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): Michael & Jackie Carter Phone (hm/wk): 07 877 8056 Phone (cell): 021 143 9007 Postal Address: Sargents Road, RD1 Te Kuiti 3981

Full Name(s): Matthew & Amy Carter Phone (hm/wk): 07 895 5015 Postal Address: 889 Tapuiwahine Rd, RD1 Ongarue 3997

Email: mjcarterlp@gmail.com

We are not a trade competitor for the purposes of the submission but the proposed plan has a direct impact on our ability to farm. If changes sought in the plan are adopted they may impact on others but we are not in direct trade competition with them.

We wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Janke. 7. 3. 17

Vinter 7/03/2017

Signature

date

tate 7/3/17

Signature

date

Introduction

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

We are sheep and beef farmers in the West Coast catchment. Mike and Jackie have been farming this property for 46 years. Craig and Michelle Carter came home to farm in 2005 and Matthew and Amy Carter in 2013.

The objectives are to farm the land in an economically, socially and environmentally sustainable way.

The operation received recognition from farming experts and peers in the mid-nineties by winning the King Country Farmer of the year. This recognised stock performance and financial results.

The next priority was to focus on the operations interaction with the environment. This process continued in year 2000 with the implementation of the Greentick system. A land and environment plan was created using the Land Resource Inventory (LRI) and the Land Use Classification (LUC) systems. A Social Responsibility Plan and an Animal Management Plan was also part of the Greentick system.

The Mapiu River runs through the property. Over the last 20 years Mike and Jackie have fenced off 90% of the stream and planted the riverbank extensively with natives. They have also fenced off and planted several wetlands. 200 ha of native bush has been fenced off and put into QEII.

Although the property is predominantly rolling to easy hill country a high ration of sheep are carried. This is a farming operation that has seriously considered its impact on waterways and soils throughout the property.

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 Waikato Regional Council to make is:
	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	REASON	RELIEF SOUGHT
Objective 2	I support with amendments	The reasons for this are: Farming is the backbone of our rural communities and maintaining the social, economic and cultural wellbeing is crucial to their survival. We are worried that the plan change will not benefit the communities and their economies.	We seek that the provision is: amended as set out below As an alternative we propose: The objective remain but the plan be withdrawn until the long term social, economic, and cultural impacts of implementing the plan have been properly assessed.

Schedule C / Stock	We support the	The reasons for this are:	We seek that the provision is: amended
exclusion	general concept		as set out below
	but believe there need to be gmendments to	to be definition of "Stock" in the concept of stock exclusion.	As an alternative we propose:
	address the		Waterways on intensively farmed class I
	following areas:	In many cases it is not practical or economically viable to fence hill country streams.	to IV land must be fenced.
			Waterways in Class V to VIII land must
		There is a high risk of flood damage in some catchments	be assessed as part of the Farm Environmental Plan.
		Weed invasion due to resulting lack of grazing pressure is an issue in the fenced off areas (for us Tutsan and blackberry in particular)	Timeframe for compliance to be determined as part of the Farm Environment Plan.
		If stocking policy is matched to your LUC then hill country is farmed less intensively (low stocking rates of cattle in Winter) therefore the potential negative impacts are reduced compared to flat land farming with high cattle ratios.	
		Our farm has an extensive stock water reticulation system through the hill country. This almost eliminates stock entering waterways (in our experience in paddocks with troughs we do	
		not see sheep and cattle drinking or entering natural waterways).	

Nitrogen Reference Point	l oppose	The reasons for this are:	We seek that the provision is: Deleted in
(NPR) & use of OVERSEER		Farms that have been operating as low emitters	its entirety
Policy 2 and 7		are penalised under the NPR system.	As an alternative we propose:
Schedule B		The NPR system prevents farmers from matching their stocking policy to the LUC therefore restricting reasonable intensification. For the next generation of farmers this is an issue due to high debt levels requiring production to be optimised. Farmers that are overstocking are not penalised under the NPR system. The NPR will have an impact on land values that could lead to social issues (farms with similar Class of land having a different value because of the way they have been farmed in the past). We oppose the use of OVERSEER due to its poor accuracy of calculating the nitrogen that enters waterways on sheep and beef farms.	The nitrogen discharge limit is based on the LUC system (a farms stocking policy is calculated using LUC). This would be assessed as part of a Farm Environment Plan in areas where the waterway is identified as having a problem and requires a reduced nitrogen level.

Farm Environment Plans (FEP) Schedule 1	I support with amendments	The reasons for this are: We support the concept of a Farm Environment Plan. The proposed schedule is too detailed and prescriptive	We seek that the provision is: amended as set out below The Farm Environment Plans be used to identify the LUCs and identify suitable stocking policies. This would include allowable nitrogen discharge limits (if applicable). The FEP would also identify waterways that require fencing and the timeframe. An alternative process needs to be developed that takes into account identified sub-catchment priorities and allows farmers to self-prepare their own Farm Environment Plans.

Removal of northeastern portion of the plan area	Oppose	The reasons for this are: This policy does not support Objective 1 and 2. The ability to achieve Objective 1 within the proposed timeframe may be compromised. Having different rules for different groups of people can create social issues.	We seek that the plan is placed on hold until the northeastern portion of the plan is included in the whole plan
Policy 16	Oppose	The reasons for this are: This policy does not support Objective 1 and 2. The ability to achieve Objective 1 within the proposed timeframe may be compromised. Having different rules for different groups of people can create social issues.	We seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety

Yours sincerely

Michael Carter, Jackie Carter, Matthew Carter, Amy Carter

fait. 7.3.17 17

Stander 7/03/2017

tate 7/3/17

Signature

Date