



Waipā District Plan Plan Change Submission Form

Form 5

Clause 6 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

Send 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 Friday, February 13, 2026**.

COUNCIL USE ONLY

Date received

Document ref:

1. Submitter details

Full name of submitter:	Matthew Boyd
Contact name if different from above:	
Contact phone number(s)	
Email address:	
Address for service: (required if no email address is provided)	

We will serve all formal documents electronically via the email address provided above. Where there is no email address provided the documents will be posted to the above address.

2. This is a submission on the following proposed plan change to the Waipā District Plan

Proposed Plan Change 25 – Shelterbelts and Artificial Crop and Support Protection Structures

3. Trade competition

Select one	☐ I could ☒ I could not	gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Select one	☒ I am ☐ I am not	directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that – (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

4. Attendance at Council hearing

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

5. The specific provisions of the plan change my submission relates to are: (give details)

Select one	☐	I SUPPORT
	☒	I SUPPORT IN PART
	☐	I OPPOSE

6. My submission is: (please include the reasons for your view)

See attached word document & photo

7. I seek the following decision/s from Council: (give precise details – e.g. what you would like the wording of a specific provision (or map) to be changed to)

See attached word document & photo

8. 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:
(or person authorised to
sign on behalf of submitter)



Dated 1/2/2026

PC25 Submission Matthew Boyd

1. Issue that's needs to be resolved: The definition of an ACP being 1.8m or over means that smaller ACPs (also known as scrim) can be any colour resulting in considerable effects.

Note: some horticulturalists can have these every few crop rows resulting in considerable cumulative visual effect as often these are white. See photo.

I seek the following change: Change the wording to ensure lower ACPs are included in the colour restrictions.

Note: a. these are not fences and should not be compared to fences.

Fences contain or prohibit entry or surround a property.

Scrim is undeniably a crop protection structure, made of the same materials as higher ACPs, and they often traverse fields multiple times resulting in cumulative effects. Scrim has only one purpose – to screen and protect crops.

- b. Many horticulturists do use colours that would match the PC25 colour requirement already (namely green).

I have heard arguments that since they are 1.8 m or less they should be treated as a fence and have no colour restrictions. This is cherry picking and if this logic is accepted then surely a 6m high crop protection structure is a building and the current requirements for RCs should continue.

2. Issue that needs to be resolved: PC25 specifies the colours of ACPs to reduce effects. However, there are large volumes of existing ACPs, many that do not use the colours specified by PC25. (most common is white verticals)

I seek the following change:

To add a Rule:" when existing (before PC25 date) ACP cloth is replaced PC25 colours must be used.

Note: this adds no additional burden on any party. i.e. it passes the fairness test. It seems illogical that the colour of materials that only have a life of approx. 10 years are grandfathered "forever" when there is acceptance that the PC25 specified colours mitigate effects. Wording needs to ensure that minor cloth replacement for repair purposes is not captured in this which could result in a patchwork result.

3. Issue that needs to be resolved: ACPs at a 6m setback and 6m high create significant negative visual impact on those living next to ACPs.

I seek the following change:

To add a Rule that requires property owners (horticulturists) to screen ACPs by planting shelter belts to mitigate the effects where a dwelling exists within 50 m of the shared boundary

Note: most ACPs do not “face” dwellings – this requirement is not likely to be onerous on horticulturists and something that could be planned for when determining if a site was suitable for development. It adds no requirement on existing orchards with ACPs. This helps to reduce the burden on dwelling owners to mitigate an effect, not of their making. It is important to understand that if a large farm structure e.g. shed pad (over 250sqm) was constructed near a boundary, a 25m set back rule applies therefore the ACP 6m setback is considerably more generous compared to other large structures.

4. Issue that needs to be resolved: Rule 4.4.2.57A height limit for a shelter belt is a positive change but the wording needs tightening relating to how and when the max height is measured. The intention was a max height at any time, but the current wording isn't tight enough.

Note: shelter belts can grow as much as much as 1 m per year in height and horticulturists generally trim every year or every two years.

If a shelter belt is trimmed to only 6m then, if trimmed once per year the average height will be 6.5m, if trimmed every two years the average height will be 7m not 6m and the shelter belt could reach 8m (before trimming) resulting in loss of amenity

I seek the following change:

To ensure the Rules are unambiguous, stating that the maximum height of a shelter belt is 6m at any time during the trim cycle. Perhaps an additional Advice note is required.

Note: without this clarity, WDC enforcement will be forever arguing with horticulturists when 6m is measured.

Note: this is not difficult to achieve- a horticulturist that trim annually will need to trim to 5m to allow for the growth.

5. Issue that needs to be resolved: Rule 4.4.2.2 Minimum Setback is confusing, ambiguous and may lead to abuse of the intention

Note: Current wording allows for an exemption when "there is screening from any adjoining site (not in common ownership) by an existing shelter belt.

I seek the following two changes:

- a. Suggested wording change : "there is screening from any adjoining site (not in common ownership) by an existing shelter belt situated on the owner's property. For avoidance of doubt – an existing shelter belt on land not owned by the horticulturists does not provide for an exemption"

Note: I believe that this was the intention but without this clarification horticulturists may unilaterally decide that a neighbour's hedge that may be over 3m is deemed a shelter belt and therefore provides existing screening.

In addition to a. above :

- b. Also suggest additional wording that the existing shelter belt must be providing mitigation at the time of construction

Note: without clarity there is a risk that horticulturists will argue that the plants “will mitigate effects at a later date when they mature”

- c. Also suggest additional wording that defines the level of minimum setback if existing screening is present.

Note: recommended that if an exemption is granted the structure can not be less than 4m (instead of 6m) from any internal boundary .

Shelter belts are trees- they are prone to poor trimming techniques, disease and fires (note: three incidents in the Karapiro area have resulted in loss of shelter belts from fire in recent time). These occurrences result in loss of screening which can take a decade to rectify. Therefore, any exemption due to existing shelter belts still require some control.

- 6. Issue that needs to be resolved : PC25 allows for exemptions but its not clear on how and who decides if an exemption should be granted

I seek the following change:

- a. To clarify who and how an approval for an exemption is granted. Suggest a RC (just like any other setback exemption request for buildings) or an new application to WDC is required plus suitable fee to cover costs of processing, site visit, consultation. I do not see this as onerous on a horticulturist as they are seeking an exemption to increase productive land available. Surely any RC or Application costs would be “ less than minor” compared to the potential benefits from the exemption.
- b. In addition to setbacks, exemptions can apply if an existing shelter belt mitigates effect. A process is required to ensure that an existing shelter belt actually mitigate effects now.

Note: horticulturists should NOT be given unilateral power to make these decisions without a robust, balanced and neutral process, including all effected parties having input.

Note: Without an application process and review ,there is a risk that the current practice, by some horticulturists, of building crop protection structures and ACPs without consent and applying afterward and gaining exemptions post construction, will continue. i.e. horticulturists will grant themselves exemptions.

Note: one of the benefits of PC25 is it provides transparency, clarity and certainty for the property owners and those neighbouring orchards e.g.

heights, set backs, colours etc. Without an application process, exemptions will potentially not be transparent and will create uncertainty for those neighbouring horticulture operations, which is the current unsatisfactory situation.

7. Issue that needs to be resolved : There are still unconsented crop protection structures

I seek the following change:

Additional wording to ensure that once PC25 is in force any existing unconsented Crop protection structures /ACPs must abide by the PC25 requirements or be altered to comply.

