

## Submission: Waikato Regional Council's Proposed Healthy Rivers/Wai Ora Plan Change 1 (PPC1)

Submission on a publicly notified proposed Regional Plan prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Submitting On:** The Waikato Regional Council's Proposed Healthy Rivers/Wai Ora Plan Change 1 (PC1)

**Submitting To:** Waikato Regional Council  
401 Grey Street  
Hamilton East  
Private bag 3038  
Waikato Mail Center  
HAMILTON 3240

*Fill in the table (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 i.e. collectively referred to as the ..... group.)*

Date:	6/3/2017
Full Name:	RICHARD WALKER
Phone (home):	078246191
Phone (mobile/work):	027 3090529
Postal Address:	1905 <sup>c</sup> Gordonton Rd Taurangi RD1
Email Address:	RS Walker@xtra.co.nz

### Submission

- I have reviewed Waikato Regional Council's Proposed Healthy Rivers/Wai Ora Plan Change 1 (PPC1) and ~~oppose/support~~ (delete one) the Plan Change in its current form.
- ~~I wish to be heard in support of this submission.~~ (delete if you do not wish to speak)

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.

## **SUBMISSION FOR PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL'S PROPOSED HEALTHY RIVERS/WAI ORA PLAN CHANGE 1 (PPC1)**

I have been farming for 45 years; 25 of those have been on my own 1,000 acre property southeast of Port Waikato in the district of Glen Murray.

I have since sold my farm - thank goodness - as this PC1 Plan would surely have sunk us, both emotionally and financially.

I still work in the Glen Murray district, and at the age of 65 I'm nearing the end of my farming career. So you could say the PC1 Plan won't impact on me too greatly. I do however feel for my fellow farming colleagues, especially those of my age who perhaps were hoping to sell their properties in order to retire after many years of hard work, and doing without many of the things city people take for granted.

The estimated loss in land values in the greater Waikato region is \$44.2 billion, so it will impact on these people. Not to mention lost jobs, displaced families and local communities, local towns and service industries. Don't look the other way and say it won't happen, because it will.

There are no other industries that I'm aware of that have a moratorium slapped on them. It will make it very difficult for those forming businesses to function properly.

It seems to me a very, very high price to pay to lift the water quality of the Waikato and Waipa rivers to a swimmable, food gathering standard (killing a flea with a sledgehammer would be a fair description). The degradation of these two rivers seems to have been over-stated, given they both rate very favourably in recent OECD findings.

Farmers all want good environmental outcomes, just like the general public, but we all need to be realistic as regards to our ability to pay, and the timeframe it may take to get there. Not to mention the degree of difficulty of getting the job done over some very difficult terrain.

It has taken 2.5 years and \$14 million for the CSG to come up with the PC1 Plan. They've enlisted the help and knowledge of the TLG people with qualifications and letters behind their names. These people appear to have all the technical data, shonky Overseer computer modelling, statistics, graphs, pie charts, etc. The majority of the people of the CSG (with the exception of a few), would have very little practical experience or knowledge of farming. Did it not occur to anyone on the CSG that farming is not just computer-modelling?

There is also the physical element. It seems no-one has had a light bulb moment and realised that they need far more information. Did they not need to get boots-on-ground? Walk the ridges, streams, gullies and drains, talk to farmers as to their ability to pay for such an extravagant plan. Talk to fencing contractors, etc, asking what they would charge to fence streams and dams in remote locations. They'd find few

interested in going there, and only at a highly inflated price (50 - 70% extra).

Did they not think about the environmental impact of bulldozing fence lines in steep gullies? Undercutting hillsides causing sediment runoff during flooding? The degree of difficulty of doing some of the work on hill country is extreme, and in many cases not practical.

Did they not want to learn more about sediment disruption in our lakes - Whangape, Rotongaro, Waikerie - caused by koi carp? "Not our brief" they said. But koi carp shift 14 times their weight in silt every day, and they are in their millions. Do the maths, surely this would be one of the first and biggest hurdles to overcome. Is it because they can't extract money out of the koi carp that makes this massive problem less important?

