

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
Entire Variation					
04	D. Fraser	Entire variation	Support	▪ Maintaining area is essential.	04.01 Retain entire variation.
05	Robert George	Entire variation	Support	▪ Favours having historical items such as neighbouring houses built in 1910s and 1930s protected.	05.01 Supports adopting the variation to the District Plan.
06	Peter Singleton	Entire variation	Support		06.01 That the entire variation be retained without dilution.
07	Carlene Eves	Entire variation	Support		07.01 Supports the variation
12	Gregor Dunn	Entire variation	Support		12.01 Supports the philosophy of variation 20
13	Lisa Rapana	Entire variation	Support	▪ Supports entire variation	13.02 Supports the variation
14	Katherine Fell	Entire variation	Support	▪ Full support of the entire proposal.	14.01 That the entire variation be retained.
17	Chris and Ruth Eames	Entire variation particularly setback from road, permeable surfaces, planting and screening.	Support in part	▪ Supports proposed rule changes under variation 20, particularly setback from the road, permeable surfaces and planting and screening.	17.01 Decision from Council that reflects support for retention of variation 20.
18	Clifford and Raewyn Jackson	Entire variation, particularly section size	Oppose	▪ Opposes the variation particularly with respect to the ability to subdivide large sections. The growing, ageing population need accommodation close to facilities not larger sections and urban sprawl.	18.01 Keep the status quo [withdraw variation]
19	Jeffrey Neems	Entire variation	Support	▪ Supports the proposed variation and would like it adopted by HCC	19.01 Retain the variation
20	Judith McDonald	Entire variation	Support		20.01 Retain the variation as proposed.
29	Lynette Evans	General	Support	▪ General support for provisions of variation 20.	29.01 Supports provisions of variation 20.
30	Suzanne O'Rourke	Entire variation	Support	▪ Support entire variation and its rules to protect the existing character of Hamilton East. ▪ In particular support tighter controls over apartment development, minimum site areas, road setbacks which prevent garages in front yards and ensure an open streetscape.	30.01 Retain variation as proposed.
34	Merilyn Manley-Harris	General	Support	▪ Supports the proposed variation to the city plan to manage change and character in Hamilton East.	34.01 Supports the variation.
36	New Zealand Transport Agency	General	Support	▪	36.01 That Hamilton City Council retain variation 20.
35	Mrs Beverly Underwood	General	Support	▪ Supports the proposed variation to the city plan to manage change and character in Hamilton East.	35.01 Supports the variation.
40	William and Joan Graham	General	Support	▪ Supports Variation 20: Managing change and character in Hamilton East.	40.01 Supports Variation 20.
47	Ian James Fraser and Keri Pavreal-Fraser	Entire variation	Support	▪	47.01 Retain all changes proposed by the variation.
49	Christine and Lloyd Hollis	General	Oppose	▪	49.01 Opposes the proposed rule changes.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
52	Kewwa Low	Entire variation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Variation is contrary to urban sustainability and resource management practices. ▪ Area has strategic importance, and is urban hub that defines Hamilton as a City. ▪ Variation prepared in fragmented manner focussed solely on Residential Zone. ▪ Variation 20 restricts housing development which is contrary to mixed use zoning concepts. Mixed use zoning concepts are not adequately addressed. 	<p>52.05 That the entire variation be withdrawn. 52.06 That the variation is included as part of Council's District Plan Review.</p>
55	McCracken Surveyors	Entire variation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to entire variation ▪ Opposed to standards introduced by variation 20, specifically minimum lot size, site coverage, setbacks, planting and screening, built form, and building orientation. 	55.01 Delete variation 20.
64	M A Pollard	General	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Variation does not far enough to protect character. 	64.40 Stronger changes to the District Plan rules are needed.
65	Elizabeth Dawe	Provisions that relate to private residential housing, particularly demolition control rule and restrictions on alterations and additions to pre 1960 houses	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Variation need not relate to whole Hamilton East area and should be site specific if concept of protecting special character is to remain. ▪ Range of housing styles and there needs to be a chance for the area to develop without the type of controls being promoted. 	<p>65.01 Delete the variation. 65.02 To review the need for the proposed variation in its present form.</p>
73	Monica van Oostrom	Entire variation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restricts property rights of Hamilton East property owners. Property owners should be able to do what they wish with their own properties, so long as they do not impinge on the rights of others. 	73.01 Strongly urge Hamilton City Council to not implement any of the proposals.
75	3 Broke Bros Ltd Hayden and Brad Porter	General	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	75.15 Oppose proposed variation changes.
78	Mark McLennan	Entire variation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If design of high density housing is the issue, then why not introduce new rules to control this (if this isn't achieved already by existing provisions). ▪ Difficult to retrofit older houses to meet modern needs. 	78.01 Existing District Plan provisions for Hamilton East to remain unaltered.
91	Neil Brimblecombe	General	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Damage (if any) has already been done. ▪ Does not need fixing. 	91.01 Leave Hamilton East as it is, don't change anything.
92	Brent Hoyle	Entire variation	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	92.01 Adoption of Variation 20 with amendments and changes suggested in 92.02 — 92.18.
95	Ashley Brown	General	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	95.02 General support for variation.
97	Simon Mahoney	General	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May decrease property value given that it would become less desirable for development. ▪ HCC too slow, much of area already butchered. 	97.01 Opposes the variation.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
Special Character Area					
27	Susan Woodhouse	Special Character Area	Support	▪	27.01 Declare Hamilton East a special character area similar to Claudelands and Hayes Paddock.
38	Margaret McQuillan	Special Character Area	Support	▪ That Hamilton East be designated as a special character area.	38.02 That Hamilton East be designated as a special character area out to Cobham Drive.
48	Brian Smith	Special Character Area	Support in part	▪ Does not go far enough	48.01 Declare a special character area similar to Hayes Paddock and Claudelands.
72	Erin Dillon	Special Character Area	Support	▪	72.01 Declare Hamilton East a special character area similar to Hayes Paddock and Claudelands.
74	Cushla Mawston	Special Character Area	Support	▪	74.01 Declare Hamilton East a special character area similar to Hayes Paddock and Claudelands.
76	John Kellaway	Special Character Area	Support	▪ Title of zone inconsistent — at least on same level as Claudelands west.	76.01 Description change to the 'Hamilton East Special Character Zone'.
85	Jackie Broughan	Special Character Area	Support	▪	85.01 Declare Hamilton East a special character area similar to Hayes Paddock and Claudelands.
88	Clare Mataira and Peter Dornauf	Special Character Area	Support	▪	88.01 Declare Hamilton East a special character area similar to Hayes Paddock and Claudelands.
Extent of the Hamilton East Residential Zone					
25	Judith White	Extent of Hamilton East Residential Zone	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes inclusion of Dey Street (between Naylor and Brookfield Streets) in the Hamilton East Residential Zone. In particular inclusion of 75 Dey Street. ▪ Character of area compromised by proposed Hamilton Eastern Arterial ▪ Impact on property values and re-sale potential ▪ Character of area compromised by infill and subdivision, 75 Dey Street only section that doesn't contain infill housing and is not subdivided. 	<p>25.01 To exclude the part of Dey Street bounded by Naylor Street and Brookfield Street from the proposed Hamilton East Residential Zone.</p> <p>25.02 To exclude 75 Dey Street from the proposed Hamilton East Residential Zone.</p>
44	Warren Stace	Proposed Hamilton East Residential Zone MS/MAP036	Support	▪ Supports extent of proposed Hamilton East Residential Zone boundary. Area has older residential buildings with character verging on warranting heritage protection.	44.01 Retain the area defined on MS/Map — 036 and bordered by the black line to be the Hamilton East Residential Zone boundary.
61	Jason Cargo	Extent of character area	Oppose	▪ Area too large to hold as a character zone with heritage houses. Developers need options.	61.03 Reduce extent of area, have northern boundary at Clyde Street.
77	John Manning	Extent of Residential Zone	Oppose	▪ Inclusion of arterials (Cobham Drive and Dey Street link) inconsistent with desired residential amenity within the Hamilton East Residential Zone.	77.03 Exclude properties fronting arterial routes from the Hamilton East Residential Zone (Dey Street E1, Cobham Drive).
82	Stephen Tunnicliffe	Extent of area of the Hamilton East Zone	Oppose	▪ Houses to east of Galloway Street are mainly 1950's — 1960's and there are not many that have not been substantially altered or subdivided.	82.01 The area bounded by Variation 20 should stop at Galloway Street.
100	Anne Jacobson	Extent of Hamilton East Residential Zone	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 44 Te Aroha Street next to block of flats. ▪ Surrounding businesses- property not suitable as residential. ▪ Intention of future development of site — needs to be flexible. 	100.01 Retain current zoning for shop end of Te Aroha Street.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long narrow section so more suited to 'sideways' building. ▪ Street front door does not exist and cannot be added. 	
102	Graeme Steed	Extent of area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only isolated pockets of development that justify the radical changes proposed (including proposed heritage area). ▪ Proposed changes for other areas not in best interests of residents. ▪ Not much to set area apart from rest of the city. 	102.01 Variation 20 should be addressed only to those areas which are genuine heritage value and high density zones. It should not apply to other parts of the General Residential Zone.
Extent of the Hamilton East High Density Area					
08	Janine Cornor	Extent of Residential High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Live at 123A MacFarlane and constant noise problems from flats on high density lots. 	08.01 Requests that section of MacFarlane Street currently zoned as high density be removed from the Residential High Density Area and be rezoned as general residential.
27	Susan Woodhouse	High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extent of High Density Area 	27.03 Rezone parts of the High Density Area back to general residential as proposed to the public in April 2009.
38	Margaret McQuillan	Extent of High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That the high density area boundary changes presented at the April meeting be kept and the amount of land zoned high density be reduced in Hamilton East. 	38.01 That the high density area boundary changes presented at the April meeting be kept and the amount of land zoned high density be reduced in Hamilton East.
48	Brian Smith	Extent of High Density Area	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High density housing has adverse impacts on neighbouring heritage housing 	48.02 Restore variation to version presented to the public in April 2009 by rezoning parts of current high density area to general residential.
52	Kewwa Low	Planning Maps — Extent of High Density Area	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retention of existing Residential High Density Area. 	52.04 Retain the existing Residential High Density Area.
55	McCracken Surveyors	Extent of High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not provide for inner city living in close proximity to where people work and play. 	55.12 Reconsider area of High Density Area for inner city living.
57	Hamilton East Community Trust	Extent of High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High Density Area is too extensive. Parking and congestion problems. 	57.02 Reinstate the original area presented to the community as 'high density area'.
72	Erin Dillon	Extent of High Density area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	72.02 Restore variation to version presented to public in April 2009 with some of the High Density Area rezoned to general residential.
74	Cushla Mawston	Extent of High Density area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	74.02 Restore variation to version presented to public in April 2009 with some of the High Density Area rezoned to general residential.
76	John Kellaway	Extent of High Density Zone	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keeping existing boundary of high density zone forgets purpose of the exercise in the first place. 	76.17 Eliminate or reduce the High Density Zone, if retained it must be included in main zone.
79	Andrew Yeoman	Extent of High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limits density of development in area. ▪ Area close to CBD so makes sense for higher density living. 	79.01 Recommends that Council increase the High Density Area in the suburb rather than trying to limit it by imposing restrictive and largely prohibitive constraints.
85	Jackie Broughan	Extent of High Density area		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	85.02 Restore variation to version presented to public in April 2009 with some of the High Density Area rezoned to general residential.
88	Clare Mataira and Peter Dornauf	Extent of High Density area		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	88.02 Restore variation to version presented to public in April 2009 with some of the High Density Area rezoned to general residential.
93	Margaret Southgate	Extent of High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	93.06 Oppose change back to high density from what was shown earlier this year.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
Zoning around Steele Park					
57	Hamilton East Community Trust	Steele Park zoning	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Zoning around Steele Park needs to be changed to commercial allowing the development of the Hamilton East Village to extend into this area. ▪ This in line with Streetscape proposals for Hamilton East and future development to the South. 	57.03 Rezone land around Steele Park as commercial.
83	Jane Landman - Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House	Steele Park/apartments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Apartments of several stories high could be built around Steele Park with boutique shops on the ground floor and outdoor tables around Steele Park 	83.03 Consider mixed use apartments around Steele Park.
93	Margaret Southgate	Steele Park	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not address issue of commercial/retail zoning around Steele Park. 	93.07 Address issue of commercial/retail zoning around Steele Park.
High Density Development - General					
19	Jeffrey Neems	High Density Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like the rules of the variation extended to prevent further high density development in Hamilton East. 	19.02 Extend rules to prevent continued high density residential development in Hamilton East.
52	Kewwa Low	4.1B.2 General Standards - High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hamilton East High Density Area standards should not be different to other High Density Area standards in the city. ▪ Hamilton East High Density Area is not dissimilar to other High Density Areas. ▪ Common set of provisions provides ease of administration of district plan and certainty. 	52.02 Delete specific rules pertaining to Hamilton East Residential High Density Area. 52.03 Retain a common bulk and location standard for all High Density Areas within Hamilton City.
61	Jason Cargo	High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hamilton East area prime location for infill as promoted by planning documents on future growth of the city. ▪ Development needs to be allowed at higher density than present to support CBD, hospital and University. 	61.01 Allow a higher density of development than provided for presently.
76	John Kellaway	High Density Zone		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keeping existing boundary of high density zone forgets purpose of the exercise in the first place. ▪ Apartment blocks necessary component of cities but they relate to urban centres not single unit housing areas especially those with heritage values. 	76.04 Restrict apartments in the Residential Zone/area. 76.18 Protect heritage buildings in the high density zone.
92	Brent Hoyle	High Density Area	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development money driven, little or no consideration given to existing character and style in the area. 	92.08 Support regulations to restrict high density housing to conform to character of the area and deter out of character high density housing.
93	Margaret Southgate	Extent of High Density Area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cook and Wellington Streets are good examples of what happens when waste collection does not have follow up cleaning support. 	93.04 Do not go ahead with further high density until the present situation is tidied up and good processes are in place (e.g. Parking, rubbish). 93.05 Investigate ways in which the existing problems around high density and multi-units can be contained.
Policy 5.1 Residential Areas					
75	3 Broke Bros Ltd Hayden and Brad Porter	Objective 5.1.7	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to Objective 5.1.7 	75.12 Opposes the proposed objective 5.1.7. 75.13 Opposes policies i, j, k, l and wording 'buildings that contribute significantly to local character'.
77	John Manning	Objective 5.1.7		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inconsistencies 	77.04 Clarify inconsistencies

