

**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:** Nathan John Wright

**Phone (Hm):** ~~027343451~~

**Phone (Wk):**

**Postal Address:**  
455 Stannard Rd Rd1 Tekauwhata

**Phone (Cell):** 0273434551

**Postcode:** 3781

**Email:** natewright@windowslive.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.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

6/03/2017  
\_\_\_\_\_  
date



## Introduction

I have been born and raised on a hill country farm up the Matahuru valley. Now at the age of 25 I am the third generation, in our family's hill country farming business. My entire career I have planned on farming in our family business and investing in hill country farming. I studied Agri-Commerce at Massey university, and have worked in various farming enterprises, in order to give myself the best platform of knowledge going forward.

I am a huge supporter of healthy rivers, and believe strongly in what is trying to be achieved. However, I am very much concerned with the blanket approach that is being used to reach these targets. It seems that low N emitting hill country dry stock farmers are being painted with the same brush as high N emitting dairy farmers. This means that rules which are quite achievable for lowland dairy farmers may be completely unfeasible and impractical for hill country farmers, and the cost of compliance will likely outweigh the potential improvements.

"The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to and the decisions it seeks from Council are as detailed in the following table. The outcomes sought and the wording used is as a suggestion only, where a suggestion is proposed it is with the intention of 'or words to that effect'. The outcomes sought may require consequential changes to the plan, including Objectives, Policies, or other rules, or restructuring of the Plan, or parts thereof, to give effect to the relief sought".

<p><b>Objective 1 and 3</b> Short-term improvements in water quality in the first stage of restoration and protection of water quality for each sub-catchment and Freshwater Management</p>	<p><b>I oppose</b></p> <p>The reasons for this are:</p> <p>The plan sets an interim goal of 10 years which should be sufficient to achieve 10% of the water quality goal. This leaves a lack of certainty, to all the stakeholders involved, of the rules beyond 10 years. This is of great concern to me for two reasons. 1) There is no guarantee that we will be allowed to farm in the hill country in the future. 2) and how can the huge capital investments required, in order to become compliant, be economical with such an uncertain hill country farming future.</p>	<p><b>Withdraw and Reconsult</b></p> <p>Certainty needs to be provided by the WRC, considering the huge compliance costs. Also to provide reassurance to upcoming generations that hill country farming has a viable future.</p>
<p><b>Policy 6:</b> Restricting land use change</p>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b>, it makes sense that some areas of the Waikato require restrictions, however land use change required in order to meet the increasing food demand which is the result of increasing population. Underutilised, Underdeveloped land will also be at a disadvantage</p>	<p><b>Withdraw</b></p> <p>Allowance needs to be made for underutilised and underdeveloped land.</p>
<p><b>Rule 3.11.5.1</b> - Permitted Activity Rule – Small and Low Intensity farming activities</p>	<p><b>Oppose:</b></p> <p>The blanket requirement for stock to be excluded from waterways is by no means always practical in the hill country. The stocking rate threshold is too low.</p>	<p><b>Amended as set out below</b></p> <p>I seek that the stocking rate in clause 5 is <b>modified to 18 stock</b> units per hectare</p>
<p><b>Schedule B:</b> Nitrogen reference point</p>	<p><b>OPPOSE:</b> The use of an inaccurate management tool such as overseer, will reward high N emitters, while disadvantaging low emitters, by potentially reducing their land values and removing seasonal flexibility. (ie their ability to farm more stock in good growing seasons. Or</p>	<p><b>Withdraw.</b></p> <p>A sub catchment approach, where farmers are educated as to the best management practices to reduce N loss would be more appropriate. These practices could also be included in the FEP, which could also be audited.</p>

	the ability to use N fertiliser and run more stock when cattle prices are up).	
<b>Schedule 1</b> Requirements for a farm environment plan (2 (a) (ii))	<b>Oppose.</b> Fencing off slopes up to 25 degrees I believe, will do more harm than good. The earthworks required to fence off these streams and the stock tracking along fence lines will increase the sediment load into the streams. Also the huge economic cost of fencing off these hill country farms will leave many hill country farmers bankrupt.	<b>amended as set out below</b> 25 degrees needs to be changed to the nationally recommended standard of 15 degrees
<b>3.11.4.3</b> Farm environment plans	<b>Support</b> FEP are a very good way to get all farmers on board in reducing the environmental impacts of farming and optimising on farm practices. It will also allow farmers to identify critical source areas and to identify and implement mitigation strategy's for these areas. However, these FEPs need to be kept simple practical and useable for the average farmer.	
3.11.4.4 Lakes and Whangamarino wetlands	<b>Support</b> This cannot be achieved without dealing to the issue of pest fish. KOI CARP.	A plan to Eradicate or control Koi carp needs to be included if the sediment targets are to be met.

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

Yours sincerely  
**NATHAN JOHN WRIGHT**

Print Name:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Nathan John Wright', written over a horizontal line.

Signature

6 / 03 / 2017

Date