Had the CSG done its job properly in the first place, the PC1 Plan would be very different today. If it's taken 2.5 years for the CSG to come up with the PC1 Plan, then perhaps the farming community need the same length of time (not just 3 months and with no budget), to come up with a workable alternative that suits everyone.

This all says to me that the CSG has treated farmers with utter disregard and contempt, and disrespected. The CSG has been loaded with people with no skin in the farming game. This has become glaringly apparent to the farming community.

This all leads to the second part of my submission. Those people of the TLG, who have been enlisted to help with technical issues, need to understand that they may have compromised their own ability to do further work in this field in future. There may well be a conflict of interest, as it appears that their own businesses may prosper with this plan proceeding. We could call it "insider trading", or "jobs for the boys".

I suggest that these members of the TLG should be in the 10 year moratorium, and not be allowed to take advantage of any business opportunities deriving from the PC1 Plan.

In the third part of my submission, I wish to draw your attention to the emotional and psychological effects this will have on farmers. There are those amongst us that will feel this more acutely than others. With the huge effort that government is putting into suicide prevention, it seems to me that the WRC is going in completely the opposite direction. We will be watching the statistics, and may you not have blood on your hands.

In summing up, I would say WRC have been vested with considerable powers. However I feel that these people with their hand on the tiller fall well short of being qualified. They lack good reasoning, responsibility and prudent stewardship, and allow personal agendas to interfere with their decision-making - which I suggest may have been woeful.

Farmers simply can't trust them to get the job right. I therefore suggest Waikato Regional Council should be aligning with the national policy statement on freshwater.

In finishing, I would like to support the PLUG submission. Thank you for hearing my submission.

Richard Walker

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard Walker", written in a cursive style. The signature is positioned to the right of the printed name "Richard Walker".

4. The table below are the details for the specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to and the decisions it seeks from Council. 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.

No.	Section number of the Proposed Plan Change 1	Support/ Oppose	Submission	Decision sought
<b>3.11.2 Objectives</b>				
4.1	<b>Objective 1</b> Long-term restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit	Support with amendments	Support the intention of Objective 1.  Oppose the attribute targets set in Table 3.11-1. The attribute targets are too prescriptive and should align with the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Waikato River Authority's (WRA) Vision and Strategy. Objective 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not consider all contaminant sources holistically</li> <li>• Includes flood/high flow conditions in water quality target data which are considered outliers</li> <li>• Does not take into consideration the variability associated with sub-catchments i.e. climate and soil type</li> </ul>	Retain the long-term restoration and protection of water quality for the Waikato and Waipa rivers.  Amend PC1 to be holistic and include all sources influencing the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River and its catchments, for example Koi Carp, point source discharges, and hydro-dams.  Remove flood/high flow conditions from water quality target data.  Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.
4.2	<b>Objective 2</b> Social, economic and cultural wellbeing is maintained in the long term	Support with amendments	Support maintaining the long term social, economic and cultural wellbeing; this must be a foundation objective in PC1.  However, PC1 is not achieving Objective 2 because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The section 32 analysis is incomplete due to the withdrawal of the Hauraki iwi area.</li> </ul>	Retain the maintenance of long-term social, economic and cultural wellbeing in the Waikato and Waipa catchment communities.  Withdraw PC1 until the Hauraki Iwi area and the WRA's Vision and Strategy has been amended. Then conduct a section 32 analysis to investigate the revised impact PC1 could have on society