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
Rule 4.1B Hamilton East Residential Zone					
03	Kevin Peter Russell	Rule 4.1B	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Particularly supports the specific provisions relating to building and fence heights, reduction in site coverage, increase in setbacks and minimum lot sizes, requiring permeable surfaces on site, requiring planting in front yards, houses orientation towards the street, and the requirement to obtain resource consent for demolition of pre 1960's dwellings. 	03.01 Retain Rule 4.1B
15	Nancy and Harry Chaloner	General residential area rules	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposed rules as set out in the variation for the general residential area. 	15.01 Supports the proposed rules as set out in the variation for the general residential area.
20	Judith McDonald	Hamilton East Residential Zone	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completely supports the proposed new Hamilton East Residential Zone 	20.02 Supports the proposed new Hamilton East Residential Zone.
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.3 b) ii)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ancillary flats should be allowed to be 70m². 	60.13 4.1B.3 b) ii) maximum gross floor area shall be 70m ² .
75	3 Broke Bros Ltd Hayden and Brad Porter	Rule 4.1B	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to Rule 4.1B Eliminates second storey houses which could assist in increasing economic benefit. Setbacks make it hard for smaller corner sites. 	<p>75.08 Opposes proposed changes as set out in Rule 4.1B.</p> <p>75.09 Oppose permitted activities being restricted by 4.1B.2 and any further restriction on potential future income opportunities, and alterations.</p> <p>75.10 Oppose all changes in 4.1B.2.</p> <p>75.11 Oppose 4.1B.3 a).</p>
83	Jane Landman - Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House	Building restrictions such as setbacks and similar	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are requiring larger overall sections Slightly larger ancillary flats would improve living quality. 	83.02 Supports building restrictions such as set backs and the like.
91	Neil Brimblecombe	Boundaries	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	91.02 Leave the rules for boundaries as they are.
92	Brent Hoyle	Design of houses — General Residential Area	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like provision in variation to allow 'good' design within the heritage area, as it helps to enhance the area around (23B Brookfield a good example) 	92.09 Require provision for houses of 'good' design (being defined by design being accepted by recognised design/architectural standards/style) to be allowed to be built on sites, especially where existing dwelling has no style or design or is beyond repair/restoration or retaining.
94	Sarah Cameron Brodnax	New rules for General Residential Area	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Particularly support changes for front sections. Hope rules will discourage out of character developments on rear sections. 	94.01 That the proposed changes, as outlined in Councils letter to affected ratepayers are adopted.
96	Michelle Akoorie	Rule 4.1B	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infill housing does nothing to support the character; much damage has already been done. 	96.01 Supports the variation.
Rule 4.1B.1 a) Permitted Activities					
33	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	4.1B.1 Activities General residential area and high density area — demolition and removal of buildings as a permitted activity.	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for unrecorded archaeological sites to be disturbed by this activity. Protection of historic heritage a matter of national importance in the RMA 1991. Definition of historic heritage includes archaeological sites. Historic Places Act 1993 provides for identification, protection and conservation of historic and cultural heritage. Authority required from NZHPT if there is reasonable cause to suspect an archaeological site may be modified, damaged or destroyed. Authority must be 	<p>33.01 Requests that the same advice note [about the requirements of the Historic Places Act when an archaeological item is discovered] be included in Rule 4.1B to account for the possibility of archaeological sites being disturbed by demolition or removal of buildings.</p> <p>33.02 Suggests that Council develop and archaeological alert layer for the Hamilton East Zone.</p>

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission.
Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>obtained before works proceed lawfully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alert layer is used as an early warning system. It can be used by Council to assess the risk factor and likelihood of damage to archaeological sites; likewise it provides applicants with certainty when undertaking work. ▪ Hamilton East known to have had significant human activity prior to 1900. 	
33	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	General residential area — alterations and additions to the exterior of any dwelling constructed prior to 1 January 1960 (re: side and rear walls)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Permissive nature of this activity could promote a culture of facadism. ▪ Activity status allows for an owner to remove (in totality) side and rear walls and replace them with any material without the need for resource consent. It allows for partial demolition of up to three quarters of the dwelling as a permitted activity. ▪ Activity status contrary to proposed Policy 5.1.1(i). ▪ Removal of three quarters of a building could affect wider street context and ultimately the special character. ▪ Controlled activity status does not restrict alteration or additions, rather establishes a control mechanism that does not promote a façade culture and applicant has a degree of certainty regarding the resource consent process. 	33.03 Amend the activity status of alterations and additions to the exterior of any dwelling (other than the streetscape exterior) constructed prior to 1 January 1960 to a controlled activity and extending matters of control to choice of materials, form and design to be used in the alteration or addition.
59	Betty Connolly	Rule 4.1B.1 — Permitted activities: Minor work	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is defined as minor work? Definition of alterations and additions does not leave much scope for minor work. 	59.02 Clarification of what is classed as 'minor work' as the definition of alterations and additions does not leave much scope for minor works.
77	John Manning	Rule 4.1B.1 Minor Work		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify the definition of minor work as impossible to administer i.e. restrictions on fencing that complies with the Building Act. 	77.05 Clarify permitted 'minor work'.
Rule 4.1B.1 c) Restricted Discretionary Activities: General Residential Area — Alterations and Additions					
39	John Irvine	Rule 4.1B Activity status of alterations and additions	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Object to requiring resource consent for demolition and alterations and additions to the street front exterior of pre 1960 buildings. ▪ Own ugly state house — Council should encourage change by reducing fees and red tape to make changes to such buildings. 	39.02 Seek a date change [to the age of buildings the variation applies to] to ensure 237 Dey Street does not require resource consent for alterations and additions.
77	John Manning	Alterations and additions to pre-1960 buildings	Oppose		77.15 Replace alterations to dwellings pre-1960 from a Restricted Discretionary Activity to a Permitted activity provided they comply with design criteria.
91	Neil Brimblecombe	Alterations to pre-1960 dwellings	Oppose		91.04 Leave the rules for alterations to pre-1960 dwellings as they are.
92	Brent Hoyle	Alterations and additions to street	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overkill. 	92.05 That alterations and/or additions to the street front exterior of a pre 1960's dwelling not be subject to resource consent.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
		front exterior of pre-1960 dwellings General Residential Area			92.06 Allow alteration and additions within existing design, and character provided it doesn't detract from character/style of the house. 92.07 Consider making alterations/additions conditional on neighbours consent.
Rule 4.1B.1 d) Discretionary Activities: General Residential Area — Demolition and Removal of any dwelling on a street front section constructed prior to 1 January 1960.					
13	Lisa Rapana	Pre 1960's Demolition	Support	▪	13.03 Supports the retention of rules and regulations to ensure pre 1960s houses within Hamilton East Residential Zone are protected.
17	Chris and Ruth Eames	Demolition Rule	Support in part	▪ Supports the demolition rule but only if it is to be implemented on dwellings from the time of their next sale, so owners are aware of what they are buying into.	17.03 Suggests imposing demolition rule on properties from time of next sale.
22	D. MacDonald	Demolition Rule	Support	▪ Supports the requirement of a resource consent for demolition of pre 1960's dwellings on street front sections.	22.06 Retain rule relating to demolition of dwellings pre-1960.
27	Susan Woodhouse	Demolition Rule	Support	▪ Rule is good for front houses but not for rear houses. Extending the demolition rule across the remaining area would preserve total character of the area.	27.06 Support demolition control rule. 27.07 Extend the demolition rule across the remainder of the area (rear sites), even if it was downgraded to pre 1940 demolition rule for rest of the area.
33	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Rule 4.1B Assessment criteria g) Demolition and removal of pre 1960 buildings v)	Oppose	▪ Proposed provision promotes an allowance for buildings to be demolished or removed if they are beyond restoration or repair, or are deemed a risk to public safety. ▪ Concerned that phrase 'beyond restoration or repair' sets a precedent for demolition by neglect. ▪ A disincentive to owners to maintain their buildings to a standard of public health and safety.	33.06 That the Assessment Criteria should be amended to exclude reference to restoration or repair. i.e. v) <i>The extent to which the building is beyond restoration or repair, or poses a risk to public health and safety.</i>
39	John Irvine	Rule 4.1B Activity status of demolition	Oppose	▪ Object to requiring a resource consent for demolition and alterations and additions to the street front exterior of pre- 1960 buildings. ▪ Own ugly state house — Council should encourage change by reducing fees and red tape to make changes to such buildings.	39.01 Seek a date change [to the age of buildings the variation applies to] to ensure 237 Dey Street does not require resource consent for demolition.
42	Andrew Pope	Resource consent to demolish pre 1960 homes	Oppose	▪ Property of approx 13m by 100m, seven bordering properties with only one pre 1960.	42.06 Delete the rules proposed in the variation in respect of requiring resource consent to demolish pre 1960 homes.
44	Warren Stace	Proposed Hamilton East Residential Zone MS/MAP036	Support	▪	44.04 Support rules that require resource consent for demolition or removal of residential buildings.
47	Ian Fraser and Keri Pavreal-Fraser	Demolition Rule	Support	▪	47.02 Demolition control rule should also apply to the shopping area.
48	Brian Smith	Demolition Rule	Support in part	▪ Character about entire area not just the street front. ▪ Demolition control should apply to rear sites to maintain integrity of the character of the area.	48.06 Extend demolition control rule to cover rear sites.
50	New Zealand Heavy Haulage	Entire variation, including all	Oppose	▪ Two aspects to shifting of buildings — removal and relocation (change regulates both aspects).	50.01 Recognition in the policies, rules and criteria for the positive 'recycling' effects of building demolition, removal and relocation.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission.
Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
	Association Inc.	provisions related to removal, demolition and relocation of buildings and blanket protection for pre 1960 houses		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Graduated scale for controls for protection of heritage in Hamilton East. Not opposed to scheduling of Heritage Items and Heritage Precinct but oppose blanket pre-1960 protection. ▪ Use of blanket protection rules is not necessary, efficient or effective in achieving the purpose of the Act. ▪ Change not justified by proper evaluation of character of areas. ▪ Does not recognise diversity of existing housing stock and contribution of diverse housing types to cultural and amenity values. ▪ Imposes significant costs without corresponding benefits. i.e. restrictions on private property rights, intensification, resource consent processing costs and opportunity costs. ▪ Does not recognise positive effects of re-use and re-cycling buildings. ▪ Change does not recognise the potential for removed and relocated buildings to sustain the potential of natural and physical resources in accordance with purpose and principles of RMA. ▪ Not necessary for assisting council to carry out its functions. ▪ Does not meet section 32 criteria. ▪ Transfers cost of character and heritage to private property owners in unreasonable way. 	<p>50.02 Withdraw the variation; and/or</p> <p>a) delete the proposed Hamilton East Residential Zone,</p> <p>b) modify and/or limit the scope of the change in relation to building removal, demolition and relocation following an assessment on a street-by-street or house-by-house analysis of character/heritage within the zone,</p> <p>c) Schedule or classify specific buildings within the zone following such property character/heritage assessment.</p> <p>50.03 Make such amendments to the general provisions, objectives, policies and assessment criteria so as to recognise the matters in paragraphs 6 and 7 of this submission. [summarised in reasons]</p> <p>50.04 Delete discretionary activity status for controls on dwellings in the general residential area, and the high density area, including the demolition and removal of any dwelling constructed prior to 1 January 1960.</p> <p>50.05 Delete the arbitrary 1 January 1960 rule.</p> <p>50.06 Rewrite the rules and assessment criteria to be less onerous and restrictive and to properly reflect the actual character and resource significance for the residential zone.</p> <p>50.07 Allow for the relocation, removal or the demolition of buildings where they do not have scheduled/listed heritage value, or where required as part of a comprehensive site development — as a permitted activity.</p> <p>50.08 Alternatively to 50.07 where the rules require resource consent, than activity classification no more restrictive than restricted controlled activity status shall apply with provision for consent to be dealt with expressly on a non-notified basis by precluding public notice and/or service on affected parties.</p> <p>50.09 Exclude from variation 20 the re-siting of buildings within sites.</p> <p>50.10 Retain activity classification status for all activities referred to in the variation as no more restrictive than a controlled activity.</p> <p>50.11 Make any such consequential amendments to give effect to this submission, including such amendments as may be required to the objectives, and policies and assessment criteria of the change and to give recognition to the positive effects of relocation and removal of buildings and dwellings.</p>
55	McCracken Surveyors	Demolition control rule	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-1960 buildings generally not orientated to the sun, not insulated, not of sufficient quality to renovate economically. 	<p>55.10 Seek that current rules are retained for removal of buildings i.e. allow older buildings to be removed for urban renewal [delete removal of buildings rules introduced by variation 20]</p> <p>55.11 Identify and protect buildings worthy of protection</p>
61	Jason Cargo	Demolition control rule	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protect character while allowing appropriate development. ▪ Do pre 1960s houses need protection? Would pre 1940s be more appropriate? 	<p>61.02 Change to a pre-1940 demolition control rule.</p>
68	Waikato Property Investors Association	Demolition controls	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Against recent reform of RMA. 	<p>68.07 The Council reverses its intention to apply the new District Plan standards introducing demolition controls for Hamilton East, and the status quo remains in place.</p>
72	Erin Dillon	Demolition control rule	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good for houses fronting the road but not so good for those at the back or down a driveway. 	<p>72.05 Extend demolition control rule across remaining area, even if downgraded for rest of area to a pre 1940 or similar rule. [i.e. rear sections]</p>
74	Cushla Mawston	Demolition control rule	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good for houses fronting the road but not so good for those at the back or down a driveway. 	<p>74.05 Extend demolition control rule across remaining area, even if downgraded for rest of area to a pre 1940 or similar rule. [i.e. rear sections]</p>

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
75	3 Broke Bros Ltd Hayden and Brad Porter	Demolition Control over pre 1960 houses	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to requirement for discretionary resource consent. 	75.14 Opposes the change requiring discretionary resource consent to demolish or remove a pre 1960 house.
78	Mark McLennan	Demolition Control Rule	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undue democratic interference. Uncertainty for property owner. 	78.13 Opposes the demolition control rule.
79	Andrew Yeoman	Resource Consent requirement for demolition of pre 1960 dwellings.	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area too intermingled to warrant 'saving'. Should be building newer energy efficient housing. Type of housing protected is not what any global community would call heritage. 	79.05 Opposes requirement to obtain resource consent for demolition of a pre 1960 dwelling.
80	John Ferguson Weir	The demolition control rule in 4.1B	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with preservation and controls relating to heritage dwellings. Blanket demolition control rule goes beyond what is necessary and puts owners at risk of not being able to develop properties that do not have heritage value. Aside from heritage buildings and soldier's cottages the character of the area has been irreversibly lost due to previous Councils inaction in allowing a mismatch of high density development. 	80.01 Deletion of the demolition control rule.
83	Jane Landman - Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House	Demolition Control	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	83.01 Supports demolition control rule.
85	Jackie Broughan	Demolition control rule	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good for houses fronting the road but not so good for those at the back or down a driveway. 	85.05 Extend demolition control rule across remaining area, even if downgraded for rest of area to a pre 1940 or similar rule. [i.e. rear sections]
88	Clare Mataira and Peter Dornauf	Demolition control rule	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good for houses fronting the road but not so good for those at the back or down a driveway. 	88.05 Extend demolition control rule across remaining area, even if downgraded for rest of area to a pre 1940 or similar rule. [i.e. rear sections]
91	Neil Brimblecombe	Demolition and removal of pre-1960 dwellings	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	91.05 Leave the rules for demolition and removal of pre-1960 dwellings as they are. [i.e. delete rule]
98	Nicholas Edgar and Madeleine Alderton	Demolition Control Rule	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about removal of heritage houses. Concerned at removal of character houses and subsequent erection of multi-unit apartments that are out of character and have little regard to amenity. 	98.01 Supports demolition control rule
Rule 4.1B.1 Activities d) Discretionary Activities: High Density Area — Demolition and removal of Soldiers Cottages					
10	Dianne Yates	Soldiers Cottages (55, 57, 59, 61 and 63 Cook Street).	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property owner of one of the soldier's cottages. 	10.01 Retain rule requiring a consent process for demolition of soldier's cottages.
13	Lisa Rapana	Soldiers Cottages	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the protection of the Soldiers Cottages 	13.04 Supports the protection of the soldier's cottages.
Rule 4.1B.1 Activities e) Non-Complying Activities					
77	John Manning	Rule 4.1B.1 e) Non-Complying Activities: Comprehensive Residential	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent with potential density provisions table. 	77.07 Oppose Rule 4.1B.1 e) Non-Complying Activities: Comprehensive Residential Developments.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
		Developments			
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Density / 6.3.1 Subdivision standards for individual zones					
01	Clint Prior	Minimum site area for detached dwellings 4.1B.2 (b)	Support		01.02 Fully supports the proposed provisions especially the increased minimum site area for subdivision.
16	Craig Woodhouse c/- Blue Wallace Surveyors	6.3.1 a) Minimum site area for street front sections Inconsistency between the approach taken in rules 4.1B.2, 6.3.5a and 6.3.1a)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rule 6.3.1a) Compromises development in general residential area within Hamilton East Residential Zone. ▪ Original surveys in area created 1000m² land parcels. Need 1100m² site to subdivide within Rule 6.3.1a). ▪ Inconsistency between minimum site area required by subdivision consent and second and subsequent dwellings on the same site by land use consent. This inconsistency could result in individual street front lots being developed with an area less than 600m² [see plans attached to submission] 	<p>16.01 Review the proposed rule 6.3.1 a) minimum site area for street front sections in Hamilton East Residential Area.</p> <p>16.02 Consider amending the policies to not be area specific.</p> <p>16.03 Introduce the criteria in 16.04 — 16.06 to achieve the intent of Rule 6.3.1a without specifying a minimum area required.</p> <p>16.04 The street front amenity is not being compromised (i.e. all development is to take place at rear of the site).</p> <p>16.05 Any relocation of existing (pre-1960) buildings is to the street front of the site.</p> <p>16.06 That development provides for a suitable living area (6m diameter minimum) at the rear of the existing house.</p>
22	D. MacDonald	Lot sizes	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports increase in minimum lot size 	22.05 Retain rule relating to lot sizes.
23	Claire-Lucia Maria Ingram	Minimum site area for detached dwelling		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify section size for rear sections 	<p>23.02 Allow for rear sites with unattached dwellings to be 400m²</p> <p>23.03 Alternatively to 23.02 make an exception for 23 Argyle Street to allow for a 400m² rear subdivision.</p>
45	Hamilton City Council	Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards a) Density	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarification of the density standards for General Residential Area — Street Front Sections. 	<p>45.01 That under '600m²' per unit the following is added: 600m² in total for both dwelling and ancillary flat. For second and subsequent dwellings on a site 600m² for the front unit and 400m² for the rear unit.</p>
47	Ian James Fraser and Keri Pavreal-Fraser	Site Area	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<p>47.03 Increase proposed general residential area minimum site size from 600m² to 700m². [Front Sections]</p> <p>47.04 Increase proposed high density area minimum site size from 350m² to 500m².</p>
52	Kewwa Low	Minimum Lot size 4.1B.2	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hamilton East close to areas of employment and education and premium area for infill. Current density of 400m² is and has been working more than adequately. 	52.08 Reinstate the subdivision status quo of 1 lot per 400m ² .
55	McCracken Surveyors	Minimum Lot size	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to standards introduced by variation 20, specifically minimum lot size, site coverage, setbacks, planting and screening, built form, and building orientation. 	55.02 Seek that current rules are retained for minimum lot size [i.e. delete minimum lot rules introduced by variation 20].
56	Barry David Lawford	Rule 4.1B standards	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed 9 standards introduced by variation 20. ▪ Current rules are adequate. ▪ Changes undemocratic, unfair, illegal. ▪ Prevent landowners making best use of their property and implementing designs/materials that improve health and well-being of occupants. 	56.04 That the proposed rule change for minimum site area for a detached dwelling be dropped [i.e. delete minimum site area introduced by variation 20].
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 (a) Minimum lot size — Street Front Sections	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are already many sections smaller than this. ▪ Character damaged by poor design not size. 	60.01 Change the minimum lot size for the general residential area Street Front Sections to be 500m ² net site area.
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Minimum site area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	63.12 Adopt a minimum site area for a detached dwelling in the general residential area

