

**Form 6**

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on notified proposed policy statement or plan, change or variation

*Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991*

To Waikato District Council

Name of person making further submission:

Federated Farmers of New Zealand

This is a further submission in support of and opposition to submissions on the following proposed plan,

**Proposed Waikato District Plan 2018 (Stage 1):**

I am

- *a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest;*
- *a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has.*

Grounds for further submission:

*Federated Farmers of New Zealand is a representative body for farmers, so both represents a relevant aspect of the public interest and has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest that the general public has*

I support and oppose the submission of:

Submitters stated in the schedule attached to this further submission.

The particular parts of the submissions I support and oppose are:

Variously stated with respect to respective submitters in the schedule attached to this further submission.

The reasons for my support and opposition are:

Variously stated with respect to respective submitters in the schedule attached to this further submission.

I seek that the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed:

As variously stated with respect to respective submitters in the schedule attached to this further submission.

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission.

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.



Hilary Walker on behalf of Federated Farmers of New Zealand

(person authorised to sign on behalf of person making further submission)

Date: 15 July 2019

Electronic Address for Service: [hwalker@fedfarm.org.nz](mailto:hwalker@fedfarm.org.nz):

Telephone: 0800 327 646

Postal Address:           Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
                                  L5 169 London Street  
                                  PO Box 447  
                                  Hamilton 3240

Contact person:         Hilary Walker - Senior Regional Policy Advisor

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
8	Geoscience Society of New Zealand	Oppose in part submission points 8.2 and 8.3	Adding extra sites and features into schedules of the PDP	FFNZ considers that only new sites or features located on public land should be added to schedules in the plan using this submission process. It is inappropriate to add any sites that may be located on private land without direct landowner consultation in the first instance. There are very restrictive land use controls which apply to these sites and as such, a rigorous identification process with meaningful consultation is necessary.	Disallow part of submission points 8.2 and 8.3	Do not allow any new areas or features, identified on private land, to be added to schedules without prior landowner approval.
8	Geoscience Society of New Zealand	Oppose submission point 8.4	Add more policies and rules to protect Outstanding Natural Features and provide criteria for the potential identification of others.	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission but considers the notified policies and rules, incorporating the amendments sought by FFNZ, will provide appropriate protection for identified ONFs. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement provides direction for territorial authorities concerning identification of local sites.	Disallow submission point 8.4	
8	Geoscience Society of New Zealand	Oppose submission point 8.5	Add into Section 3.3 Outstanding Natural Features, criteria for identifying Outstanding Natural Features, similar to that in the Auckland Unitary Plan, Northland Regional Plan and other local districts: <i>Assessment criteria for identifying ONFs</i>	FFNZ opposes the submission on the basis that the relief sought is unnecessary to meet RMA requirements. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement provides the appropriate framework and local context with regards to ONFs and ONLs.	Disallow submission point 8.5	
12	Carl Ammon	Oppose submission point 12.4	Amend Chapter 3 Natural Environment to strengthen the requirement for development to protect and improve biodiversity.	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission but considers the notified policies and rules, incorporating the amendments sought by FFNZ, will provide appropriate protection when required and more generally improve biodiversity outcomes across the district and region.	Disallow submission point 12.4	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
48	Beverley Bell	Oppose submission point 48.2	Add a rule to require fencing of Significant Natural Areas to exclude stock.	FFNZ fundamentally opposes this relief sought; it is inconsistent with the enabling intent of the RMA and is not required to achieve improved protection over SNAs across the district. The FFNZ submission introduces a range of options that, if adopted, would help to achieve those goals without isolating the landowners whose buy-in is required to achieve successful outcomes.	Disallow the submission point 48.2	
55	Shelley Munro	Oppose submission point 55.2	Amend the Proposed District Plan to only allow Rural enterprise in the Rural Zone that protects the natural environment.	The RMA does not require 'no effects' and protection at all costs. FFNZ considers the notified policies and rules, incorporating the amendments sought by FFNZ, will provide appropriate controls on land use activities to ensure potential adverse effects on the natural environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated as is appropriate.	Disallow the submission point 55.2	
55	Shelley Munro	Oppose submission point 55.4	Amend the Proposed District Plan to not allow commercial or rural pollutants such as fertiliser plants near Significant Natural Areas	FFNZ considers the notified policies and rules, incorporating the amendments sought by FFNZ, will provide appropriate controls on land use activities to ensure any adverse effects on SNAs are avoided, remedied or mitigated as is appropriate.	Disallow the submission point 55.4	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.11	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide for district-wide provisions in the Natural Hazards and Climate Change zones/overlays to restrict activities that take place in these areas, and to discourage inappropriate use and development	The submitter has not provided any wording to enable an assessment of the merits or impacts this relief may have on our members. It is more appropriate to address these issues fully when the opportunity is provided via the Stage 2 process.	Disallow the submission point 81.11	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support submission point 81.12	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide for cross references between issues, objectives, policies and rules.	FFNZ agrees these changes would improve the plan and raised similar concerns in our submission.	Allow the submission point 81.12	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support submission point 81.16	Amend Chapter 4, Chapter 16, the Planning Maps and any other provisions that are proposed for unserviced urban residential areas where there is uncertainty about the funding, staging and timing for infrastructure provision.	FFNZ agrees with the intent of this submission. WDC needs to be upfront and transparent about these issues to ensure informed decisions can be made.	Allow the submission point 81.16	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support in part submission points 81.191	Amend Chapters 6: Infrastructure and 14 : Infrastructure and Energy to include a policy and rule framework that will provide for the ongoing maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of flood and drainage scheme infrastructure. OR Alternatively provide specifically for flood protection and drainage scheme infrastructure in the policies and rule frameworks for each zone. (Refer to original submission for full details)	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission; however, without proposed policy or rule wording, it is difficult to know whether private flood protection and drainage infrastructure would be captured by design or fault. It is also difficult to assess the impact this proposal could have on private landowners who may host public flood and drainage scheme infrastructure.  FFNZ submits this issue could be better addressed under the Stage 2 process.	Allow submission 81.191 in part	Provisional Support is extended but more detail is required to allow a more informed decision to be made.
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support, in part submission point 81.92	Amend Chapter 3.1 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats to provide for the opportunity to offset non-significant biodiversity.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission, however without proposed policy wording or specific amendments, it is difficult to assess the merits or otherwise of the submission. FFNZ accepts that opportunities for offsetting non-significant biodiversity maybe useful for a resource user but that opportunity is not precluded under the notified plan.	Disallow the submission point 81.92	Provisional support is extended but more detail is required to allow a more informed decision to be made.

Further Submission in support of, or opposition to, submission on Proposed Waikato District 2018 (Stage 1)

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.93	Amend Objective 3.1.1 Biodiversity and ecosystems to clearly state that the outcome that is being worked towards is to achieve no net loss.	It is not necessary to include that level of detail in the objective. The relief sought may be more appropriate for a policy.	Disallow the submission point 81.93	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose, in part, submission point 81.94	Amend Chapter 3.1 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats to provide a mitigation hierarchy for indigenous biodiversity outside of an Significant Natural Area	A mitigation hierarchy is not required for indigenous biodiversity outside of an Significant Natural Area (WRPS 11.1.3(a)(i)).	Disallow submission point 81.94	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support submission points 81.95 and 96	Amend Section 3.1 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats to ensure that policies related to indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Area are not under section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas.	FFNZ agrees the amendments would provide useful clarification and avoid confusion.	Allow submission 81.95 and 81.96	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission points 81.103	Amend Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting to address biodiversity offsets in relation to indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Areas.	Policy 3.2.4 does address biodiversity offsets in relation to indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Areas	Disallow submission point 81.103	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission points 81.249	Amend Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting to require offsetting of more than minor residual adverse effects on Significant Natural Areas	Policy 3.2.4 does require offsetting of more than minor residual adverse effects on Significant Natural Areas through reference to Policy 3.2.3	Disallow the submission point 81.249	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission points 81.251	Amend Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance to recognise that only clearance with minor adverse effects in relation to the maintenance	FFNZ opposes the amendment. The policy does not need to repeat the WRPS verbatim. The notified policy, using the direction from the WRPS, has identified the activities which have minor adverse effects and enabled them	Disallow submission point 81.251	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			or protection of indigenous biodiversity will be enabled as a permitted activity.	accordingly. This is an appropriate planning approach that provides certainty for plan users and good biodiversity outcomes for the district.		
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support submission point 81.252	Amend or Relocate Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance so that it is clear that it applies to both SNA's and indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Areas.	FFNZ supports the amendment for reasons outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 81.252	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.58	Amend provisions to exclude clearance of Manuka and Kanuka in wetlands and the coastal environment from this rule (Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area) any other area of the Proposed Plan where similar provisions apply.	FFNZ opposes the blunt planning response. If manuka and kanuka contributes to the values of the particular SNA then it may be appropriate, but if not then some clearance should be allowed. FFNZ supports more site-specific planning responses to better protect SNAs and enable resource use when appropriate.	Disallow the submission point 81.58	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support, in part submission point 81.242	Amend the definition of "Conservation Activity" in Chapter 13: Definitions to exclude the establishment of walkways, cycle ways and accessory buildings.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission, however the submitter has not included proposed threshold limits or an activity status and as such, we are unable to assess the merits or impact of the proposal.	Support, in part submission point 81.242	Provisional support is extended but more detail is required to allow a more informed decision to be made.
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.193	Amend the definition of "infrastructure" in Chapter 13: Definitions to include Waikato Regional Council flood infrastructure with associated flood management regime.	FFNZ understands the concerns raised by the submitter to be better addressed in Stage Two, when natural hazards and climate change resource management issues are incorporated into the plan.  It is inappropriate to include flood management infrastructure into the definition. It may have the potential to capture flood management regimes on private land and become subject to a rules framework not	Disallow submission point 81.193	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				designed with that type of infrastructure in mind.		
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission points 81.29, 81.30, ,81.34, 81.35	Submitter's relief seeking amendments to 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area	FFNZ opposes the restrictions on clearing indigenous vegetation proposed by the submitter as being unduly onerous and unnecessary to achieve positive biodiversity outcomes for the district.	Disallow submission points 81.29, 81.30, 81.31, 81.35	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission points 81.62, 81.63, 81.64, 81.66, 81.68, 81.69, 81.72	Submitter's relief seeking amendments to Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area	FFNZ opposes the submitter's relief sought. In our view the notified planning approach, incorporating FFNZ amendments, is appropriate.	Disallow submission points 81.62, 81.63, 81.64, 81.66, 81.68, 81.69, 81.72	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission points 81.97	Submitter's relief seeking amendments to Indigenous vegetation clearance Amend Policy 3.1.2(c) Policies as follows: <i>(c) Provide for the removal of Manuka or Kanuka for domestic firewood or arts and crafts on a sustainable basis</i>	The policy direction provided in the notified version of Policy 3.1.2(c) is appropriate. The rules framework addresses the submitter concerns.	Disallow submission point 81.97	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.3	Amend Permitted Activity standards for all zones for earthworks to provide for a minimum 5 metre distance from any waterbody or overland flow path	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission however, planning mechanisms such as buffer zones and setbacks should not be an automatic planning response. Setbacks should only be proposed for a specific purpose and to manage specific effects. The District Council has a specific function with regards to managing the effects of earthworks.	Disallow submission point 81.3	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose in part submission point 81.4	Amend Permitted Activity standards for all zones to provide for a shorter period of time for earthworks to be revegetated, as follows:	The proposed time frame is inappropriate and unreasonable within a farming context. Blanket planning mechanisms should not be an automatic planning response. Farmers have a vested interest in retaining soil on	Disallow submission point 81.4 in part	The proposed amendment must not apply in the rural zone.



