

# PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 WAIKATO AND WAIPĀ RIVER CATCHMENTS



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

Important: Save this PDF to your computer before answering.  
If you edit the original form from this webpage, your changes  
will not save. Please check or update your software to allow  
for editing. We recommend Acrobat Reader.

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

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

## 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	healthyivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz <i>Please Note: Submissions received by email must contain full contact details.</i>
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: René Alexander and Ereine Johanna Vos  
 Full address: 812 Te Ohaki Road RDI Huntly 3771  
 Email: raandejvos@extra.co.nz  
 Phone: 07 828 0194 Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

## ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER

Full name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address for service of person making submission: As above.  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

## TRADE COMPETITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS (select appropriate)

- I could /  could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
- I am /  am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
- (a) adversely effects the environment, and
  - (b) does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

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.  
 I do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.

JOINT SUBMISSIONS

- 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.  No, I have not attached extra sheets.

SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER

Signature:



Date:

07/03/2017

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.

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.

After having worked through the Dairy Industry, Rene having started in 1998 as a 16 year old farm cadet, and together as a married couple through management and sharemilking roles, we have just been able to purchase our own Dairy Farm. It is situated just north of Huntly and currently milks 210 cows on 134 ha, 100ha being the effective milking platform. It is listed in the Rangiriri subcatchment and listed as a Priority 2 area. We also run a separate 600 cow sharemilking job and in total employ 6 staff. Farming for us is more than a career, it is a passion and a lifestyle. For us, writing this submission, is something that is totally out of our comfort zone and something we know nothing about how to do. We feel though, that this issue is something that will greatly effect us, our family and staff, that we must have our say, even if it is not in the way that it is supposed to be said and is coloured by emotion.

We were able to purchase our farm due to it being run down and under managed and therefore performing below its potential at a cheaper price per hectare to comparable farms in the area. It is our intention to increase the production of this farm by using sustainable farm management practices that we have learnt over the years, and to tidy it up and make it environmentally sustainable. For example growing quality pasture through using top grass species, focusing on soil tests and using fertilizer in strategic doses concentrating on the smaller elements to focus animal health, using Nitrogen in small doses to keep grass growing continuously. Using our knowledge in breeding to develop our herd into efficient producers with lower health issues. We also plan to increase stocking rate to make effective use of the dairy platform and plant crops so we can ensure that our cows are fully fed over both the winter and summer seasons. Due to supplying Fonterra, we are compliant with having our waterways fenced off and we are hoping to as time goes on and we tidy up the farm as budgets allow, to plant out our swamp to create a wetland area and also plant our steeper sidelings.

We are concerned about PC1 and the issues that it raises and how it will effect our ability to be able to run our farm as we plan and the costs to us if we are unable to farm it as we planned at the time of our farm purchase. Some of these being:

- Grandparented N number and the effect the Nitrogen reference point will have on our business and economic wellbeing
- Use of Overseer as the modelling tool
- The Farm Environment Plan requirements leading to unnecessary and costly regulation of inputs, outputs, normal farming activity and business information

With the NRP being placed in 2014-15 or 2015-16 season for us is a concern due to the fact that we were not owners of the property at this time. We are concerned over whether farm information has been inputted correctly and whether the information will be 100% accurate as we are relying on what the previous owners to have inputted. Also due to the farm being under managed, this puts a cap on any further production increase from better management and stock. This will severely impact on our business as we have budgeted on our ability to better the farm when we purchased it and this reflects in the price

we have paid. The loss of income for us at a \$5 payout in the difference in potential is \$120,000 a year.

We are also concerned with the use of Overseer as a regulatory program and would oppose this idea. Overseer was created as a "management tool to assist farmers and adviser to examine nutrient use and movements within a farm to optimise production and environmental outcomes.. model calculates and *estimates* the nutrient flows in a productive farming system and identifies risk for environmental impacts through nutrient loss" taken from Fertiliser Association website [www.fertiliser.org.nz](http://www.fertiliser.org.nz). It is a modelling tool that has a +or - 30% error rate. It hasn't had all its latest tech changes peer reviewed and all possible climate, soil combinations tested as this is too expensive. This is not the best tool to be using to make a definitive decision as to accurate rates of leaching. Work needs to be done to create a better tool, with better scientific accuracy. Instead of using Overseer to create a 'must stick to' number, use it as a tool to create a workable plan with farmers, to highlight good and bad things, one that does not need a costly consent process. Is there a more practical way to test for leaching issues rather than using a computer program. Could water sampling be done at point of farm entry and point of exit to determine water quality and any issues? And if no issues are found, is it necessary to make people comply with a fixed N number which will restrict farming practices?

Under Rule 3.11.5.3 and 3.11.5.4 also concerned about FEP requirements and what this means for our stock. The ability to be able to grow crops to feed stock at crucial times through our season is massive. The amount of crops that we need to grow changes from season to season depending on weather, grass growth, and budgets. Being told the amount of land that you are able to crop, takes out any flexibility we have in our farming system and impacts on our ability to fully feed our cows. The inability of being able to crop ground on slopes >15 degrees is also a concern as this severely impacts on the amount land our farm has available for use. Would it be possible to look at if those areas are not dropping into a stream and likely to cause erosion that they would still be able to be worked up? Or maybe re-evaluate whether a greater degree slope could be used. We are also semi-opposed to keeping 5 meters from a waterway if cropping. If the waterway is constantly flowing like a stream or river this makes sense but if it is just a farm drain is it really necessary?

In conclusion, we agree that some things need to be changed to improve water quality, but should farmers be the ones to be immediately hit? Are cities and power companies being asked to help? Cities with effluent disposal and power companies with dams that hold up river flow. Nothing seems to be being said about how they are being held responsible for their contributions to the issue. Also the issue of pests affecting our waterways needs to be addressed for example Koi Carp, geese and ducks.

If PC1 goes through in its current form, between our farm that we own, and our sharemilking business, profits will fall due to not being able to expand our operation and costs that we will incur through PC1. We will have to in all

likelihood lay off 2 of our staff members which will remove \$100,000 from our local economy and leave 2 families without a home.