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
		for a detached dwelling			(front sections) of 800m ² . 63.13 Adopt a minimum site area for a detached dwelling in the High Density Area (front sections) of 580m ² .
64	M A Pollard	Minimum site area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too small to maintain the current open streetscape and built character of area. 	64.23 Adopt rule: Minimum site area for a detached dwelling in residential general to be 800m ² for street front sections. 64.24 Adopt rule: Minimum site area for a detached dwelling in residential general to be 800m ² for all other sections. 64.25 Adopt rule: Minimum site area for a detached dwelling in residential high zone to be 580m ² for all sections.
68	Waikato Property Investors Association	Increase in minimum lot size for street front sections	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takes away development choice. Likely outcome of unattractive development with rear site built to maximum allowed. 	68.06 The council reverses its intention to apply the new District Plan standards increasing minimum lot sizes for street front sections for Hamilton East, and the status quo remains in place.
77	John Manning	Rule 4.1B.2 a) Density	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 600m² for front sections requirement precludes majority of properties from further development without undertaking quasi comprehensive residential developments. Many properties are quarter acre sites. 	77.12 Oppose Rule 4.1B.2 a) Density requirement of 600m ² for front sections.
78	Mark McLennan	Increase in minimum lot size in general residential area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unnecessary development constraint. Result in little dwellings covering rear site to full extent. 	78.09 Opposes the increase in minimum lot size in general residential area.
82	Stephen Tunnicliffe	Site area for a detached dwelling	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much too generous. 	82.04 The area for a detached dwelling remain at 400m ² . [i.e. delete rule]
84	Rosemary Allbrook	Section 4.1B.2 (a) Density	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases density for high density housing. 	84.05 Should remain as it is at present, ideally have minimum area increased.
92	Brent Hoyle	Minimum Site Area for Street Front Sections in General Residential Area	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	92.16 Supports the regulation requiring a minimum of 600m ² site per detached dwelling.
92	Brent Hoyle	Minimum Site Area High Density Area	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	92.17 Amend variation to read minimum site area for detached dwelling for the High Density Area be 400m ² .
101	Marty and Katarina Dale	400m ² minimum site area for a detached dwelling on a rear lot and that the driveway cannot be included as part of figure if to side of the front lot.	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some Provisions impractical and untenable. Few properties would comply with figures. Have designed a subdivision for our property, complying with all the standards does not provide the best design outcome [see diagrams attached to submission] 	101.01 Minimum site area figures to be withdrawn or revised to more realistic numbers or alternately allow access ways to side of Front Lots to be included in the overall site area.
102	Graeme Steed	Minimum lot size/ existing use rights	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 600m² restriction on subdivision will virtually eliminate all future subdivision in zone. Diminish value of larger properties in area. Reduce capital investment in rejuvenating zone. Places pressure on extending boundaries of high 	102.03 Existing subdivision rule should not be tampered with.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				density development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Places pressure on resources by forcing housing to perimeter of the city. Inconsistent with imperative to incentivise inner city development. ▪ Limiting property rights and creating a large numbers of properties with existing use rights only. ▪ Future development would have to be by resource consent, and subject to neighbours consent. ▪ Property at 81 Dey Street impacted by change of property value and loss of property rights. 	
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Site Coverage					
22	D. MacDonald	Site Coverage	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports site coverage limitations 	22.03 Retain rule relating to site coverage.
55	McCracken Surveyors	Site Coverage	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to standards introduced by variation 20, specifically minimum lot size, site coverage, setbacks, planting and screening, built form, and building orientation. 	55.03 Seek that current rules are retained for site coverage [i.e. delete site coverage rules introduced by variation 20].
56	Barry David Lawford	Rule 4.1B standards — Site Coverage	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to 9 standards introduced by variation 20. ▪ Current rules are adequate. ▪ Changes undemocratic, unfair, illegal. ▪ Prevent landowners making best use of their property and implementing designs/materials that improve health and well-being of occupants. 	56.02 That the proposed rule change for site coverage be dropped [i.e. delete site coverage rules introduced by variation 20].
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 (b) Site coverage for front sections	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modern houses larger and have internal garages. ▪ Restrictions would mean people don't improve property but convert to rentals generally reducing overall quality of area. 	60.02 Maximum site coverage to be 40% of net site area for front sections.
62	Grant and Amanda Reid	Site Coverage	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brought property to develop. Reduction will prevent fitting in new unit. Need 50% site coverage given narrow nature of section. 	62.01 Support Hamilton East initiative but seek an exemption on site coverage for this development.
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Site coverage	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	63.05 Adopt a maximum site coverage for general residential area street front sections of 25%. 63.06 Adopt a maximum site coverage for general residential area rear sections of 25%. 63.07 Adopt a maximum site coverage for the High Density Area of 30%.
64	M A Pollard	Site coverage	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To maintain open character of Hamilton East smaller maximum site coverage is needed. 	64.14 Adopt rule: In the residential general zone site cover to be not more than 25% for street front sections. 64.15 Adopt rule: In the residential general zone site cover to be not more than 33% for rear sections. 64.16 Adopt rule: In residential high zone site cover not to be more than 35% for both street front and rear sections.
68	Waikato Property Investors Association	Reduction in site coverage in High Density Zone	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	68.02 The Council reverses its intention to apply the new District Plan standards reducing site coverage in the High Density Area for Hamilton East, and the status quo remains in place.
78	Mark McLennan	Reduction in site coverage in HDA	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unnecessary constraint on development — should promote more intensive land use in inner city suburbs. 	78.04 Opposes the reduction in site coverage in the High Density Area.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
79	Andrew Yeoman	Reduced site coverage	Oppose	▪	79.02 Opposes reduction in site coverage.
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Permeable surface					
31	Joseph Fagan	Permeable Surfaces	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support rule changes. ▪ In particular support requirement for permeable surfaces and planting and screening. ▪ Loss of trees and green areas affects wider community not just property under development. 	31.01 Council to retain the new rules for permeable surfaces.
42	Andrew Pope	Permeable surfaces,	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Totally against the proposed variation. 	42.01 Delete rules in the variation in respect of permeable surfaces.
55	McCracken Surveyors	Permeable surfaces	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to standards introduced by variation 20, specifically minimum lot size, site coverage, setbacks, planting and screening, built form, and building orientation. 	55.06 Seek that current rules are retained for permeable surfaces [delete permeable surface rules introduced by variation 20].
56	Barry Lawford	Rule 4.1B standards	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed 9 standards introduced by variation 20. ▪ Current rules are adequate. ▪ Changes undemocratic, unfair, illegal. ▪ Prevent landowners making best use of their property and implementing designs/materials that improve health and well-being of occupants. 	56.05 That the proposed rule change for permeable surfaces be dropped [delete permeable surface rule introduced by variation 20].
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 (c) Permeable surfaces	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People should be allowed to concrete if they choose i.e. If insufficient parking. ▪ Account for modern times and way houses are used. 	60.03 Delete 4.1B.2 (c) as there is no need for rules like this.
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Permeable surfaces	Oppose	▪	<p>63.14 Adopt a minimum permeable surface of 70% of the site in the general residential area.</p> <p>63.15 Adopt a minimum permeable surface of 70% of the site in the High Density Area.</p>
64	M A Pollard	Permeable surfaces	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large areas of permeable surfaces required to maintain openness and greenness of landscape in Hamilton East. ▪ Owners and tenants will dislike, need parking for cars. ▪ Result in permeable surfaces that can also be driven on. 	<p>64.26 Adopt a district plan rule that calls for a minimum of 70% permeable surfaces cover in the front yard for the residential general area.</p> <p>64.27 Adopt a minimum of 50% of total site area to be of a permeable surface in the general residential area.</p> <p>64.28 Adopt a district plan rule that calls for a minimum of 70% permeable surfaces cover in the front yard for the residential high zone.</p> <p>64.29 Adopt a minimum of 50% of total site area to be of a permeable surface in the residential high zone.</p> <p>64.30 Consider constructing a complimentary rule that avoids the use of permeable concrete but allows for the construction of permeable surfaces that can be both planted and driven on in all weathers.</p>
68	Waikato Property Investors Association	Permeable surfaces	Oppose	▪	68.04 The council reverses its intention to apply the new District Plan standards requiring permeable surfaces for Hamilton East, and the status quo remains in place.
77	John Manning	Rule 4.1B.2 c) Permeable surface	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inconsistent with site coverage standards and access drive requirements. 	77.08 Oppose Rule 4.1B.2 c) Permeable surface.
78	Mark McLennan	Permeable surfaces requirement in HDA	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will be used for parking anyway so why not allow hard standing for vehicles. 	78.05 Opposes the requirement for permeable surfaces in the High Density Area.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
92	Brent Hoyle	Permeable surfaces — general residential area	Support	▪	92.13 Supports the change to require minimum of 40% permeable area of a site.
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Building height					
10	Dianne Yates	Building Heights — High Density Area	Support	▪ To allow gardens to grow around the soldiers cottages.	10.02 Supports the reduction of building heights to 10m [in the High Density Area adjacent to the Soldiers Cottages].
22	D. MacDonald	Building Heights	Support	▪ Supports the reduction in building heights	22.01 Retain rule relating to building heights.
23	Claire-Lucia Ingram	Building Height	Support in part	▪ Keep the two story restriction but remove the height limit to enable diversity in design (i.e. different roof types).	23.01 Keep a 2 storey restriction on building height but allow for a diversity in design.
56	Barry Lawford	Rule 4.1B standards — Building height	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed 9 standards introduced by variation 20. ▪ Current rules are adequate. ▪ Changes undemocratic, unfair, illegal. ▪ Prevent landowners making best use of their property and implementing designs/materials that improve health and well-being of occupants. 	56.01 That the proposed rule change for maximum building height be dropped [delete maximum rule height introduced by variation 20].
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 (d) Building height	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two storey houses will have a flat roof and not be art deco. ▪ This will not be in keeping [with the character of the area] 	60.04 Allow height of buildings on Street Front Sections to be 8m.
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Maximum building height	Oppose	▪	<p>63.01 Adopt a maximum building height for general residential area street front sections of 5m.</p> <p>63.02 Adopt a maximum building height for general residential area rear sections of 5m.</p> <p>63.03 Adopt a maximum building height for High Density Area street front sections of 5.0m.</p> <p>63.04 Adopt a maximum building height for High Density Area rear sections of 7.0m.</p>
64	M A Pollard	Maximum building height	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allows for buildings that are too large to be sympathetic to existing built landscape, and will block views and cast shadows. ▪ 10.0m height will encourage flat roof buildings which are more likely to have weather tightness issues. ▪ Current height rules encourage construction of buildings with conventional looking hipped and gabled roofs. ▪ Absolute height of buildings not the real problem — problem that buildings are large or tall relative to open space and buildings around them. 	<p>64.01 Tall buildings only be allowed where long thin sections are combined into large sections and where sections are large enough to have a generous distance between any new building and existing neighbours.</p> <p>64.02 Tall buildings should be a controlled activity.</p> <p>64.03 Adopt rule: The maximum building height for buildings in the residential general zone on street front sections to be a maximum of 5.0m.</p> <p>64.04 Adopt rule: The maximum building height for buildings in the residential general zone not on street front sections to be 6.0m.</p> <p>64.05 Adopt rule: The maximum building height for buildings in the residential high zone on street front sections to be 6.0m.</p> <p>64.06 Adopt rule: The maximum building height for buildings in the residential high zone not on street front sections and less than 50.0m from the road to be 7.0m.</p> <p>64.07 Adopt rule: The maximum building height for buildings in the residential high zone not on street front sections and more than 50.0m from the road boundary to be 12.0m.</p>
77	John Manning	Rule 4.1B.2 d) Building heights	Oppose	▪ Discourages pitched roofs and encourages flat roof structures inconsistent with many dwellings in the area.	<p>77.09 Delete provisions relating to maximum height of buildings and retain existing District Plan restriction.</p> <p>77.10 Replace with design guides.</p>
78	Mark McLennan	Reduction in	Support	▪	78.02 Supports reduction of maximum building height in the High Density Area.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
		maximum building height in HDA and general residential area.			78.03 Supports reduction of maximum building height in the general residential area.
91	Neil Brimblecombe	Building Heights	Oppose	▪	91.03 Leave the rules for building heights as they are. [i.e. delete rule]
92	Brent Hoyle	Building Height; definition of maximum building height	Support in part	▪ Could building height be better defined by daylight angles than sheer building height?	92.18 Maximum building height to be defined by daylight angles relevant to property boundaries and neighbouring dwellings rather than a blanket overall building height.
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Height in relation to boundary					
58	Colin Davis and Associates Limited	4.1B.2 General Standards e) height in relation to boundary	Oppose	▪ 2.0m is too low when combined with angles. ▪ Lose over 1.0m from current rules — house needs to move over 1.8m from present 28° at 3.0m to proposed 28° at 2.0m [see diagram included in submission].	58.02 Keep the elevation height at 3.0m as it is in all other areas — be consistent city wide.
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 (e) Height to boundary	Oppose	▪ No reason to be different to where a boundary adjoins a road access.	60.05 Where boundary adjoins a road access change to 3m.
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Height in relation to boundary		▪	63.24 Adopt rule for residential general area that building envelope is defined by recession planes that commence 2.0m vertically above the ground pointing inwards at an angle of 15° at all boundaries. 63.25 Adopt rule for the High Density Area that building envelope is defined by recession planes that commence 2.0m vertically above the ground pointing inwards at an angle of 15° at all boundaries.
64	M A Pollard	Height to boundary	Oppose	▪ Steep recession planes combined with small setbacks and tall buildings are the root of the problem. ▪ Suggest that Council amend District Plan rules so that a set of building envelope recession planes control the building heights of street front buildings in such a way that any new building maintains the scale of the built landscape relative to that of the streetscape. ▪ More complex set of rules will show in roof lines of buildings, especially in high density area.	64.08 Adopt rule: On all street front properties in the residential general zone the building envelope will have recession planes commencing 3.0m vertically above the ground pointing inwards at an angle of 15° from each boundary. 64.09 Adopt rule: On all other sites in the residential general zone the building envelope will have recession planes commencing 3.0m vertically above ground pointing inwards at an angle of 15° the northern boundary, 30° for the eastern and western boundaries, and 15° for the southern boundary. 64.10 Adopt rule: On all street front properties in the residential high zone the building envelope will have recession planes commencing 3.0m vertically above the ground pointing inwards at an angle of 15° from each boundary. 64.11 Adopt rule: On all other sites in the residential high zone, less than 50.0m from a road boundary the building envelope will have recession planes commencing 3.0m vertically above the ground pointing inwards at an angle of 15° the northern boundary, 15° the eastern and western boundaries and 15° for the southern boundary. 64.12 Adopt rule: On all sites in the residential high zone more than 50.0m from a road boundary the building envelope will have recession planes commencing 3.0m vertically above ground pointing inwards at an angle of 30° the northern boundary, 30° the eastern and western boundaries, and 15° the southern boundary. 64.13 Alternatively to 64.08 — 64.12 adopt new rule: For both residential general and residential high zones the building envelope for all street front properties will be formed by recession planes that commence 3.0m vertically above ground pointing inwards at an

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
					angle of 15°.
66	Andrew Lowe	Rule 4.1B.2 General standards e) Height in relation to boundary	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2.0m is too low and will result in difficulty in getting a house on a site. ▪ Need to build house too close to boundary and have no lawn for kids to play on. ▪ Rule effect for overshadowing not location of dwelling. ▪ Coverage should dictate house position and character. 	66.01 Keep the elevation height at 3.0m as in other residential areas.
67	Katy Roach	Rule 4.1B.2 General standards e) Height in relation to boundary	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose as related to section 16A Grey Street as rule will not allow a family home to be built on site. ▪ Maintain as area to live not business area. 	67.01 Keep the elevation height at 3.0m as in other residential areas to maintain ability to build weatherboard home on section at 16A Grey Street as planned.
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards — Setbacks (general)					
22	D. MacDoanld	Set-back	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports increased set-back 	22.04 Retain rule relating to set-backs.
79	Andrew Yeoman	Increased setbacks	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	79.03 Opposes increase in setbacks.
82	Stephen Tunncliffe	Boundary setbacks	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The rule will make it more difficult to modify or extend existing houses. 	82.02 The boundary setbacks should remain as present. [i.e. delete rule]
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Setback from road boundary					
01	Clint Prior	Accessory Buildings (4.1B.2(f)(ii))	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accessory buildings should be located behind the dwelling because the side of a garage [accessory building] is taller and uglier than a fence. 	01.03 Ensure that locating accessory buildings behind the dwelling is enforced
36	New Zealand Transport Agency	Road Setbacks	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NZTA supports maintaining a 5 metre minimum setback for residential properties from the State Highway 1 boundary. 	36.02 Maintain a 5 metre minimum setback for residential properties from the State Highway 1 boundary.
55	McCracken Surveyors	Road setback	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to standards introduced by variation 20, specifically minimum lot size, site coverage, setbacks, planting and screening, built form, and building orientation. 	<p>55.04 Seek that current rules are retained for road setbacks [delete road setback rules introduced by variation 20].</p> <p>55.05 Seek that current rules are retained for other setbacks [delete rules introduced by variation 20 that regulate other set backs].</p>
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 (f) Setbacks from road boundaries.	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety issue to force carports and garages to the rear. ▪ If the front of the house excluding decking is within the building line restriction on the title it should be fine. 	<p>60.06 Change setback from roads to 3m from boundary for General Residential Area.</p> <p>60.07 Change setback from roads for garages to 3m from street boundary on arterial roads.</p>
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Setback from Road Boundary		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<p>63.08 Adopt a minimum road setback for general residential area (front sections) of 8.0m.</p> <p>63.09 Adopt a minimum road setback for the High Density Area (front sections) of 8.0m.</p>
64	M A Pollard	Setback from road boundary	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed setbacks are too small to keep the openness and greenness that is so attractive in Hamilton East. ▪ Concern that recent developments set on or near street boundary, and near existing buildings. ▪ Too small to be of practical use and to allow sunlight on winter days. ▪ Better to use ratios than absolute distances. 	<p>64.17 Adopt rule: For street front sites in the residential general zone no ancillary building to be built within 12.0m of the road front boundary.</p> <p>64.18 Adopt rule: No building to be built within 9.0m of the front boundary in the residential general zone.</p> <p>64.19 Adopt rule: For street front sites in the residential high zone no ancillary building to be built within 12.0m of the road front boundary.</p> <p>64.20 Adopt rule: No building to be built within 6.0m of the front boundary in the residential high zone.</p>
68	Waikato Property	Increase in setback	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unnecessary constraint. 	68.03 The council reverses its intention to apply the new District Plan standards

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
	Investors Association	from road boundary		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many properties not wide enough to get car beside dwelling. Being unable to provide garaging in front yard severely limits development options for property owners. 	increasing setbacks from the road boundary for Hamilton East, and the status quo remains in place.
77	John Manning	Rule 4.1B.2 f) Setback from Road Boundary	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No rationale for setbacks. Not consistent with other parts of the District Plan. No recognition of reduced amenity levels from arterial and proposed arterial roads. 	77.11 Oppose Rule 4.1B.2 f) Setback from Road Boundary.
78	Mark McLennan	Increase in setback from road boundary general residential area.	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No valid reason. Reduced living area to rear of dwelling. People like to live in privacy to the rear of dwelling. 	78.10 Opposes the increase in the setback from the road boundary in the general residential area.
92	Brent Hoyle	Setback to road boundary	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<p>92.10 Make provision for variations to the setback from the road boundary in the general residential area, within parameters like neighbours consent/being in keeping with character of the house, to within 2.0m of the road boundary providing there is still vegetation between the house and road boundary.</p> <p>92.11 Require setback from the road boundary for the High Density Area to be 5.0m or allow for variations within parameters like neighbours consent/being in keeping with character of the house/vegetation between house and road boundary. Neighbours consent would need to be defined as owner-occupied — not rented out.</p>
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Other setbacks					
45	Hamilton City Council	Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards — g) other setbacks	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The notified variation allows for ancillary flats and accessory buildings to locate within side boundary setbacks with the written approval of neighbouring property owners. Intention of rule is to provide for ancillary flats and accessory buildings to locate within setbacks behind a dwelling only. 	45.02 Under 'c) setbacks may be reduced where': amend bullet point 2 to read '... the length of the boundary which is behind the rear building line front yard setback defined by rule 4.1B.2 f ii) and iii); or'
55	McCracken Surveyors	Boundary Setbacks	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to standards introduced by variation 20, specifically minimum lot size, site coverage, setbacks, planting and screening, built form, and building orientation. 	55.05 Seek that current rules are retained for other setbacks [delete rules introduced by variation 20 that regulate other set backs].
56	Barry Lawford	Rule 4.1B standards	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed 9 standards introduced by variation 20. Current rules are adequate. Changes undemocratic, unfair, illegal. Prevent landowners making best use of their property and implementing designs/materials that improve health and well-being of occupants. 	56.03 That the proposed rule change for setback from other boundaries be dropped [delete setback rules introduced by variation 20].
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Setback from other boundaries		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<p>63.10 Adopt minimum other setbacks of 3.0m for one side boundary, 6.0m for the other side boundary and 10.0m for the rear boundary in the general residential area (front sections).</p> <p>63.11 Adopt minimum setbacks of 4.0m for all side boundaries and 7.0m for rear boundaries in the High Density Area (front sections).</p>
64	M A Pollard	Setback from other	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open built landscape needs plenty of space between 	64.21 Adopt rule: For street front sections in the residential general zone 3.0m on one

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
		boundaries		buildings.	side boundary and 6.0m on the other side boundary and 9.0m for the rear boundary. 64.22 Adopt rule: Residential high zone 3.0m on each side boundary, and a 6.0m setback for the rear boundary.
77	John Manning	Rule 4.1B.2 g) Other setbacks	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement for 3m side yards. 	77.13 Support in part requirement for 3m front yards.
78	Mark McLennan	Increase in setback for 1 side boundary in general residential area	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Normally have a driveway to the side of a property so rule just for the sake of it. 	78.11 Opposes 3m setback from one side boundary rule as being a rule just for the sake of it.
84	Rosemary Allbrook	Section 4.1B.2 (g) Other setbacks		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too close. Not enough room to plant trees or shrubs for screening. Does not provide access for maintenance of the property or emergency services. 	84.06 Figure should be increased to at least 2m.
92	Brent Hoyle	Minimum setback from other boundaries in High Density Area	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	92.12 Require amendment to High Density minimum setback from other boundaries to read: 3.0m from one side and 1.5m for other boundaries.
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Separation distances and privacy					
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 (h) Separation distances and privacy	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing rules are fine the way they are. 	60.08 Minimum of 3m from boundary lines for balconies and windows.
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Planting and Screening					
13	Lisa Rapana	Planting and screening	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	13.05 Supports the retention of rules relating to planting and screening.
31	Joseph Fagan	Planting and screening	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support rule changes. In particular support requirement for permeable surfaces and planting and screening. Loss of trees and green areas affects wider community not just property under development. 	31.02 Council to retain the new rules for planting and screening.
42	Andrew Pope	Planting and screening	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Front of property is required for parking. 	42.02 Delete rules proposed in the variation in respect of planting and screening.
55	McCracken Surveyors	Planting and Screening	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to standards introduced by variation 20, specifically minimum lot size, site coverage, setbacks, planting and screening, built form, and building orientation. 	55.07 Seek that current rules are retained for planting and screening [i.e. delete planting and screening rules introduced by variation 20].
56	Barry Lawford	Rule 4.1B standards	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed 9 standards introduced by variation 20. Current rules are adequate. Changes undemocratic, unfair, illegal. Prevent landowners making best use of their property and implementing designs/materials that improve health and well-being of occupants. 	56.06 That the proposed rule change for planting and screening be dropped [i.e. delete planting and screening rules introduced by variation 20].
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 (i) Planting and screening	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peoples homes are their personal spaces and should be able to create own living environment. 	60.11 Delete 4.1B.2 (i).
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Planting and		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	63.16 Adopt provision that 70% of the front yard setback is required to be vegetated for

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
		screening			general residential area (front sections). 63.17 Adopt provision that 70% of the front yard setback is required to be vegetated for the High Density Area (front sections).
64	M A Pollard	Planting and screening	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Idea in variation 20 is right, but practical problems with it. ▪ Not obvious what size of vegetation is required. ▪ Temptation to make pebble gardens. ▪ Tall, dense planting a safety issue. 	64.31 Adopt rule: No hedge, screening or planting along a front boundary is to be higher than 600mm. 64.32 Adopt rule: No hedge, screening or planting within 5.0m of the front boundary to be higher than 600mm on street front sections unless the planting is of a kind that can be easily seen through or around up to a height of 1.5m and provided the vegetation does not unduly block the view of the footpath from the driveway entrance.
68	Waikato Property Investors Association	Planting and screening	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flawed philosophy. ▪ Maintenance burden on property owners. ▪ Security issue, against police guidelines. 	68.05 The council reverses its intention to apply the new District Plan standards requiring planting and screening for Hamilton East, and the status quo remains in place.
77	John Manning	Rule 4.1B.2 i) Planting and Screening	Oppose in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May impact on residential amenity through restricting solar access 	77.06 Review Rule 4.1B.2 i) Planting and Screening.
78	Mark McLennan	Planting and screening requirement in HDA	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wide tree filled berms in the area so planting provisions unnecessary. ▪ Security and maintenance issue. 	78.06 Opposes the requirement for planting and screening in the High Density Area.
92	Brent Hoyle	Planting and Screening — general residential area	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	92.14 Supports the change to require 50% of front setback to be vegetated.
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Built form					
42	Andrew Pope	Built form	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	42.05 Delete the rules proposed in the variation in respect of built form.
55	McCracken Surveyors	Built form	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to standards introduced by variation 20, specifically minimum lot size, site coverage, setbacks, planting and screening, built form, and building orientation. 	55.09 Seek that current rules are retained for built form [delete built form rules introduced by variation 20].
56	Barry Lawford	Rule 4.1B standards — built form	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed 9 standards introduced by variation 20. ▪ Current rules are adequate. ▪ Changes undemocratic, unfair, illegal. ▪ Prevent landowners making best use of their property and implementing designs/materials that improve health and well-being of occupants. 	56.09 That the proposed rule change for built form be dropped [delete built form rule introduced by variation 20].
58	Colin J Davis and Associates Limited	4.1B.2 General Standards j) Built form	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too prescriptive in determining shape and floor plan of house. ▪ Difficult to achieve on south boundaries of small sites. 	58.01 Break in wall can be achieved with a smaller break or change in materials/claddings. i.e. No wall shall exceed 15m in length without a break in materials and/or a step in plan of at least 500mm.
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 (j) Built form	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A wall that is 17m long can't have a 5m step in. 	60.09 Abolish 4.1B.2 (j) 60.10 Alternatively apply 4.1B.2 (j) to Residential High Density Area only.
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Built form		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	63.22 Adopt a built form rule that walls shall not exceed 15.0m without a step in or step out plan of at least 4.0m by 6.0m in the general residential area. 63.23 Adopt a built form rule that walls shall not exceed 15.0m without a step in or step out plan of at least 4.0m by 6.0m in the High Density Area.
64	M A Pollard	Built form	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does little to avoid bad features of recent new 	64.38 Adopt the current built form rules i.e. have no rule.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				development. ▪ Encourages flat walls along the street, and near existing properties.	
66	Andrew Lowe	Rule 4.1B.2 General standards j) Built form	Oppose	▪ 2.0m x 5.0m is too prescriptive and there are other ways to achieve the design break. ▪ 2.0m too hard to achieve on small sites, particularly on south boundaries.	66.02 No wall should exceed 15.0m in length without a break of 600mm.
67	Katy Roach	Rule 4.1B.2 General standards j) Built form	Oppose	▪ 2.0m x 5.0m is too prescriptive and there are other ways to achieve the design break. ▪ 2.0m too hard to achieve on small sites, particularly on south boundaries.	67.02 No wall should exceed 15.0m in length without a break of 600mm.
78	Mark McLennan	Built form in HDA	Support	▪	78.08 Supports the built form rule in the High Density Area.
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Fence height					
01	Clint Prior	Fence heights 4.1B.2 (k)	Support		01.01 Fully supports the proposed provisions especially the new lower fence heights.
05	Robert George	Fence height(4.1B.2 (k))	Oppose		05.02 Questions whether a maximum fence height of 1.2m provides sufficient privacy, security and limits road noise.
09	Sharon Hatherill	Fence Heights (4,1B.2(k))	Oppose	▪ Opposes the 1.2m fence restriction because would like right to maintain privacy in backyard	09.01 Requests the fence heights remain at 1.8m. 09.02 Request that any fence height restrictions apply only to the street front boundary, and not to the side and rear boundaries.
11	Michael Collins	Fence Heights (4.1B.2(k))	Oppose	▪ Has safety concerns with lower fences.	11.01 Requests that the permissible fence height be increased to a secure level.
13	Lisa Rapana	Fence Heights	Support	▪	13.06 Supports the retention of rules relating to fence heights.
21	C. Farrell	Fence Heights (4.1B.2k) - High Density Area	Oppose	▪ The 1.2m fence height does not provided the degree of privacy and security required.	21.01 Restrict fence height to a max height of 1.8m or return to existing rules.
22	D. MacDonald	Fence Heights	Support	▪ Supports the reduction in fence heights	22.02 Retain rule relating to fence heights.
32	Duncan and Linda Ryder	Fence height	Oppose	▪ Proposed fence height restriction not practical, an invasion of privacy and security. Have large boundary.	32.01 Review fence heights to 1.8m for front boundary. 32.02 Regulate the type and quality of materials used to build fencing or walls i.e. mandate on materials and colours.
36	New Zealand Transport Agency	Fence Heights	Support	▪ Portion of State Highway 1 included in proposed Hamilton East Residential Zone accommodates approximately 27,000 vehicles per day. This high traffic volume can generate significant road noise effects and adversely impact upon visual amenity. Fences can serve as a visual screening and an acoustic barrier. ▪ Unclear if 1.2m fence height applies to Cobham Drive. ▪ Height restriction many compromise peoples ability to mitigate reverse sensitivity effects along state highway frontages. ▪ Constructing a fence is not the only means to mitigating adverse noise and amenity effects, as such if fence height restriction is essential to preserving the	36.03 Support fence height provision if essential to preserving character of the area.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				character of Hamilton East than NZTA will not be opposed to the provision.	
39	John Ewen Irvine	Fence Heights	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Object to maximum height of 1.2m for fences. ▪ Dey Street is to be used as a major route. ▪ A high fence for privacy, noise control, and visual traffic pollution is essential. 	<p>39.03 Seek that no maximum fence height be put in place for Dey Street.</p> <p>39.04 Seek that if there is a maximum fence height that Council builds new Dey street route such that there is privacy, no visual pollution, and no additional noise</p>
42	Andrew Pope	Fence heights	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed fence heights allow free access from neighbouring flats and dogs will have to go. 	42.03 Delete rules proposed in the variation in respect of fence heights.
53	Scott Nelson	Fence Heights	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infill housing only has front as outside primary living area, which with a 1.2m fence will not have privacy. ▪ Unnecessary and damages property values. 	53.01 Reinstate existing rule for general residential areas with respect to fence heights.
56	Barry Lawford	Rule 4.1B standards — fence heights	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed 9 standards introduced by variation 20. ▪ Current rules are adequate. ▪ Changes undemocratic, unfair, illegal. ▪ Prevent landowners making best use of their property and implementing designs/materials that improve health and well-being of occupants. 	56.07 That the proposed rule change for fence heights be dropped [delete fence height rule introduced by variation 20].
62	Grant and Amanda Reid	Fence Height	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need 1.8m fencing to provide security and privacy to development. 	62.02 Support Hamilton East initiative but seek an exemption for fence heights for this development.
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Fence Heights		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<p>63.18 Adopt a maximum fence height of 0.6m for the general residential area (front sections).</p> <p>63.19 Adopt a maximum fence height of 0.6m for the High Density Area (front sections).</p> <p>63.26 Adopt rule that all fences within 6.0m of the road boundary are of an open construction.</p> <p>63.27 Adopt rule that no fence is taller than 900mm.</p>
64	M A Pollard	Fence heights	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good traffic engineering to keep sight lines at an intersection as open as possible. ▪ Motorist eye level in most instances less than 1.2m. ▪ Blind driveway exits a danger to pedestrians and cyclists using footpath. 	<p>64.33 Adopt rule: No fence, hedge, screening or planting on street front sections along a front boundary to be higher than 600mm.</p> <p>64.34 Adopt rule: No fence, hedge, screening or planting on street front sections within 5.0m perpendicular of the front boundary to be higher than 600mm.</p> <p>64.35 Adopt the following exceptions to 62.33 and 62.34:</p> <p>a) A standard seven wire with strainers no higher than 1.2m is allowed along the front boundary and any side boundary within a distance 5.0m perpendicular to the street front boundary.</p> <p>b) No hedge, screening or planting within 5.0m of the front boundary to be higher than 600mm on a street front section unless that planting is of a kind that can be easily seen through or around up to a height of 1.8m and the vegetation does not unduly block the view of the footpath from the driveway entrance.</p>
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 k)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People should be allowed privacy and security 	60.11 Delete 4.1b.2 (k)
77	John Manning	Rule 4.1B.2 k) Fence Height	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced privacy, loss of amenity, conflicts with planting and screening provision. 	77.14 Remove restrictions on front yard fencing and/or combine with the landscape/screening provisions.
92	Joshua Brent Hoyle	Fence Height General Residential Area	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduction in fence heights should apply only to front fences, not side and back boundary fences. 	<p>92.02 A maximum of 1.2m height for fence along front boundary.</p> <p>92.03 Allow all other fences to be a maximum of 2.1m or current regulations.</p> <p>92.04 Allow owners to replace existing fences and retain the same height, providing they do not detract from the character/style around.</p>

