

## 79-GRANT AND TANIA MCKENZIE-G and T McKenzie Partnership-

**Address** 1652 Argyle-Otahuti Road Isla Bank 4RD INVERCARGILL Postcode 9874

**Email Address** tanzgrant@gmail.com

**Phone Number** 03 2246 141

**Public Hearing** I DO NOT wish to be heard in support of my submission; or

**Trade Competition** I COULD NOT gain an advantage in Trade Competition through this submission; or

**Gain**

**Joint Hearing**

SWLP Topics-Select the topics that you would like to provide feedback for:

**Cultivation**  
**Farm Environmental Management Plans**  
**Intensive winter grazing**  
**New or intensive dairy farming**  
**Physiographic zones**  
**Tile drains**

<b>Cultivation</b>	Oppose
<b>Cultivation Comments-Please comment on the proposed rule for cultivation (Rule 25). Include any change or decision you want council to make.</b>	Though this rule will have minimal effect to our property, we oppose it as we feel that for those farmers with steep land, much of their grazable land will revert back to poor species and weeds due to not being able to regrass certain areas. This will have a severe environmental and economic impact on their farms and others in the region. (eg. invasion of gorse/broom)
<b>Farm Environmental Management Plans</b>	Oppose
<b>Farm Environmental Management Plans Comments-Please comment on the proposed rules for Farm Environmental Management Plans (Rules 20-23 and Appendix N). Include any changes or decisions you want council to make.</b>	We oppose this rule for the following reasons. We feel that creating a management plan such as this is not only time consuming but unsustainable. Though in theory the idea is sound, we feel that the extra work involved in creating the plan does not justify the outcomes. Although our Fertiliser Company currently provides Nutrient budgets free, we have been advised this is likely to change. This is an extra cost in already challenging times.
<b>Intensive winter grazing</b>	Oppose
<b>Intensive winter grazing Comments-Please comment on the proposed rule for intensive winter grazing (Rule 23). Include any change or decision you want council to make.</b>	We feel that this plan does not take into account the actual farm size, relative to the area allowed for intensive grazing. We think a much more realistic approach would be using a percentage of your farm as the allowable permitted activity. Farms in Southland can not realistically winter stock without an intensive grazing approach during the winter months.
<b>New or intensive dairy farming</b>	Oppose
<b>New or intensive dairy farming Comments-Please comment on the proposed rule for new or intensive dairy farming (Rule 22). Include any change or decision you want council to make.</b>	We oppose this plan as we believe that it limits our options going forward with regards to changing our land use. We should have the same conditions applied to us as our existing Dairy Farm neighbours. Furthermore, failure to give us the same rights, will have the effect of lowering our land value.  In the future, Nutrient allocation needs to be based on the same rates for everyone, irrespective of farming practice.
<b>Physiographic zones</b>	Neutral

<b>Physiographic zones Comments-Please comment on the physiographic zones. These are incorporated in objectives, policies and rules throughout the plan. Include any change or decision you want council to make.</b>	<p>Our farm currently is classified as having 3 of the zones, and we believe that limitations to our farming practise should be only on the farming zone with the greatest land percentage. This will help simplify farming practises.</p>
<b>Tile drains</b>	<p>Neutral</p>
<b>Tile drains Comments-Please comment on the proposed rule for tile drains (Rule 13). Include any change or decision you want council to make.</b>	<p>We support mapping new tiles and drainage systems but also feel that for intensive grazing paddocks it is near on impossible to map all the pre existing tiles as records have not been kept from previous generations. Also, we think that it is important that ES encourages filtering or sediment traps where practical, but not as a compulsory requirement. We also feel that ES needs to be realistic with regards to their proposed discharge requirements, especially during adverse weather conditions.</p>