

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 <i>Please Note: if you fax your submission, please post or deliver a copy to one of the above addresses</i>
Emailed to	healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz <i>Please Note: Submissions received my email must contain full contact details. We also request you send us a signed original by post or courier.</i>
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers
We need to receive your submission by 5pm, 8 March 2017.	

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS			
Full name Bolt Trust, King Country Partnership 2013 LP and Lone Pine Trust			
Full address 834 Barber Road, RD5, Otorohanga			
Email	jcmbolt@gmail.com	Phone	0274853773
		Fax	

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER			
Full name Jesse Bolt			
Address for service of person making submission 908 Barber Road, RD5, Otorohanga			
Email	jcmbolt@gmail.com	Phone	0274853773
		Fax	

THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 1 THAT MY SUBMISSION RELATES TO

*Please state the provision, map or page number e.g. Objective 4 or Rule 3.11.5.1
(continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)*

see below

I SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE ABOVE PROVISION/S

(select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)

- Support the above provisions
- Support the above provision with amendments
- Oppose the above provisions

MY SUBMISSION IS THAT

*Tell us the reasons why you support or oppose or wish to have the specific provisions amended.
(Please continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)*

I SEEK THE FOLLOWING DECISION BY COUNCIL

(select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)

- Accept the above provision
- Accept the above provision with amendments as outlined below
- Decline the above provision
- If not declined, then amend the above provision as outlined below

Amend as follows:

PLEASE INDICATE BY TICKING THE RELEVANT BOX WHETHER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION

I wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.

JOINT SUBMISSIONS

Yes joint submission!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! If others make a similar submission, please tick this box if you will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

IF YOU HAVE USED EXTRA SHEETS FOR THIS SUBMISSION PLEASE ATTACH THEM TO THIS FORM AND INDICATE BELOW

Yes, I have attached extra sheets.

SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

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

Signature jesse bolt

Date 8/3/17

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.

PLEASE CHECK that you have provided all of the information requested and if you are having trouble filling out this form, phone Waikato Regional Council on 0800 800 401 for help.

Additional sheet to assist in making a submission

Section number of the Plan Change	Support /Oppose	Submission	Decision sought
Please refer to title and page numbers used in the plan change document	Indicate whether you support or oppose the provision.	State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it.	State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.
	<p>Waterway Fencing:</p> <p>Oppose</p>	<p>To fence all waterways is basically impossible and impractical to maintain.</p> <p>There has been no credit given for example to Fonterra farms (and dairy farming in general) effort which has fenced off virtually all waterways over 1m wide and 500mm deep. We were led to believe that this was to be the request. To fence smaller waterways is impossible and impractical on most farms, dairy and drystock included</p>	<p>Leave as per Fonterra requirement: 1m wide and 500mm deep.</p> <p>Existing waterway fencing must be left where they are.</p> <p>Farmers who have taken action already must have this action recognised not be penalised by it.</p> <p>Different farming systems and types of farming must be treated differently.</p> <p>A blanket approach must not be used.</p>

