



# Proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land

## Submission Template

We would like to hear your views on the proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL).

Please feel free to use this template to prepare your submission. Once complete please email to [soils@mpi.govt.nz](mailto:soils@mpi.govt.nz).

You can also make a submission using the online submission tool. A link to the online submission tool is available at [www.mpi.govt.nz/HighlyProductiveLand](http://www.mpi.govt.nz/HighlyProductiveLand).

### Contact details

Name:

Alison Horn

Postal address:

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

Phone number:

[Redacted]

Email address:

[Redacted]

Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation? Yes [ ] No [no ]

If yes, which organisation are you submitting on behalf of?

[Redacted]

### Submissions are public information

All or part of any written submission (including names of submitters) may be published on the Ministry for Primary Industries' website, or the Ministry for the Environment's website.



Unless you clearly specify otherwise in your submission, the ministries will consider that you have agreed to have your submission and your name posted on their websites.

Contents of submissions may be released to the public under the Official Information Act 1982, if requested. Tell us if you do not want some or all of your submission released, stating which part(s) you consider should be withheld and the reason(s) for withholding the information.

Under the Privacy Act 1993, people have access to information held by agencies about them. Any personal information you send with your submission will only be used in relation to matters covered by this document. In your submission, indicate if you prefer that we do not include your name in the published summary of submissions.

## Questions for submitters

The questions for submitters that are included throughout the discussion document are provided below. We encourage you to provide comments to support your answers to the questions below. You do not have to answer all questions for your submission to be considered.

The page numbers mentioned below indicate where further information about the question is located in the discussion document.

### Section 2.3: Defining highly productive land [page 19]

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

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



### Section 3.1: Problem statement [page 23]

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

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

How are values and wider benefits of highly productive land being considered in planning and consenting processes?

### Section 3.2: Urban expansion on to highly productive land [page 24]

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

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



### Section 3.3: Fragmentation of highly productive land [page 25]

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

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

### Section 3.4: Reverse sensitivity [page 26]

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

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



**Section 3.5: These issues are being seen throughout New Zealand [page 26]**

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

Are you aware of other problems facing highly productive land?

**Section 4.5 Preferred option – a National Policy Statement [page 31]**

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

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

Are there other options not identified in this chapter that could be more effective?



## Section 5.2 Purpose of the proposed National Policy Statement [page 34]

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

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

## Section 5.3 The scope of the proposal [page 35]

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

What matters, if any, should be added to or excluded from the scope of the National Policy Statement? Why?

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?



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

#### **Section 5.4 The proposed National Policy Statement [page 37]**

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

#### **Policy 1: Identification of highly productive land [page 41]**

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

Are the proposed criteria all relevant and important considerations for identifying highly productive land? Why/why not?

#### **Policy 2: Maintaining highly productive land for primary production [page 42]**

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



### Alignment with the Urban Growth Agenda [page 43]

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)?

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?

### Policy 3: New urban development on highly productive land [page 45]

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

### Policy 4: Rural subdivision and fragmentation [page 46]

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



#### **Policy 5: Reverse sensitivity [page 47]**

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

#### **Policies 6 and 7: Consideration of private plan changes and resource consent applications on highly productive land [page 49]**

How should the National Policy Statement guide decision-making on private plan changes to rezone highly productive land for urban or rural lifestyle use?

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

#### **Section 5.6 Implementation [page 52]**

What guidance would be useful to support the implementation of the National Policy Statement?



## Specific / technical questions

The questions below are included in the outline of the proposed NPS-HPL (Chapter Five of the discussion document) and may assist technical experts when providing a submission.

### Specific questions

#### Section 5.3: The scope of the proposal [page 35]

How should the National Policy Statement best influence plan preparation and decision-making on resource consents and private plan changes?

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?

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

### Specific questions

#### Section 5.4: The proposed National Policy Statement [page 37]

What level of direction versus flexibility should the objectives provide to maintain the availability of highly productive land for primary production?



Should the objectives provide more or less guidance on what is “inappropriate subdivision, use and development” on highly productive land? Why/why not?

### Specific questions

#### Policy 1: Identification of highly productive land [page 41]

What are the pros and cons of requiring highly productive land to be spatially identified?

Is the identification of highly productive land best done at the regional or district level? Why?

What are the likely costs and effort involved in identifying highly productive land in your region?

What guidance and technical assistance do you think will be beneficial to help councils identify highly productive land?



## Specific questions

### Appendix A: Criteria to identify highly productive land [page 41]

Should there be a default definition of highly productive land based on the LUC until councils identify this? Why/why not?

What are the key considerations to consider when identifying highly productive land? What factors should be mandatory or optional to consider?

What are the benefits and risks associated with allowing councils to consider the current and future availability of water when identifying highly productive land? How should this be aligned with Essential Freshwater Programme?

Should there be a tiered approach to identify and protect highly productive land based on the LUC class (e.g. higher levels of protection to LUC 1 and 2 land compared to LUC 3 land)? Why/why not?



### Specific questions

#### Policy 3: New urban development on highly productive land [page 45]

How can this policy best encourage proactive and transparent consideration of highly productive land when identifying areas for new urban development and growth?

How can the proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land best align and complement the requirements of the proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development?

### Specific questions

#### Policy 4: Rural subdivision and fragmentation [page 46]

Should the National Policy Statement provide greater direction on how to manage subdivision on highly productive land (e.g. setting minimum lot size standards for subdivisions)? If so, how can this best be done?

Should the proposed National Policy Statement encourage incentives and mechanisms to increase the productive capacity of highly productive land (e.g. amalgamation of small titles)? Why/why not?

### Specific questions



#### **Policy 5: Reverse sensitivity [page 47]**

How can the National Policy Statement best manage reverse sensitivity effects within and adjacent to highly productive land?

#### **Specific questions**

#### **Policy 6 and Policy 7: Consideration of private plan changes and resource consent applications on highly productive land [page 49]**

Should these policies be directly inserted into plans without going through the Schedule 1 process (i.e. as a transitional policy until each council gives effect to the National Policy Statement)? What are the potential benefits and risks?

How can these policies best assist decision-makers consider trade-offs, benefits, costs and alternatives when urban development and subdivision is proposed on highly productive land?

Should the policies extend beyond rural lifestyle subdivision and urban development to large scale rural industries operations on highly productive land? Why/why not?



## Specific questions

### Section 5.5: Interpretation

Do any of the draft definitions in the National Policy Statement need further clarification? If so, how?

Are there other key terms in the National Policy Statement that should be defined and, if so, how?

Should there be minimum threshold for highly productive land (i.e. as a percentage of site or minimum hectares)? Why/why not?

## Specific questions

### Section 5.6: Implementation [page 52]

Do you think a planning standard is needed to support the consistent implementation of some proposals in this document?

If yes, what specific provisions do you consider are effectively delivered via a planning standard tool?



## Specific questions

### Section 5.7: Timeframes [page 52]

What is the most appropriate and workable approach for highly productive land to be identified by council? Should this be sequenced as proposed?

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?



Please use the space below to provide any additional comments you may have.

I applaud you for proposing the development of a national statement for highly productive land.

The Purpose: Recognising the full range of values, benefits etc. Maintaining primary productive land for future generations. Protecting it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Over the last 20 years or so I have watched the development of urban sprawl, life style blocks etc over running productive orchards, and vegetable growing fields in Nelson with disbelief and dismay.

I am so encouraged that this lack of foresight is being recognised and will be challenged.



Ministry for the  
**Environment**  
*Manatū Mo Te Taiao*

**Ministry for Primary Industries**  
Manatū Ahu Matua

---



This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.