Waikato Regional Council Proposed Plan Change 1 For The Waikato and Waipa River Catchments

I am submitting on behalf of Fiona and John Scott of Hauturu. We have farmed together in the catchments of the Kawhia Harbour for nearly 50 years. John is a third generation farmer.

Very recently we succeeded our holdings between our two sons and so are no longer land owners. However we still live and work on this land for our families.

Good stewardship of our land has been of paramount importance to us. This has enabled us to hand onto our sons viable opportunities and we would wish that they are able to do the same for their families.

Some key points in the proposed plan changes would be difficult for us to achieve if they were applied to our hill country in particular.

We are concerned that a precedent may be set by this process and that these requirements of concern could be transposed to our zone as they exist now. Therefore we would like to take this opportunity to make the following comments.

Yours faithfully, Fiona and John Scott

Hona Scott

8/3/2017.

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

Fuli Name: John & Fiona Scott

Phone (Hm): 07 8710780

Phone (Wk):

Postal Address: 1333 Hauturu Road, RD 2, OPARAU

Phone (Cell):

Postcode: 3886

Email: fiona.scott@farmside.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.

Signature

date

8/3/2017

(beef+lamb)

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:	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.	whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 1; brief reasons for your views.	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
Provisions Objective 1 – Long Term restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit.	We support this objective in principle but feel that the word restore is setting the bar too high. Over 4 million people live in New Zealand now and their needs all need to be met sustainably.	As an alternative we propose to replace restore with improve.

Objective 2 - Social, economic and cultural wellbeing is maintained in the long term.	We support this.	

Objective 3 – Short-term improvements in water quality in the first stage of restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit.	We support this.	I seekthattheprovisionis Retained as proposed

Objective 4 – People and community resilience	We support this.	I seekthatthe provision is: Retained as proposed

Policy 1: Manage diffuse discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and microbial pathogens Section C Progressively excluding cattle, horses, deer, pigs from rivers, streams, drains, wetlands and lakes.	We oppose Section C of this policy. The reasons for this are: We oppose Section C in areas of low stocking rates. Costs would be prohibitive and we are unaware of any data supporting this requirement. We feel that we run appropriate stocking rates on a steeper country, do not crop and make no supplementary feed.	I seekthatthe provision is: amended as set out below As an alternative I propose That section C excludes areas of low intensity farming.

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS Policy 9: Sub-catchment (including We support this policy. I seekthatthe provision is: Retained as edge of field) mitigation planning, coproposed ordination and funding.

OSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO A	
we oppose this.	I seekthattheprovisionis: Deleted in its entirety
The reasons for this are:	
We oppose this policy. It is unfair. Rules for stewardship should be the same for everyone.	
Many European have long and abiding attachments to their land that they have farmed for generations.	
	We oppose this. The reasons for this are: We oppose this policy. It is unfair. Rules for stewardship should be the same for everyone. Many European have long and abiding attachments to

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS **Implementation Methods** We support these methods. I seekthatthe provision is: Retained as 3.11.4.1 Working with Others proposed The reasons for this are: In particular we support the introduction of FEP's especially if they are used to provide discretion and data for improved management. In particular we also support 3.11.45 sub catchment scale planning.

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS Implementation Methods We support this. I seekthattheprovisionis Retained as 3.11.4.5 Sub-catchment scale proposed planning

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS Implementation Methods 3.11.4.3 Farm Environment Plans We support this. I seekthatthe provision is: Retained as proposed

		
Rules 3.11.5.1 Permitted Activity Rule - Small and Low Intensity farming activities	We support the permitted activity rule, but oppose the requirement for stock exclusion. The reasons for this are:	I seekthatthe provision is amended as set out below As an alternative I propose
	We oppose the total stock exclusion in point 2. The financial implications of stock to be excluded by this provision would make farming much of our country unviable.	That exclusion of stock be removed and replaced with a fencing policy on low intensity farms that allows discretion on a farm by farm basis.

Rules 3.11.5.2 Permitted Activity Rule – Other farming activities Point 2 Point 3. e.	We support the permitted activity rule. BUT: We oppose the total stock exclusion rule. We oppose the total 3 metre setback. In most cases it will be impractical and definitely not viable.	I seekthatthe provision amended as set out below As an alternative I propose That this point be removed and replaced with best practical option.
Point 4 c	We oppose 4c. Large tracts of our land will exceed this slope. Our slopes are well grassed and show no signs of slippage. We do not cultivate hill country.	That clause 4c is removed.

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS Rules We support the terms of notification for this rule. I seekthatthe provision is: Retained as 3.11.5.6 Restricted Discretionary proposed. Activity Rule - The use of land for farming activities.

Rules Schedule C – Stock Exclusion	We oppose this schedule	I seekthattheprovisionis: Deleted in its entirety
	The reasons for this are:	
	We have many kilometers of waterways that would require fencing under a blanket rule.	
	As stated previously we could not afford to fence all waterways and remain viable. The effects of this alone would be socially, economically and culturally crippling. It is hard to see how the environmental gains perceived can be justified.	

THE THE TENED TO T	OLD WITHOUT WEST CONTROL OF WASHING A	NO WALLA KEVER CALCINIENTO
Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	
Indicated costs to the plan changes to be met by WRC are CONCERNING.	Will rates have to rise to cover additional monitoring, planning etc, required by the new plan?	
	Will there be enough resource to continue with the excellent plant and pest control that our Regional Council is well known for?	

Yours sincerely

from Scott 3/3/2017

ature Date