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

Complete the following

Full Name: NEAL PHILLIPS

Phone (Hm): (09) 232 8713

Phone (Wk): (0 a) 232 8713

Postal Address: 151 PONGANUI ROAD, R.D.2. TWAKAM

Phone (Cell):

Postcode: 267

Email: rflatspicloud.com

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 $\frac{1-03-17}{\text{date}}$.



The specific provisions my submission relates to are:	My submission is that:	The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:
State specifically what Objective, Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to.	whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 1; brief reasons for your views.	precise details of the outcomes you would like to see for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand the outcome you seek
Provision Whole plan in general	I support/ppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend an appropriate process. The reasons for this are: **The Mark Control of the process of the	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/amended as set out below (close to as required) As an alternative I propose * What would be accompanied to the subconduction of the second to the subconduction of

Provision Lsupport/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ to amend (to be on the quire c) Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below ideacte as required). STOCK EXCLUSION The reasons for this are: On ow form As an alternative I propose What would be an appropriate allowable

Provision .Lsupport/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/amended as set out to amend (lelete as required). below (delete as required) The reasons for this are: SERMENT Koi carp are abundant! in the Operation Stream on our Nother boundary. They As an alternative I propose What would be an appropriate all inch. come erosion + permant be developed on sediment in the strann. Smaller dilbutaries run dear 3-4 days after heavy regularly covers fences be manually removed to minimise damage by the

CHANGE OF LAND The reason of the second of	toppose and for each whether or not you wish and were the respectable sons for this are: and of Shallow rock many places forestly not an option. tes cannot get a grift rock).	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below (cleic to as a granted) As an alternative I propose What would be an appropriate alternative Delete Suggestion to convert to forestry
---	--	---

Provision

NUTRIENT
MANAGEMENT

Lsupport! oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend (delete a required)

The reasons for this are: Application of 'N' fertiliser is not cost effective on hill country. This plan seems to limit our or future owner to the present stocking rate as per "Overseer." This may lower farms Value.

I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below (delete as required)

As an alternative I propose

than 12s.u. ha are exempt from N measure Maistain soil 'P' level at or below optimum levels as per regular soil tests, (3-4 yoly

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety /
Provision 10 YR REVIEW OF F.M.P.	Isupport/oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend present in removed. The reasons for this are: Dequirements in F.M.P. may totally change every 10 yrs - uncertainty for owners - Cannot plan for a heard	Retained as proposed/amended as set out below (delete as a quired) As an alternative I propose What would be an appropriate alcoholing DD YN according to progress

Provision

25° SLOPE DEFINITION -Hsupport/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend Ideals a required)

The reasons for this are:

No specification as to where 25° starts or finishes—water edge, or stream bank. Also if slope varies from flat to 25°, when does it need to be fericed equals

I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below (delete as required)

As an alternative I propose

Specify: no fence regions if more than 50% of slope is greater than 250 along its length.



Photo shows depth of floodwater on the Poporo stream, approx 300m upstream from where it meets the Operation. Note fences almost covered, which catch delatis