

Summary of decisions requested in submissions to Proposed Plan Change 25 –Shelterbelts and Artificial Crop Protection and Support Structures

May 2026

Contents

Reader's Guide	3
How to read the summary.....	3
How to make a further submission	4
Submitter details	5
(1) Ele Duncan	6
(2) Nicholas Dromgool	6
(3 & 4) Shirley Hewetson.....	7
(5 & 6) Ronan Cavanagh.....	7
(7) Matthew Boyd	8
(8) Jo Wrigley, Go Eco.....	10
(9) Grant V Walker	11
(10) Waipā District Council.....	12
(11) John Mills.....	17
(12) Fire and Emergency New Zealand	17
(13) Powerco	19
(14) Raukawa Charitable Trust.....	21
(15) Nancy C Donald.....	23
(16) New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated and Horticulture New Zealand	25
(17) Federated Farmers Waikato	34
(18) Carole A Searle	37
(19) Bryan Clements (B&B Clements Family Trust No2) - LATE	38

Reader's Guide

This document is a summary of the nineteen (19) submissions received on Proposed Private Plan Change 25 – Shelterbelts and Artificial Crop Protection Structures (PC25) and the relief sought/decision(s) requested. This summary is ordered by submitter number. This summary helps readers to see all the decisions requested by submitter.

Call for further submissions opens on **Thursday, May 14, 2026**. The closing date for making further submissions is **5pm, Thursday May 28, 2026**. **No late further submissions will be accepted.**

In the summary, every submitter has been allocated a submitter number, and each submission point is referenced by a unique number. This whole number (e.g. 1/3) is required to be referenced when you make a further submission.

EXAMPLE:

Submission 1/3:

‘1’ is the submitter number

‘3’ is the submission point number

How to read the summary

- This summary is ordered by submitter number. The summary lists all of the submission points made by all the submitters.

How to make a further submission

People can make a further submission if they represent a relevant aspect of the public interest and/or have an interest in the plan change greater than the interest of the general public.

A further submission can only be made in support or opposition of matters raised in the submissions. No new points can be raised.

Further submissions should be set out in the format shown in the submission form. Copies of the further submission form are available at Council offices at Cambridge and Te Awamutu, as well as online at www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchange25.

In accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 a copy of the further submission must be sent to the person who made the original submission within five (5) working days of sending the further submission to the Waipā District Council.

We have made the decision to redact the contact details of all submitters. We have done this because increasingly people are expressing privacy concerns with having their contact details publicly available. If you need to contact a submitter Council can provide their details to you on request. **Please email districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz to request the contact details of the original submitter.**

Submissions can be:

- Posted to:** Waipā District Council
Private Bag 2402
Te Awamutu 3840
- Delivered to:** Waipā District Council – Te Awamutu Office
101 Bank Street
Te Awamutu
- Delivered to:** Waipā District Council – Cambridge Office
23 Wilson Street
Cambridge
- Emailed to:** districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Submitter details

Submission Number	Submitter
01	Ele Duncan
02	Nicholas Dromgool
03	Shirley Hewetson
04	Shirley Hewetson
05	Ronan Cavanagh
06	Ronan Cavanagh
07	Matthew Boyd
08	Jo Wrigley, Go Eco
09	Grant V Walker
10	Waipā District Council
11	John Mills
12	Fire and Emergency New Zealand
13	Powerco
14	Raukawa Charitable Trust
15	Nancy C Donald
16	New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Inc and Horticulture New Zealand
17	Federated Farmers Waikato
18	Carole A Searle
19 - (LATE)	Bryan Clements (B&B Clements Family Trust No2)

(1) Ele Duncan

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
1/1	Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A(e)(iii)	Support in Part	Rule 4.4.2.57A(e)(iii) is unworkable/impractical for existing shelterbelts that currently require maintenance. Existing shelterbelts become non-complying as they are unable to be maintained from the site on which the shelterbelt is located. The rule should be consistent with the rest of the provision and allow grandparenting – maintenance for existing shelterbelts from outside the boundaries of the site on which the shelterbelt is located.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.57A(e)(iii) to read: All maintenance activities (such as trimming to maintain the height and width) occurs within the boundaries of the site within which the shelterbelt is located for a shelterbelt planted after [DATE] .

(2) Nicholas Dromgool

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
2/1	Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A	Support in Part	A commercial kiwifruit operator on Gorton Road has planted shelterbelts within 8m of the road and is not willing to trim the height to the required 6m. The current shelterbelt causes significant debris on the road and significant shading. The owner needs to be forced to replace to the terms of the rules and/or Council at minimum instruct the owner to	That Existing shelterbelts not meeting the rules are to be either removed and replanted or trimmed to the maximum height of 6m.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				maintain the height of the shelterbelt at 6m high.	

(3 & 4) Shirley Hewetson

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
3/1	Shelterbelts	-	Support	Popular trees at 62 Kay Road, Puahue are falling on power lines, cars, fences, buildings and people every month. Trees need to go before someone is killed.	Remove shelterbelts at 62 Kay Road, Puahue.
4/1	Shelterbelts	-	Support	I phoned Worksafe, they said they wouldn't do anything until someone was killed, sounds about right in the way things are currently sorted. The overgrown shelterbelts are less than 1m from the boundary fence	No specific relief sought

(5 & 6) Ronan Cavanagh

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
5/1	Rubbish	-	Oppose	I would like to council to look at bin tags because it makes it cheaper than paying a private company for rubbish	I'd like to take over rubbish because it makes it cheaper for everyone with a bin tag if we have bin tags and makes it fair and you can pay what you use
6/1	Food Scrap Collection	-	Support in Part	Council should provide a weekly food scrap collection service.	That a weekly food scrap collection service be provided.

