## 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: Werner + Curista Fuolis, Fuels-Hill Trust

Phone (Hm): 07 870 22 66

Phone (Wk):

Postal Address: 153 Koroko Rd, RDI, Te Awamutu

Phone (Cell):

Postcode: 3879

mail: christa wernentuelis & gmail 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

(beef+lamb

\$ Pages

The specific provisions my submission relates to are:  State specifically what Objective, Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to.	My submission is that:  State:  whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 1;  brief reasons for your views.	The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:  Give:  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	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:  ***The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below provided as an alternative I propose  * What would be an approvide alternative.

We farm on a 240 ha Drystoch Farm with even proportions of flat, volling and steep land. We have Larmed this land 17 years. Our property is located in the Waipa River Freshwater Managment Unit: and within the Managpiko sub-catalment. On the farm we have sheep and cattle, generally at a 20:80 ratio but this fluctuates years to year with market changes. We have a stream along the length of the farm and numerous freshwater springs and wetlands areas also we have 5 ha block of Bush with 0.12 covernant. We also actively manage a network of Doc 200 traps around the farm for pest management. Additionally, we are looking into creating a wetland area on our fall time the objective of capturing any nutrients and sediment farm neighboring properties and our own to achieve a better outcome for the stream.

Provision

Stock exclusion from streams

I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend

The reasons for this are:

On steeper land fencing is not possible or not cost effective or environmentally not effective because of erosion. Animals tendency is to walk along fenclines eventing erosion. Stock exclusion would have to be cosidered case to case, from farm to farm. There are farm's that just alon't have the money and time to do these big changes. Do we have the since Behind stream the decisson to fence drystock eand stream's without compromissing the livelihood of affected dry stock former's?

I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below [classical as required]

As an alternative I propose

Visit was all be an uppropriate alternative

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend [[]] The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below (1996) (1996)
	The reasons for this are:	As an alternative I propose
		What would be an appropriate alternative

Provision

Restricting land use change

I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend

The reasons for this are:

as Drystock farmers we oppose this because we need the Flexwhility to react to the market.

In the long term restricting land use change would lower the value of the land. It would be even harder to find people to work on dry slock farm.

Hill country farmers expect water policy, that is both environmentally and financially systainable.

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

As an alternative I propose

What we uid be an apprepartic alternative

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/Retained as proposed/amended as set out below panete as required.  As an alternative I propose  What would be an appropriate afternative.

Provision

Nitrogen management adopts a grandparanting approah. Nitrogen referenz point I support/oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend

The reasons for this are:

I can't see that aplan that vestrict
Nitrogen losses from the farm as
modelled though OVERSEER is
workable.
It looks in losses in the year 2014
2015. We were effected by a
drought that year.
As cirystock farmers we have less
fertiliser in put and lower stocking,
rates than our dairy counter parts.

This was not considert when the

the drystock farmers were not

and just way.

asked or represented in a fair

pean was made. I have the feeling

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

As an alternative I propose

What would be an appropriate alternative



		T
Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend promote a required.  The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/Retained as proposed/amended as set out below ration as required).  As an alternative I propose  What would be an appropriate alternative.