

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Te Paepae Kaiwawao Motuhake o te Mahere Kotahitanga o Tāmaki Makaurau

**Report to Auckland Council
Hearing topics 056 and 057**

Rural zones

July 2016

Report to Auckland Council-Hearing topics 056 and 057 Rural zones

Contents

1.	Hearing topic overview	3
1.1.	Topic description	3
1.2.	Summary of the Panel's recommended changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.....	3
1.3.	Overview	4
1.4.	Scope.....	5
1.5.	Documents relied on	5
2.	Protection of land containing elite and prime soils	6
2.1.	Statement of issue.....	6
2.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	6
3.	Landscape and biodiversity values	7
3.1.	Statement of issue.....	7
3.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	7
4.	Subsidiary dwellings and workers' accommodation	7
4.1.	Statement of issue.....	7
4.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	8
5.	Reverse sensitivity	10
5.1.	Statement of issue.....	10
5.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	10
6.	Rural Conservation Zone.....	10
6.1.	Statement of issue.....	10
6.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	11
7.	Rural - Mixed Rural Zone	11
7.1.	Statement of issue.....	11
7.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	11
8.	Providing for post-harvest activities	12
8.1.	Statement of issue.....	12
8.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	12

9.	Equestrian centres	13
9.1.	Statement of issue.....	13
9.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	13
10.	Provisions for shooting and fishing	13
10.1.	Statement of issue.....	13
10.2.	Panel recommendation and reasons	13
11.	Consequential changes	13
11.1.	Changes to other parts of the plan	13
11.2.	Changes to provisions in this topic	14
12.	Reference documents	14
12.1.	General topic documents.....	14
12.2.	Specific evidence	15

1. Hearing topic overview

1.1. Topic description

Topics 056 and 057 address the district plan provisions of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan relating to:

Topic	Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan reference	IHP reference
Rural Objectives, Policies and Activities	Chapter D - 5 - Zone Objectives and Policies Chapter I - 13 - Zone Rules	Chapter H19

Under the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010, section 144 (8) (c) requires the Panel to set out:

the reasons for accepting or rejecting submissions and, for this purpose, may address the submissions by grouping them according to—

- (i) the provisions of the proposed plan to which they relate; or
- (ii) the matters to which they relate.

This report covers all of the submissions in the Submission Points Pathways report (SPP) for this topic. The Panel has grouped all of the submissions in terms of (c) (i) and (ii) and, while individual submissions and points may not be expressly referred to, all points have nevertheless been taken into account when making the Panel's recommendations.

This report needs to be read in conjunction with the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 011 Rural environment July 2016.

1.2. Summary of the Panel's recommended changes to the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

- i. Retention of the five rural zones notified in the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan.
- ii. The provisions are more enabling than the notified proposed Auckland Unitary Plan for rural activities, particularly those associated with or supporting rural production or rural communities where other values are protected.
- iii. The policy provisions are strengthened in relation to protection of biodiversity and ecological values.
- iv. Confirmation that land containing elite soils is protected and the adverse effects on them avoided, while avoided where practicable on land containing prime soil. It is noted that the Panel has not identified a High Productive Potential Overlay as requested by Horticulture New Zealand and the Pukekohe Vegetable Growers Association.

- v. Subsidiary dwellings (now called minor dwellings across the Plan) and workers' accommodation are enabled to a greater extent than in the notified proposed Auckland Unitary Plan, however their subdivision from the parent lot is prohibited.

1.3. Overview

Overall, the purpose of the changes summarised in 1.2 above, in conjunction with the provisions of the Plan as notified (many of which have not changed), and those recommended in the Council's opening and closing statements, is to provide greater flexibility for activities that support or are related to rural production and/or rural communities.

At the same time the policies have been strengthened in relation to protection of ecological and biodiversity values, as well as confirmation of the regional policy statement provisions for the protection of land containing elite soils and the management of prime soils.

