

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Chapter: Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management

1206

Section: Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management

1206

## Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendation on this section.

## Panel Reason

### Submissions

Submission Number: 1: 9 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Lindsay Hugh and Alison Lyndsay Moore  
Submission Summary: The plan change is ill conceived and inadequately researched. It is simplistic in ways that will generate unintended adverse consequences.  
Decision Sought: Amend to reflect concerns.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 2: 1 Submission Type: Neutral  
Submitter: Cliff Lee  
Submission Summary: I suggest that an effort be made to locate the major subterranean water flow patterns from the high country into the lake so that these flows may be diverted into a substantial containment scheme that would allow the waters to collect near the lake edge in a large ditch. Grow trees or shrubs that are very good at turning such waters into foliage and wood constructing a fairly aesthetic tree line on the lake edge. It would provide a pleasant walkway while providing benefit from using or selling the trees for a profit.  
Decision Sought: Have Councils engineers consider the proposed scheme.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 4: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Max Winders  
Submission Summary: I have taken the trouble to see how I could pollute the lake from my farm and on scientific advice from me Agronomist assures me nothing will go through our Mamaku soils and that our undergrounds water is some of the purest in the world. How are we possibly polluting the Lake with all the water bores between my property and the Lake being drinkable. I can only conclude that I should be able to carry on farming this land the way I always have. I do not use nitrogen fertiliser.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 6: 3 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Robert Mackay  
Submission Summary: Properties of our size should be given the opportunity to subdivide into smaller sizes.  
Decision Sought: Properties of our size should be given the opportunity to subdivide into smaller sizes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management  
Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further  
Submissions – Part 1**

Submission Number: 7: 1    Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: John de Jong  
Submission Summary: I do not agree with the proposed plan change to reduce nitrogen losses from rural land because I believe the implications outweigh the benefits.  
Decision Sought: I do not agree with the proposed plan change to reduce nitrogen losses from rural land because I believe the implications outweigh the benefits.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 9: 1    Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Shobdon Trustee Limited Shifnal Trust  
Submission Summary: I have taken the trouble to see how I could pollute the lake from my farm and on scientific advice from me Agronomist assures me nothing will go through our Mamaku soils and that our undergrounds water is some of the purest in the world.  
How are we possibly polluting the Lake with all the water bores between my property and the Lake being drinkable.  
I can only conclude that I should be able to carry on farming this land the way I always have. I do not use nitrogen fertiliser.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 10: 1    Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Bryce Heard  
Submission Summary: The Objectives of improved lake water quality and continues profitable land use practices by land owners are supported. The target of a 320 tonne reduction in nitrogen discharges is based on unproven science, but it is the best estimate that we have. It will need to be kept under constant, formal review.  
Decision Sought: BoPRC withdraws from its course of rules and enforcement and embarks on a pathway of solution development with the land owners by way of an Accord to solve the lake water problem. Both long and short term focused.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 10: 2    Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Bryce Heard  
Submission Summary: The process used has been to engage scientists and consultants to seek advice and from this information to develop rules. This process without appropriate is the land owners did not was improved lake water quality. However land owners are supportive of the objectives. The correct process is to guide and drive the scientists and consultants behaviors. The proposed rule change is based on flimsy, unproven scientific knowledge and evidence.  
Decision Sought: BoPRC withdraws from its course of rules and enforcement and embarks on a pathway of solution development with the land owners by way of an Accord to solve the lake water problem. Both long and short term focused.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No: 11 - 1    Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Deer Industry New Zealand  
Submission Summary: DINZ supports an 'Accord' approach. The process to arrive at the proposed Plan Change 10 has not been inclusive and collaborative despite the council's best efforts.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

## **Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1**

Submission Number: 10: 3 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Bryce Heard

Submission Summary: The remedial measures proposed are not going to provide a solution in our lifetime. We need a short term solution. The measures proposed will have an immediate negative effect on livelihoods and wellbeing, an immediate negative impact on land values, an immediate negative effect on house values, will shrink the Rotorua economy and destroy jobs and livelihoods of our core long term citizens.

Decision Sought: BoPRC withdraws from its course of rules and enforcement and embarks on a pathway of solution development with the land owners by way of an Accord to solve the lake water problem. Both long and short term focused.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 11: 1 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Ian McLean

Submission Summary: Lake Rotorua is environmentally degraded below its states of 50 years ago. To restore the water quality requires nutrient inflows to be reduced. A scheme has been developed to share the burden of adjustment and the cost of the change across all sectors. This scheme has been developed in a series of partnerships between local, regional and central government, and Iwi and the rest of the community. The proposed plan changes are part of the proposed scheme.

Decision Sought: I support the proposed changes and seek their formal approval by the Council.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 11: 2 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Ian McLean

Submission Summary: It has been suggested that action of the rules should await further scientific evidence. I oppose such a delay because of the potential effect on the lake and because it would lead to less certainty for farmers. Farmers in the Lake Rotorua catchment have been constrained in planning their futures by uncertainties over the future nutrient regime. Adopting the proposed rules would allow a measure of certainty while allowing the regime to be modified would fresh science indicate that there is a better way of achieving water quality targets.

Decision Sought: I support the proposed changes and seek their formal approval by the Council.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 13: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Alister Snodgrass

Submission Summary: Farm targets should remain practical and affordable and option to adoption of best science.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

Submission Number: 15: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Murray and Robyn Pearce

Submission Summary: Land use capacity was dismissed in the consultation process. Current land use has been locked in and current sector land uses protected. The rules are an attempt at appeasing lobby groups and force the majority of land owners and users to subsidise established poor land management practices. The rules give special rights and privileges to activities that have an established history of preventable Nitrogen leaching. The proposed levels of nitrogen leaching are unfair, environmentally unsustainable and unnecessary.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No: 17 - 1 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Murray and Robyn Pearce

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 15: 7 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Murray and Robyn Pearce

Submission Summary: The consultation process was flawed. The rules were about protected vested interests of a small number of residents and land users. As a consequence the rules environmental and community protection elements have been compromised. No derivation from the established council plan of action was considered.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No: 17 - 6 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Murray and Robyn Pearce

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submitter Number 16: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Neil Heather

Submission Summary: Environment work carried out prior to Rule 11 2001-2004 was not taking into account when I was given my Rule 11 benchmark. I installed detainment bunds as well as ponds to capture the storm runoff. This shows that the land owner does understand flood-flow particulate nutrients, attenuation processes and pathways, and the increasing likelihood of P-limitation in the lake. BoPRC is focused on one nutrient at the expense of phosphorus. Due to nitrogen increasing on my effective area it is not possible for me to do any more environmental work when PC10 is all about nitrogen.

Decision Sought: I suggest Council parks PC10 and works with the catchment farmers in prioritising sub-catchments delivering significant nutrient loads to the lake; assisting sub-catchment committees in developing action plans to prioritise critical source areas and cost effective interventions for reducing high nutrient base flow and flood flows to the lake.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

---

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

---

Submission Number: 16: 6 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Neil Heather  
Submission Summary: That Council re-prioritise resources to invest in independent co-ordination and increase land management team support for the development of sub-catchment action plans.  
Decision Sought: That Council re-prioritise resources to invest in independent co-ordination and increase land management team support for the development of sub-catchment action plans.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

---

Submission Number: 16: 13 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Neil Heather  
Submission Summary: That Council confirms that the Rotorua Lakes WMA scheduled for 2020 is intended to give effect to the NPS-FW 2014; that this policy will be informed by the results of the science review and will include a review of values, objectives limits and methods.  
Decision Sought: That Council confirms that the Rotorua Lakes WMA scheduled for 2020 is intended to give effect to the NPS-FW 2014; that this policy will be informed by the results of the science review and will include a review of values, objectives limits and methods.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part
---------------------------------------

---

Submission Number: 16: 16 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Neil Heather  
Submission Summary: That the Council re-prioritise resources to invest in independent co-ordination and increased land management team support for the development of sub-catchment Action plans; based on the successful project like they did in the years 1990 to 2000.  
Decision Sought: That the Council re-prioritise resources to invest in independent co-ordination and increased land management team support for the development of sub-catchment Action plans; based on the successful project like they did in the years 1990 to 2000.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

---

Submission Number: 17: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: D & A Trust  
Submission Summary: The proposed rules will prevent any further economic development. Thus expansion to the urban area cannot happen. In the rules area, de-nitrification will be required to meet the targets further reducing economic activity. The proposed Rules place an unfair burden on a small group of landowners - not on the wider community.  
Decision Sought: The rules as proposed in PC10 do not progress in their current form. Council develop a plan for purchase land and change the land use at community cost, not individual cost.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

---

Submitter Number: 19:7 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Dixon Reeves  
Submission Summary: The plan unnecessarily and unfairly restricts my ability to farm by basing allocation on my current land use not my ability to manage effectively or whether the land use is suitable for the productive capacity of the soil.  
Decision Sought: I seek that the Council provide flexibility in the plan to allow for ongoing development and flexibility in farm management above the sector average.  
I seek that the Council review nitrogen allocation and flexibility to lower N discharge properties to better reflect their ultimate productive potential not limited by their current land use.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

---

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 20: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Peter McLean and Michelle Rennie

Submission Summary: I do not support the Policies, methods or rules of PC10. I do not support the nitrogen discharge allowance process and the requirement that land owners reduce nutrient loss by way of regulation. It should be in collaboration with suitable persons involved in creating a benchmark not consent.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 23: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Roger and Norreen Martin

Submission Summary: The rules are not fair nor equitable. It will affect our farm business, capital value and flexibility of farm use in the future. I do not support the policies, method or rules of PC10.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 24: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: JT & SA Butterworth

Submission Summary: Our farm is 22km away from Lake Rotorua and we believe it takes 88 years for the nutrients to get to the lake so we haven't even started to contribute to the decline in water quality. We are also very conscious of the need to restore and maintain the quality of water in our lakes but not at the expense of the PC10 which has become highly prescriptive of farm inputs with intensive monitoring which is the opposite of what Panel indicated throughout the entire consultation process.

Decision Sought: The solutions must be fair and equitable. They must minimise the economic costs and be based on sound and robust science. I strongly suggest that council parks PC10 and works with the catchment farmers in prioritising sub-catchment delivering significant nutrient loads to the lake; assisting sub-catchment communities in developing sub-catchment action plans to prioritise critical source areas significant at sub-catchment scale and cost effective interventions for reducing high nutrient base flow and flood flow loads to the lake; and that these interventions would appropriately being considered by the incentives fund.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 24: 13 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: JT & SA Butterworth

Submission Summary: Nitrogen in lake water is not the only nutrient causing any environmental impact. A lake that has been stable for 12 years is significant and should inform policy. It also means that the law makers can take sufficient time to make sure that the path they are travelling on is the right one. The effects of the rules will be irreversible so when it transpires that the figures were wrong or there was another way to restore the lake it would be dishonorable for Councilors to have not considered all the options prior to the rules being implemented.

Decision Sought: Council parks PC10 and works with the catchment farmers in prioritising sub-catchments; assisting sub-catchment communities in developing sub-catchment action plans to prioritise critical source areas and cost effective interventions for reducing high nutrient base flow and flood flow loads to the lake; and that these interventions would appropriately being considered by the incentives fund.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 24: 14 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: JT & SA Butterworth

Submission Summary: The timeframe that has been set to restore the lake is not fair or equitable of takes account of the intergenerational principal to current land owners given that the current water quality issues were mostly created by decisions of past community leaders. Waikato Regional Council has decided to allow 80 years for restoration of the Waikato catchment as they feel it took that long to degrade it.

Decision Sought: I strongly suggest that council parks PC10 and works with the catchment farmers in prioritising sub-catchments; assisting sub-catchment communities in developing sub-catchment action plans to prioritise

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management

## Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

critical source areas and cost effective interventions for reducing high nutrient base flow and flood flow loads to the lake; and that these interventions would appropriately being considered by the incentives fund.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 26: 4 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
Submission Summary: The objectives and policies do not preclude introducing similar allocations or reductions from urban loads. The 435tN sustainable limit and the allocation by dischargers within the integrated framework also implies that there will be no opportunity to increase the discharge from the Waste Water Treatment Plant.  
Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion in PC 10 to the Regional Plan of appropriate objective(s), policies and methods to address its submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 2 - 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
Further Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd  
Submission Summary: It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas.  
Decision Sought: Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 4 - 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
Further Submitter: Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust  
Submission Summary: The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua. The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.  
Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 26: 5 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
Submission Summary: The objectives and policies do not preclude introducing similar allocations or reductions from urban loads. The 435tN sustainable limit and the allocation by dischargers within the integrated framework also implies that there will be no opportunity to increase the discharge from the Waste Water Treatment Plant.  
Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion in PC 10 to the Regional Plan of appropriate objective(s), policies and methods to address its submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 2 - 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
Further Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd  
Submission Summary: It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas  
Decision Sought: Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: Further Submitter: 4 - 2 Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submission Summary: The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua.  
 The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.  
 Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 8 - 62 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
 Support the intent that PC 10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake.  
 We do not support exemptions for particular sectors as this will place an even greater and impossible burden on remaining sectors – rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject in Part

Further Submission No: 12 - 5 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
 Support the intent that PC10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake.  
 We do not support exemptions for particular sectors - rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.  
 Decision Sought: Include all sectors and contributors to both the problems and the solutions.

Panel Recommendation: Reject in Part

Submission Number: 26: 6 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
 Submission Summary: RLC supports Bay of Plenty Regional Council's ('BOPRC') use of a rules-based approach as a planning method in the Regional Plan to reduce discharges of nitrogen into land and then into the catchment. However, PC 10 must allow Rotorua communities to continue to provide for their social, cultural and economic well-being, which is not currently the case with PC 10.  
 Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion in PC 10 to the Regional Plan of appropriate objective(s), policies and methods to address its submission.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 26: 15 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
 Submission Summary: BERL Population projections predict a population increase. The size of the tourism sector is planned to double from 2015 to 2030. This will create additional load on the Rotorua Waste Water Treatment Plant ('WWTP'). There may be opportunities to reduce nitrogen from land use within the Lake Rotorua catchment e.g. land use change to lifestyle or residential, that would require a greater output from the WWTP. In addition RLC is receiving pressure to consider reticulation of Lake Tarawera. The current RPS and Regional Plan provisions do not explicitly allow for these increases to be accommodated and could result in a requirement for expensive technical solutions or offsets being purchased. RLC does not want to be forced to limit growth and/or enact expensive solutions prior to 2032 when it is not known whether the PC 10 targets or their timing are correct.  
 Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion of appropriate objective(s), policies and relevant methods in PC 10 to the



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Regional Plan to recognise and provide for urban growth in the Rotorua district, and for consequent increased loads to the WWTP that result in nitrogen entering Lake Rotorua.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	2 - 3	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd		
Submission Summary:	It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas.		
Decision Sought:	Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.		

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No:	4 - 3	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust		
Submission Summary:	The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua.  The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.		
Decision Sought:	Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.		

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number:	26: 18	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Rotorua Lakes Council		
Submission Summary:	BERL Population projections predict a population increase, the size of the tourism sector is planned to double from 2015 to 2030. This will create additional load on the Rotorua Waste Water Treatment Plant ('WWTP'). There may be opportunities to reduce nitrogen from land use within the Lake Rotorua catchment e.g. land use change to lifestyle or residential, that would require a greater output from the WWTP. In addition RLC is receiving pressure to consider reticulation of Lake Tarawera. The current RPS and Regional Plan provisions do not explicitly allow for these increases to be accommodated and could result in a requirement for expensive technical solutions or offsets being purchased. RLC does not want to be forced to limit growth and/or enact expensive solutions prior to 2032 when it is not known whether the PC 10 targets or their timing are correct.		
Decision Sought:	RLC seeks the inclusion of appropriate objective(s), policies and relevant methods in PC 10 to the Regional Plan to recognise and provide for urban growth in the Rotorua district, and for consequent increased loads to the WWTP that result in nitrogen entering Lake Rotorua.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	2 - 4	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd		
Submission Summary:	It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas.		
Decision Sought:	Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.		

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No:	4 - 4	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust		
Submission Summary:	The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua.		

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.

Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 8 - 63 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC 10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake, both urban and rural and including underdeveloped Maori land; that consideration is given to inter-generational equity; that proposed restrictions – urban or rural – are subject to robust cost-benefit analysis; and that expensive solutions should not be mandated when it is not known if the PC10 targets and timings are correct. We do not support exemptions for particular sectors as this will place an even greater and impossible burden on remaining sectors – rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject in Part

Further Submission No: 12 - 6 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake; that proposed restrictions are subject to robust cost-benefit analysis and that expensive solutions should not be mandated when it is not known if the PC10 targets and timings are correct. We do not support exemptions for particular sectors - rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: Include all sectors and contributors to both the problems and the solutions.

Panel Recommendation: Reject in Part

Submission Number: 26: 19 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council

Submission Summary: PC 10 does not give effect to Policy WL 5B of the RPS for the following reasons:  
 a. PC 10's proposed allocation of 435tN among land use activities, and in particular the implied allocation for the discharge from Rotorua's WWTP, does not:  
 i. Allow for intergenerational equity in that Rotorua's urban growth will be effectively capped.  
 ii. Consider the extent of the immediate impact given the discharge of treated wastewater accounts for less than 5% of the nitrogen load into Lake Rotorua;  
 iii. Provide for resource use efficiency due to the extremely high cost of removing nitrogen from future wastewater discharges;  
 iv. Have sufficient regard for the high public cost of constraining growth through restrictions placed on WWTP discharges.

Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion of appropriate objective(s), policies and relevant methods in PC 10 to the Regional Plan to recognise and provide for urban growth in the Rotorua district, and for consequent increased loads to the WWTP that result in nitrogen entering Lake Rotorua.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 2 - 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd

Submission Summary: It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas.

Decision Sought: Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part
--------------------------------------

Further Submission No: 4 - 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust

Submission Summary: The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua.

The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.

Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part
--------------------------------------

Further Submission No: 8 - 61 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC 10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake, that consideration is given to inter-generational equity; that proposed restrictions – urban or rural – are subject to robust cost-benefit analysis. We do not support exemptions for particular sectors as this will place an even greater and impossible burden on remaining sectors – rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject in Part
--------------------------------------

Further Submission No: 12 - 4 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake; consideration of intergenerational equity; that proposed restrictions are subject to robust cost-benefit analysis. We do not support exemptions for particular sectors - rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: Include all sectors and contributors to both the problems and the solutions.

