

HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND SUBMISSION ON DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING STANDARDS 2018

TO: NATIONAL PLANNING STANDARDS
MINISTRY FOR ENVIRONMENT
PO BOX 10362
WELLINGTON 6143
PlanningStandards@mfe.govt.nz

SUBMISSION ON: DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING STANDARDS 2018

NAME: HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND

POSTAL ADDRESS: [REDACTED]

1. Horticulture New Zealand's (HortNZ) submission and the decisions sought are detailed in the attached schedules and appendices:

- Schedule 1: Horticulture in New Zealand
- Schedule 2: Cover submission
- Schedule 3: Completed submission form

Rachel McClung
Environmental Policy Advisor – South Island
Horticulture New Zealand

Dated: 17 August 2018

Address for service:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

SCHEDULE ONE: HORTICULTURE IN NEW ZEALAND

Horticulture New Zealand (HortNZ) was established on 1 December 2005, combining the New Zealand Vegetable and Potato Growers' and New Zealand Fruitgrowers' and New Zealand Berryfruit Growers Federations.

HortNZ represents the interests of New Zealand's 5,000 commercial fruit and vegetable growers who employ over 60,000 workers. Land under horticultural crop cultivation in New Zealand is calculated to be approximately 120,000 hectares.

Horticultural exports are rapidly growing, and the industry is on target to meet Horticulture New Zealand's industry mission of \$10 billion by 2020. For the first time New Zealand's total horticultural produce exports in 2017 exceeded \$3.44bn Free On Board value, 83% higher than a decade before.

It should be acknowledged that it is not just the economic benefits associated with horticultural production that are important. The rural economy supports rural communities and rural production defines much of the rural landscape. Food production values provide a platform for long term sustainability of communities, through the provision of food security.

HortNZ involvement in Resource Management planning processes

On behalf of its members, HortNZ takes a detailed involvement in resource management planning processes. HortNZ works to raise growers' awareness of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to ensure effective grower involvement under the Act, whether in the planning process or through resource consent applications.

The principles that HortNZ considers in assessing the implementation of the RMA include:

- The effects-based purpose of the RMA
- Non-regulatory methods should be employed by councils
- Regulation should impact fairly on the whole community, make sense in practice and be developed in full consultation with those affected by it
- Early consultation of land users in plan preparation
- Ensuring that RMA plans work in the grower's interests both in an environmental and sustainable economic production sense.

SCHEDULE TWO: COVER SUBMISSION

Introduction to this submission

HortNZ welcomes the opportunity to provide this submission to the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) on its Draft National Planning Standards 2018.

The commercial fruit and vegetable growers that HortNZ represent are frequent users of RM plans and HortNZ supports progress to improve the user friendliness of RM plans and to provide certainty as a result of consistent plan interpretation.

HortNZ have completed the submission form (attached). All submission questions have been answered within the submission form, with the exception of Questions 18a and 18b. Given the length of the HortNZ submission points, we have responded to the questions on Definitions below.

Q. 18. CM – 1: Definition standard

HortNZ generally supports Definitions Standard, including the mandatory directions. In particular, HortNZ supports Direction 3c – *Policy statements and plans may include definitions that only apply to a subcategory or narrower application of a term defined in the Definitions table*. An example of where this particular clause is important can be seen when considering the RMA definition of ‘bed’ and ‘active bed’ as a sub-category of bed, such as it is used in the Horizons One Plan. If sub-category definitions are not provided for, then this would affect the status of rules in their application, making rules wider than previously negotiated through the public planning processes.

Decision sought – retain Clause 3c as notified.

HortNZ considers that it is unnecessary to repeat the full RMA definitions in plans. It is preferable to state that the definition ‘*has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA*’ and simply provide a hyperlink in plans to the legislation.

Decision sought – do not require RMA definitions to be repeated in plans, rather ensure they are hyperlinked to legislation.

HortNZ generally supports the proposed definitions and in particular the following:

- Accessory building
- Intensive primary production
- Reverse sensitivity

Decision sought – retain the above listed definitions as notified.

However, care needs to be taken in some of the definitions that have clearly been drafted with urban activities in mind. As proposed, these definitions will have unintended consequences for the management of rural activities such as; artificial crop protection, crop support structures, land preparation, seasonal workers accommodation and rural research facilities.

