

Reader's Guide

Private Plan Change 9: Brookvale East was notified on 4 October 2025, with the submission period being open through to 4 November 2025.

This document is a summary of those submissions and further submissions and the relief sought/requested. The submission points have been ordered by submission topic. This enables you as a reader to read all of the submission points that relate to each other. Should you wish to read a submission in its entirety, refer to the submissions list on the Council website ([Private Plan Change 9 - Brookvale East | Hastings District Council](#)).

Within this document, each submitter has been allocated a submitter number. Alongside this each submission point is referenced by a unique reference number.

How to read this summary

The submission points in this document are ordered by topic. Each submission point has a unique number. A submitter's entire submission can be read on Council's website.

The document may include abbreviations. These, and their meanings, include:

- HDC – Hastings District Council
- LUC – Land Use Classification
- HPL – Highly Productive Land
- PC9 – Plan Change 9: Brookvale East
- RMA – Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMITTERS

Submission Number	Submitter	Contact Details
1	Conrad and Verena Waitoa	conrad@iakomaori.nz
2	Sam Newbigin	sam@newbigin.nz
3	Gerald Mulinder	gtmul@orcon.net.nz
4	Pip and Dan Taylor	piptaylor2014@gmail.com
5	CDL Land New Zealand Limited	emma.howie@woods.co.nz
6	Paul Maurice Stevenson	pmstevenson@xtra.co.nz
7	Landsdale Developments Ltd	matthew.holder@developmentnous.nz
8	Tony & Suzy Martin	tonysuzymartin@outlook.com

Topics

This document categorises submission points received into relevant topics. These topics are as follows:

Topic	Page Number
1. Traffic Impacts	4
2. Stormwater	6
3. Soil Contamination	8
4. Highly Productive Land	9
5. Infrastructure	9
6. Cultural Values	11
7. Reverse Sensitivity	12
8. Zone Extent	12
9. Amenity	13
10. Construction Impacts	13
11. Structure Plan	14
12. Residential Development	15
13. Consultation	15
14. Staging	16
15. Commercial Services	16

1. Traffic Impacts

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with amendment	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S1.1	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<p><u>Safety and capacity on Davidson Road and Brookvale Road</u></p> <p>The ITA identifies Davidson and Brookvale as Secondary Collectors, noting very low existing volumes on Davidson and modest volumes on Brookvale, with forecast growth requiring urbanisation and frontage upgrades. It also relies on Council's Brookvale Road Development projects, including upgrades at Napier Road and Thompson Road. These works must be specific, funded, and delivered alongside any staging east of Davidson Road to avoid safety and capacity deficits for existing residents who rely on both roads for access. Rooding solutions should reflect care for people and place, ensuring movement occurs safely and harmoniously within the landscape and supports the long-term wellbeing of the community.</p>	<p>Approve with Amendment</p> <p>Urban-standard frontage and intersection upgrades on Brookvale and Davidson Road as a precondition to development east of Davidson Road.</p>
S1.2	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<p><u>Intersection safety and local speed environment</u></p> <p>The ITA confirms the need to urbanise the Brookvale Road / Davidson Road intersection and manage sight distances, including for any new intersection from Area E to Brookvale Road near existing curves and the 50 km/h threshold. Without binding design controls and traffic calming, increased traffic will heighten risk at this rural-form intersection and along the curved approaches. Intersection design should preserve the calm and balance of the area, protecting the lives and dignity of those who travel through while maintaining the natural character of the surrounding land.</p>	<p>Approve with Amendment</p> <p>Urban-standard frontage and intersection upgrades on Brookvale and Davidson Road as a precondition to development east of Davidson Road.</p>
S1.3	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<p><u>Walking, cycling, and public-transport readiness</u></p> <p>The proposal shows shared-path extensions and a crossing of Davidson Road at the back-to-back curves. Safe path continuity, controlled crossing design, and speed management at that location must be required up-front. The ITA also notes that current bus access is limited, with plans indicating a trunk service along</p>	<p>Approve with Amendment</p>

