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: T. J. WILLIAMSON (TERRY)

Phone (Hm): 09 - 233 4/33

Phone (Wk): 09 - 233 4133

09.253 4.33

Postal Address: 69 OTUITI RD

R. D. 1 TUAKAU 2696

Phone (Cell): 021 133 6715

Postcode:

2696

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.

ignature 20.2.17



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:	The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
	 State: whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 1; brief reasons for your views. 	precise 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
Provision 3 · 11 · 2	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are: The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below padelete and council) As an alternative I propose
OBJECTIVE 1	FOR WATER QUALITY	TARGETS TO THE NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT FOR FRESHWATER MANAGEMENT. TO INCLUDE CHEMICALS IN THE TESTING REGIME. ALSO ROADING / AUTOMOTIVE DISCHARGES

MY NAME IS TERRY WILLIAMSON, AND TOGETHER WITH MY PARTNER LEANNE, LIVE AND FARM AT NO 69 OTUITI ROAD, IN THE OPUATIA DISTRICT, NORTH WAIKATO, OUR PROPERTY MEASURES APPROX 44 Ha. FOR THE PAST 4 YEARS 1 HAVE BEEN FARMING A DAIRY HEIFER REPLACEMENT REGIME 1. E. DRYSTOCK, GRAZING ONLY, DAIRY SUPPORT. AS YOU WOULD IMAGINE WE ALSO HAVE (NEED) SOME LIMITED OFF-FARM INCOME. (AGE AND HEALTH ISSUES ARE THE MAIN LIMITATIONS).

I CONSIDER MY FARMING TO BE LOW IN PUT AND SENSIBLE USE OF THE LAND TYPE. (I.E. RESPONSIBLE). DOING WHAT WE ARE DOING, WE ARE ABLE TO EKE OUT A MODEST INCOME / LIFE STYLE AND IT CONCERNS US GREATLY THAT WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCILS ASPIRATIONAL DREAM OF A HEALTHY RIVER VIA PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE ! WILL PLACE A DISPROPORTIONATE BURDON ON US WITH NO MEASURABLE IMPROVEMENT TO THE HEALTH OF THE RIVER . IT SEEMS OBVIOUS THAT W.R.C. ARE READY TO BOMBARD ALL LAND OWNERS WITH AN UNREALISTIC ARRAY OF COSTS THAT SOME WILL FIND SIMPLY UNAFFORDABLE. MY MICRO- CATCHMENT (INCLUDING NEIGHBOURS APPROX 1000 Ha) TO MY KNOWLEDGE HAS NEVER HAD ITS DISCHARGE WATER TO THE WAIKATO RIVER TESTED. SHOULDN'T IT ?? IF THIS PLAN PROCEEDS, I PREDICT THAT THE COUNCIL WILL NOT ONLY HAVE TO DEFEND THE LEGAL CHALLENGES BUT ALSO A VOTE OF NO CONFIDENCE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

W

P.S. OUR LAND IS OUR RETIREMENT RESOURCE. PLEASE DON'T MUCK IT UP.

I seek that the provision is. Deleted in its entirety/ Provision Jsupport/oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend A--- in the read Retained as proposed/amended as set out below idelete as requestly The reasons for this are: As an alternative I propose 3.11.3 a " " has to did the a mar out he was in the ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE ABLE TO POLICY RECONSIDER THE HISTORIC A MINIMUM INCREASE NITROGEN REFERENCE POINT THRESHOLD AS A MEASURING TOOL, EXCLUDE ANIMALS FROM REPLACE IT WITH A PRAGMATIC PRACTICAL WATER WAYS WHERE SYSTEM THAT ALLOWS FOR PRUDENT USE OF LAND - ALSO MANAGE BIRDS AND KOI CARP POTENTIAL WHERE THEY ARE CONTRIBUTING + WHERE FENCING IS PROBLEMATIC THE WATER QUALITY NEGATIVELY. PERHAPS A WATER TEST THE OPUATIA STREAM IS A MNDDY COULD BE THE DECIDER . MESS ON ANY DAY OF THE YEAR - ESTABLISH CONTROL OF BIRD MOST CERTAINLY CAUSED BY AND KOI CARP POPULATIONS THE CARP. WHERE APPLICABLE.

