

Submitter No: 434

Submitter Name:

Kuana Daley & Taffy Ltd

Good morning all

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to my submission.

Date Received: 15/6 /17

My name is Todd Anderson and with my wife and family have interests in dairying and also sheep and deer.

My background is that I originally grew up in Invercargill but have an extreme passion for farming and the environment. This led me to Lincoln University where I graduated with a double major in farm management and rural valuation. After finishing LU I had 10yrs rural banking experience and now sell rural real estate as well as farm.

On our dry stock property we have a 40ha QEII covenant and in recent times fenced off another significant area of native bush at a personal cost of \$26,000. This bush is currently the home to a pair of New Zealand falcons and some rare native plants.

We see ourselves as stewards of the land and believe we will hand it on to the next generation in even better heart.

I would like to start by stating that I congratulate Todd Barclay for taking the time to place a submission.

In his submission he correctly states that holding the line on water quality is meant to be the initial objective, however this plan is pre-empting the limit setting process. This is concerning.

The following extract from Todd Barclay's submission needs to be understood.

Although the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management requires the management of water quality and water use, local government is directed to undertake this management in an integrated and sustainable way. The intent of the RMA is that the use and development of land and water resources are managed in a way that enables people and communities to provide for their economic, social and cultural well-being. I am concerned that this plan does not consider the economic and social implications to the same extent as the environmental issues, and this specifically undermines the intent of the RMA.

What science does tell us today is that we will know more tomorrow and in 10 years' time than we do today. We didn't reach where we are today overnight it's been occurring for over a century. Therefore it is unfair and unreasonable to expect the current individuals and communities to carry the financial burden. The process needs to be carried out over time.

In the Land and Water Forum 2012 (2nd report) page five it states that

"We share responsibility as city dwellers and farmers, as domestic and industrial users etc. - in short as New Zealanders"

It also states that

"We know that collaboration is essential to achieve this reconciliation because it depends on reaching decisions which are widely shared, and reflect both national requirements and regional and local preferences"

I stress we need to take **time** and all work together to achieve a positive outcome and way forward for the long term benefit of all New Zealand

Rule 14 Discharge of fertiliser a iii 2 – needs amended

It states that if the waterway doesn't have a fenced riparian strip then a 10m buffer zone is required for fertiliser spreading.

This is not sensible with 10m multiplied by the length of water ways calculates to be significant land that will not remain productive and hence affect incomes. Also what type of riparian strip are you meaning? How do you clean out the waterways if they are planted both sides?

This should be amended to read that you can spread to the fence that is protecting the waterway. Spreading should be able to be accurate these days with the ability to do it by GPS mapping and proof of placement.

Rule 23 Intensive Winter Grazing – We oppose

The timeframe of May 2018 is too tight given some current businesses are purely based on wintering.

20-50ha per land holding? What is the definition of landholding?

Does not take into account the scale of the property

Does this then mean if you own 50ha you can crop 100% every year?

The vegetative strip – the amount needs considering and how it is applied practically in relation to the slope. If you feed downhill you will end up with break outs and injury to stock.

Grazing not to occur within 100m of a lake? What is the definition of a lake?

Discoloration of water via overflow? From time to time tiles are required to be cleaned and at such time there will be some moderate discoloration of water.

While we are talking about discoloration of water I would like to note that any local body should be treated like any individual or company under the plan. For example the Southland District Council state that they only require the road verge for drainage purposes, however this probably only has a chance of being correct if there is enough material on the roads to make them higher than the verge. This statement appears to be contradicted by their actions with road sumps being installed which have been tapped into farmer's tiles and cuttings being strategically made in the road verge beside water ways to allow water off the road.

Given that the tiles and creeks are being used by this local body without owner consent one wonders whose responsible for the resulting discoloration of water from the fine silts washed from these gravel roads.

Then recently the roading crew was busy just north of Winton cleaning off the side of the main road which from a safety point of view is good, however they then leave a road verge denuded awaiting a heavy rain event to sluice sediment into the nearest water way

It needs to be remembered that everything that people would like to happen costs money hence making changes quickly will not only stifle the economy and therefore the money available, also it will allow science to prove we have done it wrong due to rushing.

I find it interesting that the Government on one hand wants to double the country's export earnings which one would think indicates increased productivity and on the other hand they are stating that water quality needs to be improved via nutrient capping which will affect farm productivity. I would be interested to hear Nick Smith's explanation.

The current money being spent by Government in the joint venture partnerships is all about targeting increased farm productivity. Where is the research into adding value to what we already produce?

Port Tauranga

You all need to be aware of the wide reaching consequences of your decisions and take this responsibility extremely seriously as individuals.

Many of the proposed points in the plan affect property rights.

By influencing property rights you in turn affect asset values. Let me explain from a banking point of view. Banks take security over assets when lending money and then they discount these assets to get a bank value depending on how tangible they are i.e. freehold land being the best. If a property's value declines then the bank value also drops and hence the security margin changes resulting in the property owner potentially paying a higher interest rate for their borrowings. Also it may affect the businesses ability to secure borrowing in the future, hence restricting family succession due to funds not being able to be raised to allow the older generation to make way for the younger generation. Also the immediate viability could be affected resulting in current staff being laid off or property sale. That's if the farm asset is still deemed to have liquidity at the end of this process.

I was recently talking to an elderly farmer and when I asked him why he had not put in a submission his response was my time in farming is almost finished thank goodness given the proposed change of rules.

However for those of us that are still the future of farming in Southland it is very concerning and unacceptable that we are getting the provinces water quality issues dropped at our feet.

As stated above we need to take time and all work together to achieve a positive outcome and way forward for the long term benefit of all New Zealand.

Currently I don't believe that all parties are being treated equally.

Finally I would urge you to reconsider these issues and take some more time to work things through in a supportive and equitable way.

Thank you for your time