

FURTHER SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 25 TO THE WAIPA DISTRICT PLAN
PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 8 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

To: Steph O'Sullivan
Chief Executive
Waipa District Council
Private Bag 2402
Te Awamutu
Via email only: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Submitter: New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated & Horticulture New Zealand (Herein
referred to as 'NZKGI & HNZ')

Address for service: Nicklin CE
C/- Simone Williams

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Signed on behalf of NZKGI



Simone Williams

Senior Planner

28 May 2026

1.0 Submission Information

- 1.1 The specific Plan Change 25 submissions that NZKGI & HNZ wish to comment further on are attached.
- 1.2 NZKGI & HNZ supports and/or is in opposition to the specific submissions submitted as listed in the attached document. The reasons are also provided in the attached document.
- 1.3 The decisions NZKGI & HNZ wishes Council to make to ensure that the issues raised by NZKGI & HNZ are dealt with are contained in the attached document.
- 1.4 NZKGI & HNZ wishes to be heard in support of this further submission.
- 1.5 If others make a similar submission, NZKGI & HNZ will consider presenting a joint case with them at a Hearing.

2.0 Introduction

- 2.1 NZKGI & HNZ welcome the opportunity to provide further submissions on the original submissions lodged in relation to the Plan Change 25 Shelterbelts and Artificial Crop Protection and Crop Support Structures (hereafter referred to as PC 25).
- 2.2 NZKGI & HNZ note that PC25 has been progressed as a targeted plan change relating to shelterbelts, artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures within the Rural Zone. NZKGI & HNZ consider it important that the final provisions remain practical, proportionate and workable, avoid unnecessary consenting or compliance requirements, and recognize these structures as anticipated components of rural production activities.

3.0 General Feedback

- 3.1 NZKGI & HNZ further submissions relate to the following submissions, which are documented in alphabetical order as per Council's summary of decisions document:
 - Submission #01 Ele Duncan
 - Submission #02 Nicholas Dromgool
 - Submission #03 Shirley Hewetson
 - Submission #04 Shirley Hewetson
 - Submission #05 Ronan Cavanagh
 - Submission #06 Ronan Cavanagh
 - Submission #07 Matthew Boyd
 - Submission #08 Jo Wrigley (Go Eco)
 - Submission #09 Grant V Walker

- Submission #10 Waipā District Council
- Submission #11 John Mills
- Submission #12 Fire and Emergency New Zealand
- Submission #13 Powerco
- Submission #14 Raukawa Charitable Trust
- Submission #15 Nancy C Donald
- Submission #16 New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Inc and Horticulture New Zealand
- Submission #17 Federated Farmers Waikato
- Submission #18 Carole A Searle
- Submission #19 Bryan Clements (B&B Clements Family Trust No2)

4 Further submissions on Proposed Plan Change 25 to the Waipā District Plan – Shelterbelts and Artificial Crop Protection and Crop Support Structures



Submission#	Support / Oppose / Seek Amendment	Comments / Reasons	Relief Sought
Submission #01 – Ele Duncan	Neutral	The submitter seeks amendment to Rule 4.4.2.57A(e)(iii) to clarify that maintenance requirements relating to shelterbelts only apply to shelterbelts planted following the operative date of PC25. The submission identifies that existing shelterbelts are commonly maintained from adjoining road verges and that the current drafting may unintentionally create non-compliances for existing lawful activities.	NZKGI & HNZ take a neutral position to the relief sought.
Submission #02 – Nicholas Dromgool	Oppose	The submitter seeks that existing shelterbelts which do not meet the proposed rules are either removed, replanted, or maintained at a maximum height of 6m. The submission is concerned with existing shelterbelts on Gorton Road and alleged effects on road users and adjoining properties.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought as it would apply the proposed PC25 standards retrospectively to existing shelterbelts. Existing shelterbelts form part of the established rural environment and are often required for productive, shelter and screening purposes. Retrospective removal, replanting or mandatory height reduction would create unnecessary compliance costs and may adversely affect existing rural production activities.
Submission #03 – Shirley Hewetson	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns regarding large poplar trees and shelterbelts causing damage to powerlines, fences and	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought to the extent it seeks removal of specific shelterbelts or retrospective restrictions through PC25.



