

HEALTHY RIVERS & WAIKATO REGION. GOVT. NZ ^{Re-}

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 -
WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

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): MARTIN JOHN TRIBE

Phone (hm): 021942827

Phone (wk):

Postal Address: PO BOX 126 PATUMAHOE (FARM ADDRESS
373 MANGAORONG
ROAD MAHOENUI
3798

Phone (cell): 021 942827

Postcode: 2344

Email: MARTIN@NZC APPLES.CO.NZ

Comment [1]: If this is a group submission everyone must include their details and sign the form, unless the group is a legal entity.
To help the council the group could give itself a name ie collectively referred to as the ... group.

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. ✓

- 1 NO ADVANTAGE IN TRADE COMPETITION
- 2 AGREE TO SPEAK AT THE HEARING
- 3 JOINT CASE YES IF REQUIRED



1
Waikato regional council proposed plan change 1

Waikato and waipa river catchment

Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to submit to the WRC proposed plan change

We are Pukeroa farms, sheep and beef farmers with 476 hec in Mahoneui

The property has been farmed since 1904 and we are the 4th owner during this time having taken ownership in 1995

Like all properties we have continued to improve the property during this period

This is called by most as progress, some of what the council is proposing is certainly not and we see some detail as actually inhibiting progress

We do however agree that all new Zealanders need to improve both land and urban welfare, so all must be treated equal in keeping New Zealand as clean and green as possible; reality says most of our population are in cities or suburbs therefore they have a bigger part to play.

Nitrogen management plan

Policy 2 rules 3.11.5.3- 3.11.5.7 schedule 1

1

While we agree nitrogen needs to be managed on all properties we do consider that sheep and beef farms are a much smaller part of the nitrogen issue than other types of farming and should not be bracketed with them

Farms should be treated on their merits not as a blanket policy, properties need to be administered individually and the WRC is in my opinion looking to find an easy way out to improve the waterways

Things to consider are soil types, rainfall, farming technics and fertilizer usage.

2

The use of overseer by the WRC to set N reference point for all farms is simply not acceptable as noted in item 1

3

Some farms have a low reference point as they do not have the high nitrogen input as dairy or horticulture

4

Council needs to be able to implement N reference point based on true science not some guess as it currently seems and it is well noted that this currently can not be completed.

If as currently it is to be implemented based on (overseer) across a broad range of properties this we feel will be open to legal challenges

5

All individual Farms should have watershed test taken independently to see what and if and contaminants ,N, P, and sediment pathogens are detected, this surely allows farms to see their true position and then make the changes where and if necessary.

This is why a blanket plan on area is dangerous and the council needs to go public with considerably more information on problem areas

6

All property within the regional council needs to be in the plan, not allowing politically sensitive areas to be free of controls

7

The plan states the N point is to be averaged over either 14/15 or 15/16, MODELED Nutrient losses

Not science and actual results, this we feel is open to a multitude of challenges, this I feel must be completed on a farm to farm basis to be accurate and perhaps legal

We are happy to treated on an individual and be counted on this, not to be counted like sheep in a pen

Restricting land use

Policy 6

Rule 3.11.5.7

This is totally opposed

1

We are the farm owners, if we farm correctly we should be allowed the reward as a free enterprise not be told what we can or can't do. Base rules can be fine if fair and understanding but dictators eventually fall on their swords

We stress each farm is individual and if the rules are set lets say fair and we meet our obligations we should be able to use the property to meet our own agenda.

I can see this issue having serious political, social and economic issues if brought into he plan

Governments wish all to go forward and benefit the country, by potentially bringing in some ridiculous rules it creates more damaging issues

If land use is restricted then what actually happens to this land, it potentially reverts to scrub or weeds such as gorse, blackberry etc, this over time creates a bigger environment issue, just look at some of the south island countryside

Over a period of time farming has changed and farms have expanded or perhaps become more intensive. Stock numbers per land area have grown,

The decision we feel the WRC needs to make is

Work with the farms individually on an open book basis

Get practical and provide the correct information to farms, don't throw a flawed plan into the public arena and wait for the reactions,

That stock numbers on properties can not increase is possible illegal and totally open for political repercussions not seen in New Zealand

I wonder if new Zealanders were suddenly told we had a one child policy, can you imagine the issues we might see

Waikato regional council Proposed plan change 1 Waikato and Waipa rivers

Stock exclusion from water ways

Policy 2 schedule c and table 11-2

Rule 3.11.5.1 3.11.5.2

We partially support this issue but with some variation

On open and main waterways we agree that restriction is practical,

However on steeper land there can and are issues with practicality,

Areas are steep

The water way is generally not where stock either want or can venture

Perhaps these areas can be looked at in consultation rather than attempting blanket rules

Conclusion

Our opinion is the council needs to review this plan approach the farming community with a practical and common sense approach.

I guess the way to say is don't use a sledge hammer when a rubber one can work well

The main points are

4

Review the way the N reference is completed

Review the land restrictions

Review the restriction

Treat farms on an individual basis not one bullet for all

The plan should still allow farms to progress and increase productivity if it does not impact on levels of pollutants

Reward clean and progressive farms

Judge land on natural and historical capability not slopes

Review the waterway requirements for hill country to practical variation

MQ
A

8/3/17