HortNZ strongly submits that the following definitions are included in the Definition Standard to avoid unintended consequences for rural activities;

Land preparation– *Land preparation means the disturbance of soil by machinery for planting, replanting, tending or harvesting pasture or crops. Land preparation includes*

blading, contour ploughing, ripping, mounding, stepping, contouring, bunding and sediment control measures and drainage associated with horticultural crops but does not include direct drilling or mechanical land preparation associated with plantation forestry.

Seasonal Workers Accommodation– *A dwelling or accommodation that is used for part of the year to meet labour requirements in the rural sector which may include sleeping and ablution facilities and a communal kitchen and eating area.*

HortNZ provides specific comment on the following definitions:

Ancillary activity – This definition is too narrow and will be problematic for ancillary activities occurring on non-contiguous properties. It will create significant difficulties for rural enterprises where ancillary activities are located on separate sites. For example; post-harvest facilities and storage are often on sites physically separated from where crops are grown, however, they are ancillary to the growing activity.

Decision sought – Amend as follows: *means an activity that either provides support to, or is incidental and subsidiary to, the primary activity on the same site.*

Building – As proposed this definition captures artificial crop protection.

Artificial Crop Protection Structures are structures that use permeable materials to cover and protect crops and are now essential for horticulture production of some crops. With changing practice, crop types and diversification in the horticultural sector, growers have become increasingly reliant on a variety of Crop Support Structures and Artificial Crop Protection Structures to support rural production activities.

The definition of building is contingent on the definition of roof and walls. It is HortNZ's contention that permeable materials on the top and/ or sides should not constitute a roof or walls and therefore not be classed as a building.

There are a range of resource management and building consent issues that have arisen across the country and it has been HortNZ's experience that the response by regulatory authorities to these issues has been inconsistent. Much of the inconsistency has arisen from a lack of understanding of the requirements for this form of horticulture and how best to address in plans and interpret through the Building Act.

Crop Support Structures extend to a variety of structures upon which various crops rely for growth and support and are positioned and designed to direct growth to establish canopies. While Artificial Crop Protection Structures protect fruit from sunburn, windburn and hail, assist with spray coverage, reduce mowing and weeding, assist pruning and picking. An additional benefit of crop protection is the reduced need for bird scarers, as less birds get into the crops.

Photos 1, 2 and 3 below were taken in May this year in a kiwifruit orchard near Opotiki. They show a typical example of Artificial Crop Protection Structures. Crop Support Structures can also be seen in the photos supporting the kiwifruit vines.



Photo 1 – Artificial Crop Protection – Kiwifruit



Photo 2 – Artificial Crop Protection – Kiwifruit



Photo 3 – Artificial Crop Protection – Kiwifruit

As mentioned above, such structures are essential for protecting fruit from climatic events and wind. For instance, wind rub in kiwifruit can downgrade the fruit significantly and hail on ripe cherries can split the fruit, making it of little value. Traditionally live shelter was used, but increasingly growers are using artificial crop protection as it provides benefits immediately and can also provide horizontal as well as vertical protection.

As Artificial Crop Protection Structures are made of permeable material, rain and wind can pass through the structure, but the intensity is reduced.

Such structures are generally not totally enclosed, in that the cloth does not come to the ground level or some sides may be open. Some structures are vertical, but increasingly the benefits of overhead shelter are being recognised. In some location, the horizontal 'roof' material is pulled back during winter (when plants are not fruiting) to prevent deterioration of the cover that can be caused by winter weather.

For these reasons, Artificial Crop Protection Structures are distinctly different from buildings which are a totally enclosed environment and made of impermeable material and usually have a controlled temperature environment. Therefore, the effects of the two types of structures are different. Artificial Crop Protection should not be considered a building, however the definition of building as drafted would capture this.

Decision Sought – Amend the definition of building as follows:

Means any impervious structure, whether temporary or permanent, moveable or fixed, that is enclosed, with 2 or more walls and a roof, or any structure that is similarly enclosed.

Coverage – the definition of structure again causes an issue for crop protection structures.

Decision Sought – amend definition of structure to avoid unintended consequences for rural activities.

Drain – HortNZ have experienced issues with the definition of drain and river. We note that the RMA definition of River refers to farm drainage canal. Therefore, where a watercourse is defined as a river, it is not a drain. The definition of drain should also reflect this in reverse.

Decision sought: Clarify that drains are not rivers

Drinking water – HortNZ strongly believes that further clarification is required with respect to 'drinking water' which should be defined to differentiate from other end uses.

- Essential drinking water and sanitation – potentially includes hospitals and other critical public facilities.
- Domestic drinking water supply – water for domestic purposes only.
- Municipal water supply – recreational and amenity water, commercial and industrial water.

