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: Dan Frew
Organisation*: Frew Farming Ltd
Postal Address: 738 Otapiri Gorge Rd
RD2, Winton
Email: farmerdanfrew@gmail.com

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

Phone (Hm): 032369078
Phone (Wk): 
Phone (Cell): 021878758
Postcode: 9782
Fax: 

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: D Frew
Date: 31/7/2016

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

Please note:
(*) 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Submitted by:</th>
<th>Council Decision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rule 70         | I support the rules around the exclusion of sheep n the waterways, in our experience within the Makarewa catchment is that overall water quality is easier to maintain where sheep are allowed access, although I think the opposite around the exclusion of cattle in extensive land. I don't believe the benefits to water quality will be seen. | (1) 3m from outer edge I believe should be at 10 degrees  
2) 10m from outer edge I believe should be between 10-20 degrees  
3) Sloped above 20 degrees should be done with a Farm management plan, leading into consent where necessary |
<p>| Rule 25         | I agree through my experience that you have the buffer zones correct apart from the actual figures are stretched too far, impending restriction on good productive land that could be very well utilized, and farmed environmentally within more leanient boundaries and GMP. I would rather not see too many rules in place here rather than GMP. |                                                                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The specific provisions my submission relates to are: (Specify provision number and title, e.g. Policy 17 – Effluent management)</th>
<th>My submission is that: (Please include whether you support, oppose or wish to amend each separate provision you have listed in column 1 and the reasons for your views.)</th>
<th>The decision I would like Environment Southland to make is: (Please 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.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rule 23, (IV) | ☐ Support ☑ Oppose ☐ Amend  
Reasons: I did agree with the 15% cultivated approach, as it targets those specifically concentrated on heavy winter grazing, irrespective of scale. This allows smaller farms to do large portions of their farms, but restricts large extensive producers. | Take it back to the 15% rule, which is a recognised amount in regards to a general regrassing programme |
| Physiographics | ☐ Support ☑ Oppose ☐ Amend  
Reasons: In general I oppose the use of Physiographics unless they are used as a guideline, not a hard rule. There is far too many variabilities within each zone, and blanketing across all areas within the same zone would be very unfair on all parties, and all individual parts of the farmer. | Physiographics are a good guide, but only should be used once scientifically bold then they may be used in the consent process |
| Consents | ☐ Support ☐ Oppose ☑ Amend  
Reasons: If possible, which will be near impossible due to staff levels and costs, I would like to see all Farms have to undertake some form of generic consent to farm in the future. This allows the council records of what every farmer is doing, not just targeting certain folk. It is often the farmers under all consent levels that |  |

Add further pages as required – please initial any additional pages.
Hello Carmen

Hopefully this works...

I see my answer in the bottom consents box is incomplete somehow, it was supposed to say; It is often Farmers that are under the generic consent levels that are actually the worst environmental offenders, such as those that don't read mail and info on what is supposed to be done, and have no idea on what is right or wrong. These guys to me are the ones that are going to be able to continue to farm under marginal practice and continue to degrade the environment more so that those whom are going to have to apply for consent...

Thanks, Dan Frew