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

Full Name(s): Hugh Robert Oatway

Phone (hm): 07 8252020

Phone (wk):

Postal Address: 222 Livingstone Rd, RD 10 , Hamilton

Phone (cell): 0274210607

Postcode: 3290

Email: strathmore.farms@gmail.com

I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of the submission but the proposed plan has a direct impact on my obility 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.

If others make similar submissions, I would consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Signature		date	V SETTINGS SERVICE AND
Signature	1	date	
Webste	Jay	08/03 date	116

Introduction

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

Lam a sheep and beef farmer in the Waipa catchment.

The Finlayson family have owned and have been farming this property for over 100 years.

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 our submission relates to are:	My submission is that: I oppose PC1.		The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is:
	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	REASON	RELIEF SOUGHT
3.11.3 Policy 16	Oppose	The reasons for this are: The approach to reducing contaminant losses from pastoral farm land should have no bearing an ownership of the land and wether rules apply or not	seek that this policy is removed
3.11.5.1 3.11.5.2	Орроѕе	Fails to provide for law intensity and law risk land uses and falls to provide flexibility for these land uses. All land owners should be treated the same regardless of the area of land owned. Stocking rate should be according to the land contour and should be done, not on a specific date, but on what the land is capable of sustaining.	Incorporate Info one rule. Remove stocking rate refered to in 3.11.5.1 or offer to reflect a sustainable rate for an individual property. Delete any standards or clauses which hold land uses to historic discharge levels or stocking rates. Delete 4c and diffrom 3.11.5.2

The specific provisions our submission relates to are: 3.11.5.2 to 3.11.5.7 inclusive	My submission is that: 1 oppose PC1.		The decision I would like the Walkalo Regional Council to make is:
	Cppose	I opppose this approach of holding users to their N trogen reference point. Low emitters are being penalised and the poliuters may continue to portute. If penalises low emitters who will not longer be able to develop their land and therefore affects their ability grow their business. I oppose the use of Overseer as a means of determining the Nitrogen reference point. It was never designed for this purpose. It can vary depending on the information entered. Do not allocate based on 2014/15 or 2015/16 years as these were drought years as stock numbers were lower than other years and this will restrict us in the future.	Remove the Nitrogen Reference Foint and the use of Overseer from the plan in its entirety. Amend the plan so it is science based to determine issues in each sub catchment. Use FEP's to determine what is best for each farm.
3.11.5.7 and pofcy 6	Cppose	it affects the value of our farm and impedes any future ability to develop and grow our business	Delete in its entirety
Pian Change I	Oppose	I seek that the plan change should not be implemented until the scientific data around which contaminants are causing water quality	

The specific provisions our submission relates to are:	My submission is that: I oppose PC1.		The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is:
	*	decline is available for each sub catchment.	
Removal of the northeastern partian of the plan	Oppose	Removal of a significant section of the lower catchment from PC1 is unethical	Place the plan process on hold or withdraw the plan in its entirety until the lower catchment is reinserted so the plan can be notified as a whole.
Farm Environment Plans		FEP's should be produced by the landowner with WRC guidance and and support and not require the compusory use of a consulant.	
Timeframes		Timetrames should be set through consultation with the individual farmer taking into account their financial constraints.	

Yours sincerely

ElDatury 08/03/16