

Hi we are Mark and Paul Heslip . We along with our wives and families Farm904 ht as a sheep and Beef breeding and finishing unit in the Hokonui Hills

We are great believers in treating our environment with respect as it is our way off life and have done so for many years. Our hope today is to highlight some of our concerns from our submission

1. Our father worked with the catchment board. We fenced off our peat swamp (photo of peat swamp) , initiated some burm fencing and had many discussions about development
2. In regards to the Land and Water Plan we would like to comment on ;

-Stock exclusion Rule 70

-Intensive Winter Grazing Rule 23

-Cultivation of slopes Rule 25

Submitter No: 316.

Submitter Name: Glenafric Partnership

Date Received: 4 / 9 /17

Rule 70 Stock exclusion

3. We agree with sheep being excluded from this rule
4. We strongly disagree with the implementation of this rule on extensively farmed properties
5. We have not seen any evidence that conclusively shows that complying with this rule will improve water quality.

Where are the test results for our property??

6. We believe one broad rule will not fit all situations
-
7. Our farm was developed out of native country. This was done with three aspects in mind;
 - Fenced for natural water for stock
 - Fenced for shelter from gully's
 - Fenced for ease of stock movement

Slide 2 (map)

8. To now re-fence many areas would be an expensive and what we believe to be an unnecessary task. This would also force us to become an intensive farming operation to justify the huge expenditure.

9. **The Cost:** Fencing Our two main creeks have a total of 9km and then, all the tributaries which we would estimate to be somewhere close to 20 plus km.

29000 meters x \$15 per mt = \$435,000 (one side fenced)

In addition to this there would also be digger/ dozer costs & culverts.

Slide 3&4 (changing creek bed & ditches)

10. **Maintenance** – If fenced off we will need to regular be cleaning the ditches (we believe this would destroy the life living in the creeks).

11. Natural changing of stream paths (15 meters)

12. Spraying, this is an example of what will happen. We don't agree with this approach.

13. **Loss** of access for stock and loss of grazing (these are example of creek grazed & creek not)

14. **Implementation** of water scheme \$350-450 thousand

Rule 23 Intensive Winter Grazing

Slide 8 (10 Sediment ponds)

15. We support the definition of Intensive Grazing as per S42A
16. We would like to see a percentage of the property to be used to decide how much winter grazing is allowed rather than a set amount
17. Setback areas are very difficult to decide upon on properties like ours
18. By applying this rule we will need to cultivate more land to be able to feed our stock adequately

Rule 25: Cultivation on Slopes

Slide 13 (loss of production)

19. We oppose this rule

If this rule is implemented we will need to cultivate more land to make up for the percentage lost (as per the slide above would be approx. 30%), this will impact on carrying capacity and overall profitability

We believe Measuring the Slopes on our farm will be extremely difficult & even controversial.

For all of these rules we believe the best practical common-sense approach to make progress is

Buffer Zone x 2 slides

1. We have many sediment ponds, filtration areas and sound management practices. Can we suggest that these tools are a far more effective and practical way to handle run off and sediment flows than what is proposed. Can we also suggest that ponds at strategic locations be encouraged and that consents for them not be required.

A bonus to is that any sediment trapped in a pond can be cleaned out & put back on the land.

2. Test the water to see if there is an issue on each individual property. We believe that testing the water when it come into the property and when it leaves would give a very good and clear picture of what is happening with water quality on that farm . if its fine leave them alone . If its not, then its up to the farmer to sort it out

3. We would also like to suggest having case managers to liase with.

4. Will all the proposed rules improve water Quality? If not in our case it will put immense financial pressure on our business. In excess of 1.4 million that's a huge Cost which merely decreases productivity due to loss of graze able land and lack of cultivatable land.

5. One rule will not fit all farming operations.