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
95	Ashley Brown	Fence height	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Security risk, easier access for intruders. ▪ Rubbish and bottles thrown over fence. ▪ Show HCC's commitment to the privacy and safety of ratepayers. 	95.01 Allow corner property owners with sections exposed to the road on two sides to build higher fences.
100	Anne Jacobson	Fence Height	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inadequate to provide privacy and freedom from eyes of people who sit on their second storey balcony and look over the fence much of the day. 	100.02 Oppose fence height.
101	Marty and Katarina Dale	Fence Height	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Security issues for our family. ▪ House in 'fish bowl' situation with clear view from footpath into front yard and house. 	101.02 Fence heights up to 1.8m to be allowed where security is an issue and where street appeal is maintained.
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Orientation					
17	Chris and Ruth Eames	Building Orientation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not support the proposed requirement for the front door and principal room to be orientated to the road if it can be argued that an alternative orientation would be more beneficial for capturing sunlight. 	17.02 Opposes orientation rule that allows alternative orientation if it can be argued to be more beneficial for capturing sunlight.
42	Andrew Pope	Orientation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	42.04 Delete the rules proposed in the variation in respect of building orientation.
55	McCracken Surveyors	Building Orientation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to standards introduced by variation 20, specifically minimum lot size, site coverage, setbacks, planting and screening, built form, and building orientation. 	55.08 Seek that current rules are retained for building orientation [i.e. delete building orientation rules introduced by variation 20].
56	Barry Lawford	Rule 4.1B standards - orientation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed 9 standards introduced by variation 20. ▪ Current rules are adequate. ▪ Changes undemocratic, unfair, illegal. ▪ Prevent landowners making best use of their property and implementing designs/materials that improve health and well-being of occupants. 	56.08 That the proposed rule change for orientation be dropped [i.e. delete building orientation rule introduced by variation 20].
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Orientation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<p>63.20 Adopt the orientation rule that requires a front door and principal room to be orientated to the street in the general residential area (front sections).</p> <p>63.21 Adopt the orientation rule that requires a front door and principal room to be orientated to the street in the High Density Area (front sections).</p>
64	M A Pollard	Orientation	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree front door must face the street but reservations about placing principal room facing the street on all sites regardless of position of street and winter sun. ▪ May lead to bad designs. ▪ Principal rooms should face north. ▪ No spectacular views to the south as area is flat. ▪ If idea is stop windowless garage walls near the street then ban that. 	<p>64.36 Adopt a orientation rule into the District Plan that demands that a building have an entrance that faces the street, and if you must, also demand that a principle room faces a street.</p> <p>64.37 Give careful thought to an exception to 62.36 that allows people to argue that because the site faces south or southwest that it is not practical to comply with the rule and following the rule will produce a bad design.</p>
68	Waikato Property Investors Association	Street orientation requirements	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Against modern sustainable design, where buildings are orientated for sun and warmth. 	68.08 The council reverses its intention to apply the new District Plan street orientation standards for Hamilton East, and the status quo remains in place.
76	John Kellaway	Orientation Rule		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Having a front door and principal room orientated to the street may be usual with older houses but does not necessarily meet requirements of today. 	76.03 Better consider inclusion of orientation rule, including need for guidelines.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested															
78	Mark McLennan	Street orientation requirement in HDA and general residential area.	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks merit to not orientate buildings to the sun. 	78.07 Opposes the orientation rule in the High Density Area and general residential area.															
79	Andrew Yeoman	Orientation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	79.04 Opposes orientation rule.															
82	Stephen Tunnicliffe	Street Orientation	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not always possible to follow good design sun orientation and also have front door/rooms facing the street. 	82.03 The orientation rule should be deleted from the variation.															
84	Rosemary Allbrook	Section 4.1B.2 (l) Orientation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better design will be achieved on many sites if this not mandatory. 	84.07 Orientation rule should be a recommendation not a requirement.															
92	Brent Hoyle	Orientation Rule — general residential area	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	92.15 Supports the orientation regulation.															
99	John Perry	Orientation proposal	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section gives no credence to traffic, on-site parking and manoeuvring, noise, sunshine and prevailing wind. Principal room should consider activities overlook rear yard where children play. 	99.01 Deletion of the relevant section as being impractical.															
Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards - Service Areas/ Outdoor living Areas																				
45	Hamilton City Council	Rule 4.1B.2 General Standards — n) service areas	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarification distinguish what applies to the high density area. These standards do not directly apply to the general residential area as Comprehensive Residential Developments and Apartment Buildings are Discretionary activities on rear sections and Non-Complying activities on street front sections 	45.03 Amend the table as follows: <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Activity</th> <th>Minimum area (per unit)</th> <th>Minimum dimension</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Detached dwellings <i>and Comprehensive Residential Development</i></td> <td>20m²</td> <td>3m</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Apartment buildings and ancillary flats</i></td> <td>10m²</td> <td>2.5m</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Comprehensive Residential Development (in the High Density Area)</i></td> <td>20m²</td> <td>3m</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Apartment buildings (in the High Density Area)</i></td> <td>10m²</td> <td>2.5m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Activity	Minimum area (per unit)	Minimum dimension	Detached dwellings <i>and Comprehensive Residential Development</i>	20m ²	3m	<i>Apartment buildings and ancillary flats</i>	10m ²	2.5m	<i>Comprehensive Residential Development (in the High Density Area)</i>	20m ²	3m	<i>Apartment buildings (in the High Density Area)</i>	10m ²	2.5m
Activity	Minimum area (per unit)	Minimum dimension																		
Detached dwellings <i>and Comprehensive Residential Development</i>	20m ²	3m																		
<i>Apartment buildings and ancillary flats</i>	10m ²	2.5m																		
<i>Comprehensive Residential Development (in the High Density Area)</i>	20m ²	3m																		
<i>Apartment buildings (in the High Density Area)</i>	10m ²	2.5m																		
60	Orlando Robbins	4.1B.2 m)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most pre-1960s properties do not conform to 4.1B.2 m) i). Outdoor living area should be accessible but not necessarily from a living area, can be a kitchen. 	60.12 Delete point 2 of 4.1B.2 m) i).															
84	Rosemary Allbrook	Section 4.1B.2 m) Outdoor living area		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4m as largest measure for open space for 4 dwellings does not allow a usable area for 4 households. 	84.08 Should be a garden area with planting for air quality, and an area for outside seating or play for children that has added benefit of decreasing runoff into stormwater drains.															

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
Policy 7.1 Built Heritage					
03	Kevin Russell	Policy 7.1	Support	▪	03.02 Retain Policy 7.1.
33	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Objective and Policies 7.1.2 Hamilton East Villa Heritage Precinct	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District Plans need to provide for protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. ▪ Proposed objective and policies set a stable platform for the management of this inter-related group of heritage items. 	33.05 That Objective and Policies 7.1.2 Hamilton East Villa Heritage Precinct are adopted in the Proposed District Plan.
75	3 Broke Bros Ltd Hayden and Brad Porter	Objective 7.1.1	Oppose	▪	75.16 Oppose objective 7.1.1 policies a, b, c, f, g
75	3 Broke Bros Ltd Hayden and Brad Porter	Objective 7.1.1	Support	▪	75.17 Support objective 7.1.1 policies d, e
Rule 2.3 Heritage Items Overlay					
02	Jean Winifred Roberts	Heritage Item (No. 110) 18 Frances Street	Oppose	▪ Opposes inclusion of item because the property has no visual or other appeal.	02.01 Opposed the inclusion of the 'star flats' 18 Frances Street (H110) as a Heritage Item.
12	Gregor Dunn	Heritage Items	Support	▪	12.02 Supports the listing of the heritage items
18	Clifford and Raewyn Jackson	Heritage Item (104A Cook Street)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes the inclusion of 104A Cook Street, only original materials are the bricks. ▪ Building on a large site and would impact on other dwellings on the site. ▪ 	<p>18.02 Do not schedule 104A Cook Street.</p> <p>18.03 If decision made to retain variation then request compensation and incentives to own heritage properties. I.e. Rates reduction, subdivision costs, maintenance assistance, purchase property.</p>
20	Judith McDonald	Heritage Items	Support	▪ Supports the additional 23 new individual heritage Items	20.04 Supports the 23 new Heritage Items.
26	John Hutcheson	Heritage Items and Heritage Precinct	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose the inclusion of 624 Grey Street (H120) as a Heritage Item, unless either one or both of the following occur: ▪ Significant rates rebate be made available, ▪ A fund is set up and made available for property owners of the proposed Villa Heritage Precinct and the 23 Heritage Items to meet costs of repairs and maintenance to these buildings. 	<p>26.01 To not schedule 624 Grey Street as a Heritage Item, unless financial assistance is provided by either:</p> <p>a) making available a significant rates rebate; and/or</p> <p>b) setting up a fund for property owners of the proposed Villa Heritage Precinct and 23 new Heritage Items to meet costs of repairs and maintenance to these buildings.</p>
27	Susan Woodhouse	Heritage Items	Support	▪ Supports listing of heritage items	27.05 Supports Heritage Items.
33	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Rule 2.3 Heritage Items Overlay	Support	▪ Council is complying with Part 2 of the RMA.	33.07 That Council retain the 24 new heritage items identified in the proposed variation. [Note: Only 23 Items were notified in the variation].
37	Helen King	Heritage Items 121-126 (11,13,15,17,19,21 Pinfold Ave)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal confers a low density constraint over a line up of 6 properties in a medium density zone, when population increase is the civic challenge. ▪ Heritage status removes usual ownership rights of adapting it within normal building rules. ▪ Purchased with no warning from Council regarding its proposed scheduling. 	<p>37.01 That the proposal be abandoned as impractical, unethical, and unwarranted by building quality or aesthetics.</p> <p>37.02 If the scheduling goes ahead purchase as a museum or I expect substantial compensation and a reduction in rates.</p>