(7) Matthew Boyd

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
7/1	Definition of 'Artificial Crop Protection Structure'	Definitions	Support in Part	The proposed definition of an artificial crop protection structure (ACPS) being 1.8m or over means that smaller ACPs (also known as scrim) can be any colour resulting in considerable effects. I have heard arguments that since they are 1.8m or less they should be treated as a fence and have no colour restrictions.	Change the wording of the definition for ACPS to ensure lower ACPS are included in the colour restrictions.
7/2	Cloth Colour for Artificial Crop Protection Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.88	Support in Part	PC25 specifies the colours of artificial crop protection structures (ACPS) to reduce effects. However, there are large volumes of existing ACPSSs not using the colours specified in PC25. When cloth for	Insert a new rule to require that when existing (before PC25 date) ACPS cloth is replaced PC25 colours must be used.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				existing ACPs is replaced or repaired the new cloth colours should be limited to the colours for new ACPs.	
7/3	Visual Impact of Artificial Crop Protection Structure	-	Support in Part	Artificial Crop Protection Structures (ACPSs) at 6m setback and 6m high create significant negative visual impact on those living next to the ACPs.	Add a new rule requiring the screening of an artificial crop protection structure by planting a shelterbelt where an existing dwelling is within 50m of the shared boundary.
7/4	Height limit for Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A	Support in Part	Rule 4.4.2.57A needs tightening to state how and when the maximum height is measured. Need to ensure that at any time the height of the shelterbelt is 6m, and not only at the time at which the shelterbelt is trimmed.	Amend the rule to ensure that the maximum height of a shelterbelt is 6m at any time during the trimming cycle.
7/5	Setback for Artificial Crop Protection Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.2	Support in Part	The proposed exemption for when the setback can be reduced if screening is provided by an existing shelterbelt is confusing, ambiguous and may lead to abuse of the intention.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.2. as follows: - Rule 4.4.2.2.d.ii to read: The artificial crop protection structure or crop support structure is screened from any adjoining site (not in common ownership) by an existing shelterbelt situated on the owner's property. For avoidance of doubt – an existing shelterbelt on land not owned by the horticulturists does not provide for an exemption. Suggest additional wording that: - the existing shelterbelt must be providing mitigation at the time of construction. - defines the level of minimum setback if

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					existing screening is present to be not less than 4m from an internal boundary
7/6	Rule exemptions	Rural Zone Rules 4.4.2.1 and 4.4.2.2	Support in Part	PC25 allows for exemptions but it is not clear on how or who decides if an exemption should be granted.	Amend the exemptions proposed under PC25 to: - Clarify who and how an approval for an exemption is granted. - Require a resource consent application to reduce the setback. - Include a process to assess whether an existing shelterbelt would mitigate the effects of the artificial crop structure. - Ensure all affected parties have an input.
7/7	Unconsented Crop Protection Structures	Section 4 – Rural Zone	Support in Part	There are still unconsented crop protection structures.	Additional wording to ensure, at the operative date of PC25, that any existing unconsented crop protection structures must abide by the PC25 requirements or be altered to comply.

(8) Jo Wrigley, Go Eco

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
8/1	Shelterbelts	-	Support in Part	Species used in shelterbelts to support: habitat for indigenous fauna, pollinators and biological control agents to support productive and biologically based crop protection systems;	Mandate the use of mixed-native and non-native, climate resilient species in shelterbelts.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				- strengthen ecological corridors and assist in linking locally, regionally and nationally significant sites; - increase native seed dispersal - reduce wind speed and force and reduce soil erosion; and - shade for stock.	
8/2	Artificial Crop Protection Structures	-	Support in Part	Certain aspects of the proposed provisions would benefit from revision to ensure they are future-proof in light of the biodiversity and climate crises and better align with the non-statutory documents referenced in section 5.7 of the Evaluation Report.	That the following matters are incorporated into the Waipā District Plan: - Integrated climate goals; - Support organic and permaculture systems in the Rural Zone; - Provide planning definitions for <i>regenerative, organic</i> and <i>mātauranga-based</i> agriculture; - Local food governance mechanisms; and - Development of a local food systems statement. - Use of plastic free or sustainable materials standards for artificial crop protection structures

(9) Grant V Walker

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
9/1	Penalties or Fines for Non-Compliance	-	Support in Part	Current penalties for non-compliance are lacking in strength. Enforcement need more powers and the ability to stop work immediately for non-compliance.	Increase fees and penalties for non-compliance and give the Enforcement Team more power to do their job.