	<p>Land Use Slope Restrictions; crops and grazing including crop grazing (summer and winter)</p> <p>Oppose.</p>	<p>A large percentage of farms could not exist in this form at all. We crop extensively on slopes above 15 degrees both summer and winter crops and this is a major source of feed for our stock as well as grazing steeper land greater than 30 degrees with permanent pastures on 3 of our dairy farms would be required to shut down these farms under these rules as well as many of our neighbours and friends around the district.</p> <p>The value of land would fall causing monetary chaos, farmers will go bankrupt, farm jobs will dramatically reduce and local towns will fall apart.</p> <p>Farming is one of the largest if not the largest contributors to New Zealand's GDP and a significant amount of that productivity comes from this region.</p> <p>We also provide a lot of food to the world. What happens with the farming industry in our region is far more far reaching than just cleaning up the river.</p>	<p>All present grazing land must be able to continue to be grazed with current stock classes grazed.</p> <p>Cropping must be able to continue as it now does in regards to sloping ground greater than 15 degrees and winter crops have to be able to be grazed directly by livestock.</p> <p>Grass buffers around crop areas continue to be used to control nutrient and sediment runoff; these could possibly be increased in size.</p> <p>Relate cultivation requirements directly and initially to those farms near waterbodies and prioritise them more closely to the risk of adverse effects, with clear definitions.</p> <p>Clearer definitions of slope.</p> <p>Take into account world requirements of our agricultural sector in the Waikato region.</p> <p>Farmers who have taken action already must have this action recognised not be penalised by it.</p> <p>Different farming systems and types of farming must be treated differently.</p> <p>A blanket approach must not be used</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Nitrogen and other leaching and land use changes.</p> <p>Oppose</p>	<p>Completely and selectively unfair and unjust. Potentially takes away peoples life work and savings at the stroke of a pen. Makes many farming ventures unworkable and cause changes far beyond the farm gate. Takes into account no history of farms and land management and scientific gains made for over 100 years and no consideration for what products overseas markets require from our farm land.</p> <p>Not allowing land use change unless it creates a reduction in N leaching is heavily restricting. The farming industries will not be able to improve their performance as new products, species and technologies are developed and invented as it will likely require a system change and ultimately a change of the land use.</p> <p>No real distinction on how different farming systems are actually different.</p> <p>We must be able to change land use.</p>	<p>Allow land use changes to remain unconsented and to happen.</p> <p>Farmers who have taken action already must have this action recognised not be penalised by it.</p> <p>Different farming systems and types of farming must be treated differently.</p> <p>A blanket approach must not be used</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Using Overseer as Regulatory Tool:</p> <p>Oppose</p>	<p>Overseer nutrient budgeting was never ever created to be a regulatory tool or based on a one year scenario. It was originally designed to be a 3-5 year rolling average model to help farmers manage and improve their environmental impact. The numbers out of overseer change when science is upgraded and overseer is upgraded thus making it impossible to set rules from!!</p> <p>Goat farming is not currently provided for on overseer nutrient budgets. There is no base reference point to start from.</p>	<p>Monitor Nitrogen leaching, sediment runoff, pathogens etc through overseer.</p> <p>Do not regulate or enforce rules based on overseer.</p> <p>N reference points must be adjusted with each new version of overseer, probably using the original data entry figures.</p> <p>Take into account that goat farming cannot even be modelled on Overseer at this stage so cannot be benchmarked and has no starting point and therefore no end goal.</p> <p>Farmers who have taken action already must have this action recognised not be penalised by it.</p> <p>A blanket approach must not be used</p>
	<p>Monitoring Catchments:</p> <p>Support with changes</p>	<p>This must be to aid and help to get things right but not to police enforce and prosecute and impose fines.</p>	<p>This must be to aid and help to get things right but not to police enforce and prosecute and impose fines.</p> <p>A blanket approach must not be used</p>
	<p>Town and Industry discharges</p>	<p>Must be treated as equal emitters/leachers to farming i.e. have no special rules and not just be allowed to continue as they currently do.</p>	<p>Reduce town and industry discharges in the same time frame as farming.</p> <p>All citizens must be treated equally.</p> <p>A blanket approach must not be used</p>
	<p>Length of Time for implement of changes</p>	<p>Timeframes are too short to allow financial integration.</p>	<p>All time frames should be extended by a minimum of 10 years.</p> <p>Ensure that appropriate alternative mitigations that will achieve any prescribed standard in the Plan Change are provided for specifically in regards to timeframes as science r&d takes time.</p> <p>A blanket approach must not be used</p>
	<p>Certified farm environment plans</p>	<p>Who will do them? How must they be qualified? Will there be enough people? Who will enforce these? Will there be penalties?</p>	<p>More clarification around these plans and the people doing them and the repercussions/ consequences of them.</p> <p>A blanket approach must not be used</p>

The proposal in its present form is completely over the top with unpractical and unnecessary in all aspects. It completely disregards 150 years of honest hard work and scientific input made in NZ Farming. It does not treat people equally and takes away generations of lives of work and savings and freedoms. If implemented it would cause massive inequity, loss of lifetimes of work and what created by these lifetimes of work loss of income; personal income; district income; provincial income; national income and have other repercussions far in excess of any national disaster ever experienced in NZ. It would very likely lead to mess, disruption nationally, from family level to government level; or possibly some form of civil war. We could not expect no suicides, mass repercussions to something that was taken away peoples lifes and generations of lifes works and basic freedoms.