

Appendix 1 – Summary of Engagement Undertaken in the Preparation of PC25

This appendix summarises the pre-notification engagement undertaken by Council staff during the development of PC25. This includes broad community engagement and targeted engagement with key stakeholders and Mana Whenua and Iwi.

Contents

General statement:	2
1. Elected Members, Community Board Members, and Ward Committee Members.....	3
2. Mana Whenua and Iwi	7
3. Statutory Bodies.....	14
4. Adjoining Councils and Regional Council	14
5. Network Utility Operators	15
6. Industry Groups	17
7. Interested landowner parties (adjoining property owners)	22
8. Internal Waipā District Council Teams.....	26
9. Wider Rural Community	26
Attachments:	27
Attachment A - Draft PC25 plan provisions ('July 2024 Version')	27
Attachment B - Council responses to Have Your Say Feedback.....	27
Attachment C - Analysis of significant views from Marae to Maunga/Awa.....	27
Attachment D - PC25 Draft Provisions and Recommendations ('January 2025 Version')	27

General statement:

Through the preparation of PC25, the information listed below was made publicly available via a dedicated webpage for PC25:

- The background and reasoning for PC25;
- A set of draft planning provisions and an information sheet;
- A link to the 'Have Your Say' page for people to provide their comments and ask questions;
- A webinar that set out the objectives of PC25 and responded to questions received through the engagement period;
- Council's staff responses to the feedback received; and
- An updated set of draft planning provisions as a result of the feedback.

In addition to the broad community engagement, targeted engagement was undertaken with the following groups:

1. Elected Members, Community Board Members, and Ward Committee Members;
2. Mana Whenua and Iwi;
3. Minister for the Environment and Statutory Bodies;
4. Adjoining Councils and Regional Council;
5. Network Utility Operators;
6. Industry Groups;
7. Interested landowner parties;
8. Council's Transportation Team; and
9. Rural community in general.

Details of the targeted engagement is set out below:

1. Elected Members, Community Board Members, and Ward Committee Members

Elected Members, Community Board Members, and Ward Committee Members		
Date	Group	Commentary
6 August 2024	Elected Members Workshop	The purpose of the workshop was to inform Council’s Elected Members of the draft PC25 provisions prepared by staff (refer to Attachment A); and to understand elected members’ level of comfort with these provisions before they were publicly shared as part of stakeholder engagement. Elected Members supported the commencing of engagement on the draft planning provisions but directed that staff broaden the scope of engagement to include entire rural community in addition to Mana Whenua and Iwi and key stakeholders. A Communications Plan was developed with Council’s Communication Team prior to the commencement of pre-notification engagement. The pre-notification engagement period commenced on 9 September 2024, with the PC25 webpage (including links to all relevant information) and the “Have Your Say” survey both being made live on this date. The engagement period closed on 18 October 2024. <u>Actions:</u> Staff to update to Elected Members once the engagement period was completed and all feedback received and analysed.
3 September 2024	Pirongia Ward Consultative Committee meeting	Staff introduced draft PC25, outlining the purpose of the plan change and discussing and seeking feedback from the Ward Committee on the initial draft provision set (refer to Attachment A). <u>Discussion at the meeting related to:</u> - The impacts of the draft plan change on existing shelterbelts, in particular whether existing shelterbelts would have to comply with any proposed / new rules; - Proposed height controls;

Elected Members, Community Board Members, and Ward Committee Members		
Date	Group	Commentary
		- Proposed shading rules for shelterbelts; - The use of white coloured cloth; and - And the maintenance of the cloth material. <u>The Ward Committee provided the following formal feedback:</u> - For those residents with an elevated view, the use of the colour white for material is not the best choice of colour; and - Concern in relation to the heights of existing shelterbelts. <u>Actions:</u> Staff to update the Ward Committee once the engagement period was completed and all feedback received and analysed.
12 September 2024	Cambridge Community Board Meeting	Staff introduced draft PC25, outlining the purpose of the plan change and discussing and seeking feedback from the Community Board on the initial draft provision set (refer to Attachment A). <u>Discussion at the meeting related to:</u> - Setbacks in rural vs urban zones; - Shade cloth colours; - Standards for maintenance of cloth; - Consultation with industry representatives; - Comparisons to other councils in similar circumstances; and - Road user safety and shade restrictions. The Community Board did not provide formal feedback on PC25, although they asked that staff provide an update on the results of the engagement period.