(10) Waipā District Council

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
10/1	Error Correction	Rural Zone Objective 4.3.2 Policies 4.3.2.1-4.3.2.7	Support in Part	The notified version of Appendix 7 – <i>Summary of the Proposed Changes to the Waipā District Plan</i> of the S.32 Evaluation Report is corrupted with incorrecion referencing for the policies associated with Objective 4.3.2. This requires correcting.	Reinstate the correct numbering for Policies 4.3.2.1 – 4.3.2.7 as follows: ~~a.~~ 4.3.2.1 Policy - Management of rural resources ~~b.~~ 4.3.2.2 Policy – Rural environment ~~c.~~ 4.3.2.3 Policy - Farming activities to avoid adverse effects ~~d.~~ 4.3.2.4 Policy - Farm buildings and activities to internalise adverse effects ~~e.~~ 4.3.2.5 Policy – Equine industry ~~f.~~ 4.3.2.6 Policy – Storage and processing of horticultural and agricultural produce grown on the holding ~~g.~~ 4.3.2.7 Policy – Goat and deer fencing
10/2	Error Correction	Rural Zone Rules 4.4.2.1, 4.4.2.2 and 4.4.2.3	Support in Part	The notified version of Appendix 7 – <i>Summary of the Proposed Changes to the Waipā District Plan</i> of the S.32 Evaluation Report is corrupted with incorrectly number references for Rules 4.4.2.1, 4.4.2.2 and 4.4.2.3. This requires correcting.	Amend the numbering of Rule 4.4.2.1, 4.4.2.2 and 4.4.2.3 to read: Rule – Minimum building setback from road boundary ~~a.~~ 4.4.2.1 The minimum building setback from road boundaries shall be Rule – Minimum setbacks from internal site boundaries

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					~~b.~~ 4.4.2.2 The minimum building setback from internal site boundaries shall Rule – Dwellings adjoining marae ~~c.~~ 4.4.2.3 No dwelling shall be placed or
10/3	Error Correction	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.13A	Support in Part	The notified version of Appendix 7 – <i>Summary of the Proposed Changes to the Waipā District Plan</i> of the S.32 Evaluation Report is corrupted with incorrectly number reference for the Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.13, which should be referenced as 21.1.4.13A. This requires correcting.	Amend the numbering of the Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.13 Shelterbelts (Rule 4.4.2.57A) to read: 21.1.4.13A Shelterbelts (Rule 4.4.2.57A)
10/4	Error Correction	Rural Zone Rules 4.4.2.2, 4.4.2.7, 4.4.2.8, 4.4.2.10, and 4.4.2.58	Support in Part	The notified version of Appendix 7 – <i>Summary of the Proposed Changes to the Waipā District Plan</i> of the S.32 Evaluation Report is corrupted with the restriction of discretion and assessment information for rules 4.4.2.2, 4.4.2.7, 4.4.2.8, 4.4.2.9, 4.4.2.9A, 4.4.2.10 and 4.4.2.58 not having been displayed.	Reinstate the Restriction of Discretion and Assessment Information for: Rule 4.4.2.2 to reinsert the Restriction of Discretion and Assessment Information as follows: Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion being restricted over: • The provision of daylight and sunlight into neighbouring buildings; and • Visual and aural privacy; and • The general appearance/effect on the openness and character; and • The safety and efficiency of traffic flow; and

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					• Access around the site; and • Effects on surrounding properties; and • Potential reverse sensitivity effects on any adjoining rural activities. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21. Rule 4.4.2.7 to reinstate the Restriction of Discretion and Assessment Information as follows: Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over: • Effects on the significant natural area vegetation and biodiversity. This matter shall be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21. Rule 4.4.2.8 to reinstate the Restriction of Discretion and Assessment Information as follows: Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion being restricted over: • Potential effects on activities within the building in terms of safety, shading/loss of daylight, and amenity; and

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					• Effects on surrounding properties; and • Reverse sensitivity effects on future harvesting of the commercial forest. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21. Rules 4.4.2.9 and 4.4.2.9A to reinstate the Restriction of Discretion and Assessment Information as follows: Activities that fail to comply with rules 4.4.2.9 and 4.4.2.9A will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion being restricted over: • Visual effects including bulk, scale and location of the building; and • Effects on rural character and amenity; and • Effects on surrounding properties; and • Loss of daylight to adjoining sites. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21. Rule 4.4.2.10 to reinstate the Restriction of Discretion and Assessment Information as follows: Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion being restricted over: • Visual effects including bulk, scale and

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					location of the building; and • Effect on high class soils; and • Effects of traffic generation; and • Effects on identified landscapes or cultural values; and • Effects on rural character. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21. Rule 4.4.2.58 to reinstate the Restriction of Discretion and Assessment Information as follows: Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion being restricted over: • Effects on adjacent properties; and • Effects on infrastructure and utilities; and • Effects on water bodies as a result of potential tree fall and/or harvesting. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21.
10/5	Error Correction	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A	Support in Part	In Rule 4.4.2.57A is referenced '[DATE]' to be inserted when known. The intended date is the operative date of the plan change, and this is what was intended to be stated in Rule 4.4.2.57A.	Amend Rules 4.4.2.57A.a; 4.4.2.57A.b. and 4.4.2.57A.c. to read: a. The maximum height of a shelterbelt planted after [Operative Date] shall be 6m above ground level within 20m of a property boundary.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					b. Then minimum setback of any shelterbelt planted after [Operative Date] from a road boundary shall be 4m unless:..... c. The minimum setback of any shelterbelt planted after [Operative Date] from an internal boundary shall be 4m unless:.....
10/6	Error Correction	Assessment Criteria 21.1.25.10	Support in Part	As a result of PC25 the term ‘ancillary structures’ has become redundant. It is only referenced in this assessment criteria and is neither defined nor used elsewhere in the district plan. As a result, the term should be removed and replaced with crop support structure to avoid confusion.	Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.25.10 to replace all references to ancillary structures with crop support structures:

(11) John Mills

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text in red; deletions in red and struck through)
11/1	Shelterbelts	-	Not stated	Trees such as poplars if planted in urban areas can become a hazard. Big trees in urban areas can be a hazard to utilities and other houses.	That the plan includes urban areas also.