The Panel recommends the retention of the zoning structure of the five rural zones (and sub-zone areas), but has recommended a number of changes to the zone provisions. The zones are:

- i. Rural - Rural Production Zone;
- ii. Rural - Mixed Rural Zone;
- iii. Rural - Rural Coastal Zone;
- iv. Rural - Rural Conservation Zone; and
- v. Rural - Countryside Living Zone.

The policy direction set out in the notified proposed Auckland Unitary Plan for these zones has generally been retained, and gives effect to the provisions in the regional policy statement (see the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 011 Rural environment July 2016). These provisions recognise that rural areas are where people work and live and a range of activities and services to support these functions needs to be enabled. Rural production activities are provided for throughout rural areas while requiring these activities to contain adverse environmental effects on site.

In terms of elite and prime soils, land containing elite soil is to be protected, and land containing prime soil protected where this is practicable, for its rural production potential. Horticulture New Zealand's request for a High Productive Potential Overlay to address elite and prime land for horticultural purposes is not supported by the Panel. The reasons for this are set out in some detail below. However the primary concern of Horticulture New Zealand - to ensure areas of elite and prime soils for horticultural production are not compromised by inappropriate land use and subdivision - is addressed by the Panel's recommendations. Rural lifestyle development, while provided for, must avoid fragmentation of productive land.

In respect of rural character, amenity, landscape and biodiversity values, these are to be maintained or enhanced while accommodating the localised character of different parts of these areas and the dynamic nature of rural production activities. Significant indigenous biodiversity is to be protected and enhanced.

The Panel's amendments to the provisions will ensure that the objective and policy direction and the rules enable rural production and rural communities to function, while at the same time protecting and where appropriate enhancing, rural character, amenity, landscape and biodiversity values. In this respect, one of the matters outstanding between the Council and submitters is the extent to which subsidiary dwellings and workers' accommodation should be enabled to provide accommodation in the rural areas. The Panel's recommendations are to enable these to a greater extent than in the notified Plan and as set out in Council's evidence.

This report acknowledges that many of the issues between the Council and submitters were resolved through mediation and through the hearings process. This report focuses on those issues that were not otherwise agreed:

- i. the extent to which elite and prime soils should be identified and protected;
- ii. the need to strengthen objectives and policies in relation to landscape and biodiversity values;
- iii. the extent to which subsidiary dwellings (now called minor dwellings across the Plan) and workers accommodation should be provided;
- iv. reverse sensitivity issues relating to the North Shore Airfield;
- v. the Rural - Rural Conservation Zone's objectives and policies relating to the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Protection Area;
- vi. the Rural - Mixed Rural Zone;
- vii. providing for post-harvest facilities as a permitted activity;
- viii. provisions for equestrian centres; and
- ix. provisions for fishing and shooting.

1.4. Scope

The Panel considers that the recommendations in 1.2 above and the changes made to the provisions relating to this topic (see 1.1 above) are within scope of submissions.

For an explanation of the Panel's approach to scope see the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Overview of recommendations July 2016.

1.5. Documents relied on

Documents relied on by the Panel in making its recommendations are listed in full below. See section 12 Reference documents.

2. Protection of land containing elite and prime soils

2.1. Statement of issue

There was considerable debate (through submissions and evidence) about the extent to which land containing elite and prime soils was to be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. This has been addressed in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 011 Rural environment July 2016.

Horticulture New Zealand sought a High Productive Potential Overlay to cover what the submitters considered to be important elite and prime land. Horticulture New Zealand, in its evidence for Topic 048 Aquifers and groundwater, proposed a series of rules for the taking, using, damming and diversion of water and drilling where this was within the High Productive Potential Overlay.

2.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

This matter was raised and fully addressed in the hearing on Topic 011 Rural environment. The Panel's recommendations and reasons for the district plan objectives, policies and rules are the same as for Topic 011. Please refer to that report for the reasons and recommendations.

In a submission point coded to hearing Topic 046 Water Quality and Quantity (5431-4), Horticulture New Zealand sought the spatial identification of land with high production potential. In mediation on Topic 048 Aquifers and groundwater, Horticulture New Zealand put forward a set of changes to the activity table in H4.17 of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan to implement this spatial overlay in regards to water takes and dams. The final version of these changes was attached as an appendix to Mr Hodgson's evidence.

This overlay had previously been presented to the Panel in the hearings on this topic (Rural 056 and 057) to inform the subdivision and land use approach supported by Horticulture New Zealand. Given that the overlay is addressing elite and prime soil and is part of Horticulture New Zealand's overall approach, the Panel decided it was appropriate to address this matter in this report, and refer to it in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topics 046, 047, 048 and 049.

The primary concern for Horticulture New Zealand is that areas of elite and prime soils used or available for horticultural production should not be compromised by inappropriate land use and subdivision. To assist its case Horticulture New Zealand provided a set of maps that examined the spatial extent of land containing elite and prime soil important to current horticultural activity and future industry growth. These maps were attached to Mr Hodgson's evidence for hearing topics 056 and 057. It is noted that the maps combined land containing elite and prime soils, and these are not shown separately.

As set out in the Panel's Report to Auckland Council – Hearing topic 011 Rural environment July 2016 the Panel does not support the position of the Council, nor Horticulture New Zealand that land containing prime soils needs to be protected in the same way as land containing elite soil. In summary this is due to:

- i. the broad definition of prime soil in the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan which included LUC 2 and 3. This land is not always highly productive;

- ii. that land containing prime soils is reasonably extensive; and
- iii. land containing prime soil has a wide spatial distribution.

It is also the Panel's view that, had it supported a high production potential overlay, the information provided by the Council and Horticulture New Zealand would not have been sufficient on which to base the overlay and the mapping required to clearly identify its location would be a significant exercise.

3. Landscape and biodiversity values

3.1. Statement of issue

The Environmental Defence Society and Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (the Societies) contended that the issue of landscapes and biodiversity had not been sufficiently recognised and provided for as part of the general objectives and policies for rural zones.

3.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

This matter was raised and fully addressed in the hearing on Topic 011 Rural environment. The Panel's recommendations and reasons for the district plan objectives, policies and rules are the same as for Topic 011 and are set out in the Panel's report on that topic as referenced above. Additional reasons why the Panel considers its recommendations result in the most appropriate provisions are set out below.

The Council, having further considered the legal submissions from the Societies' counsel and reviewed their proposed amendments, considered that the amendments reflected a more holistic account of the rural environment and were in keeping with the revised policy framework for the rural zones as proposed by the Council.

The Panel agrees, and it has amended the objectives and policies in light of the Societies' concerns, the Council's position and other changes recommended by other submitter. As an example the objectives previously headed 'rural character and amenity values' are now 'rural character, amenity and biodiversity values' with objectives seeking to maintain and enhance biodiversity values and protect and enhance significant indigenous biodiversity.

4. Subsidiary dwellings and workers' accommodation

4.1. Statement of issue

The Plan as notified provided for subsidiary dwellings (now called minor dwellings across the Plan, and used in this report) and workers' accommodation, and as set out in Council's closing statement their activity status is restricted discretionary, other than in the Rural – Rural Conservation Zone and Rural - Countryside Living Zone where workers' accommodation is non-complying.

Through mediation and hearing the Council substantially amended the provisions by removing a number of the matters of discretion. However the assessment criteria remained extensive. It was the Council's position that in making the provisions more enabling, the

subdivision of minor dwellings and workers' accommodation from the parent lot should remain as a prohibited activity.

A number of submitters sought to make the provisions more enabling, recognising that minor dwellings and workers' accommodation were a valid, accepted and appropriate land use, and necessary to enable rural production and rural communities to function.

4.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

There was a considerable amount of evidence on this topic. Mr Cross, Council's expert planner, produced extensive evidence on these matters including evidence in chief and rebuttal and a supplementary statement. Evidence in support of amending the provisions for minor dwellings and workers' accommodation came from a number of submitters, including Man O'War Farm Limited and Clime Asset Management Limited, Smithies Family Trust, D B Mason, Huia Private Reserve Limited, K and H Turner, Horticulture NZ Limited, Pukekohe Vegetable Growers Association, Better Living Landscapes Limited, J Foster, L Renwick and Parallax Consultants Limited. The evidence addressed the activity status, definitions, land use controls, development controls, matters and criteria for restricted discretionary activities.

Mr Cross for the Council supported significant amendments to the provisions for both minor dwellings and workers' accommodation. He had relied to a significant extent on the provisions from the operative district plans (Rodney and Franklin), but many of the submitters did not consider these appropriate or necessary and would inhibit rural production activities and rural communities from meeting their social and economic needs.

The outcome of the Council's amended provisions is set out in its closing statement and limits the matters of discretion to:

- i. minor dwellings:
 - a. building siting, design, and external appearance;
 - b. access;
 - c. servicing;
 - d. proximity to the principal dwelling on the site;
 - e. cumulative effects; and
 - f. effect on landscape and rural character;
- ii. workers' accommodation
 - a. need for the workers' accommodation; and
 - b. cumulative effects.

The Panel finds that those matters of discretion applying to minor dwellings are appropriate, but that the matters of discretion workers' accommodation should be similar to those for minor dwelling. Accordingly the Panel recommends that the matters be limited to:

- i. building siting, access and effects on landscape and rural character; and
- ii. the cumulative effects of additional development on the site.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the matters of discretion, an extensive list of prescriptive assessment criteria was proposed. Due to the way these criteria are written they appear almost as rules. This issue has been addressed in the Panel's report to Auckland Council – Overview of recommendations July 2016 and is not canvassed in any detail here. The Panel has redrafted the criteria for minor dwellings and workers' accommodation to reflect the Panel's approach to criteria across the entire Plan.

As an example one of the criteria for minor dwellings is:

Subsidiary dwellings should be occupied by the dependent relatives of the occupants of the principal dwelling on the site, and the applicant should be able to demonstrate that it would be unworkable to provide the required accommodation by way of other permitted buildings such as a sleep-out or an extension to an existing dwelling on the site. The applicant should be able to demonstrate that the occupants of both dwellings have a close relationship and that the extent and nature of the dependence of the occupants of one household, on the assistance of the other, is such that they are required to be located on the same site.

The Panel does not consider that the nature of the relationship between the occupants of the minor and principal dwellings on the site, and whether that relationship is a close one or not, is a resource management issue. Notwithstanding this, while the initial occupant may be a dependant relative, the criteria (and the definition of a minor dwelling as proposed by the Council - but changed by the Panel's recommendations) would require each occupier to be assessed as to their relationship to the occupier of the principal dwelling. This requirement is clearly impractical and unreasonable.

It is the Panel's finding, based on the evidence of a number of the submitters, that the provisions themselves (including size limitation, proximity to the principal dwelling, access and servicing, prohibition of any subdivision of the minor dwelling, and the requirement for a consent (restricted discretionary)) are a sufficient constraint to limit the number of minor dwelling units.

The same approach applied to minor dwellings has been applied to the provision of workers' accommodation. While the matters of discretion have been limited, a criterion requiring the applicant to demonstrate that a separate dwelling is required on the site for the purpose of accommodating workers engaged on the site or in the surrounding rural area has been retained.

As set out in section 1.3 of this report the main purpose of the changes made to the entire chapter, and those to the provisions for minor dwellings and workers' accommodation, is to provide greater flexibility for activities that support or are related to rural production and/or rural communities. Having said this the Panel is satisfied that the provisions it recommends are the most appropriate to give effect to the regional policy statement as recommended by the Panel, and enable people and (rural) communities to provide for their social, cultural and economic well-being.

5. Reverse sensitivity

5.1. Statement of issue

The provisions as notified address reverse sensitivity. However during discussions at the hearing, the North Shore Aero Club stated that, despite revisions to the provisions by the Council to address reverse sensitivity, the aero club considered the district objectives and policies were deficient in how they addressed reverse sensitivity challenges against normal operations of the aero club, which has been in existence for many decades.

