

Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

Submission form on publicly notified – Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

SubForm	PC12016	COVER SHEET	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
		Submission Number	
Entered		Initials	
File Ref		Sheet 1 of	

FORM 5 Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS CAN BE	
Mailed to	Chief Executive, 401 Grey Street, Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240
Delivered to	Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East, Hamilton
Faxed to	(07) 859 0998 Please Note: if you fax your submission, please post or deliver a copy also
Emailed to	healthyivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz Please Note: Submissions received my email must contain full contact details. We also request you send us a signed original by post or courier.
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyivers
We need to receive your submission by 5pm, 8 March 2017.	

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS		
Full name: Michael McGehan		
Full address 369A Marshmeadow Rd, RD 6, Newstead		
Email thedukenz@gmail.com	Phone 0272467633	Fax

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER		
Full name As above		
Address for service of person making submission		
Email	Phone	Fax

PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION
Yes I wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.
<input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

SIGNATURE

OF

SUBMITTER

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Signature

Date 8/3/2017

Personal information is used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public. All information collected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

SUBMISSION POINTS: General comments

Myself and wife Charys own a 13ha block at Newstead, as well as lease 6ha at Morrinsville and 45ha at Te Hoe which we run dairy heifers on that we have reared over the last 5 years, by day I am a rural bank manager with coming up 10 years' experience while Charys is a stay at home mum to our 2 children (3yrs and 1yr). I was brought up in Auckland city with my mother's side of the family instilling a rural affinity in me from a young age.

Due to land and capital constraints, we have leased blocks and run these intensively with reasonable rates of Nitrogen and bought in feed used in order to get ahead, we have improved the blocks we have leased with new pastures and fertiliser and see ourselves as good farmers, likewise the people we have leased off.

We are currently looking to purchase our first farm at the age of 34 and with 2 children as a result of over 5 years of hard work rearing calves and leasing land to get ahead. We have 380 cows to calve for 1/6/17 of which we will look to sell approximately half if we find a farm suitable for circa 200 cows to calve, at present due to family and other work commitments we are looking in the Waikato/Waipā river catchments which is now the subject of PC 1.

We have also recently branched out into the Wagyu beef cattle breed as well as bee hives, both of which have significant future potential for our business.

Given that we are looking to purchase our first farm at the age of 34 with essentially no family help I consider what we have achieved to date as being the result of a lot of hard work along with some good business decisions along the way.

It concerns me that with the stroke of a pen, council may potentially be able to wipe significant value off an asset that we have built up and financially pushed the limits on in order to get ahead and provide a good way of life for our family.

It concerns me that there has been a moratorium on dairy conversions in the catchment for a minimum 10yr period, given that I have an Applied Science degree in Agriculture and Agribusiness from a respected NZ university, as well as being a Kellogg Rural Scholar, I would like to think that I am educated enough to know that a research and evidenced based approach to anything should be paramount.

It concerns me that some of the methodology and proposed restrictions of PC1 including the swim ability targets, in particular the issue around nitrogen as a contaminant have been significantly over looked, specifically;

- i) The blanket approach to all 4 contaminants under PC1 versus a targeted approach for specific waterways/catchments, e.g. where the Mangawara stream feeds the Waikato river at Taupiri, the major contaminant there is not N
- ii) Application of a Nitrogen reference point through the use of Overseer
- iii) The restrictions proposed through what is effectively "grand parenting" for farmers to choose either 2015/16 or 2014/15, as well as the restrictive nature of this when it comes to properties being sold
- iv) Unfair application of rules from iii) above compared to vegetable cropping which can use a 10yr period
- v) The non-existence of a level playing field when it comes to discharges, e.g. councils who are able to discharge as part of their consent (overflows in sewerage)

It concerns me that there has been significant progress made over the years by farmers in order to make the environment in which they operate better (e.g. fencing water ways, effluent storage).

Finally, it is a major concern of mine that the financial implications of PC1 have not been thought through fully and accurately and that the impact of PC1 will be far more significant than what is being proposed, to this I would ask, who pays the rates in our communities and do you think these rates will be able to be even maintained let alone increased to fund the Waikato as a great place to live in the future?

I fully support the notion of making our environment (including but not limited to rivers) more sustainable, both from a holistic point of view but also from the point of view as a proud New Zealander.

I have travelled extensively around the globe, as well as worked on farms in a number of countries in my travels and have seen first hand that in New Zealand we are at the cutting edge of technology, systems and expertise in terms of the way we farm and want the best for NZ Inc.

I am in support of the submission that has been lodged by Federated Farmers, as an aside to my own issues above, I also support the following aspects of Plan Change 1:

- The significant negative effect on rural communities
- The cost and practicality of the rules.
- The effect that the Nitrogen Reference Point will have on my business and my economic wellbeing.
- The Farm Environment plan requirements leading to unnecessary and costly regulation of inputs, outputs, normal farming activity and business information
- The costs and practicality of the rules and requirements for stock exclusion, the Nitrogen Reference Point and the Farm Environment Plan.
- The timeframes for complying with the Nitrogen Reference Point rules which are too short and unachievable
- The plan significantly exceeding the 10 year targets in many attributes and areas
- The lack of science and monitoring at the sub catchments level

I wish to be heard at the Hearing.

Yours sincerely,

Michael McGehan

SUBMISSION POINTS: Specific comments

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy, or Rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought Say what changes to Plan Change 1 you would like	Give Reasons
40	Rule 3.11.5.2 Permitted Activity Rule – Other farming activities			
41	Rule 3.11.5.3 Permitted Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan under a Certified Industry Scheme	OPPOSE	Amend 3.11.5.3 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	This proposal will impose significant costs on my farming activities, the dates are extremely restrictive, I don't believe the N reference point methodology and also its subsequent effect on the specific environment in this location in terms of river swim ability.
42	Rule 3.11.5.4 Controlled Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment	OPPOSE	Amend 3.11.5.4 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy, or Rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought Say what changes to Plan Change 1 you would like	Give Reasons
	Plan not under a Certified Industry Scheme			
44	Rule 3.11.5.5 Controlled Activity Rule – Existing commercial vegetable production			
45	Rule 3.11.5.7 Non-Complying Activity Rule – Land Use Change	OPPOSE	Amend 3.11.5.7 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	I would like to convert a property to dairy farming and believe I could do so with a positive impact on the environment so I should not be restricted from doing so.
46	Schedule A: Registration with Waikato Regional Council			
47	Schedule B: Nitrogen Reference point	OPPOSE	Amend Schedule B as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	This proposal will significantly reduce the ability of my business to continue in its existing state as well as grow due to the limitations on N use under the Overseer model, I believe I am an efficient farmer and to have the Overseer model blanket applied does not take into

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy, or Rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought Say what changes to Plan Change 1 you would like	Give Reasons
				account the variability in just how good some farmers are compared to others.
50	Schedule C: Stock Exclusion	OPPOSE	Amend Schedule C as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	I am also concerned that this has not been fully thought through for those on steeper country of which we may be a future land owner.
51	Schedule 1: Requirements for Farm Environment Plans	OPPOSE	Amend Schedule 1 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	I do not think the plan requirements are workable, eg setbacks and fencing.