(12) Fire and Emergency New Zealand

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
12/1	Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A	Support	Shelterbelts can increase wildfire risk, because: • Of where they are planted, what species is used, and how they are managed. • They create long continuous corridors that can act as fuel corridors for fire spread; • They can be located close to buildings and structures which could become involved in a vegetation fire; • With poor management and climate change become more susceptible to ignition and rapid fire spread. Permitted activity standard 4.4.2.57A which includes standards that have co-benefits for fire risk management is supported Where compliance with the standards in Rule 4.4.2.57A is not achieved resource consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity. An additional matters of discretion should relate to fire risk to allow consent to be declined should a shelterbelt present an unacceptable fire risk.	Amend matter of discretion to Rule 4.4.2.57A to read: ... Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion being restricted over: • The proximity to, and the effects on adjoining activities. • The ability to maintain shelterbelt within the boundaries of the subject property. • The effects on infrastructure and/or network utilities. • Effects on the safety of road users. • The fire risk associated with surrounding structures, assets and infrastructure. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
12/2	Shelterbelts	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.13A Shelterbelts (Rule 4.4.2.57A)	Support	As a consequence of the addition of a fire risk matter of discretion being included there is the need for corresponding assessment criteria.	Add new Assessment Criteria 12.1.4.13A.e to read: e. the fire risk management measures to manage any identified effects on surrounding structures, assets and infrastructure.
12/3	Artificial Crop Protect Structures and Crop Support Structures	-	Support	Artificial Crop Structures, while still a fire fuel, are less of a fire risk due to their limited density of fuel source. landowners are encouraged to consider fire suppression systems such as having a suitable firefighting water supply due to the likelihood of restricted emergency service access and to reduce the risk to the loss of crop assets.	No amendments sought.

(13) Powerco

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
13/1	Artificial Crop Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.9A	Support	Support the addition of an advice note relative to the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP:34 2001). This provision:	Retain as drafted

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				- will raise awareness of the need to maintain safe separation distances between artificial crop protection structures and overhead electricity lines; and - is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks 2008 which now applies to Powerco's networks.	
13/2	Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A (d)(ii); Notes 1 & 2; and Matters of Discretion	Support	Support no shelterbelts being located within 10m of the outer conductor of an overhead powerline. This is consistent with the: - New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances; - Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003; and - NPS-EN Policies 11 and 12(1)(d).	Retain as drafted
13/3	Artificial Crop Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.88(b)(i), Note 1 and Matters of Discretion	Support	Support: - all artificial crop protection and support structures being setback a minimum of 10m from the outer conductor of an overhead powerline. - The advice note referring to NZECP:34:2001; and - The matter of discretion that refers to effects on infrastructure and network utilities this will raise awareness of the need to maintain safe separation distances and will also be consistent with NPS-EN Policies 11 and 12(1)(d).	Retain as drafted

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
13/4	Shelterbelts	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.13A(c)	Support	Support the addition of effects on infrastructure and/or other network utilities as a matter of discretion. This is consistent with NPS-EN Policies 11 and 12(d).	Retain as drafted
13/5	Artificial Crop Structures	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.29A(e)	Support	Support the addition of effects on infrastructure and/or other network utilities as a matter of discretion. This is consistent with NPS-EN Policies 11 and 12(d).	Retain as drafted

(14) Raukawa Charitable Trust

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
14/1	Cultural Implications	-	Oppose	Insufficient information was provided to enable mana whenua to fully assess the cultural implications of the artificial crop protection and support structures.	Propose the completion of a Cultural Impact Assessment process to identify and evaluate the full range of potential cultural impacts
14/2	Cultural Landscapes	Section 25 – landscapes and Viewshafts	Oppose	Commend Council for recognising the cultural importance of viewshafts between marae and significant maunga and for engaging with mana whenua to identify and protect those valued connections. The Waipā District Plan already recognises and provides for several cultural landscapes within the district, and we endorse the proposed additional protections.	In the event that the Waipā District Council adopts Plan Change 25 to the Waipā District Plan, Raukawa supports: - the inclusion of and provision for these viewshafts. - The inclusion of provisions aimed at protecting cultural values and landscapes