5.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

This matter was raised and fully addressed in the hearing on Topic 011 Rural environment. The Panel's recommendations and reasons for the district plan objectives, policies and rules are the same as for Topic 011 and are set out in the Panel's report on that topic as referenced above. Additional reasons about why the Panel considers its recommendations result in the most appropriate provisions are set out below.

As stated above the general rural plan provisions address reverse sensitivity. However the North Shore Aero Club was most concerned about the Rural - Countryside Living Zone provisions, on the basis that most challenge to the aero club is anticipated from rural lifestyle dwellings in the adjacent Rural - Countryside Living Zone.

The Council agreed there was a policy gap in terms of recognising the risks to infrastructure services in the rural environment, particularly from the establishment of additional noise-sensitive activities in the adjacent Rural - Countryside Living Zone. Amendments were made to the objective and policies to require any existing infrastructure to be protected from reverse sensitivity effects and to ensure that subdivision and development is prevented from, among other things, compromising the safe and efficient operation of existing infrastructure.

The Panel agrees, and has recommended changes to the Rural - Countryside Living Zone objectives and policies as set out above.

6. Rural Conservation Zone

6.1. Statement of issue

This issue relates to this zoning and the Waitākere Ranges, and the area covered by the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008.

A number of submitters challenged the Rural - Rural Conservation Zone and how it provides for the people who live within this zone. These submitters sought that the zoning should be changed to better reflect the nature of land uses in the Waitākere Ranges.

Submitters were also concerned about the tension between the precinct provisions and the underlying zone as they related to the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area. They generally sought more enabling zone objectives and policies, flowing down to the rules, to allow a suite of activities which they feel are relevant to the needs of the community in the Waitākere Ranges.

It is noted that Mr Ryan on behalf of the Waitākere Ranges Protection Society supported the Council's proposed amendments to the Rural - Rural Conservation Zone description, objectives and policies.

6.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Rural - Rural Conservation Zone covers several discrete areas throughout the region and, although the area covered by the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 is the largest area with this zone, areas such as Kawau Island, Wēiti and parts of Hatfields Beach are also zoned Rural - Rural Conservation Zone. The Council considers that this spatial distribution impacts on its desire to keep the zone description and overall provisions reasonably general.

The Panel notes that the area is subject to separate legislation (Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008) which requires the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan to give effect to its purpose and objectives.

The Panel has not recommended any changes to the Rural - Rural Conservation Zone, but questions the appropriateness of this zone applying across most of the area covered by the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008. This matter has been addressed in the zoning and precinct hearings (Topic 075 Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area as well as Topics 080/081 Rezoning and precincts).

7. Rural - Mixed Rural Zone

7.1. Statement of issue

Horticulture New Zealand and the Pukekohe Vegetable Growers Association raised the issue of the inconsistency between the extent of the Rural - Mixed Rural Zone anticipated in the Auckland Plan and that notified in the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. Horticulture New Zealand raised the issue of whether this zone and the Rural - Rural Production Zone should be merged.

7.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

Ms Andrews, the Council's expert planner, set out in her evidence the rationale for the extent of the Rural - Mixed Rural Zone and the distinction between it and the Rural - Rural Production Zone. The Council acknowledged that the extent of the Rural - Mixed Rural Zone in the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan does not fully reflect the Auckland Plan's expectation for the zone. However, the Council considers that the proposed extent of the Rural - Mixed Rural Zone is appropriate.

As set out by the Council, a number of principles were considered in the development of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan to establish the nature and extent of the rural zones. These adopted the general zoning patterns of the operative district plans and took into consideration recent plan changes which were subject to consultation processes. The Council therefore does not consider changes are required to address the matters raised by Horticulture New Zealand.

