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: Graham & Robin WINTER
Organisation*: [Signature of, person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission]
Postal Address: No. 4 RD CORE
Phone (Hm): 03 206 6900
Phone (Wk): 8888
Phone (Cell): 8888
Postcode: 9774
Fax: 8888
Email: robinandgraham@gmail.com

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: [Signature of, person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission]
Date: 29/7/16

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

ATTACHMENT
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of Farm Ownership</td>
<td>□ Support □ Oppose □ Amend Reasons: In the event of the farm being sold, if consents costing several thousands of dollars are required to change the land use – this would negatively affect the sale, and be a crippling exercise for no benefit.</td>
<td>⬜ Support ⬜ Oppose ⬜ Amend Freedom – without huge consent exercise or costs!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add further pages as required – please initial any additional pages.
It is of concern that by implementing a new Southland Water and Land Plan there will be a bureaucratic monster, rampant and loose, requiring recruitment of more staff, consent demands – inspections, costs, increased rates, to fund all this from ratepayers expected to pay, pay, pay! Farmers are struggling now.

At this point in time, little or no recognition has been made for those who already have done the hard yards – fenced off water ways to stock, done plantings and beautification of berm areas for now and the future.

Beacon Environment Southland Mapping Service – a totally new name to us that seems to be a broad brush approach to a real issue. What’s so wrong with the very detailed mapping done by Topo Climate that shows so much detail and soil variants on individual farms, enabling easy decisions on activity – like wintering or crop suitability.

The proposed policy of 20 – 50 Ha and consenting seems an imposition! Poor or Virgin land of lower quality needs a larger area, say, for Winter crop. To improve this territory, more regular cultivation is required to add, say, lime and fertilizers for regressing. Re-grassing is the only way to have productive and sustainable farming for the future.

Wouldn’t a more realistic approach to cropping/wintering be to have a percentage criteria – i.e. less fertile land, more percent of total farm permissible. Likewise, high country colder, later seasons need more crop before Spring growth comes.

We believe it to be unjust that limits be placed on any given farms reducing full potential of production. Likewise, any farm in, say, a recognised dairy location, shouldn’t be penalised from becoming another dairy unit or add-on to already neighbouring dairy production.

Those of senior and retirement years would be gutted if a changed policy affected the price of land downwards and inhibited a prospective purchaser from farming as they wanted.