Elected Members, Community Board Members, and Ward Committee Members		
Date	Group	Commentary
		<u>Actions:</u> Staff to update the Community Board once the engagement period was completed and all feedback received and analysed.
25 September 2024	Te Awamutu & Kihikihi Community Board Meeting	Staff introduced draft PC25, outlining the purpose of the plan change and discussing and seeking feedback from the Community Board on the initial draft provision set (refer to Attachment A). <u>Discussion at the meeting related to:</u> ▪ Colour and permeability of materials; ▪ The 15m setback rule; ▪ Viewshafts; and ▪ Engagement date. The Community Board advised they would consider providing feedback at a later date. Staff offered to provide an update to the Community Board once the engagement period was completed, and all feedback received and analysed.
12 February 2025	Elected Members Workshop	The purpose of the workshop was to update the Elected Members on the progress of the draft PC25 since August 2024 and in particular outline: ▪ The key matters raised through the discussions with the JMA partners, NITOW, stakeholder groups, and the feedback from the community engagement; ▪ Revisions to the draft provision set made as a result of the community engagement (refer to Attachment D); and ▪ An outline of the next steps and actions needed to finalise the plan change documentation for notification purposes.

Elected Members, Community Board Members, and Ward Committee Members		
Date	Group	Commentary
		Feedback from Elected Members related to: ▪ Supporting the height and setback controls for shelterbelts rather than a shade rule; ▪ Confirmation of the proposed cloth colours to include transparent cloth on horizontal surfaces; ▪ Support for the reduction from a 15m to 6m setback for artificial crop structures; and ▪ Support for the retention and application of the Landscapes and Viewshaft provisions under Section 25 of the WDP to artificial crop structures.
19 February 2025	Cambridge Community Board Meeting	Staff provided an update to the Community Board on the progress of draft PC25 and outlined key changes to the draft ruleset following engagement and the recommended provisions being advanced: ▪ Removal of the shade rule and replaced with height and setback controls for shelterbelts; ▪ Reduction of the 15m setback to 6m for artificial crop structures; and ▪ Inclusion of transparent cloth for horizontal surfaces.
26 February 2025	Te Awamutu & Kihikihi Community Board Meeting	Staff provided an update to the Community Board on the progress of draft PC25 and outlined key changes to the draft ruleset following engagement and the recommended provisions being advanced: ▪ Removal of the shade rule and replaced with height and setback controls for shelterbelts; ▪ Reduction of the 15m setback to 6m for artificial crop structures; and ▪ Inclusion of transparent cloth for horizontal surfaces.
27 March 2025	Pirongia Ward Consultative Committee meeting	Staff provided an update to the Ward Committee on the progress of draft PC25 and outlined key changes to the draft ruleset following engagement and the recommended provisions being advanced: ▪ Removal of the shade rule and replaced with height and setback controls for shelterbelts; ▪ Reduction of the 15m setback to 6m for artificial crop structures; and ▪ Inclusion of transparent cloth for horizontal surfaces.

Elected Members, Community Board Members, and Ward Committee Members		
Date	Group	Commentary
		The Ward Committee questioned the status of existing or recently planted shelterbelts under any new provisions. Staff advised that the proposed rules would not be retrospective, and existing rules in the district plan relating to the planting of shelterbelts need to be complied with (or resource consent application made).
25 June 2025	Council Meeting	Council resolved to publicly notify draft Plan Change 25 – Shelterbelts and Artificial Crop Protection and Support Structures to the Operative Waipā District Plan to proceed to public notification in accordance with Clause 5 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

2. Mana Whenua and Iwi

Mana Whenua and Iwi		
Date	Group	Commentary
10 September 2024	Email to: - Waikato River Authority - Maniapoto Māori Trust Board - Raukawa Settlement Trust - Waikato-Tainui - Ngā Iwi Topu o Waipā (NITOW)	Correspondence was sent advising Mana Whenua and Iwi of Council's initiation of the plan change process in relation to shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures.
16 September 2024	Hui (in person) with Ngā Iwi Tōpū o Waipā (NITOW)	Council staff attended the monthly NITOW hui to: - Introduce PC25, including the purpose of the plan change; - Discuss the draft planning provisions (refer to Attachment A); and

Mana Whenua and Iwi		
Date	Group	Commentary
		- Seek feedback on any cultural values / effects that required consideration. <u>NITOW provided written feedback (17 September 2024), advising the following:</u> - NITOW existed to represent hapu cultural and historical interests over land and water, and the considerations on artificial crop protectors and shelterbelts in the district is of importance to them. - No opposition to the proposed changes promoted by PC25 but sought the following consideration regarding viewshafts: - The identified special landscapes and viewshafts map does not identify viewshafts from marae to maunga. An unobstructed view from marae to maunga (and awa where applicable) is critical to mana whenua connection with our ancestral land and waterways. - NITOW requested that this viewshaft consideration be included in Council's work on the plan change.
24 September 2024	Hui (online) with: Joint Management Agreement Iwi Partners (JMA)	Council staff attended the September hui Council's Manager District Plan and Growth has with the JMA partners, to: - Introduce PC25, including the purpose of the plan change; - Step through draft planning provisions prepared to initiate discussion (refer to Attachment A), and - Seek input on whether there were cultural values / effects that should be considered. At the meeting concern was raised about how sites of significance to Māori were presently recognised in the district plan, and that many sensitive sites and landscapes continue to go unrecognised and unprotected in the operative district plan. Raukawa provided the example of their Waipapa ki Arapuni Wāhi Ahurei project as an example of cultural landscape mapping. Staff advised that there would be a scope issue and this matter was unable to be addressed via PC25; however, staff would consider the matter further and provide a response.

Mana Whenua and Iwi		
Date	Group	Commentary
		The JMA partners requested that, through PC25, Council: - Consider methods to ensure sensitive sites and cultural values are protected from the establishment of artificial crop protection structures and shelterbelts; and - Address the mapping and management of cultural landscapes and sites of significance in the District Plan.
29 November 2024	Email correspondence to JMA partners	In response to the question raised at the September hui regarding the mapping and management of cultural landscapes and sites of significance in the District Plan, a fuller explanation was provided advising that: <i>The District Plan team have now had a thorough look at the Waipapa ki Arapuni Wāhi Ahurei mapping. It is a fantastic piece of work to which a great deal of time and effort has clearly been committed. We appreciate the various map layers and how each individual layer contributes toward the overall picture or story of the landscape. We are keen to understand how this mapping is ultimately envisaged as supporting or “translating” into a set of District Plan provisions.</i> <i>The Waipā District Plan needs to consider cultural values from a districtwide perspective. This is true not only in respect of cultural landscapes but also individual sites (particularly as required during the plan change process by RMA Section 74(2)(b)(iia)). We note too that a range of activities permitted by the District Plan to occur in the Rural Zone may have effects on cultural values. We would appreciate further guidance to understand these effects in relation to the entire suite of rural activities and how they may be avoided, remedied, or mitigated via District Plan provisions.</i> <i>Any undertaking to identify:</i> <i>cultural landscape areas across the entire District to the standard of Waipapa ki Arapuni Wāhi Ahurei; and</i> <i>the effects of all rural activities on cultural values / landscapes and the means by which the District Plan might address them is beyond the approved scope of Draft PC25 as well as Council’s current financial resources.</i> <i>In terms of programming this work into any future district plan review, Council is unable to make a decision on commencing a full district plan review until it knows the outcome of ongoing RMA reform.</i>

Mana Whenua and Iwi		
Date	Group	Commentary
		<i>But there is staff level enthusiasm and acknowledgement of need for this to occur once more certainty is provided from Central Government.</i> <i>Draft PC25 relates specifically to shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures. As part of the plan change process, Council would appreciate specific feedback from JMA partners to better understand the effects of shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures from a cultural perspective and how these effects may be avoided, remedied, or mitigated via District Plan provisions. It is appreciated that our previous conversation touched on this in general terms but, if you have capacity, if you could expand on this to help articulate and prepare for a workshop with you in the new year that would be appreciated.</i> <i>Also to note that we are working through the issues raised in respect of Draft PC25 by Ngā Iwi Tōpū O Waipā, which focused on the potential for shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures to restrict views from marae, e.g., to awa / maunga.</i> <i>We intend to workshop these matters with yourselves and Ngā Iwi Tōpū O Waipā in early 2025 and this will be ahead of any formal process but is intended to benefit from having already had community feedback so we can further test those ideas with you as well as further expand your own feedback. This is still being designed, but hopefully end Jan/Feb.</i> <i>If there is any interest to present/discuss this plan change at a JMA governance level, please let us know.</i> No further input received from the JMA partners; and staff were unable to arrange an early 2025 hui.
13 January 2025	Hui (in person) with NITOW	Council staff attended the January hui and provided NITOW with an update on PC25 since last meeting with them in September 2024. Staff shared the site-specific analysis that had been undertaken in response to the concerns raised by NITOW over the potential for culturally important views from marae to maunga / awa to be obstructed by artificial crop protection structures and shelterbelts. Staff presented the analysis for the District's five rural marae on the matter of views from marae to maunga/awa (refer to Attachment C). For each of the marae sites, staff sought to understand: Are there specific views of concern?

