

## SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 50 – IRONGATE INDUSTRIAL REZONING

| # | Submitter                           | Address                        | Summary of Submission   | Oppose / Support   | Decision Sought   | Wishes to be heard?  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | David Renouf                        | 603A Ballantyne St, Hastings   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That all discharges of stormwater discharged to waterways be treated to HBRC – Regional Resource Management Plan 5.4 surface water quality and ANZECC 2000 freshwater levels.</li> <li>• That stormwater volume not increase above average flood levels in any waterways.</li> <li>• That riparian buffer option 3 or 4 (in Section 32) should be adopted so that any stormwater is enhanced to Irongate Stream.</li> <li>• Roof water to be used for toilet water.</li> <li>• All stormwater runoff to be treated.</li> </ul> | <b>Does not state</b>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That all discharges of stormwater discharged to waterways be treated to HBRC – Regional Resource Management Plan 5.4 surface water quality and ANZECC 2000 freshwater levels.</li> <li>• That stormwater volume not increase above average flood levels in any water ways.</li> <li>• That riparian buffer option 3 or 4 (in Section 32) should be adopted so that any stormwater is enhanced to Irongate Stream.</li> <li>• Roof Water to be used for toilet water<br/>All stormwater runoff to be treated</li> </ul> | Yes  |
| 2 | Bruce Stephenson Family Trust       | 41 – 43 Ruataniwha St, Waipawa | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signs – Has small road frontage and needs larger sign than what has been proposed.</li> <li>• Noise – How can it be measured? Owns trucking business with associated high noise levels, impossible to control or contain noise. Noise levels need to be sufficient to cater for this type of industry.</li> <li>• Water Supply needs to be sufficient for transport industry requirements.</li> <li>• Sewage System must be capable of taking relative quantity of water supplied from settling ponds.</li> </ul>              | Not stated but appears to <b>Support</b> with amendments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in signage provisions (for 20 Irongate Road Specifically)</li> <li>2. Increase in Noise provisions including clarification on how it could be measured.</li> </ol>   | Yes  |
| 3 | New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) | P.O. Box 740 Napier 4140       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports restriction on max area of advertising signs on Stage 2 of deferred zone to 2.5m<sup>2</sup> as area will front expressway. Large Signs Distracting.</li> <li>• Supports Rule relating to yard setbacks.</li> <li>• Supports rules relating to shelterbelts along expressway.</li> <li>• Supports rules relating to reduction of light and glare near expressway.</li> </ul>  | <b>Supports</b>  | Plan Change 50 be approved in its entirety.   | <b>No</b> – but would consider presenting a joint case with others |

|   |   |                                      |   |                 |  |     |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|-----|
| 4 | James Lee – Whakatu Property Management | P.O. Box 5 Whakatu 4161              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not opposed to the rezoning of land for any purpose provided the need can be established and shown that it meets the overall purpose of the RMA.</li> <li>• Believes rezoning of land for Industrial 2 purposes is not currently required within 10 year planning horizon envisaged by section 79 of the RMA.</li> <li>• Is not in favour of rezoning on a “deferred” basis.</li> <li>• Proposed rezoning is inconsistent with Council’s functions under Section 31 of RMA.</li> <li>• Needs to be a regional approach to industrial land supply similar to HPUDS study.</li> <li>• Existing Hastings Industrial Study is flawed, does not reflect good resource management practice or the most recent demographic predictions.</li> <li>• Rezoning does not represent efficient and sustainable use of existing natural and physical resources.</li> <li>• Plan Change contrary to Part 2 of RMA.</li> </ul> | <b>Opposed</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plan Change 50 be rejected in its entirety.</li> <li>2. Council undertake proper and thorough Section 32 analysis to demonstrate proposed rezoning is most appropriate means of achieving objectives and purpose of sustainable management.</li> <li>3. Council undertake comprehensive study of need for this rezoning having regard to regionally available supply of industrial land.</li> </ol>  | Yes |
| 5 | Richard Anthony Cranswick               | C/- WHK, P.O. Box 941, Hastings 4156 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supports the proposed Plan Change given the poor quality soils in the area and the existing industrial activities in the area.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding council costings in relation to the development levies. Believes original development margins were excessive.</li> <li>• Concerned that the Frank Spencer report valued land prices to low (\$4.80 per square metre) and needs to take into account a number of other improvements on the land eg trees, fences, dwellings, swimming etc, rather than just bare land, believes cost are closer to \$20 per square metre.</li> <li>• Requests council to review a number of factors involved in land costs.</li> </ul>   | <b>Supports</b> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does not state, but appears to support Plan Change 50, but wishes to review the costings for land valuation.</li> <li>2. Requests Council to review factors involved in costings, factors include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Economic Viability</li> <li>- Council Costs</li> <li>- Multiplier Effect – community economic benefit</li> <li>- Land quality</li> <li>- Holding Costs</li> <li>- Risk Margin</li> <li>- Delaying of Services</li> <li>- Sharing of Costs</li> <li>- Waste Water</li> <li>- Lot Size &amp; Shape</li> <li>- Water</li> <li>- Roundabout Costs</li> </ul> </li> </ol> | Yes |
| 6 | Hastings District Council               | Private Bag 9002, Hastings 4156      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests amendments to Section 10.7.4 and 10.9.1 of the plan to limit commercial activities to the threshold table in the Plains Zone for the DI2 (Irongate) Zone, as well as other minor amendments (for correction purposes).</li> <li>• As above, requests that DI2 (Irongate) be removed from the Commercial Threshold table in the Industrial Section (as the Plains Zone threshold table will now be used).</li> </ul>   | <b>Supports</b> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That Proposed Plan Change should be accepted subject to requested amendments.</li> </ol>   | Yes |

