

SubForm	PC1201 6	COVER SHEET	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
		Submission Number	
Entered		Initials	
File Ref		Sheet 1 of	

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.

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 Graham Harold Anderson		
Full address 27 Blakett Road Otorohanga 4394		
Email gwan@kinect.co.nz if - n@kinect.co.nz	Phone 078731875	Fax

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER		
Full name		
Address for service of person making submission		
Email	Phone	Fax

TRADE COMPETITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS <i>(select appropriate)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> I could / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I am / <input type="checkbox"/> am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that adversely affects the environment, and <u>de competition.</u>
(a)

- (b)
- (c) does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
- (d) Delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

I live and farm in sub catchment 43 Waipa at Pirongia Ngutiniui RD BR

I am a 4th generation farmer in New Zealand and my son and his children work on our Farm My great grandparents on both sides of my family emigrated to New Zealand in the 1800s and both of my grandfathers took up ballot blocks of virgin bush in the early 1900s when the King Country was opened up for settlement I have been farming for over 58 years and my wife and I are in our 50th year in our farming business of G H & D W Anderson. We currently farm at Kio Kio east of Otorohanga .We farm a 208 hectare dairy farm that we converted to dairying 20 years ago in 1996 from sheep and cattle and arable cropping growing maize for grain and silage and barley wheat and oats .Parts of the farm is quite steep and we have planted 5.5 hectares of forestry and have fenced over 4 hectares of native bush covenanted with the QE11 Trust and there is another 2 or 3 hectares of bush that is mainly surrounded by forestry , We have spent over \$200000 on building a 2600000 litre concrete effluent storage pond and associated pumps and stirrers and two sludge channels both 36 meters long 4.5 meters wide and 1,4 meters deep with weeping walls to catch the solids off the feed pad and the liquid drains into the pond We winter milk a herd calving in April and a spring herd calving in August We aim to milk 520 cows when the last cows calve in ealy October then dry off autumn calvers in February .We are in our second year of growing fodder beet on the milking platform to feed the winter milkers Where we grow the fodder beet the land is free draining and the herd is on the beet for two hours before milking in the afternoon .As each block is fed off we drill in greenfeed oats which rapidly grows and takes up nutrient and is harvested for silage in the spring .

In 1964 I in partnership with my father converted a small sheep farm on Ouwhero Road at Otorohanga and that was one of the first farms in the district that had a sump and a pump to aply the dairy effluent to the land .Otrer practises that we currently use is to spray liquified urea at half rates and add gibberellic acid and more grass can be grown with half the rate of urea .This practise should be trialled and documented as I am quite sure that spreading urea at 80 kgs a hectare results in losses as pasture cannot absorb that much in poor spring conditions .

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.)

Rule 3.11.3

I object to the following

Policy1

A

B

C

Policy 2

A

B

C

D

E

Policy3

Policy 4

Policy 5

Policy 6

Policy 7

Policy9

Policy10

Policy 11

Policy 12

Policy 13

Rule 3.11.5.1

This is a waste of good land at under 6 stock units a hectare.

Rule 3.11.5.2

This rule is far to restrictive. and unfair.

Rule 3,11.5.3

This rule is unfair and will give bureaucrats control over all farming enterprises which is unacceptable to most farmers and little progress will be made ..

Rule 3.11.5.4.

The nitrogen reference point is unfair and is a form of grand parenting future farming activities on all land .

Rule 3.11.5.5.

This rule is extremely short sighted in that as New Zealands population increases there will be presure on supply and surely the country must be able to supply adequate vegetables to the population .This rule restricts the area of vegetables that can be grown to the area grown at present ..

Rule 3.11.5.6.

Schedule A and B

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.

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

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

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

Signature



Date 01/03/2017

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.

**PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PLAN CHANGE 1
WAIKATO AND WAIPA CATCHMENTS
Submissions To The Waikato Regional Council**

This scheme as proposed is neither practical nor achievable. To have a vision to return the rivers to the state they were in 150 years ago is a great idea until the practicalities are taken into account.

Nitrogen

Firstly nitrogen as you are aware comes from many sources and the least source is from native bush so plainly the region is not going to regenerate into forest. The region has been farmed for well over 100 years and nitrogen leaching from livestock and crop farming is part of this. Low levels of nitrogen does not make water undrinkable or un-swim-able, the problem with nitrogen is that it induces water weed and algae to grow in slow moving or stagnant water. There has to be a balance between the amount of nitrogen leached and weed growth in the lower Waikato river. I maintain that it would be of immense benefit to the whole region economically to encourage agricultural production rather than restrict it and harvest the weed growth in the lower Waikato river for compost making or ensiled for stock feed. The technology is available and makes perfect sense to extract the nutrient in the water by harvesting the water plants. Businesses could be set up to harvest this vegetation and turn it into useful products.