The Panel notes the statement of Mr Hodgson for Horticulture New Zealand:

The format of the Rural Production and Mixed Rural Zones is not of primary concern to Hort NZ. These comments are provided only to assist with improving the structure. The primary concern for Hort NZ is that areas of Elite and Prime land used for or available for horticultural production should not be compromised by inappropriate land use and subdivision. This is an issue across both the Rural Production and Mixed Rural Zones. (Paragraph 2.8, supplementary evidence, 19 June 2015).

The Panel agrees with the Council. However, while the Panel supports the two zones, for the reasons set out in the zone purpose statements, it accepts that the distinction between the two zones has narrowed further with the recommended changes made to the objectives and policies of the Rural - Rural Production Zone in relation to enabling a wider range of rural-related activities.

8. Providing for post-harvest activities

8.1. Statement of issue

Horticulture New Zealand sought provision for post-harvest facilities as a permitted activity without any land use or development controls.

8.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Council agreed that post-harvest facilities should be provided for, but reiterated its view that because of the scale of post-harvest facilities and their potential effects, a permitted activity status was not appropriate. The Council considered that the approach discussed in its legal submissions to be more appropriate as, unlike the approach supported by Horticulture New Zealand, it will enable an assessment of the adverse effects of any proposal and the ability to turn down an inappropriate proposal.

The Panel agrees with this, noting that the activity status is restricted discretionary in the Rural - Rural Coastal Zone, Rural - Rural Production Zone and Rural - Mixed Rural Zone, with on-site primary produce manufacturing being permitted in these zones. While it is accepted that these are different activities, it demonstrates that it is the scale issue, and not the activity itself that is of concern. The matters that could be considered include the effects on:

- i. rural character and amenity values;
- ii. noise;
- iii. traffic volume and safety;
- iv. stormwater;
- v. land containing elite or prime soils; and
- vi. effects on outstanding natural landscapes, outstanding natural character and high natural character areas.

9. Equestrian centres

9.1. Statement of issue

At the hearing Mr Putt presented submissions in relation to equestrian centres, relying on the Environment Court decision in *Byerley Park Limited v Auckland Council* [2013] NZEnvC 90 as a basis for proposing an amendment to the definition of equestrian centre to include residential accommodation. In Mr Putt's view this amendment will "ensure that residential accommodation essential for the operation of an equestrian centre is provided as an integral part of the land use activity".

9.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

In his submission, Mr Putt noted that the Environment Court decision was quashed by the High Court in *Auckland Council v Byerley Park Ltd* [2013] NZHC 3402, [2014] NZRMA 124.

The proposed Auckland Unitary Plan as proposed to be amended by the Council provides for equestrian centres as a restricted discretionary activity. The Panel supports this activity status. Where a proposal for an equestrian centre also involves multiple dwellings, this would fall to be considered as a non-complying activity overall. This is an appropriate level of control to ensure that the rules for multiple dwellings in the rural zones are not circumvented. However it is noted that the provision of workers' accommodation and subsidiary dwellings have been made more flexible (addressed above) by the Panel's recommendation, and if accepted by the Council may go some way to addressing the submitters' concerns. Therefore, the Council's position, which the Panel supports, is that the provisions that relate to equestrian centres are sufficiently enabling and the definition of equestrian centres does not require amendment.

10. Provisions for shooting and fishing

10.1. Statement of issue

Fish and Game New Zealand submitted at the hearing that the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan does not contain provisions that enable fishing and shooting.

10.2. Panel recommendation and reasons

The Council considers, and the Panel agrees, that fishing and shooting are provided for in the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. These activities come within the definition of informal recreation, which includes sport and leisure, and are provided for as a permitted activity across all rural zones.

11. Consequential changes

11.1. Changes to other parts of the plan

There are no consequential changes to other parts of the Plan as a result of the Panel's recommendations on this topic.

11.2. Changes to provisions in this topic

As a result of the Panel's recommendations on other topics, there are consequential changes to the provisions in this part of the Plan as set out below.

Subsidiary dwelling was the terminology and activity class used in the rural section of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. Subsidiary dwellings are now referred to as minor dwellings throughout the Plan.

