SUBMISSION TO ENVIRONMENT SOUTHLAND ON WATER AND LAND PLAN

We are putting in an opposing submission to outline how this is going to affect our farm and the ongoing costs to us.

You have already stated that no further dairy farming or dairy grazing is permitted on Old Mataura soils, which appears to be our farm. Once you have stated this, it in effect halves the equity of our land because if we want to sell the property it can really only be sold as a sheep farm. The value of the farm at present is based on movement and sales of farms in our area. When a lot of farms in our area are dairy or dairy support our valuation is now way too high but we are still expected to pay rates on this valuation. Is it fair to us that our equity is now half of what it could have been? Environment Southland needs to be accountable for the economic impact that their changes are making.

Another point is the plan to limit crop grazing to 20ha per farm. We can’t understand how anyone with any sort of education can limit each farm to 20ha, which means that a 100ha farm can have 20ha and 500ha farm is only allowed 20ha. Surely rules around crop need to based on either stock units per farm or land area per farm. It is incomprehensible that Environment Southland thinks this will work. Once again if we have to cut back on stock units to meet the 20ha requirement then basically we will be out of business in a very short space of time. We realise that there will be an option of a consent to plant more than 20ha but as a sheep farmer we are being penalised for doing what we have been doing for over 20 years. During winter our stocking unit is the lowest for the year, with summer being over double. People that are dairy grazing are stocking up over winter to make money but at the end of the day we are being treated the same as dairy or dairy support farms.

We understand what Environment Southland are trying to achieve and are fully behind trying to protect our waterways but on one hand you say that sheep farmers don’t have to fence waterways and on the other you are grouping us with all the other farmers. None of this makes sense to us. All that we ask is that we are treated fairly with how we are farming. At the end of the day we will always be out of pocket due to your rules but we would like to think that Environment Southland aren’t in the business of putting people out of business. There has to be a balance between economic impact and water quality.

Ian and Jodi McKay
Wendonside
03 2025304
Hi,

Please see below and attached - submission to the Proposed Water and Land Plan.

Thanks,
Rebecca

---

From: Ian and Jodi [ihmckay@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 7 July 2016 10:26 a.m.
To: Rebecca Robertson
Subject: Opposing Submission Water and Land Plan

Attached please find our submission regarding the water and land plan. Please pass this onto the appropriate person. Thank you.

Can you please send us a more comprehensive map of soil types for our farm, 1069 Riversdale/Waikaia Road.

Ian and Jodi McKay
Wendonside No 7 RD
Gore 9777
03 2025304
ihmckay@xtra.co.nz
SUBMISSION TO ENVIRONMENT SOUTHLAND ON WATER AND LAND PLAN

We are putting in an opposing submission to outline how this is going to affect our farm and the ongoing costs to us.

You have already stated that no further dairy farming or dairy grazing is permitted on old Mataura soils, rule 22(b) deems our property to now be a non-complying activity. Once you have stated this, it in effect halves the equity of our land because if we want to sell the property it can really only be sold as a sheep farm. The value of the farm at present is based on movement and sales of farms in our area. When a lot of farms in our area are dairy or dairy support our valuation is now way too high but we are still expected to pay rates on this valuation. Is it fair to us that our equity is now half of what it could have been? Environment Southland needs to be accountable for the economic impact that their changes are making.

Another point is the plan to limit crop grazing to 20ha per farm (old Mataura), rule 23 (b) (iii). We can’t understand how Environment Southland can believe that this is a feasible option. The first problem would be an animal welfare issue, with no way of feeding our stock adequately would result in underfeed stock. Surely rules around crop need to based on either stock units per farm or land area per farm. It is incomprehensible that Environment Southland thinks this will work. At present our farm is about 7% winter cropped which is surely not an environmental problem. We realise that there will be an option of a consent to plant more than 20ha but as a sheep farmer we are being penalised for doing what we have been doing for over 20 years. During winter our stocking unit is the lowest for the year, with summer being over double. People that are dairy grazing are stocking up over winter to make money but at the end of the day we are being treated the same as dairy or dairy support farms.

We understand what Environment Southland are trying to achieve and are fully behind trying to protect our waterways but on one hand you say that sheep farmers don’t have to fence waterways (rule 70) and on the other you are grouping us with all the other farmers. None of this makes sense to us. All that we ask is that we are treated fairly with how we are farming. At the end of the day we want to continue farming the land but certain rules will make this very difficult. We would like to think that Environment Southland aren’t in the business of putting people out of business. There has to be a balance between economic impact, animal welfare and water quality.

Ian and Jodi McKay

Wendonside

03 2025304