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: GRAHAM VOTTER.

Phone (Hm): 09 2334878

Phone (Wk): 09 2333 090

Postal Address: 152 CLARKE & DENIZE Rd

R.D. I TUAKAU.

Phone (Cell):

Postcode: 2696

Email: glendale 65 @ xtra. co.nz.

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. L

nature

beef+lamb

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.	State:	Give:
	 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 Rule 2. > 20 ha. 1. N Reference point.	I support / oppose / and for each whether or not you wish to amend (delete as required) The reasons for this are: Try to justify your response using data or by providing an example or story from your furm / own experiences Concerned that the Nitrogen reference point is modelled taking the Oberseer program which was never intended as a regulatory tool. Concerned that not being able to increase levels from the cement low levels may impact an the farms ability to develop to its Pull potential over time which after the investments already startal could make farming in the future unsustainable.	the reference point for all properties so low risk forms can still develop to those low France that the current high pollulers and low pollulers are treated equally.

Provision

Rule 2. > 20 ha.

2. no land > 15° slope cultivated or grazed. Lsupport/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend (detelle as required)

The reasons for this are:

A 15° slope on some proporties can be considered flat or the best land on the farm. Excluding it from grazing eattle is vidiculous and unpractical and totally impacts on my ability to remain firmancially viable. 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

What would be an appropriate alternative

Provision I support/-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 (delete as required). Retained as proposed/amended to below-(delete as required)

The reasons for this are:

As an alternative I propose

What would be an appropriate allemative body

The reasons for this are:

As an alternative of the only practical suggestions what would be an appropriate allemative body.

Provision

Rule 2. > 20 ha.

4. No winter forage crops grazed in situ.

I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend (delete as required)

The reasons for this are:

Not growing winter crops at all impacts directly on the finnancial viability of my business and using heavy machinery to remove crops to be fed elswhere will damage any soil stucture I have spent years to biedd up.

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

What would be an appropriate alternative

Provision

Kule 2. > 20 ho 5. Feneing of all I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend (delete as required)

The reasons for this are:

Not all waterbodies are equal.

Some are high risk of the contominants highlighted and some are low risk.

Why should I go to huge expenses to fence a low risk water body or one that passes through my property carrying contaminants it picked up further up stream in a high risk environment.

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

As an alternative I propose

why not classify water bodies on a scale from no risk or low the risk to high risk. This could be done at point of registration or as part of the FEP process. Then model the fencing requirements under a priority process.