundary. c) Is able to accommodate a 30m x 30m square area. <del>d) Is generally flat.</del> 2) <del>Neighbourhood parks shall be located so that no residential dwelling is more than 500m from a neighbourhood park.</del> ”
53	The Adare Company	53.79	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1 PSP:R23 Local Centre: Peacocke Precinct and Neighbourhood Centre Zones: Peacocke Precinct	Oppose	The widths proposed for accesses or private ways in the Local Centre Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone are unnecessarily space-consuming. 7m would be sufficient as this allows for between 5.5m and 6.0m for two-way slow moving traffic and for a combined 1.0m to 1.5m separation on either side.	Amend rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R23 to reduce the widths of accesses and private ways within the Local Centre Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone in clauses (5), (6), (7) and (8) to 7m for all four scenarios.
53	The Adare Company	53.80	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1 PSP:R24 Provision of ecological areas	Oppose	The provision of the Proposed Bat Corridors (which are also identified as Bat Habitat Areas) forms part of a proposed approach to mitigate and compensate the effects of development on the long-tailed bat within Peacocke as a whole. The submitter opposes the notified provisions because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is unfair for the costs and responsibility for the mitigation and compensation of these effects to fall on a limited number of landowners whose land is within these proposed Bat Habitat Areas. The land would otherwise be developable without any significant adverse effects.</li><li>• All Bat Habitat area should be vested in and managed by the Council to ensure integrated management across the Peacocke Structure Plan and the wider city to avoid delays and impracticalities arising from vesting and planting.</li><li>• It is unclear what the requirement that the “Bat Corridors ... shall be provided” means. The intent of the rule is presumably that subdividers must vest the land in HCC as local purpose reserve.</li><li>• The Proposed Bat Corridors straddle property boundaries and land capable of being vested at subdivision stage within any single property will not necessarily be the full width of the corridor. Given the land is shown on Planning Maps and in the Peacocke Structure Plan, it is clear what area is required to be vested without the need to refer to a width in the rule.</li><li>• The requirement for a 50m wide corridor is inconsistent with the Environment Court’s findings in <i>Weston Lea Limited v Hamilton City Council</i> [2020] where the Court determined that a 35m corridor was appropriate.</li></ul>	Amend Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R24 to read: “Where subdivision includes <u>Natural Open Space zoned</u> areas identified as Bat <u>Habitat Areas</u> <del>Corridors</del> these shall be <del>provided vested in Hamilton City Council as public open space</del> in accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan. <del>and be designed to the following requirements:</del> <del>a) Maintain a minimum width of 50m.”</del> Amend Plan Change 5 to reduce the identified width of Bat Habitat Areas associated with the Proposed Bat Corridors to 35m (Cross-reference this relief with the reasons and relief under submission [2] in relation to the description and width of Bat Habitat Areas.).
53	The Adare Company	53.81	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Rule SUB-PREC1-PSP:R25 Provision of public transport infrastructure	Oppose	The standard in clause (a) requiring bus stops to be provided in locations agreed with Waikato Regional Council is uncertain and unlawful. The location of bus stops should be determined as part of detailed engineering design in accordance with HCC engineering standards. If the standards do not already address these requirements then they should be updated to do so. The standard in (c) requiring pedestrian crossing facilities that enable safe and step free access between stops is unclear because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The rule does not define what is meant by “step free”;</li><li>• The standard implies that people will move between bus stops on either side of the road which is unlikely unless the location is an interchange for different bus services.</li></ul> The requirement for the transport corridor to be designed to be accessible to all users is adequately covered by clause (b) of Rule R25.	Amend SUB-PREC1-PSP:R25 to read: “1) Subdivision creating a new, or requiring the upgrading of an existing, transport corridor that is identified as a Public Transport Route in the Peacocke Structure Plan shall: a) Provide bus stops in locations <del>as agreed with Waikato Regional Council</del> <u>which are consistent with the requirements of the Waikato Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications.</u> b) Design the transport corridor to ensure bus stops are constructed to be accessible to all users. <del>c) Provide pedestrian crossing facilities that enable safe and step free access between stops.”</del> <u>c) Include pedestrian crossing facilities at or near to bus stops.”</u>
53	The Adare Company	53.82	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	Rule 25.6.4.4	Oppose	Policies 25.6.2.2a and b make it clear that the purpose of the rule is to be about “fixed lighting”. This rule needs amendment to be consistent with this approach.	Amend Rule 25.6.4.4 to read: “Lighting <del>from fixed sources</del> shall not exceed 0.3 lux (horizontal and vertical) when measured at the external boundary of the <del>Significant</del> Bat Habitat Area.”
53	The Adare Company	53.83	Chapter 25.14 Transportation	Rule 25.14.4.1(h)	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments to this rule for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some of the standards for internal vehicle access in Rule 25.14.4.1(h) are inconsistent with the standards in Table</li></ul>	Amend Rule 25.14.4.1(h)(vii) to read: “The <u>internal vehicle</u> access <u>width</u> requirements of i-; <u>for residential units</u> and the requirements of iv and v do not apply to <del>rear lanes in the</del> Peacocke Structure Plan <u>area</u> . Instead the following shall
53	The Adare Company	53.84	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Appendix 1.1.2	Oppose	This proposed terminology is consistent with other submissions to change ‘Seismic Setback Line’ to ‘Seismic Investigation Area’. There is currently no definition so it is unclear what the purpose of the proposed overlay is.	Add a new definition for ‘Seismic Investigation Area’.
53	The Adare Company	53.85	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Appendix 1.1.2 “Minor works” definition	Oppose	The definition of minor works requires amendment to include reference to the Local Centre Zone (Peacocke Precinct) as a consequential change to the submission on Appendix 1.2.2.26 (submission point 88 below).	Amend the definition of “Minor Works” to read: “Minor works (in the Business 1-7, Central City, Industrial, Ruakura Logistics, <del>and</del> Ruakura Industrial Park Zones <u>and Local Centre Zone (Peacocke Precinct).</u> ”
53	The Adare Company	53.86	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Appendix 1.2.2.24 Landscape Concept Plans Peacocke Structure Plan Area	Oppose	Amendments are required to ensure that the Landscape Concept Plans provide clear and helpful guidance to plan users: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Landscape Concept Plan should relate to landscaping within public areas only rather than within private lots.</li><li>• The provisions should be clear that the content of the Landscape Concept Plan should relate to open space zones and the other public infrastructure described in (i), namely streets, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater swales, wetlands, detention basins, streams and riparian margins, as relevant to the subject site.</li><li>• A Landscape Concept Plan should not be required where public land is not existing, proposed or required for a particular site.</li></ul>	Amend Appendix 1.2.2.24 to read: “ <del>For any subdivision application in the Peacocke Structure Plan adjoining or including any open space zone or involving more than two hectares of land, a</del> Landscape Concept Plan shall be <del>provided with the application that meets the following requirements (and shall apply to the application footprint of the proposed subdivision) prepared for any subdivision application in the Peacocke Structure Plan area where the subdivision site involves more than 2 hectares of land and includes any open space zone or new public roads, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater swales, wetlands, detention basins and streams or riparian margins.</del> The objectives of the Landscape Concept Plan <del>is are</del> to identify opportunities <u>for existing or proposed public land that is within the subdivision site</u> to protect or enhance the natural character and cultural, heritage and amenity values- <del>within the subdivision site</del> , to recognise and provide for tangata whenua values and relationships with Peacocke, and their aspirations for the area, and to reflect the area’s character and heritage. The landscape concept plan shall include:”

**Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan**  
**Summary of Submissions**

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
53	The Adare Company	53.87	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Appendix 1.2.2.25 Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan Peacocke Structure Plan Area	Oppose	<p>The Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan should relate to ecological rehabilitation and management within public areas only rather than within private lots. A distinction must be drawn between what is mitigation for a proposed activity and what is wider protection and enhancement responding to a city-wide issue. The provisions should be clear as to which public areas the Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan should apply. An Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan should not be required where public land does not exist, nor is proposed or required for a particular site. Rehabilitation and management should take place on public land and the cost of preparing an Ecological Rehabilitation and Management Plan should not be transferred to individual private landowners. Clause (iii) of Appendix 1.2.2.25 should be deleted. Requiring fixed lighting design to be provided for private lots near areas of Significant Bat Habitat is impractical at subdivision stage. It is also unnecessary given there are proposed land use controls which limit light spill into Bat Habitat Areas (Rule 25.6.4.4) and which require 5m building setbacks to the boundary of Bat Habitat Areas (Rule MRZ-PREC1-PSP: R39(8)). Clause (iv) should be amended by adding the words “as relevant to the site”. This reflects that wetland restoration, for example, will only be relevant to sites which contain wetlands. Clause (v) relates to the establishment and enhancement of identified “Significant Bat Habitat corridors” and should be deleted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hamilton City Council should take leadership on the provision of the Bat Habitat Areas by purchasing the affected land and being responsible for their creation and maintenance.</li> <li>• It is an unreasonable burden to require the limited number of owners of land that is subject to the Bat Habitat Areas to be responsible for their creation, which is likely to require extensive planting and other improvements at significant cost under the direction of ecological and landscaping experts.</li> <li>• The Bat Habitat Areas are for the mitigation and compensation of effects on bats across the Hamilton city home range and the Peacocke Structure Plan area and they will also have community recreation benefits. Therefore, the burden for their creation should be shared.</li> <li>• The Bat Habitat Areas straddle property boundaries. The purchase of the land and the creation of the Bat Habitat Areas by Hamilton City Council would ensure a coordinated approach, allow greater control over the timing of their provision and be more equitable.</li> </ul>	<p>Amend Appendix 1.2.2.25 to read:  <del>“All subdivision applications within the Peacocke Structure Plan adjoining or including any open space zone or involving more than two hectares of land shall include, as part of the resource consent application, an Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan (ERMP). The objective of the ERMP is to enhance freshwater and terrestrial ecological values within the site. As a minimum, it is to include the following, and the methods to implement them: An Ecological Rehabilitation Management Plan (ERMP) shall be prepared for any subdivision application in the Peacocke Structure Plan area where the subdivision site involves more than 2 hectares of land and includes any open space zone or new public roads, footpaths, cycleways, stormwater swales, wetlands, detention basins and streams or riparian margins. The objective of the ERMP is to identify opportunities to enhance freshwater and terrestrial ecological values within existing or proposed public land that is within the subdivision site. The ERMP shall include:</del></p> <p>i. An indigenous fish management plan for any stream or wetland habitat within the site, including a summary of fish habitat and species present, a summary of planned works, permitting requirements, procedures for dealing with pest fish, biosecurity protocols, timing of works, procedures for recovering indigenous fish prior to and during works, roles and responsibilities of parties, reporting requirements and any specific mitigation measures.</p> <p>ii. Planting of indigenous tree species to provide indigenous vegetation and habitat for indigenous fauna.</p> <p>iii. <del>Fixed lighting design that achieves the required lighting standards in relation to areas of Significant Bat Habitat, and is sensitive to bats in the wider area, including avoidance of upward facing lighting and UV lighting, and avoidance of lighting in wetland and riparian margin areas.</del></p> <p>iv. Restoration planting to include wetland restoration, habitat enhancement and riparian buffer zones, <u>as relevant to the site.</u></p> <p>v. <del>The establishment and enhancement of identified Significant Bat Habitat corridors as identified within the Peacocke Structure Plan.</del></p> <p>vi. Evidence of engagement with tangata whenua during preparation of the ERMP including how the outcomes of that engagement have been addressed.”</p>
53	The Adare Company	53.88	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Appendix 1.2.2.26 – Peacocke Local Centre Master Plan para. [1]	Oppose	<p>While the requirement for a Master Plan is supported, it is considered that minor works (as defined in Appendix 1.1.2) should not trigger this requirement as these works do not generate more than a minor change to the environment or adverse effects. Further, the Local Centre is a large area, and it is likely that development will be staged. Accordingly, the information prepared can be conceptual and indicative, unless it is for the specific development proposed and for which resource consent is being sought.</p>	<p>Amend Appendix 1.2.2.26 to read:  “All applications for development within the Peacocke Local Centre Zone that relate to the establishment or alteration of buildings (<u>except minor works</u>), associated parking, transport corridors, or areas <u>of</u> public space shall include a Master plan that includes: <u>the information in (1) to (4) below. While detailed information is required regarding the specific development which is proposed, the Master Plan information regarding future development and staging may be conceptual and indicative.</u>”</p>
53	The Adare Company	53.89	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	Appendix 1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria P – Peacocke Structure Plan	Oppose	<p>1. The term “Seismic Setback Line” which is used in criteria P3(g) and P5(u) and elsewhere in the Plan Change 5 provisions has the potential to create considerable confusion. It is understood that the “setback” refers to a distance from gullies and the river within which specific geotechnical investigations are required to determine engineering design requirements for development, rather than requiring setbacks for buildings from these features. A clearer term would be “Seismic Investigation Area”. Refer also to other submission points on this matter.</p> <p>2. Criterion P4(a) lists matters which are to be assessed in terms of whether a development in the Peacocke Business Centres achieves high quality urban design. Although objectives, policies and rules for the Local Centre Zone anticipate some residential activities within the centre, there is currently no reference to opportunities for mixed use development. This should be included.</p> <p>3. Reference to correct terms and those used elsewhere in the provisions and Planning Maps is necessary for referencing and certainty.</p> <p>4. Assessment criteria are required to reinforce the centres hierarchy within the district plan and to ensure that development within the Peacocke Structure Plan area outside of the Local Centre Zone does not undermine the primacy of the Peacocke Local Centre. The proposed assessment criteria, which is based on similar wording to that adopted elsewhere in the district plan, is important alongside the new rule proposed in other submissions which would limit gross floor area of retail and office activities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone. The proposed assessment criteria are consistent with Objective DEV01-PSP: O9 and the outcomes envisaged in Chapter 3A.</p> <p>5. Reference to correct terms and those used elsewhere in the provisions and Planning Maps is necessary for referencing and certainty.</p> <p>6. The proposed change is a correction of a minor error and will improve the clarity of the assessment criterion.</p> <p>7. The reference to “Significant Bat Habitat Area” can be confused with “Significant Natural Area”. The word “Significant” should therefore be deleted. Refer to other submission points on this matter.</p> <p>8. Criterion P5(r) anticipates that the “ecological corridors” will be used to mitigate and offset the effects of development on the long-tailed bat. Rather than requiring this to be considered by applicants for resource consent for individual developments, the Council should take leadership on the provision of the ecological corridors by purchasing the affected land and taking responsibility for the creation and maintenance of the new Bat Habitat Areas. This would be the most appropriate and equitable approach given that the Bat Habitat Areas are for mitigating the effects of urban development across the wider Hamilton City and surrounding environments.</p>	<p>Amend reference to “Seismic Setback Line” in assessment criteria P3(g) and P5(u) to “Seismic Investigation Area”.</p> <p>Amend P4(a) by adding a new clause (xii) stating:  <u>“(xii) Consideration of suitable opportunities for mixed use development.”</u></p> <p>Amend P4(d) to refer to the “Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide” rather than the Peacocke Local Centre Guidelines.</p> <p>Add the following new assessment criteria P4(e):  <u>“For retail and office development in the Medium Density Residential Zone or retail and office development which exceeds a total 800m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area in any individual centre in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, the extent to which the proposal:</u>  <u>a) Avoids adverse effects on the vitality, function and amenity of the Local Centre and other Neighbourhood Centres within Peacocke that go beyond those effects ordinarily associated with competition on trade competitors.</u>  <u>b) Avoids the inefficient use of existing physical resources and promotes a compact urban form.</u>  <u>c) Promotes the efficient use of existing and planned public and private investment in infrastructure.”</u></p> <p>Amend P5(h) so that it refers to the “Local Centre”, rather than the Suburban Centre.</p> <p>Amend P5(p)(5) to read:  “5. Reflects the <u>area’s</u> characters and heritage.”</p> <p>Amend P5(q) to refer to change the reference to “Significant Bat Habitat” to “Bat Habitat Areas”.</p> <p>Delete P5(r) as follows: <u>“The extent to which the proposal mitigates or off-sets the effects of development on Significant Bat Habitat through the provision and enhancement of ecological corridors.”</u></p>
53	The Adare Company	53.90	Appendix 1.4 Design Guides	Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide	Support in Part	<p>1. The Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide is repetitive, not well structured, misses clarifying diagrams and uses incorrect terminology to reference the Peacocke Local Centre Concept Plan in Appendix 2.</p> <p>2. Point 12 under the heading ‘Main Street’ refers to parking in a general sense and requires that, where provided, it must be located to the rear of sites. The provision of on-street car parking will be very important for the commercial visibility and functioning of the Local Centre. The guide should be clear that the reference to parking being at the rear of sites applies to off-street parking only.</p> <p>3. The ‘key design principles’ for the Local Centre are listed under the Business Areas description in Chapter 3A but would be better included within the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide in Appendix 1.4.10.</p>	<p>Amend the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide in Appendix 1.4.10 to be clearer and more succinct.</p> <p>Amend point 12 under the heading ‘Main Street’ to read:  “12. Where provided, <u>off-street</u> parking should contribute to a well-functioning high amenity local centre by:</p> <p>a. Being located to the rear of the site and outside of identified frontages.</p> <p>b. Being designed and located to be safe and achieve a high level of amenity using appropriate lighting and landscaping and high-quality materials and finishes.</p> <p>c. Be connected to areas of activity through footpaths that provide clear, safe and direct universal access.”</p> <p>Insert the key design principles from clause (a), para. [5] of Chapter 3A to the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide in Appendix 1.4.10.</p>

