

**INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSION
ON PROPOSED NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT
FOR INDIGENOUS BIODIVERSITY**

TO: MINISTRY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT
indigenousbiodiversity@mfe.govt.nz

DATE: 13 March 2020

Submitter's Name and Contact Details

Name	Phone Number	Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Introduction

My name is [REDACTED] and we farm a [REDACTED] extensive approximately [REDACTED] medium to steep hill country property in North Canterbury running ½ bred and Merino sheep, and a breeding cow herd. Our family has farmed the property for the past 32 years. [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]. Approximately a third of the property has been cultivated and most of the remainder has been partially developed by in the past by burning and oversowing, and more recently by spraying and oversowing.

Biodiversity on my farm

The farm has scattered scrub on the uncultivated country, varying from individual bushes to larger areas. There is a 20Ha QE2 covenant of regenerating lowland bush on the property, established about 10 years ago and regularly monitored by a QE2 representative.

The existing scrub on the property is very useful for stock shelter but does need controlling in some areas when it becomes too dense for stock to penetrate. I make a point of not controlling native scrub in the bottom of gullies adjacent to waterways creating a riparian margin.

How the NPS will impact my farm and local council

As our farm has significant areas of native scrub on it I am very concerned about how the NPS will affect my ability to farm the property. I am very concerned about what areas someone will determine what is 'significant'. The local regional council recently "mapped" (without consultation) wetlands on our property and managed to include two man made dams and some random patches of rushes in the middle of previously cultivated paddocks.

Unless I am able to control scrub on the property, the viability of the farm will reduce with time. Currently the amount of native scrub on the property is about constant. We clear patches that have become too dense while other areas regenerate.

I am very concerned about the what rules could be put in place for the SNA's and the buffering around them, especially if say regenerated matagouri is mapped as an SNA.

The local district council has not mapped any SNA's hence will have a significant cost to incur to implement the NPS. This cost will have to borne by a small ratepayer base. The timeframes indicated in the NPS appear to be way to short and there is a lack of suitably qualified and experienced staff to undertake the work.

Conclusion

While the intent of the NPS is reasonable I do not believe a regulatory 'top down' approach with the associated regulatory, enforcement and compliance costs will be practicably implementable or produce the desired results effectively or be cost efficient.

The proposal will add significant workloads and costs to local government to be paid for by ratepayers. One of the greatest effects of the proposed NPS will be on rural councils – those with the largest areas and smallest ratepayer base.

I believe better results could be achieved in a more socially acceptable way by a 'bottom up' approach working cooperatively with landowners and with organisations such as the QE2 Trust. Therefore I do not support the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity as it is currently written.

Thank you for considering our views.

[REDACTED]