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 OFFIC	E USE ONLY	
		Submission	
		Number	
	· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Entered	1	Initials	
File Ref		Sheet 1 of	

FORM 5 Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

(b) does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

SUBMISSIONS (CAN BE		
Mailed to	Chief Executive, 401 Grey Street, Private Bag 3038, Waika	ito 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 send us a signed original by post or courier.	n full contact details. We also request you	
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers		
	We need to receive your submission by 5pm, 8 M	arch 2017.	
YOUR NAME AN	ND CONTACT DETAILS		
Full name Ocea	nview Farms Limited		
Full address 2	160 Thomson Road RD2 WAT	ZUKU.	
Emailer the	raten @ ttra, co.nz. Phone uq 2352854	Fax	
ADDRESS FOR S	SERVICE OF SUBMITTER		
Full name Ocea	nview Farms Limited		
Address for serv	vice of person making submission 260 Thomson Rea	d RD2 WAEUNU	
Email Sothor	nton@psigen.az Phone 092352739	Fax	
TRADE COMPET	TITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS (See a. 1. Historia 144)		
☐ I could / ✓ d	could not gain an advantage in trade competition through thi	s submission.	
	n not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the	ne submission that:	

THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 1 THAT MY SUBMISSION RELATES TO
CP parametrization (x, y) for an expression parametrization of y . The x is $x \in \mathbb{N}$ by x
Acort nue en seu ante decetisy finecess as, y
Refer attached separate sheet.
I SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE ABOVE PROVISION/S (Select as approximate and can be an separate since the fire cessary.)
Support the above provisions
Support the above provision with amendments
✓ Oppose the above provisions
MY SUBMISSION IS THAT THE CONTROL OF SUBMISSION AS A PRODUCT OF SUBMISSION OF SUBMISS
To ease content of an impacted shoetpy, it increases as a
Refer attached separate sheet.
nerer actached separate sneet.
<u></u>
I SEEK THE FOLLOWING DECISION BY COUNCIL
fixed as appropriate into continue on separate screens), fine, essay j
Accept the above provision
Accept the above provision with amendments as outlined below
✓ Decline the above provision
✓ If not declined, then amend the above provision as outlined below
Amend as follows:
Refer attached separate sheet.

Doc # 9150077

PLEASE INDICATE BY TICKING THE RELEVANT BOX WHETHER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION		
✓ I wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissio	ns.	
I do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my sa	ibmissions.	
JOINT SUBMISSIONS		
✓ If others make a similar submission, please tick this box hearing.	if you will consider presenting a joint case with them at the	
IF YOU HAVE USED EXTRA SHEETS FOR THIS SUBMISSION I	PLEASE ATTACH THEM TO THIS FORM AND	
✓ Yes, I have attached extra sheets.	No, I have not attached extra sheets.	
SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER An intersect authorised to the intersect of KERS (etc.) There As an intersect of the authority of the appears on the sound of the conditions.	n garagana	
Signature MMShowkon	Date 3-3-17	
Personal information is used for the administration of the s collected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with su information	ubmission process and will be made public. All information bmitters having the right to access and correct personal	

PLEASE CHECK that you have provided all of the information requested and if you are having trouble filling out this form, phone Waikato Regional Council on 0800 800 401 for help.

Additional sheet to assist in making a submission

Section number of the Plan Change	Support /Oppose	Submission	Decision sought
Please refer to title	Indicate whether	State in summary the	State clearly the decision and/or
and page numbers	you support or	nature of your submission	suggested changes you want Council
used in the plan	oppose the	and the reasons for it.	to make on the provision.
change document	provision.		
Definition – Nitrogen Reference Point	Oppose	Oppose the use of OVERSEER as the primary model for deriving a nitrogen loss number from a farming activity. The OVERSEER model was	Remove reliance of PC1 on OVERSEER as the primary model for deriving a nitrogen loss number from a farming activity. This ten year plan should rely only on establishing good management
		not developed to be used	practice for farming activities to
		as a regulatory tool but has been adopted for this purpose in PC1. The model is inaccurate with version updates affecting the reliability of results.	reduce or minimise the risk of contaminants entering a water body. Over the next ten years further research and analysis should be undertaken on appropriate methods and approaches to contaminant
		•	management for all activities in the catchment from urban and rural activities.
Schedule B – Nitrogen Reference Point	Oppose	Oppose the use of OVERSEER as the primary model for deriving a nitrogen loss number from a farming activity and	Remove reliance of PC1 on OVERSEER as the primary model for deriving a nitrogen loss number from a farming activity.
		oppose the reference period being the two financial years covering 2014/2015 and 2015/2016.	Should the method be retained then the reference period should be extended to a five year period and the Nitrogen Reference Point being highest annual nitrogen leaching loss
		This period of farming activity was characterised by low payouts and less	that occurred during a single year (being 12 consecutive months) within the reference period.
		1	the reference period.
		inputs and is not an accurate or realistic	
		rationian at a number	
		reflection of a typical	
		farming system which will fluctuate with market and	