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
14/3	Sites of Significance	-	Oppose	Te Ture Whaimana speaks to the identification and protection of sites of significance.	That wāhi tūturu and other sites of significance should be both recognised and protected to uphold the cultural, spiritual and historic relationship with the Waikato River.
14/4	Cultural Landscapes	Section 25 – landscapes and Viewshafts	Support	Support the objective and policies for shelterbelts, artificial crop protection and support structures in natural landscapes that they: • Avoid locating in viewshafts where the views to outstanding natural features, and mountains and heritage items cannot be maintained. • Shall not detract from the character and amenity of landscapes or viewshafts • Are oriented and located to minimise adverse effects on natural landscapes and viewshalfts.	No specific relief sought.
14/5	Cultural Landscapes	Section 25 – landscapes and viewshafts		The Wāhi Ahurei stretches approximately 14km along the Waikato River, from Waipapa through to Lake Arapuni, and encompasses the surrounding areas. This was an intensively occupied area, with many pā sites, very closely organised with line of sight to one another along the river. The maps and information of the cultural landscape are an accessible tool to tell Raukawa's stories and share why this place is very special and significant to Raukawa.	That the Waipapa ki Arapuni Wāhi Ahurei cultural landscape is included in the Waipā District Plan as a Cultural Landscape Area or other relief that ensures the recognition and provision for the historic heritage values and the relationship of Raukawa with their ancestral lands through maintaining the values associated with this cultural landscape.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				Additionally, the Wāhi Ahurei cultural landscape forms a working document within the Raukawa Charitable Trust framework for environmental management of our landscapes. Raukawa requested a number of times during engagement that the Waipapa ki Arapuni Wāhi Ahurei Cultural Landscape be covered by the provisions proposed for the protection of the values of cultural landscapes in Plan Change 25 and this was not addressed.	

(15) Nancy C Donald

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
15/1	Rural Activities	-	Support in Part	Parts of PC25 need to be mitigated as a rural zone is a mixture of crops, orchards, animals, farmers, horticulturalists and lifestyle living:	No specific relief stated

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				- Should not be used for industry - Soils are rated as high class - Only organic sprays should be used	
15/2	Shelterbelts	Rule 4.4.2.2 and Rule 4.4.2.57A	Support in Part	- Planting of shelterbelts would be 1m (allowing for trimming on neighbours side) 4m between the shelterbelt and the Artificial Crop Protection - There is already a power company requirement of 2m clearance if shelterbelts are planted directly under power lines.	Proposed setbacks for shelterbelts and structures to be altered as follows: Shelterbelts = 1m from boundary and 2m from electricity lines
15/3	Shelterbelts	Rule 4.4.2.57A		In cases of the planting of new shelterbelts input from the neighbour as to which type of tree could be sorted at the same time advising of types most suitable.	Amend the rule to ensure neighbours are consulted on the most suitable tree species to be planted.
15/4	Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A	Support in Part	That the proposed 6m height control for shelterbelts is retained;	Neighbour approval is required if the height of a shelterbelt is proposed to be greater than 6m.
15/5	Cloth Colours	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.88	Support in Part	Only have colour controls on cloth if there is no shelterbelt in place or if slopes are over 10 degrees.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.88 to Have no colour controls if a shelterbelt is in place; or if there is no shelterbelt: - Vertical = green - Horizontal = white (or green where slopes are more than 10 degrees)
15/6	Cloth Colours	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.88	Support in Part	Where white cloth is continuous it should be broken into separate blocks of approximately 5 hectares.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.88 to manage the maximum size of Artificial Crop Protection Structures to 5 hectares per structure.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
15/7	Shelterbelts	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.13	Support in Part	Positive effects of shelterbelt screening of artificial crop protection structures are the protection from wind for both horticulture, animals and people.	No relief stated.
15/8	Views	Policy 25.3.10.1	Support in Part	Artificial Crop Protection Structures should not be located in viewshafts of outstanding natural features, mountains or heritage items unless mitigated by hedges or shelterbelts.	Amend policy 25.3.10.1 to allow artificial crop protection structures in viewshaft areas if they are screened by a hedge or shelterbelt.

(16) New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated and Horticulture New Zealand

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
16/1	General	-	Support in Part	PC25 supported provided that the potential impacts on horticultural productivity and land use are properly mitigated. Without adequate mitigation measures PC25 is opposed.	Incorporate plan provisions that provide: a) Clear and robust expectations for a rural working environment where ACPS are recognised as a positive contribution to maximising the productivity of horticultural activities b) Rules that are user-friendly for growers, farmers, and neighbours, making them easy to understand and implement; c) An incentivised pathway that encourages the use or planting of hedges and shelterbelts, allowing for reduced setbacks for ACPS and enabling more efficient use of highly productive land;

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					d) Alignment with the objectives, policies and clauses in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS – HPL); and e) A more flexible rule for Landscape, Viewshaft, and Natural Landscape areas that permits the use of ACPs, provided they are appropriately mitigated or screened from public view.
16/2	Definitions	Definition of 'Artificial Screen'	Support	This is a supplementary definition to Artificial Crop Protection Structures.	Retain this definition, with a suggested diagram clearly defining the difference between an artificial screen, artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures.
16/3	Definitions	Definition of 'Artificial Crop Protection Structures'	Support	Supports the proposed definition.	Retain this definition, with a suggested diagram clearly defining the difference between an artificial screen, artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures.
16/4	Definitions	Definition of 'Building'	Oppose in Part	The definition of a building should exclude artificial crop protection structures (and artificial screens as contained in that definition) and crop support structures to remove ambiguity. If the structures are not specifically excluded from the building definition, then other standards like site coverage will not apply, where they are not relevant.	Include: “... but does not include: - ARTIFICIAL CROP PROTECTION STRUCTURES - CROP SUPPORT STRUCTURES

