

Issue 1 – Plan Change as a whole

Recommendations and Reasons

- A) That the submissions of New Zealand Transport Agency (Submission 3) and the Hawke's Bay Regional Council (Submission 10) and the further submissions by Richard Anthony Cranswick (Further Submissions 2, 3 and 4); all in general support of Plan Change 50 be ACCEPTED insofar as Plan Change 50 is adopted with amendments resulting from decisions on other submissions.
- B) That the submissions of James Lee – Whakatu Property Management (Submission 4), Awatoto Ltd (Submission 9) and Lowe Corporation (submission 12) opposed to Plan Change 50 and seeking its withdrawal, be REJECTED.

With the reason for these decisions being:

- (1) That Plan Change 50 is considered an effective and efficient proposal for increasing industrial land within the District when considered against section 32 of the RMA.
- (2) That amending the plan generally in accordance with Plan Change 50 will increase the industrial land available for large lot and dry industrial activities within the District while avoiding remedying and mitigating the potential for adverse effects to the environment.
- (3) That the industrial rezoning resulting from Plan Change 50 will take the pressure off the Plains Zone for accommodating industrial development.
- (4) That Plan Change 50 is an efficient use of resources and promotes sustainable management in giving effect to Part 2 of the RMA; further to this it has been endorsed on a regional basis in being consistent with the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy

Issue 2 - Stormwater needs to be properly managed in regards to quality and quantity entering natural watercourses

Recommendations and Reasons

- A) That the submission of David Renouf (Submission 1) making various requests relating to stormwater management be REJECTED insofar as no changes are made to the Plan as a result of this submission; but ACCEPTED IN PART insofar as some of the requests made will happen as a matter of course to achieve compliance with Hawke's Bay Regional Council consents and plans.
- B) That the submission of Te Taiwhenua o Heretaunga (submission 8) making various requests relating to stormwater management be REJECTED insofar as no changes are made to the Plan as a result of this submission; but ACCEPTED IN PART insofar as some of the requests made will happen as a matter of course to achieve compliance with Hawke's Bay Regional Council consents and plans.
- C) That the Further Submission of Rick Cranswick (Further Submission 1) in opposition to that part of the submission of David Renouf seeking that roof water be required to be collected for use as toilet water be ACCEPTED insofar as no such change is made to the Plan.

With the reason for these decisions being:

- (1) That all discharges of stormwater discharged to waterways will need to be treated to meet HBRC – Regional Resource Management Plan and surface water quality and ANZECC 2000 freshwater levels and managed to ensure that stormwater volume does not increase above average flood levels in any waterways. Not all stormwater needs to be treated, but all stormwater runoff will meet HBRC guidelines.
- (2) That riparian management options 3 or 4 are not appropriate as riparian options, as they will cost developers too much to implement.
- (3) That requiring the use of roof water for toilet water will add significant costs to development, and is not justifiable environmentally as the roof water will be discharged to ground soakage and so will not add to storm water loadings.
- (4) That regular monitoring of the Irongate Stream should take place to ensure the industrial development is not polluting the water ways, this is not however a matter that can be regulated through a district plan.
- (5) The proposed Irongate Industrial Zone will not be located over the unconfined aquifer, and any development over the shingle bed mentioned will need to be designed to ensure contamination of the groundwater does not occur.

Issue 3 - Amendments to signage provisions

Recommendations and Reasons

- A) That the part of the submission of Bruce Stephenson specifically seeking amendment to the District Plan signage provisions (Submission 2) be **REJECTED**.

With the reason for these decisions being:

- (1) That the District Plan industrial and commercial signage area limits of 5.0m² or 0.7m² of signage per metre of site frontage (whichever is larger), have worked effectively for a number of years and there is no justification for larger areas to be permitted at Irongate.
- (2) That any increase in signage requirements for this specific site can be better dealt with through the Resource Consent process.

