

**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: Hemi Wetere Rauputu

Phone (Hm): (07) 8778164

Postal Address: 2192 State Highway 3, RD1, Mahoenui 3978

Phone (Cell): 021892131

Email: hemirauputu@gmail.com

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 a similar submission I would consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing



08/03/2017

Signature

date



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

<p>State specifically what Objective, Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to.</p>		<p>The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:</p>
<p>Rule 3.11.5.2 Permitted Activity Rule – Other Farming Activities (stock exclusion, nitrogen reference point etc)</p>	<p>I oppose this provision. The reasons for this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would need to fence off 9km of creek/rivers. These costs would vary as some fences would require sheep fencing (8 wires) to be practical to run the current farming operation. This would be required for 1 km of fencing at a cost of \$22 per metre. Other fencing for cattle exclusion (one wire electric) would be required for the remaining 8km of fencing at a cost of \$6 Per metre. Total cost would be \$70,000 dollars. This would not be feasible in terms of current income versus costs to run the farming operation. • Weed control expenses would increase due to the stock not grazing to the water's edge. Our farm is susceptible to such noxious weeds as Gorse, Blackberry, Ragwort, Barberry and Thistles. Weed control expenses are currently already a very expensive on-farm cost. • Some of the paddocks on the farm are not connected to the water system (approximately one third or 150 hectares) and therefore rely on natural sources to water the stock. If this provision were to be implemented, we would need to supply water to a number of paddocks. Included 	<p>I seek that the provision is amended as set out below.</p> <p>As an alternative I propose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rule to exclude stock from rivers only (this would need to be closely defined.) This would be difficult, timely, and costly for farmers to fence off the rivers that run through their property; but manageable over time for many farms. If this was the only requirement (streams and creeks would be excluded as 'waterbodies' under this rule) then many farms would be able to make steps begin working towards this. • At Waipari Matuku Farm, we agree with the vision of having cleaner waterways. We have made significant steps to fence off the Awakino River over the years as well as other natural waterways on the farm. Waikato Regional Council should recognise those farmers who have already been doing the right thing environmentally rather than penalising them, and allow an increase in farm

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

	<p>in this would be new troughs and connections, piping, labour and machinery costs. This would cost \$500 per hectare for an approximate overall cost of \$75,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to fence off these areas, heavy machinery will need to be hired (digger/bulldozer) to set a solid foundation for fencing to occur in some places. Cost to hire a digger is approximately \$125 per hour. Rule 3.11.5.2, which states a setback distance of 3m would increase costs for this dramatically. • Time needed to implement this fencing would be extensive and that is time that would need to be acquired outside of normal duties that need to be performed on a day to day basis. Productivity and efficiency would decrease significantly. As a result of this, income would decrease which would make funding the requirements for this rule very difficult. • 3m setback for fencing would mean 6m on either side of water source that is no longer productive for stock grazing. This would result in a decreased stocking rate and therefore a decrease in income. • The introduction of a nitrogen reference point would make it difficult for this farm to diversify or grow as required to continue developing and improving our farm. We are a family owned farm, with a new generation coming through, and this rule would limit any changes or improvements which can be made in order to increase the 	<p>productivity and profitability, rather than preventing it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stock exclusion could be looked at on an individual basis, blanket rules for all farms irrespective of farm system and environmental risk does not seem feasible. • Waikato Regional Council could take a more community approach to issues and less regulation. There is no one size fits all approach to farming, and an environmental plan set out individually by the farm owner could instead be effects based, and submitted for approval by the council every 2 years. This way farms would be held accountable for constant improvement of their environmental impact, whilst working within their time and financial means. • I disagree with the introduction of a limiting nitrogen reference point, and instead suggest allocation is fair, equitable, and did not reward polluters.
--	---	--

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

	<p>income capacity of this land to support the growing financial needs of both a near-retirement couple and a growing young family.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each year we cultivate areas of old pasture with new grass to improve productivity. No cultivation on land >15 degree slope and no grazing on the same, would have huge implications to current farming management practices. Again, the ultimate result being financial loss.	
--	---	--

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

<p>Rule 3.11.5.7 Non-complying Activity Rule – Land Use Change</p>	<p>I oppose this provision. The reasons for this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have 400 acres of a 1000 acre farm which is relatively flat. This land is perfect for dairy farming, and we have plans to convert to dairy farming in the future. Seeking consent for the conversion through the recommended rule is likely to add time and cost to the process, which would be likely to prevent progress. • If the prices for sheep and beef plummet, we would be in a difficult position because this plan would mean we cannot easily convert to running a dairy operation, and also could not bring in any extra income by buying more stock due to the nitrogen fixing. We would be forced to lose money and risk ultimately going bankrupt. It would be more desirable if PC1 allowed freedom to change our farming systems rather than being locked in at current state 	<p>I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety</p> <p>Waikato Regional Council should maintain the land owners' freedom to change farming systems at will.</p> <p>For all of these provisions to be met, it would result in most of this farm and other farms current practices becoming unsustainable. It would result in many farms being sold and a likely resulting crash in the sheep and beef market. It would remove the freedom to increase profit and to farm to suit your lifestyle. We would be locked into a system of limited options and heavy penalties for not meeting requirements. Not to mention having to apply for council consent in order to perform new duties. How long would the turnaround time be for consent? If consent isn't granted then what are the alternatives? What would the legal ramifications be for not meeting requirements? How long will consent be granted? The amount of extra paperwork that would be required to perform these duties would take away from time needed to actually perform farm duties. E.g. consents, farm plans, sending information to council etc.</p>
---	--	---

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

Yours sincerely,

Hemi Rauputu



08/03/17

Signature

Date