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate social modelling conducted</li> <li>• Compliance costs alone are likely to cost my business (a considerable amount /\$___ as estimated by the Federated Farmers (2016) case study (or Frank's economic analysis if member) delete one).</li> <li>• Outcomes from PC1 will highly alter my XX (name community) business and community because they will be undermined through unsustainable and unjustified compliance and mitigation costs, farm devaluation and Nitrogen Reference Point (NRP).</li> <li>• Waikato Regional Council (WRC) have stated they currently have no known means of robustly measuring social, economic or cultural wellbeing.</li> </ul>	<p>and economy.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP to align with intention of Objective 2.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored Farm Environment Plan (FEP) to align with intention of Objective 2.</p> <p>Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments to align with intention of Objective 2.</p> <p>Develop robust indicators to measure social, economic and cultural wellbeing.</p>
4.3	<b>Objective 3</b> Short-term improvements in water quality in the first stage of restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management Unit	Support with amendments	<p>Support reducing the diffuse discharges in the short-term by 10%, of the overall long-term 80-year water quality targets.</p> <p>However, there is a lack of scientific data to support PC1 to achieve Objective 3. For example, PC1 incentives high emitters - to maintain flexibility on my farm, and therefore my land value, I will need to keep my NRP as high as possible.</p> <p>To me, this is the opposite effect of what PC1 should achieve to improve the health and wellbeing of the Waikato and Waipa rivers.</p>	<p>Retain a 10% achievement of the long-term water quality targets set out in PC1 by 2026.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP.</p> <p>Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p>
4.4	<b>Objective 4</b> People and community resilience	Support with amendments	<p>Support people and community resilience – it must be a cornerstone objective in PC1.</p> <p>However, currently PC1 does not meet the</p>	<p>Retain the staged approach.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP and land use change restriction.</p>

			<p>requirements of Objective 4. The proposed rules undermine community resilience in the rural communities of the Waikato and Waipa catchments and will adversely impact on social and economic wellbeing in both the short term and long term. The NRP, associated farm devaluation and loss of flexibility, coupled with substantial compliance and mitigation costs on many farms is unsustainable, as evidenced by case studies.</p> <p>Water quality already meets attribute targets in the majority of these sub-catchments. Despite this, no benefit is awarded to low emitters who may be forced off their land through unsustainable financial impacts imposed by PC1. This will in turn undermine the rural communities of the Waikato and Waipa catchments, as detailed in Objective 2.</p>	<p>Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p>
4.5	<b>Objective 5</b> Mana Tangata – protecting and restoring tangata whenua values	Support <i>with Conditions.</i>	<p>Support protecting and restoring Tangata whenua values. Mana Tangata is important to New Zealand's culture, but it also needs the support of industries, markets, and communities (primary production). The Waikato region is an integrated community therefore co-management is the key, not run all primary sectors into the ground.</p>	Revise PC1 to acknowledge primary production as a core value to reflect Mana Tangata.
4.6	<b>Objective 6</b> Whangamarino Wetland	Support	The Whangamarino Wetland should be restored.	Retain as proposed
<b>3.11.3 Policy</b>				
4.7	<b>Policy 1</b> Manage diffuse discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and	Support with amendments	<p>Support managing water quality on a sub-catchment basis because it considers soil suitability and climate conditions.</p> <p>Support stock exclusion, however only where it</p>	<p>Retain managing diffuse discharges and water quality on a sub-catchment basis.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be</p>

	microbial pathogens		<p>is practical to do so, and is relative to water quality benefit gains.</p> <p>Support enabling low intensity land uses.</p> <p>Support moderate to high levels of contaminant discharges to reduce their discharges by appropriate mitigation strategies through a tailored FEP.</p> <p>However, the rules in PC1 do not reflect Policy 1 and 9.</p> <p>Oppose mandatory fencing in areas where slopes are over 15°. This requirement is unjustified, does not align with proposed amendments to the NPS-FM, and is financially unsustainable for the majority. It is considered that the increased erosion risk and sediment loading in waterbodies from constructing fences over 15°.</p>	<p>made, through a tailored FEP. Amend rules in PC1 to reflect Policy 1 and 9.</p> <p>Amend Policy 1 in PC1 to state (changes are red):</p> <p>c. Progressively excluding cattle, horses, deer and pigs from rivers, streams, drains, wetlands and lakes for areas with a slope less than 15 degrees and on those slopes exceeding 15 degrees where break feeding occurs.</p> <p>d. Requiring farming activities on slopes exceeding 15 degrees (where break feeding does not occur) to manage contaminant discharges to water bodies through mitigation actions that specifically target critical source areas.</p> <p>Require clarification on how slope is measured given the ranges of topography experienced within each paddock and adjoining watercourses.</p>
4.8	<b>Policy 2</b> Tailored approach to reducing diffuse discharges from farming activities	Support with amendments	<p>Support a tailored, risk based FEP, allowing appropriate and tailored mitigations to reduce diffuse discharges.</p> <p>Support the reduction of diffuse discharges throughout all sub-catchments, however only where applicable i.e. if the sub-catchment is well below all attribute targets then maintenance would be appropriate.</p> <p>Oppose a NRP because there should not an uncertain, estimated number that governs land management based upon nitrogen only. My FEP will provide transparency and confidence</p>	<p>Retain appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p> <p>Amend PC1 to reflect Policy 1 in adopting a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP.</p>