Panel Recommendation: Reject in Part
--------------------------------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 26: 36 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
 Submission Summary: The consequence for change to occur in how rural land is used in the Rotorua District as a result of the implementation of PC10 requires RLC as the administrator of the Rotorua District Plan to in turn consider indirect but related adverse effects of land use change including visual effects and amenity effects, both at the macro/whole of district amenity level and also amenity for individual land owners.  
 Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion in PC10 to the regional plan of appropriate objectives(s), policies and methods to address its submissions on the topic of rural land use.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 26: 40 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
 Submission Summary: The Lake Rotorua Integrated Framework referenced in the introduction of PC10, includes an Incentives Scheme to remove 100tN which is not set up to minimise the economic impact while seeking the reduced nitrogen limit.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 27: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Gro2 Ltd  
 Submission Summary: The proposed changes will mean it is no longer economic for us to continue farming.  
 Decision Sought: Work with farmers to make improvements we can do now, detention dams arrest nutrient, prevent erosion, eliminate flooding and stop soil reaching the lake.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No: 7 - 12 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No: 8 - 14 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 27: 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Gro2 Ltd  
 Submission Summary: Nitrogen is a natural element not a pollutant, leaching is an act of nature triggered by the Autumn rains, it is not an act of Farming. Nitrogen leaches from all legumes being clover, lucerne, broom and gorse.  
 Decision Sought: Work with farmers to make improvements we can do now, detention dams arrest nutrient, prevent erosion, eliminate flooding and stop soil reaching the lake.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Further Submission(s)**

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Further Submission No: 7 - 14 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Further Submission No: 8 - 16 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number: 27: 10 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Gro2 Ltd  
 Submission Summary: In haste to restore the lake to water quality of the 1960's they have forgotten that;  
 -There are not 50,000 more people living in the catchment, Rotorua became a city of 20,000 people about 1962  
 -There are now 3 million visitors to Rotorua per year.  
 -The weir in the Ohau Channel is maintaining an artificially high lake level preventing the lake from flushing and causing silting in the inflowing streams. They need dredging as they used to be in the 1960's.  
 -The introduction of trout proved fatal for much of the indigenous foods. Trout have eaten the native fish that are part of the lifecycle for the native Kakahi which filter nutrients from the waters.  
 -Significant water takes from Rotorua City not operating in the 1960's are reducing the volume of clear clean water and increasing the volume of grey water.  
 -There were more animals in the Rotorua county in the 1970's than there is today, 71,000 beef cattle, 66,000 dairy cattle, over 1 million sheep.  
 -The work effort of our forebears who cleared the bush, and struggled with low fertility soils. No one should be encouraged to put now productive farmland back into trees.  
 -Diversification of land use in the catchment was tried in the 80's. To my knowledge blueberries at Mamaku is the only business that has prospered. The rest have gone back to sheep, dairy, beef, radiata and gorse.  
 Decision Sought: Work with farmers to make improvements we can do now, detention dams arrest nutrient, prevent erosion, eliminate flooding and stop soil reaching the lake.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject in part
------------------------	----------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 7 - 10 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. Council knows these statistics but has chosen to make farming the political scape goat as they are small in number.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject in part
-----------------------	----------------

Further Submission No: 8 - 11 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. Council knows these statistics but has chosen to continue on its original pathway as farming is an easy target. Rather than rules, work with land owners to make improvements, accept that controlling phosphorus by way of detention dams, together with riparian plantings will prevent erosion, eliminate flooding and stop sediment reaching the lake.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject in part
-----------------------	----------------

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Further Submission No: 12 - 1 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: Amend Method LR M2 Science reviews to include consideration of:  
the effects of the weir in Ohau Channel  
- the effects of loss of kakahi consequent to introduction of trout.

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number: 29: 1 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: WB Shaw and SM Beadel

Submission Summary: We support the principle of the plan change. Landowners, such as ourselves, are going to continue to re-assess sustainable land use practices. There needs to be very good ongoing coordination between the Regional Council and Rotorua Lakes Council in terms of potentially related provisions in District and Regional Plans.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 29: 3 Submission Type: Support in Part

Submitter: WB Shaw and SM Beadel

Submission Summary: An overall vision of what will comprise sustainable long-term land use across the lakes catchments seems to be lacking.

Decision Sought: The Regional and District Councils, combined, need to continue to investigate options for sustainable land management, and to support a science-based approach to that.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part
---------------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 1 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part
--------------------------------------

Further Submission No: 7 - 27 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part
--------------------------------------

Submission Number: 30: 1 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Fish & Game New Zealand (Eastern Region Fish and Game Council)

Submission Summary: The Eastern Fish and Game Council recognise that the Rotorua lakes require further management to reduce nutrient loads. Fish and Game support the land use allocation approach to nutrient limitation as detailed within the plan change.

Decision Sought: No changes specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept
-------------------------------

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 34: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Chris Sutton

Submission Summary: The Lake Taupo example saw landowners paid a fair price for changing land use. If you want dairying out of the catchment, then buy their farms.  
This rule change seems unfair, punishing a generation, unfocussed and overly complicated.

Decision Sought: Break the lake catchment into stream catchments with individual stream catchment plans, combining to form the total Lake Rotorua Catchment Plan.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 34: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Chris Sutton

Submission Summary: These rule changes will drive land use not to its most economic but that that is allowed, forestry. In Taupo no one asked the people if a catchment of pine trees was what they wanted? But that was what they now have. Are we about to repeat this in Rotorua?  
Facts are now showing us that it is no longer N that should be the focus nutrient but P. By ruling forestry as the default land use, forestry will pulse P into the catchment far quicker.

Decision Sought: Break the lake catchment into stream catchments with individual stream catchment plans, combining to form the total Lake Rotorua Catchment Plan.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 7 - 25 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth

Submission Summary: The Rotorua community stated very strongly when District Council did their eastern and western district consultations that they did not want to look out at a sea of pine trees located within the caldera. Regional Council have never asked the community what they would like to see in their caldera, but they are driving land use change to trees. Forestry will deliver huge quantities of P to the lake at harvest and up until canopy cover is established (5 years or more) that will significantly alter the N:P ratio and in fact encourage algae growth in the lake waters. You could end up having to dose the lake with Nitrogen.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No: 8 - 29 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: The Rotorua community stated very strongly when District Council did their eastern and western district consultations that they did not want to look out at a sea of pine trees located within the caldera. Regional Council have never asked the community what they would like to see in their caldera, but they are driving land use change to trees. Forestry will deliver huge quantities of P to the lake at harvest and up until canopy cover is established (5 years or more) that will significantly alter the N:P ratio and in fact encourage algae growth in the lake waters.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 36: 1 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Tracey Friend and Myles McNaught

Submission Summary: We support the ideal of a clean lake and environment.

Decision Sought: We would like to see some more science being done before such a huge change is made. The economic and social consequences will be much larger than anyone has thought through.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 37: 7 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Ngati Whakaue Tribal Lands Incorporation

Submission Summary: PC10 is focused almost exclusively on N. It is our very strong recommendation that the recent advances in our knowledge compel an adaptive management approach.

Decision Sought: The scope of PC10 must be broadened to address nutrient reduction pathways for both N and P.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 5 - 1 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Astrid Coker

Submission Summary: Control of both N and P within the catchment is necessary to improve water quality and reduce algal blooms caused by cyanobacteria in Lake Rotorua. Control of only nitrogen will lead to worsening water quality in the long term. Best management practices for P mitigation are more appropriate than use of OVERSEER® in farm plans for P mitigation.

Decision Sought: On farm nutrient reductions under PC 10 must address both N and P. OVERSEER® should not be used in farm plans for P mitigation.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 38: 3 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Donald Rosslove

Submission Summary: I recommend that rather than imposed rules an Accord is drafted- similar to the Forestry Accord. More consistent with a cooperative approach by all farming interests towards innovative and effective sustainable farming practices which do not compromise Lake Rotorua.

Decision Sought: I recommend that rather than imposed rules an Accord is drafted- similar to the Forestry Accord. More consistent with a cooperative approach by all farming interests towards innovative and effective sustainable farming practices which do not compromise Lake Rotorua.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 41: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Craig Hurst

Submission Summary: We all want to see the water quality in the lake improve. It is great to see the progress we have made in this regard and the lake TL1 at the targeted 4.2. If adopted the proposed rules have the capacity to put rural land owners out of business through:  
 •Reduced Equity  
 •Reduced Cash Flow  
 •No Credit  
 There are 15,000 ha of dry stock land in the catchment. The N reduction target for my farm is 7t N from 157.2 ha, or 16% of the total dry stock target from 1% of the total land. This is unequitable. The proposed rules are unequitable, unfair & unrealistic.

Decision Sought: Farming in the catchment should remain a permitted activity. Land owners should be allowed to operate at or below their current benchmark figure and manage a staged reduction in nutrient loss based on best management practice.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 42: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Damon Campbell

Submission Summary: The proposed rules using the best science available it not equitable and independent science reviews are necessary. The health of the lake is an intergenerational problem and needs an intergenerational solution.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject



## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 44: 8 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Andrea Hammond  
 Submission Summary: There is no information on how nitrogen discharge from properties within the town boundaries is to be measured or managed.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 45: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Wendy and John Roe  
 Submission Summary: The rules are not fair or equitable. I do not support the policies, methods or rules of plan change 10.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 48: 4 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Parekarangi Trust  
 Submission Summary: Both Nitrogen and phosphorus are key nutrients in the TLI measurements.  
 Decision Sought: Change name to nutrient management plan.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 48: 30 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Parekarangi Trust  
 Submission Summary: Plan change 10 has been developed on the premise that TLI for Lake Rotorua will continue to increase, based on modelling with the likes of ROTAN. Such models are poor predictors of Lake Rotorua water quality, with actual TLI confirming this, showing a steady decline since 2005. There remains no current evidence to support the modelling that has determined a sustainable nitrogen load for Lake Rotorua of 435 tonN/year, when the steady state is up to 755 tonN/year, and yet the TLI target is being achieved.  
 Decision Sought: The TLI target of 4.2 for Lake Rotorua is supported. Proposed solutions are:  
 i. By 2022 all dairy farmers are achieving best practice as defined by DairyNZ.  
 ii. By 2022 if TLI for Lake Rotorua continues to achieve a 5 year average of 4.2, then no further N or P reductions are required on-farm.  
 iii. If 5 year average TLI for Lake Rotorua exceeds 4.2, then new NDA's are set subject to advances in science and technology, that ensure farmers profitability and long term viability are not impacted.  
 iv. If (iii) above is unable to be achieved, then farmers will be compensated for their loss in capital value.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 7 - 35 Submission Type: Not Applicable  
 Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Further Submission No: 8 - 40 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 48: 31 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Parekarangi Trust  
 Submission Summary: Plan change 10 has been developed on the premise that TLI for Lake Rotorua will continue to increase, based on modelling with the likes of ROTAN. Such models are poor predictors of Lake Rotorua water quality, with actual TLI confirming this, showing a steady decline since 2005.  
 There remains no current evidence to support the modelling that has determined a sustainable nitrogen load for Lake Rotorua of 435tN/year, when the steady state is up to 755 tN/year, and yet the TLI target is being achieved.  
 Decision Sought: The TLI target of 4.2 for Lake Rotorua is supported. Proposed solutions are:  
 i. By 2022 all dairy farmers are achieving best practice as defined by DairyNZ.  
 ii. By 2022 if TLI for Lake Rotorua continues to achieve a 5 year average of 4.2, then no further N or P reductions are required on-farm.  
 iii. If 5 year average TLI for Lake Rotorua exceeds 4.2, then new NDA's are set subject to advances in science and technology, that ensure farmers profitability and long term viability are not impacted.  
 iv. If (iii) above is unable to be achieved, then farmers will be compensated for their loss in capital value.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 49: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: The present plan is based on grandparenting, despite being called an "integrated framework". Section 11.7 of the section 32 report identifies several alternative options that were discarded after very little consideration.  
 Tax/charge was covered very sketchily. The only analysis being two reports, one from 1999, the other a 2011 OECD report.  
 Unlike grandparenting, pollution charge/tax is property neutral. A pollution charge has all the focus on driving that cost down. Activities must internalise their costs of production, or the land use changes. Charging appears to have been dismissed, without investigating:  
 • what it might be set at.  
 • how transitions in level of charge could drive behavior.  
 • how to divorce it from political interference.  
 • how it could be used to drive behavior in the right direction, and how to tune it to meet targets.  
 Comparing the level of effort to assess whether a charging regime could work, to the amount of time effort and funds that have gone into trying to make the grandparenting allocation/OVERSEER® regime work. CNI believes that other options for driving down N pollution were discarded without adequate consideration.  
 The decision to choose grandparent allocation was made without carrying out any sensitivity analysis of such relevant things as:  
 • Internal Rate of Return (IRR, which was done at 8%, when present rates are closer to 3%,  
 • Price variation for land use  
 Decision Sought: Revise the approach to allocation, replace it with one that uses the approach of matching land use to natural capital.  
 Identify in the plan the route to making this transition from present use to natural capital.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 8 - 47 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: LUC or Natural Capital was found at StAG to be completely unsuitable to the particular circumstances pertaining to this region. The reality of these proposed methods in Rotorua

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

would mean that all lifestyles and surrounding the lake and city should actually be dairy farms whilst most dairy farms in Rotorua would be forced to convert to sheep and beef, and many sheep and beef would be designated as appropriate for no more than forestry. It is untenable to support LUC once the reality of it in Rotorua is understood and if land in Rotorua were designated along these lines it would be a full-scale attack on existing land uses and property rights.

LUC is not appropriate for Rotorua as a method to reallocate land use but could be a way forward in the future for directing any future development of land in the catchment.

Decision Sought:

As above

Panel Recommendation:	Accept in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Further Submission No:	14 - 4	Submission Type:	Support
------------------------	--------	------------------	---------

Further Submitter:	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd
--------------------	------------------------------------

Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission. Supports a transition to a fairer approach based on natural capital.
---------------------	--

Decision Sought:	As above
------------------	----------

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number:	49: 7	Submission Type:	Oppose
--------------------	-------	------------------	--------

Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd
------------	-----------------------------

Submission Summary:	The development of the rules was done by a collaborative stakeholder group. This group was well represented by those land uses creating the pollution, and not represented by those land uses creating the lowest amount of pollution, and representation on that group didn't correlate to the land area subject to the rules.
---------------------	---

Decision Sought:	In revising the fundamental approach to allocation, and in order to zero-base the discussion, ensure that all those parties with significant landholdings in the catchment have a place at the table for discussion on any allocation regime.
------------------	---

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	14 - 5	Submission Type:	Support
------------------------	--------	------------------	---------

Further Submitter:	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd
--------------------	------------------------------------

Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission. The plan change approach reflects the makeup of the collaborative stakeholder group and while forestry is a significant land use in the catchment forestry was not represented in the final stages of the process.
---------------------	--

Decision Sought:	As above
------------------	----------

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number:	49: 8	Submission Type:	Oppose
--------------------	-------	------------------	--------

Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd
------------	-----------------------------

Submission Summary:	The plan avoids confronting the fact that the level of N leaching from bovine dairying makes it an unsustainable land use in the Rotorua catchment. Instead of directly dealing with that problem it introduces an extremely complicated regime while heavily constraining all other land uses. The methodology used by the plan also creates a value for that pollution which will increase the value of the land on which this activity is carried out through nitrogen discharge entitlements of allowance.. It overrides the principles regarding polluter pays, fairness and equity, and sustainable management.
---------------------	---

Decision Sought:	Revise the approach to allocation set out in the policies and rules, so it uses the approach of matching land use to natural capital rather than the proposed regime, which is based on averaged sector contributions. Identify in the plan the route to making this transition from present use to natural capital.
------------------	---

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 8 – 49

Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: LUC or Natural Capital was found at StAG to be completely unsuitable to the particular circumstances pertaining to this region.  
It is untenable to support LUC once the reality of it in Rotorua is understood and if land in Rotorua were designated along these lines it would be a full-scale attack on existing land uses and property rights.  
LUC is not appropriate for Rotorua as a method to reallocate land use but could be a way forward in the future for directing any future development of land in the catchment.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Accept in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Further Submission No: 14 - 6

Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. The plan change approach reflects the makeup of the collaborative stakeholder group and while forestry is a significant land use in the catchment forestry was not represented in the final stages of the process.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number: 49: 9

Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: A 'Grandparenting' approach limits the ability of other responsible landowners in the catchment, who have historically minimised their nitrogen emissions from using and developing their land in a manner that enables them to provide for their wellbeing. It is inequitable. It places the cost of future compliance on those responsible landowners that have historically mitigated the effects, whilst enabling those polluting to continue to pollute.

Decision Sought: Revise the approach to allocation set out in the policies and rules, so it uses the approach of matching land use to natural capital rather than the proposed regime, which is based on averaged sector contributions.  
Identify in the plan the route to making this transition from present use to natural capital.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 8 - 50

Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: LUC or Natural Capital was found at StAG to be completely unsuitable to the particular circumstances pertaining to this region.  
It is untenable to support LUC once the reality of it in Rotorua is understood and if land in Rotorua were designated along these lines it would be a full-scale attack on existing land uses and property rights.  
LUC is not appropriate for Rotorua as a method to reallocate land use but could be a way forward in the future for directing any future development of land in the catchment.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Accept in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Further Submission No: 14 - 7

Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. The plan change approach reflects the makeup of the collaborative stakeholder group and while forestry is a significant land use in the catchment forestry was not represented in the final stages of the process.

Decision Sought: As above

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number:	50: 2	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Oturoa Properties Ltd		
Submission Summary:	Unless the science proves otherwise it is impossible to meet the 2032 target without impacting GMP and further impacting the future of my family.		
Decision Sought:	Not specified.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number:	51: 1	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Max Martin		
Submission Summary:	I have farmed my property at 99 Dansey road for 49 years during that time significant areas have been retired from grazing and other areas planted in pines. This has had a serious effect on the viability of the farming operations.		
Decision Sought:	Not specified.		

Panel Recommendations:	The Panel do not consider this to be a submission point.
------------------------	--

Submission Number:	52: 1	Submission Type:	Neutral
Submitter:	Jim and Barbara Hitchcock		
Submission Summary:	Points I would like to cover in my submission: Our story, our views, the economic impact, OVERSEER®, benchmarking and allocation and an alternative option.		
Decision Sought:	Not specified.		

Panel Recommendations:	The Panel do not consider this to be a submission point.
------------------------	--

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	16 - 1	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Jim and Barbara Hitchcock		
Submission Summary:	<p>Economic impact</p> <p>The nutrient reductions required will result in less profit and a consequential drop in farm value. A huge financial burden has been put on approximately 70 properties out of a catchment population of around 60,000 people who are the ultimate beneficiaries of a clean lake. Farms in the catchment have become unsalable. If the proposed rules come into effect the bank estimates a further 20% reduction in farm values. The farm supports 4 families. Farm modelling and financial analysis suggests additional mitigation measures will cost another \$30,000 per year or a loss of \$120,000 per year if converting a portion of the farm to forestry.</p> <p>Overseer: OVERSEER® is not calibrated to our rainfall and will take 4 years of field trial work to give accurate data to enable more accurate OVERSEER® results. Version changes have resulted in previous mitigation measures being deemed irrelevant e.g. standoff pad that wasn't lined went back up 2kgN/ha with a version change. We need a monitoring tool that is accurate.</p> <p>Benchmarking and allocation; Dairy farmers that refused to supply BOPRC benchmarking figures have been given a benchmark of 99.7kg N/ha and a target of 68.5kg N/ha. On our property we would be 1.6T N better off if we had not cooperated and been given a target of 60kg N/ha. The proposed allocation of N in the dairy sector has been skewed by one farmer who owns approximately 30% of the total benchmarked dairy land in the catchment.</p> <p>Alternative option</p> <p>An alternative option would be buying dairy farms and converting them to dry stock then selling them. Based on their calculations this would cost the Regional Council \$3 million to remove 14T of N. If this was done with 7 farms Regional Council could remove 98T of N for \$21 million. Adopting this approach would result in the remaining farms continuing to be viable, bankable operations with achievable benchmarked nutrient losses and remain an integral part of the local community.</p>		
Decision Sought:	Consider purchasing the affected properties at market value, convert them to lower N loss land uses then resell the properties		

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 53: 10 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: National and international experience shows that the closer the decisions are made to the resource managers and communities of interest, the faster and more effective is adoption of new ideas and transformation of resource use. I see sub catchment groups working in collaboration as the best way to move past the barriers being put up by PC10 rules. Let's shift the focus from rules and compliance to fixing things, managing change, achieving our shared goals and values.

Decision Sought: That BOPRC facilitate the establishment of sub-catchment action groups to implement shared goals and would include farmers, lifestyle farmers and urban communities alongside science expertise and land management support.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 55: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: NZ Deer Farmer's Association

Submission Summary: The Bay of Plenty Deer Farmers branch supports an accord in place of a rules based system. Working together to find on farm solutions and sharing knowledge through education and land environment plans developed with the support of industry and regional council would be a far more valuable approach.

Decision Sought: We request an independent review of the balance of 'representative' participants of the StAG group and independent assessment of StAG outcomes for bias relating to:  
a) sector representation  
b) land owner representation  
c) Assessment of vested interests in outcomes  
Such a review will reveal that StAG has not adequately represented all landowners and that the negotiated outcomes has resulted in bias towards vested interests of StAG participants.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 57: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Jeanette Watkins

Submission Summary: I am opposed to plan change 10. I believe there will be dire consequences if the proposed changes are implemented.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 58: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: The 435 tonnes per annum is a limit, not a target:  
- farming should not be trying to hit 435 as a target assigning all of it to themselves  
- being as dirty as possible is not managing a resource  
Setting all conservation land to an NDA of zero above rainfall, immediately and until perpetuity, is unreasonable. It is unfair that one generation is now facing the music for decades of pollution. The proposed rules do not consider the changing demographic of the catchment. The proposed rules are slanted heavily in favor of trying to establish the status quo created by opting for a Rule 11 as a baseline for pollution allocation.

