

# Riverfield Farms Ltd

Land and Water Hearing Support

- In 1965 the land supported no families, run 200 sheep and had 1 tree.
- Today it is now 1600ha – running 18,000 sheep, cattle and deer stock units
  - Supports 6 families
  - 40ha of conservation forestry
  - 20ha of shelter plantings
  - 2ha of native planting
  - 4ha of settlement wildlife area's
  - Plant 1000 trees annually.
  - We have work closely with Environment Southland, including Fish and Game to maintain willows to improve river flow and fish habitat; with proven increased wildlife numbers.
  - We have had an inspection from a Sustainability Officer for a whole day and they commented that our operation was one of the most compliant, they had visited in 5 years, with a limited number of improved suggestions

# Shelter and Forestry Plantings



# Wildlife Settlement Area





This data shows we are improving water quality.

The high E-coli test in the Upper Braxton is due to Canadian Geese in the Riparian strip above our boundary.

We have no impact to Water Quality.

We are in fact improving the quality through sound management, without legislation.

We will continue to water test in Spring and Autumn



**Hill Laboratories**  
TRIED, TESTED AND TRUSTED

R J Hill Laboratories Limited  
1 Clyde Street Hamilton 3216  
Private Bag 3205  
Hamilton 3240 New Zealand

T 0508 HILL LAB (44 555 22)  
T +64 7 858 2000  
E mail@hill-labs.co.nz  
W www.hill-laboratories.com

## ANALYSIS REPORT

Page 1 of 2

<b>Client:</b>	AB Lime Limited	<b>Lab No:</b>	1757415	SPv1
<b>Contact:</b>	F Smith	<b>Date Received:</b>	12-Apr-2017	
	C/- AB Lime Limited	<b>Date Reported:</b>	21-Apr-2017	
	PO Box 102	<b>Quote No:</b>	59349	
	Winton 9741	<b>Order No:</b>	25767	
		<b>Client Reference:</b>	Surface Water Quality Monitoring	
		<b>Add. Client Ref:</b>	Riverfield Farm	
		<b>Submitted By:</b>	F Smith	

### Sample Type: Aqueous

	<b>Sample Name:</b>	Braxton Upper 11-Apr-2017 11:00 am	Braxton Lower 11-Apr-2017 10:45 am	Hamilton Burn Top 11-Apr-2017 10:20 am	Hamilton Burn Lower 11-Apr-2017 10:35 am	
	<b>Lab Number:</b>	1757415.1	1757415.2	1757415.3	1757415.4	
Turbidity	NTU	1.15	0.76	1.30	0.85	-
Total Ammoniacal-N	g/m <sup>3</sup>	< 0.010	< 0.010	< 0.010	< 0.010	-
Nitrite-N	g/m <sup>3</sup>	< 0.002	< 0.002	< 0.002	< 0.002	-
Nitrate-N	g/m <sup>3</sup>	0.068	0.006	0.004	0.006	-
Nitrate-N + Nitrite-N	g/m <sup>3</sup>	0.069	0.007	0.004	0.007	-
Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus	g/m <sup>3</sup>	0.005	< 0.004	< 0.004	< 0.004	-
Escherichia coli	cfu / 100mL	2,700	53	230	180	-



This is a fenced off Riparian strip above our property. It is now covered in gorse and broom which is polluting our property. It is a haven for pests including Canadian Geese and no fish life extends into this area.





This is the same river on our property with the temporary Riparian strip used on this side of the river. It has been maintained free of weeds, has been in the same course for many years and the water quality has improved.



# Key area's of concern with the plan are:

## 1. Physiographical Zones

- The physiographical zoning of our property shows a significant area of peat wetland; over 250ha when the actual area is less than 10ha. This requires consent for intensive winter grazing on this class.
- The issue is that when limit setting is established this will be based on false information which will have a large economic impact on each property. We have been informed by Environment Southland that in-correct zoning only affects the land use, but the Taupo experience of limit setting is based on the Physiographical Zones
- There is known land that is peat wetland; but is not classified, so has no restrictions to management or land-use.
- **Farmers need to be able to challenge this zoning and ensure it is 100% correct.**



## 2. Intensive Winter Grazing

- Maximum of 50ha of cultivation; severely affects larger properties.
- We have 1400ha in pasture and with only 50ha able to be cultivated without consent. This would take 28 years to complete when pastures today are only recommended for 10 years. - This would have a huge economic impact.
- **Individual farmers should have the right through their F.M.P. (Appendix N) to cultivate appropriate areas without consent.**
- **This cultivation details should also not be required by the 1<sup>st</sup> June to allow for Climatic Events caused to pasture during the winter**

### 3. Cultivation on Sloping Ground

- There is no definition of a water course!
  - **A watercourse is defined as the water surface being greater than 1 metre wide, over 30cm deep, runs for more than 6 months of the year and has a gravel base.**
- Spraying is classified as cultivation
  - **Spraying is not classified as cultivation as any spraying of weeds such as gorse, broom, thistles, cutty grass etc.; for control measures is prevented.**
- What is suitable “Buffer zones” from a water course
  - **We have commented on this prior, but these should be temporary to prevent cattle and allow access to sheep in the summer to prevent erosion of the bank by maintaining healthy species, to maintain the course.**

## 4. Gravel Extraction

There are limited areas like this are causing more sediment damage and nutrient contamination from soil erosion, that any man-made implication's.

Properties with existing Gravel Consents should be able to remove these area's back to their normal course with only notification.





## 5. Landholding

- Currently the plan considers all Landholding with joining certificates of title; or under one instrument - as one common occupier.
- This takes no account of:
  - Different farming locations on different physiographical zones,
  - Different management systems on joint certificates and
  - Different farming systems on land to help improve water quality.
- This definition when connected to Rule 23 will encourage alternate ownership at the potential extra cost of ownership and attempts to limit progressive farmers.
- **Landholding under one entity should not be a limitation, especially under Rule 23**

## 6. Economic Impact

- We have not been shown, or directed to any Economic Impact Report for the implications of this Plan.
- We believe that farming in Southland is the core economic provider in the province and supports a huge number of other business's - including Accountants, Lawyers, Merchandise stores etc. This Plan could have serious consequences for these support business and also potential valuation and financial issues for farmers due to potential land use issues.
- **We have shown a positive impact without legislation both in economic returns from the land, the appearance of the land from weeds and pests, and families supported. This has been achieved while improving water quality.**
- **The Council needs to identify and correct the offending parties and leave the majority of farmers who are improving water quality to continue their good work without intrusive costs and time.**