

Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

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

SubForm	PC12016	COVER SHEET	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
		Submission Number	
ered		Initials	
Ref		Sheet 1 of	

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

SUBMISSIONS CAN 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 <i>Please Note: if you fax your submission, please post or deliver a copy to one of the above addresses</i>
Emailed to	healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz <i>Please Note: Submissions received my email must contain full contact details. We also request you send us a signed original by post or courier.</i>
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers
We need to receive your submission by 5pm, 8 March 2017.	

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS		
Full name Glynn Colin & Joanne Leigh Meads		
Full address 409 Walker Road RD2 Te Kuiti 3982		
Email meads409@gmail.com	Phone 07 212 1229 or 021 02301473	Fax

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER		
Full name Glynn Colin & Joanne Leigh Meads		
Address for service of person making submission 409 Walker Rd, RD2 Te Kuiti 3982		
Email meads409@gmail.com	Phone 07 212 1229 or 021 02301473	Fax

TRADE COMPETITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS (select appropriate)

We COULD NOT gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

We are not trade competitors for the purposes of this submission however, the proposed plan has a direct impact on our ability to farm productively. If changes sought in this plan are adopted they may impact on others but we are not in direct trade competition with them.

We DO NOT wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Introduction: We farm 100 acres (40 hectares) sheep and beef. Until 2013, we farmed 750 acres (300 hectares) at Mapiu for 12 years running sheep and beef both conventionally and then as certified organic farmers until selling to downsize. Therefore we understand the need to protect the environment and agree that the health of rivers is vital to the future of our country, however, the proposed plan does not allow any flexibility to farmers and indeed in its current form will decimate the farming community and rural towns.

We are in Priority 1 catchment – Mangapu sub catchment.

We have been farming low intensity and have grave concerns about a Nitrogen Reference Point affecting our flexibility on stock numbers. We believe overstocking is a pollutant. We have spent a lot of money on ensuring adequate water supply to all paddocks with troughs installed.

We seek that the plan in its present form be declined.

“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 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.)*

Provision 3.11.1 The Vision and Strategy: We support this. We believe we all have a part to play in the health of the Waikato and Waipa Rivers – both the urban and rural communities.

I SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE ABOVE PROVISION/S

(select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)

- 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.)*

PROVISION: Restricting Land Use Change. Policy 6. Rule 3.11.5.7.

We oppose this because:

It will have a huge effect on land values to the detriment of those currently farming the land, decreasing land values when sold due to lower productivity as stocking rates cannot be changed. Less income to rural communities because farming incomes will be lower.

We seek that this provision be deleted in its entirety.

PROVISION: Schedule B. Nitrogen Reference Point.

We oppose this because:

Excess nitrogen levels is not an issue in our catchment hence a Nitrogen Reference Point is not needed.

We question the suitability of Overseer – it has a high error rate.

It means growth restrictions for farmers that are extremely limiting and profitability will be decreased.

Stock numbers taken from the 2014/15 and 2015/16 is not a fair nor accurate indicator of individual farmers' stocking policies. Factors such as drought, financial constraints or smaller farmers having to do additional off-farm work to generate income means taking stock numbers from two seasons is not a good indicator of farming practice.

Nitrogen issues are more dairy and cropping related, than sheep and beef farmers. The focus for this provision should be more on the dairy industry.

Using a blanket rule is unfair.

We seek that this provision is deleted in its entirety.

As an alternative we believe that:

Each sub—catchment requires its own evaluation as there are extreme variations.

PROVISION: Schedule C STOCK EXCLUSION

We oppose this because:

Fencing waterways is an extreme cost to farmers and may be unnecessary for some therefore a ruling covering all farm businesses under one umbrella is unfair.

Unrealistic timeframe for this to be completed.

No scientific evidence to show pressure on waterways with low stock numbers.

Weed issues created with fencing which then means chemical sprays will be used near waterways.

Impact on employment for young people in rural communities as farmers tighten their belts to cover the extreme fencing costs.

No subsidies.

Loss of income which comes at a cost to the farmer. Eg: Fencing – paying more to produce less.

Impractical in steeper areas.

We seek this provision be amended.

As an alternative we propose:

More restriction on nitrogen fertiliser usage.

Each farming type should be assessed separately.

PROVISION: Schedule 1. FEP.

We oppose this because:

It is too expensive for small landholders.

We seek that this provision be amended.

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 below
- Decline the above provision
- If not declined, then amend the above provision as outlined below

Amend as follows:

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.

We do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.

JOINT SUBMISSIONS

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.

No, I have not attached extra sheets.

SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Signature 	Date March 8, 2017
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.