No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 2 months of the commencement of the earthworks.	their land and will ensure areas exposed are revegetated as soon as practicable. Non-regulatory methods can be used to encourage landowners to adopt good earthworks management practices if WDC considers this an issue for their district. The shortened timeframe as proposed would be difficult for WDC to monitor and enforce within a farming context.		
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.5	Add to the Proposed District Plan for all zones an additional condition related to earthworks within a flood plain (in addition to identifying these on maps), as follows (or similar):  Not be located within a flood plain as identified in the Waikato District Plan	FFNZ understands the concerns raised by the submitter to be better addressed in Stage Two, when natural hazards and climate change resource management issues are incorporated into the plan.  It is inappropriate to add this condition, which has the potential to capture everyday farming activities, in such a disconnected way.	Disallow submission point 81.5 in part	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.6	Add to the Proposed District Plan for all zones a standard to minimise impacts on water bodies as follows: <u>Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths</u>	The submitter is seeking to introduce land use controls for the purpose, as outlined in their reasoning, to improve water quality. This is a regional council function. WRPS Implementation Method 8.3.10 requires territorial authorities to manage, in accordance with their statutory responsibilities, the effects of subdivision, use and development. The context is within development and subdivision and more specifically on ensuring contaminants do not enter waterbodies via the stormwater network in the built environment.	Disallow submission point 81.6	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.9	Amend the Proposed District Plan for all zones to provide for a minimum 10m setback	The blunt planning response is unduly onerous, unreasonable and unworkable. As currently worded, it captures all activities, in every zone. FFNZ is unclear what the	Disallow submission point 81.9	

Further Submission in support of, or opposition to, submission on Proposed Waikato District 2018 (Stage 1)

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			from the banks of a perennial or intermittent stream.	setback is designed to achieve over and above regional land use controls.		
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.20	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide a mechanism to manage areas that meet the WRPS 11A criteria and have not been identified and mapped in the Proposed Plan.	FFNZ opposes this submission; it is unclear what mechanism the submitter proposes. We wish to alert Council that the use of rules and the consent process as a mechanism to assess whether a site of indigenous vegetation is to be considered significant is putting at risk the acceptance and buy in of landowners. One of the biggest issues when a site is identified by way of a rule, is that the affected landowner has no greater rights to submit on the proposal than those of the general public, and therefore indigenous vegetation on privately owned land is often treated as a public or free good. By adopting the consent process as the primary mechanism for the identification of significant natural areas the burden of proof shifts, and elevates all sites to a significance status until proven otherwise by the applicant.	Disallow submission point 81.20	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support submission point 81.21	Add advice notes drawing attention to the provisions of the Waikato Pest Management Plan, particularly for earthworks and fill activities.	Support is extended to this submission. The plan would benefit from better use of advice notes.	Allow submission point 81.21	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.22	Add assessment criteria to earthwork and fill activities to allow the consideration of effects on pest and disease management	FFNZ opposes the submission; it is not specific as to what the assessment criteria is, and when it will be triggered. We are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.	Disallow submission point 81.22	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.23	Add issues, objectives, policies and rules to address the spread of Kauri Dieback Disease.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission but until an appropriate risk assessment is undertaken, it is not appropriate for WDC to implement a planning	Disallow submission point 81.23	

Further Submission in support of, or opposition to, submission on Proposed Waikato District 2018 (Stage 1)

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				response over and above what is being undertaken at a national and regional level. Further, it is not specific as to what the planning response may be and so we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming.		
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support in part submission point 81.24	Undertake a natural character assessment for wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins.	FFNZ extends support on the proviso that there is full landowner consultation and involvement in the planning response.	Allow in part submission point 81.24	Support is extended to an assessment being undertaken with full landowner consultation and FFNZ involvement in the planning response.
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.25	Amend the provisions to ensure that natural character is managed in accordance with Policy 12.2 and Implementation Method 12.2.1 of the WRPS.	The notified plan includes land use controls that are designed to meet Policy 12.2 and Method 12.2.1 of the WRPS. A more specific planning response may be appropriate after the natural character assessment sought in submission 81.24 has been undertaken.	Disallow submission point 81.25	Not required at this time.
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support in part submission point 81.28	Amend the Proposed Plan to take into account activities that may impact on the significant habitats of indigenous fauna that have been identified and mapped in the planning maps.	Support is extended to site-specific planning responses; however, until that degree of knowledge is obtained via ground truthing, the notified rules, with amendments sought by FFNZ, provide the controls necessary to negate land use impacts on SNAs.	Support in part submission point 81.28	Support is extended to the principle of site-specific controls for SNAs. This will involve ground truthing and landowner involvement to implement.
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.235	Add to Chapter 13: Definitions a new definition for "Flood risk area."	FFNZ understands the concerns raised by the submitter will be better addressed in Stage Two, when natural hazards and climate change resource management issues are incorporated into the plan. Further, it is not specific as to what the definition will be and what areas it may cover and so we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming	Disallow submission point 81.235	
81	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose submission point 81.236	Add to Chapter 13: Definitions a new definition for "Floodplain."	FFNZ understands the concerns raised by the submitter will be better addressed in Stage Two, when natural hazards and climate	Disallow submission point 81.236	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				change resource management issues are incorporated into the plan. Further, it is not specific as to what the definition will be and what areas it may cover and so we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming.		
81	Waikato Regional Council	Support in part submission point 81.239	Add to Chapter 13 a new definition for "Biodiversity offset" as follows: Biodiversity offset A measureable conservation outcome resulting from actions designed to compensate for residual, adverse biodiversity effects arising from activities after appropriate avoidance, remediation, and mitigation measures have been applied. The goal of a biodiversity offset is to achieve a no-net-loss, and preferably a net-gain, of indigenous biodiversity values	Support for reasons provided by the submitter.	Support in part submission point 81.239	With inclusion of regional scale ie The goal of a biodiversity offset is to achieve a no-net-loss, and preferably a net-gain, of indigenous biodiversity values <u>at a regional scale</u>
197	NZ Pork	Support in submission point 197.13	Amend the definition for "Building" in Chapter 13 Definitions to clearly exclude mobile shelters for outdoor pigs from the definition of building	FFNZ agrees the definition of building should not capture mobile animal shelters and believe it is an unintended drafting consequence.	Allow submission point 197.13	
197	NZ Pork	Support in submission point 197.34	Amend the definition of Impervious Surface in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: ... <u>It excludes farm tracks comprised of compacted surfaces ancillary to rural production activities..</u>	FFNZ agrees the definition of impervious surfaces should exclude farm tracks and believe it would have been an unintended drafting consequence to capture them.	Allow submission point 197.34	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
197	NZ Pork	Oppose in part submission point 197.35	Add a new definition to Chapter 13 Definitions for "Extensive Farming" as follows: <u>Extensive Farming Means the keeping, breeding or rearing of stock for commercial purposes, on pasture at a stocking density that sustains the maintenance of pasture or ground cover.</u>	FFNZ opposes the new definition on the basis that it will unnecessarily capture a broader range of farming types than WDC intended and has the potential to impose undue restrictions on those farming practices.	Disallow in part submission point 197.35	Disallow the proposed new definition for extensive farming
281	Zeala Ltd	Support in part submission point 281.2	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to Section 1.4.3.1(a) Rural Activities	The submitter's suggested amendment to delete extra words associated with farming is not opposed. However, there are words that could usefully be retained, such as: <i>horse breeding, honey production, mining and forestry</i> , as these are not 'farming' as such, but are normally rural activities.	Disallow in part the amendment sought by submitter	Retain reference to horse breeding, honey production, mining and forestry (alongside farming) in Section 1.4.3.1(a)
281	Zeala Ltd	Oppose submission point 281.19	Add the following replacement definition for "Intensive Farming" in Chapter 13: Definitions	FFNZ opposes the inclusion of feedlots being captured by the definition for reasons outlined in our original submission.	Disallow in part the amendment sought by submitter.	Amend as follows ... <i>It may include the use of feedlots for farmed animals; free range farming where feed is introduced from off site, and vegetable, fruit and herb growing operations indoors in artificially controlled growing conditions</i>
281	Zeala Ltd	Support submission point 281.18	Amend clause (e) and (f) of the definition of "Infrastructure" in Chapter 13: Definitions to exclude farm irrigation/drains.	FFNZ strongly supports the amendment that seeks to provide certainty and clarity that farming related infrastructure such as drainage systems and water supply systems that are required for stock troughs or irrigation, are excluded from the definition of 'infrastructure'. FFNZ considers capturing	Allow submission 281.18	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				farming type infrastructure to be an unintended drafting consequence. The proposed rules framework under Chapter 14 has no practicable application to farming infrastructure.		
297	Counties Manukau Police	Oppose submission point 297.17	Add to Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities a new line as follows: <i>Manage the earthworks site to ensure that resources at the site are safe and to minimise the risk of victimisation</i>	Whilst FFNZ shares the submitter's goal for safer communities, it is difficult to understand the application of this approach to the earthworks related to rural activities. In our view, the desired outcomes could be better achieved by using non-regulatory methods to help raise awareness and improve safety in rural communities. The key concerns of the submitter relates to development sites rather than rural activities.	Disallow submission point 297.17	
297	Counties Manukau Police	Oppose submission point 297.33	Add to Policy 5.3.8(a) Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision a new point as follows: <i>(g) subdivision, use, and development is designed to conform to the national guidelines for CPTED</i>	Whilst FFNZ shares the submitter's goal for safer communities, in our view the desired outcomes could be better achieved by using non-regulatory methods to help raise awareness and improve safety in rural communities.	Disallow submission point 297.33	
341	Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Support in submission point 341.11	Amend the definition of "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions to include Ancillary buildings and structures such as barns and dairy sheds;	FFNZ supports the amendment. It will provide clarity that ancillary buildings and structures associated with farming operations fall within this activity	Allow submission point 341.11, and extend the inclusions in the amended wording to include other typical farm buildings.	.
349	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support submission point 349.10	Submitter's suggested amendment to Rule 22.2.3.1P1(a)(ii) Earthworks - General, to increase the volume of aggregate	FFNZ supports enabling volumes of aggregate from farm quarries to be set at a threshold that meets usual and expected needs.	Allow submission point 349.10	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			permitted for a farm quarry from 1000m <sup>3</sup> to 2500m <sup>3</sup> .			
372	Auckland Council	Oppose in part submission point 372.4	Add to Section 1.5 - A new section for High Class soils as a matter of strategic direction.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission and wishes to remain involved if any new section is developed. Any strategic direction relating to high-class soils has the potential to significantly effect FFNZ members.	Allow submission point 372.4 in part	Develop the new section in collaboration with interested parties.
372	Auckland Council	Support in part submission point 372.12	Amend Section 1.5 to include a strategic recognition regarding reverse sensitivity.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission and wishes to remain involved as any strategic recognition of reverse sensitivity is developed. Reverse sensitivity related matters significantly affect FFNZ members.	Allow submission point 372.12, in part	Develop the strategic recognition in collaboration with interested parties.
372	Auckland Council	Oppose submission point 372.27	Delete Policy 5.3.8(d) Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision.	FFNZ considers the policy provides appropriate direction for plan users.	Disallow submission point 372.27	
389	J and T Quigley Ltd	Oppose submission point 389.10	Amend the definition of "Rural Activities" in Chapter 13: Definitions to confirm that childcare is included or provide more examples of what rural industry activities would be	It is unclear what the submitter is referring to by the term 'childcare'. If it relates to childcare facilities then that is inappropriate to be defined as rural activity. The activity may be able to occur in the rural zone, with any effects managed via the rules framework. FFNZ opposes the inclusion of childcare into the definition of Rural activities	Disallow submission point 389.10	
394	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Oppose submission 394.1	Submitter's suggested deletion of Section 1.4.3.1(c) Rural Activities	FFNZ opposes the deletion of Section 1.4.3.1(c). It would ignore an important issue of displacement of rural activities by other activities locating into rural areas that are sensitive to effects typically associated with rural activities, such as unpleasant odours from raising livestock, spraying fertiliser or farm effluent, use of agrichemicals, and farm activity noise.	Disallow submission point 394.1	
394	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Oppose in part submission 394.6	Submitter's suggested amendment to Chapter 3 - new objective	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission but considers the provisions of the notified proposed plan, along with FFNZ's proposed amendments, will address the	Disallow submission point 394.6	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				submitters concerns, without the need for this new objective.		
394	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Support submission 394.7	Add new policies to Chapter 3 Natural Environment which provide, interalia, subdivision incentives for creating areas with significant indigenous biodiversity value, including the encouragement, establishment or protection of:	FFNZ supports the intent of this submission. These incentives can be incorporated as a new policy under the notified objective.	Allow submission point 394.7	
394	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Submission 394.10	Add new policies to Chapter 5 Rural Environment, to facilitate farm parks and ensure good quality outcomes by ...	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission and wishes to remain involved if a new planning approach is adopted. FFNZ members are directly affected by any changes to rural zone subdivision rules.	Neutral	FFNZ wish to remain involved in the planning response.
394	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Oppose submission 394.31	Add a definition of "Farm Park" in Chapter 13 Definitions	As no definition of farm park was provided it is difficult to assess the merits of the submission and implications for plan users	Disallow submission point 394.31	
405	Counties Power Limited	Oppose submission 405.24	Amend Rule 14.3.1.1 Permitted Activities relating to P2 Minor upgrading of existing infrastructure, as follows:	The proposed amendments could not be considered 'minor' upgrading, retain the permitted activity as notified.	Disallow submission point 405.24	
417	Glenys McConnell	Support Submission Point 417.1	Submitter's suggested amendment seeking addition of a further matter in Objective 5.1.1, namely that: <i>(iv) existing titles ... may be aggregated to produce a compliant small sized block and a larger block by boundary adjustment.</i>  Submitter's suggested amendment seeking addition of a further matter in	FFNZ supports the relief sought. It is appropriate for the plan to allow for boundary adjustments or realignment of titles to provide options to better enable efficient use of the land resource. This could be used where a portion of the farm could be better be utilised as a smaller block for other purposes, such as lease block for grazing or cropping, or it could be used to provide options for succession planning and ensure generations of family members can stay on the land.	Allow submission point 417.1	



No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			Objective 5.2.3, namely that: <i>(c) Subdivision by way of aggregation of titles ... to produce a compliant small sized block and a larger block by boundary adjustment.</i>	This kind of policy supports and enables more efficient use of the rural land resource		
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.3	Add a new permitted activity rule in Rule 16.2.4.1 Earthworks, as follows:	FFNZ supports the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 419.3	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.4	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 16.2.4.1 RD1 (b) Earthworks - General, as follows: (xii) Measures to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on any adjoining Rural zoned land.	FFNZ supports the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 419.4	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission points 419.5, 419.6 and 419.7	Add a new clause (v) to Rule 16.3.9.1 P1 (a) Building setbacks - All boundaries. Add a new clause (vi) to Rule 16.3.9.2 P1 (a) Building setback - Sensitive land use. Add a new clause (vi) to Rule 16.4.1RD1 (a) Subdivision - General, and Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (b).	FFNZ supports the relief sought for the reasoning outlined by the submitter	Allow all submission points	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.57	Add a new policy within Section 5.3 Rural Character and Amenity, ...	FFNZ agrees with the submitter that the amendment is required to ensure the appropriate and effective implementation of the proposed planning framework that seeks to avoid or minimise adverse effects on rural character and amenity.	Allow submission point 419.57	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.66	Amend Objective 5.6.1 Country Living Zone, as follows: (a) Subdivision, use	FFNZ supports the amendment, which provides important policy direction.	Allow submission point 419.66	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			and development in the Country Living Zone maintains or enhances the character and amenity values of the zone <u>and avoids compromising rural production land or activities.</u>			
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.68	Add Clause (vii) to Policy 6.1.2 (a) Development, operation and maintenance, as follows:	FFNZ supports the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 419.68	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.69	Delete Policy 6.1.4(a)(iv) Infrastructure benefits.	FFNZ supports the deletion for reasons outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 419.69	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission points 419.70 and 419.71	Submitter's suggested amendments to Objective 6.1.6(a), and suggested amendment to Policy 6.1.	FFNZ supports the amendments, which seek to better align the planning approach with the direction provided in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission, Policy 10. The requirement to 'protect' and 'avoid' is an unreasonable expectation in the context of this plan.	Allow submission points 419.70 and 419.71	Allow submission points 419.70 and 419.71, and consider FFNZ's submission point 680.81 amended accordingly to seek the objective emphasis be changed from <i>protect</i> to <i>manage to the extent reasonably possible</i>
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission points 419.72	Amend Objective 6.1.8 (a) Infrastructure in the community and identified areas, as follows: (a) Infrastructure takes into account the qualities, <u>land use</u> and characteristics of surrounding environments and community well-being	FFNZ supports the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 419.72	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.75	Submitter's suggested amendments to Policy 6.2.6 (a) Reverse sensitivity and the National Grid	FFNZ support this submission point as an alternative to its own submission on Policy 6.2.6	Allow submission point 419.75	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.76	Submitter's suggested amendments to Policy 6.4.7 Stormwater	FFNZ support this submission point as an addition to its own submission on Policy 6.4.7	Allow submission point 419.76	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose, in part submission point 419.116	Submitter's range of alternatives for definition of 'building'. ... OR Delete the definition of "Building" in Chapter 13 Definitions, and replace with the following: <u>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.</u>	FFNZ has no concerns with the proposal to exempt artificial crop protection structures and crop support structures from the definition or to provide a height based exemption. However, the aspect of the relief sought that introduces a new definition is opposed on the basis it is too broad and all encompassing	Disallow submission 419.116 in part	Disallow this option "Building" in Chapter 13 Definitions, and replace with the following: <u>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.</u>
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support in part submission point 419.114	Submitter's suggested amendments to definition of <i>Ancillary rural earthworks</i>	FFNZ support in part this submission point with some reservations about how the amendments to the definition fit into the proposed district plan resource management framework for rural and country living zones.	Allow submission point subject to minor modifications	Allow submission point provided that it does not reduce ability of farmers to undertake earthworks necessary for day-to-day farming operation, and reconcile the requested amendments with FFNZ's own relief sought on this definition
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.136	Add a new definition for "Farm worker accommodation" to Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Accommodation for people whose duties require them to live on-site, and in the rural zones for people who work	Support is extended to this submission.	Allow submission point 419.136	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			on the site or in the surrounding rural area.			
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.12 and 419.25	Add a new restricted discretionary activity provision to Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: And Add a new provision to Rule 22.3 Land Use - Building, as follows:	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission relating to worker accommodation in the rural zone and wish to remain involved as any planning response is adopted.	Allow submission point 419.12 and 419.25	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.121	Amend the definition of "Farming noise" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows:	FFNZ supports the proposed amendments to "farming noise".	Allow submission point 419.121	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.123	Submitter's relief seeking deletion of the definition of <i>Hazardous facility</i>	FFNZ sought deletion of Chapter 10 and all associated provisions, and only sought amendment to rules and definitions in that chapter as a 2 <sup>nd</sup> -order tier of relief.	Allow submission point 419.123	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.124	Amend the definition of "High class soils" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows:	For reasoning stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 419.124	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.132	Amend the definition for "Reservoir" in Chapter 13 Definitions, to include water storage for irrigation.	For reasoning stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 419.132	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.134	Submitter's relief seeking deletion of the definition of <i>Rural ancillary earthworks</i>	FFNZ supports deletion of this definition as it is the same as the definition of 'Ancillary Rural Earthworks', and it isn't necessary to repeat such definition, provided that the defined term is referred to in a consistent manner throughout the plan.	Allow submission point 419.134	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose in part submission point 419.20	Submitter's suggested relief that the definition of <i>Farming</i> be deleted and replaced with a definition of 'Primary Production'	FFNZ prefers a definition of 'farming' to remain as it is simple and relates to the plan rules. However, the types of activities described in submitters suggested definition of 'Primary Production' is worthy of incorporation into the definition of <i>Farming</i> .	Disallow submission point in part, but amend the definition of 'Farming' to otherwise capture the relief sought by the submitter.	Definition of <i>Farming</i> be amended to include: (a) any agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, forestry or aquaculture activities for the purpose of commercial gain or exchange; and

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
						<i>(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; but (c) does not include processing of those products into a different product.</i>
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.127	Amend the definition of "Minor upgrading of existing infrastructure" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows:	For reasons stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 419.127	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.2	Retain Rule 16.2.1.1 P1 Noise - General, as notified.	For reasons stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 419.2	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.131	Delete the definition of "Noxious, dangerous, offensive or toxic activities" from Chapter 13 Definitions.	For reasons stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 419.131	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.133	Add a definition for "Reverse Sensitivity" to Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows:	For reasons stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 419.133	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.138	Amend the definition of "Storage" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means in the context of a hazardous substance or hazardous waste, the containment of a hazardous substance or hazardous waste, either above ground or underground, in enclosed packages, containers or	For reasons stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 419.138	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			tanks. It includes vehicles used to transport any hazardous substance that are stationary within a hazardous facility for more than short periods of time.			
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.139	Amend the definition of "Use" in Chapter 13 Definitions, so that the application of agrichemicals and fertiliser is excluded.	For reasons stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 419.139	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.142	Delete the note in 14.3.1.4 AND Add a new activity specific condition 14.3.1.4 in Rule 14.3.1 Permitted Activities, relating to P5 Trimming or removal of vegetation or trees associated with infrastructure	FFNZ supports the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 419.142	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.81	Amend activity specific conditions 14.3.1.1 (2) in Rule 14.3.1 Permitted Activities, relating to P2 Minor upgrading of existing infrastructure..	FFNZ supports the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 419.81	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.83	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 14.3.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: x. effects on affected landowners.	FFNZ strongly supports the amendment – it is important that the effects on affected landowners be considered as a matter of discretion for restricted discretionary activities.	Allow submission point 419.83	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.103	Amend the activity specific conditions in 14.4.1.3 in Rule 14.4.1 Permitted Activities, relating to P3 Earthworks activities within the National Grid Yard ...	The proposed amendments improve the clarity and certainty of the rules framework	Allow submission point 419.103	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.84	Amend activity specific condition 14.4.1.2 (1) in Rule 14.4.1 Permitted Activities ...	The proposed amendments improve the clarity and certainty of the rules framework	Allow submission point 419.84	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.105	Amend Rule 14.4.4(a)NC8 Non-Complying Activities as follows:	The proposed amendments improve the clarity and certainty of the rules framework	Allow submission point 419.105	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.15	<p>Submitter's relief seeking to: Delete Rule 22.2.4 P1 Hazardous Substances AND Add a replacement Rule 22.2.4 P1 Hazardous Substances, as follows: <i>The use, storage or disposal of any hazardous substance is permitted.</i> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	FFNZ support the submitters relief as an alternative to its own relief sought for this rule for the same reasons as the FFNZ submission on this rule	Allow submission point 419.15	
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.24	Submitter's suggestion that Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, be amended to include a further instance where clearance is permitted, namely: <i>removal of vegetation for pest management and biosecurity works.</i>	FFNZ support the submitter's relief in addition to its own relief sought for this rule for the same reasons as the FFNZ submission on this rule	Allow submission point 419.24	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
419	Horticulture New Zealand	Support submission point 419.29	<p>Submitter's suggestion that Rule 22.3.6 P1 Building coverage be amended Add a new clause (iii) as follows:</p> <p><i>(a) The total building coverage must not exceed the larger of:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>(iii) except that this rule shall not apply to buildings associated with rural production activities or rural industries and services and shall not apply to artificial crop protection structures.</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	FFNZ support the submitter's relief in conjunction with its own relief sought for this rule for the same reasons as the FFNZ submission on this rule	Allow submission point 419.29	
423	Watercare Services Limited	Oppose submission point 423.21	<p>Amend Chapter 14 Infrastructure and Energy to include comprehensive rules specifying the activity status for infrastructure (including water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure) in all zones, overlays and areas covered by the Proposed District Plan including permitted activity rules, on a similar basis to Chapter E26 Infrastructure in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part)</p>	It is unclear whether the submitter's relief will result in changes to the proposed rules framework and we remain interested and involved on the basis that this submission may enable more lenient land use controls for activities that may adversely affect our members.	Disallow submission point 423.21	



