FORM 6: FURTHER SUBMISSION ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE UNDER CLAUSE 8 SCHEDULE 1 TO THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 (RMA)

HAMILTON CITY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 5 – PEACOCKE STRUCTURE PLAN

FURTHER SUBMISSION FORMS CAN BE:

- Posted to: Freepost 172189, Hamilton City Council, Private Bag 3010, Hamilton 3240, Attn: Plan Change 5 Further Submission.
- Delivered to: Hamilton City Council Municipal Building, Garden Place, Hamilton.
- Emailed to: haveyoursay@hcc.govt.nz

NOTE TO PERSON MAKING A FURTHER SUBMISSION:

Important: Further submissions must reach council by Wednesday 16 March 2022.

You must serve a copy of your further submission on the original submitter within five working days after it is served on the local authority.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Following the close of further submissions, a report will be prepared on the proposal and a hearing date will be set and notified to all submitters and 'further submitters' who wish to be heard.

Council will make all further submissions, including name and contact details, publicly available on Council's website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public.

Please print and do not use pencil. You can attach more pages if necessary. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your further submission.

SUBMITTER DETAILS (all fields required)

Full name:	Stuart and Maylene Ross
Contact Person: (If different from above, include name and designation)	Logan Ross (Agent)
Company name: (if applicable)	Blue Wallace Surveyors Limited
Postal address for service: (or alternative method of service under s 352 of the RMA)	c/- Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd, PO Box 38, WMC, Hamilton 3240
Email address for service:	logan@bluewallace.co.nz
Phone number(s):	021361576

FURTHER SUBMITTER RELEVANCE I am: (select one)

- ☐ A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.
- ☑ A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has.
- ☐ The local authority for the relevant area.

State the reason for your selection: Landowner within the PSPA

DO YOU WISH TO ATTEND AND SPEAK AT THE COUNCIL HEARING IN SUPPORT OF MY FURTHER SUBMISSION?

☐ Yes ☑ No

IF OTHERS MAKE A SIMILAR SUBMISSION WOULD YOU BE PREPARED TO CONSIDER PRESENTING A JOINT CASE WITH THEM AT ANY HEARING?

☐ Yes ☑ No

SIGNATURE OF FURTHER SUBMITTER (your signature or that of the person authorised to sign on behalf of the person making this further submission)

Signature: Logan Ross Digitally signed by Logan Ross Date: 2022.03.16 20:02:26 +13'00' Date: 16-Mar-2022

(A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.)

No	NAME AND ADDRESS OF ORIGINAL SUBMITTER AND SUBMITTER NUMBER	ORIGINAL SUBMISSION POINT NUMBER	STATE WHETHER YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THIS SPECIFIC PART OF THE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION	STATE THE REASONS FOR YOUR SUPPORT OR OPPOSITION	WHAT DECISION DO YOU SEEK FROM COUNCIL ON THE WHOLE OR PART OF THE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION?
2	Brendin Raymond and Mary Anne Ronke	2.1	Support in part	We agree with the point that the location of proposed stormwater wetlands need to be re-defined at the detailed design stage. The location, size and delineation of the proposed stormwater wetland should be properly assessed by a professional stormwater engineer.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
12	Hodgson Trustee Management Co. Limited	12.3	Support	We agree with the point that the ecological corridors as shown on the proposed structure plan are too broad- brush.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
13	Jones Lands Limited	13.4	Support	We agree with the point that the mapped bat corridors, reserves, Significant Natural Areas, Significant Bat Habitat Areas are larger than are necessary to maintain and enhance ecological features 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 seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
		13.8	Support in part	We agree with the point that the exact location of proposed wetland areas need to be re-defined at the detailed design stage. The location, size and delineation of the proposed stormwater wetland should be properly assessed by a professional stormwater engineer.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
14	Northview Capital Limited (Aurora development)	14.7	Support	We agree with the point that the ecological corridors as shown on the proposed structure plan are too broad- brush.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
		14.9	Support in part	We agree with the point that the indication of stormwater wetland location needs to be defined as part of detailed design and some stormwater wetlands may not be possible where illustrated.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
		14.10	Support	We oppose the bat monitoring requirement.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
15	Tilehurst Living Trust	15.2	Support	We support this submission point as we also believe that the mapping of the SNA and Bat Habitat is inaccurate. It is not clear how council defined the SNA boundary.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.