Decision Sought: First Choice: The idea is to have farming voluntarily wind itself down in regard to the discharge of pollution, against the 2037 deadline.  
-Use the proposed rules, and current process, as a starting point for interim rules, active until 2037 (one full generation).  
-Develop a long term set of rules as a separate process to become active in 2037  
-Develop a set of concessions to support, and provide compensation for, the shutting down of intensive/commercial pastoral farming in the catchment.  
-Add a Heritage farming operation to the list of 2017 permitted activities where land owners incentivised into early adoption of a significantly reduced NDA,  
-Add an Indigenous farming operation to the list of 2017 permitted activities where land owners incentivised into adopting low intensity farming practices.  
-Where land owners work the land, allowances made to give them time to do land conversion. (Refer to Appendix of submission for outline of the proposed rule framework).

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 58: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: The 435 tonnes per annum is a limit, not a target:  
 - farming should not be trying to hit 435 as a target assigning all of it to themselves  
 - being as dirty as possible is not managing a resource  
 Setting all conservation land to an NDA of zero above rainfall, immediately and until perpetuity, is unreasonable. It is unfair that one generation is now facing the music for decades of pollution. The proposed rules do not consider the changing demographic of the catchment. The proposed rules are slanted heavily in favor of trying to establish the status quo created by opting for a Rule 11 as a baseline for pollution allocation. The option(s) give a minimal recognition for 20 years, and leave it to 2037 rules to be developed where some of the NDA removed from pastoral is transferred to conservation allocation:

Decision Sought: Amend; Second Choice:  
 Use the proposed rules and current process as a starting point for interim rules, active until 2037. Develop a long term allocation methodology with a split between two sectors of land use: pastoral and conservation, with:  
 - easy trading of NDA an exchange  
 - as temporary NDA expire, they are transferred to the conservation sector  
 - Conservation land is allowed to consolidate their NDA for small scale non pastoral land use.  
 - majority of conservation NDA on the trading exchange to generate a supply  
 (Refer to Appendix of submission for outline of the proposed rule framework)

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 58: 3 Submission Type: Not Applicable

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: The proposed rules are focused on a commercial status quo that are not in line with the values of non-commercial and semi commercial rural land owners interested in conservation.  
 The 435 tonnes per annum is a limit, not a target:  
 - farming should not be trying to hit 435 as a target assigning all of it to themselves  
 - being as dirty as possible is not managing a resource  
 Setting all conservation land to an NDA of zero above rainfall, immediately and until perpetuity, is unreasonable. It is unfair that one generation is now facing the music for decades of pollution. The proposed rules do not consider the changing demographic of the catchment. The proposed rules are slanted heavily in favor of trying to establish the status quo created by opting for a Rule 11 as a baseline for pollution allocation.

Decision Sought: Third Option - A set of rules developed by people who aren't trying to defend their financial positions and more willing to try to clean up the lake.  
 Classify the proposed rules as commercial rules for those that wish to remain under a commercially focused set of rules  
 Allow the commercials to push forward, with those rules, most noncommercial is smaller blocks are a permitted activity at least until 2022  
  
 Attempt to engage a group of land owners who are actively, or willing to actively, engage in conservation efforts to clean up the lake  
 Land owners can opt into developing a lifestyle set of rules, where indicatively:  
 - open to solutions that don't take a status quo approach  
 - individuals could face bigger NDA reductions  
 - can accept that the average NDA is lower, as commercial have already assigned themselves a higher average NDA  
 Repeat the collaborative approach that was done with the commercial interests in the StAG, by engaging lifestyle land owners, and having them come up with preferred solutions

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 58: 30 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Max Douglas  
 Submission Summary: After the incentives schemes run out/meet their goals, pasture remaining on poor sites should be able to be gradually transferred to more suitable locations on land is classified as conservation.  
 Decision Sought: Add a mechanism for pastoral land classification to be moved. Not a mechanism to increase total pasture, just relocate it to more suitable sites.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 60: 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Lyn Brown  
 Submission Summary: The resource consent process is timely and expensive and at the end of the day will likely require a significant reduction in animals.  
 Decision Sought: Proper consideration for the social and economic effects of the farmers who are affected by this proposal.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 61: 14 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Beef + Lamb New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Reference to Nitrogen Management Plans should be deleted throughout the plan change and be replaced by nutrient management plans.  
 Decision Sought: Reference to Nitrogen Management Plans should be deleted throughout the plan change and be replaced by nutrient management plans.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 13 - 1 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Christopher James Read Meban  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. I believe that P has a far greater impact on lake water quality and should be taken into account.  
 Decision Sought:

Panel Recommendation: Accept

Submission Number: 61: 15 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Beef + Lamb New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: The plan should provide for sufficient transition times from any initial allocation approach to one that provides for optimal land use over time while mitigating short term impacts on individuals or the local or regional economy.  
 Decision Sought: The plan should provide for sufficient transition times from any initial allocation approach to one that provides for optimal land use over time while mitigating short term impacts on individuals or the local or regional economy.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 63: 1 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: Bruce Thomasen  
 Submission Summary: Clean safe water is essential for life, quality of life and livelihood. Waterways that meet or exceed the 'swimmable' standard must be protected and maintained at this level. Waterways that fail this standard must be improved to 'swimmable'. I am cognisant that some surrounding landowners / farmers are going to be significantly impacted economically.  
 Decision Sought: More funding needs to be made available to assist / compensate these landowners to transition to compliance or to find alternative use so they can continue to live, work and enjoy living in our region.



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Some of those impacted have been farming for multiple generations.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	5 - 3	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Astrid Coker		
Submission Summary:	The long term effects of alum dosing are unknown. Aluminum is an established neurotoxin and has been implicated in human neurodegenerative diseases such as Alzheimer's.		
Decision Sought:	A thorough assessment of the health and safety risk of aluminum arising from alum practices for the public who will be using the lake for recreational purposes and for owners of shoreline properties.		

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number:	66: 3	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective		
Submission Summary:	The Collective is concerned that the public are being led to believe the option of continued alum dosing is not available, when there is no current science either in NZ or internationally that shows any ill effects from continued dosing.		
Decision Sought:	That nutrient reduction takes account of all the science knowledge, and a greater emphasis is placed on the total biodiversity of catchments. That both nitrogen and phosphorus and different loading levels are considered together within the integrated framework outline suggested in this submission. That science advice is sought on the effect to the lake of significant change in land use from pasture to plantation forestry having regard to understood N:P ratio's.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part
---------------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	5 - 2	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Astrid Coker		
Submission Summary:	The long term effects of alum dosing in Lake Rotorua are unknown.		
Decision Sought:	A thorough assessment of the health and safety risk of aluminum arising from alum practices for the public who will be using the lake for recreational purposes and for owners of shoreline properties.		

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Further Submission No:	12 - 2	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission.		
Decision Sought:	Greater emphasis is placed on biodiversity within the scope of the sub-catchment action plans recommended in the FFNZ primary submission.		

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number:	66: 17	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective		
Submission Summary:	The scope of PC10 has to be broader to have an enabling framework to include a wider portfolio of options by Council to work on Community solutions. This method (number 41&47) is not new, it is already in the operative Regional Water and Land Plan. It has just never been implemented by Council.		
Decision Sought:	That Council facilitate the establishment of sub-catchment community groups which will complete action plans to identify possible nutrient loss solutions for their catchment. That these groups would include farmers, lifestylers, urban communities alongside science expertise and land management support.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 66: 18 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: It is important that the Principals of the Memorandum of Understanding on the Rotorua Lakes Restoration signed between the Crown & the members of the Rotorua Lakes Strategy Group are acknowledged and taken into account when considering the impacts of the proposed Rules.

Decision Sought: Collective re-confirm our commitment to the principles of the Oturoa Agreement. We request that Council work with us to solve the problems of our lake by adopting the new proposed integrated framework that will allow farming to remain a viable industry and not forced into land use change to satisfy a rules regime.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 19 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: The introduction of the National Policy Statement on Freshwater management has provided an ideal opportunity for Council to go back to the Communities of the Rotorua District and have a more informed discussion about the current science of Lake Rotorua, and the resulting cultural, economic, social and environmental impacts of various options, costs & achievability for improving the lake.

Decision Sought: We ask that Council confirm that the Lake Rotorua Catchment will be part of a Water management area subject to the provisions of the NPS- Freshwater in 2020.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 66: 22 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: No farms have been able to complete the farm plan process Council has dictated, thus none can obtain an understanding of the impacts of the rules on their properties. Land owners are not able to make informed submissions to this Plan Change as they do not understand the full effect of the consequences.

Decision Sought: Defer PC10 until landowners can fully understand the consequences of the rules and have the ability to make informed submissions to Council.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 33 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: The TLI parameters assumed no internal nutrient load. The legacy load within the lake contributes 360 tonnes of N that can be released up to 10 times a year. The unexpected turnaround in the lake TLI subsequent to alum treatments in two streams is significant in highlighting the ongoing importance of internal nutrients and phosphorus as a key driver of algal dynamics in Lake Rotorua.

Decision Sought: Council acknowledge that the internal loading of the lake does have effects on science data. Council work with Strategy partners to focus on mitigating the legacy internal lake loads. Council to acknowledge that the revision will necessitate review of RPS load numbers and load reduction targets.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 66: 131 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: The Collective supports the establishment of the Incentive Fund and is concerned that the narrow terms of reference coupled with a tight budget are making it difficult to deliver an enduring solution to the lake.

Decision Sought: We support the proposed from Federated Farmers that discussions are initiated with the funding partners to explore widening the terms of reference to include community wide mitigation solutions.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 67: 1 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Karl Weaver

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Summary: 1. Nitrogen reduction from pastoral landowners will be offset by increased nitrogen production from growth in tourism as our sewage system won't cope.  
2. Dairy grazing blocks of high natural capital value have not been recognised.  
I support the right environmental solutions for Lake Rotorua but the solutions must be fair and equitable across the entire community.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 67: 2 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Karl Weaver  
 Submission Summary: Early discussion indicated the likelihood of customised solutions for individual landowners via a 'toolbox' of options.  
 Decision Sought: Capturing the 'low fruit' in each catchment should be the priority and driven by landowners within that catchment.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 67: 11 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Karl Weaver  
 Submission Summary: I do not support the Policies, Method or Rules of Plan Change 10. I do not support nitrogen discharge allowance process and the requirement that landowners reduce nutrient loss by way of regulation.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 68: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Sharlene Willemsen  
 Submission Summary: Rule 10 will adversely affect the ability for our property to farm effectively. Rule 10 will adversely affect the value of our property.  
 Decision Sought: Cancel Rule.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 69: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust  
 Submission Summary: Rule 10 will adversely affect the ability for our property to farm effectively. Rule 10 will adversely affect the value of our property.  
 Decision Sought: Cancel Rule 10.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 5 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: To avoid the need for plan changes every time an OVERSEER® version is superseded, FANZ suggests that a generic reference to OVERSEER® is used throughout the Proposed Plan Change.  
 Decision Sought: FANZ suggests that a generic reference to OVERSEER® is used throughout the Proposed Plan Change.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

Submission Number: 70: 7 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Currently the Proposed Plan Change is inconsistent in its use of the terms and 'nutrient' would encompass the management of phosphorus, which is a matter addressed in Policy LR P2 and the Nitrogen Management Plan in Schedule LR Six.

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Decision Sought: FANZ suggest replacing the term 'Nitrogen Management Plans' with 'Nutrient Management Plans', and 'Nitrogen Budgets' with 'Nutrient Budgets'.

Panel Recommendations:	Accept
------------------------	--------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	13 - 3	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Christopher James Read Meban		
Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation:	Accept
-----------------------	--------

---

Submission Number:	72: 1	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers		
Submission Summary:	Policy and practices should be informed by best current science and the TORs which need to have high legitimacy with stakeholders, a comprehensive evaluation of policy options and consequences is both wise and required, the development of S&LCMGs will deliver both remediation and capacity building.		
Decision Sought:	Suspend implementation of PC10 subject to (a) an independent science review, (b) commissioned economic, social, cultural and environmental impact assessment, including a Section 32 RMA impact assessment (c) empower Stream and Land Care Management Groups (S&LCMGs) with science about 'hot spots'.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	12 - 42	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

---

Submission Number:	72: 3	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers		
Submission Summary:	PC10 will require a switch from high N discharges, high food production, and high outputs into low N, low earnings from silviculture.		
Decision Sought:	Alternative policy is developed with a far less disruptive effect on the district agribusiness' economy.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

---

Submission Number:	72: 4	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers		
Submission Summary:	The loss of dairy capital values due to PC10 in our district has been estimated at \$162m. Corresponding rates revenue loss would have to be recovered from other sectors most particularly residential and business rates.		
Decision Sought:	Suspend implementation of PC10 until an alternative policy is developed with much more reasonable impact on Rotorua Districts' ratepayers, residents and businesses.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	12 - 44	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number: 72: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers

Submission Summary: Professor David Hamilton has shown that controlling P levels is a more achievable approach to lowering the TLI.

Decision Sought: Suspend implementation of PC10 until an alternative policy is developed that shifts the focus from N to P levels and that uses a more holistic model of sustaining and improving water quality outcomes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 12 - 45 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number: 72: 6 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers

Submission Summary: The 435 target was based on the best available science of the day. Since then it has been shown that N discharges are higher from properties, that much more than previously thought is extracted from flow paths and that these extractions can be further enhanced by many mitigation methods.

Decision Sought: Suspend implementation of PC10 until an alternative policy is developed to customise N mitigation strategies stream by stream rather than by whole catchment. We recommend the development of Stream and Land Care Management Groups.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 12 - 46 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number: 72: 7 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Rotorua District Residents and Ratepayers

Submission Summary: The BoPRC Incentives programme model has struggled to gain the confidence of farmers.

Decision Sought: Suspend implementation of PC10. The focus of the programmes should move away from incentivising land use changes towards a focus on green technologies that will permanently change nutrient loadings on the lakes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 12 - 47 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

---

Submission Number: 75: 7 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: The RPS is clear that achieving further reductions to address legacy issues and to meet community values and objectives and should be funded accordingly. We acknowledge the significant contributions being made by the Crown and Council to the Incentives Fund. The fund is now in its second year and is yet to do any deals.

Decision Sought: We suggest it is timely to relook at the funding criteria.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

---

Submission Number: 75: 24 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Important context for PC10 and material to relief sought.

Decision Sought: That PC10 be amended in its entirety to give better effect to the RWLP plan review process. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

---

Submission Number: 75: 60 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: The current layout of PC10 is a bit “messy” and confusing. Most of the narrative would preferably be located in the introductory section; and the maps would preferably be located at the back with the schedules.

Decision Sought: Give consideration to re-structuring the layout for a cleaner presentation of issues, values, objectives, policies, methods, rules etc.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject in part
------------------------	----------------

---

Submission Number: 76: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Peter Seymour

Submission Summary: This proposed new plan tells me that I will have to cut back my livestock numbers. This proposed plan will very effectively cut my income and the income of the local livestock transport company, the stock agent that sells the stock, the accountant, the freezing works and on and on I could go on. How can this be good for the district?

Decision Sought: I have listed some further projects for the council to consider. I believe that these would assist to clean up the lake much more effectively:

- this catchment has more people than farmed livestock when is the council planning on reducing the number of humans, their chemicals and effluent?
- when will the number of motor vehicles on the roads be reduced?
- remove all of the pine trees from the catchment. These produce large quantities of pollen.
- why doesn't the council do something about the enormous amount of plastic bags and rubbish that are washed from the city into the lake every time it rains?
- what about removing the rafts of plastic bottles that were created?

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

---

Submission Number: 77: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Roger Wootton

Submission Summary: It's not all about dairy. Gorse should be removed and pine plantations as should all farmers have a green belt planted of nitrogen, absorbing trees, shrubs.

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 78: 15 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Tony and Joanna Carr

Submission Summary: We do not support the Incentives Fund. The narrow terms of references coupled with a tight budget are making it difficult to deliver a solution to the lake.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 79: 3 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Paul Barton

Submission Summary: The science on Lake Rotorua and the Nitrogen and Phosphorus budgets and extrapolation of them is not sound and associated N and P loading to maintain water quality are therefore not sound.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 79: 7 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Paul Barton

Submission Summary: As catfish are now in Lake Rotorua the current water quality goals are not achievable and are not going to be influenced by farming practices.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 81: 3 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Jamie and Chris Paterson

Submission Summary: Attenuation has changed all the past understandings about the catchment. That now means that there are new options to mitigate nutrients between source and the lake.

Decision Sought: Council needs to stop and take stock of the new science before proceeding with any plan change.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 13 - 2 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Christopher James Read Meban

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 81: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Jamie and Chris Paterson

Submission Summary: Te Arawa Strategy partners must take responsibility for addressing the effect of the bottom sediments in Lake Rotorua. It is not fair nor equitable that we are given only 15 years to correct a problem that was a 100 years in the making. Why are the current landowners being held accountable for nutrients in groundwater from a previous generations use.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 81: 15 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Jamie and Chris Paterson

Submission Summary: That the implementation of the proposed rules be deferred until a review of all options to enhance catchment Nitrogen attenuation, what areas and sub-catchments are more responsive to such actions. Each sub catchment needs its own catchment action plan drawn up and managed by stakeholders within the catchment.

Decision Sought: That the implementation of the proposed rules be deferred until a review of all options to enhance catchment Nitrogen attenuation, what areas and sub-catchments are more responsive to such actions. Each sub catchment needs its own catchment action plan drawn up and managed by stakeholders within the catchment.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 82: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Stuart Morrison

Submission Summary: The PC10 framework fails to take account of a changed context. The lake is meeting its TLI target, the science understanding has shifted significantly and the statutory framework has changed. PC10 carries forward a Rules and Incentives package focus on land use change as a primary driver for improving the lake.

Decision Sought: Review.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 82: 19 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Stuart Morrison

Submission Summary: I support Council's frequently expressed intent to avoid input based management in favor of a focus on outputs to measure progress.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 82: 21 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Stuart Morrison

Submission Summary: I support the commitment to the health of the lake and to meeting my part of the 2022 MRT.

Decision Sought: I support the commitment to the health of the lake and to meeting my part of the 2022 MRT.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 83: 3 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Bushlands Estate Limited and Adolle Farms Limited

Submission Summary: The Plan Change 10 Rules as they currently stand are placing an untenable burden on our farming viability. This is highly inequitable when it is borne in mind that the legacy issue is being imposed entirely on my family's shoulders. It is equally inequitable when account is made of the efforts we have gone to, to try and improve the farm's nutrient discharge.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 84: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Protect Rotorua

Submission Summary: Consultation requires the Council to provide adequate information to affected parties on the Draft Rules and to review the responses offered by affected parties with an open mind. Protect Rotorua is concerned that the Council has predetermined the substance of the Rules such as it cannot review any further feedback requested with an open mind. Protect Rotorua is concerned that the extent of expenditure on



## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

the Draft rules suggests that Council has predetermined the outcome.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 84: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Protect Rotorua

Submission Summary: Regional Council has failed to undertake a lawful consultation process by its refusal and/or failure to provide all relevant information to affected parties. In particular many landowners were not provided the rate of nitrogen loss for their property to assess the impact of the Draft Rules on them.

