

11. We urge you to thoroughly consider the definition of highly productive land. We also ask that you address the implications of restricting land use change in the context of other proposed legislation.
12. We do not consider that regional councils are adequately resourced to cater for additional mapping requirements, again compounded by the excessive resourcing requirements imposed by numerous pieces of legislation currently proposed.
13. We support the location of activities that enhance the productive capacity of Highly Productive Land on that land. For example, glasshouses, packing sheds, post-harvest facilities, and distribution infrastructure that enhance the productive capacity of outdoor growers.
14. We support using incentives to improve the productive capacity of land. In some cases, this could provide for the development of land identified as Highly Productive Land. For example, transferable development rights in exchange for title aggregation.
15. We support policies to reduce reverse sensitivity issues, for example, requiring effective buffers at the rural-urban boundary interface.
16. An alternative option not considered within this discussion document but generally preferred by the growers in our area would be a National Environmental Standard specific to Commercial Vegetable Production.

Signed:



---

Chris and Vikki Nicholson

Hinemoa Quality Producers Ltd