All are usually delivered through public supply networks. A definition is incredibly important in establishing future priorities for water in plans.

Decision sought – include the following additional definition:

Essential drinking water and sanitation – The amount and quality of water needed to adequately provide for people's hygiene, sanitary and domestic requirements but does not include water used outside or by industry (Greater Wellington)

Dust – The definition as proposed captures sprays and vapours. It is assumed that this is an unintended consequence. The focus should be on 'solid' particulate matter

Decision sought – means all non-combusted solid particulate matter...

Earthworks – This is an urban focused definition for earthworks associated with urban activities and is unworkable for the rural environment. As drafted this definition would capture cultivation and land preparation. Cultivation is a key activity for horticulture, particularly for vegetable growers. Cultivation involves working the soil to create a seed bed for planting a crop and usually occurs on flat to gently sloping land. A range of equipment may be used as part of cultivation including discs and power harrows. For some crops, such as potatoes, a mound of soil needs to be made for planting. Wheel tracks are usually left between a number of rows to provide access for machinery to apply agrichemicals and fertiliser and also for harvesting the crop.

Decision sought – exclude land preparation from the definition of earthworks and introduce a new definition of cultivation as above.

Educational facilities – it is unclear whether this definition captures childcare facilities or not.

It should be clear if childcare facilities are included. Education facilities in rural environments are sensitive activities and often require setbacks to avoid reverse sensitivity impacts.

Decision sought – clarify that childcare facilities are educational facilities.

Footprint – Environmental footprint is a commonly used term and this provides no explanation as to what this means. Using the term ‘structure’ within the definition captures crop protection structures. Again, this is an urban focused definition with unintended consequences for rural activities.

Decision sought – Delete definition.

Functional need – This is an infrastructure focused definition that has unintended consequences for rural activities. ‘Can only occur’ is too strong. This definition needs to be related to the practicality of locating an activity somewhere else, i.e. the cost of buying land to locate an ancillary activity or the practicality of having an activity located in another zone or on another property.

Decision sought – amend definition as follows:

Means the locational, operational, practical or technical needs for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate ~~in a particular environment because the activity can only occur in that environment.~~

Green Infrastructure – Delete this term. Again, this urban definition will have unintended consequences in the rural zone. It is not a commonly used term in plans so uncertain why included in the Planning Standard. The definition uses the term ‘natural waterbodies’ which would be confusing in implementation. If not deleted it should be replaced with a suitable definition of ‘water sensitive urban design’ to allow district plans to address this through rules.

Decision sought – Delete definition of green infrastructure.

Ground level – Again, this urban definition will have unintended consequences in the rural zone, in particular, clause (c) due to the use of the term ‘structure’.

Decision sought – Amend definition of ‘structure’ as sought below.

Height – Again, this urban definition will have unintended consequences in the rural zone, in particular, clause (c) due to the use of the term ‘structure’.

Decision sought – Amend definition of ‘structure’ as sought below.

Height (in relation to regional policy...) – Again, this urban definition will have unintended consequences in the rural zone, in particular, clause (c) due to the use of the term ‘structure’.

Decision sought – Amend definition of ‘structure’ as sought below.

Height in relation to boundary – Again, this urban definition will have unintended consequences in the rural zone, in particular, clause (c) due to the use of the term ‘structure’.

Decision sought – Amend definition of ‘structure’ as sought below.

Industrial activity – This is different to RMA definition of industrial and trade premise. It is unclear why a different definition is sought. Given the large number of plans that are currently in place based in the RMA definition it does not seem efficient to amend the definition as proposed. . This definition is linked to rural industry and rural production zone. However, rural industry is not an Industrial activity. HortNZ seeks the uncoupling of rural industry from an industrial activity. See comments on Rural Industry below. Delete research laboratories.

Decision sought – delete research laboratories from this definition and have a separate definition for research laboratories.

Land disturbance – see comments regarding earthworks and cultivation above.

Decision sought – Include definition of cultivation as above.

Minor residential unit – This definition has unintended consequences for workers accommodation in rural areas.

Decision sought – Include definition of ‘workers accommodation’ as above.

Net site area – see comments in relation to coverage definition.

Notional Boundary – this needs to be consistent with noise standards.

Decision sought – ensure that the definition is consistent with the noise standards.

