

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: Clare O'Kane
 Full address: 3 Reynolds Rd R.D.3, Cambridge
 Email: clare_okane_nz@yahoo.co.nz
 Phone: 07 8274329 Fax: _____

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER

Full name: _____
 Address for service of person making submission: _____
 Email: _____
 Phone: _____ Fax: _____

TRADE COMPETITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS *(select appropriate)*

- I could / I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
- I am / I 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).

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

In not being able to locate any other forum where my concerns and questions can be addressed I present my submission as follows:

I support the objective of healthy rivers.

As in all massive projects there are sections of the objective for which the consequences of implementation are overlooked or squashed by the far reaching policy rules. I wish to make the following points:-

1. I own a small farm - fractionally over the 20 hectare margin. Presently it is leased, previously it had been a dairy farm with piggery (no longer in use). Now it is partly milked upon, maize cropped (1/3 of property) and grazes young dairy stock. These activities are part of the farming practises of the leasee and incorporated in his farm. The leasee is responsible for compliance with Regional Council requirements. Nowhere in the reading I have done can I find any reference to leased land other than the leasee or owner being responsible for compliance. (An email to the Council has not yet been replied to).

2. Should the present leasee no longer wish to continue with the lease what is my position?

How are stock numbers going to be quantified? Rule 2 - 1

Use of land? Rule 2 -1,3,4.

There are drains on the property but only one continually flowing small waterway (fenced off).
Rule 2 - 5

Do all drains have to be fenced off although they don't contain flowing water all the time. The 3metre exclusion areas will **hugely** impact on the area of land for use.

Will I then require a separate Enviroment plan and nitrogen reference point? Rule 3.

Should a new leasee be sort, does that mean a resource consent will be required each time there is a change such as putting the whole area into a maize crop? Rule 4 and Rule 7.

These questions also relate to the sale of the property in the future.

These policies being implemented by the Waikato Regional Council will impact **hugely** on the value of my property. The cost of compliance on such a small area will impact drastically on what I earn from leasing the property. I see the Council acknowledges the impact on land value and mentions that other factors impact on the value such as commodity prices and urban development. The county council for which I am a ratepayer does not allow subdivision of smaller blocks of land so how can urban development help in mitigating value lost with the healthy river policies. There does not appear to be any flexibility or clarity as to the long term use of land such as mine.

What further concerns me in the overall process is the lack of professional, **experienced**, qualified people, from nutrient advisors to enviromental planning advisors. Is this lack of experienced

personnel going to lead to inequalities in decision making by these people?

Furthermore, in implementing many draconian policies in this drive for healthy rivers, farming will be stifled. Farmers on the whole love their land, their stock and their lifestyle and will work to ensure that the future of farming is maintained and will happily work towards improving the quality of water for all, to the best of their ability but no doubt with great difficulty in many instances. When is the time frame for urban policy to be developed and implemented. At present there is no policy in the offering for urban contribution to healthy rivers. If in ten years, after all the proposed contributions made by farmers to the healthy rivers project to that date, will the Regional Council come straight back to farmers as the "whipping boy" for lack of water quality (should that be the case) before taking urban areas into account. It is interesting to note that in the promotional video on the Regional Council website it is stated that the water quality in the Waikato River deteriorates after Karapiro. An interesting statement in that this takes in the area of fast developing Cambridge and the extending urbanization of Hamilton. This I believe illustrates the contribution to the deterioration of water quality by large urban areas and there appears to be nothing being done to address this. A huge inequality of contribution to the scheme. To me, this appears that farming is an "easy target" and perpetuates and instils within urbanites the assumption that farmers are the only destroyers of water quality. However there needs to be seen and demonstrated that the burden is shared by all and I therefore oppose the strictures being placed on farmers under the present policies without a demonstrable time frame for the contribution of urban areas.

Healthy rivers is a fine objective but how much research and work is being done by the Regional Council itself to develop a filter barrier protection along the "Queen's Chain" (if that is still existence) along the rivers. Sharing the burden of this project needs to be done and seen to be done rather than placing the burden on farmers of the land in whatever their capacity.

Clare O'Kane