Decision Sought: The data underlying Rules has materially changed since October 2014 such that those affected need to be consulted again.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 84: 3 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Protect Rotorua

Submission Summary: The regional policy statement provides specific direction to the regional council (Policy WL 5B). Protect Rotorua's main concern is that the unlawful process adopted to date means the draft rules will fail to meet the criteria and especially the need to be fair and equitable in the nitrogen reduction required between affected land owners.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 84: 4 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Protect Rotorua

Submission Summary: There is a need for proper communication between the Regional Council and the District Council. Under the Rules Protect Rotorua members are being told that they may have to change their land use. However, when they talk to local authority officials to get the consent to do that they are being told it is not possible.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part
---------------------------------------

Submission Number: 84: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Protect Rotorua

Submission Summary: Protect Rotorua is concerned that the proposal involved in determine the structure and terms of reference for the incentives fund are the same people that will benefit from the fund.

Decision Sought: Protect Rotorua seeks confirmation from Council that the decisions made by the Incentives Board are not conflicted and are lawful.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 84: 6 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Protect Rotorua

Submission Summary: Protect Rotorua is concerned that certain landowners have been able to take advantage of the threshold under Rule 11 because properties under 40 hectares were not allocated a nitrogen benchmark. As such owners of several properties have been able to increase the output of nitrogen on their properties by shifting their intensive farming operations to these smaller properties. This has resulted in larger nitrogen discharge allocations.

Decision Sought: Investigate this urgently and report back to Protect Rotorua.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 85: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Waiteti Farms Ltd / Waiteti Whenua Trust  
 Submission Summary: Serious disadvantages to the future of Waiteti, associated landowners and beneficiaries in many different ways, unnecessarily.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 10 - 1 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Whakapoungakau Aggregated Lands  
 Submission Summary: Whakapoungakau is a cropping and dry stock farming unit operating within their benchmark requirements under the current RWLP. An optimisation project has been initiated and will likely take, at a minimum the next 5 years, to determine overall best uses into the future. As kaitiaki, the owners are unable to commit their 'uri' to alternatives until due diligence is completed and the owners are satisfied that their decisions will not disadvantage future generations.  
 PC10 does not actively protect the interests of the future generations of Whakapoungakau, in that it will further diminish the already limited capacity of their environment under benchmarking, to provide beneficial outcomes to owners. Council seeks to impose further disadvantage by placing their costs of monitoring PC10 onto the owners who already pay rates individually and collectively, for an average of five properties per owner, annually.  
 Culturally, whatever the use/s of the whenua, the aggregated lands are a whole environmental system. Under kaitiakitanga a pre-requisite of the optimisation project is that multiple uses must complement each other to ensure the sustainable management of the environment, lands and resources for the future generations. PC10 does not actively protect and provide for kaitiakitanga in that it seeks to separate the Whakapoungakau taonga without regard for the cultural, social and economic impacts upon the owners and the future generations.  
 In terms of areas that are removed from farming for an alternative use that results in a lower nutrient footprint, Whakapoungakau will not receive replacement value or credit for their current and any further contribution toward improvement of the Lake Rotorua TLI.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in part

Submission Number: 86: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Whakapoungakau Aggregated Lands  
 Submission Summary: Serious disadvantages to the future of Whakapoungakau lands and beneficial owners, unnecessarily.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 9 - 1 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Waiteti Farms Ltd / Waiteti Whenua Trust  
 Submission Summary: Waiteti has progressed from leasing their land to establishing a dairy unit whereby collaboration with neighboring lands and development of appropriate infrastructure has halved the nutrient export from the operations under the benchmark of the RWLP. To achieve this required extensive due diligence, rigorous planning and preparation including resource consents from Council to farm. Development is ongoing with a view to being the most efficient and effective operation that it can be. PC10 will seriously reduce the ability of Waiteti to achieve the required production for economic viability. Therefore PC10 does not actively protect the interests of the Waiteti owners and their 'uri' which is contrary to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.  
 Under kaitiakitanga, PC10 does not actively protect Waiteti in the use of our lands and waters, in that corpus land (taonga) will be lost thereby alienating the owners. Therefore PC10 is not proposed in good faith.  
 Council seeks to impose further disadvantage by placing their costs of monitoring PC10 onto the owners who already pay rates individually and collectively, for an average of five properties per owner, annually.

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

PC10 proposed NDAs does not provide Waiteti replacement value for their current and any future contribution toward improvement of the Lake Rotorua TLI.  
 As above

Decision Sought:

Panel Recommendation:	Accept in part
-----------------------	----------------

Submission Number: 87: 1    Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: John Beuth

Submission Summary: I agree with the intent of the proposal to reduce the flow of nutrients into Lake Rotorua from but disagree with the methods within Proposed Plan Change 10. Farming with deforestation has been driven and approved by Central Governments and Environment Bay of Plenty for many years without consideration for the condition of the lake. Continued development of the lake edge for residential housing again has reduced the ability of the land to naturally filter the catchment through riparian plantings. With the increased settlement around the lake the birdlife has also increased. The birds excrete into the lake. This increases nutrients and sediment in the lake, increasing the growth of weed. Increased settlement has resulted in households having septic tanks with fluid and nutrient overflow. There is still a lack of Council funded sewer system connections. In storm or rain events the current sewer system is too small. Ngongotaha sewer system has numerous overflow events yearly.

Decision Sought: Prior to laying the blame on pastoral farming within the catchment area, there are a number of remedial methods available to the Council;

- Increased use of slag aggregate in roading surface preparation.
- Filters placed within the stormwater system again using slag and other filtering systems,
- Introduce the use of Rainstoppers on sewer manholes
- Nitrogen fixing pellets
- Fence and plant waterways with riparian plantings
- Replant the lake edge with riparian plants
- Increase the size and capability of the sewer system to cope with rain events by installing storage systems to allow for peak periods.
- Stop the increase of residential settlement and development in marginal zones.
- Increase the connections into the Council funded sewer reticulation higher up in the catchment
- Pond and filter rain event water utilizing overland flow paths
- Reduce the number of birds on the lake

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 12 - 3    Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: It is important to consider a wide portfolio of methods for supporting the health of the lake.

Decision Sought: Make provision for sub-catchment action plans to consider a wide portfolio of methods as suggested by the submitter.

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number: 88: 1    Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Nigel Marshall

Submission Summary: I advise of my upmost disapproval of the plan. I intend to sell my commercial holdings in Rotorua and totally relocate to Whakatane due to the massive effect this scheme will have to the business community.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations:	The Panel do not consider this to be a submission point.
------------------------	--

Submission Number: 14: 1    Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Warren Webber

Submission Summary: Representatives from the Lakeswater Quality Society (LWQS) have actively participated in StAG which has made policy recommendations which are now incorporated in the proposed plan change 10. LWQS supports the proposed plan changes in their entirety, but suggests the addition of provisions of 'Exceptions to the Rules'.

Decision Sought: Support all proposed changes with the addition to extra provision for 'exceptions to the rules' e.g. Plant/tree nurseries, Equine Agistment.

**Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management  
Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further  
Submissions – Part 1**

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 14: 11 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: Warren Webber

Submission Summary: LWQS supports the currently proposed rules and incentives programme (including sector allocation with ranges) as the most pragmatic solution to Nitrogen allocation.

Decision Sought: No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 91: 1 Submission Type: Neutral

Submitter: Robert Dansey

Submission Summary: I live beside the Ngongotaha Stream, across from me are huge willow trees. I don't know what sort of pollution they cause but at the mouth it becomes a slimy mess that must add to the lakes deterioration.

Decision Sought: I would like someone to visit to see what I mean before leaves fall.

Panel Recommendations: The Panel do not consider this to be a submission point.

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

**Chapter: Part 2 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management**

994

**Section: Introduction**

994

## Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendation on this section.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 19: 9 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Dixon Reeves  
 Submission Summary: We do not understand loads and possible options for managing discharges well enough to be able to restrict farming businesses to their current activities – the costs outweigh the benefits.  
 Decision Sought: Consider the alternative combinations of phosphorus and nitrogen lake targets in combination with alum-dosing.  
 I seek that the Council review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes; Adopt best science, ongoing 5 years reviews starting in 2017; include a thorough investigation of all lake mitigation solutions including risks, social, cultural and economic impacts.  
 Another approach which might have a more favorable outcome could be to have sub-catchment groups with a joint target.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 26: 4 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
 Submission Summary: The objectives and policies do not preclude introducing similar allocations or reductions from urban loads. The 435tN sustainable limit and the allocation by dischargers within the integrated framework also implies that there will be no opportunity to increase the discharge from the Waste Water Treatment Plant.  
 Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion in PC 10 to the Regional Plan of appropriate objective(s), policies and methods to address its submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 2 – 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Further Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd  
 Submission Summary: It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas.  
 Decision Sought: Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 4 - 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Further Submitter: Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust  
 Submission Summary: The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua. The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.  
 Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 26: 10 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Summary: RLC submits that PC 10 does not give effect to Policy WL 6B, or WL 5B of the RPS, as required under section 67 of the RMA, for the following reasons:  
 - Rural production land use activities are in some cases being required to reduce more than is reasonably practicable using on-farm best management practices;  
 -There is not an equitable balancing of public and private costs. This is impacted by a restriction on trading of nitrogen prior to 2022 and an Incentive Scheme is not required to minimise the economic impact of purchases of nitrogen.

Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion in PC 10 to the Regional Plan of appropriate objective(s), policies and methods to address its submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 7 - 21 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No: 8 - 22 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 26: 14 Submission Type: Support in Part

Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council

Submission Summary: Lake Rotorua has been identified as 755t of nitrogen entering the catchment per year when the science tells us that the sustainable load on the lake is 435tN. Reaching this limit by 2032, with 70% of the reduction occurring by 2022 is set out in the Regional Policy Statement. RLC supports the RPS policy in so long as the science is accurate and regularly reviewed.

Decision Sought: Support - No change requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 26: 19 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council

Submission Summary: PC 10 does not give effect to Policy WL 5B of the RPS for the following reasons:  
 a. PC 10's proposed allocation of 435tN among land use activities, and in particular the implied allocation for the discharge from Rotorua's WWTP, does not:  
 i. Allow for intergenerational equity in that Rotorua's urban growth will be effectively capped.  
 ii. Consider the extent of the immediate impact given the discharge of treated wastewater accounts for less than 5% of the nitrogen load into Lake Rotorua;  
 iii. Provide for resource use efficiency due to the extremely high cost of removing nitrogen from future wastewater discharges;  
 iv. Have sufficient regard for the high public cost of constraining growth through restrictions placed on WWTP discharges.

Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion of appropriate objective(s), policies and relevant methods in PC 10 to the Regional Plan to recognise and provide for urban growth in the Rotorua district, and for consequent increased loads to the WWTP that result in nitrogen entering Lake Rotorua.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 2 - 5 Submission Type: Oppose

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Further Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd

Submission Summary: It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas.

Decision Sought: Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 4 - 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust

Submission Summary: The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua. The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.

Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 8 - 61 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC 10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake, that consideration is given to inter-generational equity; that proposed restrictions – urban or rural – are subject to robust cost-benefit analysis. We do not support exemptions for particular sectors as this will place an even greater and impossible burden on remaining sectors – rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject in Part

Further Submission No: 12 - 4 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake; consideration of intergenerational equity; that proposed restrictions are subject to robust cost-benefit analysis. We do not support exemptions for particular sectors - rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: Include all sectors and contributors to both the problems and the solutions.

Panel Recommendation: Reject in Part

Submission Number: 43: 20 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The approach is considered appropriate and will assist to achieve the water quality outcomes sought by RPS.

Decision Sought: Ravensdown seeks for Council to retain the overall approach outlined in the introduction.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 15 - 19 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: Ballance supports the use of adaptive management approach to nutrient management. Regular science and policy reviews and adjustments to respond to the outcomes are an appropriate way to manage nutrients. The adaptive management approach is consistent with other regional planning documents in New Zealand.

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept

Submission Number: 47: 1 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd  
 Submission Summary: PC10 is titled Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management. Plan users would be better able to identify whether the provisions of PC10 are relevant to a particular activity if it was more accurately titled Nutrient Management - Lake Rotorua Groundwater Catchment (rural zones).  
 Decision Sought: Rename the plan change Nutrient Management - Lake Rotorua Groundwater Catchment (Rural zones) to better reflect the intended application of the provisions.  
 Adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary to give effect to these submissions as a result of the matters raised.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

Submission Number: 47: 2 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd  
 Submission Summary: In light of the intended application of these provisions to rural zones only, revisions to the introductory text would be appropriate.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to : These plan change provisions only apply to particular rural areas of the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment, as shown in Map LR1. These provisions do not apply to the balance of the catchment.  
 Adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary to give effect to these submissions as a result of the matters raised.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 53: 11 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie  
 Submission Summary: Give better clarity of intent and improve clarity.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to read: Lake Rotorua Integrated Nutrient Management  
 This plan change gives effect to the following 'provisions' in the Regional Policy Statement.  
 This plan change provides for a staged implementation of these 'policies'.  
 'A future plan changes for the Rotorua Lakes WMA including Lake Rotorua is scheduled to commence in 2020 to give effect to the values/objectives/limit-setting requirements of the NPS-FW 2014'.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 53: 12 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie  
 Submission Summary: Amend for clarity, accuracy and completeness.  
 Decision Sought: Amend preamble to: The aspirational target lake load of 435 tonnes of nitrogen per annum and 37 tonnes of phosphorous per annum is based on the best science available in 1986. These targets were proposed in order to meet a TLI of 4.2, thought to represent water quality conditions in the post-war period before problems with invasive lake weeds became evident in the 1960s. Lake Rotorua has achieved the target TLI.  
 Adaptive management is a core element of the implementation of nutrient management for the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment. This includes regular science and policy reviews and responding to the outcomes of these reviews, including review of the targets.  
 Reviewing the lake load targets for nitrogen and phosphorous also forms part of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPSFM 2014) implementation. Council may need to consider further changes to the Plan to address these and other NPSFM 2014 attributes of relevance consequent to the Science Review scheduled in 2017, or the Rotorua Lakes WMA values/objectives/limits process, currently scheduled to commence 2020.  
 The nutrient load to Lake Rotorua from current and historic activities will be reduced through an integrated/tiered/staged programme of source/transport/sink interventions, including rules, land use nutrient reductions, hard and soft engineering solutions, incentives and gorse conversion, and in lake management of nutrient release and nuisance algal growth.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 53: 13 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: Amend preamble to Table LR 1 for reasons of improved accuracy and completeness.

Decision Sought: One element of the package of interventions is the Nitrogen Management Framework, Nitrogen entering the lake is above the target set in the RPS to achieve the RWLP TLI objective 4.2. The aim is to minimise unwanted algal blooms.  
In 2011, the ROTAN model tested scenarios for reduction targets – recognising legacy loads - to achieve the target lake load by around 2080-2100:

The author proposed that the reduction target be set at around 320t N/pa. The RPS adopted a reduction target of 311t N/pa while noting that cost-benefit analysis had been undertaken only at a conceptual level. The Science Review in 2017 and/or the Rotorua Lakes WMA may revisit the target N load reduction, supported by iterative analysis of options, costs and achievability as required by the NPS-FW. Amend to: The Framework summarised in Table LR 1 below was developed through a “streamlined” consultation process with the Lake Rotorua Stakeholder Advisory Group  
It was adopted by the Regional Council on 17 September 2013 as being the preferred approach to managing nitrogen losses from rural land use activities in the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment at that time. The framework was developed prior to the OVERSEER® version change from 5.4 to 6.2; prior to the lake meeting the TLI target; prior to research indicating the main driver of lake algal dynamics is the internal nutrient load; prior to the results of alum dosing indicating the lake may now be P limited; prior to results indicating potential significance of flood flow particulate nutrients; and prior to results dis-aggregating legacy groundwater baseflow nutrients by sub-catchment.  
ROTAN re-estimates of catchment loads in OVERSEER® version 6.2 are expected mid-2016. These revised estimates may necessitate a variation to the RPS load which was estimated in OVERSEER® version 5.4.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 58: 32 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: The incentive schemes and proposed rules should be cohesive. In a set of rules where NDA allocations are temporary, holders of temporary NDA are not the owners that NDA. It is useful for the NDA to be released early.

Decision Sought: - Mention the Incentives Scheme and District Plan Subdivision Rights in a description of external considerations so a set of points can be submitted against.  
- Guide the incentives scheme in purchasing temporary (20 year) NDA allocations, versus purchasing normal NDA.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 16 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: The current wording is unclear. Adaptive management is cited as a core element. However certainty for land users is also required, which is provided by consistent application of policies. It should be clear that review does not mean regular policy change ( but rather monitoring and responding to science and policy outcomes).

Decision Sought: Amend the definition for ‘adaptive management’ in the Introduction at paragraph 1, page 2 as follows; “..... This includes regular reviews of the science and policy outcomes and responding to the outcomes of these reviews”.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 2 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Further Submission No: 15 - 32 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. Ballance supports the use of the adaptive management approach with respect to nutrient management.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Accept
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number: 75: 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: The Oturoa Agreement sets out a clear expectation that – alongside agreeing targets to assist in achieving a mediated solution on RPS appeals – those targets would be subject to ongoing review as part of regular plan changes. PC10 is a plan change. Notwithstanding this, Council propose that the RWLP objectives and RPS targets are “out of scope” for submissions.  
 Decision Sought: We do not seek changes to either the RWLP TLI objective or the RPS nitrogen reduction target at this time. Any changes would more properly be considered after the 2017 Science Review. It is however our strong submission that the objectives and targets must be in scope for submission.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number: 75: 15 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Amend to give better effect to intent.  
 Decision Sought: Amend title to read: Plan Change 10: Lake Rotorua Integrated Nutrient Management.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number: 75: 16 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Amend Preamble for improved clarity. It is important that the catchment community can refer to PC10 as the primary reference for relevant objectives, policies, methods and rules.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to read: 'The Lake Rotorua Integrated Nutrient Management.....Objectives, Policies and methods are contained in Part II.....'

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number: 75: 17 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Amend Preamble for improved clarity. It is important that the catchment community can refer to PC10 as the primary reference for relevant objectives, policies, methods and rules.  
 Decision Sought: Add text: Principal objectives, policies and methods are re-stated here to support Plan Change 10 (PC10) to stand alone as the primary reference for the Lake Rotorua catchment.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number: 75: 18 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Amend: to give effect to the intent of an integrated framework.  
 Decision Sought: Add section titled 'Scope'. The proposed changes to the table are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject in Part
------------------------	----------------

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	2 - 6	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd		
Submission Summary:	It is not appropriate to expand the scope of PC10 to include urban land use activities.		
Decision Sought:	Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.		
Panel Recommendation:	Accept in Part		

Submission Number:	75: 19	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	PC10 currently jumps in "cold turkey". It is important that all stakeholders are clear on the purpose, or at the least have the opportunity to debate it.		
Decision Sought:	Add section clarifying purpose. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number:	75: 20	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Giving effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater is critical statutory context for PC10, and material to relief sought in our submission.		
Decision Sought:	Add section clarifying national statutory context. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number:	75: 21	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	It is important to locate PC10 within the wider regional planning context; and critical to understand the regional programme for giving effect to the NPS-FW. Council have not as yet given effect to the NPS-FW for Lake Rotorua; and that PC10 does not give effect to the NPS-FW. The planned WMA for Rotorua Lakes is the step in which will give effect to the NPS-FM, and the primary focus of PC10 should be the period 2016-2022 or thereabouts.		
Decision Sought:	That the plan be amended to state that the planned Rotorua Lakes WMA and consequential RWLP plan change is intended to give effect to the NPS-FW 2014. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject in part
------------------------	----------------

Submission Number:	75: 22	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Add section summarising Rotorua District Council statutory responsibilities, in particular as they relate to the development of flexibility mechanisms to enable landuse change to assist meeting nutrient reduction objectives.		
Decision Sought:	Add section summarising RDC responsibilities for controlling landuse relevant to water quality; and updating on the mediated outcomes on District Plan provisions relating to Transferable Development Rights. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number:	75: 26	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	The Deed Funding is central to the integrated framework.		

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Decision Sought: Add section 'Funding Deed'. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 27 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Te Incentives Scheme is central to an integrated framework, central to RPS policies, central to PC10 rules and material to relief sought later in our submission.

