

### Submission on WRC proposal Healthy Rivers Plan (PC1)

Name: Peter Roberts  
Address: 87 Rataroa Road Miranda RD 3 Pokeno  
Phone: 09 2327808 or 0274417062  
Email: [peterroberts@actrix.gen.nz](mailto:peterroberts@actrix.gen.nz)  
Hearing: I wish to be heard  
Competitor: I am not a trade competitor

#### Submission:

I have reviewed the WRC's proposed healthy river plan change and oppose it completely as it is currently written. The proposed plan has a direct impact on my ability to farm. I own a dry stock farm in Miranda and have owned it for 23 years. It was an ex Landcorp block and was very run down when I bought it and still needs development to reach its potential. The stock ratio is 3:1 fresian bulls/sheep. A significant area of the property has been planted in pines.

I believe the policy and process to date has been a disgraceful expensive farce. The so called collaborative stakeholders group has one dry stock farmer when we are 45% of the land area - is this democracy in action WRC style.

The whole policy had no publicity until it was a fait accompli- What was WRC trying to hide. The policy itself is a political document that has no science or common sense but appears to be an empire building power grab by Vaughan Paine and his academic environmental advisors. If it was been run by scientists they would identify hotspots of pollution and address these first. The plan seems to ignore Koi/Carp introduced by WRC, water birds and Hamilton city the biggest source of pollution.

Addressing specific points:

Point 4.1: I totally agree with healthy rivers but totally disagree with this document

Point 4.2: the social effects of this will be devastating. Go to the East Cape and see what happened to healthy rural communities last time bureaucrat's made dry stock farming uneconomic. In addition halt the PC1 until the Hauraki Iwi are on board and publicise their terms if they agree.

Point 4.3: 10% improvement in 9 years. We could do much better than this is if you don't allow grandparenting of fertilizer inputs. Grandparenting is a complete farce totally at odds with the objectives.

Point 4.4: Community Resilience The plan as written will hurt farmers , then the down steam effects on rural schools, sports clubs and communities will compound. This will also affect the many small rural

businesses and towns in the Waikato Region, the area you are supposedly representing. The only growth area in the region will be the WRC.

Point 4.5: Totally disagree NZ is one nation and one people and not one where specific non-elected people can tell the public what to do.

Point 4.7: Discharges should be monitored on a catchment basis. I am happy to have an approved water testing regime. We are at the top of a catchment and if our water is meeting national (not WRC) standards then we should not have the cost of farm environment plans or stocking restrictions according to WRC. If we don't meet these standards, we will decide how to comply instead of having somebody in an office telling us how to run our farm.

Point 4.9: As above

Point 4.18: Point source discharges-probably sewerage, meat works, dairy factories- you wish to consider rolling over these consents because of costs to comply-no such consideration given to farmers. Let's attack individuals because they are softer and easier targets than corporates

4.21: One rule for all

4.25: If my water is tested and complies I will not do an FEP, why should I. Also the farmers should do the FEP's not consultants, just another expense to put the farmers out of business. Compliance costs will be so high.

4.26: Make a plan to deal with Koi Carp, you put them there you take them out. PC 1 completely ignores this. It does not suit your agenda.

4.33: Don't tell me how to run my farm and use your own standards as compared to the government standards.

4.34: This is all about ticking boxes and empire building by WRC, I feel sorry for your staff that are expected to turn up and tell me how to farm.

In summary I totally oppose PC 1. It was designed by WRC to increase their power and my costs. Not only that but the blanket prescriptive nature of the rule will not achieve the results that a sub catchment approach will. If it proceeds as it is there is going to be a lot of upset non co-operative farmers. I refuse to acknowledge your right to this.

If this plan proceeds as written I will be forced to conclude that this process from beginning to end is a farce. I have paid \$2000 per year to WRC for 23 years and never had any written or verbal dealings with them and can conclude they do nothing. Now they come up with this plan which will only increase rates and costs and to be now told by an office wallah how to run my farm.

Peter Roberts