PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1

WAIKATO AND WAIPĀ RIVER CATCHMENTS

Waikato Regional Council
Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato

Submission form on publicly notified – Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipā River Catchments.

Important: Save this PDF to your computer before answering. If you edit the original form from this webpage, your changes will not save. Please check or update your software to allow for editing. We recommend Acrobat Reader.

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

SubForm	PC12016	COVER SHEET	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
		Submission Number	
Entered		Initials	
File Ref		Sheet 1 of	

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 by email must contain full contact details.*
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers

We need to receive your submission by 5pm, 8 March 2017.

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS

Full name: David John Aitken

Full address: 169 Mangaiti Road Mapiu RD3 Te Kuiti 3983

Email: kimanddavid@farmside.co.nz

Phone: 07 8787853 Fax: _____

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER

Full name: _____

Address for service of person making submission: _____

_____

Email: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

TRADE COMPETITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS *(select appropriate)*

◯ I could / ☑ could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

◯ I am / ◯ am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

(a) adversely effects the environment, and

(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.

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 submissions.

☐ I do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.

JOINT SUBMISSIONS

☑ If others make a similar submission, please tick this box if you will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

IF YOU HAVE USED EXTRA SHEETS FOR THIS SUBMISSION PLEASE ATTACH THEM TO THIS FORM AND INDICATE BELOW

☑ Yes, I have attached extra sheets. ☐ No, I have not attached extra sheets.

SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER

Signature: DS Arthur Date: 27/2/17

Personal information is used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public. All information collected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

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 a suggestions 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, or parts thereof, to give effect to the relief sought.

I am a third generation farmer on our 400ha farm in Mapiu which is in the West Coast Catchment area of the the Waikato Region. My wife and I farm in partnership with my father and our 17 year old son plans to become the 4th generation to farm this land in the future. We are a drystock farm currently running 1500 breeding ewes, 500 breeding hoggets, 212 beef steers up to 18 months and 80 May to May dairy heifers.

In the last 3 years we have started fencing off the Mangaiti Stream which runs through our farm and some of our ponds and have developed a plan and taken on debt to put in a water trough system of which 61 troughs have been put in and 7.4kms of water piping has been laid. We aim to continue fencing off the rest of the Mangaiti stream, Mapiu Stream and our main drains to these streams and also bring our trough system into our hill country blocks.

Although, at this time, the proposed Plan Change 1 does not directly effect our farming management practices, I have based my submission on the possibility of parts of the plan being rolled out into the West Coast Catchment area in the very near future.

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.

THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 1 THAT MY SUBMISSION RELATES TO

Please state the provision, map or page number e.g. Objective 4 or Rule 3.11.5.1 (Continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary).

Proposed Plan Change in its current state.

I SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE ABOVE PROVISION/S

(Select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary).

◯ Support the above provisions

◯ Support the above provision with amendments

☑ Oppose the above provisions

MY SUBMISSION IS THAT

Tell us the reasons why you support or oppose or wish to have the specific provisions amended. (Please continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary).

The proposed plan in its current state provides no certainty for our farming future in regards to
- flexibility to react to market trends
- flexibility to react to weather adversities
- economic viablity
- sustainable mitigation implementation
- holistic and beneficial farm succession planning
- our health,wellbeing and lifestyle as an intergenerational farming family
- being a part of a vibrant and prosperous rural community

Provisions need to be made to enhance
- consultation at a subcatchment level
- education, engagement and clarity for all farming types at a grass roots level. This is paramount for farmers to make educated and informed decisions about why regional plan changes on environmental regulations are being imposed and is also paramount for Council to achieve its goals for our region.
- trust needs to be built by providing transparency and science that is robust, practical and easily understandable to a multi -aged farming community.
- the abiltiy for council and landowners to build relationships on the understanding that one size will not fit all. What is fesible in one part of the farming sector will not be fesible in other parts for example Dairy sector vs Drystock.

How can we embrace becoming part of a prosperous community who is environmentally responsible if rules and regulations are imposed with scientific tools that use programmes with defaults. All these plan changes do is bring about doubt for future livelihoods.

I SEEK THE FOLLOWING DECISION BY COUNCIL

(Select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary).

