



Hearing Statement Southland Land and Water Plan

Prepared Hamish Ryan

Introduction

Farming in Northern Southland

Large family business

Diverse farming operation {Sheep, Beef, Grazing, Finishing Cropping & Dairy}

Large Irrigation Development

Hill Country Development

Considerable investment stock water schemes on all properties

Farmed present area 40 years

Hamilton Burn flows through property

Considerable boundary Aparima River

Member Aparima River Liaison Group many years

Very passionate about farming, environment and enhancing water quality

Focus on behalf Upper Aparima River Group

Physiographic Zones

Intensive Winter Grazing

Farm Environmental Management Plans

Submitter No: 830

Submitter Name:

Upper Aparima Catchment
Group c/- H Ryan

Date Received: 24/5/17

Physiographic Zones

Support use of Physiographic Zones for classification of land types

Very concerned about accuracy of the classification on farm scale

Would like to have ability to challenge accuracy of zone classification on individual properties

Confusion arising with multi zones within farming properties and their impact on areas associated with intensive grazing

Intensive Winter Grazing

Rule 23 Intensive Winter Grazing Oppose

We see quite a few flaws with Rule 23 especially with thresholds talked about

Definition of Landholding

Confusion with Landholdings with different physiographic zones

Support Definition of Intensive Winter Grazing being changed under S42A report

Small block 50ha crop 100% year after year {flawed}

Adjoining small blocks

Implies large operations less sustainable than small ones

Example Ryan Farms we have one block 1500 hectares under rule 23 can only crop 50ha which is 3.3% of land holding without getting a consent

Status Quo 214 hectares crop to sustain pasture renewal programme

Shouldn't be winners and losers

Rule23 bvii to restrictive and complex

Solutions have no fixed rules but guidelines that must be approved and adhered to within farmers FEMP in accordance with Appendix N

Permitted activity threshold approved via your FEMP

Farms Environment Management Plans

Appendix N

We support in principle the FEMP

Management plan compulsory

Comprehensive documents

Considerable cost and time to prepare and maintain

Adopt Best Management Practices {guidelines do you need any fixed rules?}

Real value to farming business

Farmer buy in

Living Documents

Updated within farming year and annually

Rules tend to be set for poorest performers

Huge difference between average and good farmers

No regulatory opportunity under present plan

Emphasis back on individual landholders

Top farmers looking to develop and adopt new Technology

Oppose blanket rules approach farmers abilities vary hugely

Free to achieve desired outcomes in their own ways

Strongly recommend Implementing FEMP as formal document approved by Regional Council.

Significant financial and time savings for all parties going forward

Resource consents needed only in exceptional circumstances

Landowner to prove through FEMP that they can meet guidelines set down by Water and Land plan using BMP and own initiatives

FEMP can be audited by Regional Council at any time {Similar to GST Audit}

Penalties for noncompliance of FEMP