

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Indigenusbiodiversity](#)
Subject: Submission
Date: Tuesday, 10 March 2020 9:24:30 am

MFE CYBER SECURITY WARNING

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

He Kira Koiora i Nokia. A discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement for indigenous biodiversity

We agree that biodiversity is important. The central question for a national policy statement is what are the best methods for protection and enhancement of biodiversity on private land.

We began our journey into farming with [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. We now [REDACTED]. It has taken years of hard work to be in this position. My husband worked off farm for many years so we were financially viable. I ran the property while raising our [REDACTED]. We have been on this property for nearly 30 years. Our children and grandchildren have deep connections with this land. We wish to remain here for as long as we are physically able. The property is dry land sheep
10 years ago we modified our farming practice to be able to physically manage as we age. The property is a balance of hill and flat land and is not of a size that would allow employing a worker. We have been punished for our decision because of the grand parenting policies under the land and water plans. By decreasing our stocking numbers policies have put our land value at risk.

We submit that this national policy statement should be withdrawn. It relies entirely upon regulation. It makes biodiversity on private land a liability rather than an asset. denies local councils the right to make decisions at a local level, and in so doing pits residents against their councils.

Protection of biodiversity on private land relies entirely on the good will of landowners.

We have two QE11 Covenanted areas on our property. We actively manage these areas with weed and pest control and ensuring fencing is secure. We have a vested interest in maintaining the areas.

The proposed SNA punitive regulatory system is counterproductive to the goodwill engendered in the QE11 system and does not encourage active management of areas taken.

The proposed SNA regulations punish us again for retaining and maintaining other areas of native vegetation on our property, the criteria for significance are so broad as to include potentially any area of our land.

Responsibility under the RMA is for government policy to consider the mental health of those affected by regulation. The plethora of regulation imposed upon the rural sector is overwhelming and is not related to the effects based regulation required under the RMA. It has become a one size fits all. This policy places real risks to the financial viability of our property, not because our activities have any adverse environmental effects, but rather because of our stewardship in allowing regeneration of biodiversity and our low input farming practices.

We submit that this policy statement for indigenous biodiversity be withdrawn.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad