

To whom it may concern,

We are fourth generation sheep and beef farmers on an

[REDACTED] property that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. Our farm consists of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Over the past 30 years we have allowed our steep gullies and a large proportion of our cold sides to revert into predominantly Kanuka and Manuka forests, we have done this for a number of reasons

- waterway protection,
- erosion protection,
- provide shelter for stock in both weather extremes,
- provide corridors for native fauna to travel across the property.

We can see areas of the proposed MPSIB will have benefits for New Zealand such as

- allowing us to market our products as environmentally responsible
- Mitigating our climate change responsibilities
- Increasing habitat for native fauna

There are also areas of it which we feel will have a negative impact on farmers who have done the

most to restore native flora and fauna to their properties such as

- Reducing likelihood of people reporting locations or sightings of native fauna
- Allowing us the ability to maintain native borders to prevent them encroaching on pastoral areas of the property, this would in time lead to the entire farm potentially turning to native and leave it unfarmable and subsequently forcing multigenerational families out of the rural area and away from the farming culture.

3.6 Precautionary Approach

We oppose this because the lack of knowledge of most of New Zealand's biodiversity may force farmers to take actions around the property that are going to have negative effects. A one size fits all approach to New Zealand's biodiversity is not going to be an effective solution. We believe that part of the solution to this is engaging farmers knowledge and expertise around their own farms biodiversity coming from generations of farm ownership.

3.7 Wellbeing

We support this as we believe that as fourth generation farmers to this property we are critical to maintaining indigenous biodiversity alongside a economically viable farm. We have [REDACTED] who we hope will be able to continue farming our property, our fear with the proposal going ahead is they will end up locked out of the ability to be able to do that.

3.8 ID'ing SNA's

We oppose this because under your proposal the majority of our farm could be considered rare and distinct, we need to be able to maintain the right to stop native flora encroaching on our farmable pastures without destroying areas that we are predetermined as being native corridors.

We have a large amount of invasive scrub species that need to be aggressively managed, amongst these areas there is indigenous vegetation however we dont believe that these are rare or distinct species to our property and managing these areas by spraying will have not have a negative impact on the native flora as a whole.

An adverse result of your proposal is that one native plant could result in a large area of our property being deemed unsuitable for redevelopment, eg one manuka

plant in a 6hectare hillside could result in us being unable to redevelop that area into pasture.

We don't agree that a standardised SNA identification system is going to work, plants on different properties have different significance. For example one small block of Kanuka on a large farm could be significant whereas one small block of farmland inside a large native forest is significant. Land owners need to be able to retain the right to be included in the decision making that will have the best outcome for their property.

3.9 Managing SNA's

We oppose this because over the past 30 years areas of native have been allowed to regenerate naturally so that our stock has shelter during extreme weather conditions. Those areas have naturally regenerated despite livestock not being excluded from them, by excluding stock we believe that invasive species will be harder to manage in these areas and will have a negative effect on the native flora.

On our property we have a slow rotation, we don't want this to impact on our ability to do different farming activities in the future. For example, one part of the farm may not have been used for finishing lambs for a number of years and during this time invasive species

and some indigenous vegetation have encroached onto this land. Your proposal may mean that that land would be excluded from being able to be redeveloped back into quality pasture for finishing lambs in the future.

3.12 Existing Activities

We oppose this because historically [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] In view of wanting to improve our economic viability we need to be able to lift the production of some of our low producing areas.

The broad wording in your proposal does not identify a timeline of what “the past” refers to. This could be 1 year, 10 years or 100 years and as our family has been on this property for that long, it is of significance to us.

3.13 Areas around SNA's

We oppose this because your buffer zone is completely undefined, this could mean we could effectively be shut off our entire farm.

We also believe that this is going to stop people planting new areas of native or allowing regeneration of native flora because if it is subsequently identified as an SNA and a buffer is enforced around it they will then be

locked off a proportion of their property. This would also cause a reduction in peoples reporting and identification of native fauna.

3.15 Mobile Fauna

We oppose this because as stated in your proposal fauna are highly mobile. This means that a sighting of a native species may or may not have any significance to that area or that species survival. This again isn't a one size fits all approach, for example if a kaka is nesting a tree then yes you should not cut down the tree however if a seagull lands in the paddock you are working up to eat a worm, that redevelopment should not be stopped as a result. This is another area we believe farmers knowledge becomes critical around making the best decisions for their farm and fauna.

3.17 10% rule

We oppose this because it is very broad and open to interpretation. The issues we see with this is

- Singular farmers are being forced to maintain larger areas of indigenous cover to offset other areas of the district that have little to no indigenous cover so that the council or individual industries can meet their overall % target.

- We don't believe we should be paying rates for areas of land that we are effectively unable to use due to native fauna or flora residing in the area.

In conclusion we believe native flora and fauna to be extremely important to New Zealand as a whole however the management of it can not be done in a one size fits all policy. We believe that farmers have the most knowledge and expertise on their own properties. Taking away our ability to make decisions regarding the management of our property as a whole for us and future generations is going to have a detrimental impact on the economy and the wellbeing of the farming culture in New Zealand.

This policy will also create an injustice to those farmers amongst us who have done the most to restore their indigenous biodiversity.

Thank you for taking the time to read our submission, we trust that you will make the best and right decision regarding this for New Zealand farmers.