Issue 4 - Rural Amenity and noise concerns

Recommendations and Reasons

- (A) That the submission of Bruce Stephenson (submission 2) specifically relating to noise provisions and concerns about restrictions on his business (Submission 2) be REJECTED IN PART, insofar as no changes are made to the District Plan as a result of this submission; but ACCEPTED IN PART, insofar as the noise limits in the Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate) will actually be more permissive than the existing Plains Zone noise limits.
- (B) That the part of the submission of Thomas Graeme Heard (Submission 7) concerned about additional noise be ACCEPTED IN PART insofar as the cul-de-sac head mentioned is already proposed to be delayed until stage 2 of development, as there will be a turning head constructed on Irongate Road between the boundary of Stage 1 and Stage 2 preventing the need for heavy vehicles to have to travel to the end of Irongate Road; and insofar as changes set out under (C) below will reduce the noise received by residents in the Deferred Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate).
- (C) That the submission relating to noise and amenity concerns of Adrienne Sudfelt (Submission 15) be ACCEPTED IN PART insofar as the decision on the Notice of Requirement includes a condition to plant the proposed swale between the boundary of the Sudfelt property (58 Irongate Road) and of 22 Irongate Road to provide a landscape screening buffer during stage 1 to improve the residential amenity of the Sudfelt property and conditions are set on the Notice of Requirement requiring an acoustical noise barrier extending 50m along the Irongate Road frontage and 25m along the stage 1 boundary of the property to screen noise from the cul de sac head; and insofar as the following amendment is made to the District Plan:

Add the following new performance standard to standard 15.1.9.20:

New industrial sites created shall be subject to a consent notice pursuant to section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991 stating that:

Owners of sites within the Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate) are advised that, District Plan noise limits apply to their land to protect the amenity of residents in the Deferred Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate), until the deferred status is lifted; and residents in the Plains Zone. Buildings and activities should therefore be designed with the need to meet these noise limits in mind.

These noise limits are required to be met at a distance of 20m from the facade of the closest (or any) dwelling within the Deferred Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate) or Plains Zone and include the following limits:

55dBA L₁₀ during the hours of 7am – 10pm Monday – Friday and 7am – 12 noon Saturday

45dBA L₁₀ at all other times and public holidays

75dBA L_{MAX} during the hours of 10pm – 7am the following day

L₁₀ limits are designed to protect general amenity by limiting constant noise, but are able to be equalled or exceeded 10% of the time.

L_{MAX} limits are designed to protect residents sleep from bangs or crashes or other short duration noises and only apply during the night time hours stated above.

The limits stated above are those applying in the District Plan at the time of writing, if the District Plan noise limits are subsequently amended it is the amended limits that would apply. The limits stated above are provided for information purposes to illustrate the principle that the ability to generate noise (particularly during night time hours) will be limited by the proximity of the nearest dwellings either in the Deferred Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate) or Plains Zone and buildings and activities need to be planned with this in mind.

- (D) That the submission relating to noise and amenity from David John Healey (Submission 11) be ACCEPTED IN PART, in so far as the changes as set out in (C) above, are made to the district plan, and insofar as conditions are set on the Notice of Requirement, particularly with regard to the acoustical barrier, to reduce the noise received in the Deferred Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate).

8.3 With the reason for these decisions being:

- (1) That it is not appropriate for Mr Stephenson's existing industrial activities to be exempt from noise provisions, as they have been subject to Plains Zone requirements in the past, and this would be unfair on surrounding neighbours. The noise provisions of the Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate) are however more permissive than the existing Plains Zone noise limits and therefore will be of benefit to Mr Stephenson and other businesses.
- (2) That the proposed turning head on Irongate Road as part of Stage 1 will prevent heavy vehicles from moving along the entire length of Irongate Road, thus reducing the noise effects on those properties located within Stage 2.
- (3) That the noise levels will still provide some protection for residents within Stage 2 prior to the deferred industrial zoning being lifted. To ensure that future owners of industrial businesses within Stage 1 are aware of this a new standard is applied to the subdivision section of the district plan setting out what the noise limits are. This will result in a consent notice being applied to the title of the new stage 1 properties so that owners are aware of the noise constraints when designing their buildings and site layouts.
- (4) That additional landscaping of Stage 1 Industrial sites is considered inefficient and uneconomical, and it may result in a large quantity of unusable industrial land. It is however practicable to provide a shelter belt / landscaped visual screen in the swale proposed along the boundary of stages 1 and 2. A condition is proposed on the Notice of Requirement to implement such landscaping until the deferment on stage 2 has been lifted. This will provide some protection for residents within stage 2 while stage 1 is being developed.

