

**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 3

**STATEMENT BY JORDYN LANDERS FOR
HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND
(INDUSTRY EVIDENCE)**

31 MAY 2022

SUMMARY

1. Horticulture New Zealand (HortNZ) has a number of submission (and further submission) points addressed within Hearing 3 on the Proposed Central Hawke's Bay District Plan, in relation to the rural environment.
2. This statement provides a summary of the key outcomes sought by HortNZ, to provide additional context to the planning evidence of Ms Lynette Wharfe, to assist the Hearing Panel's understanding of what is needed to support the ongoing operation and development of horticulture in the Central Hawkes Bay District.
3. HortNZ largely agrees with the recommendations of the Section 42A authors, however seek amendment and or refinement on a number of discrete matters, including in relation to: providing for rural industry, the shading from land and roads provisions, agricultural aviation movements and non-rural activities in the rural zones.
4. The alternative relief sought is outlined in the planning evidence of Ms Lynette Wharfe.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

5. 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.
6. 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). Prior to my current role, I was employed as an Environmental Planner at GHD.
7. 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

8. HortNZ made a submission (and further submissions) on a number of provisions in the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan, which are being addressed in Hearing Stream 3: Rural Environment.
9. I have read the Section 42A reports (Volumes 1 – 4) prepared for Hearing Stream 3, and the planning evidence of Lynette Wharfe for

HortNZ. The purpose of this statement is to provide additional industry context to the relief sought by HortNZ.

BACKGROUND TO HORTNZ AND ITS RMA INVOLVEMENT

10. 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.
11. 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.

HORTICULTURE IN CENTRAL HAWKES BAY

12. 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.
13. Predominate crops grown in the District include apples, process vegetables (including peas, green beans, sweetcorn) as well as buttercup squash, potatoes and a range of other fruit and vegetables.
14. Analysis undertaken as part of the District Plan review indicates that the district contains large areas of highly productive and versatile soil and land.¹ According to the Agricultural Production Statistics there was 1,844 hectares of horticultural land in the District in 2017.² Statistics New Zealand data indicates that the horticulture sector employs 655 people in the District.³
15. The District Plan has an important role for providing for horticultural activity (both now and in the future) in the rural environment within the Central Hawkes Bay District.

¹ <https://www.chbdc.govt.nz/assets/Document-Library/Draft-District-Plan/LandVision-Report-and-Appendix-1-26-January18-WEB-READY.pdf>

² Statistics New Zealand, Agricultural Production Statistics 2017

³ Statistics New Zealand. Employee count for 2021 in Central Hawke's Bay District for 'A012 Mushroom and Vegetable Growing' and 'A013 Fruit and Tree Nut Growing'.

HORTNZ'S SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED CENTRAL HAWKES BAY DISTRICT PLAN AND RESPONSE TO THE S42A REPORT.

16. HortNZ's submission (and further submission) interests in the rural environment are at a high-level related to:
 - a) Providing for horticulture activities in the rural zones (GRUZ – General Rural Zone, and RPROZ – Rural Production Zone), through a pragmatic policy and rule framework.
 - b) Ensuring there is a robust framework to prevent and/or manage potential reverse sensitivity effects on primary production (and highly productive land) in the Rural environment, typically from non-rural activities, and at the urban/rural interface.
17. HortNZ is largely in agreement with the s42A recommendations as to how the proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan should address the issues, we raised in submissions that relate to this topic. In particular, we support the recommendations in relation to our submissions on:
 - The amendments proposed in respect of greenhouses being excluded from the intensive primary production policy/rule framework,
 - Recommendations in relation to providing a specific permitted activity rule artificial crop support structures for in the GRUZ and RPROZ chapters,
 - Retaining the framework for post-harvest facilities (with minor amendment to remove redundant standard relating to gas transmissions lines),
 - The overall policy framework in respect of enabling primary production.
18. As set out in the planning evidence of Ms Wharfe, minor amendments are sought to the provisions for seasonal worker accommodation provision audible bird scaring devices and frost fans as well as some discrete matters in the broader policy framework.
19. Amendments are also sought in respect of the approach taken to providing for rural industry, the shading from land and roads provisions, agricultural aviation movements and non-rural activities in the rural zones.

PROVIDING FOR HORTICULTURAL ACTIVITIES IN THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT

Seasonal worker accommodation permitted activity thresholds

20. As described in HortNZ's submission, seasonal worker accommodation provides for temporary and often communal living arrangements; it is quite distinct from permanent worker accommodation which might support a full-time employee and their family. It is a definable activity that requires a specific resource management response to reflect the nature of the activity.
21. It is a requirement in the Hawkes Bay region (as among others) that RSE workers not live in a residential house, unless criteria for existing use before 2019 apply.⁴ This was introduced to alleviate pressure on the availability of housing, leading to an increased need for purpose-built accommodation.
22. The Hastings District Council – who recently progressed a plan change (Plan Change 1 (Variation 7) - Seasonal Workers Accommodation) in respect to seasonal worker accommodation relating to industrial zones and the Plains Production zone is now operative.⁵
23. While HortNZ as a submitter on the aforementioned plan change sought an increase to the 125m², the decision of the Hearings Committee was to retain this area threshold for the following reason: *"The existing maximum floor area allows for a level of effects that is expected to be minor and is consistent with other permitted activities"*.⁶
24. Within the Plains Production zone in the Hastings District, seasonal worker accommodation is permitted up to 125m² (subject to a 15-metre setback and screening of outdoor storage and parking standards).
25. HortNZ supports the approach within the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan of providing a permitted activity rule for Seasonal Worker Accommodation in the GRUZ and RPROZ zones, however considers that for plan users (who may have seasonal worker accommodation across both districts in some cases), an approach consistent with the Hasting District Plan would be preferred (i.e