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
41	Shell New Zealand Limited	Amendments to 2.3 Heritage Items Overlay — Shell Service Station 116 Grey Street (H113)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Value would drop drastically. ▪ Unit is 40m² and unsuited to modern use. ▪ Can't be insulated as promoted by the government without major dismantling. ▪ Building does not qualify for an A+ ranking in the District Plan's Heritage Items Overlay with respect to geographic significance. ▪ Heritage Items currently scheduled support the contention that a ranking of 2 for geographic significance means does not qualify for an A ranking. ▪ Assessment fails to demonstrate the social, historic significance of the building to qualify for A+ ranking. ▪ Building clearly has no traditional, cultural, spiritual significance. ▪ Assessment has not determined building has sufficient technological significance to merit inclusion as an A+ item. ▪ Assessment fails to provide evidence of setting/aesthetics/landscape significance of building. ▪ Stated architectural 'excellence' of building not substantiated by assessment report. ▪ Proposed Heritage Items area generally applies ratings that are inflated and inconsistent with existing heritage items rankings. 	<p>41.01 Withdraw that part of Variation 20 which proposes the addition of new heritage items to Section 2.3 Heritage Items overlay of the Hamilton District Plan.</p> <p>41.02 Delete Item H113, the former Morris Stores and Motor Services Garage at 116 Grey Street from the proposed Schedule A+ ranking Heritage Items list.</p>
43	Lynette Barbara Blunt	Appendix 2.3 II Heritage Items Schedule 116 Grey Street (H113)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction of building is mishmash of styles from 1930s to 1980s. ▪ Original 1930s building removed and adjacent open air workshop has been roofed with orange tiles, covered in over time. Concrete block structure built 1950s. ▪ Building is a mish mash of styles. ▪ Architecturally of little value and doesn't warrant 'moderne' label. ▪ What is fair and equitable way to introduce Variation 20 to existing owners? And all parties? ▪ The variation will cause increased costs for land owners. ▪ If land required for roading — how does this fit with variation and heritage sites? ▪ Compensation under Public Works Act for restrictions. 	43.01 Property at 116 Grey Street (H113) to be removed from any Heritage classification.
46	Alex and Lynette Neeson	Heritage Items No. 5 Albert Street	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One of only 2 scheduled items in the high density area ▪ Built behind and amongst blocks of flats — not viewable from the road. ▪ Incurs extra maintenance costs (tile roof and wooden joinery) for the good of the community, but no benefit 	<p>46.01 Oppose the scheduling of 23 new heritage items.</p> <p>46.02 Oppose scheduling of number 5 Albert Street (proposed heritage status A)</p> <p>46.03 Consider supporting variation if either</p> <p>a) significant rates rebate, or</p> <p>b) fund made available to meet extra costs imposed on properties,</p>

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>to ourselves. Cheaper to reroof than to maintain roof.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential extra restrictions on flats and garage on same section (definitely opposed if restrictions apply to these). ▪ Solid construction, special character of house possible reason it has not been demolished in the past. ▪ Chosen houses as representative of an era, thereby disadvantaging owners who have maintained property to a high standard. ▪ No compensation. 	46.04 Consider supporting variation if other buildings (i.e. block of flats, garage) on the same site are excluded.
48	Brian Smith	Heritage Items	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many houses (including pre-war bungalows) that are worthy of comment. 	48.04 Supports scheduling of Heritage Items. 48.05 Many more houses, including plethora of pre-war bungalows (such as 37 Albert Street) that are worthy of comment and saving from destruction.
52	Kewwa Low	Heritage Items	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential adverse effects on property as restricts improvements and other development rights that can occur. 	52.01 Amend rules so that: a) Heritage features are listed only with owners approval, or b) Hamilton City Council compensates/purchases heritage feature.
54	Valerie Barbara Sandford	Heritage Item H111 (111 Peachgrove Road)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Heritage significance must be viewed as a whole, and not just the buildings. ▪ No protection for mature, rare trees. ▪ 3 trees on the property add to the character value, and should be included in the Building Inventory 2008. 	54.01 Seek clarification, recognition and protection of three trees on property to continue to enhance the 'old world charm' and 'sense of mystery': a) 80' Gingko, b) 80' Zeleova, c) 100' Liriodendron or tulip tree.
71	Claudette Lorraine and Henry Te Moana Walker	Heritage Item 108 Naylor Street	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overstated architectural importance. ▪ Property has been modified, including aluminium joinery which is not in keeping with the ranch style. ▪ Financial implications; increased maintenance costs, requirement for resource consent, property more difficult to sell. ▪ Further development possibility of site removed. ▪ Significant change imposed with little consultation. 	71.01 That dwelling at 108 Naylor Street not be included as a Heritage Item. 71.02 That if dwelling merits protection it be subject to protection in the same way as other pre 1960 houses. 71.03 Decision-makers on variation visit property to see for themselves in making decision rather than relying on architectural report.
72	Erin Dillon	Heritage Items	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	72.04 Support adoption of Heritage Items.
74	Cushla Mawston	Heritage Items	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	74.04 Support adoption of Heritage Items.
75	3 Broke Bros Ltd Hayden and Brad Porter	Heritage Item (154 Galloway Street)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increases burden, compliance, economic hardship, restrictive income potential. ▪ Listing would render villa incapable of reasonable economic use. ▪ Valued character eroded by High Density Housing (not same zoning as 154 Galloway Street). ▪ Unfair restrictions on a select few. ▪ Proposed ranking/heritage status weakly supported. ▪ Protecting heritage of the house not a 'matter of national importance' in RMA. ▪ Another historic 3 bay villas already protected in the proposed District Plan on Albert Street. 	75.01 Oppose listing of 154 Galloway Street as a scheduled item or overlay in the District Plan. 75.02 Oppose any adoption of ranking or restriction if scheduled. 75.03 Opposed to 154 Galloway Street being included in any heritage precinct. 75.04 Opposed to precinct rules applying to 154 Galloway Street. 75.05 Council should not hold discretion over landowners ability to alter, demolish or affect their property without being prepared to make a full market offer for that property. 75.06 Re-consider using images of 154 Galloway Street to promote Variation 20 and any heritage ideology or future restriction covenants. 75.07 Rezone 154 Galloway Street (Lot 1, 2 & 3) for retail use to cater for local residents requirements.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of photos may give false impression we support heritage status and new zoning. 	
76	John Kellaway	Heritage Items Schedule	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major omissions to the schedule. Artillery flats presumably associated with Munitions Factory and unlikely to be found elsewhere in the country. No mention or recognition of many state houses. MacFarlane Street State Houses first built in Hayes Paddock and are again missed from protection. Victorian cottages date from 1880s and some of the earliest houses of Hamilton. Number of villas and bungalows are not protected. 	<p>76.07 Consider inclusion of Dey Street Munitions factory/MOW buildings on Heritage Items schedule.</p> <p>76.08 Consider inclusion of Artillery flats on Heritage Items schedule.</p> <p>76.09 Consider inclusion of MacFarlane Street State Houses on Heritage Items schedule.</p> <p>76.10 Consider inclusion of pair of small Victorian cottages on Heritage Items schedule.</p> <p>76.11 Consider inclusion of the following villas on the Heritage Items schedule:</p> <p>a) Double gable villa in Brookfield Street.</p> <p>b) Three double bay villas in Brookfield, Frances and Bond Streets.</p> <p>c) Villa in lower Te Aroha Street with heavily detailed gables.</p> <p>d) Row of villas in Wellington Street.</p> <p>e) Small transitional villa in Nixon Street.</p> <p>76.12 Consider inclusion of the older part of the Wilson Carlisle Home in Grey Street on the Heritage Items Schedule.</p> <p>76.13 Reference to Ida Carey with H114 may relate more specifically to villa at 35 Naylor Street.</p>
78	Mark McLennan	Heritage Items	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to restrictions on property rights. Buildings have finite life span. 	78.12 Opposes the scheduling of individual heritage items.
81	Stephen Arthur Morris	Heritage Item 116 Grey Street (H113) (including other provisions that relate to site)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locality contains a number of uses and variation will compromise further development of site. Site/buildings have been modified. The buildings are not unique Restrictions on development of site will end its use as a garage. Significant financial and economic effects on owner should variation proceed. 	<p>81.01 Removal of H113 as a Heritage Item for scheduling in the District Plan.</p> <p>81.02 That the proposed variation be reviewed to ensure that the impact and effects of the proposed variation are needed for the properties that front Grey Street and that the impacts and effects of the proposed variation are understood as it relates to these properties.</p>
83	Jane Landman - Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House	Heritage Items	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be some other buildings as identified in submission number 76 (J Kellaway) that are worthy of protection. 	83.05 Supports individual heritage items.
85	Jackie Broughan	Heritage Items	Support		85.04 Supports retention of Heritage Items.
86	Warwick Hutchinson	Heritage Item H112 (4, 6 Dawson Street)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> House removed by building consent (2009/2348) 	86.01 Remove H112 from the Heritage Items Schedule.
88	Clare Mataira and Peter Dornauf	Heritage Items	Support		88.04 Supports retention of Heritage Items.
89	Leon Rutledge	Heritage Items H121-126 (11,13,15,17,19,21 Pinfold Avenue)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Properties an eyesore, run down, poorly maintained by tenants and owners. If properties are unable to be improved, renovated, demolished it would decrease value of surrounding properties. 	89.01 That the properties H121-126 not be scheduled as Heritage Items in the District Plan.
90	Alan King	Heritage Item H125 (19 Pinfold Avenue)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion would prevent major external modifications. Dilapidated with abundant potential for improvement. 	90.01 That 19 Pinfold Avenue deleted from Variation 20.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needs insulation, which flat roof makes impossible with usual products. ▪ Lack of consultation. ▪ Semi-detached houses at 23/25 Pinfold Avenue destroyed by fire, replaced with two detached houses. ▪ The detriment of not being able to improve the properties will override the preservation of the properties. The character presented by the block of properties does the era no credit. 	
93	Margaret Southgate	Heritage Items	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose limited number of proposed heritage items [more heritage items should be listed] ▪ Missed houses identified in the previous District Plan and those identified for the Hamilton East Heritage Trail. ▪ Only 12 [listed items] in the area most consider to be Hamilton East (south of Clyde Street). 	<p>93.01 Re-look and re-assess the criteria for heritage character and include not only architecture but links with social history.</p> <p>93.02 Include all earlier identified houses, businesses and buildings in the Hamilton East Heritage Trail and those previously identified in the District Plan.</p> <p>93.03 Include heritage items that the community value ahead of an architect from Wellington.</p>
94	Sarah Brodnax	Heritage Items	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	94.03 Supports retention of heritage items.
96	Michelle Akoorie	Heritage Items	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Little acknowledgement that historic villa heritage homes are an important reminder of the early settlement of Hamilton. 	96.02 Supports the naming of 23 new residential Heritage Items identified for scheduling in the District Plan.
Rule 2.4 Heritage Precincts Overlay					
03	Kevin Russell	Rule 2.4	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	03.03 Retain Rule 2.4.
17	Chris and Ruth Eames	Heritage Precinct	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the establishment of the Heritage Precinct. 	17.04 Supports the establishment of heritage precinct.
20	Judith McDonald	Heritage Precinct in Firth Street	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the Heritage Precinct on Firth Street 	20.03 Supports the proposed Heritage Precinct on Firth Street.
22	D. MacDonald	Heritage Precinct	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports a Heritage Precinct in Firth Street. 	22.07 Retain the heritage precinct. .
24	Jane Gregory	Villa Heritage Precinct	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes the proposed protection for small group of villas and other properties in the Villa Heritage Precinct. 	24.01 To extend the residential zoning to all of Hamilton East
27	Susan Woodhouse	Heritage Precinct	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports heritage precinct 	27.04 Supports Heritage Precinct.
32	Duncan and Linda Ryder	Heritage precinct		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If precinct is to be held up as a public example, Council to contribute to general maintenance and rates of privately owned property on an annual basis. Properties take great deal of private investment, time and hard work to get them to this level of restored presentation. Not appropriate Council and the public should gain from only private effort. ▪ Decrease traffic flow and speed in Firth Street which is used as bypass for busy traffic flow area on Naylor Street. ▪ Garden areas on Firth Street need to be enhanced and maintained far better. ▪ Restrictions may make future investors to these 	<p>32.05 Council to subsidise rates and provide annual grants for property maintenance.</p> <p>32.06 Install traffic control in Firth Street i.e. chicanes or judder bars with landscaped entrances.</p> <p>32.07 Council to compensate for any loss of value to property due to imposed restrictions.</p> <p>32.08 Any added Council consents or resource consents costs to be covered by Council.</p> <p>32.09 An agreed Villa Precinct mandate to be professionally drawn up to maintain visual standards.</p>