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				We consider this to be a critical change for the Council to make for clarity and certainty when interpreting the district plan.	
16/5	Definitions	Definition of 'Crop Support Structures'	Support	A new definition has been added for crop support structures, which are distinct from artificial crop protection structures, consistent with NZKGI & HNZ draft feedback	Retain this definition, with a suggested diagram clearly defining the difference between an artificial screen, artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures.
16/6	Definitions	Definition of 'Farming Activities'	Support	Support the addition of Artificial Crop Protection and Crop Support Structures to the Farming Activities definition.	No relief stated
16/7	Definitions	Definition of 'Shelterbelt'	Support	Support that smaller hedges outside of landscape and viewshaft areas area not considered to be shelterbelts.	No relief stated
16/8	Rural Character	Rural Zone Introduction 4.1.3	Support	It is appropriate for horticultural and crop production to be included in Section 4.1.3.	No relief stated
16/9	Rural Character	Rural Zone Introduction 4.1.12.b)	Support in Part	Amend the description of rural character to more accurately reflect the nature of the rural area. It is not accurate to describe flat to rolling terrain, which is primary production land, as being open and largely free from development.	Amend 4.1.12.b) to read: ~~Some areas of open~~ landscapes containing natural features and scenic vistas, including ~~flat to rolling terrain~~ , volcanic cones, streams, lakes, peat lakes, rivers and wetlands ~~that are largely free from development~~ .
16/10	Rural Character	Rural Zone Introduction 4.1.12.d)	Support	Supports the amendments to 4.1.12.d)	No relief stated
16/11	Reverse sensitivity	Rural Zone Policy 4.3.2.x	-	A new policy is needed to better ensure that reverse sensitivity effects on primary	Include a new policy under 4.3.2: ~~To avoid reverse sensitivity effects and ensure that primary production activities are~~

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				production activities are acknowledged and addressed.	not adversely affected by the establishment of sensitive activities in the Rural Zone.
16/12	Artificial Crop Protection Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.1.1.z)	Support	Artificial Crop Protection and Crop Support Structures should be specifically identified as permitted activities alongside shelterbelts. Their status should not rely on the definition of farming activities to be deemed permitted. In addition, Crop Support Structures are similar to fences and should be provided for as a permitted activity.	Add additional lines to 4.4.1.1.z) to read: z) Shelterbelts, crop support structures and artificial crop protection structures
16/13	Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.1.3.o)	Support	This activity aligns with subsequent shelterbelt rules and standards.	No relief stated
16/14	Artificial Crop Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.1.c)	Oppose in Part	A 6m setback for artificial crop structures would result in a measurable loss of productive land: - a zero-road boundary yard for ACPS and crop support structures is consistent with typical orchard layouts. - Effects on road safety and rural character can be managed through height and material controls rather than reliance on yard depth. “operational headlands” for farm vehicle manoeuvring and maintenance are provided internally within the site and do not rely on a road boundary setback.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.1.c) to read: (c) For artificial crop protection 6m structures, and crop support structures. Except no setback applies where the structure uses green or black vertical cloth or is screened by an existing shelterbelt.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
16/15	Artificial Crop Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.2.d)	Oppose in Part	A 0m internal boundary setback is appropriate for ACPS and crop support structures because maintenance is typically undertaken from within the site; crop support structures are akin to a fence. An external maintenance corridor is not generally required. Effects at sensitive interfaces can be managed through targeted controls, such as screening or limited setbacks where an established residential building is located in close proximity.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.2.d) to read: (d) For artificial crop protection 6m structures, and crop support structures ~~when a neighbouring dwelling is located within 12m of the boundary.~~ Except no setback shall apply where: i. ~~No dwelling is located within 12m of the boundary~~ ii. Any adjoining site is held in common ownership iii. The artificial crop protection structure or crop support structure is screened from any adjoining site (not in common ownership) ~~by an existing a shelterbelt~~ iv. The encroachment is authorised by a deemed permitted activity notice in accordance with s87BA(2) of the Resource

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					Management Act 1991.
16/16	Artificial Crop Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.9A	Oppose	Artificial crop protection structures may be over 6m in some circumstances. Other plans have a range of heights between 8 – 12m. 6m is not a suitable height for modern ACPS.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.9A to 9m in height
16/17	Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A(a)	Oppose	Increase permitted shelterbelt height to 9m, recognising the practical need for shelterbelts to function effectively in undulating rural environments and to manage wind turbulence and extreme weather events. 8m is the standard height for kiwifruit artificial crop protection structures an additional 1m allows for topographical changes. An unduly restrictive height limit reduces the functional effectiveness of shelterbelts and may increase reliance on setbacks to manage visual effects, resulting in greater loss of productive land without necessarily improving amenity outcomes.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.57A. a) to 9m in height .
16/18	Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A(b)	Oppose in Part	3m is the standard width required for a farm vehicle and maintenance.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.57A. b) to read The minimum setback of any shelterbelt planted after [date] from a road boundary shall be ~~4m~~ 3m unless:...
16/19	Shelterbelts	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.57A(c)	Oppose in Part	3m is the standard width required for a farm vehicle and maintenance.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.57A. c) to read The minimum setback of any shelterbelt planted after [date] from an internal boundary

