

**WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1
WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS**

Submission Form

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

The Waikato Regional Councils proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 –
Waikato and Waipa River Catchments

Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street
Hamilton East
Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
HAMILTON 3240

Chris and Andrea Grainger
764 Ahuroa Road
RD2
TE KUITI 3982
Ph 07 878 5197
Mob 027 694 8600
chrisandandrea@xtra.co.nz

We appreciate the opportunity to present our submission on the Waikato Regional Plan Change 1. We are Chris and Andrea Grainger and we are the second generation to farm this 690ha drystock farm on Ahuroa Road working towards the third generation continuing. We run 7000 stock units consisting of 55% sheep and 45% beef heifers. Our property boundaries the Waipa and feeds into the Mangakewa catchment. In the past 54 years we have established major fence lines to suit natural contour, ease of stock flow and stream/drain management over the whole farm. We have retired 68ha of regenerating native bush into QEII land in 2002/03. We have existing plans to extend this QEII block to incorporate corridors with natural streams and small pockets of native bush in conjunction with Waikato Regional Council (available funding pending). There are mature pine and blackwood plantations on erosion prone faces and we have continued this fencing, planting/retirement programme as resources become available. We will continue to take steps in ensuring our practice is sustainable and we feel we have been good custodians of the land thus far. We don't appreciate being labelled as pollutants to the environment.

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:	The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
<p>Restricting land use change</p> <p>Policy 6 3.11.5</p>	<p>We oppose this policy.</p> <p>This proposal takes away the right for us or future generations to change farm policy to fit the everchanging economic, environmental and/or the changing face of farming in NZ to meet world demand. Business growth and/or development ceases to exist.</p> <p>It effectively reduces the value of this property from potential dairy conversion to solely drystock farming; ie: \$ 12,000 /ha for dairy convertible \$ 8,000 /ha for drystock - wiping off \$2million potential value of land if we seek to sell/retire.</p>	<p>We seek that this policy be deleted:</p> <p>As an alternative, we propose – that a FEP is used to determine land use capabilities and nutrient allocation with any consequential amendments arising from the submission process.</p>

<p>Stock exclusion</p> <p>3.11.5.7 Schedule C</p>	<p>We oppose this schedule:</p> <p>We have 170 + paddocks of which 52 have no water bodies (identified in this schedule). This equates to 103ha of the total 690ha. To create stock exclusion from water bodies (as per scheduled) of the remaining 587ha places economic detriment to our business and its future family succession. We have estimated (as best we can) that these changes will cost \$700k*. This figure does not include the remedial work in fence line preparation or the IMMEDIATE upgrade of the water system. The timeframe for this schedule is too short therefore making this farm un-economic to run.</p> <p>Environmentally, the remedial work in creating these fence lines in the timeframe will increase the sediment runoff into water bodies which will counteract the main purpose of schedule C.</p> <p><i>*based on current price of \$15pm fencing costs x 45km. This works out at \$96,500 per year if started today and not including earthworks in preparation or tree planting at conclusion.</i></p>	<p>We seek that this schedule be amended:</p> <p>That we adopt the National Water Accord as the definition of water bodies ie: the 1m wide by 300mm deep flowing all year round.</p> <p>Adopting this definition would cost this farm only 4km of stock exclusion fencing by 2023 costing \$60k which is attainable and financially acceptable to this business.</p>
<p>Mana Tangata Objective 5</p>	<p>We oppose this objective and the reasons for adopting. We feel the reasons are not fair or equal as we as landowners have nearly the same amount of impediments as Tangata Whenua so why should Tangata Whenua have special rights where the environment is concerned. This doesn't make it a level playing field for all concerned.</p>	<p>An alternative: One rule for all landowners. Race or ethnicity should not come into environmental practices.</p>

<p>Long-term Restoration and Protection Objective 1 Policy 5</p>	<p>We support this but with amendments: We agree in principle with objective 1 but we are concerned in how the longer-term plan changes are going to affect our business socially, economically and environmentally. We need more clarity in these 'long term plans' for our business to continue with certainty, not a 'moving goalpost' style approach.</p>	<p>An alternative: An upfront study that covers the whole 80 years specific to our farm that shows all ramifications.</p>
--	---	---

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 wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Signature



date

5 March 2017