Doc#9150077 Page 4

Schedule C – Stock	Oppose	Oppose lack of clarity on	The definition of waterbody in
exclusion		waterbodies for the	Schedule C should exclude artificial
		purposes of stock	watercourses including farm drainage
		exclusion.	canals
			Cariais
	ļ	Schedule 8 states that	
		water bodies from which	
		cattle, horses, deer and	
		pigs must be excluded:	
		i. Any river that continually	
	1	contains surface water.	
		ii. Any drain that	
		continually contains	
		surface water.	
		iii.Any wetland, including a	
	ĺ	constructed wetland.	
	ļ	iv.Any lake.	
		The definition should	
		exclude artificial	
		watercourses including	
	ļ	farm drainage canals. Farm	
		drains are often a source of	
		stock drinking water and	
		not part of a naturally	
	1	flowing freshwater system.	
	1	A farm drain may	
		continually contain water	
		but this may percolate	
		filtering contaminants such	
		as sediment as opposed to	
		flowing to connected	
		natural freshwater	
		systems.	
Rule 3.11.5.7 – Non	Oppose	Oppose a Non-Complying	Amend Rule 3.11.5.7 to focus on new
Complying Activity		Activity status for land use	large scale land conversions on land
Rule – Land Use		change. The rule should	where contaminants cannot be
Change		focus on new large scale	mitigated rather than a blunt tool that
-		land conversions on land	affects all farming operations
		where contaminants	3
		cannot be mitigated rather	
		than a blunt tool that	
		affects all farming	
	1	operations.	
	<u></u>	Operations.	<u> </u>

Doc # 9150077 Page 5

Regulatory Framework – Farm Environment Plans, Auditing, Contaminant Management, Nitrogen Limits	Oppose	The plan will have wide ranging effects on rural land users and the viability of farming operations. Rural Production activities must be able to change and adapt to market circumstance and environmental conditions while recognising the need to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the environment. PC1 is resulting in financial hardship, stress and an excessive regulatory regime.	Provide a support package to maintain the viability of farming activities: Rates review. Compensation for loss of income and land value.
		If PC1 is to proceed rural land users must be supported financially and with the right information and government support to maintain viability.	

Level Playing Field – Rural and Urban effects

Oppose

Oppose the lack of a level playing field between rural and urban activities and their effects.

It is not reasonable that current urban land use can continue to discharge high volumes and levels contaminants authorised by long term resource consent approvals when the rural community is loaded with high regulation and land use restriction through PC1.

Urban intensification is being encouraged in the Waikato and Auckland within existing centres with substandard and/or failing infrastructure discharging contaminants into the Waikato catchment. Noting Auckland discharges wastewater to the Waikato via Tuakau.

Furthermore, greenfield growth is being promoted by regional and district councils in the Waikato when science shows that greenfield growth results in a degradation in water quality.

As urban development proceeds and continues to degrade water quality the future nutrient allocation framework will be unfairly weighted towards urban activities at the expense of rural production activities and the production of food to feed the urban activities.

Resource consent terms should be the same for urban and rural activities.

PC1 should require the point and nonpoint discharges from urban land use to be addressed within the same regulatory framework and timeframes as rural activities.

Urban intensification and greenfield development that degrades water quality in the Waikato catchment should be avoided.

Doc # 9150077 Page 7