

Submission on Proposed Timaru District Plan - He Po. He Ao. Ka Awatea.

Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Timaru District Council - Planning Unit

Date received: 14/12/2022

Submission Reference Number #:29

This is a submission on the following proposed plan (the **proposal**): Proposed Timaru District Plan - He Po. He Ao. Ka Awatea.

Submitter:

Tom Hargreaves

Address for service:

1422 Winchester Hanging rock road Geraldine 7991
New Zealand

Email: tom@kakahu Angus.com

I wish to be heard: Yes

I am willing to present a joint case: Yes

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?

- **No**

Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

- **Yes**

Submission points

Point 29.1

Section: SCHED6 – Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Kati Huirapa

Sub-section: SCHED6D – Wai taoka area

Provision:

SASM15	Te Kākaho (Kākahu) River	This awa supports significant mahika kai, and was used to harvest a variety of fish and plant species. Kāika were associated with mahika kai and other values include wahi paripari, Kā tuhituhi o neherā, repo, ara tawhito, and ngahere.
--------	--------------------------	--

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

We aim to farm in the most sustainable way we can so that the land can be left for future generations in a better position than when we started. We have been farming Sheep and Beef for 99 years, and this area is significant to everyone that lives here either as lifestyle farm or large Commercial farms. We have historical photos over the last 100 years of our farm and the change with the Enhancement of native bush as well as the Kakahu River by fencing and education in farming practice. We still use this river for Swimming and Fishing, we have people from all over the country fishing it over the summer. I completely object to suddenly have compliance placed on us to seek permission if we are to continue farming our property our way and have regulation placed and to have to seek a consent for us to continue doing what we do well. Having other people outside our business dictating how we farm is a very worrying position to be in and it will melo-dise our future business.

Relief sought

We aim to uphold all the characteristics and values that the Kakahu rive offers. I totally support the enhancement of any native fawner as well as the fishwife that occupies the Kakahu river.

As said above, We still use this river for Swimming and Fishing, we have people from all over the country fishing it over the summer, however completely object to suddenly have compliance placed on us to seek permission if we are to continue farming our property our way and have regulation placed and to have to seek a consent for us to continue doing what we do well. Having other people outside our business dictating how we farm is a very worrying position to be in and it will melo-dise our future business.

Point 29.2

Section: SASM – Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori

Sub-section: Rules

Provision:

SASM-R6	Intensively farmed stock	
1.	Activity status: Restricted discretionary	Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable
Wai taoka Overlay	Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. whether Te Rūnanga o Arowhenua has been consulted, the outcome of that consultation, and the extent to which the proposal responds to, or incorporates the outcomes of that consultation; and 2. whether a cultural impact assessment has been	

- undertaken and the proposal's consistency with the values identified in SCHED6 – Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Kāti Huirapa; and
3. the potential adverse effects of the activity on the values associated with the Site, including on sensitive tangible and/or intangible cultural values as identified through engagement with Te Rūnanga o Arowhenua; and
 4. whether the proposed activity provides an opportunity to recognise Kāti Huirapa culture, history and identity associated with the site/area, and any potential to:
 - a. affirm the connection between mana whenua and place; or
 - b. enhance the cultural values of the site/area; or
 - c. provide for the relationship of Kāti Huirapa with their taoka; commensurate with the scale and nature of the proposal; and
 5. any effects on the ability of Kāti Huirapa to access and use the Site or Area of Significance.

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

We have been farming Sheep and Beef for 99 Years. We strive to do this in the most sustainable way we can so that the land can be left for future generations in a better position than when we started. We are constantly looking at improving what we do to ensure we can look after the biodiversity already present and are always looking at ways to add to what is there. For example, we have photos from 100 years ago of no native bush in these areas, and now there is a significant amount of native bush through us enhancing bush coming through. Native plantings and excluding stock from those areas that are special to us. We therefore believe we are already managing these areas in a sustainable manner and requiring us to apply for additional consents to change what we do each year will result in a significant increase in both time and costs. Applying for a consent is no simple feat and often requires a lot of work by consultants to achieve the desired outcome. This adds a lot of extra cost to any consent application that needs to be taken into account by decision makers. As for the costs climbing considerably it is imperative that we are not held back in what we do well, to enable a stable and profitable farming business.

Relief sought

We believe the provisions related to insensitively grazed animals should be removed from all areas as they are already covered by ECAN and the provisions in the consents they require farmers to hold to farm. Requiring another consent from the Timaru District Council would result in a duplication of time and money for no material gain. This adds significant costs to the whole process and delays farmers the opportunity to be nimble in their decision making as it slows down the whole process. It also adds to the increased stress of farmers as it adds a whole new layer of rules and oversight that needs to be complied with. We do not believe this is fair and reasonable when mental stress is already a very significant issue for the rural community.