Mana Whenua and Iwi		
Date	Group	Commentary
		- What views need to be maintained (i.e., how much of the feature seen and from where)? - Cultural effects of changes of views from marae to maunga/awa? - District Plan rules to manage these effects? NITOW also provided an explanation on the cultural effects of a loss of views to maunga / awa. NITOW advised that only Te Kōpua Marae, due to flat topography, was deemed at risk of obstructed views to maunga as a result of Draft PC25. However, due to maximum allowable height and setback requirements, the risk was considered to be minor. NITOW also highlighted that there were four additional marae situated just outside the Waipā District that also have connection to the maunga and awa within the district, and requested that these be analysed too. Staff undertook the additional analysis of those marae situated just outside the District (Aotearoa, Aramiro, Pūrekireki, and Rāwhitiroa), noting that any planning provisions introduced through PC25 would only apply within Waipā District and could not be imposed over the adjoining districts in which these marae are located in (Refer to Attachment C for the full analysis).
7 April 2025	Email correspondence to JMA partners	Correspondence was sent to the JMA partners to share the revised planning provisions and recommendations following all feedback from the engagement period, and to advise that the s.32 evaluation report would be sent to them later in April for their review in accordance with Clause 4A, Schedule 1, RMA.
30 April 2025	Email correspondence to JMA partners	The Section 32 Evaluation Report for PC25 sent to the JMA Partners, seeking feedback on the s.32 requested in accordance with Clause 4A, RMA.
May 2025	Email correspondence to JMA partners	Council staff followed up with the JMA partner representatives via email on 6 May 2025 and 16 May 2025 to see if further information was required. No responses were received.

Mana Whenua and Iwi		
Date	Group	Commentary
27 May 2025	Hui (online) with: Joint Management Agreement Iwi Partners (JMA)	Council staff attended the May hui Council's Manager District Plan and Growth has with the JMA partners, to follow up with the JMA Partners on the Section 32 Evaluation Report and whether they required any further information. The representative for Waikato Tainui advised their Iwi Authority had no direct concerns (this to be followed up via an email). However, sought clarification on: ▪ how the matters previous raised by Raukawa were to be addressed (e.g. identification of sites of significance in the WDP, and ▪ whether the draft provisions were consistent with other Councils. Staff advised the following: ▪ the identification of sites of significance was addressed through the commentary in the s.32 Evaluation Report, and regarding the mapping and management of cultural landscapes and sites of significance in the District Plan should be undertaken across the entire District and as such is beyond the scope of PC25. ▪ The draft provisions had been formulated following consideration of the feedback received as a result of all engagement undertaken and the rule framework of other district councils. The Waikato Tainui rep advised they would touch base with Raukawa on the sites of significance matter, however, would be deferring to Raukawa on this matter. Raukawa Settlement Trust and Te Nehenehenui (Maniapoto Māori Trust Board) did not attend the meeting.
5 June 2025	Email correspondence from Waikato Tainui	Senior Planner for Waikato Tainui provided the following commentary: <i>As discussed, Waikato-Tainui will defer to Ngaati Raukawa in this instance, acknowledging their extensive work in mapping sites of significance within the Waipa District and beyond. Given that the</i>

Mana Whenua and Iwi		
Date	Group	Commentary
		<i>primary effects of the Proposed Plan Change relate to visual impacts, we are particularly interested in hearing their views and any concerns they may have and would be happy to offer our support where appropriate.</i> <i>In this context, we also wish to highlight the relevance of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato – the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River. The objectives of Te Ture Whaimana seek to protect and enhance the relationship of Waikato-Tainui and the wider community with the Waikato River and her catchment. This includes the maintenance of visual connections—or visual shafts—to culturally and spiritually significant landmarks such as maunga and other taonga.</i> <i>Overall, we are generally satisfied that Council has made genuine attempts to address concerns raised during the consultation phase and that environmental considerations have clearly been prioritised. We acknowledge and appreciate not only the incorporation of provisions adapted from other councils but also the development of provisions unique to Waipaa, which reflect a locally responsive approach. We encourage Council to continue refining the plan where possible to help allay remaining concerns and to further strengthen alignment with the values and objectives of affected community groups, in particular Waikato-Tainui iwi and hapuu (Ngaati Hauaa, Ngaati Koroki Kahukura).</i>
17 June 2025	Email correspondence from Raukawa Settlement Trust	Regional Strategy Manager provided the following commentary: <i>As discussed, I'm sending you links to the cultural landscape work that Raukawa has done with Isthmus Group Ltd. This is the work that I mentioned as Raukawa's main concern with respect to PC25. We accept that inclusion of the cultural landscape within the district plan is outside the scope of PC25. We are interested in discussion with Waipa DC how to incorporate the values identified in the cultural landscape into the district plan so that appropriate rules for activities such as those covered by PC25 can be included. Please have a look at the story maps and let me know your thoughts regarding the how to proceed.</i>

3. Statutory Bodies

Statutory Bodies		
Date	Group	Commentary
10 September 2024	Formal letter (electronic distribution) to: ▪ Minister for the Environment ▪ Minister of Agriculture ▪ Minister for Primary Industries ▪ New Zealand Transport Agency-Waka Kotahi ▪ Transpower.	Correspondence was sent to relevant statutory bodies advising of Waipā District Council's initiation of plan change process in relation to shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures.

