

# 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	
<b>FOR OFFICE USE ONLY</b>			
		Submission Number	
Entered		Initials	
File Ref		Sheet 1 of	

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

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

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS		
Full name	David Wayne Leslie	
Full address	150 Jay Road, Reporoa 3083	
Email	ddles@farmside.co.nz	Phone 07 3338047
		Fax

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER		
Full name	David Wayne Leslie	
Address for service of person making submission	150 Jay Road, Reporoa 3083	
Email	ddles@farmside.co.nz	Phone 07 3338047
		Fax

PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION	
<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 David Leslie



Date 7-3-2017

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**

I own a Dairy Farm along with my wife. My son and daughter-in-law are 50/50 share milkers. The farm is 180ha with 500 cows milking. We have a runoff of 85ha grazing 18 kms away where replacement stock are grazed and cows wintered for 6-8 weeks.

We run at peak 2.78 cows/ha. All streams and waterways have been fenced off as we have bought land. The original farm had waterways fenced off by my father in the 1950s.

We have one application a year of nitrogen in the spring, 25 units of N. No crops are grown on the milking platform.

In the future, I plan to remove some pine tree shelter belts on the runoff where some are 4 rows wide. Would this be regarded as a land use charge. Also the runoff is lightly stocked for most of the year, will I be able to utilize all the extra grass by grazing extra dry stock.

I am concerned about the following issues with PC.1. Grand parenting of Nitrogen discharge. We use very little nitrogen. Have no problem with high users dropping to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. But in future if it became a percentage for all then we would but very restricted. High users of nitrogen who have been responsible for some of the current problem would have more room to reduce than those who have been more retrained.

I support the submission that has been lodged by Federated Farmers. I am particularly concerned about 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 am concerned about the implications all of this will have for my property and for my current activity as described above. I set out my concerns more specifically in the table below.

**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	<b>OPPOSE</b>	Amend 3.11.5.3 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	This proposal will impose costs on my farming activities. [

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
42	<b>Rule 3.11.5.4</b> Controlled Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan not under a Certified Industry Scheme	<b>OPPOSE</b>	Amend 3.11.5.4 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	This proposal will impose significant costs on my farming activities
44	<b>Rule 3.11.5.5</b> Controlled Activity Rule – Existing commercial vegetable production			
45	<b>Rule 3.11.5.7</b> Non-Complying Activity Rule – Land Use Change	<b>OPPOSE</b>	Amend 3.11.5.7 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	<p>This proposal will impose significant costs on my farming activities. It maybe that when taking out shelter belts that are not in right place I will be forced to replace them.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this is not practical. What do I do with the land where these shelter belts were</p>
46	<b>Schedule A:</b> Registration with Waikato Regional Council			

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
47	<b>Schedule B:</b> Nitrogen Reference point	<b>OPPOSE</b>	Amend Schedule B as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	<p>We have half of our farm irrigated by bore water. Because of this we are regarded as having a higher nitrogen leaching than if we did not irrigate. We dispute this.</p> <p>(1) We irrigate depending on the rainfall. Less rain more irrigation, more rain less irrigation which we track via a Spread sheet. Our irrigation is monitored on actual figures, but rainfall is taken as a yearly average for the district by the WRC for the purpose of calculating nitrogen leaching.</p> <p>This is wrong. In a wet year we use less irrigation water therefore the WRC calculates that we leach less Nitrogen even though the combined water from rain and irrigation is more. Conversely in a dry year when we use more irrigation water, it is assumed that we are leaching more nitrogen even though the combined rainfall and irrigation is less than in a wet year. Rainfall should be on actual amount. We have a weather station two kilometres away which we could use.</p> <p>(2) We contend that irrigation leads to less nitrogen leaching. Because the grass under irrigation grows continuously using nitrogen all the time, when autumn rains come there is less nitrogen in the soil to be leached.</p> <p>We are been given a false leaching level based on incorrect assumptions and calculations.</p>

<b>Page No</b>	<b>Reference</b> (e.g. Policy, or Rule number)	<b>Support or Oppose</b>	<b>Decision sought</b> <b>Say what changes to Plan Change 1 you would like</b>	<b>Give Reasons</b>
50	<b>Schedule C:</b> Stock Exclusion		Amend Schedule C as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	
51	<b>Schedule 1:</b> Requirements for Farm Environment Plans	<b>OPPOSE</b>	Amend Schedule 1 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	