WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 -WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

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

Submission made by:

Full Name(s): John Crichton

Phone (hm): 07 872-2186

Phone (wk): 07 872-2186

Postal Address: 63 Ngaroma Road, RD 4, Te Awamutu 3874

Postcode: 3874

Email: crichtonj@no8wireless.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 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.

I wish to present my own case, and do not wish to present a joint case with any similar submissions.

57 Groff 3-3-17 Signature

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 -WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Introduction

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

My name is John Crichton and I am a sheep and beef farmer in the Puniu at Wharepapa sub-catchment.

My family and I have been farming this property for 57 years, when the property was purchased by my father with a returned soldier's rehabilitation loan after World War 2.

I have taken active steps to protect the environment over the last three decades, including planting trees, fencing rivers to keep stock out, and fencing off sections of native bushland.

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	REASON	RELIEF SOUGHT
Policy 6 – Restricting Land Use Change Rule 3.11.5.7 - Non- Complying Activity Rule – Land Use Change	l oppose	 The reasons for this are: This unfairly benefits those who are already doing the most damage to the environment (ie. Those who already doing high intensity activities are allowed to continue). This policy will severely reduce the value of my farm – which is my retirement fund and life savings - by an estimated 25%. This reduction is due to the removal of the opportunity to convert to dairy. 	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety As an alternative I propose: • That this clause is deleted entirely, and water pollution is addressed by other methods.
Subsets of rules 3.11.5.2 through 3.11.5.7 relating to nitrogen reference points	l oppose	 The reasons for this are: This clause unfairly benefits existing polluters - ie. existing high nitrogen producers. (For example, while even the top 25% of nitrogen polluters are required to bring levels down to the 75th percentile, existing low polluters are not allowed to increase by even a small amount). I have destocked my property as I near retirement, and this clause now prevents my property from being restocked to its previous stocking levels. The New Zealand Government is targeting a doubling of agriculture production by 2025. Restricting nitrogen prevents this target from being achieved. 	 I seek that the provision is: amended as set out below As an alternative I propose: Initial nitrogen allowances should be based on land size (ie. every hectare of property should have the same nitrogen allowance). Potentially these initial nitrogen allowances could be traded on a commercial basis.

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that	:	The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
Subsets of rules 3.11.5.3 through 3.11.5.7 relating to Farm Environmental Plans	l oppose	The reasons for this are: This rule imposes a high burden on farmers for compliance, particularly for smaller farming units. 	 I seek that the provision is: amended as set out below As an alternative I propose: Only requiring full Farm Environmental Plans for larger farming units, say 100 hectares and larger. Implementing much simpler Farm Environmental Plans for smaller units, or not requiring a Farm Environmental Plan at all for units under 100 hectares.
Subsets of rules 3.11.5.1 through 3.11.5.4 relating to Stock Exclusions	l oppose	 The reasons for this are: The high cost required to construct and maintain fences and alternative water supplies for stock. I note that providing alternative water alone significantly discourages stock access to existing waterways (on my property, providing alternative water to two paddocks has reduced cattle access to the waterway to almost zero). The high cost of weed control, and the introduction of additional chemicals into the catchment area as a result of weed control (for example current fenced areas of the waterway through my property has heavy blackberry infestation, requiring ongoing weed spraying. This weed spraying negates some of the benefit of the reduced stock access. 	 I seek that the provision is: amended as set out below As an alternative I propose: Requiring fencing for stock access to major waterways only. Reducing the requirements of stock access to more practical levels, such as the provision of alternative water at a minimum distance away from existing waterways.

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Yours sincerely,

John Crichton:

Crichle 1-3-17 Date Signature