		Brookvale and Arataki. Any early-stage occupancies should deliver bus-ready infrastructure on Brookvale Road, ensuring that future service changes are viable from day one. Well-connected, low-impact transport options strengthen the health of both people and the environment and should form a core part of any early investment.	Controlled crossings and shared-path links are delivered in the initial stages.
S4.4	Oppose	<p><u>Construction Impacts on Neighbours</u></p> <p>As directly opposite neighbours, we are very concerned about years of disturbance from construction noise, heavy vehicles, dust and vibration.</p> <p>Sections 16 and 17 of the Resource Management Act require the avoidance or mitigation of unreasonable noise and adverse effects. We ask that these effects be fully assessed and mitigated before any rezoning is granted.</p>	<p>Decline</p> <p>If granted, Strict construction management conditions be applied to protect neighbours' amenity. Strict limits on construction hours (weekday daytime only), mandatory dust suppression and vibration monitoring, advance notice to residents of major works and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) before any works commence</p>
S4.7	Oppose	<p>Brookvale Road already experiences high traffic volumes from local residents, school traffic, cyclists and service vehicles. A large retirement village and residential development will significantly increase this, increasing safety risks, especially during the construction period.</p> <p>We request that no access be allowed from Brookvale Road. If the proposal proceeds, the main access should be from Davidson Road, where there are no houses at present and therefore there is less direct residential impact.</p>	<p>Decline</p> <p>If granted, no access be allowed from Brookvale Road.</p> <p>Main site access be via Davidson Road, not Brookvale Road.</p>

S4.8	Oppose	Cumulative impacts from new developments in the wider Havelock North area (including the Middle Road/Iona area) may exceed the capacity of existing infrastructure and roads.	Decline If granted, comprehensive traffic and environmental assessments be completed.
S8.1	Support with Amendment	We are concerned about the current 100 km/h speed limit directly outside our property, particularly given how close this stretch of road is to the 50 km/h residential zone. With the additional traffic generated by both the Brookvale East and Arataki Extension developments, the transition from 50 km/h to 100 km/h within such a short distance feels unsafe. We strongly suggest that Council review and lower the speed limit on this section of Brookvale Road to reflect the increasing residential activity and traffic volumes.	Approve with amendment Lowering the speed limit along Brookvale Road near the residential zone
S8.2	Support with Amendment	Even before these developments proceed, the eastern (country) end of Brookvale Road is already hazardous for walkers, runners, and cyclists, as there is no dedicated footpath or cycleway. With an expected increase in residents seeking the lifestyle benefits of this semi-rural area, it is likely many will use Brookvale Road for recreation or to access nearby areas by foot or bike. We ask that Council consider the provision of a shared pathway or safe pedestrian/cyclist route between Brookvale East and Thompson Road to ensure safety and accessibility for all users.	Approve with amendment Providing safe walking and cycling infrastructure to the Eastern end of Brookvale Road as part of your proposal.

2. Stormwater

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S1.4	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<u>Stormwater quality and Crombie Drain / Karituwhenua catchment</u> The S32 material and Structure Plan changes extend the Crombie Drain reserve and anticipate detention within it. Given the direct hydraulic linkage under Romanes Drive to Karituwhenua, stormwater design should achieve clear water-quality outcomes, sediment control, and cultural-health monitoring, recognising mana	Approve with Amendment

		whenua concerns flagged in the S32 regarding cumulative effects. Staged and updated Stormwater Management Plans are anticipated and should be finalised with performance standards for turbidity, metals, and gross pollutants. Water is a living system that sustains all life; therefore, stormwater design must respect its integrity, ensuring that the flow from Brookvale enhances rather than diminishes the life of downstream waterways.	Enforceable stormwater and water-quality performance standards for Crombie Drain and downstream receiving environments.
S2.1	Support with Amendment	I have no objection to the rezoning of this land. My concern is that sufficient land or provision has been made for stormwater management. I am aware that a close neighbour is in dispute with the HDC over compulsory acquisition of their land under the Public Works Act to provide for stormwater management. It would appear that this was an after thought once the block of neighbouring land was rezoned rather than have that included in the original application to rezone the land. Is there sufficient stormwater management area provided in this application so that the neighbours will not be affected by stormwater runoff or have the HDC try to acquire our land under the Public Works Act (or any similar act that I may not be aware of) at a later date?	Approve with amendment. That sufficient stormwater management land has been put aside so that neighbours are not affected by stormwater runoff and that the HDC will not try to forcibly acquire our land at a later date.
S3.2	Support with Amendment	We don't want excessive storm water or run off discharged towards our property, the water needs to be piped away from our property	Approve with amendment. Pipe Stormwater away from 134 Thompson Road
S6.1	Oppose	My concerns regard water detention based on my previous experience of not having my voice heard. I oppose this submission based on a lack of water detention in this whole area and am concerned that more of my land be taken without my knowledge due to unfair process. That Council do not give approval for this submission on the grounds that water detention ponds are already inadequate in this area. The Karamu Creek is already under pressure if a major event was to take place.	Decline
S7.3	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<u>Stormwater / Crombie Drain Capacity</u> The 28 m Crombie Drain Reserve is the trunk corridor for the entire Structure Plan catchment. There is still outstanding work being undertaken by the council which properly defines the required area of land necessary to achieve the current outcomes of the structure plan, notwithstanding a greater level of development is now	Approve with Amendment Require the integrated SMP to