Decision Sought: That a section 'Incentives Scheme' be added and that Council review the funding criteria for the Incentives Fund to consider opportunities for a wide focus. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 3 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: That detail on the operation and criteria for use of the 'Incentives Scheme' be added. That Council review the funding criteria for the Incentives Fund, to consider opportunities for a wide focus. This should be added as LR M6, a complete method rather than in the introduction.

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 28 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: OVERSEER® is central to the PC10 framework.

Decision Sought:

- That a section 'Overseer' be added. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail. -
- That use of OVERSEER® in monitoring progress toward managed reduction targets is assessed as five year rolling averages.
- That - pending the Rotan review and any consequential review of the RPS target - numerical NDAs are not included in PC10 rules.
- Add method making provision for a process to recognise management practices and innovations which are not currently recognised in OVERSEER®
- That a method be developed which supports prioritisation of interventions at sub-catchment scale.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 29 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Understanding state and trends in Lake Rotorua is central to development of an appropriate portfolio of methods and rules. It is not sufficient to rely on the issue description in the operative RWLP. Consideration of the NPS-FW National Objectives Framework is also material to consideration of PC10: clearly PC10 does not include NOF. Lake Rotorua is one of the priority catchments where we need to reduce the uncertainties to provide the necessary confidence in decisions.

Decision Sought:

- That the section 'Lake Rotorua: State, Trends, Targets' be added. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.
- That Council amend the plan to acknowledge significant shifts in the science, including in the significance of internal bed nutrients, flood-flow particulate nutrients, sub-catchment attenuation processes and pathways, and the potential shift to P-limitation in the lake.
- That the plan be amended to state that the planned Rotorua Lakes WMA and consequential plan change will give effect to the NPS-FW 2014, including the National Objectives Framework.
- That a method be included for developing improved understanding of requirements for safeguarding indigenous species, preliminary to the Rotorua lakes WMA scheduled in 2020.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in Part

**Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management  
Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further  
Submissions – Part 1**

Submission Number: 75: 30 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Important context and material to relief sought.  
Decision Sought: Add section 'Science Review'. Amend the Method LR M2 to include review of whole system understanding to support effective and efficient interventions; and to include consideration of wider ecosystem health outcome  
The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No: 6 - 4 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: Supports amending LR M2  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 31 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Important context and material to relief sought later in the submission.  
Decision Sought: Add section 'Statutory and Non-Statutory Reviews: Summary of Timelines 2016-2022'. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 32 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Important context and material to relief sought.  
Decision Sought: That the section 'Integrated Nutrient Management: Principles and Approach' be added and council amend its plan in its entirety to give better effect to these principles and approaches. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 33 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: It is our submission that PC10 was initially crafted over five years ago and has stayed 'stuck in a groove', notwithstanding material shifts in the scientific, economic, statutory and social context. The section records some of the alternate solutions packages canvassed over the last five years, some of these options were dismissed too quickly in favor of the proceeding with the already determined path. PC10 presents the first formal, public opportunity to review the critical decisions made in the development of PC10.  
Decision Sought: - That Council amend the plan in its entirety to give better effect to RMA s5.  
- That Council provide analysis of the impacts of the proposed rules on individual properties against the RMA s85 tests.  
- That Council amend the plan to remove regulation of farms to achieve the 2032 N target.  
- That Council amend the plan to remove prescriptive controls of farm plans and inputs. That Council clarify if "align well" with the NPS-FW has the same meaning as "give effect to".  
- That the section 'Development of Plan Change 10' be added. The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 75: 59 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Amend for clarity.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to read:  
 This plan change gives effect to the following provisions in the Regional Policy Statement.  
 This plan change provides for a staged implementation of these provisions.  
 A future plan change for the Rotorua Lakes WMA including Lake Rotorua is scheduled to commence in 2020 to give effect to the values/objectives as required by the NPS –FM 2014.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 75: 61 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: There are other RPS objectives and policies relevant to PC10 methods and rules.  
 Decision Sought: That additional RPS provisions be added in full as follow:  
 - Water Quality and Land Use  
 - Objectives 26, 27, 28  
 - Policies IR 3B, UG 18B, UG 23B & Explanation, WL 1B, WL 2B, WL 3B;Explanation, WL 4B & Explanation; Policy WL 5B Explanation, Explanation for Policy WL 6B  
 That the RPS provisions be in scope for submissions to the extent they are relevant to the approach proposed in the methods and rules.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 62 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: This section (preamble) forgot to mention the Oturoa Agreement.  
 Decision Sought: Amend for clarity, accuracy and completeness as outlined in the hardcopy submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 115 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Recent science shows that PC10 should include P as a key contributor to lake algal dynamics.  
 Decision Sought: Add new section 'Phosphorous Management Framework', table LR 3B 'Table LR 3B: Lake Rotorua Phosphorous Management Framework – indicative annual loads and managed reduction targets' and supporting narrative as outlined in the hardcopy of the submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 116 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Recent science shows that PC10 should include P as a key contributor to lake algal dynamics.  
 Decision Sought: Add new section, table 'Table LR 3C: Sub-Catchment Phosphorous Contributions and Indicative Targets' and supporting narrative as outlined in the hardcopy of the submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 13 - 4 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Christopher James Read Meban  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. I believe that phosphorus has a far greater impact on lake water quality and should be included in a incorporated Nutrient Budget.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject in part



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Summary: Supports the nitrogen reduction proposal for Lake Rotorua and encourages the use of bio-fertiliser.

Decision Sought: The use of all chemical fertilisers on pastoral land be prohibited 3 years after Plan Change 10 becomes operative.  
The use of NPK on applications other than pasture be restricted to 50% or less of current application rates.  
Consider financial incentives to pastoral farmers and growers who cease or reduce the use of NPK on their properties voluntarily.  
BOPRC to fund an independent research programme on conversion from NPK to bio-fertiliser in the catchment.

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

<b>Section: Table LR1 Annual loads and reductions</b>	995
---	-----

### Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendation on this section.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 12: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Astrid Coker

Submission Summary: Oppose results being used from different versions of OVERSEER®. It is not clear why some calculations in PC10 use OVERSEER® 5.4 and others 6.2. Need to use the best science estimates of nitrogen entering the Lake.

Decision Sought: All results to be calculated by the latest version of OVERSEER®

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 19: 9 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Dixon Reeves

Submission Summary: We do not understand loads and possible options for managing discharges well enough to be able to restrict farming businesses to their current activities – the costs outweigh the benefits.

Decision Sought: Consider the alternative combinations of phosphorus and nitrogen lake targets in combination with alum-dosing.  
I seek that the Council review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes; Adopt best science, ongoing 5 years reviews starting in 2017; include a thorough investigation of all lake mitigation solutions including risks, social, cultural and economic impacts.  
Another approach which might have a more favorable outcome could be to have sub-catchment groups with a joint target.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 20: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Peter McLean and Michelle Rennie

Submission Summary: The sustainable load to Lake Rotorua was first estimated in the early 1980's and has not been verified by actual scientific testing since.

Decision Sought: I request the recalculation of the sustainable load target to Lake Rotorua using robust, evidence based biodiverse system that encompasses both N and P.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 23: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Roger and Norreen Martin

Submission Summary: The sustainable load to Lake Rotorua was first estimated in the early 1980's and has not been verified



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

since.

Decision Sought: I request the recalculation of the sustainable load target to Lake Rotorua and the recalculation of the nitrogen input from land use to the Lake as part of a larger Science review to be started in 2017.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 26: 4 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council

Submission Summary: The objectives and policies do not preclude introducing similar allocations or reductions from urban loads. The 435tN sustainable limit and the allocation by dischargers within the integrated framework also implies that there will be no opportunity to increase the discharge from the Waste Water Treatment Plant.

Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion in PC 10 to the Regional Plan of appropriate objective(s), policies and methods to address its submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 2 – 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd

Submission Summary: It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas.

Decision Sought: Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 4 – 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust

Submission Summary: The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua.

The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.

Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 26: 11 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council

Submission Summary: PC 10's proposed allocation of 435tN among land use activities will cause a disparate impact on iwi due to the nature of the multiple ownership of Maori freehold land, impact land values, inability to sell, reduction of lease income, and cultural limitations on viable alternatives for land use. RLC believes that insufficient regard has been held to RPS Policy WL 5B(d) "Iwi land ownership and its status including any Crown obligation".

Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion in PC 10 to the Regional Plan of appropriate objective(s), policies and methods to address its submission.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 5 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission and to acknowledge Policy IW 3B "Recognising the Treaty in the exercise of functions and powers under this Act".  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 26: 15 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
Submission Summary: BERL Population projections predict a population increase. The size of the tourism sector is planned to double from 2015 to 2030. This will create additional load on the Rotorua Waste Water Treatment Plant ('WWTP'). There may be opportunities to reduce nitrogen from land use within the Lake Rotorua catchment e.g. land use change to lifestyle or residential, that would require a greater output from the WWTP. In addition RLC is receiving pressure to consider reticulation of Lake Tarawera. The current RPS and Regional Plan provisions do not explicitly allow for this increases to be accommodated and could result in a requirement for expensive technical solutions or offsets being purchased. RLC does not want to be forced to limit growth and/or enact expensive solutions prior to 2032 when it is not known whether the PC 10 targets or their timing are correct.  
Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion of appropriate objective(s), policies and relevant methods in PC 10 to the Regional Plan to recognise and provide for urban growth in the Rotorua district, and for consequent increased loads to the WWTP that result in nitrogen entering Lake Rotorua.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 2 - 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
Further Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd  
Submission Summary: It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas.  
Decision Sought: Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 4 - 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
Further Submitter: Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust  
Submission Summary: The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua.  
The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.  
Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 31: 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Patricia Hosking  
Submission Summary: I oppose the current load limit for the catchment. I do not understand loads and possible options for managing discharges well enough to be able to restrict farming businesses to their current activities – the costs outweigh the benefits.  
Decision Sought: Review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 32: 3 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Kaitao Rotohokahoka 2D Trust

Submission Summary: The Trust opposes the use of 2001–04 benchmark as the starting point for nutrient allocation. The current land use is significantly different from the benchmark years. place our Trust and its future owners in a position of considerable disadvantage. We support the overall concept but do not feel the process will lead to a fair and equitable outcome.

Decision Sought: Amend how the nitrogen discharge allowance is calculated and applied. Provide flexibility to allow for on-going development to fully establish an economic unit.  
The Trust requests an alternative allocation methodology to be used, not based on their benchmark in order to remain economically and environmentally viable.  
Review nitrogen allocations so that the baseline better reflects the ultimate potential of the farm not just the current situation.  
Extend the years over which the calculation of nitrogen baselines are derived and work on the maximum discharge from any one of those years as the baseline.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 33: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Utuhina Valley Farm

Submission Summary: I oppose the current load limit for the catchment.

Decision Sought: I seek that the Council review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes. There should be a reassessment of targets after the 2017 Science review.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 33: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Utuhina Valley Farm

Submission Summary: I oppose the allocation of nitrogen within the Lake Rotorua catchment.

Decision Sought: I seek that the Council review nitrogen allocation and flexibility to lower N discharge properties to better reflect their ultimate productive potential not limited by their current land use. If the proposed plan comes into force a 5 year rolling average to Nutrient losses should be applied to allow for adverse events.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 39: 4 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Eileen Campbell

Submission Summary: We are told 435t on N is a sustainable load for the TLI target of 4.2 but this target has been reached with the current N load.

Decision Sought: Independent peer reviewed science is needed and a recalculation of the sustainable load target.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 14-8 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Warren Webber

Submission Summary: Shared responsibility promoted and accepted..

Decision Sought: Support - No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 14-9 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Warren Webber

Submission Summary: Land owner commitment to the Integrated Framework was critical to Central Government Funding. Any reduction in commitment could jeopardise government funding.

Decision Sought: No changes requested.

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendations: Accept	
Submission Number:	14-12 <span style="float: right;">Submission Type: Support</span>
Submitter:	Warren Webber
Submission Summary:	LWQS supports the currently proposed rules and incentives programme (including sector allocation with ranges) as the most pragmatic solution to Nitrogen allocation. Decision Sought: No changes requested.
Decision Sought:	No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part	
Submission Number:	40: 2 <span style="float: right;">Submission Type: Oppose</span>
Submitter:	Maraeroa Oturoa 2B Trust
Submission Summary:	The Trust opposes the allocation method and nitrogen reductions as outlined in the Integrative Framework.
Decision Sought:	Amend how the nitrogen discharge allowance is calculated and applied. Amend the timeframes to determine nitrogen loads and reductions required by landowners. Extend the years over which the calculation of nitrogen baselines are derived and work on the maximum discharge from any one of those years as the baseline.

Panel Recommendations: Reject	
Submission Number:	40: 4 <span style="float: right;">Submission Type: Oppose</span>
Submitter:	Maraeroa Oturoa 2B Trust
Submission Summary:	The Trust opposes the allocation method and nitrogen reductions as outlined in the Integrative Framework.
Decision Sought:	Amend how the nitrogen discharge allowance is calculated and applied. Amend the timeframes to determine nitrogen loads and reductions required by landowners. Extend the years over which the calculation of nitrogen baselines are derived and work on the maximum discharge from any one of those years as the baseline.

Panel Recommendations: Reject	
Submission Number:	43: 1 <span style="float: right;">Submission Type: Support</span>
Submitter:	Ravensdown Limited
Submission Summary:	Ravensdown supports the intention to reduce the nitrogen load into Lake Rotorua from a variety of sources to achieve the 2032 sustainable lake load required by the RPS.
Decision Sought:	Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept	
Submission Number:	43: 5 <span style="float: right;">Submission Type: Support</span>
Submitter:	Ravensdown Limited
Submission Summary:	Ravensdown supports the determination of individual Nutrient Discharge Allowances that must be achieved by 2032.
Decision Sought:	Ravensdown supports the determination of individual Nutrient Discharge Allowances that must be achieved by 2032.

Panel Recommendations: Accept	
-------------------------------	--

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	12 - 49 <span style="float: right;">Submission Type: Oppose</span>
Further Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Submission Summary:	Oppose the determination of an individual Nitrogen Discharge Allowance that must be achieved by 2032.
Decision Sought:	As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 44: 4 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Andrea Hammond  
 Submission Summary: There is no scientific evidence that the allocation, or the levels of the allocation will have the effect claimed.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 45: 10 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Wendy and John Roe  
 Submission Summary: The sustainable load to Lake Rotorua was first estimated in the early 1980's and has not been verified by actual scientific truth since then.  
 Decision Sought: I request the recalculation of the sustainable load target to Lake Rotorua and the recalculation of the nitrogen input from land use to the Lake as part of a larger science review to be started in 2017.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 49: 18 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: Replace the approach labelled "Integrated Framework" with one that does not use any variant of grandparenting nor on an allocation of pollution "rights".  
 Decision Sought: Replace the approach labelled "Integrated Framework" with one that does not use any variant of grandparenting nor on an allocation of pollution "rights".

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 14 - 10 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. The approach of the Plan Change is inconsistent with the effects based approach of the Resource Management Act.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 49: 23 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: It is not clear why the allocation regime is so heavily weighted on the four principles that the STAG added to policy WL 5B rather than the principles of the RPS policy itself. WL 5B did not say that this allocation process would be to allocate all the rights to just the farms. Nor did it suggest that the allocation would favor the highest polluting farms.  
 Decision Sought: Delete the pastoral sector reductions using the Integrated Framework Approach. Replace with a system that is consistent with the effects-based philosophy of the RMA and meets the purpose of the RMA; the relevant policies of the RPS; policies 21 and 23 of the RWLP; Taking a zero-based approach to identifying land use value and efficiency, and not relying on the inherent inequity of the allocation approach.  
 Replace at minimum with an allocation system based on natural capital principles. Preferably replace with a system that uses a hybrid of tradable emission units and fees.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	8 - 52	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective		
Submission Summary:	<p>LUC or Natural Capital was found at StAG to be completely unsuitable to the particular circumstances pertaining to this region.</p> <p>It is untenable to support LUC once the reality of it in Rotorua is understood and if land in Rotorua were designated along these lines it would be a full-scale attack on existing land uses and property rights.</p> <p>LUC is not appropriate for Rotorua as a method to reallocate land use but could be a way forward in the future for directing any future development of land in the catchment.</p>		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation:	Accept in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Further Submission No:	14 - 8	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd		
Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number:	49: 28	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	<p>The present allocation regime does not have any clear regard for the principles and considerations of RPS policies. The Integrated Framework Approach does not achieve equity or fairness, including intergenerational equity. The Integrated Framework Approach does not address the extent of the immediate impact, instead it allocates the lion's share of any available nutrient to those activities creating the most immediate impact. The Integrated Framework Approach does not support the aspirations of Iwi land ownership including any Crown obligation.</p> <p>The Integrated Framework Approach assumes that cultural values correspond to Maori Land ownership, and be concurrent with their values. And that was the only group consulted. The Integrated Framework Approach makes no attempt to calculate the resource use efficiencies (total water footprint) of water required to generate product, sustain crops, or the subsequent loss of assimilative capacity of receiving water through pollution attenuation.</p> <p>WL 5B (g) there is complete concord with existing land use, whether or not this land use is appropriate. it is not easy to transfer allocation from heavily polluting land uses to non-polluting land uses. It is not even contemplated. The rules make it impossible.</p>		
Decision Sought:	Delete. Replace with a regime that uses the WL 5B criteria to determine the allocation, not one that gives pre-eminence to the StaG additional criteria or to the highest polluting land uses in the catchment.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	14 - 9	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd		
Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission. The approach of the Plan Change is inconsistent with the effects based approach of the Resource Management Act.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 58: 20 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: The integrated framework does not have dual sectors targets. The splitting into two sectors appears to be a decision made later by the StAG. The two numbers (96 and 44 tN/yr) are not a part of the integrated framework. Presenting it as the Integrated Framework is misleading.

Decision Sought: Remove the split in the 140 tN/yr into one number for dairy and one number for drystock.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 58: 32 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: The incentive schemes and proposed rules should be cohesive. In a set of rules where NDA allocations are temporary, holders of temporary NDA are not the owners that NDA. It is useful for the NDA to be released early.

Decision Sought: - Mention the Incentives Scheme and District Plan Subdivision Rights in a description of external considerations so a set of points can be submitted against.  
- Guide the incentives scheme in purchasing temporary (20 year) NDA allocations, versus purchasing normal NDA.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 58: 35 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: Table LR 1 needs consideration due to intergenerational equity and fairness.

Decision Sought: In the cases of land:  
- locked out of development or use due to imposed zoning and later unzone.  
- taken for public works and later returned, e.g. land taken for roads and later returned  
- gifted by Maori for public use/works  
- under historic long term leases  
When the land is eventually returned to the original owner(s) a mechanism or guideline should be in place for it to receive a non-zero NDA.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 61: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Beef + Lamb New Zealand

Submission Summary: The current plan does not provide the right mix of regulatory and non-regulatory methods to achieve lake water quality objectives. Farmer led, farm specific and industry supported initiatives and actions are the most effective method to achieve practice change that results in long term sustainable management of natural resources.

Decision Sought: That Council immediately adopt an Integrated Nutrient Management Framework for Lake Rotorua working at a sub catchment level that aims to acknowledge existing and prioritise immediate on farm actions within current farm systems to meet the objectives of improved lake water quality.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 11 - 2 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Deer Industry New Zealand

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. The submitter implicitly recognises established good management practices, thereby acknowledging existing efforts by farmers. This is a better base from which to increase efforts to minimise off-farm environmental impacts. DINZ considers the submitters' requests are consistent with an over-arching Accord approach.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 66: 38 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: A new nutrient management framework is outlined with the Collective hardcopy submission addressing N & P rural and urban source, transport and sink. The framework is non-regulatory: the scale and complexity of the challenge demand generous engagement, not grudging compliance.

Decision Sought: Adopt the new proposed integrated framework that will allow farming to remain a viable industry and not forced into land use change to satisfy a rules regime.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 41 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: The Collective does not agree with the 320tN recorded as the reduction target. The RPS records this figure as 281tN therefore all other figures are affected.

