

HortNZ submissions and further submissions – Hearing 3 Strategic objectives

Sub point	Provision	Submission	S42A Report Ref and Rec.	LPW Evidence Ref and Planning response
FS1168.29	Strategic Direction Chapter – Urban Growth	Support Hamilton City Council 535.5 Amend 1.12.1 to be clear how district will accommodate growth	Section 5 Reject	Section 6 Pg 5 Ensure that the policy framework considers the effects of urban growth on rural production activities are considered when future growth areas assessed.
FS1168.30	Strategic Direction Chapter – Natural Environment 1.12.2	Support Federated Farmers 680.20 to amend 1.12.2	Section 8 Reject	Section 7 Pg 5 Amend as per Federated Farmers submission to better reflect s6 of the RMA.
419.100 FS1168.31	Strategic Direction Chapter – Strategic objectives 1.12.8	HortNZ sought recognition of rural production activities in strategic direction. Support Federated Farmers 680.22 to amend 1.12.8	Section 11 Accept Recommend that 5.1.1 be moved to 1.13.3	Section 8 Pg 6 Recommended amendments to 1.12.2 partially address the issue through recognition of rural production activities. But doesn't address interaction between growth and rural community. Seek that 1.12.2 includes: <i>Plan for future development and growth that supports the district's rural communities and rural economy.</i>
FS1168.32	Chapter 4 Urban Environment – 4.1.1 Objective – Strategic	Support Housing NZ Corp 749.94 to emphasise need for compact urban model concentrating growth around existing towns and villages and avoid fragmentation of rural land	Section 13 Reject Recommend that 4.1.1 be moved to 1.13.2	Section 9 Pg 7 Recognise the rural/ urban interface in Objective 4.1.1 to ensure that urban development is cognisant of the effect on the rural area.
419.101 FS1168.33 FS1168.34	Chapter 4 Urban Environment – 4.1.2 Objective – Urban Growth and Development	HortNZ sought that the objective be retained Support Housing NZ Corp 749.95 to emphasise need for compact urban form	Section 14 Accept	Section 10 Pg 8 Support the recommended addition to Obj 4.1.2 but also need to consider the rural/urban interface.
419.85 FS1168.35 FS1168.36	Chapter 4 Urban Environment – 4.1.3 Policy - Location of Development	HortNZ sought that the policy include avoiding development on high class soils. Support Housing NZ Corp 749.96 avoid urban subdivision in rural environment where possible	Section 15 Reject	Section 11 Pg 8 No recognition of rural/ urban interface in Urban Environment chapter. Support inclusion of new clause in 4.1.3 to avoid urban development on high class soils.
419.102 FS1168.37 FS1168.38	Chapter 4 Urban Environment – 4.1.10 Policy - Tuakau	HortNZ sought that reverse sensitivity effects on farming and horticulture be avoided.	Section 22 Reject	Section 12 Pg 9 Amend 4.1.10 by adding <i>farming and horticulture</i> to 4.1.10 a) ii):