		surrounding property, and seeks removal of existing trees.	
Submission #04 – Shirley Anne Hewetson	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns regarding existing shelterbelts planted close to boundaries and the ongoing maintenance and safety effects associated with overgrown vegetation.	No relief sought.
Submission #07 – Point 1-Matthew Boyd	Oppose	The submitter seeks that lower-height crop protection “scrim” be subject to colour controls and that existing ACP cloth comply with PC25 colour requirements when replaced. The submission raises concerns regarding the visibility and appearance of crop protection structures within the rural environment.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought as additional colour controls for lower-height crop protection cloth are not considered necessary to manage visual effects within the productive rural environment. Lower-height scrim is typically limited in visual prominence due to its scale and height and does not warrant the same level of regulation contemplated for larger structures. The proposed relief would create unnecessary compliance costs and operational constraints for existing and future horticultural activities.
Submission #07 – Point 2-Matthew Boyd	Neutral	The submitter seeks that replacement ACP cloth comply with the colour requirements proposed through PC25 where existing cloth is being replaced or renewed.	NZKGI & HNZ take a neutral position to the relief sought insofar as replacement ACP cloth should accord with any applicable colour restrictions applying under the District Plan.
Submission #07 – Point 3- Matthew Boyd	Oppose	The submitter seeks a rule requiring ACPS to be screened by shelterbelts where a dwelling is located within 50m of a shared boundary.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought on the basis that a blanket shelterbelt screening requirement within 50m of a shared boundary would unnecessarily constrain productive land use and is not considered proportionate to the effects being managed within a rural working environment.



			A 50m interface distance is substantial in a productive rural context and would capture a significant number of horticultural activities that are otherwise anticipated within the Rural Zone.
Submission #07 – Point 4- Matthew Boyd	Oppose	The submitter seeks clarification that the maximum shelterbelt height of 6m applies at all times during the trimming cycle rather than only at the point of trimming. The submission raises concerns regarding potential ambiguity in enforcement and interpretation of Rule 4.4.2.57A.	NZKGI & HNZ consider that any amendments should remain practical and avoid creating unnecessarily onerous shelterbelt maintenance requirements for growers and rural landowners.
Submission #07 – Point 5- Matthew Boyd	Oppose/ Neutral	The submitter seeks clarification to Rule 4.4.2.2(d)(ii) regarding when setbacks may be reduced where existing shelterbelt screening is present. In particular, the submitter seeks clarification that the shelterbelt must be located on the property owner’s land and must already provide mitigation at the time of construction.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought as worded by the submitter. However, NZKGI & HNZ consider the rule could be more simply addressed by requiring screening “by an existing shelterbelt within the site boundary”, noting that “site boundary” is already defined within the District Plan.
Submission #07 – Point 6- Matthew Boyd	Oppose	The submitter seeks a formal resource consent or application process for setback exemptions associated with shelterbelts and crop protection structures, including assessment by Council and affected parties.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought as it would introduce additional consenting requirements, procedural complexity and compliance costs for activities otherwise expected within the Rural Zone.



Submission #07 – Point 7- Matthew Boyd	Oppose	The submitter seeks additional provisions requiring all existing unconsented crop protection structures and ACPS to comply with PC25 once operative.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought on the basis that it would impose retrospective compliance obligations on existing structures and activities. Existing crop protection structures form part of the established rural environment and retrospective compliance requirements may create significant operational and financial implications for existing horticultural activities. NZKGI & HNZ do not consider retrospective compliance requirements to be necessary or appropriate through PC25.
Submission #08 – Jo Wrigley (Go Eco)	Neutral	The submitter seeks mandatory climate-resilient shelterbelt planting, restrictions on crop protection materials, emissions reporting and broader environmental management controls relating to horticultural production.	NZKGI & HNZ consider that these matters extend beyond the scope and intent of PC25, which is focused on managing the effects of shelterbelts and artificial crop protection structures.
Submission #09 – Grant V Walker	Oppose	The submitter seeks increased enforcement provisions, penalties and monitoring requirements associated with shelterbelts and ACPS.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought as enforcement and penalty matters are addressed through the Resource Management Act framework and do not require additional district plan provisions through PC25.
Submission #10 – Waipā District Council	Neutral	The submitter seeks correction of drafting errors, numbering inconsistencies, missing assessment criteria and removal of redundant references to “ancillary structures” within the notified plan change documents.	NZKGI & HNZ take a neutral position to the relief sought to updated referencing of the PC 25 provisions.