Decision Sought: The RPS records this figure as 281tN therefore all other figures are affected.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 67: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Karl Weaver

Submission Summary: The sustainable load to Lake Rotorua has not been verified by actual scientific truth testing since then.

Decision Sought: I request the recalculation of the sustainable load target to Lake Rotorua as part of a larger Science Review to be started in 2017.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 20 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: The RPS and the proposed LR P3 lock in earlier science assessments of the lake load, rather than provide for new science reviews and updated assessments. Without flexibility to update the science and management approach, this policy could be argued to be the antithesis to 'adaptive management'. These N load values should be recognised as starting points but not locked in.

Decision Sought: Amend Policy LR P3 as follows or similar and any consequential changes, e.g. context for Tables LR 1, LR2 and LR 3 in the introduction:  
Balance certainty and the use of best available science and good environmental data in the management of nitrogen within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment by using:  
a) the 435 tonne sustainable annual nitrogen load for Lake Rotorua from the operative Regional Policy Statement Policy WL 3B(c) as a starting point but with provision to update with new science;  
b) the 755 tonne load to Lake Rotorua estimated by the ROTAN model in 2011 as the starting position from which nitrogen loss reductions will be determined with provision for updated science;  
c) the most current version of OVERSEER® for nitrogen discharge allowance allocation purposes; and  
d) the pastoral sector reductions within the Integrated Framework approach.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 15 - 35 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: In order to implement an adaptive management approach, there must be provision for change to occur in response to advancement in science and/or level of understanding. Locking in a particular version of OVERSEER® is inconsistent with an adaptive management approach of PPC 10. Ballance supports a mechanism for updating OVERSEER® without the need for a plan change to occur.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in part



## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 73: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: P F Olsen Ltd

Submission Summary: PF Olsen Ltd have been involved in the lakes quality issues since the formation of the "Landuse Futures" group. With the dissolution of the Landuse futures group and reformation into the 'STAG", PF Olsen's formal involvement ceased.  
On more than one occasion PF Olsen, on behalf of the industry sought an invitation to have the details of the economic modelling presented to the industry. Finally, toward the end of the STAG process, the forestry sector was provided a choice to present our concerns. It seems decisions were largely made by that stage through the STAG process, a process that was effectively a collaborative process between the constituents of the pastoral sector, not the land based primary sector owners.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: The Panel does not consider this to be a submission point.
---

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 6 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. And the make-up of the collaborative group was not fully representative of the land use of the catchment. CNI had no voice at any stage of deciding upon this distribution, despite owning 7% of the land in the catchment.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number: 73: 8 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: P F Olsen Ltd

Submission Summary: It is noted that a set of criteria used by the STAG group in coming to the conclusions within its integrated framework approach. The only potential for windfall gains lies with those who have most heavily and continue to most heavily contribute to the pollution problem. Existing land is not an appropriate criteria for future sustainable landuse.

Decision Sought: Reevaluate decision criteria, especially in respect of wider land use sector equity issues and more appropriate evaluation of the true significance of past committed capital.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 7 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: The set of criteria and integrated framework approach used by the STAG group used to reach its conclusions misinterprets the potential for windfall gains.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Further Submission No: 14 - 1 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd

Submission Summary: Existing land use is an inappropriate and inequitable basis for allocating future land use rights, which creates the perverse outcome of effectively rewarding those who created the problem by giving a greater property rights allocation.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 74: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Deer Industry New Zealand

Submission Summary: Rotorua catchment deer farmers have not been represented on the StAG and do not support some of the outcomes of this group particularly those pertaining to the proposed differential nutrient allocation system.

Decision Sought: We request an independent review of the balance of 'representative' participants of the StAG group and independent assessment of StAG outcomes for bias relating to:  
a) Sector representation  
b) Land owner representation  
c) Assessment of vested interests in outcomes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 8 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: Supports a review of StAG representation and outcomes.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 14 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: We propose a modified integrated framework. It includes nutrient reduction targets and management pathways for both N and P. The framework is both regulatory and non-regulatory. The focus is reducing nutrient losses from current landuse at source. Specifically, we propose the active resourcing of Sub-catchment Action Plans, to map hotspots significant at catchment scale and to prioritise nutrient reduction opportunities along the source-transport-sink pathway. These Sub-catchment Action Plans would help give effect to the higher-level Lakes Action Plan.

Decision Sought: The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 63 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Amend preamble to Table LR 1 for improved accuracy and completeness. For clarity; Federated Farmers do not seek changes to the TLI objective, N reduction target or intermediate target at this time, that re-consideration will be better made after the 2017 Science Review.

Decision Sought: Amend preamble to Table LR 1 for improved accuracy and completeness. Add title and amend narrative as outlined in hardcopy of submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 64 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Amend for improved accuracy and readability. amendments include changes to reflect the following:  
- The 755t load should be amended to be consistent with the RPS.  
- The heading of Table LR1  
- Rain  
- Managed target reductions  
- Internal nutrient loads  
- Drystock and dairy reductions.

Decision Sought: The proposed changes are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 75: 83 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Amend for improved accuracy and readability.

Decision Sought: Amend note to read:  
Table notes:  
(a) The values used are based on OVERSEER® 5.4 and reflect ROTAN 2011 estimates of nitrogen entering the lake; catchment loads and attenuation factors are currently being re-estimated in OVERSEER® 6.2.  
(b) tN/yr is the load to the lake in “tonnes of nitrogen per year” assuming no attenuation.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 78: 8 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Tony and Joanna Carr

Submission Summary: We support the proposal that sub-catchment groups are established, driven by community & supported by Regional Council. This recognises that each sub-catchment has its own unique set of issues that can be focused on for the benefit of the lake.

Decision Sought: That both nitrogen and phosphorus loading levels are considered together within an integrated framework for nutrient reduction that takes account of all the science knowledge, and a greater emphasis is placed on the total bio-diversity of catchments.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 79: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Paul Barton

Submission Summary: The science on Lake Rotorua and the Nitrogen and Phosphorus budgets and extrapolation of them is not sound. Associated N and P loading to maintain water quality are therefore not sound.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: The Panel does not consider this to be a submission point.

Submission Number: 80: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Te Paiaka Lands Trust

Submission Summary: We oppose the allocation of nitrogen within the Lake Rotorua catchment.

Decision Sought: Provide flexibility in the plan to allow for ongoing development and flexibility in farm management above the sector average. Only use OVERSEER® as a decision support tool to allow Council and farmers to understand compliance with discharge limits.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 80: 6 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Te Paiaka Lands Trust

Submission Summary: We oppose the current load limit for the catchment.

Decision Sought: Review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 80: 9 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Te Paiaka Lands Trust

Submission Summary: We oppose the allocation of nitrogen within the Lake Rotorua catchment.

Decision Sought: Provide flexibility in the plan to allow for ongoing development and flexibility in farm management above the sector average. Only use OVERSEER® as a decision support tool to allow Council and farmers to understand compliance with discharge limits.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 81: 6 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Jamie and Chris Paterson  
 Submission Summary: That both nitrogen and phosphorus loading levels are considered together within the integrated framework.  
 Decision Sought: That both nitrogen and phosphorus loading levels are considered together within the integrated framework.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 81: 8 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Jamie and Chris Paterson  
 Submission Summary: We do not support the integrated framework until such time as the catchment load and the sustainable load is recalculated by either Rotan or its replacement.  
 Decision Sought: Recalculate the catchment load and the sustainable load by either Rotan or its replacement.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 82: 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Stuart Morrison  
 Submission Summary: The PC10 framework fails to take account of a changed context. The lake is meeting its TLI target, the science understanding has shifted significantly and the statutory framework has changed.  
 Decision Sought: Review.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 82: 14 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Stuart Morrison  
 Submission Summary: The portion allocated to the pastoral sector falls outside the qualifying RPS requirement of being "reasonable, practical and affordable". Further, there is an element of maintaining this tough stance to make farming so difficult as to force uptake of N purchase by the incentive fund. This stance is unacceptable, unreasonably harsh.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

:

Submission Number: 83: 7 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Bushlands Estate Limited and Adolle Farms Limited  
 Submission Summary: The sustainable load to Lake Rotorua was first estimated in the early 1980's & has not been verified by actual scientific truth testing since then.  
 Decision Sought: I request the recalculation of the sustainable load target and the recalculation of the nitrogen input from land use to the Lake as part of a larger Science Review to be started in 2017.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Section: Table LR2 Pastoral reductions

996

#### Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing.

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

## Submissions

Submission Number: 3: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Kaingaroa Timberlands Partnership  
 Submission Summary: There needs to be recognition that there are land uses that do not fall within the majority classification of the sectors. This recognition will set the platform for provisions that have been proposed for such land uses.  
 Decision Sought: Include a statement that some existing land uses do not fit into the identified sectors and or OVERSEER® has not been developed to provide certain nitrogen leaching rates from such land uses, or other words to the same effect.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 12: 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Astrid Coker  
 Submission Summary: Oppose results being used from different versions of OVERSEER® It is not clear why some calculations in PC10 use OVERSEER® 5.4 and others 6.2.  
 Decision Sought: All results to be calculated by the latest version of OVERSEER®

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 30: 4 Submission Type: Support  
 Submitter: Fish & Game New Zealand (Eastern Region Fish and Game Council)  
 Submission Summary: The rules have been set by land use categories to more heavily target sectors that leach greater amounts of nutrient. Major changes to farm management practices may be required but the time frame proposed gives a fair and equitable period to plan for and meet objectives.  
 Decision Sought: Support - No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 9 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: Submitter has opposed in part. The land use categories that have been most heavily affected/"targeted" are those that leach least. Plantation forestry is locked at 2.5kgN/Ha, or less than 1/20th of dairying. Those presently with dairying land have considerable flexibility of what to do with their property, including use of the incentives scheme. Forestry has none. The submission ignores the unfair and inequitable effect of meeting those objectives, on those with land in forestry.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in part

Submission Number: 36: 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Tracey Friend and Myles McNaught  
 Submission Summary: We have issues with the impact of the present majorly lowered nitrogen leaching levels being proposed.  
 Decision Sought: We would like to see some more science being done before such a huge change is made. The economic and social consequences will be much larger than anyone has thought through.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 40: 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Maraeroa Oturoa 2B Trust  
 Submission Summary: The Trust opposes the allocation method and nitrogen reductions as outlined in the Integrative Framework.  
 Decision Sought: Amend how the nitrogen discharge allowance is calculated and applied. Amend the timeframes to determine nitrogen loads and reductions required by landowners. Extend the years over which the calculation of nitrogen baselines are derived and work on the maximum

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

discharge from any one of those years as the baseline.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number:	43: 21	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Ravensdown Limited		
Submission Summary:	Ravensdown is concerned that an old version of OVERSEER® has been used to determine these figures and the figures may be inaccurate. This is an important building block for the Integrated Framework developed in PC10, and the figures may be accurate for use as proposed. Ravensdown considers any reference to a particular version of OVERSEER® is inappropriate.		
Decision Sought:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update Table LR 2 using latest version of OVERSEER®;</li> <li>- Include in the Note a need to update when OVERSEER® updated;</li> <li>- Delete the reference to a particular version of OVERSEER® used.</li> </ul>		

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number:	43: 22	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Ravensdown Limited		
Submission Summary:	Ravensdown is concerned that OVERSEER® 5.4 has been used to determine the proportional reductions in Table LR 2, and OVERSEER® 6.2.0 has been used to determine the sector contributions in Table LR 3. Ravensdown considers consistency is required. It is not appropriate to lock one version of OVERSEER® into the plan, and a mechanism should be included to address when OVERSEER® is updated in future without a plan change.		
Decision Sought:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Be consistent in use of OVERSEER®;</li> <li>- Delete reference to a particular version of OVERSEER® used;</li> <li>- Provide for a mechanism for updating when OVERSEER® changes without having to undertake a plan change (as per ECan Plan Change 3).</li> </ul>		

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part
---------------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	15 - 2	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited		
Submission Summary:	It is essential that the Council use the most up to date version of OVERSEER®, rather than a version that has been superseded or rendered redundant. Not to do so creates questions as to the appropriateness of the loads and allowances that are prescribed.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number:	48: 1	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Parekarangi Trust		
Submission Summary:	Lake Rotorua TLI has averaged 4.2 since 2014. It only increased last year to 4.4 after prolonged stratification.		
Decision Sought:	Look for a better predictive model than Rotan. This model has proved ineffective at determining Lake Rotorua Water Quality.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	6 - 10	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission and ROTAN relies on inputs from OVERSEER®, it compounds any issues with the accuracy of OVERSEER®, and its various versions.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Further Submission No: 7 - 34 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Further Submission No: 8 - 39 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number: 58: 22 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Max Douglas  
 Submission Summary: The integrated framework does not have dual sectors targets. The splitting into two sectors appears to be a decision made later by the StAG. The two numbers (96 and 44 tN/yr) are not a part of the integrated framework. Presenting it as the Integrated Framework is misleading.  
 Decision Sought: Consolidate this into a single sector: pastoral.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 70: 21 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: The RPS and the proposed LR P3 lock in earlier science assessments of the lake load, rather than provide for new science reviews and updated assessments. Without flexibility to update the science and management approach, this policy could be argued to be the antithesis to 'adaptive management'. These N load values should be recognised as starting points but not locked in.  
 Decision Sought: Amend Policy LR P3 r and any consequential changes, e.g. context for Tables LR 1, LR2 and LR 3 in the introduction.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 14: 13 Submission Type: Support  
 Submitter: Warren Webber  
 Submission Summary: LWQS supports the currently proposed rules and incentives programme (including sector allocation with ranges) as the most pragmatic solution to Nitrogen allocation. A sincere effort was made to ensure that the StAG process was inclusive, collaborative, open and transparent; the greatest reductions were required from dairy properties; the greatest reductions were required from the highest leaching properties..  
 Decision Sought: Support - No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part
---------------------------------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 73: 3 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: P F Olsen Ltd

Submission Summary: PF Olsen Ltd reiterates its opposition to the grandparenting of other landuses pollution rights. Grandparenting represents a subsidy in perpetuity for those parties whose land based endeavors are creating the most pollution. Permanent Grandparenting is at odds with the fourth report of the Land and Water Forum.

Decision Sought: Beyond 2032, N discharge totals from pastoral sources must be less than the targets set in the notified plan change with the surplus being allocated back to those currently under commercial forest cover. As a minimum, a further 2 Kg reduction across the pastoral sector would enable the existing plantation growing industry to achieve a discharge allocation of around 6 kg/ha/yr. With dairying and dairy support well above that level it would seem appropriate that they bear the greater share of that reallocation. The reallocation to forestry should be useable and or tradable. It is accepted that new forest planted should not receive an added allocation.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 11 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. Grandparenting - of which "sector averaging" is a variant - represents a subsidy in perpetuity for those whose land-based endeavors create the most pollution. It is inequitable, unreasonable and unfair.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No: 14 - 2 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. Hancock Forest Management is steadfastly opposed to the use of grand parenting as a basis for solving water quality problems in New Zealand. Grand parenting effectively removes property rights in inverse proportion to contribution to the problem, which in our view is contrary to the purpose of the RMA, requiring those who create adverse effects on the environment to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects. It creates a perverse incentive to pollute. Provisions should be logical, equitable and create the right incentives for the future.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 74: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Deer Industry New Zealand

Submission Summary: The new rules proposal suggests a 20% reduction for drystock and a 30% reduction for dairy. This differential between sectors does not reflect the actual economic difficulty faced by the different sectors to meet this target.

Decision Sought: We suggest a robust study of the economic impacts of any proposal so everyone fully understands how this will affect the whole Rotorua community.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 74: 9 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Deer Industry New Zealand

Submission Summary: DINZ opposes the principle of grandparenting which essentially rewards existing businesses that have high nitrogen losses and restricts activities of businesses that have lower losses. DINZ does not support an allocation system that grossly favors one sector over another.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject





# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1006

**Section: Table LR3 Sector contributions**

## Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 12: 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Astrid Coker  
 Submission Summary: Oppose results being used from different versions of OVERSEER® It is not clear why some calculations in PC10 use OVERSEER® 5.4 and others 6.2. Need to use the best science estimates of nitrogen entering the Lake.  
 Decision Sought: All results to be calculated by the latest version of OVERSEER®

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 19: 6 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Dixon Reeves  
 Submission Summary: The current proposed plan change may restrict my ability to realise the long term land management plan for the property and to respond to markets.  
 Decision Sought: I seek that the Council provide flexibility in the plan to allow for ongoing development and flexibility in farm management above the sector average.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 30: 5 Submission Type: Support  
 Submitter: Fish & Game New Zealand (Eastern Region Fish and Game Council)  
 Submission Summary: The rules have been set by land use categories to more heavily target sectors that leach greater amounts of nutrient. Major changes to farm management practices may be required but the time frame proposed gives a fair and equitable period to plan for and meet objectives.  
 Decision Sought: Support - No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 36: 4 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Tracey Friend and Myles McNaught  
 Submission Summary: We have issues with the impact of the present lowered nitrogen leaching levels being proposed. The proposed levels mean that we would have to drop our production/stock rates to a level that will make our farm uneconomic. The values of the properties will drop significantly and the lowered stock rates will affect the income causing most farmers into severe financial strain.  
 Decision Sought: We would like to see some more science being done before such a huge change is made. The economic and social consequences will be much larger than anyone has thought through.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 41: 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Craig Hurst  
 Submission Summary: My farm is a specialist dairy support unit. The council NDA sector allocation table makes no provision for specialist dairy support so my farm is included in the dry stock. To fall within the dry stock range my farm needs to reduce by 46%. This is unrealistic.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 43: 114 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: Ravensdown is concerned that OVERSEER® 5.4 has been used to determine the proportional reductions in Table LR 2, and OVERSEER® 6.2.0 has been used to determine the sector contributions in Table LR 3. Ravensdown considers consistency is required.  
It is not appropriate to lock one version of OVERSEER® into the plan, and a mechanism should be included to address when OVERSEER® is updated in future without a plan change.

Decision Sought: - Be consistent in use of OVERSEER®;  
- Delete reference to a particular version of OVERSEER® used and provide for a mechanism for updating when OVERSEER® changes without having to undertake a plan change (as per ECan Plan Change 3).

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 13 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: Oppose in part. OVERSEER® is being used as a determinative tool when it is not [yet] competent for that type of use. Rather than retaining a flawed tool and trying to reduce the visibility of those errors, some other technique is needed to set allocative policy.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No: 15 - 3 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: It is essential that the Council use the most up to date version of OVERSEER®, rather than a version that has been superseded or rendered redundant. Not to do so creates questions as to the appropriateness of the loads and allowances that are prescribed.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 48: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Parekarangi Trust

Submission Summary: Version 6.2.0 has seen large changes in output that may not be correct, depending on base assumptions in the model.

Decision Sought: Enable science time to catch up and develop accurate models. OVERSEER® has not been designed to be used this way. Every version can produce large changes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 14 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 58: 21 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: The integrated framework does not have dual sectors targets. The splitting into two sectors appears to be a decision made later by the StAG. Presenting it as the Integrated Framework is misleading.

Decision Sought: Remove “(Integrated Framework)” from the third title heading.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management

## Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number	58: 23	Submission Type: Oppose
Submitter:	Max Douglas	
Submission Summary:	The integrated framework does not have dual sectors targets. The splitting into two sectors appears to be a decision made later by the StAG. Presenting it as the Integrated Framework is misleading.	
Decision Sought:	Consolidate dairy and drystock into a single sector: pastoral. The 3rd column of Table LR 3 gives the uninformed reader the impression that the dairy sector already has a higher allocation.	

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number:	59: 2	Submission Type: Oppose
Submitter:	Northdale Holdings Ltd	
Submission Summary:	Drystock areas is not as intensive as dairy and NDA of 13 11 loading 210 is unfair and is not achievable over 16 years.	
Decision Sought:	Not specified.	

