Submission Form

Submission on a publically notified proposed Regional Plan prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991.

- On: The Waikato Regional Councils proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 -Waikato and Waipa River Catchments
- To: Waikato Regional Council 401 Grey Street Hamilton East Private bag 3038 Waikato Mail Center HAMILTON 3240

Full Name(s): Brendan Denize

Phone (hm): 078778349

Phone (wk): 078778349

Postal Address: 1317 Mangaotaki Road RD1 Piopio

Phone (cell): 0275555462

Postcode: 3971

Email: brendandenize@farmside.co.nz

I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of the submission but the proposed plan has a direct impact on my ability to farm. If changes sought in the plan are adopted they may impact on others but I am not in direct trade competition with them.

I do not wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Hand

Signature

07/03/2016____ date

Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Waikato Regional Councils proposed Plan Change 1.

I am farming a low intensity sheep and beef farm in the Mokau catchment.

The farm has been owned by our family since 1941. I am 3rd Generation.

In my time of farming this property I have under taken many incentives to mitigate the farms environmental footprint. This includes fencing off many waterways, establishing lakes and wetlands with stock exclusion, riparian plantings.

Retiring land to bush regeneration. planting of pine blocks for soil conservation and planting of popular poles.

I am in regular contact with my Waikato Regional Land Management Officer (Adrian Jepson) and consider his help and support a critical part of my farming operation.

I do all these things because I am motivated to improve and provide a better future for my children. All motivation is lost when I am complied to do it

The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to and the decisions it seeks from Council are as detailed in the following table. The outcomes sought and the wording used is as a suggestion only, where a suggestion is proposed it is with the intention of 'or words to that effect'. The outcomes sought may require consequential changes to the plan, including Objectives, Policies, or other rules, or restructuring of the Plan, or parts thereof, to give effect to the relief sought.

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
	SUPPORT / OPPOSE	REASON	RELIEF SOUGHT
Objective 2	I support with amendments	 The reasons for this are: Objective 2 carries the same weight of importance as objectives 1 and 3. However this plan lacks targets, to measure the "social economic and cultural well being of the communities. The tangible targets of other objectives (specifically objective 3) will come at the peril of objective 2. For extensive hill country farming. The cost to comply with this plan it its current form will directly impact our ability to employ staff and grow our business and contribute to our communities. 	 That the intent of objective 2 is retained. Strengthen this objective to have measurable targets. Procedures put in place to protect the Waikato Waipa communities should it be found that meeting water quality targets is having a negative impact on economic resilience, and small town/rural communities Costs of implantation of plan cannot fall solely on the farms directly but shared with the greater Waikato (As an alternative I propose Remove the blanket approach to fencing of waterways.

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:	
Objective 3.11.5.4	Oppose	The reasons for this are:	Remove in its entirety	
		 In ref to NRP; simply rewards bad practices and punishes good practices. Overseer is not the correct tool, has way too many margins of error and encourages "fudging the numbers". Creates animosity between neighbours with different NRP. Has an unfair dramatic effect on property values which is only related to what a farmer was doing in 15/16 and NOT based on farm potential. E.g. low intensity farm surrounded by cropping farms will be forever low valued because of past NRP. That's stupid Caps low performing small footprint farms to grow business and change to meet the market opportunities. Not being able to adapt to opportunities and threats is a recipe for financial ruin. The years chosen to determine NRP are a complete lottery based on the farming operation in those years. Drought, developing, selling capital stock, restructuring are all every year examples that happen on farms. 	 remove NRP requirement for individual farms Replace with NRP based on best practice farming relative to the farming enterprise. e.g. sheep and beef farm can change to dairy grazing and be allocated a different NRP based on NRP specific to dairy grazing (that falls within best practice and relative to that area) if a NRP is to be implemented than it must be catchment specific and take into account rainfall and topography and stocking rate and farming type. Not simply a NRP based on what an individual farm was leaching in 2015/16 	

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
Objective 3.11.5 schedule C	oppose	 The reasons for this are: The definition of a water body for which stock must be excluded is unachievable. I support meaningful water bodies being excluded from intensive farming (over 18 S/Units). Flowing lakes, streams, and rivers I Support I have numerous drains swamps, non flowing ponds on farm. It is practically impossible to fence these off as suggested under the plans definition of a water body. Although cattle can enter these drains, they are so lightly stocked (less than 5 S/U per Ha) the impact on water quality is negligible The cost to comply will be crippling \$450,000+ with no measurable water quality improvement 	Undertake a catchment by catchment approach which takes into topography, rainfall and farming practice and amend definition to suit. Eg. Low lying easy contour dairy farming = all water bodies stock exempt Hill country less than 18 S/U farming, large % of land over 25 degrees = all rivers, and streams greater than 1 meter in width, drains, small water bodies exempt

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
Objective 3.11 Schedule 1	Support with amendments	 The reasons for this are: An environment plan that is catchment focused, helps identify water quality issues that are specific to that catchment. This provides a benchmark for framers to collectively focus their efforts to water quality issues. As an example, our catchment has been identified as having sediment issues but no nitrogen or phosphorus. Why would we be punished with NRP when it is not an issue in our catchment? Having plan change 1 that is based on Farm environment plans will get greater water quality results rather than the blanket approach for the 4 main containments identified. It encourages each farm to take ownership over their local water quality 	 Amend schedule c - stock exclusion schedule B - NRP to be removed Containments targets tailored to catchments and Environment plans

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:		The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:

Yours Sincerely Brendan Denize

07 March 2017