		<p>proposed ahead of this being resolved for areas A and B as defined by the current structure plan. Therefore, the proposed “updated, integrated Stormwater Management Plan” must retain sufficient detention and conveyance capacity for Areas A and B and not allow Area D/E to occupy that capacity prematurely. Three options have been presented as part of the servicing report prepared by Strata Group. It would be expected that a confirmed solution is selected at the time of structure planning, which does not presently appear to be the case, and therefore appears to remain unresolved.</p> <p>One of the options presented (Option 3) intends to utilise land outside of the proposed structure plan area on Plains Production land. This discrepancy with the Structure Plan requires resolution.</p> <p>None of the proposed stormwater solutions have been tested through detailed 1d and/or 2d modelling to properly assess the impacts of the proposed solutions, including the assessment of backwater effects from the Karamu and Karituwhenua catchments to the west, as well as the Taco Stream to the east, which is physically disconnected from the Crombie Drain at present. It is suggested that the solutions presented are tested to assess these dynamic influences and effects.</p> <p>No assessment of stormwater quality management have been provided. This requires consideration and incorporation into a proposed structure plan solution.</p> <p>Should there be any required modification to the Drain where it has detrimental effects on Landsdale’s land and development this needs to be properly defined and understood. Landsdale wish that this be confirmed. All actual or adverse effects on Landsdale should be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p>	<p>demonstrate adequate Crombie Drain capacity for all Structure Plan areas and how the identified stormwater detention area can be developed without adverse effect of Landsdale and other landowners in the area.</p>
--	--	---	---

3. Soil Contamination

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S1.5	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<p><u>Contamination and NESCS management</u></p> <p>The Detailed Site Investigation identifies HAIL activities, including historical sheds, chicken houses, and a burn pile with arsenic marginally above the NES high-density residential at one location. Trace chrysotile asbestos was detected in one composite sample within guideline limits. Development must require verified NESCS compliance, a discovery protocol, and disposal pathways for soils that exceed background or ecological guideline values (e.g., zinc exceedance) before bulk earthworks commence. Land carries memory and vitality; remediation should restore balance and health to the soil before construction proceeds to ensure a safe and enduring foundation for future residents.</p>	<p>Approve with Amendment</p> <p>Certified contamination-management and discovery protocols before earthworks.</p>

4. Highly Productive Land

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S1.6	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<p><u>Productive-land context and the necessity of rezoning</u></p> <p>The land is LUC 3S1, characterised by shallow stoniness and a shallow clay horizon, which limit productivity and uniform growth. Notably, there are no current irrigation consents, and HBRC is not issuing new ones, making commercial horticulture unsuitable. This supports rezoning in this location rather than displacing higher-class soils elsewhere. This must be transparently recognised in the decision and monitoring to align with national policy intent and the FDS. Land-use decisions should respect the natural limits and potential of the whenua, ensuring future development sustains rather than depletes the balance between people, soil, and water.</p>	<p>Approve with Amendment</p> <p>Recognition of the limited productive value of LUC 3S1 soils to inform balanced rezoning decisions.</p>
S4.5	Oppose	<p>It also conflicts with the Hastings District Plan, the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land, and the amenity provisions of the Resource Management Act.</p> <p><u>Inconsistency with Planning Policy</u></p> <p>The Plains Production Zone is intended to protect versatile land for primary production and avoid irreversible loss of productive soils.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (2022) requires councils to protect such land from urban development.</p> <p>This rezoning would conflict with both.</p>	Decline