Primary production – support in part the definition. The definition is similar to the definition of production land in the RMA. While the definition excludes ‘processing’ it should be clear that there may be some washing and packing as part of preparing product for market

Decision sought:

Add to b) includes any land and auxiliary buildings used for the production of the products, including storing, washing and packing of product for market, that result from the listed activities

c) does not include processing of those products into a different product

Residential unit – This definition has unintended consequences for workers accommodation in rural areas.

Decision sought – Include definition of ‘workers accommodation’ as above.

Rural Industry – HortNZ seeks the uncoupling of rural industry from an industrial activity. There are a number of activities which are undertaken within the rural area that support primary production and are appropriately located within rural areas. It would be clearer to refer to rural services and industry and list the types of activities that are anticipated.

Decision sought: Delete definition of rural industry and include a definition for rural services and industry as follows:

Rural services and industry means an activity undertaken within a rural area where the activity is directly related to rural production activities and includes:

- facilities for processing, packing, and storing primary products and
- activities which service rural production
- rural contractors depots
- postharvest facilities
- Research facilities

Rural production activities: HortNZ seeks that there is a definition for rural production activities which is wider than primary production and encompasses the range of activities that occur within a rural environment associated with primary production.

Decision sought: Include a definition for rural production activities:

Rural production activities means rural land use activities that rely on the productive capacity of land or have a functional need for a rural location such as agriculture, pastoral farming, dairying, poultry farming, pig farming, horticulture, forestry, quarrying and mining.

Also included in this definition are processing and research facilities that directly service or support those rural land use activities.

Setback – This definition will have unintended consequences in the rural zone, in particular, clause (c) due to the use of the term ‘structure’.

Decision sought – Amend definition of ‘structure’ as sought below.

Special audible characteristic – This definition is not suitably clear and its interpretation is opinion based.

**Decision sought – Amend definition as follows:
means sound that has a distinctive characteristic such as tonality or impulsiveness
~~which affects its subjective acceptability.~~**

Structure – This definition has unintended consequences for rural activities. As discussed above under the definition of building, ‘artificial crop protection’ structures and ‘crop support’ structures will be caught by this definition and every other definition in the Definition Standard that uses the term ‘Structure’. HortNZ is also concerned that the definition is inconsistent with the current interpretation under Part 1 of the RMA and that the proposed definition will now cover structures not fixed to land.

Decision sought – Delete the definition of Structure or limit the scope of the definition to urban activities only.

Visitor Accommodation – This definition has unintended consequences for workers accommodation in rural areas.

Decision sought – Include definition of ‘seasonal workers accommodation’ as above.

Water sensitive design – Support this definition, but include groundwater recharging effects.

Decision sought – Amend definition as follows:

Means an interdisciplinary approach to land use and development planning, design and implementation which integrates land use and water management, to minimise adverse effects on freshwater systems (surface and groundwater) and coastal environments, particularly from stormwater runoff.

Wetland – This is a very broad definition that has been subject to many contentious hearings, mediations and other debates. This definition should be removed from the Definition Standard and wetlands should be defined spatially (i.e. mapped), rather than with a narrative definition.

Decision sought – Delete definition of wetland from standard and require spatial definition of wetlands.

SCHEDULE THREE: COMPLETED SUBMISSION FORM

Draft first set of National Planning Standards

SUBMISSION FORM

The Government is seeking views on the draft first set of National Planning Standards.

For more information about the Government's proposals read our National planning standards consultation document available at <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/consultation/draft-national-planning-standards>.

Submissions close at 5:00 pm on Friday 17 August 2018.

Making a submission

You can provide feedback in three ways:

1. Use the online submission form available at <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/consultation/draft-national-planning-standards>. This is our preferred way to receive submissions.
2. Complete this submission form and send it to us by email or post.
3. Write your own submission and send it to us by email or post.

Publishing and releasing submissions

All or part of any written submission (including names of submitters) will be published on the Ministry for the Environment's website www.mfe.govt.nz. Unless you clearly specify otherwise in your submission, we will consider that you have consented both your submission and your name being posted to the Ministry's website.

Contents of submissions may be released to the public under the Official Information Act 1982 following requests to the Ministry for the Environment. Please advise if you have any objection to the release of any information contained in a submission and, in particular, which part(s) you consider should be withheld, together with the reason(s) for withholding the information. We will take into account all such objections when responding to requests for copies of, and information on, submissions under the Official Information Act.

The Privacy Act 1993 applies certain principles about the collection, use and disclosure of information about individuals by various agencies, including the Ministry for the Environment. It governs access by individuals to information about themselves held by agencies. Any personal information you supply to the Ministry in the course of making a submission will be used by the Ministry only in relation to the matters covered by this consultation. Please clearly indicate in your submission if you do not wish your name to be included in any summary of submissions that the Ministry may publish.