|   |                           |   |   |                              |   |     |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|-----|
| 7 | Thomas Graeme Heard       | No. 70 R.D. 5<br>Irongate Rd<br>Hastings          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with the noise that will be generated by industrial activities.</li> <li>• Wishes to know whether the 4 metre service corridor will be constructed inside or outside their boundary (70 Irongate Rd)?</li> <li>• Wishes to know whether property owners in Stage 2 of the development will be required to pay an increase of rates to help finance the development?</li> <li>• Suggests that the cul-de-sac on Irongate Rd should be postponed until the second stage of development is started, as there is no need for traffic to proceed past their gateway and every effort needs to be made to discourage boy racers, rubbish dumpers etc.</li> </ul> | Does not State               | Does not state  | Yes |
| 8 | Te Taiwhenua o Heretaunga | 821 Orchard Road                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wishes to be consulted for input into the treatment process &amp; design of systems that will ultimately discharge Stormwater into Irongate drain.</li> <li>• Main concerns are potential contaminants from industrial activities and road runoff that could enter Irongate drain.</li> <li>• Monitoring of traps/interceptors on regular basis to ascertain their makeup.</li> <li>• Monitoring drains to ascertain any effects of discharges before entering into a sensitive environment.</li> </ul>  | Neither Supports nor Opposes | <p>Does not accept or reject plan change, but seeks the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regular monitoring of treatment processes and discharge to streams.</li> <li>2. That monitoring is reported to a tangata whenua body, i.e. tangata whenua waste water joint committee &amp; Taiwhenua o Heretaunga.</li> <li>3. That if any significant effects of stormwater or industrial discharge occur, i.e. high levels of contaminants, that these should be dealt with immediately.</li> <li>4. Has a concern over an existing shingle bed and dug out hole in the area which is above the unconfined aquifer that has in the past or is currently being used as a point of Stormwater discharges on top of a sensitive area. What is to be done with this area, will it be tar sealed or will water be run through swales?</li> </ol> | Yes |
| 9 | Awatoto Ltd               | C/- P.O. Box 84001,<br>Westgate,<br>Auckland 0657 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes the Proposed Plan Change 50 should not have been notified ahead of the adoption of the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy (HPUDS).</li> <li>• Believes that Industrial rezoning should be looked at on a Regional level (as identified in the development stage of HPUDS).</li> <li>• States there are other locations for additional industrial land that are superior to Irongate.</li> </ul>   | <b>Opposed</b>               | That Council Reject Proposed Plan Change 50 in its entirety.  | Yes |

|    |                                    |  |   |  |   |   |
|----|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| 10 | Hawkes Bay Regional Council (HBRC) | 159 Dalton Street<br>Private Bag 6006, Napier 4142 | <p>Supports plan change entirely for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is consistent with RMA's purposes and principles.</li> <li>• Gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement, particularly provisions in Chapters 3.5, 3.8 and 3.10</li> <li>• Is consistent with all regional plans</li> <li>• Will contribute to the reduction of industrial sprawl across the Heretaunga Plains</li> <li>• Provides Satisfactory stormwater solutions.</li> <li>• Will enable integrated management of infrastructure with land use and development in the rezoned area.</li> </ul>   | <b>Supports</b>  | That the Plan Change be accepted in its entirety  | Yes   |
| 11 | David John Healey                  | 62 Irongate Rd, Hastings 4120                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property in Stage 2 of proposed structure plan.</li> <li>• Proposes that the plan change be implemented in 3 stages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stage 1 would be as currently proposed.</li> <li>- Stage 2 would encompass the land north of Irongate Road which is currently within proposed Stage 2.</li> <li>- Stage 3 would encompass land south of Irongate Road, which is currently within proposed Stage 2.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reasons are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That there are 3 landowners within proposed Stage 2 north of Irongate Rd. All have dwellings on their land.</li> <li>- There is only one landowner in the currently proposed Stage 2 who is south of Irongate Road and that land owner also owns land in the proposed Stage 1. Due to the staging the submitter believes his land will not be saleable until Stage 2 is implemented.</li> <li>- Believes that preference will be given to land south of Irongate Rd for Stage 2, as it is one title and the land north contains dwellings.</li> <li>- Believes the owner of land to the south of Irongate Road in Stage 2 will have an economic benefit as they already own land in Stage 1.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned about loss of rural amenity if his site is within the last stage to be developed and is thus surrounded by industrial activities.</li> </ul> | Does not state, but would be more supportive if Plan Change was undertaken in 3 Stages as suggested. | <p>Appears to accept Plan Change provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stage 1 would be as currently proposed.</li> <li>- Stage 2 would encompass the land north of Irongate Road which is currently within proposed Stage 2.</li> <li>- Stage 3 would encompass land south of Irongate which is presently in proposed Stage 2.</li> </ul> | <b>Yes</b> – and would consider presenting a joint case with others |

