

Thank you for the opportunity to present my submission on the Waikato Regional Councils proposed Plan Change 1.

My name is Kerry Bryant. My husband and I have owned our farm in Arohena in the Otorohanga District Council area for almost 26 years. I have lived all my life on farms. Both sides of my family have been farmers for many generations. I am married to a farmer who also has many generations of farming in his family – farming is well and truly in our blood. I was brought up with the ethos of trying to leave the environment in a better state than when we arrived and have tried to instil this into our children also. Over the years that we have owned our farm, we have planted trees and erected new fences and change fence lines to restrict stock access or reduce stock movement to elevate possible erosion. We farm stock classes to suit the land. Two of our children aspire to be farm owners in the future. We have no desire to leave them a rundown, erosion prone, polluted farm. I believe most drystock farmers are farmers because they love the land. If this were not the case then, for the vast majority, they would not be farming as in most cases the financial return on the capital investment is very poor and they would be far better off investing their time and energy elsewhere. It makes me incredibly sad that we are now at a point where my husband recommends to our children that they seriously reconsider their aspirations of farm ownership due to the interventions such as these. You cannot imagine how distressing it is to me to think we may be the last generation in our families to be farmers.

I support the plan in principle - To have a pristine environment with crystal clear waterways would be a truly great outcome, but I have serious concerns:

- I have doubts about the science in Plan Change 1 around how to reach the desirable outcomes of obtaining drinkable and swimmable water— just one example is that the Mangatautari Ecological Island Reserve has no animals in the waterways yet the water is undrinkable due to e-coli. However a recent newspaper article stated “Waitomo and Otorohanga Districts are one of the few regions that do not have any streams, rivers or lakes on the list of waterways that are unsafe to swim in” yet this is a region that is largely farmed. How can the council encroach on private property use if that property has no current detrimental effect on the environment? Under Plan Change 1 it is unlikely we will make any difference to water clarity yet there will be a big economic effect on our operation. I feel that no one sector of our society should be singled out and made to pay such a cost irrespective of whether or not they have contributed the problem. I assure

you, it is not I who is dumping litter on the roadside that would eventually end up in the waterways if farmers like us did not pick it up.

Is the outcome of "Drinkable and Swimmable water" even able to be achieved? I, for one, would not want to be drinking water that other people have been swimming in.

- Another concern I have is in relation to consultation. Initially I didn't feel that there was adequate consultation from the Waikato Regional Council. Time and money has been put into this since we first put in our submissions. We attended a day held in Hamilton towards the end of last year. This day was scheduled for the same day that Beef & Lamb NZ had already arranged and advertised workshops to help us prepare our submissions for this hearing. While several emails were sent to us about this day, only one of the earlier ones gave the venue and even then it was in an attachment and not in the body of the email. We were asked to submit questions prior to the day so that they could be answered on the day. Ours were not addressed at this time and other parties in attendance said theirs were not addressed either. On one occasion, when an attendee asked a question, the panel member asked a question back in a way to subtly belittle the attendee. This was not productive to open dialogue. There have been an overwhelming number of emails since this meeting some with attachments over 100 pages long. I feel that many of these tactics, whether intentional or not, have had the effect of getting stakeholders to disengage.
- I didn't feel I was able to fully complete my submission due to not knowing how the proposed changes will be applied. How can we fully address our concerns with Plan Change 1 when we are not fully informed on how they will be implemented?
- I have serious concerns about putting time, energy and finances into PC1 when I don't know what will be in Plan Change 2 and if what we do now will need to be redone under subsequent Plan Changes.
 - If we plant trees, will we be able to harvest them and replant in the future? Some foresight is required.
 - What will be the flow on effects from putting PC1 into action? For example: the waterways that are fenced under PC1 will see weed growth in the near future. How is this to be handled? Will the use of herbicides be allowed given that the herbicide could likely end up in the waterways? Or will the vegetation be left

uncontrolled leading to the spread of noxious weeds and development of habitats for pests that are dangerous to our native birds and spread diseases that are harmful to the agriculture industry and ultimately the NZ economy?

The perceived environmental “wants” – not “needs” are being put in place, not only above, but at the detriment of economics and ultimately food supply.

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:	
	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	REASON
<p>3.11.5.2</p> <p>Nitrogen leaching grandparented to highest annual loss rate calculated for either the 2014/15 or 2015/16 and must be no greater than 15kg/n/ha/yr</p> <p>And any relevant standards</p>	<p>I oppose this rule.</p>	<p>Land use should be based on its potential not it's current or historical use.</p> <p>Grandparenting Nitrogen leaching levels penalizing those that have been proactive in the past and have introduced farm management procedures (reduced stock numbers) to cater for adverse weather and environmental conditions over the past couple of years.</p> <p>Going forward, this will limit our ability to adequately manage our farm business to allow good feed growth periods.</p>
<p>3.11.5.7</p> <p>Changes in land use from woody vegetation to farming, or from Drystock to Dairy, or arable cropping to dairy, require resource consent.</p>	<p>I oppose this rule.</p>	<p>This is limiting the ability of farmers to adjust to the markets, affecting their ability to manage their business in the most productive manner.</p>
<p>Policy direction is that these applications will generally be declined with the exception of Maori owned land.</p>		<p>I am lead to believe that the Waikato Regional Council Healthy Rivers Wai Ora – Proposed Plan Change has come about due to Te Treaty o Waitangi. As such I cannot see why Tangata Whenua and Tauwi should be treated differently – surely we should all be working towards the same goals. I consider this a form of racism – discrimination based on ethnicity.</p> <p>Furthermore, I feel that everybody should take responsibility irrespective of ethnicity, nationality or occupation or whether we live in a rural or urban setting.</p>