- (5) That no additional landscaping or noise level mitigation measures can be implemented around the Healy's property (or any property) to reduce the amenity effects in case the site is the last to be developed, as it can not be known with any certainty whether or not the northern side of Irongate Road will be the last to be developed.**
- (6) A condition is proposed on the Notice of Requirement to require an acoustical barrier fence on the boundary of the Sudfelt property to block the line of sight between the proposed cul de sac turning head and the three residential dwellings on the northern side of Irongate Road within stage 2. This will block the noise from vehicles using the turning head in relation to these residential properties.**

Issue 5 - Water supply needs to be appropriate for transport industrial activities. Sewer Supply needs to meet increased quantity of water supplied.

Recommendations and Reasons

- A) That the part of the submission of Bruce Stephenson (Submission 2) specifically relating to water and sewer supplies be **REJECTED insofar as no amendments are made to Plan Change 50 as a result of this submission.**

With the reason for this decision being:

- (1) That having full water and sewer services for the Irongate Industrial Rezoning was looked into as a part of the Hastings District Council Industrial Expansion Strategy, and was found not to be a feasible option. The Irongate area has been earmarked for dry Industry only.
- (2) That the Stephenson Trucking business has existing use rights to continue its current practice. The business will not be forced to connect onto the Council's reticulated network unless the existing activity is altered.

Issue 6 - Costings on initial land valuation

- (A) That the submission of Richard Anthony Cranswick (Submission 5) supporting the rezoning, but raising concerns about the cost of the development levies and seeking some flexibility with regard to the minimum lot size be; **REJECTED IN PART** in so far as the submission relates either to financial and development levy matters which cannot be addressed through the Plan Change submission process; and **ACCEPTED IN PART insofar as the rezoning takes place and policy direction is given to provide for some flexibility in the assessment of non-complying subdivision applications by amending section 10.4 of the Plan as follows:**

IZP20 Provide for the establishment of dry industrial activities on larger sites in the Irongate Industrial Area.

Explanation

The infrastructure for the Irongate Industrial Area has been designed to support dry industrial activities such as timber processing activities and transportation depots. No provision has been made for trade waste. **A minimum site size has been set at 1 hectare as this is**

the density of development that service infrastructure and roading has been designed to accommodate. Some flexibility in lot size may be able to be accommodated provided a 1 hectare average site size density is retained. The limited access nature of Maraekakaho Road and the lack of profile on Irongate Road means that this area is not appropriate for activities seeking smaller sites with a high profile and access to passing traffic.

With the reason for these decisions being:

- (1) That the points raise in the submission are relevant to the overall rezoning of the Irongate Industrial area, and should be looked at as part of the ongoing consultation with landowners for Irongate through the LTCCP processes. However they are not Resource Management issues and they can not be reviewed as part of the submissions report, and therefore must be rejected on this basis.
- (2) That council has implemented policies to ensure services are delayed until they are absolutely necessary in most instances to reduce holding costs, however recognise that certain services need to be constructed upfront.
- (3) That having full industrial supply water and sewer services for the Irongate Industrial Re-zoning was looked into as a part of the Hastings District Council Industrial Expansion Strategy, and was found not to be a feasible option. The Irongate area has been earmarked for dry Industry only.
- (4) It is considered that some flexibility in the minimum lot size for the Irongate Industrial Area may be beneficial. This may help the development cater for a larger variety of industrial business and therefore help alleviate some of the economic concerns by opening up more options to potential developers.
- (5) That any flexibility in Lot sizes must be tempered by the fact that the roading and servicing networks, as well as landscaping and visual amenity have been calculated to account for a 1 hectare average Lot size. More intensive development past this point can not be provided for.
- (6) The limited access nature of Maraekakaho Road and the lack of profile on Irongate Road means that this area is not appropriate for activities seeking smaller sites with a high profile and access to passing traffic.

