

I would like to start by say I'm not that comfortable being here and have found the whole process of making a submission on this proposed plan quite onerous. For me it was a mammoth job trying to read the proposed plan and sifting out the parts that would really affect our business. Then 9 months after the submission was in, I found out that there was a deadline for any evidence (and what is that!) to be in to council. Then another 3 months go by and here we are.

So please excuse us if our submission is not as professional as others you have heard but it is our first time and we will do our best.

I do acknowledge the summary from beef and lamb was helpful though.

Jeanette and I own a 352 ha farm of which 255 ha is effective at Fortrose in Southern Southland. It is an all sheep farm wintering 2500 ewes and 700 hoggets. Because it is a sheep farm, and the way we farm it, we think we have a low environmental impact.

Take pride in farming.

We use very little nitrogen fertilizer and soil test every year to make sure we are applying the optimum amount of fertilizer.

We have about 67ha of native bush which the sheep cannot access plus another 3 ha with the balance of the ineffective area in shelter belts, forestry plantations and gullies. Also there are 8 duckponds.

Submitter No: 686

Submitter Name:

Ruddonkare, I & J

Rule 22... Oppose

Date Received: 15 / 8 /17

The proposal is for dairying, on the zone our farm is in (Hill Country), is to become discretionary. Now our sheep farm is surrounded by dairying, so in the future if we, or our family, wanted to sell it and if the buyer wanted to convert it to dairying, and even if he meets all the conditions, the council could still turn that buyer down from converting it. On todays prices that would mean a \$1.3 million drop in value of our farm.

That is a huge loss in the investment we have worked all our working lives for.

Now we do not agree with the principle that Environment Southland can decide on the value of our farm.

Sheep \$12,800 / ha. Diff \$5000-00 x 255 ha = \$1.27
Suitable Dairy \$17,800 / ha.

And as I have said it will also limit our option to lease to our dairying neighbours.

~~Rule 23~~

Winter.... May to September is too long. Should be start of June until end of August (3 months)

Support that the paddock grazing of sheep on pasture does not come under the definition of "Intensive Winter Grazing".

Rule 25..... Amend

A 3 metre buffer zone on slopes up to 10 degrees and 10 metre buffer zone on slopes ~~up~~ to 23 degrees would sufficient to catch any sediment runoff.

Cultivation should be allowed up to 23 degrees. I was surprised how much difference each 1 degree made over 20 degrees. In summer on hard clover ground I would not be comfortable topping over 22 deg. With duals on would be happy cultivating up to 23 degrees, I think there would be too much soil movement once over 24 degrees.

Rule 70 a (vi)..... Support..... I note that in Section 42a report (page 551, 10.292) there are submitters wanting sheep included in this rule, that is sheep being excluded from waterways. I also note that the author of that report (in 10.305) wants to hear from farmers and industry groups before making a recommendation. *Can this be incorporated as a reaction to that?*

Strongly support sheep being exempt from this rule. We maintain that for most of the year sheep seldom visit waterways and the times they do, they never stand in the water so there are no direct deposits from sheep into the waterways.

We have had a workout and if we were to fence off our waterways of which there are about 10.5kms it would cost us about \$170,000 . Also if we included an area for Riparian Planting on one side only we would loose production from about 10.5 ha which equates to \$12,600 per year. All this would have a huge impact on the financial viability of our business.

Not members plucked out of the air.

Appendix N

Farm Management Plan

Well I would rather have this scrapped altogether.

If we cannot achieve that there should be no need for annual updating, once developed the plan should be right unless there is a change of land use.

It is far too complex, complicated and compulsive. There are 5 pages of requirements. For us I think there would be far better buy in to a simple "Best Practice Document" Also with all the publicity about this proposed plan, it has raised awareness among farmers in general.

As it stands with this proposed management plan I can see it is a way of forcing sheep farmers to fence off and do riparian plantings on critical source areas. (6 a (ii))

Photos.

We think that gullies such as these are already natural riparian areas that enhance the ecosystem and filter any runoff without any interference by man.

Gullies on our sheep farm that are not fenced showing how the natural vegetation remains.

We think there would be no improvement in the water quality by fencing here.

Practicalities of fencing around here....area lost gorse will flourish.

(Crossing) Where sheep are allowed to graze keeps the grass healthy and in a vegetative state and more likely to capture any nutrient runoff and also more stable in floods.

Environment Southland Officers should have a lot of discretion.

In conclusion I guess I am saying that if have to spend 100s of thousands of dollars on fencing, riparian planting and then perhaps a water scheme and find that the water quality leaving our farm, is not altered, it would be a total waste of hard earned money. I think there really has to be a measurable outcome before any money is spent.