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

Full Name(s): Peter and Kirsty McCormick

Phone (hm): 078777897

Phone (wk): 078777897

Postal Address: 603 Paraheka Road RD Aria

Phone (cell): 0274265939

Postcode: 3979

Email: rockendherefords@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.

place -	
ľ	08/03/2016
Signature	date
M	
08/03/2016	
Signature	date

Introduction

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

We are a family hill country sheep and beef breeding farming operation in the West Coast catchment, farming 650ha wintering 8-10su/ha. We have been farming this property for the past 14 years.

As a large part of our property bounds the Mokau river we aim to farm sustainably with moderate stocking rates. Since purchasing the property in 2003 we have significantly increased the reticulated water system which we note has significantly reduced stock accessing water courses. Phosphate is applied in the form of dicalcic phosphate with much lower water solubility to reduce phosphate run-off. Selective drainage, planting and natural regeneration has been done to reduce erosion in susceptible areas. We aim to continue these activities as finances permit.

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
Schedule 1- Farm Environment Plan	Support but require amendments	The reasons for this are: We support the development of farm environment plans (FEP), but it should not be mandatory to have a professional prepare this due to it being another significant compliance cost.	We believe the requirement to have a qualified farm environment planner should be deleted. A template should be available and as long as all sections are completed correctly, individual property owners should be able to submit FEP's with appropriate supporting documentation such as stock unit history, fertiliser history, farm map etc
Schedule B- Nitrogen reference point	Support but require amendments	The reasons for this are: We support limiting nitrogen run-off, but disagree with basing permitted levels off farm history. And also using a NRP in low intensity catchments where nitrogen discharge is not the issue.	We disagree with basing NRP on historical activities as this appears to reward the worst nitrogen polluters with no incentive to change and therefore reduce nitrogen run-off. We believe NRP should be based on best practice for the farming type eg horticulture, dairy, sheep and beef. We are also concerned with the accuracy of a NRP generated by OVERSEER, as research seems to indicate significant discrepancies in this program. The

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
			changes indicated in PC1 will have serious financial implications for farmers and therefore the scientific evidence must be accurate and provable.
Schedule C- Stock exclusion	Support but require amendments	The reasons for this are: We support excluding stock from waterways where intensification results in stock regularly entering waterways. But believe in low intensity farming (<12su/ha) the financial cost outweighs any provable benefits	We believe that in low intensity farming (<12SU/ha) the prevalence of stock in waterways is minimal and the financial cost of fencing water courses off significantly outweighs any provable benefits. We have noted since we have expanded the reticulated water system and now have troughs in most of the paddocks which bound the Mokau river stock rarely venture to the river. Also preventing animals from grazing around water courses will lead to an invasion of weeds (blackberry, woody nightshade, tutsan etc). We have observed that the presence of these weeds on river banks actually hold up the water when the river is in flood and eventually the force of the water peels off both the weed and the soil it roots grow in causing significant erosion. We notice a lot of fenced off waterways are frequently sprayed with herbicide to control weeds, but question the detrimental effect this has on the eco-system of the water course and its surrounds.

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
Policy 16 (b)	Oppose	The reasons for this are: The plan should not discriminate for or against any persons or race	We believe there must be one plan for all land owners. The creation of positive economic, social and cultural benefits should apply to all regardless of race

Yours sincerely
Peter and Kirsty McCormick

Music I

08/03/2016

Signature

Date