Issue 7 – Minor amendments and questions

Recommendations and Reasons

- (A) That the submissions of Thomas Graham Heard (Submission 7) and the Kowhai Park Trust (Submission 16) were seeking points of clarification rather than amendments to the plan change, so cannot be accepted or rejected.
- (B) That the submission of Hastings District Council (Submission 6) seeking various technical amendments; be **ACCEPTED insofar as the following amendments are made to section 10 of the District Plan** (text to be added shown as bold and underlined, text to be deleted shown with strike through):

10.7.4.2 PERMITTED ACTIVITIES

- (a) The following activities shall be permitted, provided they comply with the General Performance Standards and Terms in Section 10.8 and the relevant Specific Performance Standards and Terms in Sections ~~10.9.1, 10.9.3, and 10.9.7,~~ and 6.9.4.
- LAND BASED PRIMARY PRODUCTION (EXCLUDING FORESTRY).
 - COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES (EXCLUDING VISITOR ACCOMMODATION).
 - TEMPORARY EVENT DAYS.

10.7.4.3 CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES

- (a) The following activities shall be Controlled Activities in the Deferred Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate), provided they comply with the General Performance Standards and Terms in Section 10.8 and the Specific Performance Standards and Terms in Section ~~10.9.1, 10.9.3,~~ 10.9.5, 10.9.7. and 6.9.1:
- INTENSIVE RURAL PRODUCTION.
- (b) Applications for Controlled Activities will be considered without notification or without the requirement to serve notice. Conditions may be imposed in relation to the matters over which control will be exercised, identified in the Assessment Criteria in Sections 6.10 and 10.10 of the Plan.

and

10.9.1 ACTIVITY THRESHOLD LIMIT

In the I1, I2, I2 (Irongate), ~~DI2 (Irongate)~~ and I3 zones, the following activity threshold limits shall apply to all permitted and controlled activities (other than industrial activities) and shall be used as a guide in the assessment of all other activities.

Outcome
Optimum and efficient use of industrial land resources and the avoidance of significant adverse effects. Non-industrial activities will remain ancillary to the principal activities taking place in the Industrial Zones.

Activity	Threshold Measure	Limit Per Site		
		I1	I2, I2 (Irongate) DI2 (Irongate)	I3
Commercial Service Activities (Excluding dairies and Takeaway food premises)	Net indoor Retail and Display Building Gross Floor Area	200m ²	100m ²	200m ²
Sale Yards	N/A	Nil	Nil	No limit
Service Stations	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tavern	Number of persons to be accommodated	200	100	200
Visitor Accommodation	Number of rentable units	20	Nil	Nil
Warehousing and storage	Total indoor/outdoor storage	No limit	No limit	1000m ²
All other activities	Building Gross Floor Area	100m ²	100m ²	100m ²

~~In the Deferred Industrial 2 Zone (Irongate) there are no threshold limits on land based primary production.~~

With the reason for these decisions being:

- (1) That the 4 metre service corridor shown on the 'Irongate Industrial Area Structure Plan' is located inside the boundary of the Heard's property.
- (2) That no new shelterbelt will be required to be provided on a boundary where there is an existing legally established shelterbelt parallel to and within 10m of that boundary, even if it is within the Plains Zone.
- (3) That the amendments to the proposed plan change will ensure that the stricter of the commercial threshold tables is incorporated into the proposed deferred industrial zones. This will ensure that the integrity of the proposed industrial zone remains and limited commercial activities will occur before the industrial rezoning is completed.