Submission form

The questions below are a guide only and all comments are welcome. You do not have to answer all of the questions. To ensure your point of view is clearly understood, please explain your rationale and provide supporting evidence where appropriate. The structure of this form is in line with the draft first set of national planning standards as shown in the overview section tables 1 and 2.

Contact information

Name*	Rachel McClung	
Organisation (if applicable)	Horticulture New Zealand	
Address	[REDACTED]	
Phone	[REDACTED]	
Email*	[REDACTED]	
Submitter type*	Individual	<input type="checkbox"/>
	NGO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Business / Industry	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Local government	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Central government	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Iwi	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

* Questions marked with an asterisk are mandatory.

Draft first set of National Planning Standards

1. Do you support the draft first set of National Planning Standards?

- Yes (subject to requested amendments)
- No

Please refer to the cover letter that also informs this submission and includes general submission points.

2. S-RPS: Regional policy statement structure standard

HortNZ support the proposed S-RPS with the following amendments sought:

- **Part 1** - HortNZ consider that there is great value in an Integrated Management chapters to provide overarching guidance about how a Regional Policy Statement relates to regional and district plans. It is recommended that this sits within Part 1 – Introduction and General Provision

Decision sought – Include Integrated management chapter within Part 1 – Introduction and General Provisions.

- Part 2 – HortNZ seeks inclusion of spatial identification (maps) of mana whenua status to ensure clarity for consultation with iwi.

Decision sought – include instruction under Part 2 that local authorities must include maps of mana whenua status.

a. Parts 3 and 4 – Core policy statement provisions

- The Strategic Direction theme should be compulsory in the RPS at a minimum to ensure consistency of direction for urban and rural growth/future development. Currently this is only included in the S-SD standard.

Decision sought – Include Strategic Direction Chapter within Part 3 – Significant Resource Management Issues for the Region

- The term ‘Landforms’ does not align with s6 of the RMA and will cause unnecessary confusion.

Decision sought – replace landscapes, landforms and natural character with RMA terminology ‘natural features, landscapes and character’

- HortNZ oppose the option to combine the Land and Water chapters in an RPS as the RPS includes directions to both regional and district councils who have different functions and authorities with respect to land and water. Therefore, direction in an RPS should be separated and very clear on the themes of water and land.

Decision sought – remove instruction that states ‘Local authorities must consider whether to combine this chapter with Water/ Land Chapter’.

b. Part 5 – Evaluation and Monitoring

No comment

3. S-RP: Regional plan structure standard

HortNZ support the proposed S-RP with the following amendments sought:

- Part 2 – HortNZ seeks inclusion of spatial identification (maps) of mana whenua status to ensure clarity for consultation with iwi.

Decision sought – include instruction under Part 2 that local authorities must include maps of mana whenua status.

a. Parts 3, 4 and 5 – Core plan provisions

- The term ‘Landforms’ does not align with s6 of the RMA and will cause unnecessary confusion.

Decision sought – replace landscapes, landforms and natural character with RMA terminology ‘natural features, landscapes and character’.

- Spatial identification of wetlands would remove unnecessary confusion and debate as to what areas meet criteria to be classed as wetlands.

Decision sought – include an instruction under ‘Water’ theme to map wetlands within the region.

b. Part 6 – Evaluation and Monitoring

No comment

4. S-DP: District plan structure standard

HortNZ support the proposed S-DP with the following amendments sought:

- Part 2 – HortNZ seeks inclusion of spatial identification (maps) of mana whenua status to ensure clarity for consultation with iwi.

Decision sought – include instruction under Part 2 that local authorities must include maps of mana whenua status.

- Part 3 – The Strategic Direction theme should be compulsory in a district Plan to ensure consistency of direction for urban and rural growth development. Currently this is only required *if a local authority is including provisions on significant resource management matters...*

Decision sought – Strategic Direction within Part 3 is a ‘must’, not an ‘if’.

- Part 3 - The term ‘Landforms’ does not align with s6 of the RMA and will cause unnecessary confusion.