			to Waikato Regional Council, and the wider community, that my property is reducing, or maintaining where applicable, its diffuse discharges relative to all four contaminants.	
4.9	<b>Policy 4</b> Enabling activities with lower discharges to continue or to be established while signalling further change may be required in future	Support <i>with Conditions</i>	Support enabling low intensity land uses.  However, I consider the uncertainty surrounding 'future mitigation actions' to be unacceptable. The level of capital expenditure required to meet the 10-year plan without assurance of future compliance for hill country farmers is prohibitive and counterproductive. If best practice is being adopted, then future certainty should be provided.	Retain provisions allowing for low intensity land uses to continue and establish.  Remove any signalling of future mitigation action requirements from Policy 4 in PC1
4.10	<b>Policy 5</b> Stage approach	Support with amendments	Support an 80-year staged approach to achieve the long-term water quality targets.  However, Policy 5 does not support Objective 2, 4 and 5. Because it does not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimise social disruption</li> <li>• Allow for innovation and new practices to develop</li> <li>• Support prosperous communities</li> </ul> There is little scientific evidence that PC1 will reduce diffuse discharges to achieve the long-term water quality targets.	Retain the staged approach.  Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP.  Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment.  Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.
4.11	<b>Policy 6</b> Restricting land use change	Oppose	Oppose restricting land use change based on the type of land use, as it is a blunt tool. This Policy, and related rule (3.11.5.7), will inhibit growth and innovation within the Waikato region, and nationally because I am unable to adapt to market demands/changes.	Amend PC1 to state high priority sub-catchments, in relation to water quality, have a Restricted Discretionary activity status. And low priority sub-catchments to have a Permitted activity status.  Amend PC1 to adopt a sub-catchment

			<p>Land use flexibility is key to running sustainable business operations. Therefore, Policy 6 conflicts with Objective 2, 4, 5 and Policy 5.</p> <p>Where a sub-catchment is of high priority (in terms of water quality), land use change should be a restricted discretionary activity status. However, where a sub-catchment is of low priority, land use change should be a permitted activity.</p>	<p>management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment. Then enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP</p>
4.12	<p><b>Policy 7</b> Preparing for allocation in the future</p>	Support with amendments	<p>Support as it takes into account land suitability regarding diffuse discharge reductions.</p> <p>However, PC1 is severely restricting growth and innovation on my farm and in my community in order to give more time to gain scientific data to appropriately implement this Policy in the future.</p> <p>WRC needs to work collaboratively with stakeholder groups to develop sub-catchment management approach, and enable appropriate mitigation strategies through a tailored FEP.</p>	<p>Retain reducing diffuse discharges while considering land suitability.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p> <p>WRC to work collaboratively with stakeholder groups to develop sub-catchment management approach.</p>
4.13	<p><b>Policy 8</b> Prioritised implementation</p>	Support	Support prioritising sub-catchments and implementing at different stages.	Retain as proposed.
4.14	<p><b>Policy 9</b> Sub-catchment (including edge of field) mitigation planning, co-ordination and funding</p>	Support with amendments	<p>Support managing water quality at a sub-catchment level.</p> <p>However, the rules in PC1 should give effect to this Policy and enable appropriate mitigation strategies through a tailored FEP.</p>	<p>Retain managing water quality on a sub-catchment level.</p> <p>Amend the rules in PC1 to reflect Policy 1 and 9.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be</p>

