

---

**From:** rflats@farmside.co.nz  
**Sent:** Friday, 10 March 2017 3:09 p.m.  
**To:** Healthy Rivers  
**Subject:** RE: Submission

I will not gain a commercial advantage from this submission.  
I am happy go be grouped with similar submitters to speak to the submission.  
Teresa Phillips

On Friday 10/03/017 at 8:55 am, Healthy Rivers wrote:

>  
> Hi Teresa,  
>  
> Thank you again for sending this through. I just require answers to a  
> few questions in order for your submission to be considered complete,  
> this is a requirement under the Resource Management Act.  
>  
> <![if !supportLists]>· <![endif]>Could you gain an advantage  
> in trade competition through this submission?  
> <![if !supportLists]>· <![endif]>Do you wish to speak at the  
> hearing in support of your submission?  
> <![if !supportLists]>· <![endif]>If others make a similar  
> submission, would you consider presenting a joint case with them at  
> the hearing?  
>  
> Once this information has been received your submission will be  
> processed.  
>  
> After all submissions have been collated, you will then be sent a  
> formal letter acknowledging receipt of your submissions. This letter  
> will contain further information about the next steps in the  
> submission process including information about hearings dates.  
>  
> Kind regards,  
> Danica  
>  
> Danica de Lisle | Submissions Co-ordinator | Science and Strategy  
> Waikato Regional Council  
> DDI: 07 859 0835  
> Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240 Please consider  
> the environment before printing this email  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> From: Teresa Phillips [mailto:rflats@farmside.co.nz]  
> Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2017 12:00 PM  
> To: Healthy Rivers  
> Subject: Submission  
>  
>  
>

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Teresa Mary Phillips  
>  
> 09 232 8713. (No cellphone coverage)  
>  
> 151 Ponganui Rd, Onewhero, RD 2, Tuakau 2697  
>  
> Rockyflatsnz@gmail.com  
>  
>  
> The specific provisions our submission relates to are:  
> Our submission is that:  
> The decision we would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:  
> Schedule B – Nitrogen Reference Point  
> We oppose the methods of calculating the Nitrogen Reference Point  
> (NRP).  
> The reasons we think this are:  
> - The NRP will be based on recent farm management practices  
> rather than the land's natural capabilities.  
> - The methods of calculation are not fair and equitable across  
> farms of similar soil type, climate and topography.  
> - New farm owners are at an immediate disadvantage as they  
> 'inherit' the NRP from the previous owner.  
> We would like to see the methods of calculating the NRP amended as  
> follows:  
> - Consider the topography of individual properties. We think  
> neighbouring farms of similar soil type, climate and topography should  
> have the same NRP/ha. How the NRP for each farm is managed will be  
> determined by their respective Farm Environment Plans. For example,  
> the nitrogen effects of cropping may be offset by a reduction in stock  
> numbers, or by planting an area of pine trees etc.  
>  
>  
>  
> Schedule C – Stock Exclusion  
> We oppose the rules and timelines set by Schedule C.  
> The reasons we think this are:  
> - We have 3 named rivers and a number of streams on our 460ha  
> hill-country property (according to the WRC Water Classification map  
> at  
> <http://giswrcmaps.waikatoregion.govt.nz/WRCMaps/Full.aspx?variant=Water-Classification>).  
> The 3 named rivers measure a minimum distance of 6km. The unnamed  
> rivers measure a minimum distance of 3km. In addition to these, we  
> have several smaller tributaries, and numerous swamps and constructed  
> dams/ponds. To ask us to exclude cattle, horses, deer and pigs from  
> all of these water bodies, and by 1 July 2023 is extraordinary and  
> unrealistic.  
> - The farm is divided into 40 paddocks of various sizes and  
> contour, a small number of which have water reticulation. All of the  
> defined water bodies are sources of water for our stock. We would need