Decision sought – replace landscapes, landforms and natural character with RMA terminology ‘natural features, landscapes and character’

- Zones:

- Part 6 – HortNZ generally support the proposed Zones, including the naming and number of zones, with the expectation of Special Purpose Zone. It is important that Post-Harvest Facilities and Research Facilities can be identified a Special Purpose Zone in Part 6. These facilities are not subsets of other zone types as they can be established within a range of zones including; Industrial Zones or Rural Zones. For this reason, a precinct approach would not work as these activities are not a subset of just one zone type. They are of importance to a District or Region due to their contribution to the economy, employment, food security and the horticulture industry. Furthermore, HortNZ consider that horticultural research is not a subset of ‘Education Zone’. Research facilities face a number of resource management issues which are specific to the nature of their activities so do not fit neatly within other zones. There are different objectives for each of these zones and different environmental impacts. They must be identified separately.

Decision sought – include ‘Post-Harvest Zone’ and ‘Research Zone’ are included in the list of Special Purpose Zones within Part 6

- Part 6 - A number of plans currently contain a 'Coastal Environment Zone' or equivalent. HortNZ have assume that this will be identified and managed through a precinct overlay and consider that this approach can work.

5. S-CP: Combined plan structure standard

HortNZ support the proposed S-CP and seeks the same decisions as sought above for the following:

- Integrated Management
- Mana Whenua status
- Landforms
- Strategic Direction; and
- Special Purpose Zones.

What is not clear to HortNZ is whether the Combined Plan Structure is also intended to cover Unitary Plans. If not then a separate plan structure standard should be provided.

6. S-IGP: Introduction and general provisions standard – Part 1 of all plans and policy statements

- Definitions need to be identified in the plan and hyperlinked (put this here or in definitions)- check this in form standards?
- **HortNZ support the proposed S-IGP.**
 - Introduction chapter
Support - No further comment
 - How plan works chapter
Support - No further comment
 - Interpretation
Support - No further comment
 - Plan integration
Support - No further comment
 - Formation of standards with tangata whenua
Support - No further comment
 - National direction
Support - No further comment

7. S-TW: Tangata whenua structure standard – Part 2 of all plans and policy statements

HortNZ support the proposed S-TW with the following amendments sought:

- a. Recognition of iwi/hapū chapter
Support – No further comment
- b. Tangata whenua local-authority relationships chapter
Support – No further comment
- c. Iwi and hapū planning documents chapter
 - HortNZ support the recognition of iwi and hapu planning documents as proposed in Part 5. It is important to include a description of how the local authority has taken the iwi/hapu planning documents into account in the plan.
- d. Consultation chapter
 - HortNZ seeks inclusion of spatial identification (maps) of mana whenua status to ensure clarity for consultation with iwi.

Decision sought – include mandatory direction under 6 Consultation Chapter that maps of mana whenua status are to be included in policy statements and plans.
 - HortNZ recommends that a guidance document is as prepared by MfE to assist Council's and Tangata Whenua to identify how they will work together to identify engagement requirements for resource consent processes. Currently, the approach is unclear and ad hoc in many Districts. This causes confusion and unnecessary tension which could be avoided with clear guidance. It can also add considerably to the cost of a consent if consultation with multiple iwi is required and the iwi do not always agree on what is sought.
- e. Use of te reo Māori
Support – Te reo Māori is an official language of New Zealand and planning documents should reflect this.

8. S-SD: Strategic direction structure standard – Part 3 of District plans

HortNZ support the proposed S-SD.

In particular, HortNZ support this as a mandatory standard, as Strategic Direction is of critical importance to regional policy statements, regional and district plans.

Strategic direction is important for managing urban and rural growth, resource pressures, integrated management and cross-boundary issues and ensuring section 6 matters are addressed consistently.

9. S-DWM: District wide matters standard – Part 4 of District plans

HortNZ generally support the proposed S-DWS and questions why there is not an equivalent Region Wide Matters Standard.

Decision sought – provide a Region Wide Matters Standard.

- a. Natural Environment Values Chapter

HortNZ support the use of RMA terms and consider that 'natural resource values' or 'natural and physical values' are more appropriate terms.

Decision Sought – amend title to either 'natural resource values' or 'natural and physical values'.

The term 'Landforms' does not align with s6 of the RMA and will cause unnecessary confusion.

Decision sought – replace landscapes, landforms and natural character with RMA terminology 'natural features, landscapes and character'.

The Coastal environment must be by mapping, not identification by narrative, as mapping is the clearest method to avoid confusion and ensure clarity.

Decision sought – remove

b. Environmental Risks Chapter

It is unclear to HortNZ if matters such as drainage, flood protection and climate change will be addressed under 12 – Natural Hazards or 23 vii -other network utilities not listed. Climate Change in particular should be explicitly mentioned as to where this is to be covered.

