

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 St
Hamilton East
Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240

Full Name: Rozel Farm Ltd

Phone: 07 878 7617
0274 822246

Postal Address: 4 Ahoroa Road
RD2
Te Kuiti 3982

Email: reduder@rozelfarm.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.

If others make similar submissions, I would consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

R. F. Judd 3/3/17
Signature date

Signature date

Rozel Farm is located in the Rangitoto district which is within subcatchment Mangaoekewa of the Waipa priority 1 area.

The land area is 1023ha. It is a mixed operation comprising 2 dairy platforms of 337 and 294ha, and a dry stock area of 210ha. The farm area also includes 60ha of radiata pine plantations. Native bush, QE 2 covenants and new native plantings total 69ha, plus 5.6ha of wetlands and 9ha houses and yards etc.

The farm has boundaries with DOC areas and radiata plantations on land owned by LINZ.

The farm when purchased in 1995 was a traditional sheep and beef fattening unit.

Dairy conversion on easier contoured land began in 2008 and involved the purchase of an additional neighbouring property.

While undertaking the dairy conversions in recent years, streams and waterways have been fenced and planted with natives as have many of the steeper faces.

Some forestry areas have been harvested with replanting, some has been allowed to regenerate to natives but the easier contoured ground has been converted to grazing land.

The purpose of this plan change is to restore and protect the water quality in the Waikato River. Much has been made of the collaborative approach to developing this report and that the problem needs shared solutions.

It is therefore disappointing that this proposed plan change does not include all the land owners in the catchment and is only focussing on farmers.

DOC land, LINZ and commercial forestry areas are not included. These tracts of land are large and are host to significant populations of feral animals – deer, pigs, goats and possums plus bird populations which all contribute to contaminants in the water.

It seems inevitable that a consequence of this plan being implemented there will be more hill country retired from farming and planted into forestry or being allowed to revert to native forest. This will create further large areas for feral animals and bird populations.

- A. Our concern is that commercial forestry and LINZ land on our boundary harbours significant numbers of feral goats and pigs which are continually moving onto and out of our property, and have done so for the past 20 years, the pig problem is getting worse despite constant culling pressure. Wild pigs are constantly rooting up our paddocks and pine and bush areas and thus contributing to contaminants in the water.

Goats regularly enter our property through holes in the boundary burrowed by the pigs and are an ongoing threat to our native tree planting programme. We are constantly frustrated and demoralised by the negative impact these animals have on our efforts to improve water quality.

I would like to submit that all landowners in the Waipa area are included in the rules of this plan change. Farmers do not want to be held accountable for water quality issues arising from areas over which they have no control and we do not want to have our efforts undermined by feral animals from land owners exempt from the plan change.

- B. Our farm has a 3.8km boundary with a commercial forestry company. The forest was planted with no set back and has unpruned branches overhanging the boundary by up to 15 metres into our paddocks.

The effect of this is to:

1. Create bare ground which is susceptible to surface erosion.
2. Maintenance of a stock proof boundary is very difficult because of continually falling branches and feral animals making holes under the fence, thus impossible to keep goats and pigs out and difficult to keep livestock in.

Suggested Rule change for an amended Plan Change 1:

In Part A include a new section on Forestry 4.0.

1. Commercial forestry owners shall be required to control feral animals to a level that they are not a threat to the aims and objectives of Plan 1
2. Commercial forestry owners shall be required to control feral animals to a level that they do not impede the efforts of farmers to implement their farm plans proposed under Plan Change 1.
3. Commercial forest owners shall be required to set back all new forestry plantings 10m from boundaries.
4. Commercial forest owners shall, if requested by their neighbours remove plantation trees from within 10m of a boundary fence.

Suggested Rule change for an amended Plan Change 1:

In Part A include a new section 5.

To cover all rural land not covered by a farm environment plan and all land not under plantation forestry and over 20ha in area.

That these land owners must also control feral animals as in 1 & 2 above.

Non- Complying Activity Rule 3.11.5.7

We oppose this rule and wish to have it amended.

After harvesting our pine plantation, we intended to realign fences to take better land back for pasture and retire steep land back to pine forestry and native planting.

The original survey boundaries are often straight and took no account of contour. Time has proved that some fence lines have been built in the wrong places meaning difficult maintenance issues, stock being forced to walk in unnatural places causing chronic soil damage and erosion.

A common-sense approach is to replace fences according to contour, use steep land for pine forestry and native plantings and use easy land for pasture.

Common sense would also suggest that all land be used for what it is best suited to.

In order to achieve the Plan objective, offsetting of increased contaminants from a land use change should be allowed where other land within the farming enterprise and within the same catchment is de-intensified to a level where net contaminant output is reduced.

Suggested change:

Notification:

“ subject to the Council being satisfied that any intensified land use is offset by de-intensified land use and where there is a net reduction in contaminant discharge.”