# **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(s): Chris Beverland

Phone (hm):

Phone (wk): 0212507141

Postal Address:63 beverland rd R.D.2 Huntly

Phone (cell): 0212507141

Postcode: 3772

#### Email: chris\_beverland@hotmail.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.

Signature date

#### Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Waikato Regional Councils proposed Plan Change 1.

My name is Chris Beverland. I lease our family farm of 345ha in the northern Waikato area. Our farms borders both Lake Whangapae and Whangapae wetland, we have private ownership of the wetland which makes up 160 ha of the total land area. We run a fresian bull fattening operation, this is currently profitable for us and is a low input system.

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.

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	REASON	RELIEF SOUGHT
Policy 2 A,B,C	l oppose If you support you can support but require amendments	The reasons for this are: -I do not believe overseer is an accurate enough tool for measuring nutrient loss. This program was not intended for this purpose and I don't think it will be effective to use this in a legally binding agreement. -The cost to every farmer obtaining a nitrogen reference point will be prohibitive. I think there will be compliance issues that will render the process ineffective. -Developing a farm environment plan for every farm in the Waikato catchment with industry professionals is a massive task that I don't think is practical. Canterbury has requirement for nutrient budgets but has extremely low compliance.	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ As an alternative I propose. -An alternative could be a stocking rate restriction in sensitive areas. -restrictions on timing of nutrient application or stock grazing certain areas. -workshops on environmental stewardships for farmers. -Councils implementing specific plans for specific areas. Our wetland needs a management plan and care, we don't have the resources to do this.

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is tha	:	The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is: RELIEF SOUGHT
	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	REASON	

The specific provisions my submission relates to are: Policy 6	My submission is tha	t:	As an alternative I propose -Land use change does need regulation. -resource consent to change from low intensity farming to any higher intensity type. (proving the land can handle the farm system)
	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	REASON	
	I oppose If you support you can support but require amendments -Farming needs to be flexible to survive changing market place, The land use makes this difficult. -Legal problems when farm values are by this policy. People won't be happy drystock block between dairy farms isr to be converted. -Some areas that are in drystock will be suited to cropping or dairy and in market	<ul> <li>-Farming needs to be flexible to survive in rapidly changing market place. The land use restrictions makes this difficult.</li> <li>-Legal problems when farm values are affected by this policy. People won't be happy when a drystock block between dairy farms isn't allowed to be converted.</li> <li>-Some areas that are in drystock will be better suited to cropping or dairy and in many cases this will have minimal environmental impact. This</li> </ul>	
Policy 1 B	l support	-High intensity pastoral farming I believe needs regulation. The high input system puts too much strain on the land and waterways.	-Stocking rates caps and nutrient application restrictions I believe will be a more effective way of managing this. Possible requirements for wintering barns in highly intensity sensitive areas.

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:			The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
	SUPPORT	/ OPPOSE	REASON	RELIEF SOUGHT
Policy I A	l oppose		-A low intensity drystock farm needs the ability to increase production. Many farmers are nearing retirement and are running their farms with very little inputs (below maintenance). Going forward the next generation of farmers need scope to improve the production of these farms. This rule doesn't allow this.	amended as set out below: -Allow increased production up to a level where the farm can be become more economic but environmental impacts are minimal. (better economics in farming improve environmental outcomes) -Stocking rate and nutrient application

#### Yours sincerely

Print Name

Chris Beverland

Signature

Date 8/3/17