				made, through a tailored FEP.
<b>4.15</b>	<b>Policy 10</b> Provide for point source discharges of regional significance	Support with amendments	Support considering the regional significance of infrastructure and industry because there are certain point source discharges that are vital to human health and wellbeing.  However, point source discharges should be taken into consideration for achieving the short and long term water quality targets, through a sub-catchment approach.	Retain the consideration of regional significance of point source discharges infrastructure and industry.  Amend PC1 to be holistic and include all sources influencing the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River and its catchments, including Koi Carp, point sources, and hydro-dams.  Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within each sub-catchment.
<b>4.16</b>	<b>Policy 11</b> Application of Best Practicable Options and mitigation or offset of effects to point source discharges	Support with amendments	Support applying Best Practicable Options.  However, there is not applicable to all stakeholders, and there are no specific rules to reflect this Policy in PC1.	Retain applying Best Practicable Options but amend to include all stakeholders e.g. through FEP.  Provide clarification for what is a "significant toxic adverse effect".  Amend rules to reflect Policy 11.
<b>4.17</b>	<b>Policy 12</b> Additional considerations for point source discharges in relation to water quality targets.	Support with amendments	Support considering past technology upgrades and costs associated with upgrading.  However, this consideration is not consistent with land owners. Point source discharges can stage future mitigations to spread innovation costs over time to allow for a return in investment. This is not the case for me as a land owner. There is also no regard to cumulative effects from point source discharges.	Retain considering past technology upgrades and costs associated with upgrading.  Adopt a sub-catchment management approach to ensure collaborative and fair management of resources within the region.  Amend PC1 to allow these considerations to occur across all sources influencing the health and wellbeing of the Waikato and Waipa rivers. This could be achieved by enabling appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a

				tailored FEP.
4.18	<b>Policy 13</b> Point sources consent duration	Support with amendments	Support considering the magnitude and significance of the investment made.  However, land owners should be provided the same consideration when applying for consent under rule 3.11.5.4, 3.11.5.5, 3.11.5.6 and 3.11.5.7 in PC1.	Retain consideration of the consent duration in relation to the magnitude and significance of the investment made.  Adopt to include all property owners and enterprises within the Waikato and Waipa Catchments.
4.19	<b>Policy 14</b> Lakes Freshwater Management Units	Support	Support restoring and protecting lakes in 80 years through tailored plans.	Retain as proposed.
4.20	<b>Policy 15</b> Whangamarino Wetland	Support with amendments	Support restoring the Whangamarino Wetland.  However, I believe that all sources influencing the water quality of the wetland should be considered and remediated in collaboration, not just one source.	Retain restoring the Whangamarino Wetland.  Amend Policy 15 to be holistic and include all sources influencing the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River and its catchments especially pest fish species, in relation to sub-catchment management.
4.21	<b>Policy 16</b> Flexibility for development of land returned under Te Tiriti o Waitangi settlements and multiple owned Māori land	Support with amendments	Support flexibility for development of Māori land. However, there is no rule in PC1 to reflect this Policy (16).  Additionally, under PC1 all property owners and enterprises have restricted flexibility. This in turn reduces the social, economic and cultural benefits for everybody because the surrounding rural communities are compromised.	Retain flexibility for development of Māori land.  Amend PC1 to include a rule to reflect Policy 16.  Consider a similar flexibility for all property owners and enterprises.
4.22	<b>Policy 17</b> Considering the wider context of the Vision and Strategy	Support with amendments	Support applying policies and methods based on the Vision and Strategy.  However, the WRA's Vision and Strategy is currently under review, therefore PC1 may end up inadequately reflecting the Vision and Strategy.	Retain applying policies and methods based on the Vision and Strategy.  Withdraw PC1 until the Hauraki Iwi area and the WRA's Vision and Strategy has been amended.

