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 Centre
HAMILTON 3240

Full Name: Francis James Turton

Phone (Hm): 07 8285773

Phone (Wrk): N/A

Postal Address:

616 Matahuru Road

RD4 Ohinewai

3784

Phone (Cell): 0272714951

Postcode: 3784

Email: fjturton@xtra.co.nz

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 adapted 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.

Opening Statement:

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

- I support vision of clean healthy rivers
- Hill country land owner & farmer sole operator 113Ha in the Matahuru
- Treasurer Matahuru and Waiterimu Hall
- Husband to a very hard working professional wife
- Father to three hard working professional high achieving grown up children
- The property that we own is the labours of our life's work to date
- Have invested and implemented on farm environmental friendly water quality solutions when finances have allowed to endeavour to meet the ongoing requirements for modern day environmental friendly farming and safety
- Hill country farming is my life-my home-my business-my income and my family's future
- We are submitting because of concern over the impact on landowners and communities
- The Collaborators Stakeholders Group (CSG)'s INTERPRETATION of the VISION and STRATEGY
 misrepresented the hill country landowners and farmers with SOME major statistics that were never proven
 or used, were unrealistic to achieve and financially punishing. Nobody came to look ask or listen !!!!! or took
 any notice of the feedback our farming sector / CSG representative gave. (Hill country farmers under
 represented regarding waterways kilometres and land Hectares owned)
- Most hill country farmers drink and wash with water from their springs and streams unlike dairy farming
- Hill Country farming is totally different to DAIRY FARMING and not as intensive, on different terrain and should have its own set of rules.
- I feel we have been badly let down by the Waikato Regional Council by aligning hill country farming with the DAIRY INDUSTRY

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:	Why?	The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
State specifically what Objective, Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to.	Do you support, or oppose?	Brief reason for your views – try to justify your reason using data or by providing an example or story from your farm/own experience.	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. E.g. do you want the provision to be deleted in its entirety, retained as proposed, amended as described below, or propose an alternative.
Waikato Regional Councils proposed Plan Change1 (PC1) in its current form	Oppose	Fails to identify precise location of hill country farming issues or rural problems if any with regarding water quality in these catchments!!! Also makes no reference to urban runoff and sewage discharges and the remedies proposed for urban environments and waterways, some urban waterways and coastal beaches are some of the most polluted water environments in our country. We all need to share the burden!!!! Some of the science is flawed with huge amounts of inaccuracy and variation providing no guarantee for success, this gives no confidence in the financial implications proposed and incurred. Including some of the time frames proposed. The punishing costs to implement this plan for hill country farmers and unrealistic requirements to comply in its current format will halt and stall any further progress of my business and family not to mention rural communities. It has the potential to devalue property, cap business growth and further move the nation to a split demographic. The impact on family/communities is in conflict with the intention to have healthy rivers where prosperous	Renegotiate plan removing flawed science and impractical requirements for hill country farmers and instead engage with all parties, including hill country farmers to achieve the desired outcome for the CATCHMENT and the HEALTHY RIVERS VISION and STRATEGY. Adopt a smaller water catchment format, and management approaches which will identify true water quality issues within that water catchment, plus sustainability issues and enhance the healthy rivers plan by adopted an effects based and targeted approach to managing land and water issues and which will bring farmers along, ensuring that years and generations of practical knowledge and expertise are bought to the table to achieve the desired outcome for all. Recognise that one hat does not fit all farming and pastoral operations

 WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS	
communities are also sustained, as in the Waikato River	
Authorities Vision and Strategy]
Council introduced species are adding to the rivers SO	
CALLED ILL HEALTH (KOI CARP). When we look for water	
clarity standards we will never have this criteria as long as	The Waikato Regional Council needs to eradicate
KOI carp are present	the species
KOT carp are present	the species

3.11.1.2	Oppose	Gives unconditional access to private property and erodes	Propose with the consent of the land owner
Use- values-Maahinga kai		people's property rights and also has the ability to create	
		conflict around health and safety issues under current laws.	
Use -Values- Economic or commercial development Policy 10, 11 and 12 and associated rules	Oppose	Allows urban communities and industries to dump contaminated water into the waterways. One rule for all!!!!	WRC need to invest in systems and infrastructure to stop all storm water runoff and contaminated effluent entering the waterways. Management approaches should be equitable between farmers and other activities. More stringent requirements should not be imposed on one sector in comparison to another.

		WAIRATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHIVIENTS	
3.11.5.1 Permitted Activity 3.11.5.2 " " 3.11.5.3 " "	Oppose Oppose Oppose	Mitigation strategies imposed by these rules are and with reference to schedule 1 and schedule C, difficult to interpret, are impractical to hill country farmers and also financially unsustainable. Example 3.11.5.2 section 3a imposing without notification or consideration dates 22 nd OCT 2016 for stocking rates that cut through current farmers FARM PLANS. This date is irrespective where the	Prepare new Section 32 with hill country farmers taking a sub catchment approach to also include the NEW GOVERNMENT CLEAN WATER PACKAGE 2017.
3.11.5.4 Controlled Activity Rule	Oppose	farmer is within his yearly plan and will create massive financial stress and uncertainty. Nitrogen is not an issue in the hill country. Nitrogen reference points will financially constrain and unnessarily penalise hill country farmers and devalue hill country properties.	Stop aligning us with the DAIRY INDUSTRY. Propose WRC should look at their water care policy and prepose creditable science / data based practical hill country solutions
3.11.5.2 Section ii	Oppose	No prior notification to the cut off date 22 nd OCTOBER 2016 for stocking rates. This has the potential for massive effect on farmer's current yearly business plans in progress (Farm stocking Cycle)	Stocking rates should be aligned with Auckland and Gisborne - Change to 18 winter stock units per hectare over property.
3.11.5.7	Oppose	PC1 restricts land use change – this devalues properties impedes business / development and family succession plans	Sub catchment approach with up to date technologies and data to develop appropriate mitigations to enable on going farm and business development.

Schedule B Nitrogen Reference Point	Oppose	Nitrogen Reference Points on farms will reward those that have historically been higher emitters of nitrogen (GRANDPARENTING) and disadvantages those that adopted good management practices to reduce their emissions Oppose the use of OVERSEER because of its inaccuracies - Plus or minus 50% has no credibility	Review new Section 32 analysis
Schedule C Stock exclusion	Oppose	Impractical –Financially unsustainable-very hard to interpret	Review with new policy statement for freshwater management 2017
Schedule 1 Farm Environment Plans (FEP) and	Oppose	Support in principle but not in current format. Schedule 1 or Schedule C needs clarification. Too difficult to interpret especially around slope and fencing requirements plus potential costs for no improvement in water quality	Hill country farmers understand how to manage the hills. Farmers should be able to write their own Farm Environment Plans as every property is very different and should be able to work with our industry body along some common rules.

		WAIRATO AND WAIFA RIVER CATCHINETTS	
	1		
	!		
	†		
	1		

-	

WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS				
	:		·	
	j			

Closing Statement:

My family and I and my community supports improving water quality throughout the Waikato. However, the stress, the pain, the conflict and UNCERTAINTY the Waikato Regional Council has inflicted on my community by letting ill informed groups dictate and try to impose broad brush rules with PC1 by totally ignoring the hill country farming / dry stock farmers Collaborative Stakeholder Group is a little beyond belief. To lump us in with DAIRY FARMING is like comparing desk bound people with people working the land. Urban intensification and sprawl topped with high intensive Dairy Farming on the flat ponding country is the receipe for some of the environmental irregularities we currently have. Dairy Farming and Urban communities have created some of the most polluted waterways and coastal environments in this country (Not the Hill Country Farmers) and they fail to recognise or acknowledge the facts. The punishing and impractical policies proposed under Plan Change 1 for hill country farmers who are custodians of some 40% of the waterways and only had ONE VOTE!!!! The CSG is a little lopsided do you not feel This process is not about pitching one group of people or individuals up against each other. WE ARE ALL IN THIS TOGETHER but we must find a fair, practical, sustainable and cost effective solution for all BUT MUST RECOGNISE THAT ONE HAT DOES NOT FIT ALL.

I would now like to bring to your attention some personal observations and facts. I was fortunate to grow up in on the most pristine regions in the UK, on the edge of the Cotswoulds and I lived, hunted and fished with all my town and country friends. We understood both parties needs and the environments. On coming to this great country 30 years ago, I lived and worked in Hamilton. One of the first things I did was to go and visit /explore the Waikato river for recreational purposes and was appalled at what I found!! The river was badly polluted, smelt appalling and looked like pea soup. I thought the river THAMES was cleaner so we have made considerable progress and should not allow unrealistic data and standards to impede our communities and our progress. On investigation it was being used like a settling pond by the DAIRY FARMERS and A SEWER by the urban communities!!! I would now be happy to swim in the current river as it its 1000 times better than 30 years ago. Now to my current home farm and business in the MATAHURU. Over the last 50 years, dairy farms have been decommissioned thus de intensifying farming operations in the valley adding the health of the streams in the valley. HILL COUNTRY FARMERS OWN THE HILL COUNTRY NOT THE DAIRY FARMERS!!!

Yours sincerely,

Print name

Flancis Jaca Trossa

Signature

ate

Submitters page for notes: