Please find attached my submission on plan change 7

Regards
Kieran Guiney
Dear Commissioners,

Please find attached:
1/ the YouTube link to Nicola Blowey’s video, (or just google Nicola Blowey DTOTY)
2/ the further commercial development plans for Fairlie town centre beside the Fairlie Bakehouse, already developed from Guiney farms funds
3/ evidence of the wetland planting on Springfield Farm,
4/ evidence of the donations to local walkways (Gibson Bros),

Regards
Kieran Guiney
Submission on Proposed Plan
Change 7 to the Canterbury
Land and Water Regional Plan

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Return your signed submission by 5.00pm Friday 13 September 2019 to:

Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan
Environment Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Full Name: Kieran  Guiney
Organisation*: Family Trust
Postal Address: 17 Fairley Road
Email: kieran@xtra.co.nz
Phone (Hm):
Phone (Wk):
Phone (Cell): 027 2933008
Fax:

Trade Competition

Pursuant to Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission may make a submission only if directly affected by an effect of the proposed policy statement or plan that:

a) adversely affects the environment; and
b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Please tick the sentence that applies to you:

☐ I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or
☐ I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

If you have ticked this box please select one of the following:

☐ I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission
☐ I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission

Signature: ______________________ Date: 9/5/2019

(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

Please note:

(1) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.

☐ I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
☐ I wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,
☐ I would be prepared to consider presenting my submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section &amp; Page Number</th>
<th>Sub-section/ Point</th>
<th>Oppose/support</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.6.2</td>
<td>No consultation on 2030 targets, impact devastating on our business</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Delete tables 14(o) and 14(q)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6.2</td>
<td>Collaboration process outcome agreed to by affected stakeholders</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support tables 14(o) and 14(p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add further pages as required – please initial any additional pages.
Submission to ECAn

This submission relates to the South Opuha and Upper Opihi Environmental Flow Regime

Section 14.6.2 Page 167 and 168

Problem

- Negotiating minimum flows based on consensus and personal preference of interest groups, with farmers who have in some cases 30 year consents and have built infrastructure and changed land use on the basis of those consents
- The appearance of consultation (OTOP) with a collaborative planning process and negotiated solution that key stakeholders had agreed on, being overridden with stepped up targets on which there has been no consultation. The 2030 plan has been imposed by the OTOP Zone Committee and ECAN with no input from affected consent holders or key stakeholders making the consultation effectively a trap into which farmers were encouraged to give ground, which will cost their businesses in the spirit of cooperation with concerned parties. In a classic ‘give an inch and they take a mile’ scenario, the 2030 step puts all the dairy farmer businesses at risk of reversion to dryland farming with no evidence of improved environmental outcomes.
- The delegation by central government to ‘community based outcomes’ where legally consented rights have been removed and replaced with the apparent rights of submitters to influence outcomes in the absence of data and evidence of improved environmental outcomes. Consensus decision making based on opinion, emotion and personal preference with potential to push local businesses to productivity below survival level is not good democratic process.
- The refusal of iwi to be involved in the successful collaborative process, only to come in very late in the process and seemingly influence very significantly a subsequent iteration on minimum flows

Proposed Solution

- Return critical policy making to central government based on appropriate regional consultation process with expert advice
- Improve local government understanding of the wellbeing impact on local communities of the cash and employment that dairy farming creates. THEN engage in true consultation with facts and data allowing us to contribute to the best environmental, social and economic outcomes.
- Don’t allow one stakeholder unreasonable influence, with no supporting data, at a very late stage in a process in which they did not engage.
Base any recommendations for changes in minimum flows on data evidence that there IS any problem with either water quality or biodiversity and on the results of the collaborative process.

Realism on the natural impacts of low rainfall in our catchment (ie we can not target minimum flows that not even nature provides and use those aspirations as starting points for negotiation).

Realism on the economic and community impacts of removing the dairy cows from Ashwick flat, which the January 2030 recommendation in table 14 (o) would do.

Acceptance that the South Opuha now, because of the Opuha dam and the way it is managed no longer runs dry as it did in the pre dam days, well before any water storage existed and well before irrigation in our catchment. This enhances the fish population and provides more reliable water supply to Timaru. This development and maintenance is paid for by farmers and the dams hydrology was designed on our current flows.

