

## 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):** Paihere Farms Group  
Linda Ann Price, Gary Douglas Price, Bevan Douglas Price, Anna Kathleen Price

**Phone (hm):** 07 8788 510

**Phone (wk):** 07 8788 510

**Postal Address:** 1777 State Highway 4 RD3 Mapiu Te Kuiti

**Phone (cell):** 027 3060 479

**Postcode:** 3983

**Email:** akmc Alpine@yahoo.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.**

## Introduction

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

My name is Anna Price. My husband Bevan and I are working alongside Gary and Linda Price (Bevan's Mum and Dad) in a farming partnership.

We are sheep and beef farmers (50: 50) in Mapiu just twenty minutes out of Te Kuiti and are part of the West Coast Catchment.

We are raising our four children on this property and rely heavily on our small rural community for support and most definitely our local town, Te Kuiti. A fear of losing these smaller towns because of the impact the Plan Change One would have is one of our major concerns.

We are a relatively new farming business and have been on this particular farm for approximately two years. However, Bevan and I have been farming with his family for around ten years.

We purchased this property with the aspirations of fully developing it over time. In the past, the farm wasn't running efficiently and we knew we could make a positive impact on the property.

We are in the process of putting in a fully reticulated water system, with 50% of it completed. This has been extremely beneficial to our farming system. We have adapted the 'one piece at a time' ethos. This allows us to observe the water supply and make changes as we see fit before moving onto the next piece. This ensures that what we are doing, we are doing well and achieving the right outcomes environmentally. Obviously, this has come as a huge expense to our business, but given how important it is, the 'one piece at a time' approach has been beneficial.

We are also farming a lease block. The aim of the lease is to help us build up our own stock numbers. Our home block is currently carrying around 150 dairy graziers. Our hope is that in a few years' time the dairy graziers will not be part of our farming practise and will be replaced with our own stock.

Some aspects of Plan Change One will really stop our progress dead in our tracks. This will have a major detrimental effect on our business, making it unsustainable, which is the exact opposite of what we want to achieve.

If our farm is no longer sustainable, then the possibility of passing it down through generations won't be possible. We would like to leave our home/farm in a much better state than what we found it. In order for us to reach our goal it needs to be environmentally and economically sustainable. I know this is what the majority of farmers also strive towards.

Our farming future depends on the outcomes of this plan, and yet there is no certainty from this plan as to what the outcomes might be in ten years' time.

While we all agree on the vision of the plan, we think much more consultation within the rural communities needs to be completed before any of the plan is implemented.

**The specific provisions my submission relates to:**

Schedule C Stock Exclusion, Rule 3.11.5.1, definitions, and any consequential amendments arising from these submission points.

**I support or oppose the above provision/s**

Oppose

**The reasons for this are:**

- We are in the process of putting in a water supply - stock do not venture into waterways once a consistent water supply is in place
- Fencing off all flowing waterways would be far too costly (initial and ongoing)
- Stock may have to be re-directed, therefore more tracks would be needed - this would create more pressure on the land.
- The cost (environmentally/monetary) of controlling weeds such as tutsan, blackberry, gorse etc
- Cropping gives us the opportunity to improve pasture species. This takes pressure off other parts of the farm and means once the land is developed it is able to be utilised at its full potential

**I seek that the provision is amended as set out below**

- Water systems to be put in place as budget depicts and where appropriate
- Any fencing to exclude stock from waterways is done on a case by case/farm by farm basis
- Scientific testing of sub catchments is undertaken where then a variety of options to address the issue/s (if any) can be explored
- Businesses are allocated ongoing subsidies to allow for labour, fencing materials, and ongoing weed control
- Delete standard 5 and 6 (rule 3.11.5.1) For *grazed land, the stocking rate of the land is less than 6 stock units per hectare and no arable cropping occurs*
- Select appropriate paddocks for any intensive grazing

**The specific provisions my submission relates to:**

Rule 3.11.5.2, and any consequential amendments arising from these submission points.

**I support or oppose the above provision/s**

Oppose

**The reasons for this are:**

- Sheep and beef farmers are less intensive than dairy farmers
- The proposed plan suggests a one size fits all approach
- A majority of hill county farms are not working at their full potential
- No flexibility to adjust to current market trends = loss of production/income
- Takes away opportunities for young farmers to enter in at the bottom end of the market
- Loss of production/income means less spending/support in small rural towns
- Not being able to graze land of more than a 15° slope will mean most hill country farms will be unviable
- Planting pine trees may cause more environmental harm than any low intensive farming operation

**I seek that the provision is amended as set out below:**

- Delete 4c and d Rule 3.11.5.2 (No part of the property or enterprise over 15 degrees slope is cultivated or grazed. No winter forage crops are grazed in situ;)
- Re visit the rule in its entirety to ensure that ALL types of farming enterprises are being assessed fairly

**The specific provisions my submission relates to:**

Schedule B – Nitrogen Reference Point, Rule 3.11.5.3, 3.11.5.4 – 3.11.57 and any consequential amendments arising from these submission points.

**I support or oppose the above provision/s**

Oppose

**The reasons for this are:**

- The use of OVERSEER is not seen as a valid tool to measure Nitrogen leaching levels
- Ability to change stock class to support market trends will be impossible leaving your business/farm stagnated
- This approach is penalising low intensity farmers
- Creates an uncertainty for farming families given that we cannot increase production levels if data is taken from recent seasons one of which was a drought and most farms have still not reached their potential
- The impact this will have on land prices

**I seek that the provision is amended as set out below:**

- The schedule (B) is deleted in its entirety until more scientific measures are in place to measure NRP

**The specific provisions my submission relates to:**

Schedule 1 Requirements for Farm Environment Plans, Rule 3.11.5.4, and any consequential amendments arising from these submission points.

**I support or oppose the above provision/s**

Oppose

**The reasons for this are:**

- The rules set out in in Schedule 1 seem to be mirroring most of the rules of the Proposed Plan Change 1
- Lack of 'professionals' to support farmers to implement the plan
- Major cost involved (fencing, planting, loss of production, no room for improvement)
- The rules are unclear
- FEP's lock your farming practise into one model – farming is not like that
- No allowances are made for climatic changes, this would be more harmful to the environment
- No allowances for market trends = loss of production/income

**I seek that the provision is amended as set out below:**

- An initial assessment is undertaken on individual farms before any changes are made to the property, halting any unnecessary changes and will be focussing on critical points
- Plans written from initial assessment need to reflect individual farms on a case by case basis, not a blanket approach for whole communities/catchment areas
- Support given to implement environmental plans comes from the agriculture industry eg: farm advisors, allowing for best farming practise to be acknowledged

Waikato Regional Council proposed Waikato  
Regional Plan Change 1 - Waikato & Waipa  
River catchments

Gary Douglas Price 

Linda Ann Price 

Anna Kathleen Price 

Bevan Douglas Price 

Paihere Farms Group

Date 6/3/2017