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): Richard Kellie Alexander Jolly

Phone (hm): 07 8722840

Phone (wk): 0274997159

Postal Address:147 Hingaia Road

RD 4

Te Awamutu 3874

Phone (cell): 0274997159

Postcode:

3874.

Email: Jollyr@no8wireless.co.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.

Commented [j1]s 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.

Slanature /

date

Introduction

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

My name is Richard Jolly and I am the fourth generation of our family to farm a 400ha Seep and Beef property at Wharepuhunga, a district 30km south east of Te Awamutu. I also have a son on another hill country property inland from Kawhia as well as a significant interest in a 400 cow dairy farm at Ngutunui, on both sides or the Ngutunui River.

I have been farming all my adult life 40 yrs and during that time have served as a District councillor and Deputy Mayor of the Otorohanga District Council, Director of national cooperatives and in 2004 was awarded the FMG Rural Excellence award for 'excellence in farming while contributing to the community. [Topping the farm environmental section]

My property is surrounded by 'converted' dairy farms [sheep and beef to dairy] and this property has the contour and potential to milk up to 1400 cows. Over the years I chose not to 'convert' simply because I preferred my current system and lifestyle. That is not to say that I or my family may wish to change systems in the future.

I farm in an environmentally sustainable manner and have the majority of waterways fenced off from livestock as it was practical to do so. I believe that I do not harm our waterways in any way and no matter what farming system we would operate wish to do so.

Conversely, I have watched our neighbouring rivers deteriorate through the direct contamination from neighbouring dairy farms. Rivers that I used to swim, fish and drink out of have deteriorated so much that I would not let my grandchildren swim in now.

No one is more passionate about clean waterways than I. I believe the dairy industry has a lot to answer for.

In saying that I believe that there are essentially enough 'tools' in place to police our waterways but they simply aren't being utilised. Environment Waikato and other agencies simply aren't applying enough resources in this area and if all the funding that is being channelled into this process was used for compliance monitoring and policing then we wouldn't be having these issues to anywhere the same extent.

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 as a suggestion 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, including Objectives, Policies, or other rules, or restructuring of the Plan, or parts thereof, to give effect to the relief sought.

| 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: aa • whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 3. • brief reasons for your views. | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: Olive: 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 |
|---|--|--------|---|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| Objective 1 Long term restoration and protection of water quality for each subcatchment and fresh water management unit. | We support this objective | | |
| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: | My submission is that: | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: |

| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: State specifically what Objective. Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to. | whether you support or oppose each provision listed in column 1; brief reasons for your views | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: Give: 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. |
|---|---|--|---|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| Objective 2- | We support this objective | | |
| Objective 4 | We support this objective in principle –but only once scientific data has been established for each sub catchment | Allows for more accurate management plans rather than a blanket approach | |

| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: State specifically what Objective, Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to. | whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 1; brief reasons to: your views. | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: Give: Details of the outcomes you would like to see for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier if will be for the Council to understand the outcome you seek. |
|---|---|--|---|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| Objective 5 Mana Tangata-protecting and restoring tangata whenua values. | We oppose this section B of this objective. The ownership of the land should not determine what rules are applicable. | Flexibility should be based on contaminant impact from the activity regardless of who owns the land. | |

| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: | My submission is that: | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: | |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT | |
| 3.11.3 Policy 1a and all sections relating to the 'grand parenting 'of existing use/farming methods ,N levels etc | Strongly oppose | The reasons for this are; in many cases it is still acceptable to increase stocking rates, n usage, and change farming practices and still be of no adverse effect to the environment and waterways. This 'grand parenting' policy rewards the polluters and has serious consequences for those currently responsible. In my families case it would have serious financial consequences and we would be locked into a land use that currently suits our requirements as a family but may well not do so in the future, while our neighbors are allowed to farm under a different set of rules, all while we both farm similar soil types, contour and environment. I have been advised that it would decrease the value of this property by 2 million dollars – for no morally justifiable reason. 'Grand parenting' doesn't take into account scientific and farming advances that have the potential to allow us operate safely and sustainably. It is possible to measure water quality as it enters the property and as it exits the property so any targets/deterioration can be easily monitored and farming systems adopted to meet targets and not apply a blanket rule that 'you cannot change' what you are currently doing. | I seek that the provision is either deleted or amended to reflect the principles as out lined. As an alternative I propose that like land should be treated equally within each sub catchment. Rules should not reflect on past land use or ownership but future/intended land use. | |

| My submission is that: | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: |
|------------------------|--|--|
| SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| | Principle 1 Like land should be treated the same Allocation should be based on the intrinsic qualities of the land. Two pieces of land with the similar qualities should receive the same allocation. This principle recognizes that allocation regimes should not be influenced by existing use. The term 'grand parenting' has been adopted and now recognized as reflecting on past practices. Under this policy 'grand parenting' favors the worst polluters and penalizes the current responsible land users who still mat safely increase stocking rates/undertake land use change etc and still meet environmental targets. | |
| | Principle 2 Those undertaking activities that have caused significant water quality deterioration should be required to improve their management to meet acceptable water quality limits. | |
| | All New Zealanders have a responsibility to manage their activities to maintain or improve water quality. This principle reflects the need for those who have caused water quality problems or who are contributing a greater amount to them to take a greater responsibility for meeting the costs | |
| | | Principle 1 Like land should be treated the same Allocation should be based on the intrinsic qualities of the land. Two pieces of land with the similar qualities should receive the same allocation. This principle recognizes that allocation regimes should not be influenced by existing use. The term 'grand parenting' has been adopted and now recognized as reflecting on past practices. Under this policy 'grand parenting' favors the worst polluters and penalizes the current responsible land users who still mat safely increase stocking rates/undertake land use change etc and still meet environmental targets. Principle 2 Those undertaking activities that have caused significant water quality deterioration should be required to improve their management to meet acceptable water quality limits. All New Zealanders have a responsibility to manage their activities to maintain or improve water quality. This principle reflects the need for those who have caused water quality problems or who are contributing a greater amount to them to |

| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: | My submission is that: | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: |
|---|------------------------|--|--|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| | | that those who have managed responsibly should not be required to have their land use constrained | |
| | | as a result of others' activity. Principle 3 Flexibility of land use must be | |
| | | maintained | |
| | | Land owners need to have the ability to respond to changes in climate, input costs, markets and | |
| | | technological innovation in order to maintain a profitable and sustainable farming enterprise. | |
| | | Allocating nutrients in such a way that unnecessarily limits land use change constrains | |
| | | the ability of land users to respond to those changes and optimally utilise the land resource. | |
| | | Principle 4 The allocation system should be technically feasible, simple to operate and understandable | |
| | | A high level of technical feasibility is fundamental | |
| | | to a successful allocation approach. The simpler | |
| | | the system, the more likely it is to be able to operate effectively. The approach must also be | |
| | | understandable by land users and the wider | |
| | | community. It must be able to be administered | |
| | | fairly and at minimum transaction costs to users and the regulator. | |

The natural capital of soils should be Principle 5 the primary consideration when establishing an allocation mechanism for nutrient loss A natural capital approach allows for an economically efficient allocation of nutrients. Those soils with the greatest ability to retain nutrients and optimise nutrient use give land users the greatest flexibility to optimise production. respond to markets and technology while managing potential effects on water quality. Allocation systems should reflect the ability of these soil types to optimise production and land use flexibility. Principle 6 Allocation approaches should provide for adaptive management and new Information Allocation decisions are primarily made on the information we know now and modelled future scenarios. Our understanding and the availability of both catchment and farm systems will change over the life of an allocation system as will possible management techniques. Allocation systems should provide sufficient flexibility to provide for adaptive management and be reviewed regularly to incorporate new information. Adequate transition times should be provided to incorporate new information where allocation changes as a result. Principle 7 Appropriate timeframes must be set to allow for transition from current state to one where allocation of nutrients applies Timeframes should take account of the degree to which any waterway is over-allocated (if that is

the case), the period over which this state has

| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: | , | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: |
|---|------------------|--|---|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| | | come about and the costs for businesses and the current ability to manage to that allocation. It should be recognised that current water quality issues are sometimes the result of many years of land use within catchments and may have developed over generations. Consideration needs to be taken of the legitimate expectations of people and natural justice. Accordingly time should be provided for them to adjust. There needs to be a balanced approach and recognition of the uncertainty associated with water science versus the likely economic impact on businesses and the region. The primary objective should be to set an appropriate direction of travel that will see a steady improvement in water quality. Principle 8 Long term investment certainty is a critical feature of a viable nutrient management system Changes to nutrient allocation regimes must be signalled as far out as possible. Refinements to those systems must be managed to minimise their impacts on business viability, land value and the flexibility of land use. The aim must be to reflect the underlying elements of sustainable management in achieving improved water quality outcomes including reducing those adverse impacts on social and economic outcomes. | |

| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: | My submission is tha | 1: | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: RELIEF SOUGHT |
|---|----------------------|--|--|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | |
| | | Principle? Improvement in water quality must remain the primary objective of adopting any nutrient allocation regime When exploring the adoption of methods to achieve water quality improvements and manage to limits, the focus of community debates, modelling and discussion of allocation of nutrients can distract from the primary goal – maintaining and improving water quality. This principle emphasises that allocating nutrients to a property level doesn't in itself result in improved in water quality; it is the actions of land users that ultimately result in improved nutrient management. Principle 10 In under-allocated catchments, where property based nutrient allocation has not been adopted in setting water quality limits, the system for allocating nutrients must be determined well before the limit is reached, be clear and easy to understand, and designed to avoid overallocation The mechanism for allocating nutrients, even if it does not have immediate effect, should be clear from the time when water quality limits are set. Allocation mechanisms should reflect the level of risk that the catchment will become over | |

| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: | My submission is that: | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: |
|---|------------------------|---|--|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| | | threshold (e.g. 75%-90% of a limit) to determine when an allocation regime should be adopted. Principle 11 in designing the allocation system the benefits of a nutrient transfer system within the catchment or water management unit should be considered. Maximum economic efficiency of land use could be assisted by a mechanism for transferring nutrient discharge allowances within the same catchment. | |
| | | And any consequential amendments arising from this submission point | |
| 3.11.3 Policy 1b | Support in principle | Many of the current farming practices undertaken by intensive dairying are unsustainable and are harming our waterways | |
| 3.11.3 Policy 1c | Support in principle | Should be compulsory for high stocking rates and all dairy usage | Not required if it can be shown there is no adverse effect to the waterways ie |

| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: | My submission is that: | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| | | | lightly stocked, sheep, impractical. Flexibility required |
| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: | My submission is tha | l: | The decision i would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: |
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| Provision | I support/ oppose/ If you support you can support but require amendments | The reasons for this are: | I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below As an alternative I propose |
| | | | |

| The specific provisions my submission relates to are: | My submission is that: | | The decision I would like the Walkato Regional Council to make is: |
|---|------------------------|--------|---|
| | SUPPORT / OPPOSE | REASON | RELIEF SOUGHT |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Yours sincerely

Richard Jolly

Signature

Commented []2]: If a group. The final signature can be 'signed on behalf of the ... group'.