No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
423	Watercare Services Limited	Oppose submission point 423.17	Amend Activity specific condition 14.3.1.1(1) Permitted Activities relating to P1 Minor Upgrading of existing infrastructure as follows:	The proposed amendments seeking 50% increases could not be considered 'minor' upgrading. Retain the permitted activity as notified.	Disallow submission point 423.17	
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose submission point 433.38	Amend Policy 3.2.7 (a)(iv) Managing Significant Natural Areas, as follows: <i>(iv) maintaining and restoring natural wetland hydrology which in some cases may require artificial raising of water levels due to the adverse effects of drainage.</i>	FFNZ considers the amendment to be an unnecessary addition. It does not add any benefit to the notified policy direction.	Disallow submission point 433.38	
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose submission point 433.11	Add a new policy in section 5.3 Rural Character and Amenity, as follows: 5.3.19 - Public access to wetlands, streams, rivers, lakes and the coast	It is unclear what relevance this submission point has to Chapter 5 Rural environment. It seems to have more application to Chapter 3 or Chapter 8 matters.	Disallow submission point 433.11	
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose submission point 433.47	Add three new clauses to Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment ...	The submitters concerns are appropriately addressed elsewhere in the plan.	Disallow submission point 433.47	
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support submission point 433.3	Amend Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities, as follows: (a) Provide for earthworks where they support rural activities or are for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works, including: ... <i>(iv) wetland enhancement work</i>	FFNZ supports the relief sought.	Allow submission point 433.3	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose submission point 433.20	Add a definition for "biodiversity offsets" to Chapter 13: Definitions	FFNZ opposes incorporating the definition of "biodiversity offsetting" from a non statutory document into the plan.	Disallow submission point 433.20	
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose submission point 433.37	Submitter's suggested amendment to Amend Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting ...	The amendments are not supported, FFNZ considers the notified policy is appropriate to meet WRPS requirements and help achieve improved biodiversity outcomes across the district.	Disallow submission point 433.37	
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose submission point 433.63	Amend Appendix 6: Biodiversity Offsetting, as follows: The following sets out a framework for the use of biodiversity offsets. It should be read in conjunction with the New Zealand government Guidance on Good Practice Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand, New Zealand Government et al; August 2014 (or any successor document). And amendment to Appendix 6: Biodiversity Offsetting, number 2	FFNZ opposes the proposed amendments, Appendix 6 is appropriate as notified.	Disallow submission point 433.63	
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support submission point 433.64	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide for earthworks as permitted for ecosystem protection, restoration and enhancement.	FFNZ supports the amendments.	Allow submission point 433.64	
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose submission point 433.71	Add new policies to the Proposed District Plan that ensure that it maintains and enhances public access to and long wetlands, streams, lakes and rivers	FFNZ understands the submitters point that public access to lakes, rivers and public spaces can be fragmented by the subdivision process, if not carefully managed. However, in our view the proposed provisions adequately address those concerns without new policies being incorporated into the plan.	Disallow submission point 433.71	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose submission point 433.72	Add provisions to provide for the creation and protection of esplanade reserves and strips as a permitted activity.	FFNZ is unsure when the proposed permitted activity rule would be triggered. The opportunity to create esplanade reserves or strips is provided during subdivision land use change and should only be considered when there is an opportunity to create linkages with existing access points.	Disallow submission point 433.72	
433	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support in part submission point 433.61	Add two new subdivision rules in Rule 22.4.1.6 that provides for Environmental Benefits Lots, as follows:	FFNZ supports the submission. The PDP has focused conservation lot subdivision on SNAs and is missing an opportunity to incentivise other biodiversity gains such as restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that may not be an SNA, including manmade wetlands, and other areas which would benefit from active management such as erosion prone land or riparian margins.	Allow submission point 433.72	
435	Jade Hyslop	Oppose, in part submission point 435.6	Submitter's suggested amendment to add rules to Chapter 22 Rural Zone, to provide for protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops which include at least the following defined views...	FFNZ oppose any sort of view protection restrictions over private farmland in the Rural Zone. Farmland is part of the rural amenity and landscape character of the Rural Zone. Farming activities, including all manner of ancillary farm development, are part of the working rural landscape, and should not be subject to restrictions that 'protect' view shafts.	Disallow submission point 435.6 in part	Disallow submission point 435.6 in so far as it relates to private farmland
435	Jade Hyslop	Oppose submission point 435.5	Add total limits to the earthworks rules in all zones that prescribe time limits (e.g. within a 12 month period) consistent with maintaining the values of the site.	FFNZ opposes this blunt planning approach.	Disallow submission point 435.5	
535	Hamilton City Council	Oppose submission 535.35 in part	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to Section 1.4.3.1(b) The Rural environment	The submitter's suggested amendment to include the phrase 'fragmentation of rural land' has potential to frustrate the intentions of boundary adjustments and boundary relocations. This could cause unnecessary hardship to farmers that need to rationalise	Disallow submission point 535.35	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				farm property boundaries in order to farm more efficiently.		
535	Hamilton City Council	Oppose submission 535.8	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to delete Policy 3.2.6(a)(iv)	Policy 3.2.6(a)(iv) is designed to make provision for existing use right activities. The submitter outlines effects based concerns as reasoning for the opposition to this policy. Those same concerns are not identified if the activity takes place on Maaori Freehold land, as per Policy 3.2.6 (b)(iv). FFNZ does not understand the inconsistent response.	Disallow submission point 535.8	
535	Hamilton City Council	Support submission point 535.7	Submitter's suggested amendments to Chapter 22 and Chapter 23 to provide a new subdivision rule that provides specifically for biodiversity offsetting does not set a minimum lot size and requires the lot and any areas subdivided under such a framework to be restored and protected in perpetuity.	FFNZ supports these amendments for the reasons outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 535.7	
535	Hamilton City Council	Oppose submission point 535.94	Add the Hamilton City Council 'Area of Interest' map into the Proposed District Plan (as attached to the submission). This could take the form of an overlay; AND Add objectives and policies specific to the 'Area of Interest' which seek to avoid urban subdivision and development in rural zones and provide only for rural land uses in that zone; AND Add a supporting set of rules and methods including deploying a prohibited activity status for certain non-	Whilst FFNZ can broadly understand the intent of this submission, not enough detail has been provided to determine how the planning approach may affect farmers whose properties could be captured within an 'area of interest' overlay. FFNZ opposes the submission on this basis but if adopted, wish to remain involved as any mapping and planning response is developed.	Disallow submission point 535.94	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			rural land uses and subdivision.			
559	Heritage New Zealand	Oppose in part submission point 559.72	Submitter's suggestion to delete Policy 7.1.3(e)	Needs to be some element of practicality able to be applied	Disallow submission Point 559.72	
559	Heritage New Zealand	Oppose in part submission point 559.34	Submitter's suggestion to Add a new non-complying rule NC1 within each zone chapter to regarding the destruction of Maaori sites and areas of significance and waahi tapu sites and scheduled areas ...	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission however, the NC activity status is not appropriate when there are concerns with the level of accuracy with the mapping and identification of these sites. The notified planning approach is appropriate in this context. It is suggested the plan may benefit with the introduction of accidental discovery protocols that would also help to address the submitter's concerns.	Disallow submission Point 559.34	
559	Heritage New Zealand	Oppose in part submission point 559.286, 559.22, 559.23, 559.29 and 559.30	Amend rules to ensure Ancillary rural earthworks are being assessed as a restricted discretionary activity should they occur in a Maaori site or area of significance, or waahi tapu site or waahi tapu area, or the setting of a heritage item.	FFNZ considers the notified restricted discretionary earthworks rules, incorporating the amendments we have sought, provide the appropriate degree of land use controls. There is concern that the level of accuracy with the mapping and identification of these sites does not support a more stringent planning approach. It is suggested the plan may benefit with the introduction of accidental discovery protocols, which would also help to address the submitters concerns.	Disallow submission point 559.286,559.22, 559.23,559.29 and 559.30 in part	Disallow the part of the submission seeking to apply a restricted discretionary resource consent status to Ancillary rural earthworks
559	Heritage New Zealand	Oppose submission point 559.33	Add a new earthworks rule to each zone chapter as follows: D1- Earthworks, new ancillary earthworks and new rural ancillary earthworks within a waahi tapu as identified in Schedule 30.6 (Significant Waahi Tapu and Waahi Tapu area) and shown on the planning maps.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission however, the D activity status is not appropriate when there are concerns with the level of accuracy with the mapping and identification of these sites. The notified planning approach is appropriate in this context. It is suggested the plan may benefit with the introduction of accidental discovery protocols that would also help to address the submitter's concerns.	Disallow submission point 559.33	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
567	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Oppose submission point 567.10, and 567.11	<p>Add a new clause (c) to Policy 7.1.8 - Tree protection, as follows: <i>(c) trees over 200 years old unless in poor health are automatically protected.</i></p> <p>Add to Rule 16.2.6 Notable Trees and all sections of the Proposed District Plan where notable trees are referred to, the following:</p>	Whilst FFNZ has some sympathy with the concern for ancient trees it is difficult to understand how the proposed policy and rule will be monitored and enforced. How can the age of tree be determined accurately enough to support a rules framework?	Disallow submission points 567.10 and 567.11	
576	Transpower	Oppose submission point 576.49	<p>Amend Section 1.4.3.2 (b) Protecting the rural environment, as follows: ...towns or villages. <del>Non-rural activities must occur in towns, villages and defined growth areas, and the expansion of such areas should be managed so that adverse effects on rural areas are minimised.</del></p>	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. The section sets up the plan's expectation around zoning principles and what activities that may not expected or anticipated, within that zone are broadly required to do.	Disallow submission point 576.49	
580	Meridian Energy Limited	Support submission point 580.12	Submitter's suggested amendment to Objective 3.1.2(a) by deleting the phrase 'and enhanced' from the objective	FFNZ support the amendment. It is important to be clear that enhancement goals require a different approach to protection, which can be achieved, in part via regulation. Regulation can control use but not induce the active management required to achieve enhancement.	Allow the submission point 580.12	
580	Meridian Energy Limited	Support submission point 580.21	Amend Policy 3.2.4(a) Biodiversity Offsetting to provide for environmental compensation as follows: (a) Allow for a biodiversity offset <u>or environmental compensation</u> to be offered by a resource consent	FFNZ supports the amendment and agree with the submitter that environmental compensation is an important method in the toolbox of approaches to managing adverse effects and should be explicitly included in the plan.	Allow the submission point 580.21	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			applicant where an activity will result in significant residual adverse effects on a Significant Natural Area, or on indigenous biodiversity outside such Significant Natural Areas.			
580	Meridian Energy Limited	Support submission point 580.23	Amend Policy 3.3.3(a)(i) Protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as follows:	FFNZ supports the amendment to introduce some recognition that the functional and operational requirements of existing land uses can sometimes be difficult to integrate into a landscape ideal.	Allow the submission point 580.23	
581	Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose submission point 581.13	Add a new clause (iv) to Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities as follows: (iv) Encourage the adoption of sustainable farming practices to ensure long-term operation of farming as part of the rural economy	FFNZ supports farming communities in their efforts to adopt sustainable farming practices, however the proposed policy is unnecessary and not appropriate within a district plan context.	Disallow submission 581.13	
581	Synlait Milk Ltd	Support submission point 581.34	Amend Rule 22.4.1.2RD1(b)(iv) General subdivision as follows: (iv) potential for subdivision and subsequent activities to adversely affect adjoining activities through reverse sensitivity effects;	FFNZ supports the amendment for reasons made by the submitter.	Allow the submission point 581.34	
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission point 585.2	Submitter's suggested amendment seeking deletion of Policy 3.2.6(a)(iv)	FFNZ opposes the deletion sought and largely supports the notified version of Policy 3.2.6 which, in part, is designed to acknowledge existing use right activities. This is an appropriate planning approach that provides certainty for plan users.	Disallow submission 585.2	
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission point 585.5	Amend Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities to address the management of kauri dieback and measures	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission but until an appropriate risk assessment is undertaken, it is not appropriate for WDC to implement a planning	Disallow submission point 585.5	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			to prevent the spread of the disease.	response over and above what is being undertaken at the national and regional level. Further, it is not appropriate to just shoehorn rules from another district without any local analysis and consideration of other biosecurity responses that may be available. FFNZ understands that vector pests such as wild pigs could create a significant risk and look forward to better understanding how the Department is responding to that.		
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission point 585.7	Amend Policy 5.6.7 Earthworks to address the management of kauri dieback and measures to prevent the spread of the disease.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission but until an appropriate risk assessment is undertaken, it is not appropriate for WDC is implement a planning response over and above what is being undertaken at the national and regional level. Further, it is not appropriate to just shoehorn rules from another district without any local analysis and consideration of other biosecurity responses, which may be available. FFNZ understands that vector pests such as wild pigs could create a significant risk and look forward to better understanding how the Department is responding to that.	Disallow submission point 585.7	
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission point 585.8	Amend the forestry provisions in the Proposed District Plan to afford greater protection to indigenous vegetation and Significant Natural Areas within or adjacent to plantation forestry.	The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be; we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities adjacent to plantation forestry.	Disallow submission point 585.8	
585	Department of Conservation	Support submission point 585.10	Add a new definition of "Environmental Compensation" Definitions as follows:	FFNZ supports a definition of Environmental Compensation being included into the Plan	Allow submission point 585.10	