If trivial matters such as street furniture are to be listed, then critical matters such as those identified above should be explicitly listed.

Decision sought – explicit list.

c. Community Values Chapter

No comment

d. Infrastructure and Energy Chapter

Network utilities should be explicitly addressed here and this should include everything that is defined as infrastructure in the definition in the RMA. Flood protection and drainage and irrigation infrastructure are critical to rural communities. It is noted that the Infrastructure chapter is in the district plan provisions but not the regional plan. Infrastructure is also a regional plan consideration.

e. Subdivisions Chapter

No comment

f. General District Wide Matters Chapter

No comment

10. S-ASM: Draft area specific matters standard – Part 5 of District plans, Part 6 – Combined plans

a. Zone framework (individual and range)

HortNZ generally support the proposed Zones, including the naming and number of zones, with the expectation of Special Purpose Zone. It is important that Post-

Harvest Facilities and Research Facilities are identified a Special Purpose Zone in Part 6. These facilities are not subsets of other zone types as they can be established within a range of zones including; Industrial Zones or Rural Zones. For this reason, a precinct approach would not work as these activities are not a subset of just one zone type. They are of importance to a District or Region due to their contribution to the economy, employment, food security and the horticulture industry. Furthermore, HortNZ consider that horticultural research is not a subset of 'Education Zone'. There are different objectives for each of these zones and different environmental impacts. They must be identified separately

b. Purpose statements

Rural and Rural Production Zones - It is unclear how the Rural and Rural Production Zones are that different. These zone statements need to include indoor production.

Decision sought – Include indoor production within the purpose statement for Rural Zone and Rural Production Zone.

c. Additional special purpose zones and criteria

Post-harvest facilities such as processing and packing plants, cool stores and storage generally and research facilities, need to be acknowledged within a zone statement as they are significant activities. It is the strong view of HortNZ that these activities are best addressed through Special Purpose Zone.

Suggested purpose statements:

Post-Harvest Zone: The purpose of the Post-Harvest Zone is to provide specifically for post-harvest facilities that process and packing produce with associated cool stores and storage. Such facilities may be located in a number of areas so special purpose zones recognise the unique standalone nature of these facilities.

Research Zone: The purpose of the Research Zone is to provide specifically for research facilities including laboratories and associate field research which have unique requirements and may be located in a number of areas such as rural or industrial.

Decision sought – 'Post-Harvest Zone' and 'Research Zone' are included in the list of Special Purpose Zones with the above purpose statements.

Precincts chapter

A precinct is an urban planning tool. Is this fit for purpose in the rural environment?

d. Development areas chapter

It should be made explicit in the description that this tool can be used to manage rural production growth also. For example – future expansion of post-harvest facilities, research facilities, indoor production, etc.

e. Designations chapter

No Comment

11. S-SAM: Schedules, appendices and maps standard – Part 6 – Regional policy statements, Part 7 – Regional plans, Part 6 – District plans, Part 8 – Combined plans

12. F-1: Electronic accessibility and functionality standard

- Table 18, point 8 – specifically request that definitions are hyperlinked where they are referred to in plan provisions

a. Standard baseline requirements

Support all baseline requirements – Hyperlinks to definitions will be very helpful.

b. Level 5 requirements

Support Level 5 requirements as long as implementation support is provided by Government to Council's with a low rating base so that rate payers are not overburdened in poorer areas.

13. F-2: Mapping standard

a. Zone colour palette

Support

b. Symbology

Partly support – However, there should be symbols identified for Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature and wetlands.

14. F-3: Spatial planning tools (Regional) standard

a. Range of tools

Partly support – precinct needs to be included in the list.

b. Zone

Support

c. Overlay

Support

d. Specific control

Support

e. FMU

Support

f. Airshed

Support

- g. Area

Support

15. F-4: Spatial planning tools (District) standard

Support

- a. Range of tools

Support

- b. Zone

Support

- c. Overlay

Support

- d. Precinct

Support

- e. Specific control

Support

- f. Development areas

Support

- g. Designation

Support

16. F-5: Chapter Form standard

- a. Chapter form

HortNZ support there being a standard that provides this direction. We acknowledge that it is similar to the Christchurch City and Waikato plans. Our experience is that this structure is workable, but can be complicated.

- b. Rules

An important factor in this standard is that it identifies what is a standard and what is a condition. There should always be a default rule to best understand what the default activity status is.

- c. Rule tables

Support

17. F-6: Status of rules and other text and numbering form standard

- Support having a standard
 - a. Status of rules and other text

Support

- b. Numbering

Support

18. CM-1: Definitions standard

See separate document for definition comments

- a. Individual definition

Click here to enter text.