Impacts on Fairlie Town and Community.

We request a genuine analysis of the real impact of dairying cashflows on the Fairlie community and invite policy makers to visit and see for themselves.

We would like acceptance of the fact that the development of dairy on the Ashwick flat has supported, and currently supports, countless local businesses, local schools and seen the growth of a flourishing retail hub around the Fairlie Bakehouse, funded by profits from irrigated dairy farming. Ongoing development is planned in this area, funded by cash profits from, and security held against, the irrigated dairying of the Guiney Family Trust.

The site including Fairlie Bakehouse and surrounds was purchased by the Guineys in 2016. At the time the bakehouse was a small outlet with no landscaped gathering space and insufficient kitchen space for Fairlie’s invaluable business man and baker, Franz Leiber.

$ 1.5 M has been invested in this site by the Guiney family trust with a further 0.5 M planned. The site now supports 8 retail tenants whose businesses are thriving on the reputation of the Bakehouse and the attractive gathering place.

Please see attached development plans which depend on continued profitable farming.

This site has 6 shareholders which include the Guiney children. The initial equity was provided from their savings they had developed from the rearing and sale of bobby calves from the dairy farms. They still rear these calves. The Bobby Square development is to allow them fund their University education themselves so avoiding student loan debt. All this activity and the training of our children in business principals while giving back to the community would cease without our currently environmentally sustainable use of water from the South Opuha.

Our dairying EBITs per ha, at approx. $3000/ha under our current water scheme, if under the January 2030 plan would revert to the estimated $800 - 1000 /ha of drystock farming, or perhaps foreign owned forestry assets and would render all the dairy farming assets and infrastructure useless. A portion of these assets and infrastructure is debt funded. It is not unreasonably leveraged from a debt servicing perspective under our pasture farmed simple, sustainable and efficient dairying systems – provided we can continue to irrigate as per the
original consent which informed the development choices. The agreed regime in table 14 (n)
is also workable, although costly. The imposed numbers in table 14 (o) are not workable.

Our dairy farms are managed by award winning young people, who are very significant
contributors to the local young farmers and rugby club. Please reference the achievements
of William Green, runner up to the national dairy farm manager of the year 2018 and his
efforts in attracting and retaining high quality young people to Fairlie, and Nicola Blowey,
national winner of the Dairy Trainee of the Year, 2019. We have young couples employed
for long periods who have shifted from sheep farming to dairy in order to be able to afford
to raise their families and grow a financially independent future. They have also invested in
the local community now. All of these employment opportunities for young people (there
are 20 on our farms) are at risk under the 2030 imposed plan. Table 14 (o) Our dryland dairy
farms would be at risk if our irrigated farms were plunged into insolvency and their values
impaired to that of dryland farms, by removal of our water, and therefore their ability to
service debt.

$3.55 per kilogram milksolids is spent on operating expenditure producing our milk. Over
the 1 M kg MS we produce that is $3.55 Million that is spent on wages and our local rural
service businesses annually. This is very significant in a town the size of Fairlie. Profit after
interest and tax is reinvested, most recently in the Bobby Square hub in Fairlie but also in
debt repayment and farm development. A wetland restoration project is underway on one
of our irrigated dairies with 2000 natives planted to date.

In 2018 our farm funded the steel for a bridge over the Opihi, built with donated time by
Gibson brothers engineers, resurrecting a walking track that is being redeveloped by the
Lions and the community, running from Fairlie to Pleasant Point. We have been delighted to
provide an easement to ensure the public can permanently access this spectacular walkway
for swimming, fishing, walking through the Opihi Gorge which runs along our property. The
funding of these sort of projects by donations is dependant on our farming enterprise
profitability beyond “subsistence”. It is a fact that drystock (non dairy) farming in this
environment would generate little more than a living wage, if that, for the farm owners, as
evidenced by the proportion claiming working for families grants.

We set up and ran a heifer rearing scheme that funds the St Josephs’ PTA to get rural kids to
Wellington on a school trip that visits Parliament.

