#### **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

Full Name(s): Martin Ross Amesbury Coup

Phone (hm): 078777885

Phone (wk): 078777885

Postal Address: 80 Parakoko Road

Aria

Phone (cell): 0272325254

Postcode: 3979

Email: macoup35@gmail.com

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.

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

Signature

date

Signature

date

#### Introduction

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

My name is Martin Coup and I have been farming in the Aria district since 1990. My farm lies in the Mokau catchment.

My 700ha operation is an even split between sheep and beef with different stock classes allocated to the class of land that gives my land the best environmental outcomes. I have a small area of class 7 land and do not use it for cattle.

In my early days of farming I spent time developing my property through use of fertiliser, fencing and adding water troughs. I also fenced the Paraheka stream which runs through the farm. Over the past 15 years I have planted many trees both native (for biodiversity) and willows for erosion control. Where I can I have also been excluding cattle from waterways. The property receives about 1.8m of rain a year most years which means that there are a large number of seepage areas and small drains well up in the hills.

One particular area of the farm (4ha hill country) had been slowly sliding into the waterway and being washed away during heavy rain. Through a significant amount of time spent building debris dams and planting trees I have managed to stop the slide. This is a lesson on doing what is right for my property using local knowledge and talking about the issues with my neighbours and local farmers then doing the work to fix it.

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 my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is:
	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	REASON	RELIEF SOUGHT
Objective 2 – Social, economic and cultural wellbeing is maintained in the long term.	I Support	Under this plan I am concerned that there will be winners and losers. For those that are impacted less their communities will be OK but for communities that end up based in an area of low Nitrogen reference points, the corresponding erosion of property values and earning capacity of those properties will have a severe impact on the community economically and socially.	Nitrogen allocation should not be based on historic values, Allocation should be based on the lands natural capital
Schedule B Nitrogen Reference Point (NRP)	I Oppose	This will have a significant effect on my local community if sheep and beef farmers are held to a low reference point. S&B farming often requires flexibility to move with changing markets to remain profitable. This will not be possible if the reference point is low. I also think it is morally wrong that high emitters of nitrogen are rewarded by being allowed to leach nitrogen at high levels	That NRP should be used only as a benchmark to gather data on where the main sources of Nitrogen is coming from
Policy 9: Sub-catchment (including edge of field) mitigation planning, coordination and funding	I Support	We already are doing this in an unofficial way by talking to neighbors. There has been a significant shift in farmer's attitude towards the environment over the past few years. I have never talked to a	

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
		farmer that does not want to make our farms more sustainable	
Schedule B Stock exclusion	I Oppose in its current form	Common sense is important when deciding what should or should not be fenced. I have a number of waterways that I have already fenced and am in the process of fencing more. Under schedule B stock exclusion rules I may have to fence streams in paddocks up to 25 degrees. Some of these fences might end up being 50m from the stream. If I was to put a fence in these paddocks it would be very expensive, maintenance costs would be huge and the benefit to the waterway would be marginal at best	From my experience planting these steeper gullies with protected trees, using debris dams, putting a trough or two in the paddock and also planting shelter for the animals away from the waterway would be adequate. Stock then shelter under the shade trees away from the stream and do not need to go to the stream to get their water requirements  As a rule of thumb I think that we should have to fence off streams in paddocks that we are able to break feed and if we are break feeding the hills as well then streams should be fenced
Schedule 1 Farm Environment Plans (FEP)	I support the principal of this schedule	This would be a key plank to better managing our land asset. Information on catchment contaminants would need to be robust so we knew where the problems were in our catchments. I think I have an issue with sediment loss from my property and my present Farm Environment plan reflects that, but it has never been tested by science  The time frames are short to get these plans done and I have concerns that there will not be enough Farm environmental planners to get them all done	that we know what our issues are and then we can work from that point. There is no point trying to mitigate contaminants if we do not have an issue with it in our catchment.

Rules  3.11.5.4 Controlled Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan not under a Certified Industry Scheme	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
		in time. It will be a challenge also to get farmers to pay the full costs of these plans	
	I oppose the Nitrogen Reference point being used	Having a NRP based on a historic value in my view is wrong. It rewards the landowners that have been discharging high levels of Nitrogen. I think everyone should be held responsible for the contaminants that are leaving their properties	I would like to see a sub catchment approach used to mitigate contaminants. Benchmarking of waterways to find out exactly what the problem is that we have to deal with would be a good start followed by some targets to achieve. This then worked into a Farm Environment plan with some milestones that need to be achieved but within a time frame that will not place to much financial stress on the landowner.

Yours sincerely

Martin Coup

Signature

Date