

Waipā District Plan Proposed Plan Change 25 Further Submission Form

FS01

Form 6

Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waipā District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723
| Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchanges | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form.
Submissions close **5pm, Thursday 28 May 2026**

COUNCIL USE ONLY	
Date received	
Document ref:	

1. Submitter details

Full name of submitter:	
Contact name if different from above:	
Contact phone number(s)	
Email address:	
Postal address: (required if no email address is provided)	

2. In accordance with clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act (select one of the following):

- ☐ I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest.
- ☐ I have an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.

My reason(s) are:

3. Attendance at Council hearing

- (a) I wish ☐ OR do not wish ☐ to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.
- (b) If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
Yes ☐ OR No ☐

4. Signature of submitter (note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)

Signature of submitter: _____ Dated _____
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.

5. Specific Submission on PC25

Submission Point	Name	support	oppose	Reason	I seek the following decision from Council
16/9	NZKGI and Hort NZ		✓	Proposed wording adds ambiguity and opens up the argument of what are natural features etc	Retain Current Wording
16/12	NZKGI and Hort NZ		✓	Crop protection structures are not fences, have a completely different role to fences and can be over 1.8m in height	Retain Current Wording
16/14	NZKGI and Hort NZ		✓	The argument that existing shelter belts are a panacea to mitigating visual effects is flawed and misleading. In reality they seldom fully block the visibility of ACPs 1. A shelter belt can take 10 to 15 years to “fill in” and never fully mitigate due to slopes, entrance way gaps and factors below 2. New orchards (that will be covered by PC25) will also adjoin existing orchards (outside PC25	Retain Current Wording

				requirements) which will result in visual gaps 3. Fire: they are susceptible to fire. (Note: there have been 3 major fire incidents on kiwifruit related shelter belts in the eastern Karapiro area in the last ten years) – see point 1 above 4. Poor trimming methods create holes and gaps 5. Disease or poor health plants create gaps (Note: the reality is obvious in the Bay of Plenty when traveling from TePuke south on SH2. Most orchards have shelter belts but the ACPs are still highly visible) The effect on productivity argument put forward by this submission is outdated. Other rural activities accept loss of productivity to ensure effects are mitigated: limits on nutrient leaching, nitrogen levels, water quality impacts via water way setback etc. All these types of limits reduce productivity but balance the impact of a farming activity.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				N.B. PC25 allows growers (excluding special landscape zones etc) to operate without the assessment of effects. The proposed changes in this submission would increase the risk considerably of more than minor effects with no ability for review.	
16/15	NZKGI and Hort NZ		✓	The argument put forward is flawed 1. Vehicles used within the ACPs need to turn. Current practice on existing orchards on zero setbacks is often to use public land or neighbour driveways to turn 2. Spray drift is a significant issue on boundaries – effecting those that travel, live or farm next to an orchard. Zero setback will increase the risk of spray drift considerably 3. PC25 was designed to provide some certainty for growers while ensuring balance with those living, farming or traveling next to orchards and the environment, coupled with best practice for both productivity and the community. This change attempts to materially	Retain Current Wording

				affect any balance i.e. does not pass the fair test. 4. The proposed setbacks in PC25 provide balance and fairness when considering that those living and farming in rural must abide by setbacks and cannot alter those without RC e.g. water tanks, sheds, housing 5. NZKGI argument about reverse sensitivities conveniently omits the fact that in many areas the kiwifruit growers have purchased land for development with existing residential being present not the other way round. N.B. PC25 allows growers (excluding special landscape zones etc) to operate without the assessment of effects. The proposed changes in this submission would increase the risk considerably of more than minor effects with no ability for review.	
16/16	NZKGI and		√	Current kiwifruit growers use ACPs to 6m successfully. The BIG statement that this height isn't suitable appears to be an over	Retain Current Wording

	Hort NZ			statement as growers are building 6m ACPs in Waipa everyday.. Every metre above 6m would have an exponential negative effect and ability to mitigate becomes more and more difficult. The reference to other areas plans is also flawed – PC25 was designed to provide some certainty for growers while ensuring balance with those living, farming or traveling next to orchards and the environment coupled with best practice for both productivity and the community. Higher than 6m might suit growers in terms of flexibility but provides inadequate balance. Surely if a grower wants to build higher, they can apply for this via RC just like all landowners if they wish to “go outside the regulations” N.B. PC25 allows growers (excluding special landscape zones etc) to operate without the assessment of effects. The proposed changes in this submission would increase the risk considerably of more than minor effects with no ability for review.	
16/17	NZKGI and			As per 16/16 above. 6m shelter belts work effectively today, growers have been	Retain Current Wording

	Hort NZ		✓	accepting this height requirements. NZKGI conveniently avoids any reference to the shading effects of shelter belts. If this was to be allowed, then PC25 would need to add back in (as per earlier drafts) shading calculation and measures – adding complexity and cost to all. My understanding was the growers did not want to have a shading calculation in the Plan and that 6m height with setbacks found that balance. N.B. PC25 allows growers (excluding special landscape zones etc) to operate without the assessment of effects. The proposed changes in this submission would increase the risk considerably of more than minor effects with no ability for review.	
16/18 and 16/19	NZKGI and Hort NZ		✓	NZKGI again conveniently avoids one of the key reasons the 4m rule was in the draft. The closer the shelter belt to boundaries the greater negative shading effects on neighbours effecting people and neighbours' rural productivity.	Retain Current Wording
16/20	NZKGI and		✓	The argument that existing shelter belts are a panacea to mitigating visual effects	Retain Current Wording

	Hort NZ			is flawed and misleading. In reality they seldom fully block the visibility of ACPs 1. A shelter belt can take 10 to 15 years to “fill in” and never fully mitigate due to slopes, entrance way gaps and factors below 2. New orchards (that will be covered by PC25) will also adjoin existing orchards (outside PC25 requirements) which will result in visual gaps 3. Fire: they are susceptible to fire. (Note: there have been 3 major fire incidents on kiwifruit related shelter belts in the eastern Karapiro area in the last ten years) – see point 1 above 4. Poor trimming methods create holes and gaps 5. Disease or poor health plants create gaps An additional point is PC25 provides growers with coverage flexibility that simply does not exist for any other owners/users of land. To then suggest that no colour controls should apply could	
--	------------	--	--	--	--

				result in a rural environment looking like a multi coloured patchwork quilt.	
16/26	NZKGI and Hort NZ		✓	Proposed wording adds ambiguity and subjectiveness. Growers will be fully aware if proposed land development is in a view shaft and can therefore make a considered decision before purchasing or commencing development.	Retain Current Wording
16/27	NZKGI and Hort NZ		✓	Landscape and view shafts form a relatively small part of the available land in Waipa. Growers will be fully aware if proposed land development is on land that a RC is required or where an activity is to be avoided and can therefore make a considered decision before purchasing or commencing development. No additional flexibility should be provided. Colour: in several special designated landscape zones in WDC colour are controlled by the N6 appendix. Primarily this is based around setting recessive colour standards. The current green used by growers and white are not permitted colours. Growers (with land coverage % flexibility) should not have preapproval for colours. These should be applied for via RC and	Retain Current Wording

				should comply to the N6 just like every other landowner	