

# **KEY ISSUES FOR SHEEP AND BEEF FARMERS**

Waikato Regional Council is currently consulting on its proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1. The Council is seeking submissions on the proposed plan until **5pm 8 March 2017**. This template has been created to help you get involved.

## Get involved

It is critical that you get involved in the process directly. The plan and its implementation will influence how you manage your land, so it is important that you understand what is being proposed and that you have your say.

- For more information on the proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 visit: <a href="http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/Council/Policy-and-plans/Plans-under-development/Healthy-Rivers---Plan-for-Change/">http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/Council/Policy-and-plans/Plans-under-development/Healthy-Rivers---Plan-for-Change/</a>
- Review B+LNZs one page summary and full brief of the key issues by visiting the Beef + Lamb New Zealand Website: <a href="http://www.beeflambnz.com/news-events/News/2016/october/healthy-rivers/">http://www.beeflambnz.com/news-events/News/2016/october/healthy-rivers/</a>
- Download a copy of the proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 at: <a href="http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/PageFiles/46657/PlanChange1.pdf">http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/PageFiles/46657/PlanChange1.pdf</a>
- AttendaB+LNZ Farmer Submission Workshop near you in November, visit the Beef + Lamb New Zealand Website for the schedule: <a href="http://www.beeflambnz.com/news-events/News/2016/october/healthy-rivers/">http://www.beeflambnz.com/news-events/News/2016/october/healthy-rivers/</a>
- Provide feedback to the council online at: <a href="http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/Council/Policy-and-plans/Plans-under-development/Healthy-Rivers---Plan-for-Change/Plan-change-1-have-your-say/">http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/Council/Policy-and-plans/Plans-under-development/Healthy-Rivers---Plan-for-Change/Plan-change-1-have-your-say/</a>
- Provideyourfeedbacktothecouncilviaemail: healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz

Share your thoughts or get help with your submission by contacting Environment Policy Manager Corina Jordan: <a href="mailto:corina.jordan@beeflambnz.com">corina.jordan@beeflambnz.com</a>, mobile 027 202 7337.

#### Instructions for using this template:

- Make sure you complete the covering sheet on the first page of the submission form.
- Delete or add table rows as required you can say as much or as little as you like, you're not limited to commenting on just the Plan sections included in the template.
- You must either support or oppose a part of the plan and ask for the council to make a decision on your submission point
- Wherever possible, try to back up your statements with examples from your own experiences, and/or cost implications on your farm business.
- Your feedback must be lodged with Waikato Regional Council by 5pm on Wednesday 8 March 2017.

Please consider forwarding a copy of your submission to  $\underline{B+LNZ}$  so we can echo your comments in our submission



#### **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: Craig Pickens/ Julie Tanneau

Phone (Hm): 078730663

Phone (Wk): 078730663

Postal Address: 485 Lurman Road, Rd2 Otorohanga

Phone (Cell): 0212587085

Ciffichers

Postcode: 3972

Email: p1cks@clear.net.nz / julie.tanneau@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.

3 . 1 . 1

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Signature date

beef+lamb

Provisions	We support this objective.	
Objective 1 – Long Term restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit.		
Objective 2 – Social, economic and cultural wellbeing is maintained in the long term.	We support this objective.	
Objective 3 – Short-term improvements in water quality in the first stage of restoration and rotection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit.	We support this objective, but we would like to have access to actual data on the water quality at this stage, and be able to definite it as a starting point to which we would be able to compare the future improvements.	We ask for precise data/ measurements of the actual water quality in our sub-catchment to which we could relate when we need to assess the improvements of the water quality in the future.
Objective 4 – People and community resilience	We support this objective.	
Objective 5 – Mana Tangata – protecting and restoring tangata whenua values		To comply with the rules to achieve common goals should be the same for everybody, regardless to who owns the land.
Policy 1: Manage diffuse discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and microbial pathogens	We oppose this section as grazing can be a good control of the vegetation on riparian areas, as long as the management is well done and preserves the quality of the water. Good management can allow access to water but not damage to the waterway, and even keep its side clear and clean. On the farm a quick grazing allow drains to keep clean and not get full of grass and silk and therefore avoid flooding which causes more damage to land and water quality.	We suggest that the control of the waterways and their access is defined under the Farm Environment Plan.