		15.4	Support	As above.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
17	Findlay Family Trust	17.5	Support	We oppose the proposed location and extent of the ecological corridor and bat corridors.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
20	Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	20.5	Oppose	We oppose the recommendation to increase extent of setbacks from Significant Natural Area where possible. This will further restrict the buildable areas cross PSPA – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential medium density.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
		20.16	Oppose	We oppose this submission. The requirement for a 50m wide corridor is too arbitrary and there is no research showing what the optimum width for these buffer and corridor areas should be.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
27	Johnny Tsai	27.3	Support in part	We agree with the point that the bat buffer can be decreased in distance.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
		27.4	Support	We agree with the point that road infrastructure should be allowed within bat buffer.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
30	Andrea Graves	30.10	Oppose	We oppose the designation of extensive SNAs. We oppose a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
		30.11	Oppose	We oppose the submission to extend the protections to SNAs to low-to-moderate value habitat. 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.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
33	Shih-An Tseng	33.3	Support	We agree with the point to remove the requirement for bat surveys in resource consents as this introduces excessive costs to the applicants for resource consents.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
		33.4	Support	We agree with the point that road infrastructure should be allowed within bat buffer for practical reasons.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
35	Kevin and Kathy Sanders	35.3	Support	We oppose a blanket key habitat SNA overlay on all the sites abutting the Gully.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
		35.4	Support	As above.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
		35.6	Support	The 'double dipping' setback requirements will further reduce the buildable area across PSPA – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential medium density	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
		35.10	Support	We oppose the broad- brush bat corridor.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.

36	Waikato Regional Council	36.11	Oppose	We oppose the point that to add any identified wetlands as SNA. Further assessment is required.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
		36.38	Oppose	We oppose this submission. The submitter seeks that a more balanced account of ecological preservation and residential land availability is provided.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
		36.39	Oppose	We oppose this submission. The 'double dipping' setback requirements will further reduce the buildable area – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential medium density	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
		36.40	Oppose	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.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
38	Director-General of Conservation	38.20	Oppose	We oppose this submission point to include additional areas of bat habitat as 'Bat Priority Areas.' 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. This submission point will take away significant buildable areas – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential medium density.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
		38.3	Oppose	We oppose this submission. Reasons are as above.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.
39	Ron Lockwood	39.2 39.3 39.8	Support	We agree with the point that the proposed Bat Corridors can make privately owned land incapable of reasonable use and will significantly limit development potential.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
41	Shortbread Limited	50.1-50.33	Support	We agree with everything in Stuart and Maylene Ross's submission.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
46	Ben and Rachel Inger	46.2	Support in part	We agree with the point that the width of the bat corridor should be reduced, but 35m could still be extremely restrictive on residential development being the main purpose of the plan change.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
		46.3	Support in part	We agree with the point that the width of the bat corridor should be reduced, but 35m could still be extremely restrictive	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.

				on residential development being the main purpose of the plan change.	
		46.5	Support in part	We agree with the point that 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. However, we oppose the 35m corridor. Once the residential area is developed in medium and high density it is unlikely that any bats will be present.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
		46.9	Support in part	We agree with the point that the width of the Bat Habitat Areas for the Proposed Bat Corridors is reduced.	The submitter seeks that Council accept this submission point.
		46.11	Support	We agree with the point that 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.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
48	Gregory Alan Knight	48.1-48.32	Support	We agree with everything in Gregory Alan Knight's submission.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
51	Ebenezer Property Limited Partnership	51.1-51.33	Support	We agree with everything in Ebenezer Property Limited's submission.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
52	Jacky Li and Alex Zheng	52.1-52.37	Support	We agree with everything in Jacky Li and Alex Zheng's submission.	The submitter seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.
58	Harvey Aughton- Go Eco (Waikato Environmental Centre)	58.11	Oppose	We oppose this submission. The requirement for a 50m wide corridor is too arbitrary and there is no research showing what the optimum width for these buffer and corridor areas should be.	The submitter seeks that the submission be rejected in full.