

# Your submission to Proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land

Northland  
New Zealand

## Reference no: 69

### Clause

What are the values and benefits associated with existing food growing hubs and how can these be maximised?

### Notes

We need to ensure we can always feed our people - this does mean thought needs to be put into land use as well as nutrient use - they must go hand in hand. You can not close land owners avenue for subdivision and also close their ability to apply nutrients to land.

### Clause

What are the values and benefits associated with highly productive land?

### Notes

Usually highly productive land is in good rainfall area or close to population.

### Clause

Does the RMA framework provide sufficient clarity and direction on how highly productive land should be managed? Why/why not?

### Notes

No - it is not clear what and where exactly productive land is located. I am not able to figure out where my farm would be classed. Each council could interpret productive land differently.

### Clause

Does the RMA framework provide sufficient clarity on how highly productive land should be considered alongside competing uses? Why/why not?

### Notes

No - currently we have a productive land use submission (this one) and a nutrient limit submission (waterways) happening at the same time. They could each have a great influence on food production for some of our winter vegetable production areas - and this will have huge effect on cost of our locally produced food. Not enough has been done on the economics.

### Clause

How is highly productive land currently considered when providing urban expansion? Can you provide examples?

### Notes

As urban areas grow the classification of land around the city has changed from rural to residential which has meant subdivision rules are different. Some of the best flat land around Hamilton has become lifestyle blocks with bigger sections. This in turn has created problems with urban dwellers now living in a traditionally farmed rural area don't like the "farming calendar" or noises or dust that comes with farming. We are a dairy farm with 21 neighbours - I have been phoned and abused for putting LIME on our pasture when the neighbours washing was on the line. We have been called in the middle of the night when a cow was "moo-ing" too loudly - she had calved and her calf had gone under fence into next paddock. WE have also been called when we were harvesting Maize silage in the middle of the night as one of the back neighbours had to be at work at 6:00 am and we should have some consideration for others. This is a real issue in some areas.

### Clause

How should highly productive land be considered when planning for future urban expansion?

### Notes

Very clear where is productive land - don't think it should be on title but we should now where this land is.

### Clause

How is highly productive land currently considered when providing for rural-lifestyle development? Can you provide examples?

### Notes

Don't know how it is decided - just know my neighbours split their 8 ha into new titles and now have a poorly thought out group of houses all with driveways onto road - and our dairyfarm backs onto them.

**Clause**

How should highly productive land be considered when providing for rural-lifestyle development?

**Notes**

Difficult to manage growth and need for homes with rural lifestyle.... these are often cheaper land and bigger sections.... it might be better to have smaller sections close to town.

**Clause**

How should the tensions between primary production activities and potentially incompatible activities best be managed?

**Notes**

I personally have experienced this. I get annoyed that the lifestyle (new to rural living) has expectation that all is peaceful and quiet in the country. I believe the new lifestyle dwellers need to accept that farming may have been in operation for generations and it is a business. Would they expect their in-town business to make changes to their day to day operation simply because someone has moved into the neighbourhood. As long as we are following "good farming practices" there should be very little complaints about noise, dust, ruining their view because we planted a maize crop.

**Clause**

How can reverse sensitivity issues at the rural-urban interface best be managed?

**Notes**

If you want to protect "productive land" then the operation of farming/horticulture has trumps over lifestylers in my opinion they have the "right of way" as long as they are operating with good farming practices.

**Clause**

Do you agree that there is a problem? Has it been accurately reflected in this document?

**Notes**

Somewhat agree - believe the waterways / nutrients issue may have a greater affect on vegetable production than this. There are some landowners feeling squeezed as this document may limit their subdivision opportunities and the nutrient issue will stop them growing healthy veges.

**Clause**

Are you aware of other problems facing highly productive land?

**Notes**

Nutrient use limits, farm plans (not enough people to be able to do them in time frames sought), waterways, 5m setback from water source is ridiculous if other mitigation can be used.

**Clause**

Which option do you think would be the most effective to address the problems identified in Chapter Three? Why?

