

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: George Vernon STEURSON. *Bronwyn Philippa Ham Steveson* Phone (Hm): 230 6116
 Organisation*: GOV BPH STEURSON. Phone (Wk): _____
 * the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of
 Postal Address: 690 CROSS ROAD RD 2 Phone (Cell): 0272311102
Invercargill. Postcode: 9872
 Email: gedron@slingshot.co.nz Fax: _____

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 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: G. Steurson BPH Steveson Date: 1-8/16.
 (Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

Please note:

(1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.

Continue on additional pages if necessary. You are not limited to the spaces provided.

<p>The specific provisions my submission relates to are:</p> <p>(Specify provision number and title, e.g. Policy 17 – Effluent management)</p>	<p>My submission is that:</p> <p>(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.)</p>	<p>The decision I would like Environment Southland to make is:</p> <p>(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.)</p>
<p>EXAMPLE</p> <p>Appendix G</p>	<p>EXAMPLE</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend</p> <p>Reasons:</p>	<p>EXAMPLE</p> <p>Popular bathing sites should include Makarewa River at Wallacetown.</p>
<p>Rule 9 pg 44. Discharge of agricultural effluents onto or into Surface WATER</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose <input type="checkbox"/> Amend</p> <p>Reasons: I thought reason for the water & land Plan was to improve water quality</p>	<p>But the practice-</p>
<p>Rule 23 pg 52 Intensive Winter grazing. b(i). b(ii)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend</p> <p>Reasons: Larger farms need more than 50 ha to comfortably winter their stock. Varying rule dependant on slope.</p>	<p>put on a percentage land. 15-20% of farm.</p> <p>3 metres Intensive when winter grazing.</p>

<p>The specific provisions my submission relates to are: (Specify provision number and title, e.g. Policy 17 – Effluent management)</p>	<p>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.)</p>	<p>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.)</p>
<p>Rule 25 pg 54... Cultivation on sloping ground.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend Reasons: parts of already cultivated paddock would have to be walled around the result would make areas a health & safety risk which don't need to be.</p>	<p>greater degree of angle.</p>
<p>pg 110 Glossary. Intensive winter grazing.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend Reasons: winter is 3 months... we can have weather events at any time of year. no stocking rate include to define Intensive. what about summer crops</p>	<p>include a stocking RATE.</p>
<p>Rule 70 (vi) Stock exclusion from water bodies</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend Reasons: 20 metres is a large loss of grazable land.</p>	<p>fence at 3 metres from waterway.</p>

Add further pages as required – please initial any additional pages.

In general;

We see that Environment Southland want to address intensification in farming. However the effects of this plan does nothing to address the average farmers thinking and information sources. The Environment Southland plan will downsize the area farmers have complete control of, and the information coming out of Lincoln and Massey Universities are based on more production equals more money, so the average farmer will opt to intensify more, on less land. This will increase the use of Phosphate and Nitrogen chemicals. The research from Massey and Lincoln will not change because big companies such as Balance and Ravensdown fund these organisations and their best selling products are nitrogen and phosphate based. Why are they going to pay for or allow people (researchers) to find alternative ways of producing grass. A quick look at Ravensdown's website highlighted to us how their focus is now on hill country to keep their sales up.

With farmers' submissions we are asked to give alternatives; we think it only fair that Environment Southland gives us the same courtesy. Therefore a letter back to central Government asking for a unilateral agreement on New Zealand Inc's position on Genetic Modification; as this will be the next step for the average New Zealand farmer. Federated Farmers' position is that individual farmers will choose if they want to use GM or not. It is an all or nothing decision as cross pollination means we all get GM whether we want it or not, if GM is introduced.

Environment Southland should spend monies on research at the Dairy Hub at Winton and Woodlands Research Station; on what are the base levels of nitrate and phosphate loss from white clover / ryegrass pasture systems, and also research alternative fertiliser systems to give farmers alternatives to high use of N and P; backed up by science.

Has any mapping of water nitrate levels, compared to price of nitrogen (urea) been done??

At present any plan put in place will look good, as levels are going to drop because farm returns are low and not as much product is going to be applied.

CVG 12/5

The Plan as it stands appears to penalise the people doing the least to intensify the most, with a loss in capital value of their properties.

Personally to follow this Plan, it will cost us thousands of dollars to comply as fencing off of water ways (definition please of what a waterway is exactly?), means not only the cost of fencing but also the cost of an alternative stock water supply and delivery system; and shelter to replace the natural shelter fenced off to comply with the water way fencing.

90.8.2012