Please consider forwarding a copy of your submission to $\underline{B+LNZ}$ so we can echo your comments in our submission

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Waikato Regional Council's proposed Plan Change 1.

Our names are Andrew and Nicole Ewen and we are second generation farmers at Naike (part of sub-catchment 16). We farm sheep, beef and deer on 600ha of beautiful rolling hill country. Maize is also grown for both sale and on farm consumption. In addition to our farming operation we have an agricultural contracting business, covering groundwork, spreading and conventional hay baling.

Over the last 7 years, we have been fencing off our waterways and have retired approximately 10 hectares of native bush. In addition, we have spent a lot of time planting natives along our fenced off waterways. We have also fenced off existing mature native bush which comprises about 15 hectares.

We belong to a close knit and vibrant community of people who care about their land and regularly get together to discuss best farming practice. Our farm is more than just our livelihood, it is our home and where we spend so much of our time as a family. Our vision is to leave our two children with a productive farming operation which they can continue and be proud of.

Submission Form

Submission on a publicly 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: Andrew Hamish Ewen and Nicole Lisa Ewen

Phone (Hm): 09 233 3042

Phone (Wk): 09 233 3042

Postal Address: 144 Kaawa School Rd, RD2, Huntly 3772

Phone (Cell): Andrew: 027 322 3252 Nicole: 027 318 8527

Postcode: 3772

Email: nicole@das.org.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.

Align in Signature

20/2/17 date



The specific provisions my submission relates to are: State specifically what Objective, Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to.	My submission is that: State: • whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 1; • brief reasons for your views.	The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is: Give: • precise details of the outcomes you would like to see for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand the outcome you seek
Provision	I oppose The reasons for this are:	I seekthattheprovisionis: Deleted in its entirety As an alternative I propose
Long Term Land Use Objectives: 1,3 and 4 Policy 5 and 7 Rules 3.11.5.3 to 3.11.5.5 Schedule 1	 This creates too much uncertainty as we don't know how much land potentially has to go into forestry/native bush This creates potential capital devaluation and unwillingness to invest 	That the plan is amended and re-notified only when there are clear indications of what land use is required on my farm with any consequential amendments arising from the submission process

Provision	I oppose The reasons for this are:	I seekthattheprovisionis: Deleted in its entirety
Nitrogen Reference Point Objectives: 1 and 4 Policy 2 and 7 Rules 3.11.5.3 to 3.11.5.7 Schedule 1	 We are already low emitters and this does not support those who have done the right thing by the environment and effectively rewards high emitters This is a poor nutrient allocation process Sampling at the Rangiriri/Glen Murray Bridge shows that the sub- catchment is already at an acceptable level 	

Provision	I support with amendments The reasons for this are:	I seekthattheprovisionis: amended as set out below: As an alternative I propose
Stock Exclusion Rules 3.11.5.1 to 3.11.5.4	 That the National Water Accord only recommends that slopes up to 15 degrees be fenced, and this should apply. Also, it recommends a different definition of a water body which we are more comfortable with. The cost of fencing hill country farms is prohibitive as demonstrated by the Federated Farmers study. It is even more so for deer fencing. In the past, there have been cost subsidies to achieve this and there is nothing in the plan to indicate that this will continue. The timing is unachievable for us in a priority 1 catchment. We require more time to plan and prepare in order to do a proper job. 	That the rules are changed to reflect recommendations by the National Policy Statement on Fresh Water. That the timelines are extended to allow better decision making with any consequential amendments arising from the submission process

rovision	I oppose	I seekthattheprovisionis: Deleted in its entirety
Restricting Land Use	 The reasons for this are: This undermines the value of our land 	
Change Pages 15 - 16 Policy 6 Rule 3.11.5.7	 We feel that this covered by all the other rules contained in the proposed plan. This restricts the ability of future generations to develop the farming business It restricts our ability to react to changes in the market as well climatic changes and adverse 	
	 It undermines the land owner's right to utilize their land with current best practice. 	

Provision	I oppose	I seekthattheprovisionis: Deleted inits entirety
	The reasons for this are:	As an alternative I propose
Farm Environment Plan Pages 15-16 Policy 2 Rules 3.11.5.3 to 3.11.5.7 Schedule 1	 This is too restrictive and binding. It does not take into account any changes which may need to be made due to adverse weather conditions. These changes will require sign-off by a Certified Farm Environment Planner which will be costly. This will discourage innovation and people trying new systems as farmers will be locked into a Farm Environment Plan. The timing is unrealistic given how comprehensive and binding the plan is. There is a lack of Certified Farm Environment Planners which will result in sign-off being delayed and deadlines not being met. The indicative cost of engaging a Certified Farm Environment Planner is prohibitive. 	That the timeframe is extended with any consequential amendments arising from the submission process

I support	I seekthattheprovisionis: amended as set out below
The reasons for this are:	As an alternative I propose
The contribution that koi carp make needs to be included in this proposed plan	That the plan is adjusted to contain rules for the elimination of koi carp with any consequential amendments arising from the submission process
	The reasons for this are: The contribution that koi carp make needs to be included

Provision	I support The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: amended as set out below As an alternative I propose
Sub-catchment Management Policy: 9 Implementation method: 3.11.4.1 and 3.11.4.5	 We believe this will work very well for our area The policy is not given effect to in the rules 	We would like the allowance for sub-catchment approach included in the rules with any consequential amendments arising from the submission process

.

Yours sincerely

Nicole Ewen and Andrew Ewen

Mar Aler Signature 20/2/17 Date