Submission on proposed Southland Water and Land Plan

Email your completed submission to policy@es.govt.nz by 5.00pm Monday 1st August 2016

Alternatively, you can post your signed submission to:
Southland Water and Land Plan
Environment Southland
Private Bag 90116
Invercargill 9840

You can also deliver your submission to Environment Southland’s North Road office or fax it on 03 211 5252.

Full Name: Ewen Alexander Mathieson
Organisation*: Aotearoa Farm Dairy
* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of
Postal Address: 6/2 Ward Rd, Riverton
Phone (Hm): 03 348 376
Phone (Wk): 
Phone (Cell): 027 298 0479
Postcode: 9881
Fax: 

Email: mathieson6@farmside.co.nz

Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):

Public hearing
Please choose one of the following options:
☐ I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
☐ I do wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,
☐ I would be prepared to consider presenting my submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing

Trade Competition
If you could gain an advantage in trade competition, your submission must only include matters which affect the environment.

Please tick the sentence that applies to you:
☐ I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or
☐ I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

If you have ticked this box please sign below to declare that you are directly impacted by an adverse environmental effect.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 1/8/2016

(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

Please note:
(1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Regional Plan under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991
Ewen and Diane Mathieson.

We farm at Longwood, Riverton. In 1948 my grandfather Alex Mathieson bought his first piece of land where we now farm and started milking 7 cows and running 27 sheep.

We are third generation of Mathieson's to farm in the valley.

Through hard work and perseverance we have grown the farm to the point that today we are milking 900 cows, running all young stock and fattening lambs as well.

We aspire to farm as sustainably as possible whilst maintaining a profitable business so future generations of our family have the opportunity to continue to farm.

We understand the councils desire to improve water quality and there are improvements that can be made but time is required to make these changes.

Our farm has four different physiographies which are Peat Wetland, Bedrock Hill-Country, Lignite Marine and Gleyed so as you can understand the implication of this plan for us is quite significant. We have submitted on a number of areas of concern.

We do support the plan around the improvement of water quality as this is one of our focus points. Our family has strong ties to Ngai Tahu through Diane and our children.

We are concerned about the lack of detail, unclear definitions and workability of the rules at a practical level.

We would like to see a focus on bringing all parties together during the implementation of the Land and Water Plan.

We support the principle of this rule but there needs to be a process to challenge assignment of zones. There also needs to be a process included in the plan that details how individuals can appeal/contest the physiographic zones.

As per the RMA equal importance should be given to the four pillars-social, economic, water quality and quantity.

We agree with splitting Southland into fresh water management units but consider existing catchments too large and need to be reviewed into smaller units.

That consideration be given to capital investment when granting terms of resource consents.
Improvement on first draft but there needs to be allowance made for tile/drain cleaning e.g. water blasting.

Rule 20.
We support the concept of farm management plans in principle but they have to be designed in such a way that there is not too much cost in time or resources for farmers otherwise they will not be used to their potential with GMPS.

Rule 21.
We have concerns about the date of 30 May 2016 as this means all farms are non-complying. The date needs to be changed to 30 May 2018 when farmers can expect to have plans in place.

Police 16, Rule 23.
Need clarity around a number of physiographic zones with old Mataura or peat. Why do they all default to the weakest physiographic? This needs to be sorted. We should be able to put in 50 hectares with the maximum of 20 hectares on peat or old Mataura.

B (lx)
Water does not cause a conspicuous discolouration or sedimentation of an adjacent waterbody. This is not physically possible in adverse weather events and needs some allowance.

Rule 25. Oppose.
We think significant changes are required to make this rule practical. We understand what is trying to be achieved but we don’t think the rules in this plan will achieve these as most problems occur in adverse weather events and no amount of buffer will stop this. A significant amount of our farm in small parcels is over 20Deg and under the current plan we are unable to cultivate. There needs to be some solution to this otherwise significant amounts of Southland farmland will become unproductive.

Rule 35.
We see no need to test structures other than effluent ponds and see no need to test effluent ponds if they have been suitably designed and built by a qualified person to required standards.

Rule 38. Support.
1 May – 30 September will restrict maintenance on farm and cannot see why GMP cannot be followed with advise from the Environment Southland website on soil conditions.

Rule 54.
We see no reason to change the status quo. Leave as it is.

Glossary-Amend Definition for Waterway, Lake, Land Holding, Forage Crop, Avoided, Fully Mitigated
Section 32. Oppose.
We see very little in the plan that measures or takes account of the economic impacts these rules will have on the community in general.

These costs will not only affect the farming community but also have a huge impact on everyone. My understanding is that there needs to be a link back to economies as stated in the National Policy Statement of Freshwater Management.

General Comment.
The Plan appears to focus on the farming community with little acknowledgement of the contribution to water quality from industrial or urban members.

There needs to be equality for all.