**Notes**

option 1

**Clause**

Are there other pros and cons of a National Policy Statement that should be considered?

**Notes**

I

**Clause**

Should the focus of the National Policy Statement be on versatile soils or highly productive land more broadly? Why/why not?

**Notes**

What is the aim - it may be different issues for each council. I always believe the economic framework must be considered.

**Clause**

Should the focus of the National Policy Statement be on primary production generally or on certain types of food production activities? Why/why not?

**Notes**

Obviously vegetable growing will be the most obvious for the general public.

**Clause**

Do you support the scope of the proposal to focus on land use planning issues affecting highly productive land? Why/why not?

**Notes**

Better maps would have been prudent so I had better understanding of where class 1,2,3 land is located in my area and then I would have spent more time thinking how it will effect our community.

**Clause**

Should future urban zones and future urban areas be excluded from the scope of the National Policy Statement? What are the potential benefits and costs?

**Notes**

No - must be included or why bother even addressing this.

**Clause**

Should the National Policy Statement apply nationally or target areas where the pressures on highly productive land are greater?

**Notes**

Yes, Pukekohe and general vegetable growing around Auckland can fall into 2 different Regional Councils who might have different interpretations.

**Clause**

What would an ideal outcome be for the management of highly productive land for current and future generations?

**Notes**

We have lifestyle areas (more like a mini village) rather than 1-2 ha subdivided lots being split off farms.

**Clause**

If highly productive land is to be identified, how should this be done and by whom?

**Notes**

Nationally - either on some sort of map rather than listed on a title. This should have been done first in my opinion.

**Clause**

What are the pros and cons associated with prioritising highly productive land for primary production?

**Notes**

pros - keeps our nations food grown locally cons - cities may have to rethink land uses within current city boundaries.

**Clause**

Do you think there are potential areas of tension or confusion between this proposed National Policy Statement and other national direction (either proposed or existing)?

**Notes**

yes, easy for Council to change zoning which will allow land to move from rural title sizes to smaller residential titles..... and this is where new subdivision living will occur.

**Clause**

How can the proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and the proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development best work alongside each other to achieve housing objectives and better management of the highly productive land resource?

**Notes**

Need urban planners with long term views rather than councilors whom are elected and can often be looking at the short term.

**Clause**

How should highly productive land be considered when identifying areas for urban expansion?

**Notes**

contour, production class, water rights, roading, location to other residential areas.

**Clause**

How should the National Policy Statement direct the management of rural subdivision and fragmentation on highly productive land?

**Notes**

Planning - rural village with smaller lots grouped together might be better than having 2ha blocks being cutoff farms all over the place.

**Clause**

How should the National Policy Statement direct the management of reverse sensitivity effects on and adjacent to highly productive land?

**Notes**

Productive land use trumps sensitivity of urban dwellers as long as best farming practices are used. For spraying it is often unpractical to contact all neighbours - so maybe a standard form to email or text could be enough.

**Clause**

How should the National Policy Statement guide decision-making on resource consent applications for subdivision and urban expansion on highly productive land?

**Notes**

This should reduce cost of resource consents. We don't need to put more pressure on productive land farmers outside of the farm plan.

**Clause**

Should the National Policy Statement include policies that must be inserted into policy statements and plans without going through the Schedule 1 process? What are the potential benefits and risks?

**Notes**

Should always go through a submission and hearing process otherwise you are not listening to the people who this affects and whom may own productive land.

**Clause**

What areas of land, if any, should be excluded from the scope of the proposed National Policy Statement? Why?

**Notes**

none - all groups including iwi should be treated exactly the same

**Clause**

What is an appropriate and workable timeframe to allow councils to identify highly productive land and amend their policy statements and plans to identify that land?

**Notes**

This has to be done in conjunction with next plan change at a council - and the waterways and stock submissions all at the same time - at a busy farming calendar time which is absolutely done with no regard for the farming folk who work long hours and are already stressed out with the attack on us by urban, national government and councils.

**You have elected to withhold your personal details from publication.**