

Name: Robert Pavis-Hall, Gaynor Rowswell, Katie Norman, Megan Norman

Address: [REDACTED]

Email: bobpavishall@hotmail.com

We do not stand to gain commercial advantage from our submissions.

We wish to be heard in support of our submission.

My Observations is shown in Red.

My Requested relief is shown in Green.

1) Complete Lack of consultation.

I realise that it may well be the legislation, but who in this day and age reads a Newspaper? I only found out about this Plan change on Facebook after another landowner had posted it. From my understanding there are less than 800 affected Landowners, so why could these families not be contacted directly? I have endeavoured to inform as many neighbours as possible, but still keep finding affected people that have no idea about this plan change.

We consider that the lack of meaningful consultation with affected landowners that this process should cease and an effective period of consultation with as many affected, and informed landowners as possible should take place.

Total withdrawal of the Plan change

2) New Coalition Government.

I feel that GWRC have forged ahead with this proposed Plan change even though the new Government has stated that they will be re looking at this within the 100 day plan. Would it not be prudent, in this day and age of massive increases in the cost of living, high Mortgage rates, and people in general struggling to make ends meet without Local councils and presumably Regional council increasing the rates, that this Proposed Plan change be put on the back burner until a decision by the new Government is made?

We feel that it would be prudent to postpone this plan not only due to the high cost of living but also the new Government coming down hard on wasted tax payers dollars and the fact that they will be looking at this again and so far everything they have looked at has been cancelled.

Withdraw the Plan Change in total.

3) Small Farm Registration.

We do not consider "Small Farms" an accurate description of the vast majority of 4ha blocks. Most People (not farmers) who own 4ha blocks may run a few sheep and a few cows for their own consumption. Surely the definition of a farm is a commercial concern that is a means of making a living. I would consider any amount of land under 100 acres would be very difficult to make a living on as a farmer. There are many blocks that have little or no

pasture. If these landowners were “Farmers” they would probably have the tools and information needed to complete the registration and supply things like Nitrogen emitting.

We feel that GWRC who have employed contractors on huge hourly rates have taken the concept of “Farms” to the absolute extreme. The people that own these “Farms” are all Lay people who do not have degrees in Agriculture. At best most can be described as Hobbyists who have no formal training or experience and have learned from other Lay people how to do things.

Delete the requirement for “Farms” of 50ha or less to register with the GWRC.

4) Rules Relating to Livestock.

In particular, the access to small rivers. GWRC have only included Cattle, Farmed Deer and Farmed Pigs. This is only a very small list of animals being kept on Small farms. I would like to bet there is more Horses, Llamas and Alpacas than Cows or Farmed deer. Does this mean that all other animals that are not Cattle, Farmed Deer or Farmed Pigs are exempt?

Before GWRC starts to ask and regulate these animals, they should do the same with the wild Deer, Wild pigs and Wild Goats that we keep grazing for GWRC. These animals have been pushed down onto our land from the Mangaroa Forest harvest. We have lived here for 16 years and it has only been in the last 4 years or so that I have seen goats or pigs or had a problem with the numbers of Deer. We have hundreds of times more animals on our land that are nothing to do with us at all so how do we take into account these animals?

Confirm the rules, concerning all other animals. Do something about the huge numbers of pest species that are being pushed from your land to ours. If I were grazing a neighbours stock on my land I would be charging them.

5) The Assumption that Contamination originates from “Farming Activities”.

GWRC does not have sufficient data to pin point the origins of any contamination. It appears that the Lay people that own the land are required to be unpaid field scientist to gather the data that GWRC require. I believe I am correct in saying that the readings for Upper Hutt are excellent so why do we need to be your unpaid field scientists?

I personally along with many others do not fertilise my paddocks on a regular basis as our paddocks are not over stocked at all. We are the first private property that the Mangaroa stream enters after coming from the origins in the Regional Park. I would go as far as saying it is pristine. I feel that GWRC is going to extremes to solve a problem that does not exist. The problem may well exist further down stream within the urbanised area. As I pointed out in no.1 there are less than 800 families who are affected by these proposed changes, but many thousands are down stream of us as well as major roads. Surely these should be looked at first.

GWRC needs to attribute the contamination levels more on the urbanised areas rather than on the “Farming” activities and act accordingly.

6) Small streams / Rivers.

Within the documents, there are several references to small rivers, less than 1m wide but there is nowhere where it tells us what the minimum size is and also how you conclude what size it is. As previously mentioned, we have the Mangaroa stream running through our

property. Dependent on the time of the year and what the rain fall has been recently, the Mangaroa stream just on our property can be less than 1m wide in some places and over 4m wide in other places.

It is not acceptable to have open ended definitions for a minimum and no guidance on how /where to measure.

GWRC should withdraw all measures against the Upper Hutt "Farming" community and heed its own report.

7) Sheer Volume of Paperwork, Technical speak and Timing.

I am sure you will read this on just about every submission, but the large number of pages involved with this Plan change and a very short period in time for people to find, read, digest, have meeting, discuss with other affected people and prepare a submission this shows complete contempt for the people who are affected by this process. We are also just over 1 week away from Christmas, a time of the year that people are generally much busier than normal preparing for the festivities and also winding work commitments up ready for some much-deserved time off, yet you have in your wisdom, decided to land this on the laps of the tax payers now.

You have had months if not years to prepare this for publishing and have given us very little time to come back with our response. We, the general public, fund GWRC with our rates but it really does feel like you as an organisation feel nothing but contempt for us. I will be submitting an O.I.A for the costs involved with this process.

GWRC should remove this whole process to allow for a proper amount of time for public consultation at a later date in the new year when hopefully we will all know whether the new Government will change or cancel this proposed plan change.

8) Erosion Prone Land.

I have just late in the day on Friday the 15th been sent by a neighbour, the maps of the properties that have been designated as High Erosion risk land Pasture, Highest erosion risk Pasture, Highest erosion risk Plantation and Highest erosion risk woody vegetation maps 90-95. This is indicating that a large portion of our land is of high or highest risk of erosion. I understand from speaking to others that this land will need to be fenced off to prevent stock from grazing on this land. I also notice that the largest area that is Highest risk Plantation is in fact the Regional Park and Mount Climbie that is currently being harvested after the logging rights for the next several decades were sold off by GWRC. After the logging has finished and the land has been re planted with pines, will the GWRC fence off all the areas that are prone to erosion on the Regional Park? This will literally close off the Regional Park to the rate payers and the general public. Also how do the GWRC propose paying for this extremely costly exercise?

Again, the whole process should be shelved until the new Government has decided the fate of Plan change 1 and costing have been made public.

9) We reserve the right to add to this submission as we have not been afforded sufficient time by GWRC to allow all affected Landowners to make a rounded submission on as many parts of Plan change 1 as needed. The ridiculously short amount of time between the Plan change

being published and the deadline for everyone's submission to be lodged, just shows contempt by GWRC and the contractors involved.

This is the end for the time being of our submission.