No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission point 585.14	Amend Appendix 6 Biodiversity offsetting as follows:	FFNZ opposes the amendments to Appendix 6.	Disallow submission point 585.14	
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission points 585.24 and 585.19	Add rules for Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area in all Zones as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Include a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments	The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be; we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.	Disallow submission points 585.24 and 585.19	
585	Department of Conservation	Support submission point 585.32	Add introductions and/or zone descriptions at the beginning of each chapter.	FFNZ supports the submission for reasons stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 585.32	
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission point 585.33	Add new objectives, policies and rules to address the management of kauri dieback, particularly around earthworks and measures to prevent spread of the disease.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission but until an appropriate risk assessment is undertaken, it is not appropriate for WDC to implement a planning response over and above what is being undertaken at the national and regional level. Further, it is not appropriate to just shoehorn rules from another district without any local analysis and consideration of other biosecurity responses that may be available. FFNZ understands that vector pests such as wild pigs could create a significant risk and look forward to better understanding how the Department is responding to that	Disallow submission point 585.33	
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission point 585.37	Add new objectives, policies and rules to recognise and implement measures to address and manage the	The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be, and as such, we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.	Disallow submission point 585.37	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			revised conservation status of Kunzea and Leptospermum taxa.			
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose, in part submission point 585.38	Add new maps, objectives, policies and rules recognising and providing for bat zones and tree protection	The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be in the WDC context and as such; we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.	Disallow submission point 585.38	
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission point 585.41	Amend Policy 3.1.2 (a)(iii) Policies as follows: (iii) biosecurity works <u>including management of plant diseases.</u>	FFNZ opposes the amendment; the management of plant diseases is enabled within the existing provision.	Disallow submission point 585.41	
585	Department of Conservation	Oppose submission point 585.43	Amend Policy 3.1.2(c) Policies to appropriately recognise and implement measures to address and manage Kunzea and Leptospermum in light of their re-assessed conservation status.	The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be and as such, we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.	Disallow submission point 585.43	
585	Department of Conservation	Support submission point 585.48	Add a new clause (c) to Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity offsetting that provides for consideration of environmental compensation in cases where biodiversity offsetting cannot be reasonably achieved as to address environmental effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	FFNZ supports the proposal. Environmental compensation is an important method in the toolbox of approaches to managing adverse effects and should be explicitly included in the plan.	Allow submission point 585.48	
636	Anna Noakes	Support submission point 636.2	Delete the catch all rule from the Proposed District Plan.	FFNZ strongly supports this submission. We oppose this type of 'catch all' rule that requires a plan user to read the plan not only what is there but for what is not also. In our view it is a poor planning practice and	Allow submission point 636.2	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				inconsistent with a number of RMA provisions.		
642	Waikato River Authority	Oppose submission point 642.6	Amend The Proposed District Plan earthworks provisions to provide for setbacks from waterways that are consistent with the Proposed Plan Change 1 to the Waikato Regional Council and gives effect to the Vision and Strategy	FFNZ opposes any duplication of land use controls between regional and territorial authority controls. Further submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be and as such, we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.	Disallow submission point 642.6	
680	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support in part submission point 680.272	Submitter's relief seeking amendment to the definition of <i>Waste management</i>	By way of further clarification, FFNZ would like to ensure the day-to-day farming activities, such as on-site disposal of dead stock, plant waste, or agricultural packaging waste, are not captured by the definition of 'waste management' where this would trigger requirement for resource consent. Having to obtain resource consent for all manner of farm waste management, would subject farm operations to onerous, unnecessary costs and delays.	Allow submission point 680.272 with further clarification	
680	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose submission point 680.275	Amend Rule 14.2.1.1 P1 New infrastructure (relating to Rule 14.2.1 P1 New Infrastructure) as follows:	Upon reflection, FFNZ understands that the proposed plan wording is appropriate and should apply in the Rural Zone. The concerns raised in submission 680.275 will be better addressed with adoption of submission point 281.18, which seeks to exclude farming infrastructure from the definition of infrastructure.	Disallow submission point 680.275	.
680	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose, in part submission point 680.276	Amend Rule 14.2.2 (RD1) Restricted Discretionary	Upon reflection, FFNZ understands that the proposed plan wording is appropriate and the matters of discretion should apply in the Rural Zone. The concerns raised in submission 680.276 will be better addressed with adoption of submission 281.18, which seeks to exclude farming infrastructure from the definition of infrastructure.	Disallow submission point 680.276	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
680	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose, in part submission point 680.278	Amend Rule 14.2.3 NC3 Non Complying Activities, as follows:	FFNZ seek to clarify that our concerns relate to the Chapter 14 rules framework having the potential to inadvertently apply to farming infrastructure, as opposed to infrastructure in the rural zone not having to meet appropriate controls and conditions. The concerns raised in submission 680.278 will be better addressed with adoption of submission point submission 281.18, which seeks to exclude farming infrastructure from the definition of infrastructure.	Disallow submission point 680.278	
680	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support and clarify submission point 680.231	Suggestion that setbacks from water bodies be dispensed with if there is a functional need to locate closer	In considering the relief sought in this submission point FFNZ also seek alternative relief by naming further types of structures and buildings that may need to be located closer to lakes and wetlands, e.g. stock bridges, culvert crossings, and retaining structures/ramparts for such, including for farm access tracks that may lead across lakes or wetlands	Allow further clarification of submission point 680.231	Allow further clarification of submission point 680.231 so that an exercise of judgment as to compliance with the rule is avoided. In this regard, further types of structures and buildings that may need to be located closer to lakes and wetlands, include stock exclusion structures, stock bridges, culvert crossings, and retaining structures/ramparts for such, including for farm access tracks that may lead across lakes or wetlands.
688	Reid Crawford Farms Limited	Support submission 686.1	Add a new clause (b) to Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise Subdivision, to include the following, as follows:	Support is extended to this amendment and any consequential amendments for reasons outlined by the submitter	Support submission 686.1	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
692	WEL Networks Limited	Support submission point 692.33	Amend Policy 6.1.11 Undergrounding new infrastructure	FFNZ supports the amendment for reasons outlined by the submitter	Allow submission point 692.33	
692	WEL Networks Limited	Oppose submission point 692.4	<p>Submitter's suggested amendment to Rule 14.2.1.1, namely:</p> <p><i>P5 Design and location of infrastructure services</i></p> <p><i>14.2.1.5 Within all Zones new subdivision and development shall provide utilities corridors in the road reserve free of tree plantings and in accordance with Tables 14.12.5.14 and 14.12.5.15.</i></p> <p>And associated relief sought</p>	<p>FFNZ seek relief allowing subdivision for boundary adjustment and boundary relocation as a controlled activity in rural areas (Rural Zone and consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone) as per submission points 680.235, 680.238, 680.247, 680.284.</p> <p>Where no additional lots are being created, there is no overall intensification of land use, and there should not be a requirement for such utilities corridors.</p>	<p><b>Either</b> disallow submission point 692.4;</p> <p><b>Or</b> amend relief to exempt subdivision for boundary relocation and subdivision for boundary adjustment in the Rural and Country Living zones.</p>	Either disallow submission point 692.4, or amend relief to exempt subdivision for boundary relocation and subdivision for boundary adjustment in the Rural and Country Living zones from any requirement for utility corridors in adjacent road reserve/road.
695	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Oppose submission 695.159	Submitter's suggested deletion of Section 1.4.3.1(c) Rural Activities	The submitter's suggested amendment to delete Section 1.4.3.1(c) would ignore an important issue of displacement of rural activities by other activities locating into rural areas, which are sensitive to effects typically associated with rural activities, such as unpleasant odours from raising livestock, spraying fertiliser or farm effluent, use of agrichemicals, and farm activity noise.	Disallow submission point 695.159	
695	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Oppose in part submission 695.64	Add a definition for "Disposal" to Chapter 13 Definitions	It is difficult to determine the merits of the submission point, as no wording is included and no reasoning given as to why a definition is required. FFNZ would like to ensure the day-to-day farming activities, such as on-site disposal of dead stock, plant waste, or agricultural packaging waste, is not captured by any 'disposal' definition where this would trigger requirement for resource consent.	Disallow submission point 695.64	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				Having to obtain resource consent for all manner of farm waste management, would subject farm operations to onerous, unnecessary costs and delays.		
695	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Oppose in part submission 695.66	Add a definition for "Horticultural Activity" to Chapter 13 Definitions.	It is difficult to determine the merits of the submission point as no wording is included and no reasoning given as to why a definition is required	Disallow submission point 695.66	
697	Waikato District Council	Support, in part submission point 697.365	Delete from Chapter 13: Definitions the definition for "Animal feed lot".	FFNZ supports the deletion if it is correct that the term is only referenced in the Specific Area - Agriculture Research Centre.	Allow submission point 697.365 in part	FFNZ supports the deletion if it is correct that the term is only referenced in the Specific Area - Agriculture Research Centre.
697	Waikato District Council	Support submission point 697.369	Amend the definition of "Building" (d) as follows: (d) a tank with a total capacity of not more than 35,000 litres, provided that no part of the tank protrudes no more than 4-2 metre above natural ground level; or	FFNZ supports the amendment for the reasons outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 697.369	
697	Waikato District Council	Support submission point 697.384	Amend the definition of "Extractive industries" as follows:	Support is extended to the exclusion of farm quarries and earthworks.	Allow submission point 697.384	
697	Waikato District Council	Support submission point 697.385	Amend the definition of "Farming" as follows:	Support is extended to the proposed amendments with the inclusion of our original submission on this point.	Allow submission point 697.385	Support is extended to the proposed amendments with the inclusion of our original submission on this point.
697	Waikato District Council	Support submission point 697.505	Delete from Chapter 13: Definitions the definition for "Rural ancillary earthworks" AND Replace all references in the Plan to "Rural ancillary	For reasons stated by the submitter	Allow submission point 697.505	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			earthworks” to “Ancillary rural earthworks”.			
697	Waikato District Council	Oppose, in part submission point 697.569	Add a new introduction in Chapter 10: Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land as follows: ... <u>These activities can include industrial operations (for example chemical warehousing, manufacturing plants or bulk storage facilities), workshops, agricultural and horticultural activities, and some occupations that are carried out from home. The sites where such activities take place are defined as hazardous facilities.</u>	FFNZ accepts an introduction section can be useful however opposes the proposed wording for reasons outlined in relation to the notified ‘hazardous facility’ definition.	Disallow submission point 697.569 in part	Remove this sentence from the proposed introductory wording.  <del>The sites where such activities take place are defined as hazardous facilities.</del>
697	Waikato District Council	Oppose in part submission point 697.558 ...	Amend and Add to Policy 5.3.9(a) Non-rural activities	FFNZ’s preferred position is to delete this policy for reasoning outlined in our original submission. However if it is retained the proposed amendments are an improvement.	Disallow submission point 697.558 in part	Preference is to delete but changes are better than the notified version.
697	Waikato District Council	Support submission point 697.483	Amend the definition of "Accessory building"- <u>Means a building detached from the principal building on the site, the use of which is incidental to the principal building or the land use. Where no principal building has been established, an accessory building means a building that is incidental to a permitted use on the site</u>	FFNZ supports the clarification	Allow submission point 697.483	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
697	Waikato District Council	Support submission point 697.486	Amend the definition of "Airfield" as follows: Means an area of land set aside from other uses for the purposes of enabling aircraft to land and take off. <u>Does not include airstrips or landing sites used for farming</u>	FFNZ supports the proposed exclusion. The planning response was not drafted with these activities in mind.	Allow submission point 697.486	
697	Waikato District Council	Support in part submission point 697.364	Amendments to improve definition of "Ancillary rural earthworks"	FFNZ supports the intent to ensure there is no duplicated activity controls. However this could be an example, if our relief regarding rule 22.1.5 NC5 is not successful, whereby unless expressly listed, the activity becomes non-complying.	Allow submission point 697.364 in part	Support amendments if our concerns re the catch all rule are addressed and NC 22.1.5 NC5 is deleted.
697	Waikato District Council	Support submission point 697.527, and related 697.21 and 697.22	Submitter's suggested amendment to Rule 14.2.1.1 and (2), AND Rule 14.5.1(b) and 14.10.1 14.5.1.2, namely:  Delete Rule 14.2.1(1)(a) New infrastructure AND Delete Rule 14.2.1 (1)(b) New infrastructure	FFNZ supports the amendment for reasons outlined by the submitter	Allow submission point 697.527, 697.21 and 697.22	
697	Waikato District Council	Oppose in part submission point 697.7	Submitter's suggested amendment to Rule 14.4.1.3 Earthworks activities within the National Grid Yard	FFNZ opposes the submission amendments. Earthworks for many farming activities such as maintenance of farm tracks, cultivation, pasture maintenance, fence maintenance, pest plant control etc. are not sensitive to the operation of the National Grid, and therefore should be tolerated within the National Grid Corridor (unless it is hazardous to do so within a specified distance of a National Grid support tower). To otherwise require such activities to get resource consent would unduly subject farmers to onerous cost and delays for little or no environmental benefit.	Allow submission point 697.7 only if the proposed amendments in submission point 697.765 are adopted	