<b>3.11.4 Implementation Methods</b>				
<b>4.23</b>	<b>3.11.4.1</b> Working with others	Support	Support working with stakeholders to ensure PC1 is implemented effectively.	Retain as proposed.
<b>4.24</b>	<b>3.11.4.2</b> Certified Industry Scheme	Support	Support that I can opt into a Certified Industry Scheme to help me manage my operation to the highest environmental standard, while considering my social, cultural, and economic impacts. (may want to delete or alter if you are unable/don't want to join a CIS)	Retain as proposed.
<b>4.25</b>	<b>3.11.4.3</b> Farm Environment Plans	Support with amendments	<p>Support a tailored, risk based FEP for my business to improve, or maintain where applicable, my environmental standard in a desired time-frame negotiated between my Farm Environmental Planner and myself.</p> <p>However, I understand there could be a shortage of Certified Farm Environment Planners. As an alternative, I suggest that land users who have adequate experience and capabilities should be able to work with an approved industry or scheme, run by WRC, to be accredited to develop their own FEP based upon a common template.</p>	<p>Retain a tailored, risk based FEP.</p> <p>Enable land users who have adequate experience and capabilities should be able to work with an approved industry or scheme, run by WRC, to be accredited to develop their own FEP based upon a common template.</p>
<b>4.26</b>	<b>3.11.4.4</b> Lakes and Whangamarino Wetland	Support with amendments	<p>Support WRC working with others to gain knowledge and information around lakes and the Whangamarino wetland.</p> <p>Support 3.11.4.4 (d) "work towards managing the presence of pest weeds and fish in the shallow lakes and connected lowland rivers area, including Whangamarino Wetland".</p> <p>However, there are no policies, objectives or rules in PC1 that recognise this point. It should also be extended to the Waikato and Waipa</p>	<p>Retain working with others in relation to lakes and Whangamarino Wetland.</p> <p>Retain managing pest weeds and fish.</p> <p>Amend PC1 to include the management of pest weeds and fish in the policies, objectives and rules in the Waikato and Waipa Catchments.</p>

			rivers and their catchments, not just shallow lakes and connected lowland rivers area.	
4.27	3.11.4.5 Sub-catchment scale planning	Support with amendments	Fully support managing diffuse discharges and water quality on a sub-catchment level.  However, this method is not reflected in the rules of PC1.	Retain managing diffuse discharges and water quality on a sub-catchment level.  Amend PC1 to reflect this method in the rules.
4.28	3.11.4.6 Funding and implementation	Support	Support WRC providing resources and leadership to implement PC1.  Support securing funding for implementation of PC1.	Retain as proposed.
4.29	3.11.4.7/8 Information needs to support any future allocation/Reviewing Chapter 3.11 and developing an allocation framework for the next Regional Plan	Support with amendments	Support gaining data.  Support allocation on a sub-catchment basis.  Oppose future allocation.	Retain gaining data.  Amend PC1 to enable the management of diffuse discharges on a sub-catchment basis.
4.30	3.11.4.9 Managing the effects of urban development	Support	Support managing the effects of urban development.	Retain as proposed
4.31	3.11.4.12 Support research and dissemination of best practice guidelines to reduce diffuse discharges	Support	Support implementing best practice guideline to reduce diffuse discharges.	Retain as proposed.
<b>3.11.5 Rules (Please delete any rules that are not applicable to your business)</b>				
4.32	3.11.5.1 Permitted Activity Rule – Small and Low Intensity farming	Support	Support enabling low intensity land uses to continue and establish under a Permitted Activity status.	Retain enabling low intensity land uses to continue and establish under a Permitted Activity status.