4. Adjoining Councils and Regional Council

Adjoining Councils and Regional Council		
Date	Group	Commentary
10 September 2024	Formal letter (electronic distribution) to: ▪ Waikato Regional Council ▪ Future Proof ▪ Waikato District Council ▪ Hamilton City Council	Correspondence was sent to the councils adjoining Waipā and the Waikato Regional Council advising of Council's initiation of the plan change process in relation to shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures.

Adjoining Councils and Regional Council		
Date	Group	Commentary
	- South Waikato District Council - Matamata-Piako District Council.	

5. Network Utility Operators

Network Utility Operators		
Date	Group	Commentary
10 September 2024	Formal letter (electronic distribution) to: - Waipā Networks - Powerco - Firstgas.	Correspondence was sent to relevant network utility operators advising of Council's initiation of the plan change process in relation to shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures.
18 October 2024	Written feedback provided by PowerCo.	Detailed feedback provided. That was incorporated into the response document Council staff prepared (Refer to Attachment B)
18 October 2024	Written feedback provided by Firstgas.	Detailed feedback provided. That was incorporated into the response document Council staff prepared (Refer to Attachment B)
16 November 2024	Meeting (online) held with: - PowerCo - Firstgas Note: Waipa Networks also invited but did not respond to invitation.	The purpose of the meeting was to discuss: - The written feedback already provided by the utility operators on draft PC25 during the engagement period (9 September – 18 October 2024); and - The feedback / information provided by the horticulture industry on their established practices when locating artificial crop protection structures / shelterbelts in proximity to utilities assets, and whether these practices reflected the preferences of operators.

Network Utility Operators		
Date	Group	Commentary
		Discussion highlighted concern with the proximity of artificial crop structures and shelterbelts to compromise the operation of these networks: ▪ Gas assets are protected by an easement corridor extending 6m from the centreline of the pipeline; ▪ Horizontal structures could impede the regular aerial (drone) imaging/checking of electricity distribution lines / gas pipeline; ▪ Concerns around the venting/gas diffusion in the case of an emergency or a pipe failure and the potential for the gas to ‘capture’ within a covered crop protection; ▪ Recommended Council refer to their guidelines for development and tree planting from gas pipeline; ▪ Preference for 10m separation distance; and ▪ Health and safety concerns for orchard workers who could come into contact with overhead lines.
23 May 2025	Email: ▪ Waipā Networks ▪ Powerco ▪ Firstgas	Correspondence (via email) was sent to the network utility operators providing an update on the progression of PC25 and providing a copy of the updated recommendations (‘January 2025 version’) that had been workshopped with the Elected Members in February 2025. They were also advised of the intention for PC25 to go to the June 2025 Council meeting for resolution to notify.
5 June 2025	Email from Firstgas	First Gas contacted Council staff on 3 June 2025 highlighting: ▪ The setback of shelterbelts from the gas pipeline should be 10m in line with the Planting Guideline as provided on the Firstgas webpage; and ▪ the WDP presently refers to the pipeline in the planning maps as ‘High Pressure Gas Transmission Pipelines’ rather than the ‘National Gas Transmission Pipeline’. Council staff are in agreement that the setback must align with the standards set by Firstgas, and terminology used in the WDP, when referencing the gas pipeline needs to be consistent.

6. Industry Groups

Industry Groups		
Date	Group	Commentary
10 September 2024	Formal letter (electronic distribution) to: - Horticulture New Zealand - New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated - Dairy New Zealand - Federated Farmers New Zealand - Whitehall Fruitpackers - Growers' representatives – Barker & Associates (B&A)	To advise relevant rural industry groups of Waipā District Council's initiation of the plan change process in relation to shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures.
23 October 2024	Written feedback provided by New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated.	Detailed feedback provided. That was incorporated into the response document Council staff prepared (Refer to Attachment B)
23 October 2024	Written feedback provided by Horticulture NZ.	Detailed feedback provided. That was incorporated into the response document Council staff prepared (Refer to Attachment B)
13 November 2024	Email to: - Horticulture New Zealand - New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporation	Advising of responses to the Have Your Say feedback (Attachment B to this appendix) being available to view on the PC25 webpage.

