## 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 SI	HEET
	<b>FOR OFFICE</b>	USE ONLY	
		Submission	
		Number	
Entered		Initials	İ

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

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT	T DETAILS		
Full name Justin Martin Nels	son		
Full address 123 Thon	npsons Rd, RD1, Te Aroha 3391		
Email homeontheranges@gn	Phone 021998879	Fax	

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER						
Full name same as above						
Address for service of person making submission						
Email	Phone	Fax				

PLEASE	INDICATE	WHETHER	YOU	WISH	TO	BE	HEARD	IN	SUPPORT	OF
YOUR SUB	MISSION									
☑ I wish	to speak at the	e hearing in sup	port of m	ny submissi	ions.					
☐ I do no	t wish to spea	k at the hearing	g in suppo	ort of my s	ubmissi	ons.				

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

SIGNATURE (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter) gnature is not required if you make your submission by electro	OF SUBMITTER unic means
Signature	Date 7/3/17
	of the submission process and will be made public. All

correct personal information.

## SUBMISSION POINTS: General comments

We own a 200 hectare sheep beef and dairy goat farm at the base of kaimais near Te Aroha. We are not within the area affected by the plan change but would like to express our concerns about the proposed plan as it may affect us in the future.

We currently run approximately 100 sheep, 220 cattle and milk 750 goats. We fenced the majority of our waterways many years ago and have all our stock movements over waterways bridged as well. We recently retired 12ha of our steeper hill country into pine forest in order to prevent corrosion and to eliminate having to fence steep difficult waterways.

We have planted most of our fenced off creeks etc with trees and flaxes and have fenced off an area of native bush remnant to exclude all stock. We carry out regular trapping of possums and rats to encourage bird life. This has been an expensive exercise in materials and labour over the years.

We have recently changed to dairy goat farming from a mainly heifer grazing operation. We have sold most of our sheep also in the last year due to the high labour input and switched to beef cattle. This has been a major change in our farming operation. We are currently only in our 3<sup>rd</sup> season of milking goats are so are still feeling our way in regards to landuse requirements for our farm. In the future we may decide to run more cattle and or sell some land that may not be required in order to reduce debt.

I am concerned about a number of different issues with the PC1. In particular the Land use change rule which could affect the value of our farm, the grand parenting of nitrogen use which could affect both the value of our land and any future change in farming practice, the fencing of all water ways to exclude stock which is not practical on our farm due to the topography, FEP compliance costs, the use of Overseer for nutrient modelling as it does not work for dairy goats and the 15degree slope rule for cultivation and grazing which will affect large parts of our farm and I feel is far too restrictive.

I support the submission that has been lodged by Federated Farmers. I am particularly concerned about the following aspects of Plan Change 1:

- The significant negative effect on rural communities
- · The cost and practicality of the rules.
- The effect that the Nitrogen Reference Point will have on my business and my economic wellbeing.
- The Farm Environment plan requirements leading to unnecessary and costly regulation of inputs, outputs, normal farming activity and business information
- The costs and practicality of the rules and requirements for stock exclusion, the Nitrogen Reference Point and the Farm Environment Plan.
- The timeframes for complying with the Nitrogen Reference Point rules which are too short and unachievable
- The plan significantly exceeding the 10 year targets in many attributes and areas
- · The lack of science and monitoring at the sub catchments level

I wish to be heard at the Hearing.

I am concerned about the implications all of this will have for my property and for my current activity as described above. I set out my concerns more specifically in the table below.

## SUBMISSION POINTS: Specific comments

Page	Reference	Support	Decision sought	Give Reasons
No	(e.g. Policy, or Rule number)	or Oppose	Say what changes to Plan Change 1 you would like	
40	Rule 3.11.5.2 Permitted Activity Rule – Other farming activities	OPPOSE	The use of Overseer for modelling nitrogen leaching produces at times a large margin of error. There needs to be more science, testing and measuring done to better understand the process.  Change the Nitrogen reference point	Overseer does not currently work for Goat farming. Regular updates for Overseer produce different N leaching results which is unacceptable if limits are to be based on Overseer. Overseer is not available easily and should be free for farmers to use and be able to modify their system to improve nitrogen leaching etc.  This is to be based on the 14/15 and 15/16 seasons. This is very
				specific and does not take into account different seasons and changing farm policies such as in our case.  This could affect our farm value should we wish to sell parts of our farm for more intensive landuse.  It penalises us for not using any nitrogen during those years and rewards those that have used lots in the past.
41	Rule 3.11.5.2,4C Permitted Activity Rule – other farming activities	OPPOSE	Amend 3.11.5.3 to permit cultivation and grazing on land over 15deg but restricted in winter month	Cultivation is a necessary part of farming and if done sensibly the risk is very small. We are constantly trying to improve our farm by removing rocks and or weeds etc. Cultivation is a necessary part of this process and restricting cultivation and grazing on slopes over 15deg would restrict our development and grazing income significantly.
45	Rule 3.11.5.7 Non-Complying Activity Rule – Land Use Change	OPPOSE	Amend 3.11.5.7 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	This proposal will affect us substantially if we were to sell land in the future to neighbouring more intensive farms. Large parts of our farm are suitable for more intensive types of farming so why should we

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy, or Rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought Say what changes to Plan Change 1 you would like	Give Reasons
				be penalised for not farming intensively in the past?
50	Schedule C: Stock Exclusion	OPPOSE	Amend Schedule C as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	This proposal will impose significant costs on my farming activities due to the costs involved, drystock farming is barely viable on our scale at the best of times.  May I suggest it would be more feasible and better to insist there is a water trough in every paddock instead of requiring water ways to be fenced.  I am also concerned that this is not practical due to the nature of our terrain it is not possible to fence some of our water ways.