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number:	73: 4	Submission Type: Oppose
Submitter:	P F Olsen Ltd	
Submission Summary:	<p>PF Olsen Ltd reiterates its opposition to the grandparenting of other landuses pollution rights. Grandparenting represents a subsidy in perpetuity for those parties whose land based endeavors are creating the most pollution.</p> <p>If a sector is unable to operate permanently without a Nitrogen cross subsidy from other land based sectors then that sector is fundamentally unsustainable and unsuitable.</p> <p>Permanent Grandparenting is at odds with the fourth report of the Land and Water Forum.</p>	
Decision Sought:	<p>Beyond 2032, N discharge totals from pastoral sources must be less than the targets set in the notified plan change with the surplus being allocated back to those currently under commercial forest cover.</p> <p>As a minimum, a further 2 Kg reduction across the pastoral sector would enable the existing plantation growing industry to achieve a discharge allocation of around 6 kg/ha/yr. With dairying and dairy support well above that level it would seem appropriate that they bear the greater share of that reallocation. The reallocation to forestry should be useable and/or tradable. It is accepted that new forest planted should not receive an added allocation.</p>	

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	6 - 15	Submission Type: Support
Further Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd	
Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission.	
Decision Sought:	As above	

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No:	14 - 3	Submission Type: Support
Further Submitter:	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	
Submission Summary:	<p>For the reasons given in the original submission. Hancock Forest Management is steadfastly opposed to the use of grand parenting as a basis for solving water quality problems in New Zealand. Grand parenting effectively removes property rights in inverse proportion to contribution to the problem, which in our view is contrary to the purpose of the RMA, requiring those who create adverse effects on the environment to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects. It creates a perverse incentive to pollute. Provisions should be logical, equitable and create the right incentives for the future.</p>	
Decision Sought:	As above	

Panel Recommendation: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 74: 6 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Deer Industry New Zealand

Submission Summary: The new rules proposal suggests a 20% reduction for drystock and a 30% reduction for dairy. This differential between sectors does not reflect the actual economic difficulty faced by the different sectors to meet this target.

Decision Sought: We suggest a robust study of the economic impacts of any proposal so everyone fully understands how this will affect the whole Rotorua community.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 94 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Amend preamble to Table LR 3 for improved accuracy and clarity. OVERSEER® version 6.2 numbers cannot be used in advance of the 2016 Rotan review and consequential review of the RPS load target.

Decision Sought: Amend preamble to Table LR 3 as follows;  
Table LR 3 is based on Rotan information applied to the 2014 GNS groundwater boundary area and expressed as OVERSEER® 5.4 values Modelled catchment loads have not yet been updated to OVERSEER® 6.2.0 values.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 96 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Amend to be consistent with intent for integrated whole-of-community framework. All tables should use OVERSEER® 5.4 values.

Decision Sought: The proposed changes to the table are extensive – please refer to the full submission for further detail.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 108 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Amend to be consistent with intent for integrated whole-of-community framework. All tables should use OVERSEER® 5.4 values.

Decision Sought: Amend note to read: Table note: All values are OVERSEER® 6.2.0 5.4 numbers derived from Rotan 2011.. All assume no attenuation, including RLTS and Puarenga forest. Gorse was not included as a separate category in Rotan 2011, but has subsequently been determined to be a significant source.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 113 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: For completeness and to support the intent of the integrated framework add new Table LR 3A as outlined in the hardcopy of the submission.

Decision Sought: For completeness and to support the intent of the integrated framework add new 'Table LR 3A: Indicative sector loads including small blocks and urban' as outlined in the hardcopy of the submission.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 75: 114 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Very good science has recently become available which is material to PC10 and should be included.

Decision Sought: Add new table 'Table LR 3A: Sub-catchment Nitrogen Loads and Indicative Targets' and supporting narrative as outlined in the submission.

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	6 - 16	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

## Section: Map LR1 - Groundwater Catchment

997

### Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing.

### Submissions

Submission Number:	1: 6	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Lindsay Hugh and Alison Lyndsay Moore		
Submission Summary:	The pamphlets say nothing of the chosen model of assumptions of inflows into Lake Rotorua. We note that it has long been believed that west of the lake and at levels below its bases is an underground water resource. It seems unlikely that much or all of that water enters those aquifers directly rather than via the lake. Then there is the timing issue of drainage through the soil and subsoil. To what extent is its nitrogen content absorbed by plants, filtered out, or by chemical processes locked into subsoil's and deeper geological features.		
Decision Sought:	Amend to reflect concerns raised.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number:	1: 7	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Lindsay Hugh and Alison Lyndsay Moore		
Submission Summary:	The plan treats catchment areas as homogenous which it is not. Water from some areas never enters Lake Rotorua. It is pointless to restrict land use in these areas.		
Decision Sought:	Amend to exclude areas where rainfall does not enter Lake Rotorua or does so only after 200 years or more.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 47: 3 Submission Type: Support in Part

Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd

Submission Summary: As notified, Map LR1 is titled Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management – Groundwater Catchment Boundary and Rural Land. Small areas of rural land not subject to the rules are also delineated with the accompanying legend. No such overlay is provided for urban areas within the catchment. It is therefore not explicitly clear that the provisions do not apply to the areas within the Lake Rotorua Groundwater Catchment Boundary.

Decision Sought: That a new overlay be created titled 'Urban land not subject to Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Rules'. Adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary to give effect to these submissions as a result of the matters raised.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 8 - 43 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: PC 10 must provide an integrated framework for whole of community solutions, i.e., urban, industrial, lifestylers and rural.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No: 12 - 7 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: PC 10 must provide an integrated framework for whole of community solutions, i.e. urban, industrial lifestylers and rural.

Decision Sought: Sub-catchment action plans that include all catchment contributors.

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 50: 4 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Oturoa Properties Ltd

Submission Summary: The whole process is underpinned by assumptions. Cannot readily understand how 95th % uncertainty in Ground water boundary was computed. The ground water validation is +/- 640 metres.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 56: 1 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Bay of Plenty Regional Council

Submission Summary: The map shows urban developed areas as being rural. These urban areas are not used for farming activity and should not be covered by PC10.

Decision Sought: Amend the area of rural land shown to exclude developed residential sites. Examples include residential areas adjoining Lynmore, the Vaughan Road subdivision.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 8 – 44 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: PC 10 must provide an integrated framework for whole of community solutions, i.e., urban, industrial, lifestylers and rural

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Further Submission No: 12 - 8 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: PC 10 must provide an integrated framework for whole of community solutions, i.e. urban, industrial lifestyles and rural.

Decision Sought: Sub-catchment action plans that include all catchment contributors.

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number: 65: 1 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Peter Reed

Submission Summary: Applying a boundary that is scientifically based is overly complicated, not practical, and will be open to legal/scientific challenge. The boundary is "best-estimate" The extent of the uncertainty is such that the minimum groundwater catchment boundary falls within the Rule 11, the Proposed Plan Change 10 boundary could easily be justified to match the existing Rule 11 boundary for.

Decision Sought: Bring the Proposed Plan Change 10 catchment boundary in line with the existing Rule 11 boundary.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No: 8 - 36 Submission Type: Support in Part

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Bring the proposed PC 10 boundary in line with the existing Rule 11 boundary. There needs to be further discussion and exploration of the science supporting PC 10's boundaries.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number: 66: 34 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: BOPRC need to engage better with the land owners that have only recently been captured within the extended lake Rotorua ground water catchment. They must supply evidence as to the flow of their ground water given that their land is outside of the surface catchment for Lake Rotorua, with their surface water running to the Waikato. There has been no science work done to determine the new boundaries, no consultation with local residents about water movement.

Decision Sought: Due diligence has not been done for these farmers. Council must commission a scientific way of proving the direction the ground water travels.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No: 12 - 9 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: More reliable science is required for groundwater boundaries and movements in the Mamaku.

Decision Sought: Add to Method LR M2 Science Reviews

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 75: 118 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Add new map LR 1A for improved understanding and readability.  
 Decision Sought: Add new map 'Map LR 1A: Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management – sub-catchment boundaries' as outlined in the hard copy of submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 119 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Add new map LR 1B for improved understanding and readability as outlined in the hard copy of submission.  
 Decision Sought: Add new map 'Map LR 1B: Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management – urban areas and 200m OSET buffer' as outlined in the hard copy of submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 120 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Intent and application of the map is not clear.  
 Decision Sought: Add text to clarify meaning of “rural land not subject to Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management rules”.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Section: Policies 999

### Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendations on this section.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 26: 5 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
 Submission Summary: The objectives and policies do not preclude introducing similar allocations or reductions from urban loads. The 435tN sustainable limit and the allocation by dischargers within the integrated framework also implies that there will be no opportunity to increase the discharge from the Waste Water Treatment Plant.  
 Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion in PC 10 to the Regional Plan of appropriate objective(s), policies and methods to address its submission.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 2 - 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Further Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd  
 Submission Summary: It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas  
 Decision Sought: Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Further Submission No: 4 - 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust

Submission Summary: The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua. The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.

Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendation:	Accept in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Further Submission No: 8 - 62 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC 10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake.  
We do not support exemptions for particular sectors as this will place an even greater and impossible burden on remaining sectors – rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Further Submission No: 12 - 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake.  
We do not support exemptions for particular sectors - rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: Include all sectors and contributors to both the problems and the solutions.

Panel Recommendation:	Reject in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Submission Number: 26: 18 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council

Submission Summary: BERL Population projections predict a population increase, the size of the tourism sector is planned to double from 2015 to 2030. This will create additional load on the Rotorua Waste Water Treatment Plant ('WWTP'). There may be opportunities to reduce nitrogen from land use within the Lake Rotorua catchment e.g. land use change to lifestyle or residential, that would require a greater output from the WWTP. In addition RLC is receiving pressure to consider reticulation of Lake Tarawera. The current RPS and Regional Plan provisions do not explicitly allow for this increases to be accommodated and could result in a requirement for expensive technical solutions or offsets being purchased. RLC does not want to be forced to limit growth and/or enact expensive solutions prior to 2032 when it is not known whether the PC 10 targets or their timing are correct.

Decision Sought: RLC seeks the inclusion of appropriate objective(s), policies and relevant methods in PC 10 to the Regional Plan to recognise and provide for urban growth in the Rotorua district, and for consequent increased loads to the WWTP that result in nitrogen entering Lake Rotorua.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject in part
------------------------	----------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 2 - 4 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd

Submission Summary: It is appropriate to specifically exclude non rural areas.

Decision Sought: Continue specifically excluding non-rural areas from PC10. Discharges from urban areas should be addressed by way of a future plan change with appropriate S32 analysis.

Panel Recommendation:	Accept in Part
-----------------------	----------------

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Further Submission No: 4 - 4 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Ngati Uenukukopako Iwi Trust

Submission Summary: The Trust is opposed to the submission of Rotorua Lakes Council to the extent that it seeks amendments to the proposed planning framework (including objectives, policies and rules) that relate to the discharge from the Wastewater Treatment Plant to Lake Rotorua.

The Trust is opposed to the proposal to discharge treated wastewater directly into Arikiroa Bay which forms part of Lake Rotorua.

Decision Sought: Do not support RLC proposed planning framework amendments which provide for increased discharges from the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Panel Recommendation:	Accept in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Further Submission No: 8 - 63 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC 10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake, both urban and rural and including underdeveloped Maori land; that consideration is given to inter-generational equity; that proposed restrictions – urban or rural – are subject to robust cost-benefit analysis; and that expensive solutions should not be mandated when it is not known if the PC10 targets and timings are correct. We do not support exemptions for particular sectors as this will place an even greater and impossible burden on remaining sectors – rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Reject in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Further Submission No: 12 - 6 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent that PC10 should provide an enabling framework for growth alongside safeguarding health of the lake; that proposed restrictions are subject to robust cost-benefit analysis and that expensive solutions should not be mandated when it is not known if the PC10 targets and timings are correct. We do not support exemptions for particular sectors - rather we seek an enabling framework for whole of community solutions.

Decision Sought: Include all sectors and contributors to both the problems and the solutions.

Panel Recommendation:	Reject in Part
-----------------------	----------------

Submission Number: 26: 35 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council

Submission Summary: RLC supports the existing freshwater objectives for Lake Rotorua, in particular Objective 28 of the Operative Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement and Objective 11 of the Regional Plan.

Decision Sought: Support - No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations:	Accept
------------------------	--------

Submission Number: 43: 14 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: Ravensdown supports the enabling nature of a number of the policies and rules, including a range of permitted activities and the use of controlled activities.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations:	Accept
------------------------	--------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 43: 41 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: PC 10 lacks any policy direction regarding benchmarking, and the methodology outlined in Schedule LR One is confusing. Ravensdown’s preference is for Council to take a revised approach to benchmarking as opposed to reliance on an historical benchmark. This would allow for actual nutrient losses to be measured from a farm system meaning the benchmark can be determined from actual results and the percentage reduction required can be based on real not predicted values.

Decision Sought: Add a new policy that clearly identifies how benchmarking will be undertaken;  
Take a revised approach to benchmarking for the next 5 years and benchmark property/farming enterprises on the actual nutrient losses over that period.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 17 Submission Type: Support in Part

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: Agrees PC 10 lacks policy direction regarding benchmarking but disagrees with the suggested revised approach to benchmarking.

Decision Sought: Take a revised approach to benchmarking based on land use suitability and predicted externalities, not on actual use.

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number: 53: 14 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: Amend narrative after Objectives for completeness and accuracy.

Decision Sought: Shift the RPS objective back to the earlier RPS section; and amend as follows:  
The following objectives from the Operative Regional Water and Land Plan establish the freshwater objectives for Lake Rotorua.  
The objective requires that water quality be ‘maintained or improved’ to meet the TLI.  
Lake Rotorua has met the TLI objective in recent years.  
These objectives will be subject to review in the Rotorua Lakes WMA – currently scheduled 2020-2023 – which will review values, objectives, limits and methods, including for Lake Rotorua.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 53: 31 Submission Type: Support in Part

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: Give explicit effect to Treasury Principles for Best Practice Regulation. Our understanding is that all Councils are expected to have regard to these principles.

Decision Sought: Add new policy: To develop rules consistent with Treasury Principles for Best Practice Regulation.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 53: 90 Submission Type: Not Applicable

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: Delete RPS Objective 28.

Decision Sought: Delete RPS Objective 28.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 66: 44 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: The objectives from the Operative Regional Water and Land Plan establish the freshwater objectives for Lake Rotorua. The objective requires that water quality be 'maintained or improved' to meet the TLI. Lake Rotorua has met the TLI objective in recent years. These objectives will be subject to review in the Rotorua Lakes WMA – currently scheduled 2020-2023 – which will review values, objectives, limits and methods, including for Lake Rotorua.

Decision Sought: Amend Page 5: Objectives for completeness and accuracy.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 66: 45 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Amend Page 5: Objectives for completeness and accuracy.

Decision Sought: Amend as follows:  
 New Objective LR xx: The productive potential of the Lake Rotorua catchment rural land resource is sustained and the growth and efficient operation of rural production activities are provided for.  
  
 New Objective LR xy: recognise the multiple values of natural and physical resources by aligning interventions to achieve multiple environmental, social, cultural and economic objectives within a long-term strategic approach.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 18 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: Supports the CNI intent to have a more diversified use of its landholding, which is presently all in plantation forest. CNIILML seeks to increase its resilience by having a broader range of rural production activities on its land.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number: 70: 3 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: FANZ oppose the use of 'input controls' in the rule framework. The policies do not promote an input control approach yet the rules do. An input control approach does not enable innovation and flexibility in farming options.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part
---------------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 8 – 46 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

**Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management  
Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further  
Submissions – Part 1**

Further Submission No: 12 - 10 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 8 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: FANZ seeks consistency in the use of terms is sought. For example, using 'Low intensity land use activity' instead of 'low intensity farming activity' or 'no intensive land use', or 'low nitrogen loss'.  
Decision Sought: FANZ seeks consistency in the use of terms is sought. For example, using 'Low intensity land use activity' instead of 'low intensity farming activity' or 'no intensive land use', or 'low nitrogen loss'.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 70: 9 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: It is suggested that writing policies as rules should be avoided, for example, as occurs with LR P9.  
Decision Sought: It is suggested that writing policies as rules should be avoided, for example, as occurs with LR P9.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 75: 61 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: There are other RPS objectives and policies relevant to PC10 methods and rules.  
Decision Sought: That additional RPS provisions be added in full as follow:  
- Water Quality and Land Use  
- Objectives 26, 27, 28  
- Policies IR 3B, UG 18B, UG 23B & Explanation, WL 1B, WL 2B, WL 3B;Explanation, WL 4B & Explanation; Policy WL 5B Explanation, Explanation for Policy WL 6B  
That the RPS provisions be in scope for submissions to the extent they are relevant to the approach proposed in the methods and rules.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 121 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Amend narrative after Objectives for completeness and accuracy.  
The RPS objective should be located with the earlier section including RPS provisions.  
The RWLP objective was proposed in 2002 and made operative in 2008. It is our understanding that perhaps eleven submissions were received at that time.  
Some commentators are now suggesting that wider objectives for the lake might be considered, rather than relying just on the TLI.  
Decision Sought: Shift the RPS objective back to the earlier RPS section; and amend as follows:  
The following objectives from the and Operative Regional Water and Land Plan establish the freshwater

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

objectives for Lake Rotorua.

The objective requires that water quality be ‘maintained or improved’ to meet the TLI.

Lake Rotorua has met the TLI objective in recent years.

These objectives will be subject to review in the Rotorua Lakes WMA – currently scheduled 2020-2023 – which will review values, objectives, limits and methods, including for Lake Rotorua.

Amend the note to read as follows: These Objectives are provided for informational purposes only and are part of the Plan Change. They are open for submission to the extent they are relevant to the approach proposed in the methods and rules.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number:	75: 122	Submission Type:	Support in Part
--------------------	---------	------------------	-----------------

Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand
------------	----------------------------------

Submission Summary:	Add new objectives to give better effect to RPS objectives and policies.
---------------------	--

Decision Sought:	Add new objective as below: New Objective LR xx: The productive potential of the Lake Rotorua catchment rural land resource is sustained and the growth and efficient operation of rural production activities are provided for.
------------------	---

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number:	75: 123	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
--------------------	---------	------------------	----------------

Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand
------------	----------------------------------

Submission Summary:	Amend narrative after Policies to be consistent with the inclusion of relevant RPS policies; and to support PC10 standing as the primary statutory reference for the catchment.
---------------------	---

Decision Sought:	Add RWLP policies 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33.
------------------	---

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number:	75: 158	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
--------------------	---------	------------------	----------------

Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand
------------	----------------------------------

Submission Summary:	Add new policy to give better effect to Treasury Principles for Best Practice Regulation.
---------------------	---

Decision Sought:	Add new Policy as follows; LR P18 When developing rules, the Council will ensure they meet the following guiding principles: - Flexibility - the underlying approach is principles or effects based - entities have scope to adopt least-cost and innovative approaches - non-regulatory measures including self-regulation are used wherever possible - Proportionality - proposed rules have been tested against a risk-based, cost-benefit framework - the burden of rules and their enforcement is proportionate to benefits expected - changes proposed have been tested to assure the benefits outweigh the costs of disruption - Certainty - the regulatory system is predictable and provides certainty for plan users - Growth supporting - economic objectives are given appropriate weighting - identifying and justifying trade-offs is explicit in the accompanying s32 reports - the need for businesses to take longterm investment decisions is taken into account, including by providing for maximum consent durations for major investments
------------------	---

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	6 - 19	Submission Type:	Support in Part
------------------------	--------	------------------	-----------------

Further Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd
--------------------	-----------------------------

Submission Summary:	The submission paraphrases to a certain extent, which potentially changes the meaning. If the policy is included, it should use the Treasury wording as written.
---------------------	--

Decision Sought:	If the policy is included, it should use the Treasury wording as written: LR P18 When developing rules, the Council will use the following guiding principles: Flexible, durable – Entities have scope to adopt least-cost and innovative approaches to
------------------	---

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

meeting legal obligations. The underlying approach is principles or performance-based. Non-regulatory measures, including self-regulation, are used wherever possible. Feedback systems are in place to assess how the law is working in practice including well-developed performance measurement and clear reporting. The regulatory regime is up to date with technological and market change, and evolving societal expectations.

