1. I thought that the Resource Management Act and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management were what initiated the need for a regional policy statement of water management and the Southland Regional Water and Land Plan (the Plan). So I wonder why emphasis is afforded to Ngai Tahu philosophies, and presented to over-ride the basic objectives of all Southlanders regardless of race and creed, who have foremost, a desire to be good custodians of all the regions resources and pass them onto future generations in equal or better condition than when they were inherited.

Request: Acknowledgement of all Southlanders as supportive of objectives contained in the Plan and delete references to specific sectors of the community as being superior, dominant or preferential to any other race or creed within the population.

2. The Southland Water and Land Plan is a result of numerous meetings and public consultation concluding in August 2015. Approximately 8-9 months later the Plan has been released for public consultation, allowing 2 months for this process. Usually it might be expected that a local authority would hold meetings to explain and elaborate on the plan but this seems to have been left to industry good entities like Beef and Lamb, NZ Dairy, Federated Farmers and river management groups.

Request: That Environment Southland directly undertakes widespread representation of the Plan to all Southland districts and groups affected, and extend the period to receive submissions equivalent to the time taken to compile the Plan. ie: close submissions on the Plan until 31 January 2017.

3. Page 7. Includes a requirement to set limits and targets to achieve water quality outcomes, yet these aren’t set to be completed until December 2025. It is extraordinary that objectives, policies and rules are to be applied, prior to setting limits and targets within the various physiographic zones.

Request: That the Plan sets targets and limits within the physiographic zones prior to developing policies and rules to meet these presently unknown targets and limits.

4. Pages 18-21. The development of the zones is important and the explanations of the differences of each zone also. The mapping exercise would be easier to comprehend if the first maps were specific soil maps and with separate geology maps, and the overlays applied where they are relevant. I have issues around the accuracy of the maps of our properties, and fail to understand the ramifications where more than 2 zones exist on a farming property and what are the allowable farm practices there.

Request: That the maps are presented separately for both soils and geology and only overlaid where they are relevant to current farm management practices. A clear explanation of potential land use and restrictions on land use is included where multi zones are present on individual properties.

5. Pages 22-24. The region-wide objectives need to some way be related to targets and limits of nutrient or contaminant losses in the respective zones. It is fine to use talk like; ‘manage’, ‘enable’, ‘support’ and’ provide for’, etc. and ‘including the needs of people and communities’, and ‘the use and development of land and soils’ but without targets and limits the policies and rules have no defined basis.

Request: That appendices are included that define targets and limits now, that apply to all physiographic zones that then underpin the proposed policies and rules. OR suspend the Plan until the targets and limits are confirmed.
6. Page 30. Policy 16. 2. Strongly object. Environment Southland (ES) have already identified the sectors, industries or practices that contribute to adverse effects on water quality, but are intending to impose limitations on all sectors, industries and practices that are not contributing to the deteriorating water quality issues.

2.(a) A Management Plan per se will not achieve the standards or level of water quality that ES is required to achieve. Imposing plans and regular updates on landholders who have a record of following good management practices seems over-bearing, dictatorial and unwarranted. Rather a policy should be included that rewards landowners with proven records of good management, have fertiliser applications (timing and quantities) within thresholds and may have average or below average stocking rates, or be exceptional stock men and women. They should be recognised as good custodians and allowed to avoid the paper work that is required of those deemed to be responsible for adverse water quality and a threat to the environment.

Request: The Plan targets specifically; the sectors, industries and practices that contribute to adverse water quality and simplify the proposed recording, updating and planning on other sectors, industries and practices.

Request: Amend policy 18 to a slope of less than 30 degrees.

Request: Remove the requirement to implement management plans from those engaged in existing farming activities determined to not contribute to adverse water quality.

7. Page. 46. Rule 14. Discharge of fertiliser. Omitted is any rule or recommendation (or knowledge) that timing and quantities of fertiliser applications can have a significant effect on nutrient losses. Include:

- Out of season applications of nitrogenous fertiliser onto pasture at below recommended temperatures or at sowing rates beyond the plant’s capacity to take up nutrients.
- Late season applications of annual fertiliser after peak growing seasons have ended and (rather) encourage applications in warmer months.

Request: rewrite this section.


9. Pages 52-53. Rule 23. (b) Land use for dairy and intensive winter grazing is properly regarded as potentially being a cause of deteriorating water quality however the (requested) management plan needs only to cover the area devoted to the practices above, not a whole of farm plan as is required as a condition, particularly if the area is a minority of the total farm area.

(iii) and (iv) What are the areas of 20 Ha and 50 Ha for? They don’t necessarily have a relationship to property size, or other property activities, or length of rotations, or rainfall zones, or fertiliser applications, or anything. All the best with getting the location, depth, outlets and position of sub-surface drains with the change in property ownership and change in generations of owners rendering the likelihood of receiving this information as ‘unlikely’.

(vii) (1) Request: 5 metres

(vii) (2) Request: 10 metres but slope range 5 – 30 degrees

(vii) (3) Request: 20 metres but slope range over 30 degrees.

2.(c) Why 20 Ha on any property? Say if the property was 20Ha or if it was 2000Ha, what does 20 Ha mean? 100% or 1%!!


(1) Request: 5 degree slope

(2) Request: with slope range 5 – 30 degrees

(3) Request: Slope greater than 30 degrees.
11. Page 67-68. Rule 44.(a) (iii) (2) suggest 20 metres and 50 metres respectively, with proviso that site is eventually or progressively covered with soils or similar material.


What is the purpose requiring landowners’ with good farm practices, stocking rates, livestock types and profiles to update plans annually, unless there are significant changes to any of these components, or complaints notified to ES.

Secs. 1, 2 and 3. What is the relevance to water quality of:

- a critical source area?
- the location of sub-surface drains are possibly only important if irrigating effluent to land which would be already covered in the dairy consents.
- the location of a heritage site
- an adjoining property’s “significant indigenous biodiversity”

4. Nutrient budgets. Is there any proven necessity to undertake nutrient budgets on dry stock properties not undertaking intensive wintering of cows or engaged in intensive cereal or specialist cropping systems, unless there is a change to an intensive management practice(s) warranting the completion of a nutrient budget?

5. Good Management Practices.

Livestock: Non dairy

No intensive grazing - less than 10% by area in winter or fodder crops

Sheep and cattle all grass system with no additional stock wintered on or winter feed purchased.

Nitrogen fertiliser less than 10% by volume of total fertiliser applied

Nutrient losses of less than 25 units Nitrogen per Hectare per annum or within nutrient limit settings not yet set??

13. Summary

Freehold title (ownership) is almost as good as absolute ownership (which remains with the Crown) and can only lawfully be taken for public works or if an owner dies without a will or next of kin. Freehold title gives the owner the largest rights to use and enjoy their property allowed by the law.

The Southland Water and Land Plan propose to impinge on rights of freehold Title afforded to landowners that go beyond the intent of the Plan, which is to:

- Implement the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.
- Identify the sectors industries and practices causing adverse effects on water quality
- Adopt objectives, policies and rules to achieve the maintenance and improvement of water quality.

We are in support of the above where those responsible for adverse water quality are identified and subject to policies and rules to achieve the Plans purpose.

We object to Environment Southland imposing policies and rules on landowners identified as not contributing to adverse water quality and submit we have freehold title rights of use and enjoyment of ownership of land that protect us from the proposed Plan.

I WISH TO SPEAK TO THIS SUBMISSION.

SIGNED: HUGH GARDYNE and KATHIE GARDYNE