

**WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1  
WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS****Submission Form**

Submission on a publically notified proposed Regional Plan prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991.

**On:** The Waikato Regional Councils proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 - Waikato and Waipa River Catchments

**To:** Waikato Regional Council  
401 Grey Street  
Hamilton East  
Private bag 3038  
Waikato Mail Center  
HAMILTON 3240

Complete the following

**Full Name:** Adam Ross Chick

**Phone (Hm):** 07 8723 755

**Phone (Wk):**

**Postal Address:** 1986 Aotearoa Rd, RD7 Te Awamutu 3877

**Phone (Cell):**

**Postcode:**

**Email:** adamchick74@gmail.com

I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of the submission but the proposed plan has a direct impact on my ability to farm. If changes sought in the plan are adopted they may impact on others but I am not in direct trade competition with them.

**I wish to be heard in support of this submission.**



06-03-2017

Signature

date

**WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS**

<p><b>The specific provisions my submission relates to are:</b></p> <p><b>State specifically what Objective, Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to.</b></p>	<p><b>My submission is that:</b></p> <p><b>State:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 1;</b></li> <li>• <b>brief reasons for your views.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:</b></p> <p><b>Give:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>precise details of the outcomes you would like to see for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand the outcome you seek</b></li> </ul>
<p>Provision</p>	<p>I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend</p> <p>The reasons for this are:</p>	<p>I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below</p> <p>As an alternative I propose</p>
<p><i>"The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to and the decisions it seeks from Council are as detailed in the following table. The outcomes sought and the wording used is as a suggestion only, where a suggestion is proposed it is with the intention of 'or words to that effect'. The outcomes sought may require consequential changes to the plan, including Objectives, Policies, or other rules, or restructuring of the Plan, or parts thereof, to give effect to the relief sought".</i></p> <p>Submissions can be emailed to</p>		

I own 324 ha farm at Ngāroa, comprising of sheep, beef and forestry.

The farm is bran flat to steep with many waterways.

If land over 15° has to be fenced, it will be a huge financial burden and make paddocks hard to manage. Although we have forestry, the places we can harvest safely and economically are limited on our steep country.

The 10 year time frame of PC1 is far too short and gives no planning certainty. To be viable the plan needs a 30-35 year time frame.

The Waikato Regional Council failed to consult on the completed plan before notification.

I have serious concerns for the viability of my farm. If the plan is adopted in its present form.

# N.R.P Nitrogen Reference Point

Rule 3.11.5.2 - 3.11.5.7 and any other relevant rules  
I oppose these rules

Reason Penalises low ~~emitters~~ emitters while high emitters continue to pollute

Over seer is not designed for this purpose. results are highly variable.

The two year time frame for N.R.P. calculation is too short.

Relief sought Remove the N.R.P from the plan completely.  
Delete all reference to overseer.

adopt a sub catchment based approach in conjunction with a farm environment plan.

# Farm Environment Plan

Rule 3.11.5.3 - 3.11.5.7 and any other relevant rules.

## Support with Reservations:

Must not be costly;

Must have flexibility;

catchment and farm specific prepared by farmer with Regional Council input.

## Relief sought

Change stock exclusion threshold,

No fencing of waterways over 15°.

Change stock exclusion threshold to 12 su/ha

Change destination of waterway to a line with the national water policy statement

# Stock exclusion

Rules 3.11.5.1 - 5.1 - 5.2 - 5.3 - 5.4  
and any other relevant rules.

oppose these rules

Reason fencing above 15° is not practical  
cost prohibitive and the time frame  
far too short.

Water body definition is too broad

no science to prove water quality  
will improve

## Relife sought

Remove requirement to fence over 15°.

define water body as per national  
water policy statement.

exclusion fencing as per farm  
environment plan and catchment  
requirements.

Contaminant loss sub catchment scale planning

Rule 3.11.4.5 and any other relevant rules

Support in principle

Reason subcatchment approach is logical and will give ownership to land owners

Relief sought

levels must be science based.

Native bush derived contaminants must be identified when calculating.

# Land Use Change

Rule 3.11.5.7 and any other relevant rules.

Oppose

Reason: Restricts ability to diversify and take advantage of new opportunities.

Should not be discriminatory

Resource concerns are too expensive

Relief sought

Remove N.R.P.

Use land capability as a yardstick.

No preferential treatment for any sector.

Adam Chick