	activities		<p>Stock exclusion should be in conformance with the proposed amendments to the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Additionally, clarification is required to determine what constitutes slope on land where topography is undulating, and portions of the slope are both under and over the 15° threshold. This is currently subject to interpretation and difficult to implement.</p>	<p>Amend PC1 for stock exclusion: Cattle, horses, deer and pigs are excluded from water bodies in conformance with Schedule C for areas with a slope less than 15 degrees and on those slopes exceeding 15 degrees where break feeding occurs.</p> <p>Provide clarification on how/where to measure slope on undulating land.</p>
4.33	3.11.5.2 Permitted Activity Rule – Other farming activities	Support with amendments	<p>Support low intensity land uses that have little to no environmental risk to be under a Permitted Activity status.</p> <p>Support stock exclusion, however only where it is practical to do so, and is relative to water quality benefit gains.</p> <p>Oppose a NRP because there should not a number that controls my ability to manage my land in the way I see fit. My FEP will provide a risk based mitigation plan to reduce all my diffuse discharges. Additionally, the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 financial years occur when the payout was low, therefore my on-farm inputs were lower. This is not a true representation of the past use of land.</p> <p>Opposed 3.11.5.2-3b(i), I should not be limited to my stocking rate on my land at 22 October 2016. This is not a true representation of my farming activity and it severely limits my growth and innovation. It also hinders my economic viability for my business and for my</p>	<p>Retain Permitted Activity status for low intensity land uses.</p> <p>Amend PC1 for stock exclusion: Cattle, horses, deer and pigs are excluded from water bodies in conformance with Schedule C for areas with a slope less than 15 degrees and on those slopes exceeding 15 degrees where break feeding occurs.</p> <p>Amend rules in PC1 to remove NRP.</p> <p>Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored Farm Environment Plan.</p> <p>Amend 3.11.5.2 introduction to: The use of land for farming activities (excluding commercial vegetable production) and the associated diffuse discharge of nitrogen,</p>

			<p>community. In turn, this will generate an additional load of stress on myself and my community. Overall this undermines Objective 2, 4, 5 and Policy 5.</p> <p>By adding a maximum of 18 stock units per hectare, at 30 June 2016 would indicate the optimal winter carrying capacity of the land, aligning with good management practices.</p> <p>Oppose 3.11.5.4 c, "or grazed" should not be included and cultivation should be allowed up to 25°. Again, it severely limits my growth and innovation. It also hinders my economic viability for my business and for my community. In turn, this will generate an additional load of stress on myself and my community. Overall this undermines Objective 2, 4, 5 and Policy 5.</p> <p>Require clarification around stock exclusion. 3.11.5.2-3e and 3.11.5.2-4e(ii) states a three-metre buffer between water body and stock is required. However, in Schedule C the buffer is one-meter, and in Schedule 1 the buffer is based on slope.</p>	<p>phosphorous, sediment and microbial pathogens onto or into land in circumstances which may result in those contaminants entering water where the property area is greater than 4.1 hectares, and has more than 6 stock units per hectare but less than 18 stock units per hectare at the 30 June 2016, or is used for arable cropping, is a permitted activity subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to remove 3.11.2-3b(i).</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to: No part of the property or enterprise over 45 25° slope is cultivated or grazed unless effects of diffuse discharges can be mitigated</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to measure setback from on undulating land.</p>
4.34	3.11.5.3 Permitted Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan under a Certified Industry Scheme	Support with amendments	<p>Support a tailored, risk based Farm Environment Plan to reduce diffuse discharges.</p> <p>Support a Certified Industry Scheme</p> <p>Support stock exclusion, however only where it is practical to do so, and is relative to water quality benefit gains.</p>	<p>Retain FEP, Certified Industry Scheme, and stock exclusion where practical.</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to remove NRP.</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to: Cattle, horses, deer and pigs are excluded from water bodies in conformance with Schedule C for areas with a slope less than 15 degrees and on those slopes exceeding 15 degrees where break</p>

