

Proposed Change	Support or Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
7.3 b) – activity status table	Support in part	Making alterations and additions to existing buildings a permitted activity will reduce the number of minor resource consent applications. This could incentivise owners to upgrade their buildings and contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the Central City.	Retain proposed change in relation to alterations and additions.
7.4.2 – building intensity	Support	<p>Maximum building intensity provisions (floor area ratios) can artificially limit urban density which is not appropriate in the Central City Zone where development should be encouraged.</p> <p>The Restricted Discretionary Activity status for new buildings in the Central City Zone provides an appropriate mechanism to consider building intensity on a site by site basis.</p>	Retain proposed change.
7.4.3 – permeable surfaces	Oppose	20% permeable surfaces can be hard to achieve in the Central City.	Delete rule.
7.4.4 – maximum height control and bonuses	Support in part	<p>Removal of height bonuses is appropriate as the uptake has been poor and they can disincentivise developers to build higher buildings due to the cost of providing the required public amenities.</p> <p>There should be no maximum building height limit in Central City Zone as the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for new buildings in the Central City Zone</p>	Remove Height Overlays and have no height limit across the Central City Zone.

		provides an appropriate mechanism to consider building height on a site by site basis.	
7.4.5 – through-site links	Oppose	<p>The triggers for providing a through-site link are ambiguous and need to be clarified.</p> <p>The rule only anticipates a through site link to be in the form of a 2.8m wide separately defined walkway. The rule should allow for well-designed shared spaces for both pedestrians and vehicles. The benefits of a shared space are improved pedestrian amenity, reduced vehicle speeds, reduced vehicle volumes, improved safety, creation of flexible space, and improved economic activity.</p>	<p>Clarify in a) the triggers for providing a through-site link by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including a definition for “new wholesale redevelopment” • Include “GFA” after 5000m² to clarify the trigger is not site area. <p>Amend requirements in a) i) & ii) to allow a through-site link to be in the form of a shared pedestrian and vehicle space.</p>
7.4.13 – active frontages	Oppose	<p>Allowing clear glazing to be covered makes this rule superfluous. Active frontages need to be encouraged in the Central City Zone.</p> <p>Hamilton City Council should set a good example by making their building have active frontages given its prominence in the Central City. The Councillor carpark on the corner of Caro and Anglesea Streets should be pocket park / garden.</p>	Delete proposed changes.
7.4.14 – veranda cover	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain
7.5.3 b) & c) – residential density	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain

7.5.3 d) i) – outdoor living	Support	In the context of a high-density central city residential development, It is not always possible to have outdoor living facing north.	Retain.
7.5.3 d) iii) – outdoor living	Support	The proposed reduction in outdoor living areas and dimension will assist with the goal of achieving higher density living in the Central City.	Retain
7.5.3 f) – residential unit size	Oppose	There should be one method of calculating residential unit size, regardless of the number of bedrooms. It is not clear why 3 bedroom units are subject to Indoor Living Area requirements when units with less bedrooms are not.	Delete Indoor Living Area requirement for >3 bedroom units.
7.5.3 h) – external outlook area	Support	The proposed amendments are appropriate.	Retain
7.5.7 – alterations and additions	Support	Making alterations and additions to existing buildings a permitted activity will reduce the number of minor resource consent applications. This could incentivise owners to upgrade their buildings and contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the Central City.	Retain proposed change.
25.14.4 h) – design and access widths	Oppose	Requiring on fee simple subdivision any internal vehicle access serving more than 6 residential units to vest in Hamilton City Council as public road is inappropriate. In established parts of the city (such as the Central City) there will be physical space constraints to establishing a public road. Furthermore, the vesting of roads places	Delete proposed changes.

		additional financial burden on Council as they will become responsible for maintenance.	
--	--	---	--