|    |                         |   |  |  |  |   |
|----|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| 12 | Lowe Corporation        | C/- Gifford Devine,<br>P.O. Box 148<br>Hastings 4156  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not believe rezoning of land is required for Industrial 2. Does not represent an efficient and sustainable use of land or the principles and purposes of the RMA.</li> <li>• Industrial demand can be adequately serviced by existing Industrial Zones which have not yet been fully and properly utilised and serviced.</li> <li>• A regional approach to Industrial strategy, similar to HPUDS is required to ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Councils servicing are most efficiently coordinated and sustainably utilised.</li> <li>- That any rezoning meets objectives of the RMA and Section 31 requirements</li> <li>- That existing industrial areas are considered, appropriately serviced and utilised before any rezoning of Plains zone land occurs.</li> <li>- That the land zoned is consistent with a cohesive strategy of objectives, policies and methods which identify appropriate lot size and type of industrial use to be provided for.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   | <b>Opposed</b>   | That Council reject proposed Plan Change 50 in its entirety.   | <b>Yes</b> – and would consider presenting a joint case with others |
| 13 | Navillusio Holdings Ltd | C/- Planned Solutions Ltd,<br>P.O. Box 1026<br>Napier | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land owned by Navillusio Holdings Ltd &amp; occupied by Tumu Timbers should be zoned entirely Industrial 6.</li> <li>• Proposed Plan Change and Structure plan should be amended to reflect this change.</li> <li>• Reasons for requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The current proposed structure plan inhibits growth of Tumu Timbers.</li> <li>- Proposed changes do not reflect past anomalies with zoning as it relates to land, and does not recognise existing Resource Consents allowing for existing activities onsite.</li> <li>- The proposed changes suggested in this submission will support Council's overall initiative of providing further industrial land while allowing the Tumu's site to be used more efficiently.</li> <li>- Believes the existing proposed Plan Change in its current form is detrimental to current and future activities occurring on the Tumu Timbers site.</li> <li>- The land is unproductive and there is no reason why part of the site should remain zoned Plains.</li> <li>- The location of the proposed attenuation area doesn't allow for the most efficient use of the Tumu's site and creates the need to introduce a</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | Not stated but appears to <b>Support</b> with amendments | Accept the plan changes provided the following amendments are provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land owned by Navillusio Holdings Ltd &amp; occupied by Tumu Timbers should be zoned entirely Industrial 6.</li> <li>2. Proposed Plan Change and Structure plan should be amended to reflect this change.</li> </ol> | <b>Yes</b>  |