Phosphorus

Phosphorus is not mobile through the soil and generally gets into streams with the erosion of topsoil during heavy rain events. All the soils in this region are phosphate deficient and need annual dressings of phosphate to enable farms to operate profitably. Phosphorus will only be a problem with extensive soil erosion which is not happening to any extent but can with extreme weather bombs and I can recall that Kakapuka mountain was scarred from top to bottom with slips in the 1958 flood, even although the top half was well covered with native bush.

Sediment, Clarity

We have some very muddy rivers and some very clear rivers. The Waipa is labeled as a dirty river but above Otorohanga it is generally clear. The problem comes from the tributaries from the south and west. The Mangapu, the Waitomo and the Moarakura which always carry heavy silt burdens after heavy rain and they do not seem to have improved since the extensive river bank fencing has taken place. I maintain that the muddy tributaries are muddy because they run through clay country and heavy rain will always flush out the fine clay and the same is seen of the Mangawara at Taupiri which is always brown with clay running into the Waikato river.

Ecol I

If ecoli from livestock discharges are such a problem all our farmers would be sick or worse. During milking and handling sheep and cattle farmers, their staff and children all seem to survive quite well. This and other pathogens are a barrier to swimming and this is where the council should be focusing their attention. Where are these pathogens coming from and how are they getting into the rivers. With dairy farm effluent rules and containment I doubt that any quantity of dairy farm effluent reaches streams. I maintain that the majority of pathogens entering the river are urban based from sewage and storm water discharges. Some of the highest readings in the Waikato are below sewage treatment outflows and other point source discharges in urban areas. Water sampling is and should be undertaken to identify point source discharges and steps should be taken now to curtail them and not wait for resource consents to expire.

Sound Science,

The river plan has to be underpinned with robust science not lofty unattainable goals. The council has stated the readings that they are aiming for in 80 years time but are they achievable without shutting down farming in the catchment? The levels of Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Clarity and Ecoli as set out could well be impossible to achieve and scientists and economists should have a vigorous debate on

whether they are attainable without destroying the regions economy .The first part of the plan is for 10 years ,What happens after that .If the rivers are still muddy during heavy rain and the nitrogen levels are climbing in 10 years time what is the next stage. The council have to have a road map of how they are going to achieve their goals The whole 80 year plan has to be presented to the ratepayers before it is implemented . . You cannot start something without a clear plan of how you are going to achieve an outcome .None of us will be here in 80 years time .If your response is "we can't see into the future" then you should not be attempting an 80 year project..

.More forestry will be a good solution on steep marginal land but the council has to give a guarantee that all steep blocks will be able to be harvested in the future No one wants to retire land from farming and spend money and time planting and pruning trees to be told 25 years later that the land cannot be harvested because of fear of erosion and debris .

Stream Fencing

The plan will restrict agricultural production and be extremely costly for a lot of farmers on hill country to fence off streams for very little gain when measured in the lower Waikato river .Farmers need guarantees that once they have fenced drains or streams that the council will not alter the regulations and demand wider margins ie 1 meter to 3 meters and then sometime in the future demand 5 meter margins

Bureaucracy.

There is far to much Bureaucracy with this plan 'Every farm has to have a plan and submit facts and figures to the council .A whole new department will be set up at a great cost and what will be the gain ? All facts will have to be checked by an army of managers when that expense could be far better spent out on the land fencing and stream margin planting .We do not want any more personnel employed at the Waikato Regional Council as it becomes a self serving organization and has grown rapidly over the last 30 years and this plan will increase costs for little gain .We are heading into a bureaucratic nightmare were farmers will be controlled by bureaucrats who will be telling farmers what they can and cannot do on their own land .We are rapidly approaching the European model where there is one bureaucrat overseeing agriculture to every farmer ,We don't want this and we don't need this and the council has to look very carefully at this plan and how they intend to implement it .Farmers in Britain and Europe get subsidies for all manner of environmental projects and if a scheme like this was thought up it would cost millions from central government to go towards implementing it but with this scheme you are expecting farmers to not only pay to comply but you are going to restrict what farmers may do with their own land and how they farm .

Graham Anderson
27 Blackett road
Otorohanga

