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): Peter and Kirstin Fullerton-Smith

Phone (hm): 07 8788422

Phone (wk): 021 878842 Peter

Postal Address: 298 Waitepipi Rd, RD 5 TE Kuiti 3985

Phone (cell): 021 8788422

Postcode: 3985

±. 370;

Email: te.awarua@xtra.co.nz

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.

Commert [j1]: If this is a group submission everyone must include their details and sign the form, unless the group is a legal entity.

To help the council the group could give itself a name ie collectively referred to as the group.

Signature

3/3/2017 date

Signature

date

Introduction

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

We are The Fullerton-Smith family;- Peter and Kirstin, and we have three children

We farm a second generation farm and are looking to hand it on to our children. Peter was born on this farm 50 years ago.

We farm in the Mairoa catchment, we have a drystock farm of 600 ha, including 5ha of QEII, 30ha pine trees and 40ha native bush. Our farm is described as easy to medium rolling hill country. Our cattle numbers are 1000 head and 500 sheep. Since we have been farming the style of farming has changed considerably. We are now more intensive, We engage in new and innovative practices.

Our concern with the current plan is that it will take away flexibility for future generations to adapt and means farming will stagnate, with no farms being able to develop or improve. The plan needs to be more flexible and less "one rule for all", as catchments are so different. Adpotion of this plan as is would have a catastrophic effect on our Te Kuiti rural community and town.

We have land that could be developed and converted to dairy. We resisted the urge 5 years ago... believing it was something our children could do if dairying proved to be more viable than sheep and beef in the long term and they preferred that style of farming. We want our children to have the choice to convert.

We view ourselves as caretakers of our land, we nourish and care for it and we get a return for this. We value the bush, have planted pinetrees and fenced off waterways. We have a QEII block and are developing two lakes and wetlands.

Comment [j2]: Keep this section really brief. It is not imperative to your submission, but does help set the scene in relation to telling the council a little bit about your business and community.

Types of information include:

•Where you are farming (catchment)

•What type of farm

- •Stock class and ratio and whether or not this changes overtime •How long has the property been in your family and how long have you been farming the property
- Property under development future aspirations?
- •Environmental Ethos? le actively planting riparian strips or allowing native regeneration, QEII covenants, Plantation Forestry, Manuka, Wetlands or lakes etc

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
Provision 42 Rule 3.11.5.4	l oppose	The reasons for this are: it will impose significant costs on our farming activities. We believe the proposed N cap idea is untested at best and will prove to be faulty and too restrictive. It would penalise our sheep and beef operation unfairly. The "one size fits all" approach with this proposed legislation is unfair as our farm is very different to a dairy farm. Existing NRPs could be very different for neighboring farms. Having NRPs and enforcing a cap would lock farms into current production levels and consequently lock farm business values. It would stop environmentally sustainable farm business growth.	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety. As an alternative I propose much more discussion around splitting areas into subcatchments. Better still would be to classify farms by farm use category. This provides flexibility for future intergenerational land use change and ability to move between the categories. (Eg if a drystock farm converted to dairy Perhaps use individual FEPs alongside.

The specific provisions my submission relates to are: Rule 3.11.5.7 Land Use change	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is:
	I Oppose	This current proposal is unfair and will place significant costs and be too restriction on our present and future farming activities. There is no flexibility for future technological advances, climate changes, management changes. While we have chosen not to convert to dairy, it is something we thought we had "in the bank" as an option for our children farming. Our concern is that current legislation will lock land use into the existing category with very little room for improvements or changes.	Amend as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.
Schedule C – Stock Exclusion Policy	1 Oppose	Schedule C is too onerous for most Drystock farmers. Due to the extensive nature of most farms and hilly contour, the cost of compliance would be prohibitive. Large tracts of land could not be fenced, would have to be left, making our farming operation less viable, Because these area are extensively farmed, there is much less pressure on these areas anyway, therefore the need to fence them is not necessary. FEPs could benefit here as each farm is so different in land use and contour. Most farmers want to do the best they can on their farms. To try to enforce a blanket Stock exclusion policy is simply a bad decision. As we have several waterways to fence the financial impact to us is	Amend as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.

My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
	huge. It would make farming very difficult for our family for quite a few years. If this Stock exclusion policy stands, We would not consider buying any more farm land as we would consider the industry too heavily regulated, and impossible to improve or develop farms. The impact of this schedule on wider rural farming communities, would be enormous and detrimental.	
Oppose in part	We support in theory the idea of FEPs but oppose the regulatory and time consuming potential of this First and foremost WE ARE FARMERS we are not in this industry to spend huge amounts of time justifying what is common sense and in most cases good farming practices. FEPs mean added cost to our farm in time, implementation and for us the cost would outweigh the benefit.	Amend as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission If FEPS are deemed to be the way forward, PLEASE ensure they are fair to all categories of farming type and land use. Make them easily implemented, practical with flexibility built into them for future changes. (eg Changes in farm management, technology or climate.)
		huge. It would make farming very difficult for our family for quite a few years. If this Stock exclusion policy stands, We would not consider buying any more farm land as we would consider the industry too heavily regulated, and impossible to improve or develop farms. The impact of this schedule on wider rural farming communities, would be enormous and detrimental. Oppose in part We support in theory the idea of FEPs but oppose the regulatory and time consuming potential of this First and foremost WE ARE FARMERS we are not in this industry to spend huge amounts of time justifying what is common sense and in most cases good farming practices. FEPs mean added cost to our farm in time, implementation and for us the cost would

Yours sincerely

PETER FULLERTON SMITH KIRSTIN

Comment [j3]: If a group. The final signature can be 'signed on behalf of the ...

FILLERIAN - SMITH

1 3/3/2017 ture Date