- > to install water reticulation to paddocks before stock could be
- > excluded from the defined water bodies.
- > - The exclusion of stock from all defined water bodies is
- > extreme, and not logistically and financially viable on hill country
- > farms.
- > - We also need to consider soil conservation on the steeper
- > slopes of our farm, which will come at significant cost.
- > - We are concerned there is not enough scientific evidence to
- > support the exclusion of stock from all defined water bodies.
- > We would like the rules and timelines set by Schedule C amended as
- > follows:
- > - Cattle, horses, deer and pigs should be excluded from water
- > bodies with a continual flow of surface water wider than 1m on
- > average, rather than all of the defined water bodies.
- > - There should be more focus on installing water reticulation,
- > than on stock exclusion. Access to a clean supply of water would
- > reduce the likelihood of stock trampling wet areas. Stock would prefer
- > to drink from a trough, than from a swamp or small stream.
- > - Installing water reticulation not only improves water
- > quality, but increases the productive potential of the farm (see
- > <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/document-vault/15478>). This would be an
- > attractive alternative for farmers.
- > - The timeline for change needs to be realistic and should be
- > covered in the property's Farm Environment Plan. As hill country
- > farmers, we face extra challenges posed by the size and contours of
- > our land. Fencing and water reticulation will need to cover
- > significant distances over difficult terrain, and will cost hundreds
- > of thousands of dollars.
- > - Partial funding by the WRC or central Government would show a
- > willingness to work with landowners, rather than just creating rules
- > and regulations.
- > - Restrict the use of the Overseer Programme to being used for a
- > purpose that it was designed for only. Test the accuracy of the
- > Overseer programme.
- > -WRC need to understand and take into account the flooding that occurs
- > from the large catchment areas hill country properties have. Fences
- > are flattened by the large volumes of water. The mud bottom streams
- > create a huge amount of silt and vegetation residues that are
- > deposited on the fence lines.
- > -WRC need to control the extensive amount of introduced Carp that
- > erode the river banks and muddy the waterways.
- > (I'll attach a photo of an flooding example on our property. The dirty
- > water is from mud bottom streams, not from stock in the waterways)

>  
>  
>  
>  
> Sent from my iPad

>  
>  
> \*\*\*\*\*

> This email message and any attached files may contain confidential  
> information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If  
> you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately  
> and destroy the original message. Any views expressed in this message  
> are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the  
> views of Waikato Regional Council. Waikato Regional Council makes

- > reasonable efforts to ensure that its email has been scanned and is
- > free of viruses, however can make no warranty that this email or any
- > attachments to it are free from viruses.
- > Visit our website at <http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz>
- > \*\*\*\*\*

**From:** Teresa Phillips <rflats@farmside.co.nz>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 8 March 2017 12:00 p.m.  
**To:** Healthy Rivers  
**Subject:** (MERGE with 10127981) Submission

Teresa Mary Phillips  
 09 232 8713. (No cellphone coverage)  
 151 Ponganui Rd, Onewhero, RD 2, Tuakau 2697  
[Rockyflatsnz@gmail.com](mailto:Rockyflatsnz@gmail.com)

<i>The specific provisions our submission relates to are:</i>	<i>Our submission is that:</i>	<i>The decision we would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:</i>
Schedule B – Nitrogen Reference Point	<p>We oppose the methods of calculating the Nitrogen Reference Point (NRP).</p> <p>The reasons we think this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The NRP will be based on recent farm management practices rather than the land’s natural capabilities.</li> <li>- The methods of calculation are not fair and equitable across farms of similar soil type, climate and topography.</li> <li>- New farm owners are at an immediate disadvantage as they ‘inherit’ the NRP from the previous owner.</li> </ul>	<p>We would like to see the methods of calculating the NRP amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider the <i>topography</i> of individual properties. We think neighbouring farms of similar soil type, climate and <i>topography</i> should have the same NRP/ha. How the NRP for each farm is managed will be determined by their respective Farm Environment Plans. For example, the nitrogen effects of cropping may be offset by a reduction in stock numbers, or by planting an area of pine trees etc.</li> </ul>

Schedule C – Stock Exclusion	<p>We oppose the rules and timelines set by Schedule C.</p> <p>The reasons we think this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We have 3 named rivers and a number of streams on our 460ha hill-country property (according to the WRC Water Classification map at <a href="http://giswrcmaps.waikatoregion.govt.nz/WRCMaps/Full.aspx?variant=Water-Classification">http://giswrcmaps.waikatoregion.govt.nz/WRCMaps/Full.aspx?variant=Water-Classification</a>). The 3 named rivers measure a minimum distance of 6km. The unnamed rivers measure a minimum distance of 3km. In addition to these, we have several smaller tributaries, and numerous swamps and constructed dams/ponds. To ask us to exclude cattle, horses, deer and pigs from <i>all of these</i> water bodies, and by <u>1 July 2023</u> is extraordinary and unrealistic.</li> <li>- The farm is divided into 40 paddocks of various sizes and contour, a small number of which have water reticulation. All of the defined water bodies are</li> </ul>	We wo Schedu
------------------------------	---	--------------

sources of water for our stock. We would need to install water reticulation to paddocks before stock could be excluded from the defined water bodies.

- The exclusion of stock from *all* defined water bodies is extreme, and not logistically and financially viable on hill country farms.
- We also need to consider soil conservation on the steeper slopes of our farm, which will come at significant cost.
- We are concerned there is not enough scientific evidence to support the exclusion of stock from *all* defined water bodies.

