PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1



WAIKATO AND WAIPĀ RIVER CATCHMENTS

Submission form on publicly notified – Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipā River Catchments.

Important: Save this PDF to your computer before answering. If you edit the original form from this webpage, your changes will not save. Please check or update your software to allow for editing. We recommend Acrobat Reader.

FORM 5 Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

SubForm	PC12016	COVE	R SHEET
	FOR OFFIC	E USE ONLY	
		Submission Nu	ımber
Entered		Initials	
File Ref		Sheet 1 of	

SUBMISSIONS CA	AN BE		
Mailed to	Chief Executive, 401 Grey Street, Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240		
Delivered to	Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East, Hamilton		
Faxed to	(07) 859 0998 Please Note: if you fax your submission, please post or deliver a copy to one of the above addresses		
Emailed to	healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz Please Note: Submissions received by email must contain full contact details.		
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers		
	We need to receive your submission by 5pm, 8 March 2017.		
YOUR NAME AN	D CONTACT DETAILS		
Full name: COT I Full address: 259 Email: Kees R	nelis P.M & Johanna M Rombouts 167 Cambridge road, RD, Te Awamutu 3874 ombouts @ xtra.co.nz		

Full name: COThe IS T. II & Jonanna III Rombout 3 Full address: 25967 Cambridge road RD1, Te Awamutu 38 Email: Kees Rombouts & Xtra road RD1, Te Awamutu 38 Fax: Address for service of person making submission: Email: Phone: Fax: TRADE COMPETITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS (select appropriate) O I could / O could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

O I am / O am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

(b) does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

(a) adversely effects the environment and

THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 1 THAT MY SUBMISSION RELATES TO Please state the provision, map or page number e.g. Objective 4 or Rule 3.11.5.1 (Continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary). 129 I SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE ABOVE PROVISION/S (Select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary). Support the above provisions Support the above provision with amendments Oppose the above provisions MY SUBMISSION IS THAT Tell us the reasons why you support or oppose or wish to have the specific provisions amended. (Please continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary). i Anax I SEEK THE FOLLOWING DECISION BY COUNCIL (Select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary). Accept the above provision Accept the above provision with amendments as outlined O Decline the above provision O If not declined, then amend the above provision as outlined

PLEASE INDICATE BY TICKING THE RELEVANT BOX WHETHER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION
I wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.
OI do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.
JOINT SUBMISSIONS
O If others make a similar submission, please tick this box if you will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
IF YOU HAVE USED EXTRA SHEETS FOR THIS SUBMISSION PLEASE ATTACH THEM TO THIS FORM AND INDICATE BELOW
Yes, I have attached extra sheets. Ono, I have not attached extra sheets.
SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER
Signature: HMu W Date: 23-2-2017. Contract
Personal information is used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public. All information collected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

PLEASE CHECK that you have provided all of the information requested and if you are having trouble filling out this form, phone Waikato Regional Council on 0800 800 401 for help.

Do you support or oppose the provision?	○ Support ○ Oppose
Submission	Decision Sought
State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it.	State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.
ection number of the Plan Change:	
Do you support or oppose the provision?	Support Oppose
Submission	Decision Sought
State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it.	State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.

Healthy Rivers Submission WRPlan change 1 23-2-2017

Our name and contact details;

Cornelis P. M. and Johanna M. Rombouts 2596 – unit 1 Cambridge road RD 1, Te Awamutu 3879 keesrombouts@xtra.co.nz 07-871384

We wish to speak at the hearing in support of our submissions.

We own the dairy farm business mentioned below.

Orini Farm 73.7 Ha (approx. 236 cows) (flat contour)

Priority 1 sub-catchment

This property is located in the Lower Waikato Freshwater Management Unit. This property is located in the Mangawara sub-catchment. The Mangawara sub-catchment is a Priority 1 area for implementation of Farm Environment Plans. This means under the proposed plan change, farming activities may have to complete:

- property registration and a Nitrogen Reference Point by 31 March 2019
- a Farm Environment Plan by 1 July 2020
- stock exclusion by 1 July 2023

Te Awamutu Farm 95.7 Ha (approx. 295 cows) (flat contour)

Priority 2 sub-catchment

This property is located in the Waipa River Freshwater Management Unit. This property is located in the Mangapiko sub-catchment. The Mangapiko sub-catchment is a Priority 2 area for implementation of Farm Environment Plans. This means under the proposed plan change, farming activities may have to complete:

- property registration and a Nitrogen Reference Point by 31 March 2019
- a Farm Environment Plan by 1 July 2023

A HR.

stock exclusion by 1 July 2026

Things already done by us;

→ Investments made; Over the last several years we have invested a lot of capital into effluent systems including effluent storage. Over both farm-businesses together we have spend capital cost of close to \$200,000.00 excl GST spread out over the last few years, because it is financially not possible to do everything at once. Annual maintenance costs will come on top of that.