- (4) That the amendments will ensure that stormwater assessment criteria are still applied to new buildings even when the land is under deferred Industrial 2 (Irongate) status.

Issue 8 - Re-staging the Plan Change so that land north of Irongate Road is rezoned earlier

Recommendations and Reasons

- (A) That the request to alter the staging of the rezoning in the submission of David John Healey (Submission 11) be **REJECTED** and the district plan remain unaltered in this regard.
- (B) That the request to alter the staging of the rezoning in the submission of Adrienne Sudfelt (Submission 15) be **REJECTED** and the district plan remain unaltered in this regard.

With the reasons for these decisions being:

- (1) That the Sudfelt proposal, in which a portion of the land north of Irongate Road currently proposed as part of Stage 2, be included in Stage 1 will incur significant initial costs for council. These costs are considered unjustifiable as part of stage 1.
- (2) That neither of the proposals will have a defensible boundary, in that once all infrastructure has been implemented, properties to the south of Irongate Road, that have been requested to remain deferred, will be able to connect to the services. In order to gain a return on the investment in the services it would be efficient to provide access to services and therefore difficult to refuse Resource Consent to these properties to develop their land.
- (3) That it is not fair and reasonable to restrict development on the sites to the south of Irongate Road because they appear to be the most desirable to be developed first.
- (4) The mitigation measures of a shelterbelt and noise barrier fence as proposed in the Notice of Requirement will help mitigate some of the amenity issues related to having a dwelling in stage 2 of development.

Issue 9 - Request re-zoning of additional land to Industrial 6.

Recommendations and Reasons

(A) That the submissions of Navillus Holdings Ltd (Submission 13) and Tumu Timbers Ltd (Submission 14) seeking a rezoning of Plains Zone land to the south of the Tumu Timbers site to Industrial 6 be **ACCEPTED IN PART** insofar as the amendments listed below are made to the District Plan, but **REJECTED IN PART** insofar as the amendments submitted regarding the expansion of activities are not accepted.

- **Amendments to the proposed structure plan (appendix 15.1 – 7) to include Lots 1 & 2 DP 367052 (1229 Maraekakaho Road) and Lot 1 DP 26022 as Industrial 6 zoned land. Please see Amended Structure Plan as attached.**
- **Amendments to zoning Maps 53a, 62a and 18a to include Lots 1 & 2 DP 367052 (1229 Maraekakaho Road) and Lot 1 DP 26022 as Industrial 6 zoned land. Please see amended zoning Maps attached**
- **Add the following amendments to table 15.1.8.1: General site size standards:**

ZONE		Minimum Net Site Area	Minimum Legal Access Width
7.	INDUSTRIAL 2 ZONE – (EXCEPT AS PROVIDED FOR IN 7A BELOW)	Front Sites: 1000m ² Corner Sites: 1000m ² Rear Sites: 2000m ²	20m 20m 6m
7A	INDUSTRIAL 2 ZONE (IRONGATE)	1 hectare	6m
7B	STAGE 2 OF THE DEFERED INDUSTRIAL 2 ZONE (IRONGATE)	12 hectares	6m
8.	Industrial 3, 4, 5 and 6 Zones - (EXCEPT AS PROVIDED FOR IN 8A BELOW)	1000m²	20m
8A	<u>INDUSTRIAL 6 – LOTS 1 & 2 DP 367052 (1229 MARAEKAKAHO ROAD)</u> ^(Note 3)	<u>3 hectares</u>	<u>20m</u>

Note 3 Lots 1 & 2 DP 367052 (1229 MARAEKAKAHO ROAD) has been separated from the Industrial 6 minimum site size provisions , as it has been rezoned as part of the Industrial 2 (Irongate) Plan Change. The larger minimum site size is to ensure that the site relates to the specific industrial activities on the adjoining Industrial 6 site and is not used to subdivide new sites as an alternative general industrial land resource to the nearby Industrial 2 (Irongate) Zone.