In the absence of profitable farming business to support all these local fundraising initiatives,
or to invest in enhancing the environment via planting, or access to the environment for the
public, all of this expense falls on the Government. Yet local Government has been handed
the responsibility to decide the future of our business.

The dairy farms in Ashwick are integral to our thriving little town, its popular lake for
summer sports, and its positive environmental outcomes on which we are all focused.

Should our EBITs be forced to drystock EBITs however, that farming debt would be
unserviceable, as would the continued development and maintenance of the Bobby Square
retail hub. All that cash from dairy farming would cease flowing around our local community
and 20 jobs would be lost affecting young families who send 13 children between them all to our local schools. That’s in our business alone. Then there are all the others on our irrigation scheme.

The outcomes of table 14(o) in a normal Canterbury summer, would be to end our ability to carry dairy cows.

Some submitters may have a simplistic view that the issues are linear – ie remove a small amount of access to water, remove a small amount of productivity. They are not. They are binary. There is a point beyond which our dairying infrastructure becomes obsolete as the pasture growth for profitable dairying can no longer be sustained. The simple reason is that ‘enough’ water, at the critical times, can ensure we grow 12Tonne of drymatter per hectare which we can then efficiently convert to valuable milk protein. Insufficient water, in an environment where evapotranspiration can exceed 5 mls moisture per day reduces the potential of these plains to 6Tonne of drymatter per hectare. That feed supply does not support the cost of dairying infrastructure. Perhaps that is the intent of ECAN, to render the dairying infrastructure in parts of Canterbury obsolete. If so, the implications for the well being of the rural people and communities are very poorly understood. The droughts of the 1970s that saw the Opihi run dry (before the days of the Opuha Dam) should be a useful reference point to understand the implications for the rural communities.

We are requesting the right to work with all stakeholders on appropriate environmental, social and economic outcomes.

**Decision Sought**

We support table 14(n) the result of a collaborative process, as notified

Delete tables 14 (o) and 14 (q) as notified

Supporting documents emailed

Plans for further retail development in Fairlie

Nicola Blowey - you tube video DTOTY (Dairy Trainee of the year)

Receipts Gibson Bros

Wetland Project
PROPOSED COMMERCIAL BUILD for:
GUINEY LTD
# Schedule Four – Payment Details

**Funding Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task / Resource</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Paid for by</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Cost Per Unit* $</th>
<th>Total Costs* $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fence construction and materials</td>
<td>As specified in Schedule 3</td>
<td>Grant Recipient</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting including prep and maintenance</td>
<td>As specified in Schedule 3</td>
<td>Grant Recipient</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed control and removal contractor</td>
<td>As specified in Schedule 3</td>
<td>Immediate Steps Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-sourced natives</td>
<td>As specified in Schedule 3</td>
<td>Immediate Steps Fund</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combi Guards</td>
<td>As specified in Schedule 3</td>
<td>Immediate Steps Fund</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>Guards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All costs exclude GST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Council contribution</th>
<th>All other contributions</th>
<th>Total project funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,310</td>
<td>22,771</td>
<td>49,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please invoice Council on receipt of the fully signed agreement for $13,155 and then on completion of the project for the final $13,155.

Please include the following details on all invoices:

- Address all invoices to Environment Canterbury
- Springfield Wetland Restoration Project
- Purchase Order No. 184159
- GST no. if you are GST registered
- Bank account number if you wish to be paid by direct credit.

Post to Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345 Christchurch 8140, Attn Melanie Ellis or email: Melanie.ellis@ecan.govt.nz

Please note: All payment will be made to the Grant Recipient unless requested in writing otherwise. Costs in excess of the agreed amount will only be reimbursed if given prior written approval by the Council. We are only able to pay GST if a GST invoice is supplied.

Initials here:
TAX INVOICE

Shamrock Fern Dairy  
C- Kieran Guiney  
Hamilton Road  
RD 17  
FAIRLIE 7987  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All steel for Opihi walkway bridget (at cost)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2,687.00</td>
<td>$2,687.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $2,687.00  
Total GST 15% $403.05  
Invoice Total $3,090.05  
Total Net Payments $0.00  
Amount Due $3,090.05  

Due Date: 20 Sep 2018  
Thank you for your business. Please make payments to our bank account 03-0887-0015536-00