Charlie Smaill Brian Snell

- WE HIGHLY VALUE OUR EFFORTS TOWARDS WATER QUALITY, LAND QUALITY & ANIMAL WELFARE
- WE HAVE ALWAYS WORKED CLOSELY WITH OUR LAND SUSTAINABILITY OFFICER AND MATAURA RIVER WORKS INSPECTOR
- WE ARE, OF COURSE, WILLING TO MAINTAIN OUR EFFORTS IN THESE REGARDS

- WE HAVE SOME REALLY SERIOUS CONCERNS.....
- THIS GENERIC PLAN CANNOT SUIT ALL SITUATIONS : REMEMBERING THAT E.G. FARMING ON OUR HIGH COUNTRY STATION IS VERY DIFFERENT TO FARMING ON FOR EXAMPLE
 - DAIRY FARM
 - GRAIN FARM
 - CROP FARM

- WE **STRONGLY DISAGREE** WITH THE CLASSIFICATION OF OUR FARM AS "OLD MATAURA".
- THIS DOES NOT REFLECT OUR SOIL TYPE.
- WE ARE CONCERNED AS TO THE BASIS ON WHICH THIS ASSESSMENT WAS MADE.
- WE THINK THE PHYSIOGRAPHIC ZONES SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THE PLAN FOR FUTURE CHANGE MANAGEMENT

- WE **STRONGLY DISAGREE** WITH POLICY 18 AS THE STOCKING RESTRICTIONS COULD NOT BE SUCCESSFULLY APPLIED TO OUR FARMING OPERATIONS
- WE STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH RULE 23 AND THE 20HA AND /OR THE 50HA RESTRICTIONS AND WANT THIS REVERTED TO AN "ON-FARM" AGREED PERCENTAGE BASIS AS PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED

- WE **STRONGLY DISGREE** WITH RULE 25 OF NOT ALLOWING MECHANICAL CULTIVATION OVER 20 DEGREES SLOPE AND THE FIVE YEAR CULTIVATION INTERVALS
- THERE ARE ALSO SEVERAL ELEMENTS OF THE PLAN THAT REQUIRE MUCH CLEARER DEFINITION INCLUDING:
 - WATERBODIES
 - LAKES
 - INTENSIVE

- THE ADOPTION OF THE CURRENT PLAN FOR THESE ELEMENTS ALONE COULD MAKE THE CONTINUED FARMING OF GLENLAPA STATION UNSUSTAINABLE.
- DUE TO EXCESSIVE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH
 - REDUCED CROPPING CAPABILITY
 - INCREASED "UNREASONABLE" FENCING AND
 - INCREASED "UNNECESSARY" CONSENTING PROCESSES

 WE ARE FIRM BELIEVERS IN FARM AND NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND WILL CONTINUE TO WORK AS REQUIRED WITH OUR LSO TOWARDS THE CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THESE PLANS IN ACCORDANCE WITH PRINCIPLES OF BEST PRACTICE.

- WE HAVE FOUR FAMILY HOMES PLUS QUARTERS FOR FOUR SHEPHERDS ON THE STATION.
- LIKE THE ENTIRE FARMING COMMUNITY WE INJECT SIGNIFICANT FUNDS ANNUALLY INTO THE ECONOMY OF BOTH SOUTHLAND AND NEW ZEALAND.

WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WETHER ,AND HOW, ENVIRONMENT SOUTHLAND HAS ASSESSED THE POTENTIAL PERCENTAGE OF FARMING OPERATIONS THAT WILL BE LOST IN SOUTHLAND DUE TO THIS PLAN.

WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WETHER, AND HOW, ENVIRONMENT SOUTHLAND HAS ASSESSED THE POTENTIAL **ADVERSE IMPACT** THIS PLAN WILL HAVE **ON THE ECONOMY OF SOUTHLAND**

• WITHOUT KNOWING SPECIFIC DETAILS WE ARE AWARE THAT MANY OF THE OTHER SUBMISSIONS ON THIS PLAN WILL SUPPORT OUR PERSPECTIVE THAT.....

MANY ELEMENTS OF THE PLAN ARE SERIOUSLY FLAWED AND REQUIRE EXTENSIVE REVIEW TO AVOID MAJOR ADVERSE IMPACTS ON THE FARMING COMMUNITIES OF SOUTHLAND

 DOES THE ES PLAN WORKING GROUP CONSIST OF APPROPRIATELY KNOWLEDGEABLE AND "REAL EXPERIENCED" PEOPLE?

• THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO:

– PRECISE OUR SUBMISSION

- GIVE YOU OUR PERSPECTIVE

• WE WOULD NOW LIKE TO KNOW WHAT YOU THINK WILL HAPPEN NEXT.