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>properties hesitate to invest. Council will need to compensate for any loss of value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council to cover additional costs of consent processing for building alterations, additions, or subdivision. ▪ Properties within the precinct should comply with an agreed mandate on presentation. Landlords required to adhere to these guidelines to keep properties tidy. 	
33	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Heritage precinct	Supports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identifies largely coherent collection of villa style houses. ▪ Remaining formation is nestled within a thriving urban environment and needs to be carefully managed to maintain heritage values in the area. 	33.04 That Council adopt the proposed heritage precinct overlay identified as the area along Firth Street, between Albert and Naylor Street. [retain]
46	Alex and Lynette Neeson	Heritage precinct	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good quality farmland being used for low density housing on outskirts while precinct protected. 	46.05 Oppose inclusion of Heritage Precinct.
47	Ian James Fraser and Keri Pavreal-Fraser	Heritage Precinct	Support		47.05 Create the Villa Heritage Precinct. 47.06 Consider expanding Villa Heritage Precinct to include Firth Street between Naylor and Brookfield Street.
48	Brian Smith	Heritage Precinct	Support in part		48.03 Supports Villa Heritage Precinct.
57	Hamilton East Community Trust	Heritage Precinct 2.4.1C c)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Word 'Villa' wrongly used in describing demolition and removal rule. Many pre-1960 homes are not Villas. 	57.01 Change the word 'Villa' to better describe houses pre-1960.
64	M A Pollard	Heritage Precinct — Californian Ranch		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual buildings do not have significant heritage values but as a group they have high heritage value. ▪ Proposed demolition control not sufficient to keep asset from being destroyed. 	64.39 Place two blocks bounded by Fox, Brookfield and Nixon Streets with Cobham Drive into a potential Californian Ranch Heritage Precinct.
68	Waikato Property Investors Association	Heritage Precinct	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effect on property values. ▪ Possible reduction in standard of care and maintenance in zone. 	68.01 The council reverses its intention to apply these new District Plan standards for Hamilton East, and the status quo remains in place.
72	Erin Dillon	Heritage Precinct	Support		72.03 Support adoption of Heritage Precinct.
74	Cushla Mawston	Heritage Precinct	Support		74.03 Support adoption of Heritage Precinct.
76	John Kellaway	Heritage Precinct			76.14 Consider the two state house cul-de-sacs of Newall and Freyberg Streets as heritage precincts, perhaps together with adjacent state houses in Graham Street. 76.15 Consider the whole of Hamilton East School as a heritage precinct.
78	Mark McLennan	Heritage Precinct	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finite life span of villas. 	78.14 Opposes the introduction of another heritage precinct.
83	Jane Landman - Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House	Heritage precinct	Support		83.04 Supports heritage precinct.
85	Jackie Broughan	Heritage Precinct	Support		85.03 Supports retention of Heritage Precinct.
88	Clare Mataira and Peter Dornauf	Heritage Precinct	Support		88.03 Supports retention of Heritage Precinct.
93	Margaret Southgate	Villa Heritage Precinct	Support		93.08 Support Villa Heritage Precinct.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
94	Sarah Cameron Brodnax	Heritage Precinct	Support	▪	94.02 Supports retention of heritage precinct.
98	Nicholas Edgar and Madeleine Alderton	Villa Heritage Precinct	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about effect both perceived and real on property (76 and 76b Albert Street). ▪ Planned additions for growing family. ▪ Additional restrictions imposed on top of Hamilton East Residential Zone. ▪ Financially penalised by additional resource consent process. ▪ Impact on property prices and marketability of property. ▪ Villa is part of a cross lease and does not front the street. ▪ Character of the villa could be altered by modifications to the dwelling on the other part of the cross leased property. 	<p>98.02 Support Objective 7.1.2b, and principal aim to ensure any alterations or additions to villas will maintain and enhance the form, style and appearance of existing buildings, and to ensure that development within the villa heritage precinct maintains and enhances the special characteristics of the area, however, request Council considers cost burden of imposing on property owners.</p> <p>98.03 Reconsider inclusion of 76 Albert Street Villa as part of Villa Heritage Precinct.</p>
Rule 8.0 Definitions					
44	Warren Stace	Amendments to Rule 8.0 Definitions		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggest it is timely to provide a definition of significant tree to Rule 8.0 Definitions. ▪ Definition can be deduced from Rule 2.2 Significant Trees Overlay and with reference to the RNZIH standard method of evaluation. It would assist and clarify significance of trees if listed specifically in definitions. 	44.03 That Council consider adding an applicable definition of Significant Tree to the listed definitions in the District Plan.
Commercial area/properties					
08	Janine Cornor	Commercial Buildings	-	▪ Value the historic look of Hamilton East architecture.	08.02 Requests that commercial buildings be required to fit in with the character of Hamilton East local architecture.
29	Lynette Evans	Commercial Area Trees	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General support for provisions of variation 20. ▪ Would like to see similar provisions applied to the commercial areas of Hamilton East; protection of mature trees, and encouragement of pedestrian activity in the commercial area of Hamilton East. 	<p>29.02 Apply similar provisions to the commercial areas of Hamilton East</p> <p>29.03 Give appropriate consideration to encouragement of pedestrian traffic in the commercial area</p> <p>29.04 Information as to how the commercial area in Hamilton East will also sustain the character of the area</p> <p>29.05 Apply provisions protecting mature trees not otherwise protected.</p>
69	Syed Mohammad Taqi Mehdi	121 Peachgrove Road/ 21 James Street		▪ Requests rezoning of a site at 121 Peachgrove Road	69.01 Rezone the property at 121 Peachgrove Road/ 21 James Street as Suburban Centre since the property has consent to operate as a corner dairy shop.
70	Syed Raza Abbas Mehdi	121 Peachgrove Road/ 21 James Street		▪ Requests rezoning of a site at 121 Peachgrove Road.	70.01 Rezone the property at 121 Peachgrove Road/ 21 James Street as Suburban Centre since the property has consent to operate as a corner dairy shop.
76	John Kellaway	Suburban centre		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No consideration of the Hamilton East suburban centre or its heritage buildings. ▪ The suburban centre is the heart and integral to the residential areas and cannot be excluded. 	<p>76.05 Extension to include consideration of suburban centre, leading to a later stage of improvement.</p> <p>76.06 Allow multi-storey apartments in the centre, particularly along the riverside</p>

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control traffic, provide parking areas, provide planted and sitting areas, put original trees back and create pleasant people environment. ▪ Allow apartments to accommodate people's needs and improve business and commercial aspects of centre. 	
Brookfield Accommodation					
28	Manor Group Investment Trust (Adam Yates)	63 Dey Street - Brookfield Accommodation (BA)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BA has different characteristics and should be treated differently. ▪ BA does not contribute to character of area, and could be considered to detract from character of the area. ▪ Hamilton East has a broad range of character due to development over time, not all of it has special character. ▪ BA bounded by Cobham Drive (major arterial) and designated E1 arterial road which detracts from character. ▪ Whole block not built for residential purposes, site has been used for commercial purposes in the past and is run as an accommodation business activity and commercial laboratory. ▪ Buildings nearing the end of their useful life and likely redevelopment in near future as comprehensive residential development. ▪ High intensity residential use at present and envisage redevelopment encompassing intensive residential living as currently provided for under the Residential Zone rules. 	28.01 That BA should (in order of preference): a) be excluded entirely from the Hamilton East Residential Zone, or; b) be included as an adjunct to the High Density Area within the proposed Zone, or; c) have special rules permitting the development of the site.
28	Manor Group Investment Trust (Adam Yates)	Street Frontages in BA	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BA is bounded by 4 roads and the increase in setback distances from the road has significant and unfair impact. 	28.02 That if special rules are adopted for development on the site reduce setback distances required along the road frontage.
28	Manor Group Investment Trust (Adam Yates)	Comprehensive Residential Developments and Apartments in BA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site already has high intensity of development and redevelopment will enhance area by replacing sprawling old buildings. ▪ Intended use of site more difficult, uncertain, and not permitted across large part of the site. 	28.03 That if special rules are adopted for development on the site comprehensive residential developments or apartments on street frontages occupied by BA are controlled or restricted discretionary activities.
28	Manor Group Investment Trust (Adam Yates)	Demolition Rule	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Buildings at end of useful life and will be demolished at some stage. 	28.04 That it should be a permitted activity for buildings on the BA block to be demolished.
Miscellaneous					
13	Lisa Rapana	General	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports entire variation 	13.01 Inform by letter of the outcome of the changes that will occur to the District Plan for Hamilton East
27	Susan Woodhouse	General	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Value the character of Hamilton East and would like to see the area preserved for present and future generations. 	27.02 Ensure the planning rules protect the heritage values of the whole area, not just parts of it.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character created not by single building or two but by streets, parks, shops and other amenities. 	
32	Duncan and Linda Ryder	Shell Service Station	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 24 hour petrol station on corner of Grey and Naylor Street contributes to increased foot traffic, rubbish, volatile and hazardous fumes, noise and general disturbance to a residential area. Petrol stations a hazard in residential area and needs review. 	<p>32.03 Council to terminate 24 hour petrol station licence, close the petrol station between the hours of 11pm and 6am.</p> <p>32.04 Increase general cleaning up maintenance in the area, control rubbish.</p>
44	Warren Stace	Amendments to Policy 5.1 Residential Areas — Trees		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corner of Clyde and Galloway Streets is a large and attractive tree worthy of inclusion in Significant Trees Schedule. 	<p>44.02 That Council consider the tree on the corner of Clyde and Galloway Street for possible inclusion in the Significant Tree Schedule.</p>
51	Catherine Ann Daniels	Reduced site coverage	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the provisions regarding site coverage, setbacks, lots sizes and demolition control as to limit future development potential of property 	<p>51.01 Grant dispensation for provision on reduced site coverage for property.</p>
51	Catherine Ann Daniels	Increased setbacks	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<p>51.02 Grant dispensation for provision on increased setbacks.</p>
51	Catherine Ann Daniels	Increased lot sizes	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<p>51.03 Grant dispensation for provision on increased minimum lot size.</p>
51	Catherine Ann Daniels	Demolition control rule	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<p>51.04 Grant dispensation for provision relating to requirement of resource consent for demolition of pre-1960 dwellings on street front sections.</p>
52	Kewwa Low	Section 4 — Rationale to include rules and limit future development	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Philosophy fundamentally flawed. Private amenity planting maintained by private landowners, no need to legitimise or enshrine in policies and rules in plan. 	<p>52.07 Remove this argument, policies and rules from the variation.</p>
59	Betty Connolly	Objective 5.1.7 (in relation to granted subdivision consent)	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction of policies a), b), and i) impact on implementation of subdivision that's been granted under old rules. Unclear as to what level of alteration is deemed to not adversely affect the special character. 	<p>59.01 Properties where consents have already been granted are exempt from the need to comply with the new rules¹.</p>
59	Betty Connolly	Rule 4.1B.1 — Restricted Discretionary Activities: Alterations and additions	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alterations to eaves will alter streetscape exterior. Subdivision approved already, require restricted discretionary resource consent to carry out work already approved. Risk consent will be declined. 	<p>59.03 Opposes Rule 4.1B.1 - alterations and additions as a restricted discretionary activity.</p>
59	Betty Connolly	Rule 4.1B.1 — Discretionary Activities: Demolition and removal	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of subdivision may require existing house to be removed off the site or onto back section. Aim to minimise loss of dwellings and likelihood that consent be declined. 	<p>59.04 Opposes Rule 4.1B.1- demolition and removal as a discretionary activity.</p>
59	Betty Connolly	Existing consent	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New rules impact on implementation of granted subdivision consent. 	<p>59.05 Controls should not be put in place which will no longer make granted subdivision consent viable, enable this to be carried out to completion without additional consent costs or uncertainty.</p>

¹ Note: Any development authorized by resource consent does not require re assessment under the rules of variation 20.

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.

Summary of Decisions Requested — Variation 20 Managing Change and Character in Hamilton East

Submitter Number	Submitter Name /Agent	Specific Provisions to which the submission relates	Support or Oppose	Submission/reasons	Decision Requested
63	Dr Penny Pollard	Trees/heritage	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed variation does not go far enough to protect character of area. 	<p>63.28 Hamilton City Council develop a tree preservation policy. 63.29 Recommends that Hamilton City Council develops a city-wide and comprehensive heritage policy/strategy similar to the Christchurch City Council Heritage Plan. 63.30 Recommends that Hamilton City Council emphasize historic aspects of the town; encourages heritage trails and heritage across all suburbs as well as within the city centre. 63.31 Recommends that Hamilton City Council plants more trees in all parts of the city. 63.32 Recommends that all developers who want to build in the city of Hamilton pay a contribution into heritage and tree preservation fund. 63.33 Recommends that Hamilton City Council do an audit of aged trees across the city to protect historic trees</p>
76	John Kellaway	General	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Largely, if superficially, protects heritage values, ▪ Little clear recognition of what is being protected — no description of what constitutes Hamilton East. ▪ No guidelines, only restrictions. ▪ Rule changes suggest attitude of facadism. There are early buildings on rear sites. 	<p>76.02 Provide support for residents in Hamilton East Residential Zone by producing guidelines on principal styles and types of buildings involved. 76.16 Supports protection of buildings on rear sites (rule changes only protect street frontages). 76.19 Extend zone description and describe buildings in the area, and their physical value, within the zone description</p>
77	John Manning,	General		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inconsistent terminology with the existing District Plan. ▪ No design guidance. 	<p>77.01 Align wording within variation with that in the District Plan. 77.02 Retain existing District Plan provisions and work on design guidelines for development in Hamilton East.</p>
84	Rosemary Allbrook	General	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rates relief for those who choose not to subdivide would help to maintain ambience of area and make fewer demands on services including stormwater drainage [as a result of less dense development]. ▪ Modern apartments an expensive version of banana box that fell out of fashion 20 years ago and that will not stand test of time any better. 	<p>84.01 Rates relief for those who do not subdivide their sections in Hamilton East. 84.02 Actively encourage developers to look for different design options. 84.03 Offer incentives to those who construct townhouse round court yards with communal gardens or at least a grouping of trees. 84.04 Encourage duplexes instead of free standing houses with little useable outside space.</p>
102	Graeme Steed	General		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most pre 1960s development is past its useful life in terms of current building standards. Limited amenity value unless substantial capital improvements are undertaken. ▪ Variation outside parameters of public consultation that occurred. ▪ Population demographic and lifestyles have changed to not require same land use as in the past. ▪ Danger investors will redirect capital investment outside of the zone and further ghettoize area. 	<p>102.02 Proposal needs to be carefully reconsidered to be consistent with sound planning principles that apply to other parts of the city and should not act to the detriment of residents against their wishes.</p>

NOTE: This document provides only a summary of the submissions, it is important that the full submissions are referred to when preparing a further submission. Further submissions must be in relation to a decision requested.