		<p>Oppose a NRP because there should not a number that controls my ability to manage my land in the way I see fit. My FEP will provide a risk based mitigation plan to reduce all my diffuse discharges. Additionally, the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 financial years occur when the payout was low, therefore my on-farm inputs were lower. This is not a true representation of the past use of land.</p> <p>Also, Overseer is the only available tool for me to generate my NRP, but it was never designed as a regulatory tool; only as a great management tool.</p> <p>Require clarification around stock exclusion. 3.11.5.3 refers to Schedule C and Schedule 1, both have stock exclusion requirements. Schedule C states the buffer is one-meter, and Schedule 1 the buffer is based on slope.</p>	<p>feeding occurs.</p> <p>Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to measure setback from on undulating land.</p> <p>Provide clarification around how long a FEP will be viable for.</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to measure setback from on undulating land.</p>
4.35	3.11.5.4 Controlled Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan not under a Certified Industry Scheme	<p>Support a tailored, risk based Farm Environment Plan to reduce diffuse discharges.</p> <p>Support stock exclusion, however only where it is practical to do so, and is relative to water quality benefit gains.</p> <p>Require clarification around applying for consent to produce food, and other primary products, on my land. I have concerns around the costs and the background/knowledge level of the planner approving my consent. I am in priority sub-catchment (1, 2 or 3 pick one – ask Leanna if unsure) therefore I am a Permitted Activity until 1 January (2020, 2023 or 2026 in</p>	<p>Retain FEP, Certified Industry Scheme, and stock exclusion where practical.</p> <p>Amend rule in PC1 to remove NRP.</p> <p>Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.</p> <p>Recommend 15 years or more for consent duration.</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to measure setback from on undulating land.</p>

			<p>relation to above sub-catchment number - ask Leanna if you are not sure). Assuming consents will not go past the proposed start date of 2026 for Plan Change 2, my consent will be for (6 years, 3 years or 6 months in relation to above – ask Leanna). The only positive of applying for a consent is the security and certainty that I can farm my land, as stated in my consent, for the next so many years. This duration needs to an appropriate length of time i.e. at least 10 years.</p> <p>Oppose a NRP because there should not a number that controls my ability to manage my land in the way I see fit. My FEP will provide a risk based mitigation plan to reduce all my diffuse discharges. Additionally, the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 financial years occur when the payout was low, therefore my on-farm inputs were lower. This is not a true representation of the past use of land.</p> <p>Also, Overseer is the only available tool for me to generate my NRP, but it was never designed as a regulatory tool; only as a great management tool.</p> <p>Require clarification around stock exclusion. 3.11.5.3 refers to Schedule C and Schedule 1, both have stock exclusion requirements. Schedule C states the buffer is one-meter, and Schedule 1 the buffer is based on slope.</p>	<p>Provide clarification around how long a FEP will be viable for.</p> <p>Provide clarification around stock exclusion requirements i.e. setback buffers and where to measure setback from on undulating land.</p>
4.36	3.11.5.7 Non-Complying Activity Rule – Land Use Change	Oppose	<p>Oppose non-complying activity status because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unaffordable to land owners wanting to increase their land area, rather than</li> </ul>	Address contaminants on a sub-catchment basis, to enable targeting of the highest omitting sub-catchments.

		<p>intensify</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eventually end up costing the consumer due to limited food availability</li> <li>• Limits flexibility, therefore growth innovation, and reduces land value</li> <li>• Jeopardises my business, family and community success and growth</li> <li>• Transfers wealth based on high emissions and/or high NRP i.e. a dairy farm with a high NRP will have a higher land value compared to a dairy farm with a low NRP</li> <li>• Removes, to a degree, property rights</li> <li>• Adds stress to my life, my family's life, and my community's life</li> <li>• I am unable to rotationally arable crop in my dairy farm system because my cropping area is over 4.1 ha. Therefore, I cannot convert my cropped area back into pasture without a non-complying consent. This will also limit the amount of supplement feed I can grow on my farm, meaning I must purchase feed from suppliers which will be more expensive.</li> <li>• Overall will largely affect the local, regional and national economy.</li> </ul> <p>Overall this rule undermines Objective 2, 4, 5 and Policy 1, 2, 5 and 9.</p>	<p>Reduce activity status to Restricted Discretionary for high priority sub-catchments, in relation to water quality, and limit discretion to the management of the diffuse discharges of the four contaminants.</p> <p>Reduce activity status to Permitted for low priority sub-catchments, in relation to water quality.</p> <p>Enable appropriate mitigation strategies to be adopted in the context of water quality gains to be made, through a tailored FEP.</p>
--	--	---	--

---

**Signature** **date**

---

**Signature** **date**

3. Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Waikato Regional Council's Proposed Plan Change 1 (PPC1).

*My name/ We are ....., and I am a/ we are (land use) landowners or land users in the X catchment. My family and I have been productively developing*