Add an additional standard to section 15.1.9.20: General site performance standards:

15.1.9.20A INDUSTRIAL 6 ZONE (IRONGATE)

Outcome

- a) **No new site created from Lots 1 & 2 DP 367052, or part thereof, shall be provided with vehicular access to Maraekakaho Road.**

The efficient use of the infrastructure provided in the Irongate Industrial Area

Add the following amendment to Policy IZP21:

- IZP21 Ensure the integrated and efficient development of the Irongate Industrial Area through the use of a Structure Plan, a deferred zone, and staging.

Explanation

The **71.6ha** Irongate Industrial Area (shown in the Structure Plan in Appendix 15.1.7) is anticipated to provide in the vicinity of twenty years supply of 'dry' industrial land for the district. However, the actual take up of this land will depend upon the prevailing economic and market conditions. A flexible approach to the timing of infrastructural development of this area is therefore needed.

Add the following amendments to standard 10.8.4B: Landscaping:

10.8.4B LANDSCAPING IN THE INDUSTRIAL 2 ZONE (IRONGATE) AND FOR INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES IN THE DEFERRED INDUSTRIAL 2 ZONE (IRONGATE) AND LOTS 1 & 2 DP 367052, 1229 MARAEKAKAHO ROAD (Industrial 6)

- (1) Front Yards - except those fronting the Southern Expressway:
 - (a) The full length of each frontage of the site (excluding vehicle entrances) shall be landscaped for a minimum width of 2.

With the reason for these decisions being:

- (1) That it is appropriate to allow the requested Industrial 6 rezoning through this Plan Change process as the request is logical in relation to adjoining land and the request has been supported by all adjoining and opposite landowners and has not been opposed through the further submission process.
- (2) That the site can be serviced by onsite means, meaning there will be no additional cost of increasing the servicing requirements. Further to this the Industrial 6 Zone is based on the provision of on site services.
- (3) That rezoning Lot 1 & 2 DP 367052 (1229 Maraekakaho Road) Industrial 6 will not be detrimental to the integrity of Plan Change 50, as it is a relatively small segment of land, which is located over unproductive soils with strong physical boundaries in the southern expressway and Maraekakaho Road. Further to this the Industrial 6 land will form a clear southern boundary to the Industrial 2 (Irongate) Zone.
- (4) The amendments to table 15.1.8.1 (Subdivision Minimum Site Sizes) of the Plan, ensure that the site to be rezoned Industrial 6, does not have increased subdivision potential in comparison to the remainder of the Irongate Industrial rezoning, by being able to have a minimum site size of 1,000m² (the minimum applying to other Industrial 6 land). A minimum site size of 3 hectares enables the stated intent of the submissions of Tumu Timbers and Navillusio Holdings Ltd of having additional land available to expand their own timber manufacturing activities onsite. This 3ha minimum site size also mitigates the effects of this additional area of rezoned land on the uptake of land, to which reticulated utility service infrastructure is to be provided to, within the Industrial 2 (Irongate) Zone.
- (5) The amendments to the access provisions within the subdivision assessment criteria ensure that development of Lot 1 & 2 DP 367052 (1229 Maraekakaho Road) will be accessed off the existing entranceway and no new access can be created off Maraekakaho Road.
- (6) That accepting the submission of Tumu Timbers and Navillusio Holdings Ltd will ensure that their site has a consistent zoning of Industrial 6, rather than the 3 separate zonings that were proposed under Plan Change 50 as notified.
- (7) The range of activities on the additional industrial 6 rezoning has been limited to that of what is already occurring on the existing Tumu Timbers site, being timber milling, treatment, storage, sales and sales of building supplies.

Issue 10 - Replace the word 'yard' with greenbelt, restrict side yards to only containing greenspace.

