



FURTHER SUBMISSION

Thank you for the opportunity to further submit on Waikato Regional Council's Proposed Plan Change 1 (PPC1).

In support of our initial submission (March, 2018) we would like to say that over the past 12 months we have worked with the WRC to fence off, and plant, a portion of our waterways and we strongly recommend a sub-catchment approach going forward.

This is a section of flats with waterways in the Matahuru Valley, where 3 tributaries of the Matahuru Stream run into, and in the significant weather event of June 2014 a huge amount of water converged from these 3 tributaries into one area of stream through some of our property causing some erosion of the stream banks.

We still strongly oppose mandatory fencing for permanent waterways as it stands – (there should be a cost-benefit analysis done on any work). This is an area of our farm that has proven to be a problem in severe weather and we agree it needed attention following this event, to try and prevent any further erosion in the future.

Repeating what we have already stated we do not agree with the "one rule for all".

What may be appropriate and necessary for one farm may be entirely unnecessary and/or impractical for another... this the whole Waikato over.

This is too big to overlook!

A lot of the mandatory work that PPC1 is suggesting is completely inappropriate for our country – the one in at least 80 year weather event (according to locals who have lived here this long!) saw a few small areas that were obviously prone to erosion (in an extreme weather event), give way – the vast majority, however, of the hill country in the valley was completely undisturbed!

As stated in our initial submission " We want to work with council to achieve improved water quality where it is achievable, but we object to having costly and impractical measures imposed that will not achieve it, especially at the expense of our business and rural community's viability, where the science does not necessitate many of the proposed requirements for us as hill country farmers."

Thank you for the opportunity to resubmit.

Please note an error in our initial submission, page 4, first sentence. It should read "We strongly suggest decreasing the "mandatory" fencing threshold from 25 to 15 degrees, as is the National standard".

Faithfully,

Fraser and Liz Crawford.