Submission #11 – John Mills	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns that trees such as polars if planted in urban areas can become a hazard to utilities and other houses.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought as its not relevant to the purpose of PC 25.
Submission #12 – Point 1 – Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral	The submitter generally supports the proposed shelterbelt framework under PC25, including the proposed height limits, setbacks from boundaries and roads, setbacks from overhead infrastructure, maintenance requirements and the restricted discretionary activity status for non-compliance with Rule 4.4.2.57A. The submission notes that these standards provide co-benefits for fire risk management and emergency access.	NZKGI & HNZ take a neutral position in regard to the relief sought.
Submission #12 – Point 2 – Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral	The submitter seeks an additional matter of discretion and associated assessment criteria relating specifically to fire risk where shelterbelts do not comply with the proposed permitted activity standards. The submission also outlines a number of practical fire risk management measures, including low flammability planting, defensible setbacks from buildings and maintaining adequate emergency access and egress.	NZKGI & HNZ are neutral in regards to the relief sought.

Submission #13 – Powerco Limited	Neutral	The submitter seeks retention of provisions relating to safe separation from overhead electricity infrastructure, including advice notes and assessment matters for effects on infrastructure and network utilities.	NZKGI & HNZ are neutral to the relief sought.
Submission #14 – Raukawa Charitable Trust	Neutral	The submitter opposes PC25 in part on the basis that insufficient information has been provided regarding cultural implications and seeks additional cultural assessment and protection provisions relating to identified cultural landscapes and viewshafts.	NZKGI & HNZ are neutral to the relief sought insofar as additional cultural assessment requirements apply to artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures located within identified areas of cultural significance, or where known wāhi tapu, archaeological sites or identified cultural features are present.
Submission #15 – Nancy C Donald	Oppose in Part	The submitter seeks additional setbacks, neighbour input into shelterbelt species selection, restrictions on ACPS height and colour, and additional mitigation requirements within identified viewshafts. The submission also seeks recognition of the positive screening effects of shelterbelts and hedges.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought to the extent it would introduce additional setbacks, neighbour approval requirements, restrictive height controls or additional mitigation obligations that would unnecessarily constrain horticultural production activities and reduce the efficient use of highly productive land within the District.
Submission #17 – Point 8 – Federated Farmers Waikato	Support	The submitter opposes the proposed 6m height limit for artificial crop protection structures and seeks that ACPS be permitted up to 9m in height.	The submitter opposes the proposed 6m height limit for artificial crop protection structures and seeks that ACPS be permitted up to 9m in height.
Submission #17 – Point 13 – Federated Farmers Waikato	Support	The submitter opposes the restriction on locating artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures within natural landscapes and viewshafts and seeks that	NZKGI & HNZ support the relief sought as it recognises that vegetation, hedges and shelterbelts can appropriately mitigate visual effects associated with ACPS and crop support structures within identified landscape and viewshaft areas.



		these structures be enabled where screened by vegetation, hedges or shelterbelts.	
Submission #17 – Point 14 – Federated Farmers Waikato	Support in Part	The submitter opposes Rule 25.4 in part and seeks a permitted activity pathway for artificial crop protection structures, subject to standards relating to colour, setbacks, natural shelter and block size.	NZKGI & HNZ support the relief sought insofar that there should be a permitted activity pathway within the Landscapes and Viewshafts chapter.
Submission #18 – Carole A Searle	Oppose	The submitter seeks a blanket 15m setback at road corners and raises concerns regarding sightline and traffic safety effects associated with shelterbelts and ACPS.	NZKGI & HNZ oppose the relief sought on the basis that a blanket 15m corner setback is not considered proportionate in all rural contexts and would unnecessarily reduce productive land availability. Site-specific transport and sightline matters are more appropriately managed through targeted transport standards and assessment on a case-by-case basis.
Submission #19 – Bryan Clements (B&B Clements Family Trust No. 2)	Neutral	The submitter seeks recognition that existing shelterbelts planted at 124 McGhie Road for screening purposes should retain existing use rights and not be subject to additional costs or compliance obligations under PC25.	NZKGI & HNZ take a neutral position on the site-specific relief sought for 124 McGhie Road. NZKGI & HNZ generally support a planning framework that avoids unnecessary retrospective compliance obligations for existing lawful shelterbelts.