No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
697	Waikato District Council	Support submission point 697.765	<p>Submitter's suggested amendment to Rule 22.2.3(2)(a) to introduce specific standards for earthworks within rules:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(a) Rule 22.2.3.1A – Earthworks - within the National Grid Yard</i></p> <p>And Suggested inclusion of a new Rule 22.2.3.1A <i>Earthworks within the National Grid Yard</i></p>	FFNZ support earthworks for farming activities within the National Grid Yard where these are compatible with the operation of the National Grid Yard in order to promote efficient use of the rural land resource	Allow submission point 697.765	
697	Waikato District Council	Oppose submission point 697.807	<p>Submitter's suggestion that a new Rule clause <i>(f) Rule 22.3.7.7 Building setback – National Grid Yard</i>, and associated rule, be added in order "to replicate the rule regarding buildings and structure within the National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 22 for increased clarity and usability of the Plan."</p>	FFNZ has concerns with the reasoning behind this submission point and doubt that replicating the rule from Chapter 14 into Chapter 22 "will result in increased clarity and usability of the Plan". If anything, replicating rules creates confusion. It is more appropriate to improve the 'road mapping' within the plan and utilise referencing options to ensure relevant or applicable parts of the plan are linked.	Disallow submission point 697.807	
697	Waikato District Council	Oppose submission point 697.821	<p>Submitters suggestion for a new clause for Rule 22.4.1 AND Add a new rule after Rule 22.4.8</p>	FFNZ has concerns with the reasoning behind this submission point and doubt that replicating the rule from Chapter 14 into Chapter 22 "will result in increased clarity and usability of the Plan". If anything, replicating rules creates confusion. It is more appropriate to improve the 'road mapping' within the plan and utilise referencing options to ensure relevant or applicable parts of the plan are linked.	Disallow submission point 697.821	
707	Soil & Health Association of	Oppose submission point 707.4	Amend the definition of Agricultural and Horticulture Research Facilities, in	FFNZ opposes the amendment for reasons outlined in our further submissions relating to	Disallow submission point 707.4	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
	New Zealand (S&H)		Chapter 13-Definitions, to include the following: .. <u>For the avoidance of doubt, this definition does not include veterinary vaccines that use Genetically Modified Organisms, or any activities that involve Field Trials, or Release of Genetically Modified Organisms.</u>	proposals to introduce GMO provisions in the District Plan.		
707	Soil & Health Association of New Zealand (S&H)	Oppose submission point 707.5	Add five new definitions to Chapter 13- Definitions, in relation to Genetically Modified Organisms	FFNZ opposes the amendment for reasons outlined in our further submissions relating to proposals to introduce GMO provisions in the District Plan.	Disallow submission point 707.5	
737	Shand Properties Limited	Support, in part submission point 737.7	Add a definition for "natural hazard area" to Chapter 13: Definitions with reference to standards and/or mapped location	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission however; we consider it important for the Stage 2 process to be completed first. This will ensure there an accepted and agreed planning response for these areas.	Disallow submission point 737.7	Until Stage 2 has been completed
737	Shand Properties Limited	Support submission point 737.8	Amend definition of "contaminated land" in Chapter 13: Definitions to refer to standards and/or mapped locations	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission however; we consider it important for the Stage 2 process to be completed first. This will ensure there an accepted and agreed planning response for these areas.	Disallow submission point 737.8	Until Stage 2 has been completed
742	NZ Transport Agency	Support in part submission point 742.6	Amend Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting as follows: (a) Allow for a biodiversity offset to be offered <del>by a resource consent applicant</del> where an activity ... (b)(ii) the biodiversity <u>is enhanced or maintained working towards achieving biodiversity offset</u> <del>can-strives to achieve</del> no net loss of indigenous biodiversity <u>at a regional scale ...</u>	FFNZ supports in part, and opposes in part the relief sought. We are concerned that removing the resource consent application link may imply that the policy applies to all land use activities, including those that are permitted. FFNZ supports the amendments to (b).	Allow submission point 742.6 in part	Disallow deletion of the phrase 'by a resource consent applicant' from Policy 3.2.4(a). And Allow relief sought for 3.2.4(b)

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
742	NZ Transport Agency	Support submission point 742.66	Delete clause 12.3.1 Additional matters.	FFNZ supports the deletion for reasons outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 742.66	
742	NZ Transport Agency	Support submission point 742.75	Delete the definition of "noise-sensitive activity" in Chapter 13: Definitions. AND Amend the definition of "sensitive land use" in Chapter 13: Definitions to cover all of the matters in "noise-sensitive activity" and to include "student accommodation" and "places of assembly"	FFNZ supports the relief sought for reasons outlined by the submitter.	Allow submission point 742.75	
742	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose submission point 742.80	Add a definition for "rural activities" to Chapter 13: Definitions	FFNZ understands the submission point but considers the concerns can be addressed by changing the term in rule to 'farming'. There is no need for another definition	Disallow submission point 742.80	
742	NZ Transport Agency	Oppose in part submission point 742.244	Submitter's suggested amendment to Rule 14.12.1 Permitted Activities concerning sensitive activities ...	FFNZ considers that existing dwellings, or upgrades, additions or alterations thereto, within rural areas, particularly Rural Zones, should be exempt from any requirement to comply with noise rules alongside roads, state highways or railway lines.	Disallow in part submission point 742.244	Disallow relief requiring that existing dwellings, or upgrades, additions or alterations thereto within rural areas, particularly Rural Zones, should comply with noise rules alongside roads, state highways or railway lines
746	The Surveying Company	Oppose in part submission point 746.18	Amend the definition of "intensive farming" in Chapter 13: Definitions as follows	FFNZ considers the submission to be inconsistent with other relief sought i.e. (g). It will create uncertainty and confusion and has potential to capture activities that are not intensive.	Disallow in part submission point 746.18	Disallow proposed amendment (f) to the definition ... <del>(f) animal feedlots feeding livestock on food other than pasture grasses.</del>

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
746	The Surveying Company	Support in part submission point 746.84	Submitter's suggestion that Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks – All boundaries, be amended so that boundaries to have a 12m setback from the boundary of an adjoining site	FFNZ support maximising use of the rural land resource, and minimising undue delay and cost in doing so. In this regard where the Proposed plan prescribes a 25m setback, this should be a 12m setback. 12m is ample side or rear yard for rural buildings.	Allow submission point 746.84	
746	The Surveying Company	Support in part submission point 746.115	Add a new rule to Section 22.4-Subdivision as follows: Subdivisions of land containing mapped off-road walkways/trails/cycle ways	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission but does not consider a new rule is required. If a property is being subdivided with these overlays present on the planning maps, those matters can be addressed taking into account site-specific attributes and limitations, during the consent process.	Disallow submission point 746.115	
746	The Surveying Company	Support submission point 746.65	Add full provisions for transferable rural lot subdivision within the Rural Zone to Chapter 22 Rural Zone; And Add the Operative Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section Rule 22B.12 - Transferable Rural Lot Right including the provision to transfer "approved lots" to Chapter 22 Rural Zone.	FFNZ supports the amendments for reasons outlined by the submitter	Allow submission point 746.65	
746	The Surveying company	Oppose submission point 746.10	Amend the definition of "Waste Management Facility" in Chapter 13: Definitions as follows: Waste management facilities include: <u>disposal of waste to land (excluding cleanfill)</u> , commercial composting operations, recovery operations, transfer stations, recycling centres	FFNZ opposes the amendment and would like to ensure the day-to-day farming activities, such as on-site disposal of dead stock, plant waste, or agricultural packaging waste, is not captured by any definition where this would trigger requirement for resource consent. Having to obtain resource consent for all manner of farm waste management, would subject farm operations to onerous, unnecessary costs and delays.	Disallow submission point 746.10	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			and resource recovery centres.			
780	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose submission point 780.19	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan by making the Coastal Overlay a conservation area and including provisions where all major changes and consents which infringe District Plan rules, or which exceed one storey, are publicly notified.	FFNZ opposes this submission. Notification principles are well settled in the RMA and case law, and will provide for any application to be notified if it is appropriate to do so.	Disallow submission point 780.19	
780	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose submission point 780.30	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require consents requiring exemption from plan rules to be automatically publicly notified, whether the rule is on genetically modified organisms or not.	FFNZ opposes this submission. Notification principles are well settled in the RMA and case law, and will provide for any application to be notified if it is appropriate to do so.	Disallow submission point 780.30	
780	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose submission point 780.1	Add areas of Significant indigenous vegetation or habitat through the use of LENZ and in consultation with conservation and environment groups. And Add rules for Significant indigenous vegetation and habitat as follows:	FFNZ opposes the submission. Desktop analysis is one tool that can be used to inform an SNA identification process; however, there are limitations that can only be overcome with ground truthing and landowner consultation. Isolating landowners from the process will only reduce buy-in from the very people who can make a material difference towards achieving improved biodiversity outcomes.	Disallow submission point 780.1	
780	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose submission point 780.32	Amend the earthworks rules for all zones that prescribe limits over a specified timeframe e.g. 12 month period to add limits to total development, consistent with maintaining the values of the site	The planning approach outlined is already utilised in the proposed plan. FFNZ opposes this submission as no specific thresholds are provided and as such we are unable to assess the impacts on farmers.	Disallow submission point 780.32	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
780	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose in part submission point 780.5	Add new rules for all zones as follows: Construction of a building or other structure and planting of trees and other vegetation is a permitted activity if:	The relief sought should not apply to the rural zone.	Disallow, in part submission point 780.5	Disallow submission point 780.5 applying in the rural zone.
780	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose submission point 780.21	Add policies and rules to protect ridgelines from development. Amend Policy 3.3.2 (a)(i) to not just recognise but to protect.	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. The notified Policy 3.3.2 has the appropriate focus and direction required to meet RMA requirements.	Disallow submission point 780.21	
780	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose submission point 780.4	Add rules to Chapter 22 Rural Zone to provide for protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops and to include at least the following defined views:...	FFNZ oppose any sort of view protection restrictions over private farmland in the Rural Zone. Farmland is part of the rural amenity and landscape character of the Rural Zone. Farming activities, including all manner of ancillary farm development, are part of the working rural landscape, and should not be subject to restrictions that 'protect' view shafts.	Disallow submission point 780.4	
785	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited	Support submission point 785.2	Submitter's relief seeking to: Delete Rule 22.2.4 – Hazardous Substances. AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the submission.	FFNZ support the submitters relief as an alternative to its own relief sought for this rule for the same reasons as the FFNZ submission on this rule	Allow submission point 785.2	
788	Susan Hall	788.8	Submitter's suggested amendment to add rules to Chapter 22 Rural Zone, to provide for the protection of defined views from public places in Raglan to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops in the chapters on rural, residential, and	FFNZ oppose any sort of view protection restrictions over private farmland in the Rural Zone. Farmland is part of the rural amenity and landscape character of the Rural Zone. Farming activities, including all manner of ancillary farm development, are part of the working rural landscape, and should not be subject to restrictions that 'protect' view shafts.	Disallow submission point 788.8	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			business town centre zones...			
794	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose submission 794.3	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to Section 1.4.3.1 Rural Activities	FFNZ opposes the amendments sought – the notified section has the appropriate focus and context.	Disallow submission 794.3	
794	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose submission 794.4	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to Section 1.4.3.2 Protecting the rural environment	FFNZ opposes the amendments sought – the notified section has the appropriate focus and context.	Disallow submission 794.4	
794	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose submission 794.5	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to Amend Objective 3.1.1 Biodiversity and ecosystems as follows: <i>(a) Indigenous biodiversity values and the life-supporting capacity of indigenous ecosystems are maintained or enhanced.</i> <i>(b) New areas of indigenous biodiversity are established.</i>	Whilst FFNZ understands the intent of the submission, we consider the amendment is unnecessary. New areas of indigenous biodiversity being established may be a consequence of the notified Objective 3.1.1(a), it doesn't need to be an Objective on its own to achieve the outcome.	Disallow submission 794.5	
794	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support submission 794.32	Amend the provisions within Chapter 22.4 Subdivision, to provide for incentivised subdivision rules to enable ecological benefit within the rural area as a restricted discretionary activity as follows:	FFNZ supports the submission. The PDP has focused conservation lot subdivision on SNAs and is missing an opportunity to incentivise other biodiversity gains such as restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that may not be an SNA, including manmade wetlands, and other areas which would benefit from active management such as erosion prone land or riparian margins.	Allow submission 794.32	
797	Fonterra Limited	Support submission point 797.3	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to Section 1.4.2.3 Challenges	FFNZ supports the submission, it identifies an important challenge which is currently missing and provides useful context for the planning response re these matters.	Allow submission 797.3	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
797	Fonterra Limited	Support, in part submission point 797.20	Add a definition of "productive rural activities" to Chapter 13 Definitions as follows (or words to similar effect): farming, forestry, horticulture and mineral extraction.	FFNZ supports inclusion of a definition but is concerned that it may create confusion with the definition of 'farming'. In our view there only needs to be one, robust, definition.	Support in part submission point 797.2	To avoid confusion there only needs to be one definition that describes farming/ productive rural activities.
797	Fonterra Limited	Support submission point 797.21	Add a definition of "reverse sensitivity" to Chapter 13 Definitions	FFNZ supports inclusion of the new 'reverse sensitivity' definition.	Support submission point 797.21	
797	Fonterra Limited	Support submission point 797.27	Submitter's relief seeking to: Delete Rule 22.2.4 Hazardous substances. AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	FFNZ support the submitter's relief as an alternative to its own relief sought for this rule.	Allow submission point 797.27	
797	Fonterra Limited	Support submission point 797.32	Submitter's suggestion that Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P1, P2, P3 and P4 Building setbacks - All boundaries to include (or words to similar effect): <i>Providing that the setback requirements shall not apply to any boundary with land held in common ownership.</i> AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission., be amended so that	FFNZ support that where adjoining sites are in common ownership, there should be no requirement to set buildings any minimum distance from the lot boundary.	Allow submission point 797.32	
799	Leo Koppens	Oppose submission point 799.2	Amend the Proposed District Plan to allow all significant indigenous areas to be protected the same as	FFNZ opposes this submission; it is unclear how the submitter wants this approach to be implemented. We wish to alert Council that the use of rules and the consent process as a mechanism to assess whether a site of	Disallow submission point 799.2	