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
53	The Adare Company	53.91	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-1 – Peacocke Structure Plan – Land Use	Support in Part	The location of the Proposed Local Centre to the east of Peacocks Road and the application of a High Density Overlay to the Medium Density Residential zoned land immediately surrounding the centre is supported. The location for the Local Centre ensures that the centre will not be segregated by the future minor arterial road which will enhance accessibility and improve the function and viability of the centre. The location will enable optimum integration between future land uses and with the adjoining Waikato River and associated areas of open space. This support for the Local Centre is subject to amendments being made to the northern extent of the Proposed Local Centre in Figure 2-1 and on other maps to be consistent with the relief sought through other points made in this submission.	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 through submission point 53.101.
53	The Adare Company	53.92	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-1 Peacocke Structure Plan Land Use	Oppose	Provisions for the Natural Open Space Zone are supported in principle as a measure to protect and enhance and to create additional habitat for the long-tailed bat. However, the submitter does not accept the location and extent of all of these areas and considers that they should be based on either the existing natural environment, or created to the extent necessary to ensure that the role, function and connectivity of ecological areas is maintained. The diagonally slashed area on the submitter’s land which is legally described as Lot 2 DP 23381, Lot 1 DPS 78023 and Part Allotments 93 and 94 Te Rapa Parish is currently without mention on the Legend. It is accordingly innominate and meaningless. Existing wetlands are not shown on this figure and their reference in the legend should be deleted.	Delete: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Proposed Natural Open Space" areas shown on the figure included in the submission</li> <li>• Diagonally slashed area on Lot 2 DP 23381, Lot 1 DPS 78023 and Part Allotments 93 and 94 Te Rapa Parish</li> <li>• “Existing Wetlands” from the Legend.</li> </ul>
53	The Adare Company	53.93	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-2 Peacocke Structure Plan Transport Network	Support in Part	The submitter suggests that a Local Road connection is provided between Peacocks Road and Peacocks Lane in the Indicative Key Local Transport Network. This would provide better certainty that road access will be able to be obtained to the submitter’s property (Lot 8 DP 34164) from Peacocks Road and could occur at a relatively early stage without being dependent on the prior development of small surrounding land holdings which are owned by others. This would allow the potential for the site to be developed at the same time as the Amberfield development which is directly opposite on Peacocks Road. If necessary, the Key Public Transport Stop Location which is shown on Peacocks Road should be shifted to accommodate the proposed indicative Key Local Transport Network.	Amend Figure 2-2 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert a new ‘Indicative Key Local Transport Network’ within Lot 8 DP 34164 and Lot 2 DP 519671 as shown on the figure included in the submission.</li> <li>• If necessary, shift the ‘Key Public Transport Stop Location’ on Peacocks Road to accommodate the proposed Indicative Key Local Transport Network.</li> </ul>
53	The Adare Company	53.94	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-3 Peacocke Structure Plan Natural Environment and Heritage	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Proposed Esplanade Reserves identified on the Peacocke Structure Plan should be deleted as they are based on the study in Appendix W Peacocke Structure Plan: Esplanade Report which states that "the broad-scale approach was considered adequate for the purposes of the current study but could be insufficient for determining esplanade extent at the lot level when subdivision of individual lots takes place".</li> <li>• The reference to “Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area” can be confused with “Significant Natural Area”. The words “Proposed Significant” should therefore be deleted.</li> <li>• Provisions for the Bat Habitat Areas are supported in principle as a measure to protect and enhance and to create additional habitat for the long-tailed bat. However, the submitter does not accept the location and extent of all of these areas and considers that they should be located where the existing natural environment is already occupied by bats (such as the Mangakootukutuku Gully) or where there is evidence of bat corridor activity.</li> <li>• Significant Natural Areas are classified based on their existing ecological values. Reference to them as “Proposed Significant Natural Area (SNA)” should therefore be amended to “Significant Natural Area (SNA)”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete all Proposed Esplanade Reserves on Fig 2-3</li> <li>• Amend “Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area” to read “Proposed Bat Habitat Area” in the Legend.</li> <li>• Amend “Proposed Significant Natural Area (SNA)” to read “Significant Natural Area (SNA)” in the Legend.</li> <li>• Delete the “Proposed Bat Corridor” and “Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area” from Lot 2 DP 23381 and Part Lot 1 DP 23381 as shown in the figure included in the submission.</li> </ul>
53	The Adare Company	53.95	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Figure 2-3b Peacocke Local Centre Concept Plan	Oppose	The current notation of the main street as “Pedestrian Main Street” on the Peacocke Local Centre Concept Plan implies that the main street will be pedestrianised with no vehicles. We understand that is not the intention and that the main street will be used by vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, which is a supported outcome. The diagram should therefore refer to “Main Street” only. The importance of providing good pedestrian facilities within the main street environment can be addressed in the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide (Appendix 1.4.10). The “Future location for community facility” is the only land use activity that is identified on Figure 2-3b. All potential land uses, including the possible community facility, are shown conceptually on Figure 19 in Chapter 3A, which the submitter seeks to be relocated to Appendix 2 as a new Figure 2-3c. That figure is the appropriate place to show potential land uses in a more comprehensive way, rather than Figure 2-3b. Notwithstanding this, the report entitled ‘Community Infrastructure in Peacocke’ concludes that short to medium term demand for libraries and community centres will be met by existing facilities elsewhere and that there is no funding certainty for a possible community facility in Peacocke. As such, it is more appropriate to remove it from Figure 2- 3b.	Amend Figure 2-3b as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace “Pedestrian Main Street” with “Main Street”.</li> <li>• Delete the “Future location for community facility”.</li> <li>• Amend the extent of the Local Centre Precinct in Figure 2-3b to be consistent with the relief sought through other points made in this submission.</li> </ul>
53	The Adare Company	53.96	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15-1 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas – Tables and Figures	Oppose	Amendment is necessary to comply with the directive in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) for minimum car parking standards to be removed from district plans. This requirement must be met no later than 20 February 2022.	Amend the first column of Table 15-1a (oo) to read: “Single dwellings, duplex dwellings, terrace dwellings and apartments <u>and all other residential and non-residential activities</u> in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area.”
53	The Adare Company	53.97	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Appendix 15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements within the Peacocke Structure Plan Area	Oppose	Walking will be a very important “unit of movement” but so too will cycling, public transport and private vehicles. Utilisation of these other modes is likely to be significantly higher than walking for movements to destinations which are outside a reasonable walking distance from the point of origin.	Amend Appendix 15-2 to read: <p>“A <b>Design Statement</b> that addresses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An explanation of how the development will achieve the objectives and is consistent with the policies of the Peacocke Structure Plan Area, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Demonstrating how the design of the development prioritises walking as <del>the fundamental</del> <u>an important</u> unit of movement within the structure plan area. [Note: this will affect the consideration of desirable levels of service for motor vehicles.]”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
53	The Adare Company	53.98	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15-6b: Criteria for the form of Transport Corridors in the Peacocke Structure Plan	Oppose	1. The standards in Table 15-6b should be consistent with the decision sought for Rule 25.14.4.1(h) and reflect the alternative minimum Local Road, Local Road – Park Edge, Collector Road (Public Transport Route), Collector Road (Non-Public Transport Route) and Minor Arterial Road cross sections enclosed with this submission. This change is necessary because there is currently inconsistency between some of the standards in Table 15-6b and Rule 25.14.4.1(h), the alternative cross sections are more appropriate minimum roading standards, and no specific minimum standards were provided for minor arterial roads.	Amend Table 15-6b so that the standards are consistent with the relief sought for Rule 25.14.4.1(h) in submission point 53.98.2.
						2. Table 15-6b includes standards for private ways; however, Rule 25.14.4.1(h)(vii) explains that different standards apply for rear lanes.	Amend Table 15-6b to clarify that the ‘Private way’ standards in the second row exclude rear lanes.
						3. The Local Road minimum standards should be amended to reflect NZS4404 standards as indicated by the alternative Local Road cross section enclosed with the submission. The submitter proposes a narrower Local Road minimum legal width is 16.4m. New minimum standards should be included for Local Roads – Park Edge to reflect that an alternative design is appropriate where roads adjoin the edges of public open space. The submitter proposes a narrower minimum legal width of 12.8m which is similar to design standards that were proposed and accepted for the Amberfield subdivision. The alternative road cross sections will also reduce the amount of land required for roading and enable more land to remain available for residential development.	Amend the Local Road Residential criteria in Table 15- 6b to reflect the alternative Local Road and Local Road – Park Edge cross sections enclosed with the submission.
						4. The Collector Road minimum standards should be amended to reflect NZS4404 minimum standards as indicated by the Collector Road cross sections enclosed with this submission. The submitter proposes narrower minimum legal widths of 23.2m for Collector roads on Public Transport routes and 22.8m on Collector roads which are not on Public Transport routes. The alternative road cross sections will also reduce the amount of land required for roading and enable more land to remain available for residential development.	Amend the Collector – Public Transport Route and Collector – Non-Public Transport Route Residential criteria in Table 15-6b to reflect the alternative Collector Road cross sections enclosed with the submission.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
						5. There are currently no specific minimum standards included for Minor Arterial Roads in the Peacocke Structure Plan Area in Table 15-6b. Standards should be added to reflect the Minor Arterial Road cross section which is enclosed with this submission where the submitter proposes a minimum legal width of 26.8m. Without designations for all the Minor Arterial Roads in Peacocke, the inclusion of minimum standards is important so the provisions are clear and people can consider how adjoining uses will need to interact with these roads. The provision of on-street car parking along Minor Arterial Roads, such as Peacockes Road, is very important to ensure that medium and high density residential uses, as well as the Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centres and schools, are accessible to residents and visitors and that the centres are commercially viable.	Insert new Minor Arterial Road Residential criteria in Table 15-6b to reflect the Minor Arterial Road cross section enclosed with the submission.
53	The Adare Company	53.99	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Planning Maps 57B, 58B,64B and 65B	Oppose	The Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area is proposed to be expanded in its coverage within some parts of the submitters land, including into areas of the Amberfield site where resource consents have been granted for residential subdivision, roads and other infrastructure. The overlay within these areas would constrain development and impose additional and unnecessary costs for resource consents for development within the Hazard Area.	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.
53	The Adare Company	53.100	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Planning Map 64A	Oppose	The current location of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone opposite Stubbs Road conflicts with the proposed Collector Road shown on Figure 2-2 Peacocke Structure Plan – Transport Network. The location of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone should be shifted south on Planning Map 64A so that it is not located directly opposite the intersection with Stubbs Road to resolve this conflict.	Amend the location of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone on Planning Map 64A as shown on the figure included in the submission.
53	The Adare Company	53.101	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Planning Maps 64A, 64B and 65A and 65B	Support in Part	The location of the Local Centre Zone is supported subject to amendments being made to shift the northern boundary of the Local Centre Zone to the south (a reduction of approximately 7,600m2). The purpose of this change is to achieve better alignment with updated plans that the submitter has developed for this part of the Amberfield site. The submitter plans high density residential uses for the area that currently forms the northern extent of the Local Centre Zone. The proposed change will not affect the capacity of the Local Centre to accommodate retail, commercial and other uses at the required scale to service the local needs of the Peacocke Structure Plan area.	Amend the northern boundary of the Local Centre Zone on Planning Maps 64A and 65A as follows: Amend Planning Maps 64A and 65A so that the northern area shown on the figure included in the submission is zoned Medium Density Residential. Amend Planning Maps 64B and 65B so that the northern area shown on the figure included in the submission is within the High Density Overlay Area.
53	The Adare Company	53.102	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Planning Map 64A	Oppose	The identification of the Natural Open Space Zone on the Planning Maps is based on and is the same as shown in Structure Plan Land Use Appendix 2-1. Submission point 92 seeks the deletion of the zone from the submitters land. The zoning shown on the Planning Maps requires deletion to be consistent.	Amend Planning Map 64A as follows: Delete “Natural Open Space Zone” from Planning Map 64A within Lot 2 DP 23381 and Part Lot 1 DP 23381.
53	The Adare Company	53.103	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Planning Map 64B	Oppose	The identification of the “Significant Bat Habitat Area” on the Planning Maps is based on and is the same as shown in Structure Plan Land Use Appendix 2-3. Submission point 94 seeks the deletion of this area from the submitters land. The “Significant Bat Habitat Area” shown on the Planning Maps requires deletion to be consistent.	Amend Planning Map 64B as follows: Delete “Significant Bat Habitat Area” from Map 64B within Lot 2 DP 23381 and Part Lot 1 DP 23381.
53	The Adare Company	53.104	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	All Planning Maps	Oppose	The reference to “Significant Bat Habitat Area” can be confused with “Significant Natural Area”. The word “Significant” should therefore be deleted. The Legend in Planning Maps should be amended.	Amend the Peacocke Precinct Planning Maps to change “Significant Bat Habitat Area” to “Proposed Bat Habitat Area” in the Legend.
53	The Adare Company	53.105	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	All Planning Maps	Oppose	The legend requires amendment to be consistent with other submissions which request that the term ‘Seismic Setback Line’ is changed to ‘Seismic Investigation Area’.	Amend the Peacocke Precinct Planning Maps as follows: Change “Seismic Setback Line” to “Seismic Investigation Area” in the Legend.
54	Bike Waikato	54.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Integration of land development and multi modal transport system	Support	The submitter supports the vision where land development creates well-connected neighbourhoods that delivers multi-modal transport options right from the beginning. Laying out the multi-modal transport network before development occurs allows users to understand how they can access everyday activities without the need to own a private motor vehicle.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.2	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Emphasis on mode-shift	Support	The submitter supports emphasis on mode-shift away from private vehicle trips through the creation of urban environments that are walkable and cyclable around public transport and activity nodes.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.3	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Vision for a 20 minute city	Support	The submitter supports the focus on Hamilton’s vision for a 20 minute city. Many urban areas have been developed around private motor vehicle use. While these have their place, the current dependency and spread out development means many other modes are ignored. The focus on including walkable and cyclable networks means people will enjoy using alternative transport modes.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.4	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Walking and cycling connections through bat habitat	Support	The submitter supports including day time walking and cycling connections through Bat Corridors and Bat Habitat Buffers. Cycling networks that are separated from vehicle thoroughfares become more comfortable and attractive to people on bikes, further encouraging their use.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.5	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Block pattern and permeability requirements	Support	The submitter supports subdivision requirements that promote block patterns and create permeability for walking and cycling so short local trips are easily achievable without private vehicles. Peacocke presents an opportunity to create a template for a truly multi-modal transport network, which can be replicated around Hamilton and the rest of New Zealand.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.6	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Prioritisation of walking and cycling	Support	The submitter supports the priority given to walking and cycling, focusing on allocation of space and directness of routes with good connectivity to the central city and other key destinations.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.7	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Seperation of vulnerable road users	Support	The submitter supports the recognition of vulnerable road users’ needs by separating walking and cycling from each other and vehicles, having distinct entry into local transport networks and fully separated cycling facilities on Arterial and Collector roads.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.8	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Minimisation of vehicle crossings along walking and cycling paths	Support	The submitter supports requirements to minimise vehicle crossings across shared paths and separated cycleways to 50m. Reducing the number and frequency of conflicts between bikes and vehicles increases the actual and perceived safety for people considering using a bike to replace vehicle trips.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.9	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Pedestrian and cycle accessways	Support	The submitter supports the limits to pedestrian and cycle accessways to 80m in length, while maintaining accessway widths that increase passive surveillance and user’s safety.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.10	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	Cycle network	Support	The submitter supports the establishment of a high-quality cycling environment and clear accessible connections to the surrounding network within the Local Centre. Safe, connected biking networks are essential to encourage more people to consider using a bike to replace vehicle trips.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.11	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct  Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Walkways and cycleway design	Support	The submitter supports that walkways and cycleways within the Waikato Hydro System operating range will be designed to withstand the effects of inundation. Cycleways and walkways will become a major transport network for many people in the Peacocke area and maintaining accessibility in most weather events will be crucial to promote continued use and uptake of biking.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.12	Appendix 2 – Structure Plans	Major transport network hierarchy	Support	The submitter supports the major transport network hierarchy laid out on the structure plan maps where it provides safe, connected, and direct routes for people on bikes.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.13	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Low speed environments	Support	The submitter supports the low speed environments for residential roads and accessways. People-friendly design speeds will result in environments where people feel safer to walk, bike, skate and scooter for short trips.	Retain as notified.
54	Bike Waikato	54.14	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Seperated cycleways	Support	The submitter supports separated cycleways on all types of collector roads, giving people on bikes the most direct route between destinations.	Retain as notified.



Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
54	Bike Waikato	54.15	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Early construction of cycle connections	Support in Part	The structure plan needs specific requirements to construct early connections to the existing transport networks through Glenview, Melville and Hamilton East. Many early residents in Peacocke will need to regularly access services, education and employment in other parts of Hamilton while the area develops into a well serviced local centre. This connection to the existing parts of the city is just as crucial as the internal transport network. Of specific request is separated pedestrian and cycle facilities along the northern end of Peacockes Road.	Amend to include requirements to construct early cycle connections to existing transport networks. Of specific request is separated pedestrian and cycle facilities along the northern end of Peacockes Road.
54	Bike Waikato	54.16	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	Connections between walking/cycling and public transport network	Support in Part	The walking and cycling network needs to connect to the public transport network, including providing safe and secure bicycle parking at the bus transit stations to enable bike-park and ride trips.	Amend to ensure that the walking and cycling network connects walking/cycling network to the public transport network. Provide bicycle parking at bus transit stations.
54	Bike Waikato	54.17	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Accessway designs	Support in Part	When pedestrian and cycle accessways connect to public road corridors they need to be designed to not increase the risk to biking and micro-mobility users. The design should not require the installation of additional engineering measures to provide a safe connection and need to consider a variety of transport modes including, cargo bikes, trailers, trikes, and mobility device.	Amend accessway design requirements.
54	Bike Waikato	54.18	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Cycle lanes through intersections	Support in Part	When promoting high-quality walking and cycling networks, specific detail regarding roundabouts and intersections needs to be included.	Amend to include minimum requirements of protected cycle lanes through intersections.
54	Bike Waikato	54.19	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	Seperated cycleways	Support in Part	Include separated cycleways in all the transport corridors alongside the ‘bat buffer zones’ and ‘bat corridors’. This will encourage people to use bicycles in dusk and after-dark periods which will reduce replaceable vehicle trips and ‘disturbance effects’ from vehicle lights.	Amend to include separated cycleways in all the transport corridors alongside ‘bat buffer zones’ and ‘bat corridors’.
54	Bike Waikato	54.20	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Cycling connections	Support in Part	Neighbourhood Centre Zones need requirements for high quality, clear and direct cycling connections to surrounding transport networks. By providing multi-modal transport options to access Neighbourhood Centres residents will be more likely to choose active or public transport for short trips.	Amend to include requirements for high quality, clear and direct cycle connections to surrounding transport networks.
54	Bike Waikato	54.21	Appendix 1.4 Design Guides	Section 1.4.1.4 (h)	Support in Part	The Peacocke Structure Plan needs to emphasise the requirements in this section of the design guide to provide pedestrian and cycle links on the end of cul-de-sacs where they cannot be avoided.	Amend the Peacocke Structure Plan to emphasise the requirements in this section of the design guide to provide pedestrian and cycle links on the end of cul-de-sacs where they cannot be avoided.
54	Bike Waikato	54.22	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15-6a: Minimum width of one-way separated cycleways	Support in Part	One-way separated cycleways are specified with a desirable minimum width of 2.0m. This should be amended to ‘absolute minimum’ and note requirements for berm space to facilitate future cycleway widening as cycle volumes increase. Retrofitting bike infrastructure into existing roads in Hamilton is constrained by current road widths and making allowances for increases in bike use will reduce these retrofitting issues in Peacocke in the future.	Amend "Cyclepath requirements (min desirable)" to " <u>absolute minimum</u> " and note requirements for berm space.
54	Bike Waikato	54.23	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Table 15-1a	Support in Part	Add a requirement for secure, protected resident bicycle parking spaces. In response to the removal of the minimum car parking spaces there will be an increase in bicycles which will need dedicated long term and short term storage. This may require the introduction of a new requirement in this table that can progressively be applied to development across the rest of Hamilton	Amend to include a requirement for secure bicycle parking spaces for residents.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.1	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	High Density Overlay	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the “High Density Overlay” shown on the Peacocke Structure Plan as it is not considered the most effective tool for achieving the desired high density outcomes for the identified parts of the Peacocke Precinct. Kāinga Ora supports the replacement of the “High Density Overlay” with a “High Density Zone” with its own purpose, objectives, policies and rules.	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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.2	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Local Centre	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora does not consider that the Council has appropriately set the density targets for the Precinct, and as such has incorrectly determined the size and / or type of centre needed to support the Peacocke Precinct.	Amend the size of the proposed Local Centre to reflect the recalculation of density targets, or change the type of centre for the Precinct.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.3	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	New Layer - Earthworks overlay	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that a new “Earthworks Overlay” should be included 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. An overlay would enable developers and purchasers to understand the implications of potentially restricted earthworks, including costs to develop or limitations on development density.	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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.4	Chapter 3A – Peacocke Structure Plan	Overview	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora considers that the overview needs to be clear that the intent for the Peacocke Precinct is to achieve a medium to high density community.	Amend as follows: The Peacocke area is a 740ha area of rural land... - <del>Promote medium to high density development by</del> <u>Promote active street frontages</u> <del>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</del> <u>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</u> <del>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 -t</del> <u>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</u>

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.5	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Vision	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the vision needs to be clearer that the intent for the Peacocke Precinct is to achieve a medium to high density community and needs to set out the framework for achieving the vision (as it is very unclear at the moment how good design outcomes will be delivered). Kāinga Ora opposes and seeks the deletion of references to any design codes, guides or guidelines as de facto rules to be complied with in PC5, for example “is in accordance with any relevant design code”. The operative District Plan does not contain Design Guides suited to the medium to high density outcomes anticipated in the Peacocke Precinct. Kāinga Ora would support an alternative, whereby 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. If there are any proposed design guides, design codes or guidelines to be developed, Kāinga Ora seeks that any such guides are 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. Urban Design guidelines are identified as providing best practice guidance and can be updated without going through a Schedule 1 of the RMA process.	Amend as follows: The vision for the Peacocke <del>area</del> <u>Precinct</u> 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 <del>area</del> <u>Precinct</u> is Hamilton’s southern growth cell and is ideally located to <del>provide-house</del> approximately 20,000[TBC] people <del>homes</del> with easy access to destinations such as the Central City and the University of Waikato..... These features of the Peacocke <del>area</del> <u>Precinct</u> means that it is important..... The Peacocke <del>area</del> <u>Precinct</u> will be developed in line with Hamilton’s vision for a 20-minute city..This means establishing a <del>local</del> [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 <del>these</del> <u>in identified locations of topographical / geological / cultural significance, earthworks are minimised and development responds to the natural landform.</u> <del>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.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O1</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective effectively supports the vision.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.7	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O2</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective effectively supports the vision.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.8	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O3</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective effectively supports the vision.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.9	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O4</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective effectively supports the vision.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.10	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O5</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective effectively supports the vision.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.11	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O6</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the objective needs to be clear that the intent for the Peacocke Precinct is to achieve a medium to high density community.	Amend as follows: The Peacocke <del>Structure Plan</del> <u>Precinct</u> <del>is developed to deliver required housing supply for Hamilton and creates a connected, well integrated, high amenity</del> <u>medium to high density residential environment, with where areas of higher density development established is focused</u> around commercial centres, schools, public transport corridors and areas of open space and natural amenity.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.12	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O7</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports appropriate and sympathetic urban development that responds to the natural environment.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.13	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O8</u>	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora considers that the objective could be clearer as to the role of the centres and the outcomes that will be delivered	Amend as follows: <del>Business</del> <u>The C</u> centres in the Peacocke Precinct are well designed, functional, safe, attractive and vibrant and <u>provide for the commercial and community needs of the Peacocke residents, as well as high density living opportunities.</u> <del>integrate with surrounding neighbourhoods, provide for multi-level apartment buildings and create distinctive places that are functional, safe, attractive and vibrant.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.14	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O9</u>	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora considers that the objective could be clearer as to the role of the centres and the outcomes that will be delivered.	Amend as follows: The Peacocke <del>Local</del> [TBC] Centre is the primary <del>business</del> centre within the structure plan area and provides a range of commercial and community services, as well as high density living opportunities. <del>to the local community</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.15	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: 10</u>	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora considers that the objective could be clearer as to the role of the centres and the outcomes that will be delivered.	Amend as follows: Neighbourhood centres <u>provide small scale commercial and community services to the immediate community and are also</u> located in close proximity to recreational areas <u>to support and act as activity nodes for walkable catchments, providing access to smaller scale convenience activities.</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.16	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O11</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that earthworks should only be minimised where significant landforms need to be maintained. A corresponding overlay should be included to identify these geologically / topographically significant areas.	Amend as follows: Earthworks in the “ <u>Earthworks Overlay</u> ” <u>are sympathetic to the topography of the natural landform.</u> <del>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.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.17	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: New objective	Support	Kāinga Ora supports a specific objective that requires an appropriate amount of quality open space within the Structure Plan Area.	Include new objective: <u>Sufficient, well connected, high quality open space is provided to enhance the amenity and wellbeing of the community.</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.18	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O12</u>	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora supports a public edge to the Waikato River, but the objective needs to reflect that it is well connected and safe.	Amend as follows: Provide a <u>well connected and safe</u> public edge to the gully and Waikato River.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.19	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O13</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.20	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O14</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.21	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O15</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.22	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O16</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports open spaces that supports the ecological values of the Peacocke Area, but the objective needs to reflect that it is well connected and safe.	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 where they do not conflict with ecological values.