- b. Additional definitions

Click here to enter text.

19. CM-2: Draft noise and vibration metrics standard

- a. Technical support

Partly Support – Also include NZS6807 1994 – noise management and landuse planning for helicopter landing areas as this standard makes differentiation for intermittent use which is important for frost fighting in orchards.

20. Implementation

- a. ePlanning implementation

Support. Having all planning documents in a common electronic format in New Zealand will be more effective and efficient in the long term. It will assist ease of use by the general public and professionals. Under resourced Councils should be provided financial support and guidance by MfE to implement e-planning. The Government should also ensure that all regions and district have suitable internet capability before ePlanning is enforced in communities.

- b. Timing

It is important to ensure implementation timing and support works for all interested parties, not just Government and Council's. HortNZ takes an active role in resource management processes across the country, regularly submitting on plan changes and reviews and participating in Environment Court processes. There will be consequential errors in plans due to the fact that standard definitions and new structure are proposed. HortNZ will need to engage in every process to ensure such errors are identified and corrected.

It has been the experience of HortNZ that unintended consequences of new planning provisions frequently occur due to a lack of understanding of the complexities of the

rural environment by Planner's. However, once the consequences are explained appropriate solutions often appear. Therefore, HortNZ need to actively engage in all processes.

We have four full time staff dedicated to resource and environmental management matters, and cannot see how it will be possible for HortNZ to engage on every process given the timeframes proposed and the quantum of change directed by the Planning Standards.

We seek greater moderation in the timing. As proposed, there is no mechanism to ensure an even spread of Council's implementing the standards throughout the 5 to 7 years. On average there would be 11 district plan and 4 regional plan processes per year for seven years that HortNZ and other NGO's and sector groups would be expected to engage in. This number does not include RSP processes. This is a foreboding task for a team of four and for many other interested parties with limited resources.

It would assist HortNZ greatly if these processes could be undertaken region by region, reducing travel (and cost) to multiple locations across the country within short timeframes. Furthermore, if MfE should provide an anticipated timeline showing in which year each council anticipates public engagement on their planning documents over the 7 year period. This would allow HortNZ and others to plan budgets, staffing and consultancy support. This information should be collated by MfE as a matter of course to monitor implementation, regardless of the HortNZ request, therefore, it should not be additional work for MfE.

Decision sought –

- Ensure that the number of plans implementing the standards every year is moderated to evenly 'spread the load' across the 5 to 7 years.
- Implement planning standards region by region.
- Provide a public timeline of anticipated implementation for every Council planning document in New Zealand to ensure that NGO's and others who work across New Zealand have the opportunity to plan budget and staffing across the 5 to 7 year period.

c. Support

No comment

d. District plan structure guidance

No comment

Regional policy statement and regional plan structure guidance

No comment

District plan spatial planning tools and zone framework guidance

No comment

Regional plan and policy statement spatial tools guidance

No comment

Chapter form and status of rule and other text numbering guidance

No comment

Additional guidance materials required

No comment

Future content for standards

HortNZ seeks a future standard to address the use of versatile land and high class soils.

HortNZ understands that the Minister may progress an NPS for versatile land and high class land for production. This approach is supported to ensure that the most valuable land for food production is recognised through the planning framework. However if an NPS is not developed a planning standard could be developed to address the issue of protection of high class land.

e. Utilities provisions

HNZ has been working with the 'Infrastructure Group' on a draft Planning Standard. To date agreement has not been reached as to the nature of provisions. HortNZ seeks that a Planning Standard does not proceed until there has been adequate consultation and agreement between affected parties.

Other comments

21. Do you have any further comments you wish to make about the Government's proposal?

Please refer to attached comments in the cover submission.

Releasing submissions

Your submission may be released under the Official Information Act 1982 and will be published on the Ministry's website. Unless you clearly specify otherwise in your submission, we will consider that you have consented to both your submission and your name being posted on the Ministry's website.

Please check this box if you would like your name, address, and any personal details withheld.

Note that the name, email, and submitter type fields are mandatory for you to make your submission.

When your submission is complete

If you are emailing your submission, send it to PlanningStandards@mfe.govt.nz as a:

- PDF
- Microsoft Word document.

If you are posting your submission, send it to National Planning Standards, Ministry for the Environment, PO Box 10362, Wellington 6143.

Submissions close at 5:00 pm on Friday 17 August 2018.