

SUBMISSION ON THE GOVERNMENTS NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT FOR INDIGENOUS BIO-DIVERSITY.

From [REDACTED] 0374.

It seems like every month I am sitting down to write yet another submission on a Government policy. All of them well intended, but equally all of them have the potential to be hi-jacked by an over enthusiastic bureaucracy, peopled by well meaning, but impractical individuals.

The proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Diversity is no different. Because I am becoming fatigued by this ongoing drain on my time resources this will be short.

- Nobody will disagree with the objective of increasing bio-diversity. The aim should be across the Nation, that is both Rural and Urban environments.
- To the extent that there is bio-diversity on rural land, remember it is there for a reason. Because the landowner wanted to preserve it. He/she probably still does, please don't introduce anything which will dampen this enthusiasm.
- The fourth largest National Park in New Zealand is the sum total of all the land covenanted in the QEII National Trust. A gift from land owners, predominantly Farmers, to the Nation which will last for ever. The vehicle of the QEII trust was the brain child of a farmer and promoted into reality by Federated Farmers. Please do not do anything which will undermine the goodwill within the farming community which gave rise to this vehicle.
- Increasing bureaucracy will only result in increased costs, and could well have a negative impact on bio-diversity. Please do not introduce yet another layer. Surely the issue of bio-diversity can be included in the now mandated, Farm Environment Plans? Urban areas can be dealt with by way of National Policy Statements guiding municipal plans.
- Providing Government funding for Regional Councils to run educational seminars could be a practical way to demonstrate that Central Government is prepared to work with land owners, to achieve mutually accepted outcomes.
- Any Proposed National Policy on Indigenous Bio-diversity, will be given power by virtue of the RMA. So it should be subject to its own section 32 analysis. That is, ask the question, "is this the most effective way to achieve the desired outcomes?" If it addresses the above concerns it may be.

I would be prepared to answer any questions, or enter into discussion with whoever, on this short submission.

Signed this 14th day of March 2020

[REDACTED] (tel: [REDACTED])