

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
IN CENTRAL HAWKES BAY**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“**the Act**”)

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan

HEARING STREAM 2

**STATEMENT BY JORDYN LANDERS FOR
HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND
(TABLED STATEMENT)**

16 MARCH 2022

SUMMARY

1. This statement addresses Horticulture New Zealand's submission points relating to Hearing 2 on the Proposed Central Hawke's Bay District Plan.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

2. My full name is Jordyn Maree Landers. I am an Environmental Policy Advisor at Horticulture New Zealand (HortNZ). In this role I am involved with regional and district planning processes in regions where fruit and vegetables are grown commercially. I have been in this role since August 2019.
3. I hold a Master of Planning and a Bachelor of Science from the University of Otago. I am an intermediate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI). I have five years planning experience. Prior to my current role, I was employed as an Environmental Planner at GHD.
4. While I am a qualified Planner and member of NZPI, I am not submitting this statement in the capacity of an expert planner to this hearing panel. My role is HortNZ's representative.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

5. HortNZ made submissions (and further submissions) that are addressed in the S42A reports for Hearing 2:
 - a) Urban Environment.
 - b) Strategic Direction: Sustainable Subdivision and Building.
 - c) General District-Wide Matters: Noise and Signs
 - d) General District-Wide Matters: Light/Temporary Activities.

BACKGROUND TO HORTNZ AND ITS RMA INVOLVEMENT

6. HortNZ is the industry good body for the horticulture sector, representing growers who pay levies on fruit and vegetables sold, as set out in the Commodity Levies (Vegetables and Fruit) Order 2013.
7. HortNZ was established on 1 December 2005, combining the New Zealand Vegetable and Potato Growers' and New Zealand Fruitgrowers' and New Zealand Berryfruit Growers Federations. On behalf of growers HortNZ takes a detailed involvement in resource

management planning processes as part of its national environmental policy.

8. As outlined in HortNZ's submission, there are a range of horticultural crops grown in the Central Hawkes Bay District generally focused on the highly productive soils of the Ruataniwha and Takapau Plains, as well as around the Otane area.

RESPONSE TO SECTION 42A REPORT FOR HEARING 2

9. **Appendix 1** summarises HortNZ's submission points and further submissions in relation to the topics addressed in Hearing 2, with reference to the recommendations in the respective S42A reports.
10. Particularly we note support for retaining policy direction around appropriately planning urban development, so as to protect the highly productive soil resource.

Jordyn Landers

16 March 2022

Appendix 1: Horticulture New Zealand submission and further submission points

	HORTNZ SUBMISSION/FS	S42A RECOMMENDATION	HORTNZ COMMENT
URBAN ENVIRONMENT			
Objective UFD-O2	S81.047 Retain objective	Accept in part - recommends retaining, with amendment.	Accept S42A recommendation , on the basis that the strategic direction to retain and protect HPL remains. It is important that demand for land for housing is located appropriately and where possible avoids highly productive land, to protect this resource for future generations.
Policy UFD-P2	S81.048 Retain policy	Accept in part - recommends retaining, with amendment.	
Policy UFD-P4	S81.049 Retain policy	Accept - recommends retaining UFD-P4.	Support S42A recommendation.
UFD-AER3	S81.050 Amend ' minimises <u>avoids</u> the loss of valuable highly productive land.'	Accept in part - recommends retaining, with amendment.	Support S42A recommendation to amend 'minimises' to 'avoid'.
STRATEGIC DIRECTION: Sustainable Subdivision and Building			
Policy SSB-P1	S81.046 Amend to include ' <u>and where applicable, measures to mitigate reverse sensitivity.</u> '	Reject – on the basis that the intent of the SSB chapter is to 'promote innovative and environmentally sensitive approaches to subdivision and building' and reverse sensitivity is addresses elsewhere.	Accept S42A recommendation (but note that reverse sensitivity is an important consideration particularly in respect of the subdivision and rural zone chapters).

GENERAL DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS: Noise and Signs			
NOISE-O1	S81.093 Retain	Accept - recommends retaining provisions as notified.	Support S42A recommendation
NOISE-O2	S81.094 Retain		
NOISE-O3	S81.095 Retain		
NOISE-O4	S81.096 Retain		
NOISE-P3	S81.097 Retain		
NOISE-S1 (1) General (2)	S81.098 Amend '...The Rural Production Zone and the Rural Lifestyle Zone is within the notional boundary as defined in NZS6801'	Accept – recommends amendment as sought in HortNZ's submission.	Support S42A recommendation
SIGN-R2	FS17.74 in support of FFNZ submission.	Reject	Accept s42A commentary , provided it is clear that signs required to meet health and safety legislative requirements are considered 'official signs' (an undefined term).
GRZ-P6	FS17.78 opposing the submission of Kainga Ora.	Reject – recommends deleting GRZ-P6.	Accept S42A commentary that existing use rights would likely apply to existing primary production activities.
GENERAL DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS: Light and Temporary Activities			
LIGHT-S1	S81.092 Delete S1(1)(b)(ii) Delete LIGHT-S1(1)(d)	Reject – no change recommended to LIGHT-S1	HortNZ's submission was concerned with reverse sensitivity effects (from a new residential activity establishing near to an existing productive activity). It is difficult to make any further comment on the

			<p>appropriateness of the provisions without measuring the lux of typical primary production activities which may require light. However, this does highlight the importance of tools such as setbacks for new 'sensitive' activities in the rural zone (addressed in later topics).</p>
--	--	--	--