Industry Groups		
Date	Group	Commentary
	▪ Barker & Associates (S Williams) (B&A) ▪ Whitehall Fruitpackers (Mark Gardiner) ▪ Parmvir Singh Bains (kiwifruit grower)	
20 November 2024	Meeting (in person/online) held with Industry groups and Council District Plan, Transportation and Communications teams: ▪ Horticulture New Zealand (HortNZ) ▪ New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporation (NZKGI) ▪ Barker & Associates (B&A) ▪ Kiwifruit growers: ○ Mark Gardiner ○ Parmvir Singh Bains.	Matters canvassed: ▪ Issues the horticultural industry faces in establishing in Waipā; ▪ The anticipated horticultural growth over the next 10-year period; ▪ How the development of an orchard is undertaken; ▪ The projected extent of coverage of the rural zone by artificial crop protection structures (ACPS) / preferred growing areas: – It has more to do with land availability. – If covered, a kiwifruit crop (Gold or Red) could be established anywhere. – Historically average land area for an orchard is 4h, however newer developments larger – 10ha. ▪ Land availability and size are a variable fact in establishment of orchards – if the site is bigger that allows for staging of development of the orchard; ▪ Having sites in various locations spreads the risk relating to weather, which is a long-term risk to mitigate; ▪ Nationally, 80% of all kiwifruit is grown in the Bay of Plenty, but the land resource is becoming more restricted; ▪ Only 4% of all kiwifruit is currently grown in the Waikato; ▪ Unlikely for the Waikato proportion of kiwifruit to grow beyond 4% even as kiwifruit total increases; ▪ Expansion can occur via existing orchards becoming larger, or through dairy conversion / farmers diversifying; ▪ Gold and red varieties are licenced;

Industry Groups		
Date	Group	Commentary
		▪ The variant of kiwifruit grown will determine whether or not individual growers utilise ACPSs; ▪ Biosecurity concerns need to be managed – in particular the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug (BMSB); ▪ ACPS are 2-3 degrees warmer when completely wrapped. This makes it faster to establish an orchard and crop returns are earlier; ▪ Once the crop is established it is more difficult to retrospectively change the structure covers; ▪ Other horticultural crops that use ACPS may have different height and cloth colour requirements; ▪ How other councils manage ACPS and shelterbelts through their respective district plans (HortNZ highlighted recent Environment Court case with Waikato District Council); ▪ Rural amenity –perceptions versus actuality, and how these differ between growers and non-growers; ▪ Impact of setbacks on orchard productivity and the NPS-Highly Productive Land; ▪ Environmental effects relating to recycling of materials, use of spray, and fire risk. Industry advised – ACPS material carries a 10-20-year warranty and so a longer lifespan than other accepted agricultural materials such as silage wrap. – Spray management is required to be undertaken in accordance with NZS409. Spraying should be undertaken in conditions to avoid spray drift, educational material is provided to growers on spraying, a complaints line is maintained by the industry for the public to use where there are concerns about spraying, and both shelterbelts and ACPS assist in managing spray drift. – Maintenance of shelterbelts reduces fire risk. Structure/material of an ACPS means it is of low fire risk. ▪ Activity Status of reducing ACPS setbacks where a shelterbelt is planted simultaneously (i.e., is not mature) – it is proposed to be an RDA, discussion related to that potentially being a CA; ▪ In the industry’s opinion ACPS should not be defined as a building in the District Plan; ▪ Agreement that ACPS should be included in the definition for farming activities and that the proposed definition for ACPS is acceptable; and ▪ Industry considered that the proposed setback and shelterbelt shading provisions were too onerous and would have an economic cost.

Industry Groups		
Date	Group	Commentary
16 January 2025	Site visit to local orchards: 982 Kaipaki Road; and 582 Parallel Road.	Council staff visited these sites and met: - Representatives from HortNZ and NZKGI - Local growers; - A planning consultant (B&A) representing kiwifruit growers; and - An installer of ACPS. <u>982 Kaipaki Road:</u> - An older, established kiwifruit orchard with mature shelterbelts and an ACPS erected in the mid-2010s using white cloth. This was a conversion of an existing apple orchard. - Shelterbelts located directly on the road boundary with an estimated height of 10m; trimmed approximately every 18 months. - This orchard was set up requiring machinery to manoeuvre outside of the ACPS when going between bays within the ACPS, meaning there was a need to have a separation distance between the ACPS and the shelterbelt. <u>582 Parallel Road:</u> - Recently established kiwifruit orchard: black cloth vertically and transparent cloth horizontally. - Transparent cloth is becoming more readily used for kiwifruit orchards, but other crops may differ. The transparent cloth allows more light through than the white cloth. However, transparent cloth is not an effective windbreak therefore not applied vertically. - The layout of this orchard allows for the manoeuvring of machinery to occur within the ACPS and under the crop support structures. - The shelterbelts have been located 4m off the side property boundaries and 4m from ACPS to allow for maintenance of both shelterbelts and ACPS (e.g. repair damaged cloth). <u>Key points relating to the operation of these orchards:</u> - ACPS important to reduce the fruit damage.

