

Proposed District Plan submission form



Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991.

Feel free to add more pages to your submission to provide a fuller response.

To: Central Hawke's Bay District Council			
1. Submitter details <i>D.M. Bell</i>			
Full Name	<i>Denis Moore</i> Last <i>BELL</i>	First	
Company/Organisation (if applicable)	<i>Roadway Section Ltd, Clevea Section Ltd 2015, Napier Section Ltd</i>		
Contact Person (if different)			
Email Address			
Address	<i>P.O. Box 64 Hawke's Bay</i>	Postcode	<i>4240</i>
Phone <i>06 8578755</i>	Mobile	Home <i>06 8578755</i>	Work
2. This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan for Central Hawke's Bay			
3. <input type="checkbox"/> I could <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I could not – gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick relevant box)			
If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete point 4 below:			
4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I am <input type="checkbox"/> I am not – 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. (Please tick relevant box if applicable)			
Note: If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.			
5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I wish <input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish – to be heard in support of my submission in person (Please tick relevant box)			
6. <input type="checkbox"/> I will <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I will not – consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar submission, at a hearing. (Please tick relevant box)			
7. Do you wish to present your submission via Zoom? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
8. Please complete section below (insert additional boxes per provision you are submitting on):			
The specific provision of the plan that my submission relates to:			
<i>SNA. Numbers 1092045100 1092045200 (10920 45100) 1077002900 109204500A</i>			
Do you: <input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose <input type="checkbox"/> Amend (Please tick relevant box)			
What decision are you seeking from Council? <i>SNA treated as beyond currently by CHBDC</i>			
Reasons: <i>Please refer to next page</i>			
Please note: All submissions will be treated as public documents and will be made available on Council's website. However, you may request that your contact details (but not your name) be withheld. If you want your contact details withheld, please let us know by ticking this box. <input type="checkbox"/>			



The CHBDC acknowledges that farming is the primary activity in this district; as a family we have farmed many of our identified SNA's for 90 years and greatly value the native bush on our land; the decision I am seeking from the CHB DC is that all the identified SNA's on our property continue to be treated as they currently are and are removed from the long term district plan.

Specifically, I have a number of concerns around SNA's

- The practicality of fencing off the identified SNA's on our properties; in my view it will be difficult to put up a sound fence-line and one that will stand the test of time. Some of the areas identified are in gullies that are difficult to access easily.
- Where does the responsibility of the maintenance of the SNA fall including fencing, pest control and public safety – it is not at all clear who carries the burden for this.
- If the area is fenced there is very likely to be a massive weed incursion (ragwort, old man's beard, blackberry) – this was specifically mentioned in the Draft National Policy Statement which stated that pest vegetation incursions have an adverse effect on indigenous biodiversity. I'm concerned as to our responsibility in regard to this – will there now be an expectation for us to regenerate this area at a considerable financial cost to our farming business as a consequence of these areas at some point in the future being required to be fenced off.
- I have a very real concern around public safety in these areas; we already have a QEII in place on one of our farms, there are constantly poachers in the area and my fear is it will only be a matter of time before someone is shot; having multiple SNA's only increases this risk in my view
 - I question the need to have the designated bush on Oureroa Station that is protected under a QEII covenant also being classified as an SNA; the goal of protection has already been achieved, and I have concerns that the rules in relation to the SNA may become more onerous than having a QEII. I would request that this SNA be removed.
- Under the proposed SNA's there is a provision for existing activities to continue; as part of our management of our native bush we do lightly graze these areas; this is done purely by sheep for weed control and fire risk suppression purposes. This grazing is not something we undertake lightly; it was initiated some time ago following discussions with the CHBDC regarding the need to manage fire risk. My concern is that these activities will no longer be permitted, or we will need to obtain a consent to do so, again at a financial cost to our farming business. If this activity is not permitted; then there is a very real danger of fire risk at some points during the year

The point of my submission is that I have some serious concerns around the long-term consequences of some of my land becoming subject to SNA's; in my view there are too many unanswered questions as to where the burden of responsibility lies in maintaining these areas; and the financial burden of who maintains these areas; if that fall's on the landowner then will we see rate relief for this land - I don't think so