

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Indigenousbiodiversity](#)
Subject: NPSIB Submission
Date: Friday, 13 March 2020 10:20:19 pm

MFE CYBER SECURITY WARNING

This email originated from outside our organisation. Please take extra care when clicking on any links or opening any attachments.

We are 5th generation [REDACTED] Sheep and Beef farmers in coastal North Canterbury.

We feel the recognition of winning the Canterbury Ballance Farm Environment Supreme Award recently proves how we have preserved and maintained large amounts of natives on our farm on a voluntary basis and at our own cost.

Judges described our land as “an aesthetically stunning farm, where in addition to successful farming, there were management decisions focused on the preservation and enhancement of natural resources” and that it “featured stands of native bush which are protected and valued”

We are also members of the Hurunui Biodiversity Trust, which has been set up to encourage landowners in our district to preserve and enhance our stunning biodiversity.

We agree that NZ’s indigenous biodiversity should be protected, but we don’t feel that this should come solely as a cost to farmers, but to all New Zealanders. Restoration initiatives should be less regulatory and more supportive of landowners and community minded groups. There are no rewards or incentives for having planted or preserved. No carbon credits on existing natives, only SNAs which seem to have a continuous creep with ever extending buffers. Riparian plantings now, may become SNAs in 10 years time.

The proposed criteria could make it possible that these SNAs could cover our entire sheep and beef farm eventually, severely restricting farming activities and potentially limiting the ongoing use of our land, and commercially worthless.

The requirements to be imposed on farmers by this NPSIB, are to fence, retire land, undergo costly restoration action and preserve land currently used for farming practice. For example many farmers use tussock land at lambing time to provide shelter for young lambs; if not farmed too intensively, there is no reason to lock up these areas. These directives are far too broad, and hugely costly for the farmer. There is also the very real concern that significant weeds will take over retired areas, as has been shown in many DOC owned areas over run with gorse and broom. This potentially means the farmer has to pay for the control of weed and animal pest species.

The lack of consultation with experts in the field over these recommendations is of great concern to farmers, as they feel that their experiences and suggestions are not valued. There has been no mention of addressing the economic impact that the NPSIB will have on already struggling farming communities that are faced with increasing regulations, emission caps and climate change. These economic effects must be realistically quantified.

Animals and birds are adapting and taking advantage of man made environments and domains, such as lizards and dotterels. The suggested regulations concerning mobile fauna seem very difficult to manage and extremely restrictive. Having to manage areas that are seldom visited by migrating creatures is resource intensive and includes the neighbouring properties.

This NPS will impose enormous costs on both landowners and their councils. The costs of surveys and mapping seems a very poor use of funding, money which could be spent at grassroots level encouraging and rewarding landowners to preserve and protect the natural biodiversity in their areas.

We do agree with the basic intent of the NPSIB, but it is important that farming coexists with biodiversity in rural New Zealand.

[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPad