

| Your full name - Name | Chapter 4 | Chapter 23 | Chapter 25.2 | Chapter 25.5 | Chapter 25.14 | Appendix 17 | Attached file |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|---------------|
| Peter Findlay | <p>Chapter 2 Elements of Chapter 2 are generally supported, however it needs to be framed so it can organically and appropriately respond to growth, National Policy Statement directives, Corridor and Metro and Spatial plans currently under consideration and developments. The extent of the CBD outlined in Figure 2.1a is not supported as it does not respond appropriately to "Purpose" as outlined in Sections 2.1 and 4.1, sustainable resource management principles, does not best achieve the purpose of the RMA and ought to be right-sized (increased) to achieve the social, economic and cultural needs of Hamilton city residents.</p> <p>Chapter 4. Conferring 'permitted activity' status on residential development as outlined in 4.3.1 is supported in part. The extent of permitted development allowed in 4.3.1 a) is considered overly conservative and ought to be relaxed and become more broad-based, applying to other development typologies and activities in the Residential Intensification Zone. In summary, the proposed extent 'of permitted' activities is considered to lack ambition and ought to apply more broadly including the residential intensification zone and other housing typologies (e.g. 4.3.1c & d, 4.3.1f to h). This decision would better meet the objectives of the REEP as can reasonably be anticipated to arise from the delivery of more intensive development and housing typologies envisaged in areas zoned to receive the same over time (e.g. Residential Intensification Zone).</p> <p>4.4.3 The minimum permeable surface of 40% proposed in 4.4.3(a) is supported in part and together with 20% retained in 4.4.3(b) ought to be relaxed further for areas that adjoin or are in close proximity to sensitive or strategic road networks, parks, neighbourhood reserves, open spaces or the Waikato River.</p> <p>4.4.4 The building height in the Residential Intensification Zone ('RIZ') is opposed and ought to be abolished in areas in close proximity to the CBD and sensitive or strategic road networks, parks, neighbourhood reserves, open spaces or the Waikato River.</p> <p>4.4.5 (c) Amendments are supported as are amendments proposed to the point of measurement where the boundary adjoins a right of way or vehicle access, to the farthest boundary on the right of way. All other amendments proposed are opposed.</p> <p>4.4.6 The minimum distance rule proposed is opposed. Eaves should be excluded from the application of the proposed rule.</p> <p>4.4.7 Amendments proposed are opposed except for amendments to 4.4.7(a).</p> <p>4.4.8 Amendments are supported in part. Sometimes the road level is above the ground level, in which case 4.4.8(b) should be amended to read as "The height of any fence and/or wall shall be measured in terms of the greater of the natural ground level or the natural ground level of the public/strategic road the public arterial road level (measurement to be taken from its highest point).</p> <p>4.4.10 Outdoor living areas proposed in 4.4.10(d) are opposed. These are unnecessarily more onerous, adequate justification for this proposed change is not included in the s32 report, and it does not efficiently meet the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>4.4.11 Proposed changes are opposed in part. Delineation of the areas in the sizes prescribed is not supported and is not considered to effectively or efficiently meet the purpose of the RMA. The reduction in area and dimensions are supported, however it is not necessary to include the two separate areas or prescribe their size and use. Many people use energy</p> | <p>23.7.5 Minimum private ways proposed in d and e are excessive and ought to be reduced.</p> <p>Amend the Proposed Plan Change 6 as may be necessary to address the matters raised in submissions.</p> | <p>25.2.4.1 The amendment proposed to f) and g) is excessive and is opposed. These provisions should be deleted.</p> <p>Earthwork volumes proposed in h) should be increased and achieve alignment of volumes in residential and other zones.</p> <p>Amend the Proposed Plan Change 6 as may be necessary to address the matters raised in submissions.</p> | <p>25.5.3.1 (a) (i) & (ii), (b)(ii) Proposed amendments to i) and ii) are opposed. These are difficult to interpret, apply and if implemented would not effectively and efficiently meet the purpose of the RMA (please refer to submission to 25.5.3.1 (g) below.</p> <p>25.5.3.1 (g) Amendments proposed to residential units are opposed as the planting strip is prone to receipt of rubbish disposed from passing vehicles, are often difficult to maintain and poses an unnecessary burden on the ratepayer to maintain. If implemented the proposed amendment would not effectively and efficiently meet the purpose of the RMA and should be abandoned.</p> <p>25.5.3.1 (h) The form of existing and proposed rules are opposed. The suggested changes may reduce sight distance and visibility for vehicles leaving or entering the site in some areas, particularly those areas of high density development or which adjoin or connect to major arterials of the sensitive transport network.</p> <p>Amend the Proposed Plan Change 6 as may be necessary to address the matters raised in submissions.</p> | <p>25.14.4.1 (h) Minimum formation and legal widths are opposed. These do not allow for controlled one-way movement.</p> <p>25.14.4.1 (i) Internal vehicle access rules proposed are not clear and opposed. It is debatable whether the terminology as notified would effectively and efficiently meet the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>25.14.4.2 (f)(i) Rules proposed for parking and loading spaces and manoeuvring areas are opposed. These are unnecessarily restrictive and would not effectively and efficiently meet the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>25.14.4.3 Proposed changes are supported in part. These changes should be extended to exclude a simple ITA for trip generation <1499 vpd to ensure ITA requirements align consistently between zones. Further, to underpin the requirement for any ITA, Council should be necessary from trip generation of activities to materially exceed trip generation assumed in modelling activities in zoned areas and further, Council should make available a model to determine trip generation and its impact for development based on a 'plug-in and play' model or system to determine the same.</p> <p>Amend Proposed Plan Change 6 as may be necessary to address the matters raised in submissions.</p> | <p>Please refer to submissions to Section 4 for an amendment to the area of the CBD.</p> <p>Amend Proposed Plan Change 6 as may be necessary to address the matters raised in submissions.</p> | Not Answered |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>efficient heat pump driers and the efficiencies and improved amenity gain from consolidating refuse and recycling areas into communal areas is not recognised, particularly for infill developments.</p> <p>4.4.12 The introduction of 30m2 indoor living area is opposed and should be abandoned. It is an unnecessary intrusion into the design process that also reduces flexibility in responding to varying developer requirements.</p> <p>Amend Proposed Plan Change 6 as may be necessary to address the matters raised in submissions.</p> | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|