12. Reference documents

The documents listed below, as well as the submissions and evidence presented to the Panel on this topic, have been relied upon by the Panel in making its recommendations.

The documents can be located on the aupihp website (www.aupihp.govt.nz) on the hearings page under the relevant hearing topic number and name.

You can use the links provided below to locate the documents, or you can go to the website and search for the document by name or date.

(The date in brackets after the document link refers to the date the document was loaded onto the aupihp website. Note this may not be the same as the date of the document referred to in the report.)

12.1. General topic documents

Panel documents

[056-Submission Point Pathway-11 March 2015](#) (11 Mar 2015)

[057-Submission Point Pathway-1 July 2015](#) (1 Jul 2015)

[056-Parties and Issues Report-11 June 2015](#) (12 Jun 2015)

[057-Parties and Issues Report-11 June 2015](#) (12 Jun 2015)

[056 & 057 - Mediation Joint Statement - 8 May 2015](#) (8 May 2015)

Auckland Council marked up version

[056 & 057 - Mediation Markup version - 057 Rural Rules Subdivision \(Draft for 6 May\)](#) (22 Apr 2015)

[056 & 057 - Mediation Markup version \(Draft for 6 May\)](#) (22 Apr 2015)

[Combined track changes](#) (22 Jun 2015)

Auckland Council closing statement

Auckland Council - [Closing statement](#) (10 Jul 2015)

Auckland Council - [Closing statement - Annexure A](#) (10 Jul 2015)

Auckland Council - [Closing statement - Annexure B](#) (10 Jul 2015)

Auckland Council - [Closing statement \(Part II\)](#) (27 Jul 2015)

Auckland Council - [Closing statement \(Part II\) - Annexure A](#) (27 Jul 2015)

[Auckland Council - Closing statement \(Part II\) - Annexure B \(27 Jul 2015\)](#)

12.2. Specific evidence

Auckland Council

[057 Hearing evidence \(Bain Cross\) - Planning \(15 May 2015\)](#)

[056 Hearing evidence \(Ruth Andrews\) - Planning \(17 May 2015\)](#)

Better Living Landscapes Limited

[Legal submissions \(23 Jun 2015\)](#)

Byerley Park Limited

[Submissions \(24 Jun 2015\)](#)

David B Mason

[056&057 Hearing evidence \(2 Jun 2015\)](#)

Environmental Defence Society and Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Limited

[056 & 057 - Legal Submissions \(26 Jun 2015\)](#)

Fish and Game New Zealand

[Hearing statement \(John Dyer\) \(8 Jul 2015\)](#)

Horticulture New Zealand and the Pukekohe Vegetable Growers' Association

[048 Hrg - Hort NZ - Summary statement \(17 Aug 2015\)](#)

[048 Hrg - Horticulture New Zealand and the Pukekohe Vegetable Growers Association \(Vance Hodgson\) - Appendix A Track Change \(28 Jul 2015\)](#)

[056&057 Hearing evidence \(Vance Hodgson\) - Appendix D \(Part 2\) \(3 Jun 2015\)](#)

[011 Hearing Evidence - Supplementary Evidence - Attachment 2 Soils Map \(21 Jan 2015\)](#)

[056 & 057 Supplementary Statement \(Vance Hodgson\) \(21 Jun 2015\)](#)

Huia Private Reserve Limited et al

[056&057 Hearing Evidence - Bronwen Turner et al \(28 May 2015\)](#)

Jenny Foster & Lloyd Renwick

[056&057 Hearing Evidence - \(David Wren\) \(28 May 2015\)](#)

Man O War Farm Limited and Clime Asset Management Limited

[056 & 057 - Legal submissions \(26 Jun 2015\)](#)

Parallax Consultants Limited

[056&057 Hearing Evidence \(Tracy Smith\) \(29 May 2015\)](#)

Smithies Farm Trust et al

[056&057 Hearing Evidence \(Barry Kaye\)](#) (29 May 2016)