

INTRO

Clint & Adell Roxburgh

Speaking on behalf of Riverheads property.

We had the opportunity to present the first part of our submission to you on the 25th of March and we were encouraged by the respect and consideration that you showed towards our concerns.

We have included a copy of our original submission from 2017 as a summary of our views.

Today we are here to comment on the Plan 1

Provisison 3.11.5.1 through to 7

stock exclusion rule / schedule

We oppose the progressive exclusion of cattle in our streams and on our hill country, we don't feel that the damage is notable on our property due to our low stocking rates and the type of water bodies present on it.

When we presented on the 25 of March we produced photo evidence of our steeper contoured land and its natural riparian barriers along the stream banks, ie ringfern Manuka and bracken, rush bushes.

Our farming policy is to graze sheep on this steeper land and young beef stock as they are lighter in weight and it is our experience that if the mob is divided in to small numbers and spread out amongst the sheep in different paddocks they settle to forage causing minimal erosion on the sidlings and in the water ways.

2) On the rolling top country there is also many small water ways often these are dry for a greater part of the summer months and none of them are wider than 1.5 mtr normal conditions.

There are several swamp and a couple of sediment catchment ponds and we have been fencing these off in order of priority, work load and budget.

We feel cornered and fearful at the enormity of the plan proposed provisions, even if we were financially able to comply, with the huge burden of a total water body fence off we know that in every paddock of our property there are areas of contours that are more than 25° and so we will one way or another lose the ability to grow and supply beef, in addition to that we support the dairy industry with our heifer grazing and hereford bull breeding programs. Simply: we depend on cattle for our financial survival.

The Nitrogen Reference Point

Policy 2 & 7 rules 3:11:5.2 - 7 inclusive
We oppose this provision and believe that this policy rewards the intensive operations and high users while we are to be penalised for already being responsible and careful towards the environment.

We are also very aware that N.R.P would take away the equity of our family investment.

3) We wanted to take the chance to speak because this plant change has the potential to ruin our lives, and an old proven industry that has served a good purpose for decades. We know that the aspiration is to have a clean swimmable river for the future generations and we agree with this, but we just wonder if the SCG & WRC have stopped and considered that we generate revenue and I'm sure a good part of it makes its way through to help people in the welfare system, and at this point we produce good quality beef & lamb which is surely more nutritious and valuable to our local region than any imported equivalent.

Money & Food. makes us an asset.

Please consider us and all the many people like us when you make your recommendations

Thank you ~~for~~ you