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: Mark James + Janice Louise Greaten
Organisation*: The 254 Partnership + Greaten Family Trust
Postal Address: 218 Sandstone Kingston Crossing Road, R.O.B. 605
Email: 254farm@gmail.com

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 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: [Signature] Date: 26/7/16

(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
Submission to ES Water and Land Plan

Submitted by:
Mark and Janice Gerken
218 Sandstone Kingston Crossing Road
R D 6
Gore 9776
Mob: 021 519 995

Objective 2
Water & land is recognized as an enabler of the economic, social, cultural wellbeing of the region.

- For ES to stand up and be honest that this work has not been completed and not allow this plan to be adopted until further work has been done.

Objective 18
Farmers need to be recognised as being the leaders in this. The reality is that urban areas are having a higher impact on water quality than farming. In Southland the 20% of declining water bodies are below towns and 80% of the water bodies are improving in quality. Farmers are environmentalists & are being portrayed as the cause of pollution.

Policy 2
What are Ngai Tahu indicators of health?

- If you are going to limit set the public need to know this information and should already have had it

Policies 4 -12
OPPOSE
Physiographic zones – there is no validation report for these, they have not been groundtruthed therefore they should sit outside of the plan. We do not support the use of these zones in regulatory framework. The improvement and preservation of water quality in Southland needs to be the responsibility of all Southland land owners collectively – it should not be more economically detrimental to some than others.

Pyhsio graphic zones are not linked to downstream values or effects.
Until they can be peer reviewed under the Southland Science program 3.2.1
Physiographic zones should be removed from the plan.

**Policy 9, #3**

**OPPOSE**

If resource consents are strongly discouraged in the Old Mataura Zone our land values will be significantly impacted.

There are two main regions in the Old Mataura- Balfour and Wendonside and these are quite different with Balfour having historically high nitrates and shallow groundwater, while Wendonside has very deep to no groundwater and in permeable pan that is slow to filtrate water.

The Old Mataura Zone covers a large geographic area and this policy will have a significant impact on the incomes of many businesses.

This policy is also limiting in regards to change of land use.

- Old Mataura should be considered the same as Oxidising Zone and #3 under Policy 9 be removed.
- ES have been given this research and chosen to ignore it and told us to put it in this submission as a mitigating factor. We already undertake best management practice and do not need a $5000 resource consent to say so.

**Policy 13 & 14**

**SUPPORT**

**Policy 16**

Under appendix N, only clause 5 Good Management Practises should be included. A Farm Management Plan will do nothing for water quality and is just more administration for farmers. Nutrient Budgeting using Overseer is flawed science. This software was developed for Fertiliser sales representatives and no one will stand behind its use as a regulatory tool and therefore it should be omitted.

- Remove all clauses under Appendix N, except for #5.
- Only Good Management practices should be included.
- If Farm Management Plan is to remain (not our recommendation), this should be a document held by farmers, for their use to improve management.
- ES to complete a study of volunteer farmers to look at the impact of nutrient losses and this data could be used to credit farmers at limit setting.
Policy 17
AMEND
However clause 2d is not good enough with the wording “avoiding”. Urban areas should be adhering to policies in line with rural. Holding the line on pollution isn’t good enough, we need to look at point source. ES is not doing enough to mitigate and stop pollution from urban and industrial zones. It is a much easier path to put this plan in place which puts more regulation on the agriculture sector as well as financial implications, when this sector is a minority in the cause of pollution in the region. There are numerous papers that prove that the majority of NZ water ways are improving in quality which never makes the headlines.

➢ Change wording to “No discharge of raw sewerage and untreated agricultural effluent to water”.

Policy 18
OPPOSE
SUPPORT the exclusion of sheep. OPPOSE the remainder. These rules are already in place. The majority of low land water bodies have already been fenced off & it is very impractical to fence off water bodies in the hill country. Not only is it impractical but uneconomical. The hill country is best managed by the farmers rather than DOC or ES, proven by the ragwort now evident in the Mavora Valley and the disaster with the wilding pines at Mid Dome.

➢ Timed grazing prevents a lot of erosion on drains and river banks.

Policies 25 -28
SUPPORT

Policy 29
SUPPORT
This is hugely important and gravel needs to be extracted from waterways. In some areas larger consents should be granted.
Digging holes beside rivers should be illegal. Removing alluvial deposits (beach skimming) gravel should be permitted and encouraged. This benefits the wider community, the river users, the farmers and prevents damage to river banks and helps prevent Flooding.
Policies 30 & 31
SUPPORT

Policy 39
OPPOSE
What is the point in having a plan if this clause permits the council to make decision outside of it. People of the region need to know where they stand and what rules they are working within. Applying for resource consent is a lengthy and costly process that we do not want, let alone applying for one with a clause like this.
- Remove from the plan

Policy 40
OPPOSE
The terminology used in this policy is too open. Again resource consents are costly, lengthy and have economic impacts on business operations therefore they deserve to have better guidelines around terms that will be given.
- Be upfront around timeframes

Policy 47
OPPOSE
#4 Ngai Tahu indicators of health – what are these and why are they not outlined in the plan?
- Remove #4 from the plan

Rule 10
AMMEND
The discharge (of agrichemicals) shall not be to natural state waters or to waters subject to a water conservation order.
The Matura River had a conservation order put on it in 1997. With the fencing off of water ways it is essential that gorse and broom is sprayed and this will not permit that.
- Remove clause c
Rule 13
SUPPORT
In support of the requirement for mapping of new tile drains but not the maintenance of existing ones.
- Amend 13 a-5 to say “for any new drains, the location of the sub-surface drains and outlet relative depth and position is mapped and held by the land owner”.