Recommendations and Reasons

- (A) That the submission of Hawke's Bay Fruitgrowers Association (Submission 17) relating to yard spaces and buffer areas be **REJECTED IN PART** insofar as yard spaces are not prevented from being used for parking or storage space; but **ACCEPTED IN PART** insofar as the Plan is amended as shown under (C) below to required maintenance access for the required shelterbelt within the property on which it is planted.
- (B) That the further submission of Rick Cranswick (Further Submission 5) in opposition to the submission of the Hawke's Bay Fruitgrowers Association be **ACCEPTED** insofar as yard spaces are not prevented from being used for parking or storage space.
- (C) With the following alteration to section 10.8 of the District Plan (where added text is shown in bold underlined text):

10.8.4B LANDSCAPING IN THE INDUSTRIAL 2 ZONE (IRONGATE) AND FOR INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES IN THE DEFERRED INDUSTRIAL 2 ZONE (IRONGATE).

(2) Front Yards fronting the Southern Expressway and

Side and Rear Yards adjoining Plains zoned land:

(e) The shelterbelt shall be maintained so that:

(i) the branches do not extend over the boundary; and

(ii) its height does not exceed the distance the shelterbelt is from the boundary plus 4 metres

(e.g. at a distance of 5 metres from the boundary, the height limit is 9 metres; at a distance of 9 metres from the boundary, the height limit is 13 metres).

iii) That the shelterbelt must be capable of being fully maintained from within the site it is located

With the reason for these decisions being:

- (1) That the proposed rules are considered suitable for protecting the amenity of Plains Zone properties and preventing conflicts from occurring between the differing land uses. The removal of car parks from the side and rear yards would not be an efficient use of industrial land and is not necessary with regards to mitigating potential adverse effects.
- (2) That consistency throughout the District Plan should be retained by the retention of the word 'side yard' in the Industrial 2 (Irongate) Zone.

- (3) **That shelterbelts need to be fully maintained from the property they are located within and the above rule change will ensure that this expectation is met.**

Issue 11 - Restrict types of plant species for shelterbelts to more durable species.

Recommendations and Reasons

- (A) That the submission of Hawke's Bay Fruitgrowers Association (Submission 17) be **ACCEPTED IN PART** insofar as the standard 10.8.4B of the District Plan is amended as follows (added text is shown in bold and underlined):

10.8.4B LANDSCAPING IN THE INDUSTRIAL 2 ZONE (IRONGATE) AND FOR INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES IN THE DEFERRED INDUSTRIAL 2 ZONE (IRONGATE).

(2) Front Yards fronting the Southern Expressway and Side and Rear Yards adjoining Plains zoned land:

(a) A shelterbelt shall be established and maintained along the entire length of each boundary fronting the Southern Expressway or adjoining Plains Zoned land.

(b) The shelterbelt **on each boundary fronting the Southern Expressway** shall consist of one of the following tree species:

- Poplar varieties
- Pittosporum varieties
- Beech – Fagus sylvatica
- ~~Conifer – Cupressus glabra~~
- Salix varieties

(c) **The shelterbelt on any boundary adjoining Plains Zoned land shall consist of one of the following tree species:**

- **Sheoak - Casuarina**
- **Cryptomeria**

With the reason for this decisions being:

- (1) That a number of the shelterbelt species listed in the Plan Change, are known to harbour orchard pests known to affect production of pip fruit. It is therefore considered that the species which adjoin Plains Zoned sites should be restricted to those that are known not to harbour pests which are damaging to adjoining orcharding activities. The species indicated as best suited are Casuarinas and Cryptomeria.
- (2) That shelterbelts adjoining the Expressway will have less impact on neighbouring Plains Zoned activities. This is because the Expressway will provide a large buffer zone from neighbouring orchards, and this boundary is located on the eastern side of the Expressway, therefore prevailing winds will not carry airborne pests across the Expressway.

Therefore a greater variance of shelterbelt species will still be permitted along the Expressway boundary to enhance amenity. Conifers have been removed from the species list as if they are allowed to grow to large heights, airborne pests may still create problems in that they will be able to be carried further.

- (3) That given there are multiple provisions to ensure that shelterbelts are maintained to an appropriate standard, these will ensure that shelterbelts do not become unruly, even if a species which is difficult to maintain is planted.**