5. Infrastructure

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S1.7	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<p><u>Staging dependencies and infrastructure certainty</u></p> <p>The S32 report proposes that no occupation in Area D occurs until a new wastewater pump station is available or an alternative solution is provided. That condition must be strengthened, with equivalent certainty for all critical network upgrades, including roading, stormwater detention, and intersection works, before titles or CCC are issued. Development should occur only when the environment, infrastructure, and community</p>	<p>Approve with Amendment</p> <p>Infrastructure staging is tied to readiness and</p>

		systems are ready to receive it, ensuring growth takes place in a way that is measured, balanced, and enduring.	capacity to avoid premature occupation.
S4.8	Oppose	Cumulative impacts from new developments in the wider Havelock North area (including the Middle Road/Iona area) may exceed the capacity of existing infrastructure and roads.	Decline If granted, comprehensive traffic and environmental assessments be completed.
S7.1	Oppose / Support with Amendment	Landsdale Developments Ltd supports the orderly urban expansion of Brookvale but opposes PC9 unless modified to secure integrated servicing, fair capacity allocation, and the staging sequence that has previously established through the Environment Court. Landsdale is directly affected by PC9 because its land is within the same integrated servicing network (stormwater, wastewater, transport). The Council's delay in delivering stormwater infrastructure has already constrained its development. PC9 changes servicing timing and priority in ways that could further delay or increase costs for Areas A and B.	Approve with Amendment Retain and strengthen Appendix 13B staging and servicing requirements to ensure that any adverse effects on Landsdale are adequately avoided, remedied and /or mitigated.
S7.4	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<u>Wastewater Pump Station Sequencing</u> Rule 8.2.6G links occupation in Area D to availability of a new pump station but does not appear to provide no mechanism to guarantee capacity for earlier stages. A parallel control should confirm equitable timing and allocation for Areas A and B. The costs sharing associated with this should also be clarified, as should the point of discharge to the network within the Structure Plan.	Approve with Amendment Amend Rule 8.2.6G to ensure equitable pump-station capacity and timing for Areas A and B.
S7.6	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<u>Fairness and Cost Sharing</u> Landsdale has already borne delays and cost due to Council's servicing program. PC9 must not shift infrastructure burdens or re-prioritise delivery to the detriment of Landsdale.	Approve with Amendment Provide

			transparent, equitable infrastructure cost-sharing across the Structure Plan area.
S8.3	Support with Amendment	We understand the new development includes an upgrade to the wastewater system extending up to approximately 161 Brookvale Road. We would appreciate clarification on whether properties beyond this point, such as ours at 185 Brookvale Road, will have the opportunity to connect to the new system in future.	Approve with amendment Clarifying access to wastewater connections for neighbouring properties

6. Cultural Values

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S1.8	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<u>Te ao Māori values and kaitiakitanga</u> The S32 acknowledges engagement with mana whenua and concerns about cumulative sedimentation. The Plan Change should embed requirements for cultural health indicators for the Crombie Drain and for partnership approaches to stormwater and erosion controls during earthworks. This responds to obligations to actively protect taonga and waterways through practical conditions and monitoring.	Approve with Amendment The Plan Change should embed requirements for cultural health indicators for the Crombie Drain and for partnership approaches to stormwater and erosion controls during earthworks.

7. Reverse Sensitivity

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S3.1	Support with Amendment	We own the land 16.8Hec that boundaries some of this block of land in question. We support the change, with the condition's that our orcharding operation is unhindered. We don't want the situation where we are forced to cease our operation as has happened across the road at the mushroom factory where the new activity encroached on their operation then homeowners and or residents complained and shut his operation down, which was hugely unfair and unjust. The mushroom farm was there long before houses where put there.	Approve with amendment. That the re zoning goes through with the condition not to hinder our current land use as a functioning orchard operation with trucks, tractors spraying machines and other machinery any time of the day or night.

8. Zone Extent

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S3.3	Support with Amendment	We would be very happy to have our land considered for re zoning residential at this time.	Approve with amendment. Rezone 134 Thompson Road for residential.

9. Amenity

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S4.1	Oppose	As immediate neighbours at 144 Brookvale Road, we are concerned about the loss of our semi-rural outlook, privacy, the impact of years of construction activity directly opposite our home and traffic safety. The recent Middle Road/Iona development has already demonstrated how large-scale projects can cause long-term disruption and amenity loss for nearby residents. This proposal risks repeating those mistakes.	Decline
S4.2	Oppose	<u>Building Height and Amenity</u> We strongly oppose any buildings higher than single storey. Multi-storey buildings would block sunlight, dominate the streetscape, and compromise privacy and the semi-rural outlook enjoyed by existing homes. The District Plan's amenity objectives (Sections 8.2–8.3) aim to maintain privacy, outlook and character. This proposal would undermine those values. We ask that these effects be fully assessed and mitigated before any rezoning is granted.	Decline If granted, all buildings be limited to single storey (max 5m height) and a substantial landscaped buffer be established along Brookvale Road.
S4.3	Oppose	<u>Loss of Semi-Rural Character</u> Rezoning this land from productive rural use to intensive residential will permanently erode the semi-rural character of the Brookvale area. Residents currently enjoy open space, light and rural views - all of which contribute to wellbeing and property value. This proposal represents unnecessary urban sprawl inconsistent with the Hastings District Plan and the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (Section 5 - sustainable management). We ask that these effects be fully assessed and mitigated before any rezoning is granted.	Decline