Sub point	Provision	Submission	S42A Report Ref and Rec.	LPW Evidence Ref and Planning response
FS1168.39		Supported Federated Farmers 680.53 Balle Bros 466.34 and NZ Pork 197.1		<i>Existing farming and horticulture, intensive farming, strategic infrastructure and industrial activities are protected from the effects of reverse sensitivity by considering the location of new residential development</i>
419.87 FS1168.41	Chapter 4 Urban Environment – 4.7.2 Policy – Subdivision location and design	HortNZ sought that the policy address the rural/urban interface Supported Balle Bros 466.38 that sought inclusion of reverse sensitivity	Section 33 Accept Recommends amending 4.7.2 to recognise urban/ rural interface but not reverse sensitivity	Section 13 Pg 11 Amend 4.7.2 to include reverse sensitivity or rural production activities: <i>Be sympathetic to the natural and physical qualities and characteristics of the surrounding environment including <u>the urban/ rural interface and reverse sensitivity effects</u> <u>the strategic transport infrastructure networks, and regionally significant industry, and rural production activities.</u></i>
419.888 FS1168.42 FS1168.43	Chapter 4 Urban Environment – 4.7.4 Policy – Lot sizes	HortNZ sought that encouraged intensification of urban areas rather than urban sprawl on to rural production land Supported Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller 751.1 and The Surveying Company 746.97 that sought to amend Section 4.7.4 Policy Lot sizes.	Section 35 Reject Recommends an amendment but not as sought by HortNZ.	Section 14 Pg 12 Amend 4.7.4: <i>Minimum lot size, <u>shape</u> and dimension of lots <u>taking in consideration setbacks from hazards and natural features, and slope</u> <u>and the rural zone boundaries</u> enables the achievement of the character and density outcomes of each zone.</i>
419.89	Chapter 4 Urban Environment – 4.7.7 Policy – Achieving sufficient development density to support the provision of infrastructure services	HortNZ sought that encouraged intensification of urban areas rather than urban sprawl on to rural production land.	Section 38 Reject	Section 15 Pg 13 Inclusion of an urban outcome in the policy framework to provide for intensification of urban areas rather than encroaching onto rural production land. This could be in Policy 4.7.4 as sought above or alternatively added to 4.7.7.
419.90 FS1168.45 FS1168.46	Chapter 4 Urban Environment – 4.7.11 Policy – Reverse sensitivity	HortNZ sought that reverse sensitivity effects on farming and horticulture be included. Supported Balle Bros 466.39 Opposed Perry Group 464.7	Section 42 Reject	Section 16 Pg 14 Amend Policy 4.7.11 Reverse sensitivity as follows: (a) <i>Development and subdivision design (including use of topographical and other methods) minimises the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent sites.</i>

Sub point	Provision	Submission	S42A Report Ref and Rec.	LPW Evidence Ref and Planning response
		Opposed S & T Hopkins 451.4 (FS not in S42a Report) Opposed Havelock Village Ltd 862.21 (S & FS not in S42a Report)		<i>adjacent activities. or the wider environment; and</i> <i>(b) Avoid potential reverse sensitivity effects of locating new dwellings <u>sensitive land uses in the vicinity of farming including horticulture, intensive farming, extraction industry or industrial activity and strategic infrastructure. Minimise Mitigate the potential for reverse sensitivity effects through design of the activity where avoidance is not reasonably possible is not practicable.</u></i>
419.91	Chapter 4 Urban Environment – 4.714 Policy – Structure and master planning	HortNZ sought that Policy 4.7.14 to ensure that the urban/rural interface was considered as part of Structure and Master Planning.	Section 45 Reject	Section 17 Pg 16 Add to Policy 4.7.14. 'and addresses issues at the rural/urban interface'
419.92 FS1168.48 FS1168.49 FS1168.50 FS1168.51	Rural Environment 5.1 Strategic objective – the Rural environment and 5.1.1 Objective – The rural environment	HortNZ sought that countryside living be managed in the rural environment. Supported Federated Farmers 680.56 Supported NZ Pork 197.4 Supported Balle Bros 466.40 Supported Federated Farmers 680.55	Section 46 Reject Recommends moving 5.1.1 to 1.13.3 but not amending as sought.	Section 18 Pg 17 <i>Strategic Objective - Rural Environment 1.13.3</i> <i>(c) Subdivision use and development within the rural environment where:</i> <i>i. High class soils are protected for productive rural activities;</i> <i>ii. Productive rural activities are supported, while maintaining or enhancing the rural environment ;</i> <i>iii. Urban subdivision, use and development in the rural environment is avoided;</i> <i>iv. <u>Countryside living is directed to defined locations and the effects of scattered countryside living on rural production are avoided.</u></i>

Key issues:

Rural/urban interface

Location of urban development – intensification rather than urban sprawl onto rural production land

Reverse sensitivity

Countryside living in rural environment