The effluent irrigators spread the effluent on the paddocks, resulting in less fertiliser needed as effluent nutrients are valuable.

→ Stock exclusion: On our farms we have fenced of all drains, already long before it was required by Fonterra/Clean streams Accord. So we have no problem with that requirement for our farms as it is all flat. For drystock farms it will be different and they should not be pushed into expensive unpractical projects.

Things we oppose;

- → Riparian planting along our drains, we are not in favour for that as it would take up valuable land of our farm/ decrease productive land. To plant the riparian plantings would cost a lot and it would create pest problems (rats) and weeds and take a lot of time/cost to maintain it.

 Instead we prefer what we do now; spray /ditch the drains only in the base to keep the water flow going. The slope keeps the grasses and can filter nutrients that way and it stops erosion.
- Farm Environment Plan; we are very concerned about the cost of this proposal. It is again time consuming and it takes time away from our family. Overall we are very concerned about the increased cost of the whole Healthy Rivers apparatus and what it will do to our regional council rates bill and on the other side at farm level we are going to see a decrease in production / profit because of the limitations put upon us. Also the use of the Overseer software seems to have limitations with their data input and negatively affects our business.

<u>Instead</u> do a sub-catchment approach, target water quality hot-spots and allow more time.

Q. A.R.

I support the submission that has been lodged by Federated Farmers . I am particularly concerned about the following aspects of Plan Change 1;

- → The significant negative effect on rural communities
- → The cost and practicality of the rules
- → The effect that the Nitrogen Reference Point will have on my business and my economic wellbeing.
- → The Farm Environment Plan requirements leading to unnecessary and costly regulation of inputs, outputs, normal farming activity and business information.
- → The costs and practicality of the rules and requirements for stock exclusion (for some farmers), the Nitrogen Reference Point and the Farm Environment Plan.
- → The timeframes for complying with the Nitrogen Reference Point rules which are too short and unachievable.
- → The plan significantly exceeding the 10 year targets in many attributes and areas.
- → The lack of science and monitoring at the sub catchments level.

I am concerned about the implications all of this will have for our business and for our current activity. I set out our concerns more specifically below;

Submissions points;

Page 40 Rule 3.11.5.3 Permitted Activity Rulel – Farming activities with a FEP under a Certified Industry Scheme. **OPPOSE**

<u>Decision sought</u>; Amend 3.11.5.3 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.

Reason; This proposal will impose significant costs on our farming activities including restriction of 75 th percentile Nitrogen reduction. We employ 2 young sharemilking couples and they will be affected as well. As both farms are reasonably small it is a direct thread to the economic viability of both farms and indeed the 50/50 sharemilking viability in New Zealand as a whole. The young generation of next farmers will be directly hit.

Page 42 Rule 3.11.5.4 Controlled Activity Rule – Farming activities with a FEP not under a Certified Industry Scheme. OPPOSE

Decision sought; Amend 3.11.5.4 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission

Page 45 Rule 3.11.5.7 Non-complying Activity Rule – Land Use Change **OPPOSE**

B. 7/./

<u>Decision sought</u>; Amend 3.11.5.7 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission

Reason; It will take away flexibility from our business. For example if a dairy farmer is coming to retirement stage/ or illness of farmer dictates a necessary change he/she might like to switch to grazing / maize growing for example until the next generation can take over and go back to milking. If you cannot go back to milking there is a loss of value of the business or the business might need to be sold. I think it is very much a deterrent to plant any more trees for some people as you cannot reverse back to dry stock if that was the plan.

Page 47 Schedule B Nitrogen Reference Point. OPPOSE

<u>Decision sought</u>; Amend Schedule B as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.

<u>Reason</u>; the nitrogen loss restrictions are going to limit production capability of our business. Because the farms are small it is a straight attack on the viability of the business, as we employ 2 young 50/50 sharemilking couples and it will affect their incomes as well.

Page 50 Schedule C Stock Exclusion . OPPOSE

<u>Decision sought</u>; Amend Schedule C as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.

Page 51 Schedule 1Requirements for Farm Environment Plans OPPOSE Decision sought; Amend Schedule 1 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.

<u>Reason</u>; it will add more unnecessary cost to our business and takes up valuable time from us and our sharemilkers.

It is more useful to do a sub-catchment approach and target water quality hot-spots, rural as well as urban, where there are problems and identify what causes it and then implement an action plan and involve the locals.

Final thought; we are very concerned about the economic impacts the proposed details will have on our and our sharemilkers businesses. It will negatively affect my rural community/town, so too the next generation.

I am wondering if the urban areas are treated with the same requests/ criteria as the rural areas?

What about other factors that contribute to water quality e.g. Carp, Dams, Tourism?

R.M.