10. Construction Impacts

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S4.4	Oppose	<u>Construction Impacts on Neighbours</u> As directly opposite neighbours, we are very concerned about years of disturbance from construction noise, heavy vehicles, dust and vibration. Sections 16 and 17 of the Resource Management Act require the avoidance or mitigation of unreasonable	Decline If granted, Strict construction management

		noise and adverse effects. We ask that these effects be fully assessed and mitigated before any rezoning is granted.	conditions be applied to protect neighbours' amenity. Strict limits on construction hours (weekday daytime only), mandatory dust suppression and vibration monitoring, advance notice to residents of major works and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) before any works commence
--	--	--	---

11. Structure Plan

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S4.6	Oppose	The proposal lacks the comprehensive structure planning, consultation, and infrastructure assessment that supported the Iona/ Middle Road Residential rezoning. The Middle Road/Iona development has shown how large-scale rezoning and subdivision can create years of construction activity, traffic disruption, and loss of amenity for surrounding residents. Council should take those impacts into account before permitting another major development on the opposite side of Havelock North.	Decline
S5.4	Support	CDL considers that continued coordination between developers in the area, Hastings District Council, and Hawkes Bay Regional Council will be important to ensure that infrastructure, transport connections, and urban design outcomes are aligned and that growth is delivered in a well-sequenced manner.	Approve
S7.5	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<u>Structure Plan Integrity and Staging</u> Appendix 13B requires development in general accordance with staging and integrated servicing. These provisions must remain so that later rezonings cannot undermine the logical and well-ordered progression	Approve with Amendment

		endorsed by the Environment Court. Landsdale should not be adversely affected (both economically and infrastructurally) in terms of this staging in achieving the orderly and currently permitted development of this area.	Insert a policy in Section 8.2 ensuring logical and well-ordered progression of development consistent with Appendix 13B.
--	--	---	---

12. Residential Development

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S5.1	Support	CDL supports the intent and direction of the Brookvale East Plan Change as it complements and reinforces the planned pattern of residential development along the eastern edge of Havelock North.	Approve

13. Consultation

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S3.4	Support with Amendment	We wish to be completely kept in the loop on any issue which may affect our property and ourselves as landowners.	Approve with amendment.
S5.2	Support	CDL confirms that Section 6.6 of the Plan Change Request Application correctly records the engagement that has occurred between Metlifecare and CDL to date.	Approve
S5.3	Support	CDL also acknowledges the ongoing dialogue between the two parties continues in a constructive and collaborative manner, reflecting a shared commitment to ensuring integrated outcomes for the broader Havelock North area.	Approve
S7.2	Oppose / Support with Amendment	Landsdale have not been formally consulted as part of this plan change prior to its notification.	Approve with Amendment

14. Staging

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S7.1	Oppose / Support with Amendment	<p>Landsdale Developments Ltd supports the orderly urban expansion of Brookvale but opposes PC9 unless modified to secure integrated servicing, fair capacity allocation, and the staging sequence that has previously established through the Environment Court.</p> <p>Landsdale is directly affected by PC9 because its land is within the same integrated servicing network (stormwater, wastewater, transport). The Council's delay in delivering stormwater infrastructure has already constrained its development. PC9 changes servicing timing and priority in ways that could further delay or increase costs for Areas A and B.</p>	Approve with Amendment Retain and strengthen Appendix 13B staging and servicing requirements to ensure that any adverse effects on Landsdale are adequately avoided, remedied and /or mitigated.

15. Commercial Services

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S8.4	Support with Amendment	<p>With more than a thousand new households expected across the Brookvale East and Arataki developments, we feel it is important to provide local amenities to support this growing community.</p> <p>Facilities such as a service station, dairy, or small food market located along Napier Road would significantly enhance convenience for residents and reduce the need for frequent travel into town for basic needs.</p>	Approve with amendment Planning for appropriate local amenities to support the growing population