No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			identified Significant Natural Areas.	indigenous vegetation is to be considered significant is putting at risk the acceptance and buy in of landowners. One of the biggest issues when a site is identified by way of a rule, is that the affected landowner has no greater rights to submit on the proposal than those of the general public, and therefore indigenous vegetation on privately owned land is often treated as a public or free good. By adopting the consent process as the primary mechanism for the identification of significant natural areas the onus of proof shifts, and elevates all sites to a significance status until proven otherwise by the applicant.		
799	Leo Koppens	Oppose submission point 799.3	Amend the Proposed District Plan to prevent cattle grazing in Significant Natural Areas.	FFNZ fundamentally opposes this relief sought; it is inconsistent with the enabling intent of the RMA and is not required to achieve improved protection over SNAs across the district. The FFNZ submission introduces a range of options that, if adopted, would help to achieve those goals without isolating the landowners whose buy-in is required to achieve successful outcomes.	Disallow submission point 799.3	
802	Vera van der Voorden	Oppose submission point 802.2	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require all consents that would require exemption from plan rules to be automatically publicly notified, whether the rules are on Genetically Modified Organisms, or any other matter	FFNZ opposes this submission. Notification principles are well settled in the RMA and case law, and will provide for any application to be notified if it is appropriate to do so.	Disallow submission point 802.2	
819	Dominic O'Rourke	Oppose submission point 819.5	Amend the Proposed District Plan provisions so that any building activity that does not comply with the District Plan to be publicly notified.	FFNZ opposes this submission. Notification principles are well settled in the RMA and case law, and will provide for any application to be notified if it is appropriate to do so.	Disallow submission point 819.5	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
825	John Lawson	Oppose submission point 825.4	Submitter's suggested amendment to add rules to Chapter 22 Rural Zone to provide for protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops...	FFNZ oppose any sort of view protection restrictions over private farmland in the Rural Zone. Farmland is part of the rural amenity and landscape character of the Rural Zone. Farming activities, including all manner of ancillary farm development, are part of the working rural landscape, and should not be subject to restrictions that 'protect' view shafts.	Disallow submission point 825.4	
825	John Lawson	Oppose submission point 825.21	Add policies and rules to protect ridgelines from development. AND Amend Policy 3.3.2 (a)(i) t not just recognise but protect.	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. The notified Policy 3.3.2 has the appropriate focus and direction required to meet RMA requirements.	Disallow submission point 825.21	
825	John Lawson	Oppose submission point 825.19	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan by making the Coastal Overlay a conservation area and including provisions where all major changes and consents which infringe District Plan rules, or which exceed one storey, are publicly notified.	FFNZ opposes this submission. Notification principles are well settled in the RMA and case law, and will provide for any application to be notified if it is appropriate to do so.	Disallow submission point 825.19	
825	John Lawson	Oppose submission point 825.31	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require consents requiring exemption from plan rules to be automatically publicly notified, whether the rules are on genetically modified organisms or not.	FFNZ opposes this submission. Notification principles are well settled in the RMA and case law, and will provide for any application to be notified if it is appropriate to do so.	Disallow submission point 825.31	
827	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support in part submission 827.50	Delete the definition of "Extractive Industry" in Chapter 13 and replace it with the following (or words to similar effect):	FFNZ agrees there are definitions in the plan that need to be streamlined to avoid duplication and confusion. With regards to these activities FFNZ's concern is to ensure any new definition does not inadvertently capture farm quarries.	Support in part submission 827.50	Ensure any definition of Extractive Activity does not inadvertently capture farm quarries.
831	Raglan naturally	Oppose submission 831.1	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to Add	FFNZ opposes the submission. Desktop analysis is one tool that can be used to inform	Disallow submission 831.1	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat and rules in consultation with LENZ and environmental groups.	an SNA identification process; however, there are limitations that can only be overcome with ground truthing and landowner consultation. Isolating landowners from the process will only reduce buy-in from the very people who can make a material difference towards achieving improved biodiversity outcomes		
831	Raglan Naturally	Oppose submission 831.43	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to Section 1.5.7 Natural environment	FFNZ opposes the submission. Protection of natural character is not required at all costs. It is important to provide for development in appropriate circumstances. WDC is charged with striking the right balance across all the wellbeings; cultural, environmental, social and economic.	Disallow submission 831.43	
831	Raglan Naturally	Oppose submission 831.44	Submitter's suggested amendment sought to Amend Chapter 3 Natural Character, to recognise that new development should not encroach on nature and that all natural character areas (not just those of higher value) be protected through tools such as cat free covenants and similar rules imposed by the Palmerston North District Plan	FFNZ opposes the submission. It is important to provide for development in appropriate circumstances. WDC is charged with striking the right balance across all the wellbeings; cultural, environmental, social and economic.	Disallow submission 831.44	
831	Raglan Naturally	Oppose submission 831.47	No specific decision is sought, however the submitter seeks that the Council publicly notifies and informs adjoining authorities and the Regional Council of all resource consent applications for vegetation clearance.	FFNZ opposes the blunt planning approach being sought in this submission. Notification principles are well settled in the RMA and case law, and will provide for any application to be notified if it is appropriate to do so	Disallow submission point 831.47	
831	Raglan Naturally	Oppose submission	Delete Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance	FFNZ opposes the submission. It is important to provide for vegetation clearance	Disallow submission point	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
		831.56 and 831.48	And dd new rules that read as follows In a significant indigenous vegetation or habitat area the following are discretionary activities:	in appropriate circumstances. WDC is charged with striking the right balance across all the wellbeings; cultural, environmental, social and economic.	831.56 and 831.48	
831	Raglan Naturally	Oppose submission 831.87	Delete Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision AND Add policies that will increase habitats.	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. Policy 3.2.8 is one of a range of options available to WDC to encourage habitat protection.	Disallow submission point 831.87	
831	Raglan Naturally	Oppose submission 831.70	Amend the Proposed District Plan to protect existing large trees, not just those listed in Schedule 30.2.	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. It is unreasonable to protect all large trees across the whole district. The amendment would elevate all large trees to protected status – no trees for firewood, removal for H&S reasons etc.	Disallow submission point 831.70	
831	Raglan Naturally	Oppose submissions 831.84, 85 and 86	Amend Policy 9.3.3.4 Stock exclusion, to extent to all areas with water pollution caused by livestock.	FFNZ opposes this relief sought. Controlling land use for water quality purposes is a Regional Council function.	Disallow submission points 831.84, 85 and 86	
831	Gabrielle Parson	Oppose submission point 831.91	Submitter's suggested amendment to add rules to Chapter 22 Rural Zone to provide for the protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops and to include ...	FFNZ oppose any sort of view protection restrictions over private farmland in the Rural Zone. Farmland is part of the rural amenity and landscape character of the Rural Zone. Farming activities, including all manner of ancillary farm development, are part of the working rural landscape, and should not be subject to restrictions that 'protect' view shafts.	Disallow submission point 831.91	
855	Peter Buckley	Support submission point 855.1	Amend the identification of Significant Natural Areas so that any areas identified as a Significant Natural Areas remain contestable by the landowners until there has been a physical audit	Support is extended to the process and reasoning for this relief sought.	Allow submission point 855.1	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			undertaken of the area and this audit should be carried out by a panel which should be made up of: An independent Rural representative; A Council representative; An ecologist; and The Landowner or their representative.			
923	Waikato District Health Board	Oppose submission point 923.138	Submitter's suggested relief that the definition of <i>Farming noise</i> be amended to delete reference to 'agricultural machinery or equipment'.	FFNZ prefers reference to agricultural machinery or equipment to remain in the definition of <i>Farming noise</i> . It would be unreasonably onerous to burden farmers with a requirement to have to obtain resource consent for operation of farm machinery and equipment as part of normal day-to-day farming. Farming should not be constrained by sensitive activities encroaching into rural areas.	Disallow submission point 923.138	
924	Genesis Energy Limited	Support Submission Point 924.10	Submitter's suggested amendment seeking addition of a further policy criterion in Policy 3.2.6, <i>Providing for Vegetation Clearance</i> , namely that: " <u>The vegetation is impinging on adjacent existing activities</u> "	There are times when clearing vegetation may be appropriate to enable normal day-to-day operation of permitted farming activities, such a maintaining clearance within firebreaks, or next to boundary fences, water supply line, and farm access tracks. This further criterion would capture any such activity not already itemised in other clauses of the policy.	Allow submission	
942	Tainui – Angeline Greenslade	Oppose submission point 942.44	1.5.7.4 - the Proposed District Plan to ban air contaminants from sprays.	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. It is a Regional Council function to control discharges of contaminants into air.	Disallow submission point 943.44	
942	Tainui – Angeline Greenslade	Oppose submission point 942.49	1.7.2- the Proposed District Plan to the following rivers, which are important to the West Coast, to Section 1.7.2 Rivers - Vision and Strategy:	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. Section 1.7.2 applies specifically to the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.	Disallow submission point 943.49	
945	First Gas	Oppose submission points	Submitter's suggested amendments to Policy 6.2.2	FFNZ oppose these submission points for the reason that these inappropriately seek to	Disallow submission points	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
		945.40, 945.41, 945.42, 945.43	– Recognise the National Grid, and to Policy 6.2.3 - Operation and development of the National Grid, and to Policy 6.2.4 - Maintenance and minor upgrade the National Grid, and to Policy 6.2.6 - Reverse Sensitivity and the National Grid as follows, namely: the addition of 'Gas network' to the matters subject to consideration in these policies	include regulatory provision and protection for gas network infrastructure in the National Grid Corridor. Identification of National Grid corridors should be limited to only the National Grid as directed by the NPS-ET Policy 11, and not to other forms of infrastructure. If gas network operators wish to install gas network infrastructure on private land, then they need to negotiate access and easement agreements with landowners (including farmers), and it is not appropriate for the Council to include district plan rules that override the landowner's prerogative in this regard.	945.40, 945.41 945.42 and 945.43	
945	First Gas	Support in part submission point 945.19	Submitter's suggested amendment to Rural Zone Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (a) Earthworks ...	FFNZ understand the need to be cautious undertaking earthworks around infrastructure, but are concerned about incremental restrictions, which intrude on farming operation, lest such restrictions result in inefficient use of privately owned farmland.	Allow in part submission point 945.19	Allow if FFNZ's original submission changes to Rule 22.2.3.1 P2(a) are adopted.
945	First Gas	Oppose submission point 945.21 and 945.25	Add new rule to Rule 22.4.1 Subdivision and Add a new rule to Rule 23.4 - Subdivision ...	FFNZ seeks controlled activity subdivision for boundary relocation and boundary adjustment in the Rural Zone and Country Living Zone. These are types of subdivision where no additional lots are being created and therefore there is no overall intensification of land use, and effects on the environment are less than minor in the context of the wide-open spaces of the Rural and Country Living zones. It is appropriate to provide for such subdivision as a controlled activity in order to enable efficient organisation of land ownership and farm management.	Disallow, in part submission point 945.21 and 25	Disallow submission relief seeking any activity status other than controlled activity, for boundary adjustment or boundary relocation subdivision where a gas transmission pipeline is within the subject property. The matters of concern can be dealt with by appropriate controlled activity standards and matters of control.