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.23	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O17</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers this objective is redundant as the framework for the strategic transport network is in place (and under construction) and the housing objectives are responding accordingly.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.24	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O18</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.25	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O19</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this objective but considers that the numbered portion read as policies and should be shifted to the transport policy section.	Amend as follows: The transport network reduces car dependency and encourages a mode shift to walking, cycling and public transport 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
55	Kāinga Ora	55.26	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O20</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.27	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O21</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.28	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O22</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.29	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O23</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective effectively supports the vision.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.30	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O24</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective effectively supports the vision.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.31	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O25</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.32	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: O26</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.33	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P1</u>	Support in part	While Kāinga Ora consider that development should be in general accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan, it is considered that this should be reinforced with a requirement for comprehensive development plans at either subdivision or landuse stage.	Amend as follows: Development should be in general accordance with the Peacocke Structure Plan and comprehensive development plans will be required to ensure development meets the vision of the Precinct.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.34	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P2</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy effectively supports the vision.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.35	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P3</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora considers that P15 more effectively articulates the required outcome than this policy.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.36	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P4</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this objective, but the relevant policy needs to be incorporated by reference (if the Council has not already done so).	Ensure that the Hamilton City Council Open Space Provision Policy is incorporated by reference.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.37	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P5</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers the policy is confusing as ‘walkways and cycleways’ are ‘recreational activities’.	Amend as follows: Recreational activities, including walkways and cycleways, are considered for co-location with: 1.Multifunctional stormwater management. 2. Walkways and cycleways. Cultural and heritage sites. 3. Significant Natural Areas.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.38	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P6</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that appropriate access to the Waikato River should be required (rather than promoted).	Amend as follows: Promote Require accessible, well located and safe appropriate and improved access to the Waikato River to better enable sporting, recreational, and cultural opportunities.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.39	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P7</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider that this policy could be better articulated.	Amend as follows: Avoid Ensure new development is connected to and promotes surveillance of ‘turning its back’ or privatising edges to major natural features and recreational areas open spaces.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.40	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P8</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy effectively supports the vision and is better articulated in P6.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.41	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P9</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy is necessary given that the Sports and Active Recreation Zone is in the process of being designated.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.42	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P10</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy is necessary given that the Sports and Active Recreation Zone is in the process of being designated.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.43	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P11</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy is necessary given that the Sports and Active Recreation Zone is in the process of being designated.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.44	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P12</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.45	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P13</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that high density living should be established in areas of greater outdoor recreation opportunity and amenity (like the river).	Amend as follows: Higher density development in the Peacocke Structure Plan: will 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, and May be provided along adjoining areas of natural open space including the river corridor and gully network.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.46	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P14</u>	Oppose	Given the intensification requirements for the Council as a Tier 1 Council, Kāinga Ora opposes this policy. In order to achieve the vision for the Precinct for a medium to high density residential community, this policy needs to set suitable targets.	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—3050 dwellings per hectare within the Peacocke Medium Density Precinct Zone. 2. A minimum overall net residential density (excludes roads and open space) of 35—50100 dwellings per hectare within the Peacock High Density Overlay Zone.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.47	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P15</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the policy needs to be explicit that low density residential development is not desirable in this location.	Amend as follows: <del>Avoid compromising the future delivery of high density residential activity around the local centre and identified public transport routes with low density development.</del> <u>Low density residential development is avoided in the Peacocke Structure Plan area.</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.48	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P16</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers that the medium and high density living requirement should be explicit.	Amend as follows: Require a variety of <u>medium and high density</u> housing typologies <del>and densities</del> to be provided throughout the structure plan area.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.49	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P17</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy to the extent that additional land for a centre is likely required to support the higher densities promoted by Kāinga Ora.	Amend as follows: The Local <u>[TBC]</u> Centre and Neighbourhood Centres are developed in locations consistent with the Peacocke Structure Plan.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.50	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P18</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy to the extent that additional land for a centre is likely required to support the higher densities promoted by Kāinga Ora.	Amend as follows: The Local <u>[TBC]</u> Centre is to be developed to include a variety of community and commercial activities that establish a high quality, pedestrian focused centre.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.51	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P19</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy to the extent that additional land for a centre is likely required to support the higher densities promoted by Kāinga Ora.	Amend as follows: Incorporate infrastructure to support public transport services in the Local <u>[TBC]</u> Centre.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.52	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P20</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.53	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P21</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy to the extent that additional land for a centre is likely required to support the higher densities promoted by Kāinga Ora.	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 <u>[TBC]</u> Centre.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.54	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P22</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy, although considers that it is sufficiently captured by P1.	Delete this provision.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.55	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P23</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but suggests wording amendments for clarity.	Amend as follows: Near identified ecological corridors, ensure the design and location of buildings, infrastructure and lighting is managed <del>throughout the Peacocke Structure Plan in order to</del> maintain their role and function.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.56	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P24</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this policy. Based on the supporting information, Council is seeking to protect (to some degree) topographical features within the Precinct. Furthermore, to promote higher density living opportunities, Council is seeking to avoid subdivision ahead of development. Kāinga Ora consider that areas of the Structure Plan where earthworks require stricter management should be identified by way of an “Earthworks Overlay” and this should be reflected in the policy.	Amend as follows: <del>Enable the development of a medium and high density environment in the Peacocke Structure Plan, while m</del> Managing earthworks to ensure the <u>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.</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.57	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P25</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.58	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P26</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.59	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P27</u>	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora considers that the policy needs to be more directive as to significant vegetation.	Amend as follows: The loss of <u>significant</u> vegetation <u>within the Significant Natural Area and the Significant Bat Habitat Area</u> is <del>minimised</del> <u>avoided</u> .
55	Kāinga Ora	55.60	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P28</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.61	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P29</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora do not consider that this policy effectively supports the vision.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.62	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P30</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.63	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P31</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but seeks amended working for clarity.	Amend as follows: Provide for <u>the</u> revegetation <del>ed</del> <u>of</u> gullies and river margins.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.64	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P32</u>	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora supports this objective but considers that it can be combined with P34.	Amend as follows: Provide a <u>well connected, accessible and safe</u> green corridor along the Waikato River that provides recreational, pedestrian and cycling <u>opportunities</u> <del>facilities and amenity.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.65	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P33</u>	Supports in Part	Kāinga Ora supports spaces for connection and meeting places but considers that this policy is captured by P4.	Delete this policy.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.66	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P34</u>	Supports	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers that it can be combined with P32 (as amended).	Delete this policy.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.67	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P35</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.68	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P36</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.69	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P37</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.70	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P38</u>	Support in Part	Kāinga Ora considers that this policy is best located in the Urban Environment policies.	Relocate this policy to the Urban Environment policy section.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.71	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P39</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.72	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P40</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.73	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P41</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers it should be amended to partially capture O19.	Amend as follows: Encourage urban form that reduces dependency on the car by focusing on intensification and <u>encouraging prioritising</u> walking, cycling and the use of passenger transport.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.74	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P42</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.75	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P43</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.76	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P44</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.77	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P45</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers it should be amended to partially capture O19.	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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.78	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P46</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.79	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P47</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.80	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P48</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.81	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P49</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.82	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P50</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.83	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P51</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.84	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P52</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.85	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P53</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.86	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P54</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.87	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P55</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.88	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P56</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy effectively supports the vision and is captured elsewhere in the policies.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.89	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P57</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy effectively supports the vision and is captured elsewhere in the policies.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.90	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P58</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers that it can be combined with P59 (as amended below).	Delete this policy.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.91	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P59</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers that it can be combined with P58.	Amend as follows: <u>To ensure co-ordination of development and infrastructure</u> , Sstaging and sequencing is in general accordance with <u>the any stagesing indicated shown</u> on the relevant <u>Peacocke</u> Structure Plan.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.92	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P60</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.93	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P61</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.94	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P62</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy but considers that it should be relocated to the Transport Network policy section and amended to recognise stages, not areas.	Relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section and amend as follows: Integrated Transport Modelling is undertaken <del>for all Structure Plan areas</del> <u>for all activities that have the potential to adversely impact the transport network.</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.95	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P63</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers that it duplicates P39 and should either be deleted or relocated to the Transport Network policy section and combined with P39.	Delete, or relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section and combine with P39.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.96	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P64</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers that it duplicates P39 and should either be deleted or relocated to the Transport Network policy section and combined with P39.	Delete, or relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section and combine with P39.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.97	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P65</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers that it duplicates P48 and should either be deleted or relocated to the Transport Network policy section and combined with P48.	Delete, or relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section and combine with P48.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.98	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P66</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that this policy is best located in the Transport Network policies.	Relocate this policy to the Transport Network policy section.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.99	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P67</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but considers that it is already captured by P47, P48 and P49.	Delete this policy.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.100	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P68</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the idea that sensitive activities should be wholly responsible for mitigating effects, including noise and vibration effects, arising from regionally significant infrastructure, particularly in urban intensification	Amend as follows: a) Sensitive land uses avoid adverse effects on and from regionally significant infrastructure <del>and regionally significant industry.</del> 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>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.101	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P69</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that P68 sufficiently addresses reverse sensitivity effects / effects of regionally significant infrastructure on sensitive activities.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.102	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	<u>DEV01-PSP: P70</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy but considers that it duplicates P61 and could be deleted.	Delete this policy.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.103	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the guidance provided by the ‘Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan’, but it is unclear what statutory role they play in the proposed plan change, or for guiding development over the next several decades. Kāinga Ora consider that this section should be included as a part of a non-statutory Design Guide or should be embedded as objectives and policies.	Move the ‘Components of the Peacocke Structure Plan’ into a non-statutory Design Guide.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.104	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium	<del>MRZ – PREC1-PSP: ISSUES-PURPOSE</del>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that amendments are needed to the ‘Issues’ section to reinforce the medium to high density outcomes envisioned for the site.	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
55	Kāinga Ora	55.105	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports a range of housing typologies.	Amend as follows: A range of housing <del>types</del> <u>typologies and densities</u> <del>is available to meet the needs of all communities.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.106	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: O2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.107	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: O3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective is relevant to the MRZ (rather it would be better in the proposed HRZ).	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.108	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: O4	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that the policy could be worded better to reflect the intent of the zone.	Amend as follows: The Peacocke Precinct <del>is establishes</del> <u>a well connected, integrated, high amenity, medium density residential environment,</u> <del>with areas of high density around identified activity nodes, corridors and areas of natural amenity.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.109	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: O5	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that, in order to ensure that the vision of the Precinct is realised, building heights need to be appropriate. Furthermore, the specification of the height limits in the objective reads more like a policy.	Amend as follows: Development in <u>the Peacocke MRZ</u> <del>maximises the use of land and infrastructure by providing</del> <u>a range of housing typologies that are consistent with the neighbourhood's planned urban built character.</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.110	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective effectively supports the vision and is encapsulated by O9.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.111	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O7	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this objective effectively supports the vision and is encapsulated by O9.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.112	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.113	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.114	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O10	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this objective relates to urban development seeking to ensure that it maximises the use of land and infrastructure. Kāinga Ora has therefore recommended an amendment to O5 to reflect the efficient use of land and infrastructure through urban development.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.115	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: O11	Support in part	Given the wording of the related policy, Kāinga Ora considers that the wording of the objective should be clearer, and more encompassing of changes to technology,	Amend as follows: Residential <del>buildings development make</del> <u>incorporates sustainable features and technologies</u> <del>efficient use of water and energy resources.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.116	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	New Policy MRZ - PREC1-PSP: PX	Support	Kāinga Ora considers that a new policy is required to confirm that a comprehensive development plan, which demonstrates compliance with the Structure Plan.	Include new policy as follows: <u>Promote comprehensive, integrated, high amenity development of the precinct in accordance with the Structure Plan.</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.117	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	New Policy MRZ - PREC1-PSP: PX	Support	Kāinga Ora considers that it is appropriate to have a policy that is explicit about height expectations in the MRZ and is consistent with the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill.	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>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.118	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P1	Support in part	Given that Kāinga Ora are proposing a High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) this policy should be moved to that new chapter (see below). Amended wording has also been proposed.	Move this policy to the proposed HRZ Amend as follows: Higher-density residential development should be located within and close to <del>the Central City, suburban</del> <u>the Local and a</u> <del>Neighbourhood centres, tertiary education facilities and hospital, and in areas serviced by passenger transport, and in close proximity to zoned open space.</del>

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.119	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P2	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that the policy could be worded better to reflect the vision for the precinct. The policy is effectively an ‘avoid’ policy, however there are a number of non-residential activities that are appropriate to locate in a residential zone (churches, schools, etc) subject to managing their effects.	Amend as follows: <u>Manage the effects of non-residential activities while recognising that some contribute to social cohesion and should locate in the MRZ. Non-residential activities should not establish in residential areas, unless the adverse effects on all zones are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.120	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.121	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.122	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.123	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P6	Support in part	Kāinga Ora opposes the idea that sensitive activities should be wholly responsible for mitigating effects, including noise and vibration effects, arising from regionally significant infrastructure, particularly in urban intensification nodes where affordable housing is critical to addressing the housing crisis.	Amend as follows: Residential land uses should <u>contribute towards mitigating</u> <del>be managed to avoid potential the</del> effects, such as noise, from arterial transport corridors and state highways.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.124	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: P7	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy but considers that point (3) is sufficiently dealt with by P6 and can be deleted.	Amend as follows: <u>Residential Building</u> 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. <del>3.—Insulation to minimise adverse noise effects.</del> 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 <del>Principal living areas with</del> <u>Sufficient</u> outlook to create a sense of <u>visual and acoustic privacy space</u> .
55	Kāinga Ora	55.125	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.126	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P9	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this policy can be deleted as amendments to P7 have addressed outlook and privacy.	Delete objective entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.127	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P10	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the need for all buildings to be in general accordance with the Structure Plan.	Amend as follows: <del>Development in areas identified for medium and high-density residential activities should be in general accordance with the appropriate Design Assessment Criteria.</del> <u>Promote comprehensive, integrated, high amenity development of the precinct in accordance with the Structure Plan.</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.128	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P11	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this policy is more effectively achieved by P10.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.129	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P12	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this policy is more effectively achieved by P10.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.130	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that vegetation or trees that warrant protection should be protected by way of notations.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.131	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P14	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this policy is more effectively achieved by P10.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.132	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P15	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.133	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P16	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that suitable policies exist elsewhere in the plan that address the matters listed in P16.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.134	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P17	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this policy is more effectively achieved by P10.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.135	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P18	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but consider that it can be incorporated in P19.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.136	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P19	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy but consider that some aspects of the policy confuse the intent (to support a high amenity, safe public realm).	Amend as follows: Dwellings within the Peacocke Structure Plan are designed and constructed to <del>provide</del> a high amenity <del>environment</del> <u>public realm</u> by: 1. Providing passive surveillance of public spaces (including roads and areas of open space) <del>and creating a clear delineation between public and private spaces through the use of low fence heights, landscaping, glazing and clear pedestrian entrances.</del> 2- Encouraging buildings to be located towards the front of the site, so they front the street <del>and enable space for private outdoor living areas that have access to sunlight.</del> 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 provision of front porches, low fences, glazing, setbacks, direct pedestrian access and the management of parking.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.137	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P20	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.138	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P21	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.139	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P22	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.140	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P23	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.141	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P24	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy, but additional wording is needed for clarity.	Amend as follows: Residential development <del>shall</del> <u>will</u> use land and infrastructure efficiently by: <del>1- Delivering target yields from housing development in both greenfield growth areas and intensification areas, as indicated by rules or Structure Plans. in DEV01-PSP: P14.</del> 2. Staging and sequencing the development as <del>indicated by</del> <u>in accordance with</u> rules of the Peacocke Structure Plans. 3. Otherwise complying with the Peacocke Structure Plan. <del>relevant Structure Plans.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.142	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P25	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the idea that sensitive activities should be wholly responsible for mitigating effects, including noise and vibration effects, arising from regionally significant infrastructure, particularly in urban intensification nodes where affordable housing is critical to addressing the housing crisis.	Amend as follows: New buildings and activities shall <u>contribute to mitigating</u> effects <del>on and</del> from regionally significant infrastructure.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.143	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: P26	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.144	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.145	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: R2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.146	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: R3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes and seeks amendments to this rule.	Amend as follows: <u>Permitted</u> <u>Where the following are complied with:</u> <u>PER-1</u> <u>1. PREC1-P R36 – R48.</u> <u>Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <del>1-A – General Criteria</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.147	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1- PSP: R4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.148	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.149	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.150	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R7	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.



Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.151	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.152	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R9	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule. Show homes, typically single detached dwellings, do not support the vision for the Precinct and should require resource consent as a non-complying activity. Left unmanaged, they will lead to a continuation of sprawl and compromise the medium to high density objectives for the precinct.	Amend as follows: Show homes Activity Status: <del>Permitted</del> <u>Non-complying</u> <del>Where the following are complied with: PER 1 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.153	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.154	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R11	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.155	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R12	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.156	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R13	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.157	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R14	Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider that the requirements of this rule are covered by the Building Act and not considered an RMA function.	Delete rule entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.158	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R15	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule and seeks the deletion of the activity. Residential activity regardless of typology should be permitted activities in the MRZ.	Delete rule along with any relevant standards or provisions referencing and relating to duplex dwelling in the MRZ section entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.159	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R16	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule and seeks the deletion of the activity. Residential activity regardless of typology should be permitted activities in the MRZ.	Delete rule along with any relevant standards or provisions referencing and relating to terrace dwelling in the MRZ section entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.160	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R17	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule and seeks the deletion of the activity. Residential activity regardless of typology should be permitted activities in the MRZ.	Delete rule along with any relevant standards or provisions referencing and relating to apartment buildings in the MRZ section entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.161	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R18	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule. Papakainga that comply with the development standards for the zone should be permitted activities.	Amend as follows: Papakainga - Activity Status: <del>Restricted-Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> where the following are complied with: <del>RDISPER-1: 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48.</del> <del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del> <del>1. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>2. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del> Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>RDISPER</del> -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>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.162	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R19	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.163	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R20	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule. Dairies that comply with the development standards should be permitted activities.	Amend as follows: Dairy - Activity Status: <del>Restricted-Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: <del>RDISPER-1</del> 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. <del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del> <del>1. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>2. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del> Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>RDISPER</del> -1-1-3: 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>

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.164	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R21	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.165	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R22	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.166	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R23	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.167	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R24	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.168	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R25	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.169	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R26	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.170	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R27	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.171	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R28	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.172	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R29	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.173	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R30	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.174	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R31	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.175	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R32	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.176	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R33	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that, depending on their scale, health care services can be appropriate in the MRZ. A discretionary status will give the Council sufficient scope to assess the application and make a determination.	Amend as follows: Health care services Activity Status: <del>Non-complying</del> <u>Discretionary</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.177	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R34	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.178	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R36	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.179	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R37	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.180	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R38	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to this rule to reflect their position that the high density overlay should be amended to a High Density Zone and be contained within its own chapter.	Amend as follows: 1. Peacocke Precinct: 12m – maximum of 3 storeys 2. <del>Peacocke Precinct High Density Overlay: 16m</del>

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.181	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R39	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this rule should be updated to reflect the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill.	Amend as follows: 1. <del>Transport corridor</del> <u>Front yard</u> boundary: <del>3m</del> <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
55	Kāinga Ora	55.182	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R40	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this rule should be updated to reflect the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill.	Amend as follows; <del>1. For a transport corridor boundary: any portion of a building above 10m in height must be setback a minimum of 3m.</del> 2. For side and rear boundaries, no part of any building shall protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>45</del> <u>60</u> degrees. This angle is to be measured from <del>3</del> <u>6</u> m above ground level at all boundaries. Except that no height control plane shall apply: a. Where a boundary adjoins a rear lane. b. Where there is existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site. c. Where there is an existing or proposed common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites. <del>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)</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.183	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R41	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.184	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R42	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.185	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R43	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this rule should be updated to reflect the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill.	Amend as follows: 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. 2. The main living room of a dwelling must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of <del>6</del> <u>3</u> m depth and <del>4</del> <u>3</u> m width. <del>3. The principal bedroom of a dwelling must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of 3m in depth and 3m in width.</del> 4. All other habitable rooms must have an outlook space of 1m in depth and 1m in width. 5. The depth of the outlook space is measured at right angles to and horizontal from the window to which it applies. 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 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. 8. Outlook spaces may be within the site, over a public street, or other public open space. 9. Outlook spaces required from different rooms within the same building may overlap. 10. Outlook spaces may overlap where they are on the same wall plane 11. Outlook spaces must: a. be clear and unobstructed by buildings; 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 c. not extend over an outlook spaces or outdoor living space required by another dwelling.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.186	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R44	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this rule should be updated to reflect the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. Furthermore, there is no need for a communal space for any living arrangement other than apartment buildings.	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 <del>4 or more residential units</del> 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: <del>a. Single residential dwellings, Duplex dwellings, Terrace dwelling (Peacocke Precinct) At ground floor</del> i. <del>35</del> 15m2, with a minimum dimension of 3m ii. <del>Or where located in the High Density Overlay: 20m2</del> <del>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.</del> <del>b. Apartment Building Above ground floor</del> i. Ground floor: 20 8m2, with a minimum dimension of 1.8m ii. Where the sole outdoor living area is above ground floor: <del>- A studio unit and one bedroom residential unit: 5m2, no dimension less than 2.5m</del> <del>- A residential unit with two or more bedrooms: 12m2, no dimension less than 1.8m</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.187	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R45	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.188	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R46	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this rule but considers that points 4 – 6 are unnecessary and could be deleted.	Delete provisions and points 4 – 6.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.189	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R47	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the need to separate residential dwellings on the same site, as this will reduce density targets unnecessarily. Sufficient measures are in place to protect outlook and outdoor living areas.	Delete rule entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.190	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ - PREC1-PSP: R48	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the unit sizes proposed and seeks amendments to allow for greater flexibility in unit sizes in the MRZ, similar to the proposed changes sought in the HRZ.	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 <del>35</del> 30m2 1 or more bedroom unit                      Minimum 45m2 <del>2 bedroom unit    Minimum 55m2</del> <del>3 or more bedroom unit    Minimum 90m2</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.191	Chapter 4A - Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone	NEW HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE – HRZ; HRZ – PREC1-PSP: High Density Residential Zone Peacocke Precinct	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the “High Density Overlay” as it is not considered the most effective tool for achieving the desired high density outcomes for the identified parts of the Peacocke Precinct. Kāinga Ora supports the replacement of the “High Density Overlay” with a “High Density Zone” with its own purpose, objectives, policies and rules.	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. See Attachment 2 to the submission for the suite of HRZ provisions.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.192	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	<del>NZC – PREC1-PSP: Issues Purpose</del>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this section but considers that it should be renamed ‘Purpose’ with amendments to the wording to better reflect what the NCZ means to Peacocke.	Amend as follows: <del>Businesses commonly group around a series of centres in Hamilton and include activities</del> such as retailing, offices, business and financial services, manufacturing, warehousing and associated parking, storage and display areas. <del>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.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.193	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: O1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.194	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: O2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.195	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: O3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.196	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ– PREC1-PSP: P1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.197	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ– PREC1-PSP: P2	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy but propose some amendments to the wording as the activities anticipated in the NCZ are unlikely to have significant effects.	Amend as follows: The scale and nature of activities within neighbourhood centres <del>shall will not detract generate significant adverse amenity effects on</del> <u>from the</u> surrounding residential areas <del>and transport networks.</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.198	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ– PREC1-PSP: P3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.199	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ– PREC1-PSP: P4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.200	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ– PREC1-PSP: P5	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy but consider that it can be combined with P6 to be more succinct.	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. <del>Create</del> <u>Contribute to</u> 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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.201	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NCZ– PREC1-PSP: P6	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy but consider that it can be combined with P5 to be more succinct.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.202	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.203	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.204	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R3	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this rule but notes that ‘maintenance and repair’ is covered in the definition of ‘minor works’	Amend as follows: Demolition, removal, <del>maintenance or repair</del> of existing buildings...
55	Kāinga Ora	55.205	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.206	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.207	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.208	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R7	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.209	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.210	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.211	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.212	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R11	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.

**Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan**  
**Summary of Submissions**

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.213	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R12	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.214	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R13	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this rule but does not consider that it needs to include a reference to ‘at ground floor’, as this is clarified in the rule.	Amend as follows: Healthcare services <del>at ground floor</del> ...
55	Kāinga Ora	55.215	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R14	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.216	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R15	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.217	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: 16	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.218	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R17	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.219	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R18	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.220	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R19	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.221	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R20	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.222	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R21	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule as residential activities are appropriate in centres and the design is able to be controlled by the restricted discretionary activity rule for ‘new buildings’.	Amend as follows: Ancillary residential units - Activity Status: <del>Restricted Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: <del>RDISPER-1</del> 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. <del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del> <del>1. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>2. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del> Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>RDISPER</del> -1-1: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General <del>2. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>3. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>4. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.223	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R22	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule as residential activities are appropriate in centres and will achieve the vision for the precinct. The design is able to be controlled by the restricted discretionary activity rule for ‘new buildings’.	Amend as follows: Apartments above ground floor Activity Status: <del>Restricted Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: <del>RDISPER-1</del> 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. <del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del> <del>1. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>2. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del> Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>RDISPER</del> -1-1: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General <del>2. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>3. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>4. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.224	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R23	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.225	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R24	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.

**Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan**  
**Summary of Submissions**

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.226	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R25	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.227	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R26	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that single dwellings, duplex dwellings and terrace dwellings are inconsistent with the zone and should be non-complying.	Amend as follows: Single dwellings and duplex dwellings Activity Status: <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Non-complying</u> .
55	Kāinga Ora	55.228	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R28	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that smaller offices are consistent with the zone and should be permitted.	Amend as follows: Offices - Activity Status: <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: <del>RDISPER-1</del> 1. The GFA is less than 250m <sup>2</sup> per site. 2. PREC1-P R36 – R48. Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>RDISPER</del> -1-1 and 2: <del>Non-complying</del> <u>Discretionary</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.229	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R29	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.230	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R30	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.231	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R31	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.232	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R32	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.233	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R33	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.234	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R34	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.235	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R35	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.236	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R36	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.237	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R37	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.238	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R38	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.239	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R39	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.240	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R40	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.241	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R41	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.242	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R42	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that above ground floor visitor accommodation should be permitted.	Amend as follows: Visitor accommodation <u>above ground floor</u> Activity Status: <del>Non-complying</del> <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: <del>RDISPER-1</del> 1.PREC1-P R36 – R48. Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>RDISPER</del> -1-1: <del>Not applicable</del> <u>Discretionary</u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.243	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	<u>NZC – PREC1-PSP: R44</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports more height in the NCZ both to distinguish it and allow for residential above the commercial.	Amend as follows: Neighbourhood Centre Zone: <del>12</del> <u>16</u> m.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.244	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	<u>NZC – PREC1-PSP: R45</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers it is appropriate to apply height to boundary controls consistent with the Medium Density Zone (as enabled by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill).	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 <u>45 60</u> degrees beginning at an elevation of 3 <u>6m</u> above the boundary 2. ...
55	Kāinga Ora	55.245	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	<u>NZC – PREC1-PSP: R46</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.246	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	<u>NZC – PREC1-PSP: R47</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.247	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	<u>NZC – PREC1-PSP: R48</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.248	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R49	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.249	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre	NZC – PREC1-PSP:R50	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the development standards applying to residential development are too restrictive and do not achieve the vision for the precinct, particularly considering the Neighbourhood Centre Zone will be complemented with adjoining / nearby open space.	Amend as follows: [...] 4. Density (Minimum Number of Residential Units Required Per Site)
55	Kāinga Ora	55.250	Chapter 6A: Peacocke Neigh bourhood Centre Zone.	NZC – PREC1-PSP: R51	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.251	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	NLC – PREC1-PSP: <del>Issues- Purpose</del>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this section but considers that it should be renamed ‘Purpose’ with amendments to the wording to better reflect what the NCZ means to Peacocke. These comments on this chapter are notwithstanding Kāinga Ora’s overall position that the centre type will need to be reviewed following an assessment of the density targets and the consequential catchment.	Amend as follows: <del>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</del> 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 supporting role of commercial fringe areas and the peak visitor demands associated with visitor facilities. The commercial and community hub of the Peacocke <u>Precinct Structure Plan</u> 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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.252	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: O1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this objective but consider that the wording can be refined.	Amend as follows: A <del>distribution of</del> 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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.253	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	<u>LCZ – PREC1-PSP: O2</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.254	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	<u>LCZ – PREC1-PSP: O3</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.255	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	<u>LCZ – PREC1-PSP: O4</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.256	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	<u>LCZ – PREC1-PSP: O5</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.257	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy satisfactorily addresses the vision for the precinct and is addressed elsewhere in the LCZ policies.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.258	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy satisfactorily addresses the vision for the precinct and is addressed elsewhere in the LCZ policies.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.259	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy satisfactorily addresses the vision for the precinct and is addressed elsewhere in the LCZ policies.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].



Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.260	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P4	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy satisfactorily addresses the vision for the precinct and is addressed elsewhere in the LCZ policies.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.261	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P5	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not consider that this policy satisfactorily addresses the vision for the precinct and is addressed elsewhere in the LCZ policies.	Delete policy entirely [with consequential numbering adjustment].
55	Kāinga Ora	55.262	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.263	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P7	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.264	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.265	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.266	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.267	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P11	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.268	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P12	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.269	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P13	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.270	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P14	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.271	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P15	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.272	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P16	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.273	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: P17	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.274	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.275	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.276	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R3	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this objective but notes that ‘maintenance and repair’ is covered in the definition of ‘minor works’.	Amend as follows: Demolition, removal, <del>maintenance or repair</del> of existing buildings...
55	Kāinga Ora	55.277	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.278	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.279	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.280	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R7	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.281	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.282	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.283	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.284	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R11	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.285	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R12	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.

**Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan**  
**Summary of Submissions**

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.286	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R13	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.287	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R14	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.288	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R15	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.289	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: 16	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.290	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R17	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.291	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R18	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.292	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R19	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.293	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R20	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule as residential activities are appropriate in centres and the design is able to be controlled by the restricted discretionary activity rule for ‘new buildings’.	Amend as follows: Ancillary residential units - Activity Status: <del>Restricted Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: <del>RDISPER-1</del> 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. <del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del> <del>1. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>2. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del> Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>RDISPER</del> -1-1: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General <del>2. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>3. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>4. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.294	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R21	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this rule as residential activities are appropriate in centres and will achieve the vision for the precinct. The design is able to be controlled by the restricted discretionary activity rule for ‘new buildings’.	Amend as follows: <del>Apartment</del> s <u>Residential units</u> (Peacocke Structure Plan) <u>above ground floor</u> * Activity Status: <del>Restricted Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: <del>RDISPER-1</del> 1. PREC1-P R36 – R48. <del>RDIS-2</del> <del>1. Are located above ground floor</del> <del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del> <del>1. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>2. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>3. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del> Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>RDISPER</del> -1-1: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. A – General <del>2. B – Design and Layout</del> <del>3. C – Character and Amenity</del> <del>4. P – Peacocke Structure Plan</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.295	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R22	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.296	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R23	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.297	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R24	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.298	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R25	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.299	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R26	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.300	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R27	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.301	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R28	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that commercial places of assembly are a normal part of local centres and should be permitted.	Amend as follows: Commercial places of assembly including cinemas and bowling alleys Activity Status: <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> Where the following are complied with: <del>DISPER-1</del> 1. LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R40-R49. <del>DISPER-2</del> 1. Are located outside any active frontage. Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>DISPER-1: Restricted</del> <u>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> 4. <u>P – Peacocke Structure Plan</u> Activity Status where compliance is not achieved with <del>DISPER-2: Non-Complying</del> <u>Discretionary</u> .
55	Kāinga Ora	55.302	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R29	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.303	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R30	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.304	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.305	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R32	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.306	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R33	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.307	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R34	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.308	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R35	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.309	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R36	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.310	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R37	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.311	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R38	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.312	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R40	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports more height in the LCZ both to distinguish it and allow for residential above the commercial.	Amend as follows: Local Centre Zone: <del>16</del> <u>24</u> m.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.313	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R41	Oppose	Given the intent of the precinct is to surround the LCZ with HRZ, the MDZ rule is not relevant.	Amend as follows: 1. ... 2. <del>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</del> 3. ...
55	Kāinga Ora	55.314	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R42	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.315	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R43	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.316	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R44	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.317	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R45	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.318	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R46	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the development standards applying to residential development are too restrictive and do not achieve the vision for the precinct.	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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.319	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R47	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.320	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R48	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.321	Chapter 6B: Peacocke Local Centre Zone	LCZ – PREC1-PSP: R49	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.322	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: ISSUES	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the ‘Issues’ section, but like other introductions considers that it should be amended to ‘Purpose’.	Amend the title of the section to ‘Purpose’
55	Kāinga Ora	55.323	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: OBJECTIVES O1 – 07	Support	Kāinga Ora supports these objectives.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.324	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: OBJECTIVES OX	New objective	Kāinga Ora support a new objective that ties the quality of the open space to the higher density residential environment.	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>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.325	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: POLICIES P1 – P18	Support	Kāinga Ora supports these policies.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.326	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: POLICY PX	New policy	Kāinga Ora support a new policy that ties the quality of the open space to the higher density residential environment.	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>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.327	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: RULES - ACTIVITY STATUS R1 – R37	Support	Kāinga Ora supports these rules.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.328	Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	SARZ – PREC1-P: ISSUES	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the ‘Issues’ section, but like other introductions considers that it should be amended to ‘Purpose’.	Amend the title of the section to ‘Purpose’.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.329	Chapter 15B: Sport and Active Recreation Zone: Peacocke Precinct	SARZ – PREC1-P Whole of chapter	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the siting of a Sports and Active Recreation Zone within the Precinct, and also supports the related objectives, policies and rules.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.330	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.331	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.332	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.333	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.334	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.335	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.336	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O7	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers it is appropriate for the HDZ to also be recognised in this objective.	Amend as follows: Subdivision <del>considers</del> <u>supports</u> the planned medium <u>and high</u> density development outcomes and enables a range of building typologies to be constructed.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.337	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.338	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.339	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB – PREC1- PSP: O10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.340	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.341	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.342	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.343	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.344	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.345	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.346	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P7	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.347	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.348	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P9	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy but considers that it should be explicit that subdivision should occur concurrently with or following land	Amend as follows: Require subdivision to efficiently use land, and <del>to provide for support</del> 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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.349	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.350	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P11	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.351	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P12	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.352	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P13	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.353	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P14	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.354	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P15	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.355	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P16	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.356	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P17	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.357	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P18	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.358	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P19	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.359	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P20	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.360	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P21	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.361	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB - PREC1-PSP: P22	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.362	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.363	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.364	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.365	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.366	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.367	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.368	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R7	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.369	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.370	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.371	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.372	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R12	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.373	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R13	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.374	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R14	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.375	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R15	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that this rule should be amended to ensure that higher density living opportunities are not foreclosed by subdivision (if it should occur ahead of development).	Amend as follows: 1. Peacocke Precinct: <del>300</del> <u>1200</u> m <sup>2</sup> 2. <del>Peacocke Precinct High Density Overlay</del> <u>300m<sup>2</sup></u>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.376	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R16	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.377	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R17	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.378	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R18	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.379	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R19	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.380	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R20	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.381	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R21	Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider that road widths should be commensurate with the residential environment it will service and accommodates medium and high density.	Amend as follows: 1. Minimum road width of vehicle access to be formed and vested as public road: a) Local Road – <del>16.8m</del> <u>12m</u> (See note 1) b) Collector Road - no Public transport – <del>24.2m</del> <u>18m</u> (See note 1) c) <del>Collector Road – Public transport Route</del> <u>24.6m</u> (See note 1)
55	Kāinga Ora	55.382	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R22	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.383	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R23	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.384	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R24	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.385	Chapter 23A Subdivision: Peacocke Precinct	SUB-PREC1-PSP: R25	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.386	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.2 Objectives and Policies:- Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports these objectives and policies but considers that if there are significant topographical or geological features (outside of SNAs and other overlays) that should be managed, then these features too should be subject to an overlay to better inform the landowner / purchaser of potential limitations of developing the land as intensively as possible.	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. <del>This means earthworks should replicate the general orientation of topography to enable the integration of residential development within the site.</del> 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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.387	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.3 Rules – Activity Status Table – R(j)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.388	Chapter 25.2: Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.5 Rules – Specific Activities	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.389	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	25.6.2 Objectives and Policies: Lighting and Glare	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports these provisions but considers that safety of the community is paramount and should be reflected in the objectives and policies.	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 area of Peacocke identified as being Significant Bat Habitat Areas are protected from the effects of <u>excessive</u> lighting and glare.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.390	Chapter 25.6 Lighting and Glare	25.6.4.4 Peacocke Medium Density Zone: Peacocke Precinct	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this rule.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.391	Chapter 25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the various minor rule amendments / additions.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.392	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Apartment Building (Peacocke Precinct)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.393	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Public Transport Station	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.394	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Public Transport Station Catchments	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.395	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Rear Lane	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.396	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Terrace Dwelling (Peacocke Precinct)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.397	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Universal access	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.398	Appendix 1.1: Definitions and Terms	Urban block	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.399	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Information Requirements	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the provision of concept plans (comprehensive development plan) and suggests only minor wording amendments. Importantly, the additional information requirements should also relate to land development because it may occur ahead of subdivision (which is encouraged to achieve higher density living outcomes).	Amend as follows: <del>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</del> Subdivision <u>and development</u> within the Peacocke <u>Precinct</u> Structure Plan shall be prepared <u>a Comprehensive Development Plan that addresses: to comply with the requirements of 1.2.2.2 iii) and include the following- additional information:</u> a) <u>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.</u> b) <u>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:</u> <del>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<sup>2</sup> 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:</del>
55	Kāinga Ora	55.400	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Information Requirements	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the provision of a landscape concept plan and suggests only minor wording amendments. Importantly, the additional information requirements should also relate to land development because it may occur ahead of subdivision (which is encouraged to achieve higher density living outcomes).	Amend as follows: For any subdivision <u>or land development</u> application in the Peacocke <del>Structure Plan</del> <u>Precinct</u> adjoining or including any open space zone or involving more than two hectares of land, a Landscape Concept Plan shall be provided...
55	Kāinga Ora	55.401	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Information Requirements	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the provision of an ecological rehabilitation management plan and suggests only minor wording amendments. Importantly, the additional information requirements should also relate to land development because it may occur ahead of subdivision (which is encouraged to achieve higher density living outcomes).	Amend as follows: All subdivision <u>or land development</u> applications within the Peacocke <del>Structure Plan</del> <u>Precinct</u> adjoining or including an open space zone or involving more than two hectares of land shall include...
55	Kāinga Ora	55.402	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Information Requirements	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the provision of a Local Centre Master Plan.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.403	Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements	Information Requirements	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the provision of a Bat Management Plan.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.404	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the matters of discretion applying to earthworks but seeks clarification that only earthworks in the “Earthworks Overlay” need to be sympathetic to the existing landform.	Amend as follows: <del>Earthworks in the Peacocke Structure Plan</del> <u>Precinct:</u> a. The extent to which earthworks <u>in the Earthworks Overlay</u> are sympathetic to the existing landform

## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
55	Kāinga Ora	55.405	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P3	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the matters of discretion applying to development within the Peacocke Precinct but seeks minor amendments for clarity.	Amend as follows: a. The extent the proposal is consistent with the <del>objectives and policies in the</del> Peacocke Structure Plan. ... 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 <del>Structure Plan</del> <u>Precinct</u> .
55	Kāinga Ora	55.406	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports these matters of discretion.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.407	Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria	P5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports these matters of discretion.	Retain as notified.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.408	Appendix 1.4 Design Guides	1.4.10 Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes and seeks the deletion of references to any design codes, guides or guidelines as de facto rules to be complied with in PCS, such as the Peacocke Local Centre Design Guide. The operative District Plan does not contain Design Guides suited to the medium to high density outcomes anticipated in the Peacocke Precinct. Kāinga Ora would support an alternative, whereby 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. If there are any proposed design guides, design codes or guidelines to be developed, Kāinga Ora seeks that any such guides are 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. Urban Design guidelines are identified as providing best practice guidance and can be updated without going through a Schedule 1 of the RMA process.	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.
55	Kāinga Ora	55.409	Appendix 15 – Transportation	15-1 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas – Tables and Figures	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports no parking requirement for residential dwellings in the Peacocke Precinct. However, Kāinga Ora consider that the Council should use this opportunity to give effect to the NPS-UD in respect of subpart 8 and remove all parking requirements in the Peacocke Precinct.	Amend as follows: <del>Single Dwellings, duplex dwellings and terrace dwellings and apartments</del> <u>any development</u> in the Peacocke <del>Structure Plan Area</del> <u>Precinct</u> .
55	Kāinga Ora	55.410	Appendix 15 – Transportation	Integrated Transport Assessment	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the additional requirements for an ITA in the Peacocke Precinct.	Retain as notified
55	Kāinga Ora	55.411	Appendix 15 – Transportation	15-6 Criteria for the Form of Transport Corridors and Internal Vehicle Access	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose the widths of the proposed roads. Kāinga Ora considers that Collector Roads should be no more than 18m and Local Roads no more than 15m. Kāinga Ora acknowledges that this will likely require a review of the parking strategy (to potentially limit street parking) as well as services to be located in footpaths, but the road widths as proposed do not contribute to a quality transport environment focussed on pedestrians.	Amend the overall width of Collector Roads to 18m and Local Roads to 15m.
56	Riverlea Environment Society Inc.	56.1	General	General	Support	The submitter is supportive of aspects of the Peacocke Plan Change 5, and especially endorses the medium housing density provisions – enabling more people to be housed in a variety of building types within a smaller footprint. This will allow preservation of adjacent critical wildlife habitats. It represents a strong and welcome break from the traditional New Zealand suburban design of uniform lot sizes and detached dwellings. The emphasis on the ease of local transport within and beyond the Peacocke Structure Plan Area, especially for walking, cycling and by public transport, is also in line with modern trends and with policies mandating a lower carbon footprint.	Specific relief sought not stated. General relief seeks to retain the medium housing density provisions and provisions emphasising local transport especially for walking, cycling and public transport.
56	Riverlea Environment Society Inc.	56.2	General	Bat Habitat	Support in Part	A key feature of the structure plan area is the presence of the critically endangered long-tailed bat, and the submitter welcomes the extent of land reserved for priority bat habitat and the concept of connecting corridors between the Mangakootukutuku gully system and the Waikato River. The classification of these areas as Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) with adequate buffering will support their future protection and improvement. Overall these policies will support the presence of bats and other flora and fauna in southern Hamilton and will provide a more sustainable and attractive environment for future Peacocke residents. The plans have been formulated to take into account various policies including the National Policy Statements for Urban Development and Freshwater Quality, legislative protection for endangered species as well as relevant regional and local policies. It also responds to some extent to the recent judgements of the Environment Court covering issues relating to the protection of the long-tailed bat on a major Peacocke subdivision. The submitter has concerns that the Environment Court judgement is inadequately reflected in the proposed PCS. In the proposed Chapters of the Plan Change 5 there is limited explicit recognition of the imperative to protect and enhance long-tailed bat habitat and the consequent implications for developers. In bat priority areas, bats have priority. PCS should establish a clear set of expectations on the design of future subdivisions that are adjacent to bat priority habitats. The structure plan area is bordered by the Waikato River on two sides and bisected by an extensive branched gully system, all areas of prime bat habitat. The corollary is that nearby subdivisions will require significant design features to prevent adverse effects on long-tailed bat activity, especially arising from the restriction on additional artificial lighting at bat priority habitat perimeters.	Plan Change 5 should establish a clear set of expectations on the design of future subdivisions that are adjacent to bat priority habitats.
56	Riverlea Environment Society Inc.	56.3	General	Bat Habitat	Support in Part	Many of the mitigations mandated in the Environment Court to protect priority bat habitat and explicitly recommended by the Long-Tailed Bat Report of June 2021 commissioned by HCC are not in our view, sufficiently emphasised or adequately described in the updated Structure Plan. At present it is not clear how the necessary protection mitigations will be communicated to developers before subdivisions are designed and resource consent applications submitted. Relevant chapters in the revised structure plan should be amended to fully describe the mitigations necessary to protect bat priority habitats. Or a separate section, mapping bat priority habitats and the specific nature of the mitigations required in these areas, would be another option.	Amend the relevant chapters in the revised structure plan to fully describe the mitigations necessary to protect bat priority habitats. Or a separate section, mapping bat priority habitats and the specific nature of the mitigations required in these areas, would be another option.
56	Riverlea Environment Society Inc.	56.4	General	Bat Habitat	Support in Part	There is a danger that the initial shock of the Peacocke developments could cause a collapse in the long-tailed bat population in southern Hamilton. The rapid removal of bat habitat, especially food sources and the severance of flight paths, could quickly undermine the sustainability of existing bat populations. Plantings in advance of development was a practical mitigation advocated during the Amberfield resource consent hearings and adopted by the Hearing Commissioners and the Environment Court. It has again been explicitly recommended by the Long Tailed Bat Report of June 2021 commissioned by HCC. The submitter urges that a planting programme be designed to enhance priority bat habitat throughout the structure planb area, providing an evidence-based resource for all developers to call upon and advance assurance of restoration requirements. Implementation of this programme should be initiated as soon as possible in areas which the HCC already controls, including the Waikato River margin and in the Mangakootukutuku gully.	Amend to enable implementation of an early planting programme within significant natural areas to enhance priority bat habitat throughout the Peacocke Structure Plan area. This should be initiated as soon as possible in areas which HCC already controls, including the Waikato River margin and in the Mangakootukutuku gully.



## Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan

### Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
56	Riverlea Environment Society Inc.	56.5	General	Bat Habitat	Support in Part	The Environment Court adjudication of the Amberfield resource consent application set important antecedents for the structure plan area, including a panel of bat and ecological experts be established to monitor and advise HCC and the developer on the implementation of resource consent conditions as they related to the protection of the long-tailed bat. It will be impractical to establish a similar panel for each individual development in the structure plan area. The submitter proposes a similar panel is established to provide advice and input into all future resource consents and their implementation. This would ensure that the same set of ecological conditions are applied uniformly across different subdivisions as they occur over the next 20 years. Such a panel would assist HCC to fulfil the vision of Peacocke will as “a high-quality urban environment that is based on urban design best practice, social well-being, and environmental responsibility”.	Amend to enable establishment of an expert panel be established to provide advice and input into all future resource consents and their implementation.
57	Victoria Collins and Troy Radovancich	57.1	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Zoning	Support in Part	The submission relates to the property at 241 Dixon Road, Hamilton (being Lot 101 DP 505873). The parcel comprises two distinct land types: flat pasture and gully. Part of the property is also subject to the Southern Links designation, with HCC has an interest in the northern half of the parcel. The submission is limited to the southern portion of the site, being Area A as marked on the attached drawing. The submission point relates to the position of the zoning (which we support) and the position of the Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area (which we do not support). Zoning of Area A has been laid out to align with the gully top of bank, i.e the gully has been identified as Natural Open Space Zone (to the top of bank) and the flat, land at the top of the gully bank has been zoned Medium Density Residential Zone – we support this. However, the Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area (WRGHA) has been overlaid on a part of Area A that we do not agree with. We believe the WRGHA should be aligned with the boundary of the Natural Open Space Zone. This would position the limits of the WRGHA with the top of the gully bank. We believe this is the intended position of the WRGHA, but that mapping systems have not allowed the necessary accuracy.	Amend to align the position of the Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area (ie the limits of it), with the boundary of the Natural Open Space Zone insofar as it affects Area A on Lot 101 DP 505873.
57	Victoria Collins and Troy Radovancich	57.2	Appendix 17 – Planning Maps	Road Access	Support in Part	As shown on the Structure Plan and Planning Maps, there appears to be a risk that the property will become landlocked. It currently has frontage to a paper road (being an extension of Hall Road). On the Planning Maps, the nearest road to our property is shown to be a road in the Southern Links Designation. There is the road running North-South and a road running East-West (Whatukooruru Drive). We understand it will not be possible to connect to the North-South road and therefore we seek certainty that a connection to the East-West road will be possible in the future.	Amend to create a “Key Local Road” connection to Whatukooruru Drive (on the northern side) around the location of the existing paper road.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.1	Chapter 3 - Structure Plans	3.4.1.3b	Support in Part	We support the deletion of suggestions that large scale modification and earth should be avoided. Replace with specific legal policy. Gullies elsewhere in the city have been filled in and once the damage is done the ecosystem is wrecked forever.	Amend by replacing with specific legal policy.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.2	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P27	Oppose	"The loss of significant vegetation is minimised" is unacceptable wording as minimised is relative. Change wording to creating a net increase of significant vegetation or 100% maintained.	Amend policy wording to creating a net increase of significant vegetation or 100% maintained.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.3	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P31	Support in Part	Amend policy wording "Provide for revegetated gullies and river margins" to "actively restore gullies and river margins as they represent the vital eco-tone for numerous native species."	Replace policy with "actively restore gullies and river margins as they represent the vital eco-tone for numerous native species."
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.4	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P35	Support	Support policy 'Protect bat habitat adjoining the edge of the Mangakotukutuku Gully and Waikato River to ensure long tailed bats are able to continue to utilise these areas'.	Retain as notified.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.5	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P36	Support in Part	Require development adjacent to the gully network and Waikato River to meet required setbacks to support the ecological function of these areas'. The submitter's only addition here is that 5m setbacks from a Significant Natural Area is limited and should be increased where possible.	Amend policy to increase extent of setbacks from Significant Natural Area where possible.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.6	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP: P37	Support in Part	Support these additions to the policy section of the plan as they are distinct and specific references to how pekapeka should be protected during and after the development. DEV01-PSP: P37 should include a specific minimum width, otherwise there is too much flexibility to decrease the width. Increasing the width of pekapeka habitat is fine. Finding loopholes to decrease the width would be very bad.	Amend DEV01-PSP: P37 to specify a minimum width of ecological corridor.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.7	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	Transportation network	Support in Part	There is no mention of the transportation infrastructure on a policy level in regard to mitigating the impacts on the wellbeing of the pekapeka such as maximum road width, maximum light brightness, minimum suburban tree coverage (not just in gullies), maximum street lights, commercial centre light restrictions, walking and cycle path lighting which will go through parks and gullies, and issues surrounding tree felling when a potential bat tree causes the risk to the transport system.	Specific relief sought not stated.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.8	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Cultural Values (d)	Support	The submitter supports objective DEV01-PSP Cultural Values (d) as Mangakōtukutuku is both a cultural taonga as well as the habitat of a number of native taonga species, including and extending beyond pekapeka. The protections for this area should be strengthened in perpetuity.	Retain as notified.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.9	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space Network	Support in Part	Support the broad statements about the importance of Mangakōtukutuku Gully and the Waikato River, but addition should be made to align with Department of Conservation's new tree felling protocol, as this now protects bat roots in any tree as a significant natural area value.	Amend broad statements to align with Department of Conservation's new tree felling protocol.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.10	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (b) and (c)	Support in Part	Support statement in DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (b) and (c) while also encouraging enhancement focused on native foliage. Exotic pine trees have become bat roost sites across Hamilton and therefore cannot be interfered with unless there is strong evidence bats do not use the trees in question. This should follow the new Department of Conservation Tree Felling protocol.	Amend DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (c) to follow the new Department of Conservation Tree Felling protocol.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.11	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (c) • Bat Habitat Buffer	Support in Part	This bat specific module is good news. 20m is an acceptable distance, but flexibility for what accounts for a bat significant natural area may be needed. When bats start roosting in a different area of the gully then it would become a significant natural area. The proposed style of bat corridor is 50 metres, which includes the bat buffer making habitat 30m wide which is quite limited. 0.3 lux lighting is recommended in the plan and is outlined in figures displaying habitat and road layouts. A limit on this lighting must be mandated. The number of light poles must also be mandated as if there are lots more low level lighting then benefits may be limited.	Amend to include a limit on lux lighting and a limit on the number of light poles.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.12	Chapter 3A - Peacocke Structure Plan	DEV01-PSP Natural Environment and Open Space network (f)	Support in Part	The statement "Sports parks may have natural areas, play lots and links to gullies." is unclear. What does links to gullies mean? Will it mean that there will be substantial vegetation clearance where deemed 'necessary'. A network of tree copses in parks will both make them nicer to be in and allow bats a further pathway over the suburb. This is important because massive open parks are not something the bats like, they prefer gullies and parks linked by corridors.	Seeks clarification on what 'links to gullies' means in DEV01-PSP.

Plan Change 5 - Peacocke Structure Plan  
Summary of Submissions

Sub N°	Submitter name(s)	Sub Point	Proposed Chapter / Appendix	Subject	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.13	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18	Support	The submitter supports the addition of policy NOSZ – PREC1- P: P18 to ensure that pekapeka (long-tailed bat) habitat is protected through mitigation of the effects of the development. Corridors are essential to this project.	Retain as notified.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.14	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7	Support in Part	Objective NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7 should be enhance the habitat of pekapeka through restoration and establishment of healthy new habitats where possible	Amend objective NOSZ – PREC1- P: O7 to include enhancement of the habitat of pekapeka through restoration and establishment of healthy new habitats where possible.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.15	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: R16	Support in Part	Support the idea of community gardens. The restrictions of no lighting are good and the stipulation that no vegetation should be removed is essential. However, a statement on the practical way this can be enforced needs to be included here.	Amend NOSZ-PREC1-P:R16 to include a statement on the practical way the Rule can be enforced.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.16	Chapter 15A: Natural Open Space Zone: Peacocke Precinct	NOSZ – PREC1- P: R36 Setbacks	Support in Part	Support the ruling to not allow development within 5m of a Significant Natural Area, however, for known bat roost sites this should be extended as these trees may impede properties and then landowner and council conflict is inevitable.	Amend to extend setbacks for known bat roost sites.