

Submission on behalf of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on the SNA & NPSIB.

As a family we have been farming this block of land for over 100 years as a family farm. We agree with many of the principles outlined in the policy but have some reservations about parts of the policy.

Over the years we have found rules made with good intent create problems in future years. For example, a stream flows along the boundary with the forestry. When the trees were planted 30 years ago, they were planted to within 5 metres of the boundary. When milling the trees on forestry land on our side of the stream, trees could not be harvested as damage to the stream would occur in recovering the trees, so we are left with small groups of mature trees unable to be harvested. When the wind blows, they are exposed and can fall over the boundary fence allowing out stock to enter the forestry.

The Stackhouse Family have not completed a forestry chainsaw handling course so we can't cut the trees off the fence to repair it. Forestry staff have to come and cut the trees up, even that part of it on our property.

Our property has:

- a) pastoral farming areas
- b) cropping areas
- c) forestry
- d) native bush - Manuka and Kanuka
- e) tussock grasslands
- f) limestone outcrops
- g) wetlands.

As a family we have learnt how to manage those areas to retain their biodiversity. The tussock areas are managed to provide shelter for young stock at lambing time. Sheep grazing controls a lot of the weeds.

We at present spend [REDACTED] dollars per year on weed control and control pest areas. C, D, E, F & G could cover [REDACTED] hectares. If these are fenced off [REDACTED] of new fence would be required. Recent fence renewal with the forestry was approximately [REDACTED] per kilometre; so fencing would cost [REDACTED].

On-going Weed & Pest control would rise to [REDACTED] per year. Income would drop by [REDACTED] at minimum, as less area would be available for grazing.

NPSIB- Part 3 3.2 clause d

- use by all New Zealanders -

Does this mean any New Zealander can enter private land whenever they so wish?

Opportunities from NPSIB need to recognise existing use of rights and give recognition of role of landowners as custodian and managers.

3.6 Precautionary Approach

Authorities must take a precautionary approach to proposed activities where the effects on biodiversity are uncertain, unknown, or little understood; but significant. Most of NZ biodiversity is little understood, undescribed, unknown. Therefore effect of activities on that biodiversity uncertain. Can affect consent application for unrelated activities, especially discretionary and non-complying activities.

The cost of new consents could rise significantly to meet the requirements of a precautionary approach.

3.9 Managing Effects on SNAs

We must manage the effects. Exclusion of livestock is not necessary. Manage means 'manage' - manage does not mean 'do not do it'.

3.12 Existing Activities in SNA

Existing activities must not lead to the loss (including cumulative loss) or degradation of SNA's 'ecological integrity'.

Loss can occur because of lack of rainfall. However, can the landowners supply water to maintain existing growth. How can landowners become responsible when loss occurs from climate change? Will Regional Councils / Governments become active in promoting irrigation projects in drought prone areas?

3.17 Increasing Vegetation Cover

Increasing vegetation cover is grandparenting.

Cost-benefit analysis is light on costs to landowners of implementing the NPS. Impact on rates for Councils with large geographic areas and small rate-payer bases will be of particular concern.