Provision	I support oppose and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below (delete as required)
3.11.3 POLICY 2 (A → E)	A COMPLETE NONSENSE	As an alternative I propose DEVELOP A SUB-CATCHMENT PLAN TO IDENTIFY EXACTLY WHERE THE PROBLEMS ARE COMING FROM.
3.11.3 POLICY 5 47	AMEND UNCERTAINTY	PROVIDE AN 80 YEAR MODEL TO BRING SOME REASSURANCE TO THE AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY
3.11.3 POLICY 6 7 (B)	AMEND DELETE THE EXCEPTION AS PROVIDED FOR IN POLICY 16 THIS SEEMS RACIALLY DIVISIVE.	- SAME RULE FOR ALL.
3.11:3 POLICY 9	SUPPORT	

I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend with the end of the end	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out
The reasons for this are: OPPOSE EXCEPTIONALLY SELECTIVE. ARE WE TESTING THE WATER OR NOT THIS SEEMS DIVISIVE AND RESENTFUL.	As an alternative I propose When would be an appropriate all trap in SAME PLAN FOR ALL.
OPPOSE THIS LOOKS LIKE A HUGE FUNDING BURDON.	
OPPOSE A NITROGEN REFERENCE POINT IS TOO THEORETICAL AS ADVISED BY THE CREATORS OF OVERSEER. - I WILL NEED A RESOURCE CONSENT TO FARM 44 Ha. (COST) - I HAVE TO CREATE A FARM	
	The reasons for this are: OPPOSE EXCEPTIONALLY SELECTIVE. ARE WE TESTING THE WATER OR NOT THIS SEEMS DIVISIVE AND RESENTEUL. OPPOSE THIS LOOKS LIKE A HUGE FUNDING BURDON. OPPOSE A NITROGEN REFERENCE POINT IS TOO THEORETICAL AS ADVISED BY THE CREATORS OF OVERSEER. I WILL NEED A RESOURCE CONSENT TO FARM 44 Ha. (COST)

Provision

SCHEDULE B N.R.P.

C 9 F

SCHEDULE B N.R.P.
TABLE 1
ANIMAL WEIGHTS

I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend

The reasons for this are:

- OVERSEER WAS NEVER DESIGNED

TO BE USED FOR THIS PURPOSE

USING THE YEARS 2014/2015 AND

2015/2016 HAS TURNED OUT TO

BE A HISTORICAL AMBUSH!

EXTREMELY CLANDESTINE ON THE

PART OF WAIKATO THE REGIONAL

COUNCIL.

OPPOSE,

FARM PERFORMANCE WILL BE
DEFAULTED TO NATIONAL AVERAGES.
W.R.C. PPI HAS DECIDED ALL
FARMERS FROM NOW ON NEED
ONLY TO BE AVERAGE!?

I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below (delete as required)

As an alternative I propose

the reliable file an egypte per file of the state of

- USE AN INDUSTRY APPROVED
- PERHAPS USING STOCK

 UNITS PER HECTARE UP

 TO A REALISTIC THRESHOLD

 WOULD BE A STARTING

 POINT.

Provision

I support oppose and for each whether or not you wish to amend

The reasons for this are:

SCHEDULE /

REQUIREMENTS FOR FARM ENVIRONMENT PLANS

A. 2 (a+b) ii

- NO ONE HAS BEEN ABLE TO DESCRIBE ALTERNATIVE MITIGATION MEASURES

- AND ALSO THERE HAS BEEN NO SUGGESTION ON HOW TO MEASURE

LAND SLOPE

3.11.6
TABLE 11-\$1

I WONDER WHY W.R.C. HAVE INSTRUCTED OUR MOST NOTABLE TESTING LABORATORY TO TELL ANY FARMERS WANTING TO TEST FARM WATER " THEY ARE WASTING THEIR TIME "

I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/amended as set out below intelests as required.

As an alternative I propose

What we deliber the appropriate and entrance

I DON'T KNOW HOW TO BUGGEST AN ALTERNATIVE TO SOME THING THAT DOESN'T EXIST.

Provision

SCHEDULE B N.R.P.

I support oppose and for each whether or not you wish to amend the foreign all

The reasons for this are:

HYPOTHETICALLY, IF MY DAIRY
FARMER NEIGHBOUR HAS A N.R.P.

OF 40 AND MY DRYSTOCK

NITROGEN REFERENCE POINT IS 10,

AND LOCKED AT THAT, HOW

DO I NOT BECOME RESENT FUL?

I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below in the required

As an alternative I propose

While colling on agreement and area of a

THERE SHOULD BE A

COMMON MEASURE FOR

EVERY SQUARE METRE OF

LAND - IT ALL

CONTRIBUTES TO OUR

WATER WAYS.

BACK GROUND AND EXPLANATION. THE WORD REFORESTATION

IS MENTIONED. RE CONSIDERABLE

AMOUNT OF LAND TO BE CHANGED.

DOES THIS IMPLY BACK TO NATIVE

FOREST AND NO INCOME POTENTIAL?

Provision

I support/ appose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend for the antequated)

The reasons for this are:

BACK GROUND AND EXPLANATION THE COLLABORATIVE STAKE HOLDERS GROUP WAS MADE
UP WITH A DISPROPORTIONATELY
LOW REPRESENTATION OF
AGRICULTURAL VOICES - ONLY
ONE FROM DRY STOCK FARMING.
SURELY THAT MUST BE
ABSURDLY UN DEMOCRATIC.

I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below (letets as required)

As an alternative I propose

When would be an appropriate absorbin

START AGAIN AND
DO IT PROPERLY.

Yours sincerely

TERRY WILLIAMSON

Signature

Date