

## Submitter Details

**Submitter No.** S109  
**Submitter Name** Mark Phillips  
**Date received** 14/12/2023

**Notes**

**Number of uploaded docs** 1

## Submission Points

The following table lists all of the submission points made by this submitter. The details of each submission point can be edited by clicking the 'edit' link, editing the information and then clicking 'submit'.

If you can't find the provision by typing the number, try typing a word in the body of the provision. For example, typing 'polic' will bring up all provisions that have the word 'policy' in their name.

If you need to void (delete) a submission point, click the 'edit' link and change the 'Status' field to 'Void'. Once the 'submit' button has been clicked, the submission point will be removed from the table and any reports.

**Reporting Topic** **Submission Point** **Plan section** **Provision** **Support/Oppose** **Reasons** **Decision Requested** **Mapping** **Scope** **Scope recommendation**

No Data

[+ ADD SUBMISSION POINT](#)

## Raw uploaded submission points

This table contains raw submission point data that has been uploaded from the Council's online submission form. These submission points need to be transferred into Spoken by adding them as submission points using the 'Add submission point' form below or clicking on 'upload directly'. Once the raw uploaded submission has been added into Spoken, please confirm by selecting 'yes' in the 'uploaded into Spoken' field. Submission points that have not been 'lodged' are able to be edited by the submitter until either they have finalised and lodged their submission or after the submission closing date, so consider not summarising those points early.

Raw sub point	Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Decision sought	Reasons	Entered into Spoken	Upload directly
S109.1	4 Policies	Policy P70: Minimising effects of rural land use activities.	Amend	Amend plan change 1 erosions control	14-12-23  To whom it may concern,  What King Canute was to Tidal Flow, seems Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) is to erosion with plan change 1.  I own a 186 Hectare (Ha) block of land, 1071 Moonshine Road, Porirua. GWRC modelling has designated a bulk of this land as highest to high-risk woody vegetated, pasture and forestry erodible land.  I have lived and owned this 186 Ha estate for 60+ years and over this period I have seen many changes. As a humble farmer, I always endeavour to have a positive outlook, a problem is only a solution waiting to be found.  As with a tired and true model to control hazards; 1. Minimise 2. Isolate 3. Substitution 4. Eliminate I wish to address plan change 1	No	<a href="#">upload...</a>

using the above model in relation to my 186 Ha block of land.

#### 1. Minimise

Plant/Regenerate erosion prone land

It appears that GWRC is selecting regenerating land with low stock units to control erosion and totally ignoring deforested plantation forestry blocks. This seems inconsistent approach to control erosion. The late government preferred and heavily promoted the mighty Pinus Radiatus but, in this plan change 1, plantation forestry on land such as mine is not permitted. Three of my direct neighbours are on their 2-3rd rotation of this mighty tree on land equally as steep, if not steeper in parts, as my land, and are able to continue unaffected by plan change 1. GWRC has its own very large plantation 2 blocks north of my land.

#### 2. Isolate

Isolate erosion prone areas to stop stock movement and allow for speedy regeneration.

This however, will not prevent wild pigs (which are an issue in my area), goats, and deer from entering. Large vegetated areas with no firebreaks will pose an immense fire risk for the area. Large fires over numerous hectares are environmentally damaging to waterways which would flow into the Pauatahanui Inlet.

#### 3. Substitution

Stop farming and Subdivide

I could do what most of my neighbours have or are doing – subdivide.

My neighbour to the east of me is subdividing their land into blocks as small as 2.5Ha.

Which does GWRC believe is better for the environment. Land with one cow to 2+Ha or one family on 2.5Ha, with their associated infrastructure, driveway, sewage etc.

#### 4. Eliminate – This should always be the first option.

Remove all erodible Areas

Remove all erodible areas down to the lowest river level on the property. This would create level flat land leading to a gradual, controllable gentle flow of water to the Pauatahanui Inlet.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission and look forward to presenting to Plan Change 1.

Yours Humbly

14-12-23

To whom it may concern,

What King Canute was to Tidal Flow, seems Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) is to erosion with plan change 1.

I own a 186 Hectare (Ha) block of land, [REDACTED]. GWRC modelling has designated a bulk of this land as highest to high-risk woody vegetated, pasture and forestry erodible land.

I have lived and owned this 186 Ha estate for 60+ years and over this period I have seen many changes. As a humble farmer, I always endeavour to have a positive outlook, a problem is only a solution waiting to be found.

As with a tired and true model to control hazards;

1. Minimise
2. Isolate
3. Substitution
4. Eliminate

I wish to address plan change 1 using the above model in relation to my 186 Ha block of land.

1. Minimise

Plant/Regenerate erosion prone land

It appears that GWRC is selecting regenerating land with low stock units to control erosion and totally ignoring deforested plantation forestry blocks. This seems inconsistent approach to control erosion. The late government preferred and heavily promoted the mighty Pinus Radiatus but, in this plan change 1, plantation forestry on land such as mine is not permitted. Three of my direct neighbours are on their 2-3<sup>rd</sup> rotation of this mighty tree on land equally as steep, if not steeper in parts, as my land, and are able to continue unaffected by plan change 1. GWRC has its own very large plantation 2 blocks north of my land.

2. Isolate

Isolate erosion prone areas to stop stock movement and allow for speedy regeneration. This however, will not prevent wild pigs (which are an issue in my area), goats, and deer from entering. Large vegetated areas with no firebreaks will pose an immense fire risk for the area. Large fires over numerous hectares are environmentally damaging to waterways which would flow into the Pauatahanui Inlet.

3. Substitution

Stop farming and Subdivide

I could do what most of my neighbours have or are doing – subdivide.

My neighbour to the east of me is subdividing their land into blocks as small as 2.5Ha.

Which does GWRC believe is better for the environment. Land with one cow to 2+Ha or one family on 2.5Ha, with their associated infrastructure, driveway, sewage etc.

4. Eliminate – This should always be the first option.

Remove all erodible Areas

Remove all erodible areas down to the lowest river level on the property. This would create level flat land leading to a gradual, controllable gentle flow of water to the Pauatahanui Inlet.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission and look forward to presenting to Plan Change 1.

Yours Humbly

Mark Phillips



phillipsmark107@gmail.com