Policy 2: Tailored approach to reducing diffuse discharges from farming activities.	We support this policy but we wish to amend it.	The discharges levels should not be regarding of actual discharge of any farms as it will reward the high discharger and penalize low discharger. IT should be related to an uniform unit, the same for everyone, as per hectare for example.
Policy 3: Tailored approach to reducing diffuse discharges from commercial vegetable production systems.		A set amount of discharge should determine the acceptable discharge then rewarding people already doing an effort to have low impact on their environment.
Policy 4: Enabling Activities with lower discharges to continue to be established while signaling further change may be required in future.	We support this policy in principle also having a real definition of "low discharge activity" would be legitimate.	
Policy 5: Staged approach	We support this section if we can have access to a starting point data and can see with further data where reductions in discharges are needed.	We ask for actual measurement I our sub- catchment and further along the years to assess the improvement.

Policy 6: Restricting land use change.	We support this policy to an extent as farming is a constant change and adaptation. Restrict land use change reduce farmers adaptability or business progress. Cropping can be an option to compensate a low income from stock, or can be an option in hard weather to guaranty feed for stock. Cropping with a harvest can be an opportunity for extra income in prevision of hard times, or in previsions of projects (personal or in the business). It can give opportunities to youngsters to get a foot in a summer job, as we have grown sweet corn before and allow extra income allowing teenagers to get a job). Restrict land use change is restricting evolution to a more diversified agriculture, imposing people to stay in a one or 2 productions system, it is as well restricting new comers ambitions in developing a business.	We suggest that a percentage of a business is able to change land use with no consent. As 10 to 20% of a total business area.
	Restriction in land use change is devaluating the land therefore demolishing businesses which have been working hard to develop and improve all their life and will now face a big loss when it will be time to pass on the business.	We suggest the discharges to be monitored business by business allowing a little flexibility while respecting a maximum acceptable discharge. Working and monitoring with owner how they can improve without losing their ability to adapt, develop and sell their property.
Policy 7: Preparing for allocation in the future.	We support this section apart from (b) which do not work towards with objective 2 as everyone should comply with the same rules to achieve common goals.	We suggest to delete this section.
Policy 8: Prioritised implementation.	We support this policy, also we would like to have access to data of the current water quality and further data when water quality evolves.	
Policy 9: Sub-catchment (including edge of field) mitigation planning, coordination and funding.	We support this policy.	

Policy 16: Flexibility for development of land returned under Te Tiriti o Waitangi settlements and multiple owned Maori land.	We oppose it as said before ownership does not define different rules to achieve common goals.	We suggest to delete this section.
Policy 17: Considering the wider context of the Vision and Strategy.	We support this policy	
Implementation Methods	We mostly support all the implementations methods.	

Rules Schedule C – Stock Exclusion		We suggest as an alternative to set sediment traps in low streams before reaching the river. We suggest as well to refer to Farm environment Plan as a way to manage the waterways.
	We ask for a more precise definition of waterway as a minimal flow rate because we think small streams do not carry significant amount of sediments.	
	Fencing waterways would be a major cost and ongoing cost as the biggest waterways flood in wild weather and generally carry logs which would be a annual cost to maintain.  We oppose the need of crossing structures as stock crossing waterways is a on off, short event which is not a major source of pollution of waterways, we believe too that waterways are resilient and this kind of event as flooding are part of natural cycles therefore do not need to be addresses.	
Rules Schedule 1 – Requirement for Farm Environment Plans	We support the Farm Environment plan as a major management tool, and a better alternative to blanket rules which do not suit every business or business plan.	

Yours sincerely

CFRichers

Signature

Date