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					shall be 4m ~~3m~~ unless:...
16/20	Artificial Crop Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.88 a)	Oppose	Vertical cloth materials should only be limited in colour choice when in proximity to a boundary unless a shelterbelt exists to screen the cloth from the boundary. The existing proposed wording "if the cloth cannot be seen from outside the site" is vague and could mean any location in which the cloth is visible.	Amend Rule 4.4.2.88 a) to read: (a) The colours of permeable cloth associated with the vertical and horizontal surfaces of any Artificial Crop Protection Structure shall be: i. ~~For all vertical / side surfaces~~ Except no colour control applies if the cloth cannot be seen from outside the boundaries of the site is screened by a shelterbelt Dark Green or Black ii. ~~For all horizontal / roof surfaces~~ Transparent, White, Dark Green or Black
16/21	Artificial Crop Structures	Rural Zone Rule 4.4.2.88	Oppose	A new rule for artificial crop protection structures is included as 4.4.2.88. It would be more appropriate for all provisions relating to ACPS to be located in that rule	Add setback and height provisions as sought with respect to 4.4.2.2, 4.4.2.1 and 4.4.2.9A to Rule 4.4.2.88

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				Seeks consolidation of all Rural Zone operational standards relating to artificial crop protection structures, including setbacks, height and materials within Rule 4.4.2.88. This approach improves clarity, reduces duplication, and ensures the provisions are drafted specifically for horticultural structures rather than relying on general building standards.	
16/22	Artificial Crop Structures	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.6A	Oppose in Part	The phrase 'Visual openness' is vague and open to interpretation. We consider the Council is trying to consider 'visual sightlines and road safety'	Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.6A.a) to read: a. The extent to which the crop structure alters ~~the visual openness of road corridor~~ road visibility and sightlines.
16/23	Shelterbelts	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.13A	Support in Part	Positive effects of shelterbelts should also be included to the Assessment Criteria.	Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.13A to add new criteria to read: e. The ability of the shelterbelt to mitigate the effects of Artificial Crop Protection Structures.
16/24	Artificial Crop Structures	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.29	Oppose in Part	An additional consideration should be the productive benefits.	Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.29 to add the following: ~~The productive benefits of artificial crop protection structures~~
16/25	Shelterbelts	Landscapes and Viewshafts Resource Management Issue 25.2.12	Support in Part	It should also be acknowledged that shelterbelts can be used to mitigate effects without blocking views.	Amend Rule 25.2.12 to include the following text: ~~However, shelterbelts can also be used to mitigate impacts on medium to long-distance views and landscapes by shielding structures such as ACPS and, therefore, when used in these ways, without blocking views within~~

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					~~these environments, views within these environments, can have a positive impact on views.~~
16/26	Viewshafts	Landscapes and Viewshafts Policy 25.3.10.1	Oppose in Part	Artificial Crop Protection Structures should be able to locate in viewshafts if appropriate measures are taken to mitigate visual effects.	Amend Policy 25.3.10.1 ~~Shelterbelts, artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures shall avoid locating in viewshafts where the views to the outstanding natural features, and mountains and heritage items cannot be maintained.~~ Artificial crop protection structures shall not be located in viewshafts for outstanding natural features, mountains and heritage items unless the visual effects are appropriately mitigated through vegetative hedges or shelterbelts.
16/27	Artificial Crop Structures	Landscapes and Viewshafts Rule 25.4.1.1.h)	Oppose in Part	Support the management of landscape and viewshaft values. However the framework should provide a clear, effects-based pathway for artificial crop protection structures where adverse visual effects can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated. A blanket prohibition does not reflect the operational context of horticulture or the ability to manage visibility through screening and colour controls.	Amend 25.4.1.1.h) to add a permitted activity rule with standards and a restricted discretionary activity where standards are not met. Permitted activity standards - Dark green or black cloth shall be used on all vertical faces. - Green or black cloth shall be used horizontally where the slope is over 10 degrees. - The structures shall be set back 5m

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
					from the road boundary unless screened with natural shelter. Where a continuous cover of white cloth is used horizontally, the natural shelter shall be provided to separate blocks so that the maximum continuous cover in any one block is 5 hectares.
16/28	Shelterbelts	Landscapes and Viewshafts Rule 25.4.2.11	Oppose	The rule relies on subjective interpretation and would be difficult to consistently implement and enforce. Compliance would be challenging to verify across extensive rural road networks and public viewpoints. For these reasons, the rule should be deleted.	Delete Rule 25.4.2.11 in its entirety.

(17) Federated Farmers Waikato

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
17/1	Definitions	Definition for 'Artificial Screen'	Support	Support the definition of Artificial Screen.	No relief stated
17/2	Definitions	Definition for 'Artificial Crop Protection Structure'	Support	Support the definition of Artificial Crop Protection Structure as it aligns with the National Planning Standards and ensures these structures are not defined as a building in accordance with the District Plan.	No relief stated