Industry Groups		
Date	Group	Commentary
		▪ Crop support structures, located within the ACPS, were approximately 1.8m tall. Pergola form used with 'teepee' poles at approximately 2.5m tall to encourage leader growth of the plants. ▪ Rootstock and grafting allow the conversion of orchards from one variety to another (e.g. green to gold). ▪ ACPS increase the air temp by 2-3 degrees to advance the growth of the orchard and reduce time before full production. ▪ Cloth material has a lifespan of approximately 10-15 years. ▪ Discussion had on the necessity of shelterbelts alongside ACPS. Advice from the grower was that shelterbelts have an important role to shelter, screen, and provide a degree of security for an orchard, and are generally used in conjunction with ACPS (i.e., the use of an ACPS does not make a shelterbelt redundant and they commonly used together). <u>Advice from the ACPS installer was:</u> ▪ Growers prefer white sides and transparent roof for optimum growth; however, it is recognised that white is visually prominent, and growers encouraged to use dark green or black. ▪ Installer was unaware of any method to either recycle or repurpose old cloth, but it was noted that the industry and central government agencies were investigating this question.
21 February 2025	Email to: ▪ Horticulture New Zealand ▪ New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporation ▪ Barker & Associates (B&A) ▪ Whitehall Fruitpackers ▪ Parmvir Singh Bains.	Provided an update on process, advised that the revised draft planning provisions had been workshopped with Elected Members on 12 February 2025, and provided a copy of the revised draft planning provisions and recommendations (Refer to Attachment D).

Industry Groups		
Date	Group	Commentary
23 May 2025	Email to: - Horticulture New Zealand - New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporation - Barker & Associates (B&A) - Whitehall Fruitpackers - Parmvir Singh Bains.	Correspondence (via email) was sent providing: - an update on the progression of PC25 - a copy of the updated recommendations ('January 2025 version') that had been workshopped with the Elected Members in February 2025; and - advise of the intention for PC25 to go to the June 2025 Council meeting for resolution to notify.

7. Interested landowner parties (adjoining property owners)

Interested landowner parties (adjoining property owners)		
Date	Group	Commentary
10 September 2024	Formal letter (electronic distribution) to: - Karāpiro Community Protection Group; - Ngāhinapōuri Protection Society; M. Boyd; C. and J. Searle; D. Coldicutt; G. and M. Walker; and N. Dromgool.	To advise interested landowner parties of Waipā District Council's initiation of the plan change process in relation to shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures.

Interested landowner parties (adjoining property owners)		
Date	Group	Commentary
September – October 2024	Written feedback provided from individuals from this group as part of the engagement period that was incorporated into the response document Council staff prepared (Refer to Attachment B)	
13 November 2024	Email to: ▪ M. Boyd; ▪ C. and J. Searle; ▪ D. Coldicutt; ▪ G. and M. Walker; and ▪ N. Dromgool.	To advise that Council's responses to the Have Your Say feedback being available to view on the PC25 webpage.
15 November 2024	Meeting (in person) held with: ▪ Interested rural landowners (C Searle; M Boyd; M Walker; D Coldicutt); ▪ Council's District Plan, Transportation, and Communications Teams.	<u>Matters canvassed:</u> ▪ What it is like to live next to an orchard; ▪ The lack of district plan enforcement / compliance, especially setbacks from internal boundaries and shelterbelts; and ▪ Management of and disposal of cloth material/microplastics/fire hazards. Artificial Crop Protection Structures (ACPS): ▪ The need to ensure that any new rules would be strongly enforced; ▪ Spray drift (staff advised at meeting this is a Waikato Regional Council matter); ▪ Issues with ACPS not being subject to site coverage requirements – causing effects on rural character and road safety, and would allow large holdings to be fully covered; ▪ The change to the rural landscape; ▪ Enabling approach by PC25 will attract more growers and accelerate change; ▪ Concern with how structures like ACPS would dominate the landscape if kiwifruit profitability drops; and ▪ Cloth colour of concern, especially white, and in the landscape areas more rigorous colour assessments are required.

