

**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:** Jennifer Joy Templeton  
Ian Robert Templeton  
Farming as IR + JJ Templeton Partnership

**Phone (Hm):** 07 8787823

**Phone (Wk):** 07 8787823

**Postal Address:** 751 Ahoroa Rd, RD2, Tekuiti 3982.

**Phone (Cell):** No coverage!

**Postcode:** 3982

**Email:** jtempleton@xtra.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.** ✓

  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_ date 24-2-17  


## **Introduction**

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the WRC proposed plan change

Our names are Jenni and Ian Templeton and we farm at 751 Ahoroa rd. in the Rangitoto area of the King Country, priority one. One of our boundary's is the upper Waipa river but some of our catchment also flows into the Mangakewa River.

We have a sheep and beef breeding and finishing unit on 1000 hectares of rolling to steep hill country

The main part of the farm has been in the family for 50 years with neighbouring blocks being added along the way.

We consider ourselves guardians of this land until it passes to the next generation.

Our grandchildren will be 4<sup>th</sup> generation of our family to farm this land.

We do not buy in any feed but make hay and silage and have a small forestry block. Cropping involves 13 hectares of Lucerne which we established 2 years ago to offset the droughts we were getting, and some smaller crops of Pasja to fatten lambs.

We have a small QEII covenant and also privately conserve approx. 100 hectares of magnificent native forest on the steep gorge facing the Waipa River.

### Policy 1 - 3.11.3

We oppose section C of this policy for low intensity/low discharge farming activities on the basis that the impacts of exclusion (social, economic, cultural and environmental) outweigh the unproved (without scientific data) environmental benefits

Having farmed our farm for over 40 years we know how to manage this land. It is not in our best interest to stock any land, let alone steep hill country, so heavily that it pugs and the top soil is broken. This not only causes sediment run off but opens up the soil for weeds to germinate the following season.

For an example, we have some steep south facing slopes that are damp and shaded for most of the day and because of this, grow grass well through the summer, but in winter when we get a run of frosts, which is pretty common in the King Country, the ground will stay frozen all day. We stock accordingly, mostly sheep with only a light stocking rate for cattle to control grass length so we avoid thatching which stops the ground absorbing moisture. Farmers know their land and don't want their topsoil disappearing down the drain in heavy rain.

The regulations proposed are too restrictive and don't allow enough flexibility or acknowledge the farmers who have been actively farming in a way that protects from sediment, ecoli and nitrogen run off.

Section C needs to be amended to exclude low intensity farming, with any consequential amendments arising from the submission process.

Policy 2 /C—regarding Nitrogen reference points

We oppose this

The grand parenting aspect of overseer makes it an unfair process and not suitable for dry stock which it was never programmed for.

As an alternative I propose farm environment plans and stock ratios could be a more suitable measure of nutrient allocation, with any consequential amendments arising from the submission process

Policy 6 restricting land use change /Rule 3:11:5:7

We oppose this

If this policy becomes law then the value of our land is greatly affected.

The future generations who may want to farm /develop differently will not be able to.

We seek that it is deleted entirely

Rules ; Schedule C-Stock exclusion.

We oppose this for the following reasons

We farm 1000 hectares of rolling to steep hill country divided into 125 main paddocks. We already exclude stock from 100 hectares of native bush on steep slopes of the Waipa River. Because of the topography of our land the kilometres of waterways on our farm would be nearly impossible to fence and the cost of fencing all perennial waterways on hill country farms would be financially crippling. Our income barely increases enough to meet increasing costs, so there would be a severe financial effect if we were required to fence and provide water troughs. While we have a good water reticulation system providing water to most paddocks at present this would not be enough once all the new fences restricted stock movement so that would be another huge financial burden as well.

So much so that it would probably bankrupt us and selling the farm would not really be an option as who is going to want to buy it knowing they have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to comply.

As an alternative I propose that the National Water Accord Standards be applied instead with any consequential amendments arising from the submission process

ie. Streams 1 meter wide and 300 mls deep