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 SHEET		
	FOR OFFICE	USE ONLY	,	
		Submission Number		
		······		
Entered		Initials		
File Ref		Sheet 1 of		

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 to one of the above addresses	
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 DETAILS				
Neil, Ann, Brent and Louise Scott				
1057 Okupata Rd, RD1, Oparau, 3885				
Email: brentoparau@hotmail.com	Phone 07 870 5461	Fax		
ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTE	D			
Neil, Ann, Brent and Louise Scott	, K			
	aubminion 1057 Okumata BJ R	D1 Onema 2005		
Address for service of person making submission: 1057 Okupata Rd, RD1, Oparau, 3885				

Email: brentoparau@hotmail.com	Phone 078705461	Fax			
TRADE COMPETITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS (select appropriate)					
☐ I could / ☑ could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.					

Y	
PLEASE INDICATE BY TICKING THE RELEVANT BOX WHETH YOUR SUBMISSION	ER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF
wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submiss	ions.
I do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my s	submissions.
JOINT SUBMISSIONS If others make a similar submission, please tick this be the hearing.	ox if you will consider presenting a joint case with them at
IF YOU HAVE USED EXTRA SHEETS FOR THIS SUBMISSION INDICATE BELOW	PLEASE ATTACH THEM TO THIS FORM AND
Yes, I have attached extra sheets.	☐ No, I have not attached extra sheets.
SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter) A signature is not required if you make your submission by electrons.	onic means.
Brent Scott Brent Scott Weil Scott Wescott Ann Scott Lause Scott	Date 2nd march 2017
Personal information is used for the administration of the scollected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with su information.	submission process and will be made public. All information bmitters having the right to access and correct personal

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'.

We are a 2nd generation family farming business. We farm a low stocking intensity 1200 hectare block in on the westcoast in the Oparau area with our parents, and also farm a 500 hectare block in Te Anga also on the west coast.

We are committed to improving our environment and have fenced off bush areas and areas for planting natives.

We are putting in this submission as we are very concerned with the proposed changes which will no doubt will come into effect in our area before long. The changes will put our farming business and our community under extreme strain. It is going to affect farmers mental well being as we are going to have to make sacrifices with our limited time and money.

Additional sheet to assist in making a submission

Section number of the Plan Change	Support /Oppose	Submission	Decision sought
Please refer to title and page numbers used in the plan change document	Indicate whether you support or oppose the provision.	State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it.	State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.
3.11.4.5 Sub- catchment scale planning	Support	This is the only practical and sensible way. It gives us the responsibility of our own rivers and streams. We swim in these so we want them uncontaminated	We suggest the water is tested sub catchment areas to prove we have no problems with our waterways.
Nitrogen Management Objective 1 and 4 policy 2 and 7 Rules 3.11.5.3,-3.11.5.7 Schedule B and all other areas in PC1 which refer to this	Oppose	We absolutely oppose the grandparenting approach. The low emitters will be unable to develop their farms while the high emitters can continue being the problem. The years that were used to determine the NRP were droughts and many farms were carrying low stock numbers — so they will be restricted to the numbers of cattle they can farm	We want the grandparenting approach removed entirely from the plan We would like a subcatchment approach to address the contaminants that are relevant to each area, not a blanket rule that may not even be relevant to the water in that particular sub-catchment
Permitted Activity Rule- Other farming activities 3.11.5.2	Oppose	With no cultivation over 15dg means we are unable to do any cultivation on our property	We suggest on hill country where there is generally no land under 15dg that there is a larger zone between the cultivation and the waterways
Removal of North eastern portion of the Waikato river catchments(Hauraki) from the plan	Oppose	We find it unacceptable that you have removed a large catchment area when you are trying to make one rule for all	Include all areas so a difference can be made
Objective 1 – Long term restoration and protection of water quality for each subcatchment	Support		

Doc # 9150077

Stock exclusion 3.11.5.1 3.11.5.2 3.11.5.3 3.11.5.4 Support with amendments

Exclusion of stock from all waterways is not practical or viable on the country we farm. Reason one being is In this area it is a low stocking intensity rate with minimal pressure on the environment and reason two is that we would have over 120km of waterway fencing alone, plus the changing of existing fences to make paddocks work for stock movement, and then there would be the cost of getting alternate water to every paddock. On the country we farm every gully and depression has running water in it all year round, so as you have defined a waterway these are

Fencing 120,000m @ \$18/m = \$2160000

Troughs x 200 @ \$350 each = \$70,000

100,000m alkathene @ \$1.55m = \$155,000

Pumps = \$20,000

Tanks x 10 @ @2500 each = \$25000

For a total of :

2.4 Million dollars

the costs we have estimated:

Also the country we are on is ash which is known for growing weeds. Blackberry is a big problem in the native plantations we have already done. We don't want this problem right up our waterways. Spraying weeds along waterways to control them is surely a lot worse than a small amount of organic cow excrement.

On 2 occasions we have seen where one side of a river is fenced and the other is not and all the erosion is on the side that is fenced, can you explain why?

We support the exclusion of stock from the waterways where there is a high intensity stocking rate and the country is 15dg and under which is what the national waterway accord states Alternatives would be to install more troughs where practical and possible to decrease the likelihood of stock getting water from waterways.

Have a water testing system for each sub catchment to monitor water quality.

We seek for this to be removed from the plan entirely for this subcatchment.