

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	healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz <i>Please Note: Submissions received by email must contain full contact details.</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: Paul Coster

Full address: 869 Te Anga Road

Email: p.c.coster@xtra.co.nz

Phone: 078786530 Fax: _____

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER

Full name: Paul Coster

Address for service of person making submission: 869 Te Anga Road RD8 Te Kuiti

Email: p.c.coster@xtra.co.nz

Phone: 078786530 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:
- adversely effects the environment, and
 - 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.

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).

3.11.2 Objectiv e2
3.11.4.3
3.11.2 Objective 5(b)
Schedule B
Schedule C

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 support the above objective with following amendments

For the communities and economies to benefit recognition must be given to the contribution given by landowners. Landowners social, economic and cultural well being will be in a lot of cases severely disrupted by plan change one. As a landowner increases in production and profitability has become a way of life, something we have striven for, for the benefit of ourselves and our families.

A lot of anxiety and stress is being caused in rural communities regarding the uncertainty of what plan change one means for them. This we realise cannot be avoided to make changes which benefit water quality. For plan change one to be successful it needs the full support of rural communities. Without this support it is unlikely to be successful as landowners are likely to oppose every regulation or provision making the implementation impossible.

Objective 2 needs to give clear recognition on the support given by landowners and demonstrate the steps taken that acknowledge and alleviate their concerns and fears.

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
- Decline the above provision
- If not declined, then amend the above provision as outlined

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: PA Coster

Date: 28/22017

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: 3.11.4.3

Do you support or oppose the provision?

Support Oppose

Submission

State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it.

We support these provisions with admendments. We had intended to have a environmental plan done before plan change one was proposed. We fully support the need for environmental planning by qualified people.

Decision Sought

State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.

1)FEP needs to have its costs controlled by regional council .On previous experience the people that helped to make these rules then set themselves up as consultants and charge exorbitant fees. Costs should be limited to a set amount based on property size to prevent overcharging. Preferably it would be subsidized by regional council.
2) We live in the Waitomo Catchment which is a priority one sub-catchment.Each farm in the entire region that has work to be done should be given a priority number from one to five for each individual piece of work to be carried out,this would then enable the most important work to be carried out first over the entire region and on each individual farm. The reasons for this is that we believe there would be work to be done in priority 2&3 catchments that has more value than some of the work to be done in a priority one area such as the Waitomo catchment.

Section number of the Plan Change: 3.11.2 objective 5 (b)

Do you support or oppose the provision?

Support Oppose

Submission

State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it.

We oppose this objective because
1) It goes against the vision and strategy statement for plan change one that states "communities who,in turn are all responsible for restoring and protecting the health and well being of the Waikato river". For tangata whenua wanting to opt out is just hypocrisy at its best.
2)Tangata whenua ancestral lands have had many impediments to development. There are also many "ancestral" farming properties which have had many impediments to development. There are many farms that have been owned by the same family for over 100 years, now being managed by the 5th generation of the original owners,the definition of "ancestral lands" would undoubtedly apply to these properties.
3)For tangata whenua wanting to opt out of plan change one demonstrates that even to them who apparently value rivers so highly as a "treasure" the treasure of financial gain is a held to be more important. This thinking will make it difficult for plan change one to work as rules need to be set so everyone is treated as equal.

Decision Sought

State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.

Affected parties should be able to have the ability to gain consent by the same process as everyone else,then we are all equally responsible for the health and well being of the Waikato river.

ADDITIONAL SHEET TO ASSIST IN MAKING A SUBMISSION

Section number of the Plan Change: Schedule B Nitrogen Reference Point

Do you support or oppose the provision?

Support Oppose

Submission

State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it.

I oppose NRP calculations and any consequential amendments arising from this point as the use of this schedule would negatively affect the profitability of our farm business dramatically because:

In 2014 we purchased 441 ha (320ha effective) in Waitomo having previously spending 24 years farming in Taumarunui .I have tertiary qualifications from Massey University in agriculture. In 2002 we won the National Banks King Country Farmer of the year competition. I believe I through experience and knowledge gained I have an above average ability to return farm profits.

The farm we purchased had previously been leased for 9 years and as a result of that and other circumstances was poorly fenced,had a poor fertiliser history and most importantly had poor pasture composition. Currently it is carrying 10.3su per ha. Our previous farm which was steeper with a similar soil type was according to data from King Country Farmer of year competition carrying 12.3 su per ha. We believe we can develop this farm to carry another 300 su. This

Decision Sought

State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.

Nitrogen loss should be determined through the use of land use capability maps to calculate nitrogen loss and not grand parenting. The current proposal rewards higher polluters and disadvantages people such as ourselves and other people with lower levels of nitrogen loss. Hawkes Bay region council have taken a LUC approach so why not Waikato regional council?

Section number of the Plan Change: Schedule C- Stock exclusion

Do you support or oppose the provision?

Support Oppose

Submission

State in summary the nature of your submission and the reasons for it.

We do not support stock exclusion as per schedule c.
 1) We have some paddocks which are only grazed by cattle(beef cows) for a period of 3-5 days once per winter. These paddocks have trough water. Is it necessary to have these small water bodies fenced. Beef cattle obtain most if not all their water requirements from pasture over the winter. Cattle do not enter these water bodies. What gain in terms of water quality would be achieved by fencing these water bodies? We believe very little or no gain would be achieved.

2) We observe cattle on other farms that have full access year round from flat land into large water bodies. This as part of the farming profession is embarrassing. We fully support plan change one with regards to this.

Decision Sought

State clearly the decision and/or suggested changes you want Council to make on the provision.

- 1)Cost benefit studies should be done to determine where the most benefit by fencing of waterways is obtained.
- 2)As already mentioned in FEP submission. Priority should be given to areas where the most benefit is to be obtained.
- 3) A more science based approach is needed to stock exclusion