Rule 20
OPPOPOSE
This plan in its current form strips property rights from owners and allows ES to control the land use for OUR business.
Clause a should be removed from the plan. Insisting that all land holders over 20ha require a resource consent is merely a revenue collecting exercise and will in NO way work towards improving water quality.
Winter grazing should be a permitted activity with GMP
- Remove Physiographic Zones & Farm Management Plans from the plan.
- If not fully removed FMP should be for a 5 year period, exclude the requirement to use Overseer and only be required by those farmers requiring resource consent.

Rule 21
OPPOPOSE
- Expansion should be on a per ha basis.

Rule 22
OPPOSE
B Use of land in relation to the Old Mataura Zone, this will have significant impacts on land values for land owners, hence their equity changes. This breaches section 32 of the RMA which provides for social, economic and social values.
ES have failed to meet their legal obligations in relation to the completion and distribution of the Southland Economic model for Freshwater. If this had of been completed this plan would not have been published in its current form
- Remove physiographic zones.
ES to provide as they were meant to before this plan was notified, the Southland Economic Project.

Rule 23
OPPOSE
The Ha limits are not what was in the draft plan and never mentioned during consultation. They are very unfair.
The plan allows for owning 50 ha of non-adjoining land which can be 100% intensively winter grazed year after year. How is this fair or reasonable? ES needs to be held accountable for encouraging bad practice.
Wintering is an animal welfare issue, stock need to be fed. We operate under Best management practice because it is critically important to the future sustainability of our business.
- If Ha limits remain it will drive bad practice. Remove “Landholding” from the plan and replace with “Title”.
- GMP in farming

What is the definition of forage crops. The plan does not allow for those who grow the likes of fodder beet for lifting and feeding elsewhere.
- GMP should include stock class. Cows should not be wintered on heavy soils.
- Forage oats and regrowth crops should be left out of wintering.

Rule 25
OPPOSE
Oppose permitted activity limit of 20 degrees
25b ii Not allowing cultivation anymore than once in a 5 year period – for the purpose of planting your brassica crop and then returning to pasture you need to be allowed to cultivate it more than once.
- Farmers need to be allowed to cultivate twice in a 12 month period for the practicality of farming.
- Increase to 27 degrees.

Rule 35
OPPOSE
A The wording of “contaminants may enter water” is ambiguous.

- Change wording to “contaminants directly enter water way or body”
- The limit of 20 cows is ambiguous as implies milking those cows for a full lactation. This limit needs to be measured by a formula including milking time (number of cows/average time to milk/number of milking clusters and amended to an annualized figure. (i.e 20 cows annually is the equivalent of X cows for 3 months, Y cows for 4 months and so on).

A 3ibii There is only one feed pad permitted per Landholding. Again this severely disadvantages larger operators.

- Remove the word “Landholding” from the plan and replace with “Title”.

Rule 37
SUPPORT

Rule 40
SUPPORT

Rule 70
AMMEND
Support exclusion of sheep

OPPOSE extensive hill and high country farmers being required to exclude stock.

- Cattle are a very important tool in looking after highcountry. They open it up for the sheep to control the feed and weeds. Fencing off every waterway is impractical & uneconomical. High country and hill farmers manage land a lot better than ES ever could.

Rules 71,72,73 & 75
SUPPORT

Rule 76
OPPOSE
Riparian planting should be illegal. Southlands main river systems are clogged with woody weeds that cost millions to control annually. Why, when knowing this fact, can another of your departments encourage it? This issue has been discussed as part of the Mataura River Liaison Committee.
Don’t encourage riparian planting on streams as their roots clog tile drains

GLOSSARY

Intensive Winter Grazing
- This needs defined better. Wintering of stock is an animal welfare issue. ES cannot determine production of a property based on the stock wintered.

Overseer
- There is no mention of this in the glossary? The people who designed this software did so for Fertiliser Sales Reps and it was never designed as a regulatory tool. Where is the peer review and science to prove this software is relevant and accurate for the use in which ES are intending to use it?

Landholding
- The use of the term landholding in the way ES have defined it, is detrimental to property owners with larger land areas or where they have expanded through purchasing neighbouring properties. We pay rates based on Title, not landholding? This term should be removed and replaced with “Title”.

Lake or Water Body
- There is no definition of these in the plan. At the meetings this has been discussed and it was said by ES employees that duck ponds would come under Lakes. This seems ridiculous given they were created for recreational purposes, as sediment traps or for habitat. These need to be defined in the plan.