Interested landowner parties (adjoining property owners)		
Date	Group	Commentary
		Rural character: - Concern raised with the loss of Waipā's's open pastoral character; and that those moving to a rural area don't expect to be 'boxed in'; - PC25 should be used as an opportunity for Waipā to 'lead the way' and set rules that protect the district's rural character, instead of following the direction of other district plans; and - Concern around cultural impacts especially in relation to maunga. Shelterbelts: - Concern raised that draft provisions excluded a height/setback control; - The proposed shading rules did nothing to limit effects on neighbouring farmland, which may affect the productivity of other primary producers; - Maintenance of shelterbelts can be difficult; - Supportive of the proposed 4m setback from boundaries to allow for maintenance by the owners of the shelterbelts; and - Suggestions that a recession plan rule might allow a shelterbelt to grow higher the further it was set away from the boundary.
18 December 2025	Site Visit to properties neighbouring local orchards.	Council staff visited the following sites which are in the vicinity or adjoining existing orchards: 372 Parallel Road; 3715 Cambridge Road; 161 Gorton Road; 163 Gorton Road; 1/165 Gorton Road; and 20 Amber Lane.

Interested landowner parties (adjoining property owners)		
Date	Group	Commentary
		All of the above sites either adjoin or are in close proximity to existing kiwifruit orchards. The orchards in Parallel and Cambridge roads utilise ACPS, while the orchards on Gorton Road and Amber Lane are screened by tall, established shelterbelts. <u>Key matters of concern raised:</u> ▪ Traffic safety when ACPS or shelterbelts establish on the road boundary, particularly around blind road corners; ▪ The change to existing open rural outlooks and impacts on visual amenity; ▪ Close proximity of shelterbelts on shared boundaries, maintenance issues, and potential reduction in pasture growth due to shading; ▪ Impacts of cloth colours especially in the Karāpiro environs when viewed from across the lake; and ▪ How the operation of the orchards is carried out and the impacts of the orchard operation on the adjoining properties.
21 February 2025	Email to: ▪ M. Boyd; ▪ C. and J. Searle; ▪ D. Coldicutt; ▪ G. and M. Walker; ▪ N. Dromgool.	Provide an update on process, advised that the revised draft planning provisions had been workshopped with Elected Members on 12 February 2025 and provided a copy of the revised draft planning provisions and recommendations (Refer to Attachment D).
23 May 2025	Email to: ▪ M Boyd; ▪ C. Searle; ▪ D Coldicutt; ▪ G. and M. Walker; ▪ N Dromgool.	Correspondence (via email) was sent providing: ▪ an update on the progression of PC25; ▪ a copy of the updated recommendations ('January 2025 version') that had been workshopped with the Elected Members in February 2025; and ▪ advise of the intention for PC25 to go to the June 2025 Council meeting for resolution to notify.

8. Internal Waipā District Council Teams

Internal Waipā District Council Teams		
Date	Group	Commentary
16 October 2024	Internal comms with staff from the Transportation team	To give awareness about the initiation of the plan change process in relation to shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures. Discussion focused on maintenance and road safety issues caused by shelterbelts when adjoining public roads.
24 October 2024	Written feedback provided	Raised concern over the practicable use of a shading rule; and issues of concern that should be addressed from a road network perspective.

9. Wider Rural Community

Wider Rural Community		
Date	Group	Commentary
9 September – 18 October 2024	Launch of the “Have Your Say” page	Engagement plan developed with Council’s Communications Team: ▪ Webpage for PC25 launched; ▪ Publicity on the plan change and how to participate during the engagement period; ▪ Staff presented to the Cambridge and Te Awamutu & Kihikihi Community Boards and the Pirongia Ward Consultative Committee; ▪ “Have Your Say” page set up for PC25 to receive written comment / contribution; and ▪ Webinar uploaded responding to questions through the Have Your Say platform. ▪ Background information and possible direction uploaded (refer to Attachment A) Feedback from 70 individuals/organisations received.

Wider Rural Community		
Date	Group	Commentary
20 November 2024	Feedback through Have Your Say platform	Council responses (Refer to Attachment B) to the feedback received was posted to the webpage.
February 2025	Draft revised plan provisions and recommendations	Following the revised draft planning provisions being workshopped with Elected Members on 12 February 2025 a copy of the revised draft planning provisions and recommendations (Refer to Attachment D) was uploaded to the Webpage.

Attachments:

- Attachment A - Draft PC25 plan provisions ('July 2024 Version')
- Attachment B - Council responses to Have Your Say Feedback
- Attachment C - Analysis of significant views from Marae to Maunga/Awa
- Attachment D - PC25 Draft Provisions and Recommendations ('January 2025 Version')