⁴ <https://www.immigration.govt.nz/employ-migrants/explore-your-options/finding-and-hiring-workers-overseas/providing-accommodation-for-rse-workers>

⁵ Notified 23 August 2019, the provisions were resolved by consent notice dated 1 December 2020.

⁶ <https://www.hastingsdc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Variation-7/Hearings-Committee-Recommendations.pdf>

permitted activity threshold of 125m²).

26. It is largely a moot point because in meeting the Worksafe accommodation expectations⁷, for bedroom space alone at least 117m² would be required for 24 people (i.e not including the area required for cooking/dining/bathroom areas) – the gross floor area threshold is likely to be triggered before the person threshold is reached. Therefore, there does not appear to be an additional role that the person threshold serves in this case.

Shelter belts (in context of shading from land and roads provisions)

27. Effective shelter belts are an important boundary control to mitigate potential spray drift from the use of agrichemicals. They also provide crops protection from wind, among other benefits.
28. HortNZ's interest in the 'Shading of Land and Roads' provisions (proposed to be amended to 'Continuous Tree Planting along Boundaries' in the S42A Vol 2 report) is ensuring that there are pragmatic rules which enable growers to establish shelterbelts in the rural environment – as part of mitigating the potential for off-site effects such as spray drift and providing suitable conditions for a crop.

Aircraft and helicopter movements related to rural production activities

29. The agricultural aviation industry provides services to primary production activities and associated rural activities through applying agrichemicals, fertilisers and baits from the air, from both fixed wing aircraft and helicopters. Use for rural production is seasonal, short term or intermittent and directly related to the rural production activity.
30. By way of background, HortNZ also provided feedback on the draft District Plan in 2019 (and presented at the draft District Plan hearing in February 2020) and specifically sought an exemption to the provisions for helicopters and aircraft being used for intermittent primary production purposes.
31. As a result of that submission (and others seeking) rules regarding rural airstrips, the hearing panel requested further advice from the council staff to address any gaps in the District Plan.
32. The S42A report notes that the approach in the plan 'borrows' from the approach in the Proposed Selwyn District Plan. I note that HortNZ is a submitter and has prepared evidence on the Proposed Selwyn District

⁷ <https://www.chbdc.govt.nz/assets/Document-Library/District-Plan-Proposed/Hearing-Stream-3/Appendix-C-Worker-accommodation-Fact-sheet.pdf>

Plan in respect of the same activity.

33. HortNZ seek a pragmatic framework that enables this activity to occur in the rural environment, to support horticultural activities.

Rural industry

34. HortNZ's interest in providing a suitable framework for rural industry (separate to the provisions for post-harvest facilities) is two-fold:
- a) The importance of rural industry and businesses to enabling horticulture and it is sometimes necessary to have these services located in the rural area – e.g. tractor servicing, contractors; and
 - b) At the same time, it is important that there is a clear differentiation with industry/commercial activity generally, as industrial activities using rural land (rather than industrially zoned land) can have adverse effects and result in the loss of productive land.
35. This topic is addressed further in the planning evidence of Ms Lynette Wharfe.
36. For completeness, as previously noted we support the specific provision in the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan for post-harvest facilities.

'Other activities' in the rural environment

37. HortNZ made a number of submissions (and further submissions) relating to the provisions that apply to 'non-rural' activities, including seeking larger setbacks for residential buildings from internal boundaries in the RPROZ and stricter standards or activity status for a range of other activities e.g. visitor accommodation, community facilities, educational facilities.
38. The reason for these submissions is to ensure that there is a suitable framework in the plan to manage the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities such as horticulture – there have been many examples around the country of reverse sensitivity effects resulting from the establishment of new 'sensitive' activities.
39. Reverse sensitivity is a significant issue for growers and can constrain the use of horticultural land. This can arise through activities that are required as an inherent part of horticulture e.g. spreading fertiliser, using agrichemicals, noise, machinery use. These activities may seem inconvenient, annoying, disturbing or irritating from an urban

perspective, however they are typical (and necessary) in a rural environment. Reverse sensitivity issues can restrict day-to-day operations, impose additional economic burden and ultimately can prevent the productive use of land.

40. HortNZ believe that reverse sensitivity is best addressed at the planning stage, to avoid (where possible) these issues arising.

CONCLUSION

41. In closing, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Section 42A authors for the considerable effort that has gone into the analysis of individual submission points.
42. HortNZ largely support the S42A report recommendation in respect of the rural environment topic, notwithstanding further refinement sought in some areas as is outlined in the planning evidence of Ms Lynette Wharfe.

Jordyn Landers

31 May 2022