◯ Accept the above provision

◯ Accept the above provision with amendments as outlined

☑ Decline the above provision

◯ If not declined, then amend the above provision as outlined

ADDITIONAL SHEET TO ASSIST IN MAKING A SUBMISSION

Section number of the Plan Change: Schedule A - Registration with Waikato Regional Council

Do you support or oppose the provision? ☑ Support ○ Oppose

Submission	Decision Sought
State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it. I support this because - the council will be able to get a 'real time' view of farming management practices within the Waikato Region. - this will enable future proof planning with capable, practical and economically viable implementation of environmental planning throughout the catchment areas.	*State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.* Retain as proposed

Section number of the Plan Change: Schedule B - Nitrogen Reference Point

Do you support or oppose the provision? ○ Support ☑ Oppose

Submission	Decision Sought
State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it. I oppose Schedule B - Nitrogen Reference Point because - the use of Overseer and using default data if you dont have the correct information. - how can you 'own' your reference point if there are flaws in the programme being used. - of costly farm environment plans which need reviewing and will add extra costs to an already compromised profit margin. - of the added expense of a Certified Farm Nutrient Advisor and Certified Farm Environmental Planner. - of having to give out private financial information as to how we run our business. Being drystock farmers we have to work within very volitile market changes. How do we know our financial information remains confidential? - we will have no ablitly to be flexible within current market demands and will be 'locked' in on current farming practice or less depending on our Nitrogen Reference Point. This is not viable for drystock farming as we rely on this potential to make profitable decisions.	*State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.* I seek the provision is amended as set out below - farmers can choose mitiagations not modelled in Overseer. Farmers are able to choose mitiagations that allow for the transition of dealing with Nitrogen Reference Points in the 10 year period to be in stages, to be practical and financially sustainable and with the ability to impliment farm management practices to enhance those mitigations through ongoing education and support and through Farm environment plans that they should be able to do themselves simply and easily to create an 'ownership' of their plan. - that there be some type of flexibility within Nitrogen Reference Point ranges to allow for the potential to make profitable decisions based on market demands - if Farm Environmental Plans are to be implimented through a certified person then 'delicate' financial information should be sourced through the plan by your chosen Certified Farm Environmental Planner who should undertake specific criteria for 'Code of Conduct' during the certification process in where farmers are assured confidentiality on aspects of specific information required. The use of information from the farming surveys from Statistics NZ or the NAIT system could also be used as alternatives to source stock numbers instead of private financial information. - compensation or subsidies for destocking outcomes if Nitrogen Reference Points are too high to allow for loss of income and the ability to carry out further mitigation.

ADDITIONAL SHEET TO ASSIST IN MAKING A SUBMISSION

Section number of the Plan Change: Schedule C - Stock Exclusion

Do you support or oppose the provision? ☑ Support ○ Oppose

Submission	**Decision Sought**
State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it. I support this because - I believe that this would have the most immediate benefical impact the farming community could have on waterways. - we have already started excluding stock from our 7.2km of streams on our farm and plan to include main drains on flats and ponds. - we have taken on an enviromental mitigation debt to allocate a water reticulation system on farm. We have put in 7.4km of waterlines and 61 troughs over the last 3 years with more planned for our hill country areas. - we are dedicated to better environmental outcomes for our farm and our community. We believe our time on this land lends to it being left in a better condition than when we take over from the last generation. It is important to us to show our future generation that you have to give to be able to take from the land too. We also believe this needs to be in stages to be affordable, practical and sustainable.	*State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.* I seek the provision is amended as set out below. - that farmers be able to choose mitiagations that allow for stock exclusion on farms to be in stages, practical and sustainable and with the ability to impliment farm management practices to enhance those mitigations through education and support. - to achieve a sustainable outcome we are prepared to fence rivers/streams with a 1 wire electric fence with the fence placed on suitable stable ground. - fence main drains leading to the streams/rivers at least 100 to 200 metres or to the foot of the hill which ever comes first, with 1 wire electric fences. - continue with the planned prôcess and progression of water reticulation systems. - hill country stock exclusion from waterways poses major problems including vast amounts of expenditure and limited ability to be humanly possible to get to some areas.

Section number of the Plan Change:

Do you support or oppose the provision? ○ Support ○ Oppose

Submission	**Decision Sought**
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.*