|    |                  |   |   |  |  |   |
|----|------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
|    |                  |   | <p>services corridor which will sever the site and impede across their land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 32 did not demonstrate adequate consideration as to why Industrial 6 Zoning should not apply to the Tumu's site.</li> </ul>   |  |  |   |
| 14 | Tumu Timbers Ltd | C/- Planned Solutions Ltd, P.O. Box 1026 Napier | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land owned by Navilluso Holdings Ltd &amp; occupied by Tumu Timbers should be zoned entirely Industrial 6.</li> <li>• Proposed Plan Change and Structure plan should be amended to reflect this change.</li> <li>• Reasons for requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The current proposed structure plan inhibits growth of Tumu Timbers.</li> <li>- Proposed changes do not reflect past anomalies with zoning as it relates to land, and does not recognise existing Resource Consents allowing for existing activities onsite.</li> <li>- The proposed changes suggested in this submission will support Council's overall initiative of providing further industrial land while allowing the Tumu's site to be used more efficiently.</li> <li>- Believes the existing proposed Plan Change in its current form is detrimental to current and future activities occurring on the Tumu Timbers site.</li> <li>- The land is unproductive and there is no reason why part of the site should remain zoned Plains.</li> <li>- The location of the proposed attenuation area doesn't allow for the most efficient use of the Tumu's site and creates the need to introduce a services corridor which will sever the site and impede across their land.</li> <li>- Section 32 did not demonstrate adequate consideration as to why Industrial 6 Zoning should not apply to the Tumu's site.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | Not stated but appears to <b>Support</b> with amendments | <p>Accept the plan changes provided the following amendments are provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land owned by Navilluso Holdings Ltd &amp; occupied by Tumu Timbers should be zoned entirely Industrial 6.</li> <li>2. Proposed Plan Change and Structure plan should be amended to reflect this change.</li> </ol> | <b>Yes</b>  |
| 15 | Adrienne Sudfelt | 58 Irongate Rd RD5 Hastings                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As an occupier of a property on Irongate Road believes council has been a bully with the proposed changes.</li> <li>• Concerned about noise as property is adjacent to boundary of stage 1. Time and duration of industrial activities and noise is likely to increase.</li> <li>• Concerns about amenity effects on living conditions.</li> <li>• Concern about the reduction of property prices</li> </ul>   | <b>Supports</b> provided amendments made                 | <p>Will accept Plan Change provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the 3 properties on the northern side of Irongate Rd be included in stage 1</li> </ol>   | <b>Unsure,</b> but would consider presenting a joint case with others |

|         |  |  |   |  |   |            |
|---------|--|--|---|--|---|------------|
| 16      | Kowhai Park Trust  | C/- Peter Alexander Roil, R.D. 9 Hastings 4179 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Section 15.1.9.20 which will allow subdivision and creation of titles subject to clauses identified within Stage 1 Deferred Industrial 2 zone. Believes the above point is an important consideration to the economic viability of the rezoning of the Irongate plan change.</li> <li>• Essential that council officers are given discretion to allow industrial activity to occur before services can be delivered. Subject to implementation of section 10.10.3 (a) – (d)</li> <li>• Requests clarification of 10.8.4(B) – Section (f) – Landscaping in the industrial zone, where there is an existing shelterbelt on neighbouring Plains land. Does this mean that a further shelterbelt on the rezoned boundary would not be required?</li> </ul>  | <b>Supports</b>                          | Appears to accept plan change provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarification is provided for 10.8.4(B), where there is an existing shelterbelt on neighbouring Plains land. Does this mean that a further shelterbelt on the rezoned boundary would not be required?</li> </ol>  | <b>Yes</b> |
| 17<br>* | Hawkes Bay Fruitgrowers Association Inc<br><br><b>*(Late Submission)</b> | P.O. Box 689 Hastings 4156                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests amendments to 10.8.2.2 and 10.8.4B(2)(b).</li> <li>• 10.8.2.2 Side and Rear Yards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amend wording in table sections where reference is made to “any boundary adjoining and land zoned plains”, by replacing the word “yard” with “greenbelt”.</li> <li>- And add the words: “planted and able to be fully maintained from within the industrial property”.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>They suggest that the word green belt implies that the area should not be used for parking purposes, be free of debris and not be used for other activities other than a buffer zone between conflicting land uses.</p> <p>Suggest a green belt offers better protection that a yard in cases where reverse sensitivity is an issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10.8.4B (2)(b) Landscaping in Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate)....Side and Rear Yards adjoining Plains Zoned land. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests that for adequate protection only two shelterbelt types: She Oak and Casurina are required. Both are easily grown, resistant, are dense, easily managed and do not in general harbour pests.</li> <li>- Poplars can become unmanageable after a few years. Are vicious growers and send up suckers to adjoining areas and can break up yards with roots. Are major host for horticultural quarantine pests including scale.</li> <li>- Pittosporum can harbour scale</li> <li>- Beech would not provide density.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <b>Supports</b> provided amendments made | Accept the Plan Change with the following Amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 10.8.2.2 Side and Rear Yards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amend wording in table sections where reference is made to “any boundary adjoining and land zoned plains”, by replacing the word “yard” with “greenbelt”.</li> <li>- And add the words: “planted and able to be fully maintained from within the industrial property”.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. 10.8.4B (2)(b) Landscaping in Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate)....Side and Rear Yards adjoining Plains Zoned land. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review and change the speices to only include She Oaks and Casurina.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> | <b>Yes</b> |

\*Please note that submission 17 has been received after the closing date of the initial submission period of 12<sup>th</sup> of March. Under the requirements of Section 37 and 37A on the Resource Management Act (1991), Council has discretion on whether or not the late submission is accepted. This will be decided at hearing stage. If a further submission regarding the late submission is made and the late submission does not get accepted their further submission becomes void.