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
17/3	Definitions	Definition for 'Crop Support Structures'	Support	Support the definition of Crop Support Structure.	No relief stated
17/4	Definitions	Definition for 'Farming Activities'	Support	Support the amendment of farming activities to include artificial crop protection. this amendment aligns with the National Planning Standards.	No relief stated
17/5	Rural Activities	Rural Zone 4.1.3	Support	Dairy farming has been acknowledged as a predominant activity in the district. Support the inclusion of horticulture and crop production as being common throughout the district and recognising it as diversification in rural activities in the district.	No relief stated
17/6	Rural Character	Rural Zone 4.1.12	Support	Support the addition of crop support, protection structures and shelterbelts as being part of rural character to more accurately reflect the nature of the rural areas in the district.	No relief stated
17/7	Rural Character	Rural Zone Policy 4.3.2.4	Support in Part	Support in part that artificial crop protection and crop support structures shall be located and scaled to minimise adverse effects on rural character and amenity. They should also be recognised as essential infrastructure within the rural zone, and are necessary for providing for rural activities within a zone that focusses on rural activities.	Less emphasis on character and amenity of essential infrastructure that is required to support rural activities within the rural zone.
17/8	Reverse Sensitivity	Rural Zone 4.3.2	Support in Part	A new policy is required to ensure reverse sensitivity effects on rural activities is acknowledged and addressed.	Insert a new policy to avoid reverse sensitivity effects and ensure that rural activities are not adversely affected by the establishment of sensitive activities in the Rural Zone.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
17/9	Artificial Crop Structures	Rural Zone 4.4.2.(a)(c)	Support	Support this performance standard of Artificial Crop Protection Structures and Crop Support Structures being 6m from any road boundary and no setback applies where the structure is screened by an existing shelterbelt,	No relief stated
17/10	Artificial Crop Structures	Rural Zone 4.4.4.9A	Oppose	Artificial crop protections structures can exceed 6m in height. Numerous district plans permit a range of height varying between 8 – 12m in height.	Rule 4.4.2.9A should be amended to allow structures up to 9m in height as a permitted activity.
17/11	Shelterbelts	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.13A	Support in Part	An additional matter should be included in the assessment criteria relating to the positive effects of Shelterbelts in mitigating the effects of artificial crop protection structures.	Amend assessment criteria 21.1.4.13A add a new criteria to read Positive effects of shelterbelts for character and amenity purposes that mitigates the effects of Artificial Crop Protection Structures.
17/12	Artificial Crop Structures	Assessment Criteria 21.1.4.29A	Support in Part	Support the matters of discretion, but another matter should be added that considers the productive benefits of structures.	Amend assessment criteria 21.1.4.29A to add a new criteria to read: The productive benefits of artificial crop protection structures.
17/13	Artificial Crop Structures	Landscapes and Viewshafts Policy 25.3.10.1	Oppose	Allow artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures to locate in natural landscapes and viewshafts where they are screened by vegetative hedges or shelterbelts.	Amend Policy 25.3.10.1 so it allows artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures to be located in natural landscapes and viewshafts where they are screened by vegetative hedges or shelterbelts.
17/14	Artificial Crop Structures	Landscapes and Viewshafts Rule 25.4.1.1.h	Oppose in Part	Amend Rule 25.4.1.1h to allow artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures in landscape and	Seek inclusion of permitted activity rule with standards. Permitted activity standards:

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				viewshaft areas as a permitted activity subject to standards	• Dark green or Black cloth shall be used on all vertical faces • Green or black cloth shall be used on horizontally where the slope is over 100. • A setback at least 50m of MHWS. • Structures are setback 5m from the road boundary unless screened with natural shelter. • Where a continuous cover of white cloth is used horizontally, the natural shelter shall be provided to separate blocks so that the maximum continuous cover in any one block is 5 hectares.

(18) Carole A Searle

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
18/1	Artificial Crop Structures	Rule 4.4.2.1	Oppose	A 6m road setback from road boundaries does not ensure safety on road corners. A 6m setback on a corner opposite my property is causing issues with severe sight restrictions. This is a very busy road with a range of vehicles from cyclists to large trucks and truck and trailers.	I request the Council make a 15 metre setback on corners to ensure safety.
18/2	Artificial Crop Structures	Rule 4.4.2.10	Oppose	There will be no control over the size of coverage allowing vast areas of land to be covered.	I request that Council have control over the size of land that can be covered. e.g. properties over 20 hectares should require a resource consent.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
18/3	Shelterbelts	Rule 4.4.2.57A	Oppose	A minimum 4m setback from property boundaries is not enough on corners. A consent has been given for a property opposite our property where an existing maize crop shows the potential for severe sight restrictions. This is a very busy road with a range of users from cyclists to large trucks and tractors and trailers.	I request the Council to increase the setbacks for shelterbelts on corners. E.g. a 10m setback.

(19) Bryan Clements (B&B Clements Family Trust No2) - LATE

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
18/1	Shelterbelts	4.4.2.57A	Support in Part	In the case of 124 McGhie Road. Trees, Lawson Cypress (<i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>), were planted many years ago, at Councils request, as a visual barrier, to help hide the sheds. The site is leased by Comvita New Zealand Limited, for the purpose of Beekeeping and associated activities and they hold a lease back to our Family Trust. At the time of planting the trees a cycle path on Flat Road was not envisaged. I submit that existing properties, like ours, should have no economic changes / charges put on them and that they can continue with existing use rights. The tree on the cycle path and other boundaries, will be cut back once a year and the off cut placed on the property for mulching. Some of	That the property at 124 Mc Ghie Road have its shelter belt trees put in an approved status or similar. It's important that our trees stay in place, so as best as possible the site looks good from the Road.

Submission point	Topic	District Plan provision	Support / Oppose / in part	Submission summary	Relief sought / decision requested (New text underlined in red; deletions in red and struck through)
				the trees have an infrequent die back happening and if a gap in made, Manuka will be planted.	