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				The submitter's concerns can be addressed with appropriate controlled activity standards and matters of control.		
No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
695	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support submission point 695.56	Retain the definition for "Agricultural and horticultural research activities" in Chapter 13 Definitions which no longer contains references to "Genetic Engineering".	Genetic engineering is best managed by the Environmental Protection Authority on a case by case basis.	Allow submission 695.56	
245	Aaron Mooar	Oppose submission point 245.3	Add a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations.	FFNZ opposes this submission point and related submissions for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The issues raised in the submissions are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known.</li> <li>Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.</li> </ul>	Disallow submission 245.3	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Genetically modified organisms (GMO) are regulated by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act.</li> <li>• Any use of a GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA.</li> <li>• The EPA is required to exercise a precautionary approach in its decision making.</li> <li>• Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those opposed to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard.</li> <li>• Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA.</li> <li>• The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or the Resource Management Act.</li> <li>• Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to</li> </ul>		



No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
				<p>be no more risky than conventional breeding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Genetic modification has been used in other parts of the world with no scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification.</li> <li>• Led by AgResearch Ruakura , the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation.</li> <li>• Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Undermine the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation.</li> <li>2. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to:                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. address climate change, water quality and predator control;</li> <li>b. improve productivity;</li> <li>c. innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as</li> <li>d. remediate the environment, manage our biosecurity risks and incursions.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>I do not consider genetic modification is the only answer to all these issues but we will need all the tools in the toolbox if we are to make meaningful and timely progress.</p> </li> </ul>		

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
245	Aaron Mooar	Oppose submission point 245.4	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
286	Waikato-Tainui	Oppose submission point 286.37	Add clear provisions for genetically modified organisms that include: precautionary policies to regulate the outdoor use of genetically modified organisms; prohibit the release of genetically modified organisms on land; and make field trials a discretionary activity with performance standards in regard to liability and the posting of bonds.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above,	Disallow this whole submission point.	
353	Michael Anderson	Oppose submission point 353.1	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive policies and rules relating to the management of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), the same or similar to the Far North District Plan, Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
380	Waahi Whaanui Trust	Oppose submission point 380.7	Add clear provisions to include precautionary policies to regulate the outdoor use of genetically modified organisms AND Add provisions to prohibit the	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			release of GMOs on land and make field trials a discretionary activity with performance standards in regard to liability and the posting of bonds.			
480	Susan Carter	Oppose submission point 480.1	Add a resource management framework for the management of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) that is region-specific, taking into account environmental, economic and social wellbeing considerations.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
480	Susan Carter	Oppose submission point 480.4	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules for Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same (or similar) to those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
499	Adrian Morton	Oppose submission point 499.19	Add a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regional specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
525	Gillian Marie	Oppose submission point 525.1	Add a resource management framework for the management of GMOs that is regional specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
525	Gillian Marie	Oppose submission point 525.2	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive policies and rules relating to the management of genetically modified organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
525	Gillian Marie	Oppose submission point 525.3	Amend the Proposed District Plan to required all consent applications to be automatically publicly notified, regardless of whether the application is regarding genetically modified organisms or not.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
546	Lynne Adrienne	Oppose submission point 546.1	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive policies and rules relating to the management of genetically modified organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
553	Malibu Hamilton	Oppose submission point 553.1	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms. The same or similar to those in the Far North District Plan, Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
599	Martin Hastings	Oppose submission point 599.1	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, rules and policies relating to the management of Genetically Modified Organisms, made similar or the same as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan, and the Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
599	Martin Hastings	Oppose submission point 599.2	Add a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific, taking into account environmental, economic, and social well-being considerations	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
638	Nora van der Voorden	Oppose submission point 638.1	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to include a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
638	Nora van der Voorden	Oppose submission point 638.2	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			Plan and Auckland Unitary Plan			
651	GE Free New Zealand	Oppose submission point 651.1	Add new provisions to the Proposed District Plan to give Genetically Modified Organisms their own section, as follows (which replicate those provisions in the Auckland Unitary Plan): Issue: Genetically Modified Organisms The environment, including human health and well-being, is safe from the adverse effects of GMO's from land use activities. ...	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
651	GE Free New Zealand	submission point 651.2	No specific decision sought, but submission states that the AgResearch Ruakura animal field test site should be the only area zoned for Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) activity	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
651	GE Free New Zealand	submission point 651.4	No specific decision sought, but submission supports Rural Resources - 1A.6 Issues, Objectives and Policies in the Operative District Plan which ensure that rural actions do not constrain or compromise existing lawfully-established productive rural activities.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
707	Soil & Health Association of New Zealand (S&H)	submission point 707.1	Add a new provision, 1.5.7.X Genetically modified organisms (GMO), as follows:	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
707	Soil & Health Association of New Zealand (S&H)	submission point 707.2	Amend Chapter 10 Heading as follows: Chapter 10: Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land and Genetically Modified Organisms  Add section 10.3 Genetically Modified Organisms, as follows:	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
707	Soil & Health Association of New Zealand (S&H)	submission point 707.6	Add objectives and policies to address the cultural impact of Genetically Modified Organisms on mana Whenua and the environment	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
721	Jennifer Berczely	Oppose submission point 721.1	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive policies and rules relating to the management of genetically modified organisms that are the same or similar to those in the Far North District Plan, Whangarei District Plan and Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
733	Dave Currie	Oppose submission point 733.1	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive policies and rules relating to the management of genetically modified organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
733	Dave Currie	Oppose submission point 733.2	Add a resource management framework for the management of genetically modified organisms that is region specific, taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
744	Peter McCallum	Oppose submission point 744.1	Add a resource management framework for the management of GMOs that is regional specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
744	Peter McCallum	Oppose submission point 744.2	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive policies and rules relating to the management of genetically modified organisms that are the same (or similar) to those in the Far North District Plan, Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
744	Peter McCallum	Oppose submission point 744.3	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require all consent applications to be automatically publically notified, regardless of whether the application is regarding genetically modified organisms or not.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
755	Jade Penn	Oppose submission point 755.1	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to include a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	



No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			Organisms that is regionalspecific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations.			
755	Jade Penn	Oppose submission point 755.2	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to include strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same, or similar, as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
755	Jade Penn	Oppose submission point 755.3	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to require consents which would require exemption from plan rules, to be automatically be publicly notifiable, whether the rules are on Genetically Modified Organisms or any other matter.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
757	Karen White	Oppose submission point 757.12	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to include a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regional specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
757	Karen White	Oppose submission point 757.13	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to include strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
758	Clifford & Maureen Bayliss	Oppose submission point 758.1	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to include a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionalspecific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
757	Clifford & Maureen Bayliss	Oppose submission point 758.2	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to include strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to GMOs that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan, to ensure a consistent approach across Northland, Auckland the Waikato.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
759	Tracey Bayliss	Oppose submission point 759.1	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to include a resource	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regional specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations.			
759	Tracey Bayliss	Oppose submission point 759.2	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to include strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan, to ensure a consistent approach across Northland, Auckland the Waikato and to eliminate cross boundary issues	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
762	Simon Thomson	Oppose submission point 762.1	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific taking into account environmental, economic and social wellbeing considerations	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
762	Simon Thomson	Oppose submission point 762.2	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan			
762	Simon Thomson	Oppose submission point 762.3	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include that liability for spread and damage caused by Genetically Modified Organism's be with the owners of that genetic material, and secondly local and regional councils.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
762	Simon Thomson	Oppose submission point 762.4	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require those who introduce Genetically Modified Organism material into the environment be required to pay a bond to council equal in order of magnitude greater than any possible clean-up to eradicate at the genetic material.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
776	GE Free Northland (in food & environment)	submission point 776.1	Add a resource management framework for the management of genetically modified organisms that is region specific, taking into account environmental, economic, cultural and social well-being considerations	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
776	GE Free Northland (in food & environment)	Oppose submission point 776.2	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to genetically modified	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			organisms that are aligned with those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan, the Auckland Unitary Plan and Northland Regional Policy Statement			
780	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose submission point 780.39	<p>Add a new chapter that provides the following:</p> <p>A resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations. Strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan, to ensure a consistent approach across Northland, Auckland and the Waikato and to eliminate cross boundary issues.</p>	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
788	Susan Hall	Oppose submission point 788.10	Amend the Proposed District Plan so that consents which would require exemption from plan rules should automatically be publicly notifiable, whether the rules are on Genetically Modified	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			Organisms, or any other matter.			
788	Susan Hall	Oppose submission point 788.6	Add a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
788	Susan Hall	Oppose submission point 788.9	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same or similar to those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
789	BioAgriNomics Ltd	Oppose submission point 789.1	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive policies and rules relating to the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same or similar to those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
789	BioAgriNomics Ltd	Oppose submission point 789.2	Add a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
789	BioAgriNomics Ltd	Oppose submission point 789.3	Seeks Genetically Modified Organisms and all genetically engineered products completely banned from being introduced into New Zealand	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
795	Hinemaria Ward-Holmes	Oppose submission point 795.1	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same (or similar) as those in the far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan, to ensure a consistent approach across Northland, Auckland and the Waikato and to eliminate cross boundary issues	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
795	Hinemaria Ward-Holmes	Oppose submission point 795.2	Add a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific taking into account environmental, economic and well-being considerations.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
802	Vera van der Voorden	Oppose submission point 802.1	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive policies and rules relating to the management of genetically modified organisms, that are the same (or similar) as those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
802	Vera van der Voorden	Oppose submission point 802.14	Add a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific, taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being considerations.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
825	John Lawson	Oppose submission point 825.39	Add a new chapter that provides the following: A resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms ...	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
830	Linda Silvester	Oppose submission point 830.19	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same or similar to those in the Far North District Plan, Whangarei District Plan and Auckland Unitary Plan	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
830	Linda Silvester	Oppose submission point 830.20	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require public notification of resource consent applications, regardless of whether the rules are Genetically Modified Organisms or any other matter	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
830	Linda Silvester	Oppose submission point 830.6	Add A resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific and takes into account environmental,	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	



No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
			economic and social wellbeing.			
942	Angeline Greensill	Oppose submission point 942.24	<p>Add a separate chapter to include a separate chapter addressing Genetically Modified Organisms that prohibits the release of Genetically Modified Organisms into the rural environment through field trials, similar to the provisions of neighbouring Councils e.g. Auckland.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to require all applications for Genetically Modified Organism releases to be publicly notified.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to require a bond be imposed to cover clean up should the EPA approve applications for the release of Genetically Modified Organisms in the district</p>	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
963	June Penn	Oppose submission point 963.1	Add a resource management framework for the management of Genetically Modified Organisms that is regionally specific, taking into account environmental, economic and social well-being.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	

No.	The specific submission that my further submission relates to:	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	Submission Topic	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Whether the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed	If part of the submission, details of which part of the submission be allowed or disallowed
963	June Penn	Oppose submission point 963.2	Add strong precautionary and prohibitive provisions, policies and rules relating to Genetically Modified Organisms that are the same or similar to those in the Far North District Plan, the Whangarei District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	
963	June Penn	Oppose submission point 963.3	Amend the Proposed District Plan so that all consents/activities that would require exemption from plan rules would be publicly notified, regardless of whether they are on genetically modified organisms or not	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3 above.	Disallow this whole submission point.	