Proportional - The burden of rules and their enforcement is proportionate to benefits expected. A risk-based, cost-benefit framework is in place for both rule-making and enforcement. There is an empirical foundation to regulatory judgments.

Certain - Regulated entities have certainty as to their legal obligations, and the regulatory regime provides predictability over time. Decision-making criteria are clear and provide certainty of process.

Growth compatible - Economic objectives are given an appropriate weighting relative to other specified objectives. Identifying and justifying trade-offs between economic and other objectives – for example, the pursuit of other dimensions of living standards – is an explicit part of decision-making. The need for businesses to make long-term investment decisions is taken into account in regulatory regimes where appropriate.

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number:	75: 228	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Add new objectives to give better effect to RPS objectives and policies.		
Decision Sought:	Add new objective as below: New Objective LR xy: recognise the multiple values of natural and physical resources by aligning interventions to achieve multiple environmental, social, cultural and economic objectives within a longterm strategic approach		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

<i>Submission Number</i>	81: 12	<i>Submission Type:</i>	<i>Oppose</i>
Submitter:	Jamie and Chris Paterson		
Submission Summary:	The policies are to give better effect to the objectives of the RPS and RWLP. These documents already have a number of policies that cover the requirements stated in the 17 policies recorded here. The fundamental objective is to meet the TLI target of 4.2 so these policies can only enable that requirement.		
Decision Sought:	The policies must not be prescriptive beyond the intent of the TLI target of 4.2.		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1003

**Section:** LR P1 Policy One

## Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendation on this section.

## Panel Reason

## Submissions

Submission Number: 24: 10 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: JT & SA Butterworth  
Submission Summary: We believe that the setting of the target for the sustainable nitrogen load to Lake Rotorua was done without the community having any understanding of the economic and social impacts.  
Decision Sought: That council parks PC10 and works with the catchment farmers in prioritising sub-catchments, assist sub-catchment communities in developing sub-catchment action plans to prioritise critical source areas and cost effective interventions for reducing high nutrient base flow and flood flow loads to the lake; and that these interventions would appropriately be considered by the incentives fund.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 26: 1 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
Submission Summary: Lake Rotorua has been identified as 755t of nitrogen entering the catchment per year when the science tells us that the sustainable load on the lake is 435tN. Reaching this limit by 2032, with 70% of the reduction occurring by 2022 is set out in the Regional Policy Statement. RLC supports this policy in so long as the science is accurate and regularly reviewed.  
Decision Sought: Support - no change requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 31: 4 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Patricia Hosking  
Submission Summary: I oppose the current load limit for the catchment. I do not understand loads and possible options for managing discharges well enough to be able to restrict farming businesses to their current activities – the costs outweigh the benefits.  
Decision Sought: Review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 33: 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Utuhina Valley Farm  
Submission Summary: I oppose the current load limit for the catchment.  
Decision Sought: I seek that the Council review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes. There should be a reassessment of targets after the 2017 Science review.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 33: 4 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Utuhina Valley Farm  
Submission Summary: I oppose the current load limit for the catchment.

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Decision Sought: I seek that the Council review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes. There should be a reassessment of targets after the 2017 Science review.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 39: 2 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Eileen Campbell

Submission Summary: We are told 435t on N is a sustainable load for the TLI target of 4.2 but this target has been reached with the current N load.

Decision Sought: Independent peer reviewed science is needed and a recalculation of the sustainable load target.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 40: 8 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Maraeroa Oturoa 2B Trust

Submission Summary: Extend the timeframe to set rules, meet nitrogen reduction targets and measure progress towards reductions.

Decision Sought: The Trust requests a longer timeframe for Regional Council to invest in better science, research, modelling before setting the allocation methodology, rules, timeframes to meet targets and resource consents in concrete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 12 - 41 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 43: 3 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: Ravensdown supports the intention to reduce the nitrogen load into Lake Rotorua from a variety of sources to achieve the 2032 sustainable lake load required by the RPS.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 43: 23 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: Policy LR P1 is written as an aspirational Objective rather than policy. The current wording does not provide action plan for implementing an objective or a timeframe. Support intent to reduce nitrogen losses from land and the monitoring on the 2032 target.

Decision Sought: Re-write Policy LR P1 to include an action plan for implementation and a timeframe; Retain the intent to reduce nitrogen losses from land and to monitor the ongoing target.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

Submission Number: 48: 3 Submission Type: Not Applicable

Submitter: Parekarangi Trust

Submission Summary: There remains considerable disagreement between scientists on whether Lake Rotorua is limited by TP or TN. There is considerable TP legacy in LR from sewerage that is recycled into water column during stratification.

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management

## Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Decision Sought: Extend the timeframe to achieve sustainable load to 2050 to allow more time for science and technology advances.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 8 - 41 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No: 12 - 11 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Timeframes should be extended to allow time for science and technology.  
Decision Sought: Explicit analysis is required on timeframes for change. These would most appropriately be considered in the Rotorua Lakes WMA process scheduled from 2020.

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 49: 15 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: This overall intent of improving Lake Rotorua water quality by reducing nitrogen inputs to the lake is supported, as is the intent to monitor progress towards the sustainable lake level load.  
Decision Sought: Retain.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 50: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Oturoa Properties Ltd  
Submission Summary: Unless the science proves otherwise it is impossible to meet the 2032 target without impacting GMP and further impacting the future of my family.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: The Panel does not consider this to be a submission point.

Submission Number: 53: 15 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie  
Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses. The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives. There are inconsistencies between OVERSEER® 6.2 values in the policies and version 5.4 values used to develop allocation methods and the rules. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values for consistency. Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.  
Decision Sought: Amend to read: 'To reduce nitrogen losses to Lake Rotorua to support achievement of the Lake TLI objective, and to monitor this target through science and policy reviews.'

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 54: 3 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: The Maori Trustee  
 Submission Summary: The Maori Trustee supports and endorses the purpose of the Plan Change being to reduce nitrogen losses from rural land within the Lake Rotorua Catchment area to meet the nitrogen limit set by the Regional Policy Statement.  
 Decision Sought: No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 59: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Northdale Holdings Ltd  
 Submission Summary: The regional policy statement has set the annual limit of 435 tonnes of nitrogen entering Lake Rotorua, this is too high or the timeframe too short.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 32 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: The TLI parameters assumed no internal nutrient load. The legacy load within the lake contributes 360 tonnes of N that can be released up to 10 times a year. The unexpected turnaround in the lake TLI subsequent to alum treatments in two streams is significant in highlighting the ongoing importance of internal nutrients and phosphorus as a key driver of algal dynamics in Lake Rotorua.  
 Decision Sought: Council acknowledge that the internal loading of the lake does have effects on science data. Council work with Strategy partners to focus on mitigating the legacy internal lake loads.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 46 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures. Amend to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency.  
 Decision Sought: Amend as follows: To reduce nitrogen losses to Lake Rotorua to support achievement of the Lake TLI objective and to monitor this target through science and policy reviews.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

Submission Number: 67: 4 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Karl Weaver  
 Submission Summary: The sustainable load to Lake Rotorua has not been verified by actual scientific truth testing since then.  
 Decision Sought: I request the recalculation of the sustainable load target to Lake Rotorua as part of a larger Science Review to be started in 2017.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 15 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: The current wording of the policies is unclear. Adaptive management is cited as a core element. However certainty for land users is also required, which is provided by consistent application of policies. It should be clear that review does not mean regular policy change ( but rather monitoring and responding to science and policy outcomes).  
 Decision Sought: Amend Policy LR P1 as follows: Reduce the nitrogen losses from land to Lake Rotorua to achieve the 2032 sustainable lake load as required by the Regional Policy Statement while providing for an adaptive management approach. Or similar.

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 73: 5 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: P F Olsen Ltd  
Submission Summary: It is accepted that a transitional period is justified. We believe 20 years is sufficient.  
Decision Sought: It is accepted that a transitional period is justified. We believe 20 years is sufficient.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 75: 124 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. Provision should be made for developing managed reduction targets at a range of scales and across all contributing sectors (including urban and point source discharges) and sub-catchments. The targets for the period to 2032 will properly be considered as part of the Rotorua Lakes WMA. The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives, and PC10 policies should be amended to included stronger use of non-regulatory methods.  
Decision Sought: Amend to read: LR P1 To reduce nitrogen losses to Lake Rotorua to support achievement of the Lake TLI objective, and to monitor this target through science and policy reviews.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 79: 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Paul Barton  
Submission Summary: The science on Lake Rotorua and the Nitrogen and Phosphorus budgets and extrapolation of them is not sound and associated N and P loading to maintain water quality are therefore not sound.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 79: 6 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Paul Barton  
Submission Summary: The conditions should be phosphorus limiting and soil management based not stocking or nitrogen based.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 80: 7 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Te Paiaka Lands Trust  
Submission Summary: We oppose the current load limit for the catchment.  
Decision Sought: Review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 81: 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Jamie and Chris Paterson  
Submission Summary: The lake has met the target set by the community for the last 5 years. It is phosphorus control that has enabled that to happen not the control of nitrogen.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 81: 14 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Jamie and Chris Paterson  
Submission Summary: The target of TLI of 4.2 has been met for some years, and Council's own commissioned reports show that the long term trend is that the water quality is improving. It is the control of phosphorus that has improved clarity. The lake is still receiving 658t N annually and coping with it. The real issue is the intake loading.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: The Panel does not consider this to be a submission point.

Submission Number: 83: 6 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Bushlands Estate Limited and Adolle Farms Limited  
Submission Summary: The sustainable load to Lake Rotorua was first estimated in the early 1980's & has not been verified by actual scientific truth testing since then.  
Decision Sought: I request the recalculation of the sustainable load target and the recalculation of the nitrogen input from land use to the Lake as part of a larger Science Review to be started in 2017.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Section: LR P2 Policy Two

1004

### Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendation on this section.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 27: 8 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Gro2 Ltd  
Submission Summary: The lake is telling everyone that it is phosphate limiting. Phosphate can be controlled. There are tools in the toolbox to work with phosphate, with nitrogen there will be tools in the future but right now there are none.  
Decision Sought: What is needed is independent, peer reviewed science.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 7 – 18 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No: 8 - 19 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 43: 24 Submission Type: Support in Part

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management

## Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: Ravensdown supports the intent to manage phosphorus through the use of management plans. It considers the management plan proposed in Clause (iii) should be called a Nutrient Management Plan to properly reflect its purpose. Ravensdown also considers the policy should be amended to read "implementation of good management practices".

Decision Sought: Retain the intent of the Policy LR P2;  
- Re-name the management plan to a Nutrient Management Plan;  
- Amend the policy to read: "implementation of good management practices".

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 15 - 7 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: Ballance considers that the use of the terms "Nutrient Management Plan" and "Good Management Practice" are consistent with terminology being used in other regions around New Zealand.  
The use of "Nutrient Management Plan" rather than "Nitrogen Management Plan" better reflects the intent of the Plan, which isn't limited to managing nitrogen.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept

Submission Number: 49: 16 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: This policy seeks to manage phosphorus loss. To do so through a vehicle named a "nitrogen management plan is misleading and confusing. Name them for what they are. The purpose of the plan is to manage excess nutrients that are causing water pollution.

Decision Sought: Rename "nitrogen management plans" as "water pollution management plans".

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 53: 16 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.  
The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives.  
Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.

Decision Sought: Amend to read: 'To reduce phosphorus loss to Lake Rotorua to support achievement of the Lake TLI objective and to monitor this target through science and policy reviews.'

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 47 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.

Decision Sought: Amend as follows: To reduce phosphorus loss to Lake Rotorua to support achievement of the Lake TLI objective and to monitor this target through science and policy reviews.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 17 Submission Type: Oppose in Part





# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

the science and management approach. It is considered inappropriate to lock in the use of a previous version of OVERSEER® that is not currently available for use. It seems that this policy promotes the opposite of 'adaptive management' as the nitrogen loads have been 'locked in'.

Decision Sought:

Retain the intent of Policy LR P3;  
Provide for updates to the starting position and end point nitrogen load to Lake Rotorua using the best available science;  
Delete reference to a particular version of OVERSEER® used;  
Provide for a mechanism for updating when OVERSEER® changes without having to undertake a plan change (as per ECan Plan Change 3).

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part
---------------------------------------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	12 - 12	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	<p>Oppose in part. Support the intent to provide for an adaptive management approach without 'locking in' obsolete numbers. OVERSEER® numbers can be expected to change regularly: some may be very small technical changes, others may significantly change both total estimates and relativities across farms, sectors or sub-catchments. Changes of any significance must properly be subject to public process to reconsider options and implications.</p>		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part
--------------------------------------

Further Submission No:	15 - 20	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited		
Submission Summary:	<p>For the reasons given in the original submission. In order to implement an adaptive management approach, there must be provision for change to occur in response to advancement in science and/or level of understanding. Locking in a particular version of OVERSEER® is inconsistent with an adaptive management approach of PPC 10. The requirement for a plan change to occur each time that OVERSEER® is updated would make for a costly and arduous process.</p>		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number:	53: 17	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Lachlan McKenzie		
Submission Summary:	<p>Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses. The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives. There are inconsistencies between OVERSEER® 6.2 values in the policies and version 5.4 values used to develop allocation methods and the rules. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values for consistency.</p> <p>Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.</p>		
Decision Sought:	<p>Amend to read: 'To improve the use of best science and good environmental data in the management of nutrients within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment by developing integrated catchment models which account for all contributing sources of both nitrogen and phosphorous including internal lake loads; and by improving the use of sub-catchment data to inform effective and efficient nutrient reduction strategies.'</p>		

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number:	66: 48	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
--------------------	--------	------------------	----------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submitter:	Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective
Submission Summary:	Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.
Decision Sought:	Amend as follows: Improve the use of best science and good environmental data in the management of nutrients within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment by developing integrated catchment models which account for all contributing sources of both nitrogen and phosphorous including internal lake loads; and by improving the use of sub-catchment data to inform effective and efficient nutrient reduction strategies.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number:	70: 19	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	The RPS and the proposed LR P3 lock in earlier science assessments of the lake load, rather than provide for new science reviews and updated assessments. Without flexibility to update the science and management approach, this policy could be argued to be the antithesis to 'adaptive management'. These N load values should be recognised as starting points but not locked in.		
Decision Sought:	Amend Policy LR P3 as follows or similar: Balance certainty and the use of best available science and good environmental data in the management of nitrogen within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment by using: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the 435 tonne sustainable annual nitrogen load for Lake Rotorua from the operative Regional Policy Statement Policy WL 3B(c) as a starting point but with provision to update with new science;</li> <li>b) the 755 tonne load to Lake Rotorua estimated by the ROTAN model in 2011 as the starting position from which nitrogen loss reductions will be determined with provision for updated science;</li> <li>(c) the most current version of OVERSEER® for nitrogen discharge allowance allocation purposes; and</li> <li>d) the pastoral sector reductions within the Integrated Framework approach.</li> </ul>		

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	15 - 34	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited		
Submission Summary:	In order to implement an adaptive management approach, there must be provision for change to occur in response to advancement in science and/or level of understanding. Locking in a particular version of OVERSEER® is inconsistent with an adaptive management approach of PPC 10. Ballance supports a mechanism for updating OVERSEER® without the need for a plan change to occur.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number:	75: 126	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. Provision should be made for developing managed reduction targets at a range of scales and across all contributing sectors (including urban and point source discharges) and sub-catchments. The targets for the period to 2032 will properly be considered as part of the Rotorua Lakes WMA The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives, and PC10 policies should be amended to included stronger use of non-regulatory methods.		
Decision Sought:	Amend to read: LR P3 To use the best science and good environmental data in the management of nutrients within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment by developing integrated catchment models which account for all contributing sources of both nitrogen and phosphorous including internal lake loads; and by improving the use of sub-catchment data to inform effective and efficient nutrient reduction strategies.		

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 79: 5    Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Paul Barton  
Submission Summary: The conditions should be phosphorus limiting and soil management based not stocking or nitrogen based.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Section: LR P3(a)** 1009

**Panel Recommendation**  
See section LR P3 above.

**Submissions**

Submission Number: 19: 10    Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Dixon Reeves  
Submission Summary: We do not understand loads and possible options for managing discharges well enough to be able to restrict farming businesses to their current activities – the costs outweigh the benefits.  
Decision Sought: Consider the alternative combinations of phosphorus and nitrogen lake targets in combination with Alum-dosing.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 49: 19    Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: Support.  
Decision Sought: Retain.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 66: 49    Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.  
Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 127    Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. Provision should be made for developing managed reduction targets at a range of scales and across all contributing sectors (including urban and point source discharges) and sub-catchments. The targets for the period to 2032 will properly be considered as part of the Rotorua Lakes WMA. The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives, and PC10 policies should be amended to include stronger use of non-regulatory methods.  
Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 80: 8 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Te Paiaka Lands Trust  
 Submission Summary: We oppose the current load limit for the catchment.  
 Decision Sought: Review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 81: 1 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Jamie and Chris Paterson  
 Submission Summary: Rotan was first run in 1986 and has not been recalculated since to reflect current land use nor farming systems.  
 Decision Sought: Both the sustainable load to the lake and the load from the land must be newly established before any rules are put in place.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 81: 11 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Jamie and Chris Paterson  
 Submission Summary: The target of TLI of 4.2 has been met for some years, and Council's own commissioned reports show that the long term trend is that the water quality is improving. It is the control of phosphorus that has improved clarity. The lake is still receiving 658t N annually and coping with it. The real issue is the intake loading.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: The Panel does not consider that this is a submission point.

Submission Number: 82: 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Stuart Morrison  
 Submission Summary: I acknowledge that PC10 gives effect to the RPS target of 435t N load and acknowledge the commitment to review.  
 Decision Sought: I submit that the relevance of that target with respect to its influence on the form of the rules should be up for discussion.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 83: 8 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Bushlands Estate Limited and Adolle Farms Limited  
 Submission Summary: The sustainable load to Lake Rotorua was first estimated in the early 1980's & has not been verified by actual scientific truth testing since then.  
 Decision Sought: I request the recalculation of the sustainable load target and the recalculation of the nitrogen input from land use to the Lake as part of a larger Science Review to be started in 2017.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 14-4 Submission Type: Support  
 Submitter: Warren Webber  
 Submission Summary: The Waiora Agreement (June 2011) between LWQS and the Primary Sector Collective confirmed the 435tN and 6tP sustainable load targets.  
 Decision Sought: Support- No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1010

**Section:** LR P3(b)**Panel Recommendation**

See Section LR P3 above.

**Submissions**

Submission Number:	49: 21	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	ROTAN is not able to accurately or precisely define the quantum of N flowing through the system and thus the quantum of N required to be removed. A policy and process that relies on using very tight accounting systems, when the error factor is large and unknown, is deeply flawed.		
Decision Sought:	Identify that a number generated by the ROTAN model gives an indication of the likely load to reduce but cannot be used as a definitive number.. Policy and methods need to be designed to acknowledge the imperfect precision and accuracy of the data.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No:	12 - 14	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Further Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Support the recommendation that policy and methods need to acknowledge the imperfect precision and accuracy of OVERSEER® estimates.		
Decision Sought:	Support Noted		

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number:	66: 50	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective		
Submission Summary:	Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.		
Decision Sought:	Delete.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number:	75: 128	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. Provision should be made for developing managed reduction targets at a range of scales and across all contributing sectors (including urban and point source discharges) and sub-catchments. The targets for the period to 2032 will properly be considered as part of the Rotorua Lakes WMA The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives, and PC10 policies should be amended to included stronger use of non-regulatory methods.		
Decision Sought:	Delete.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Section:** LR P3(c)

1007

**Panel Recommendation**

See Section LR P3 above.

**Submissions**

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 49: 20 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: OVERSEER® is unsuitable for a very fine grained response to allocating nitrogen capacity that this policy proposes. Oppose the use of OVERSEER® as the sole measure of assessing N Stocks and flows and as the mechanisms to support an allocation process. Oppose the principle and process of allocating nitrogen discharge allowances. It is a useful monitoring device but totally unsuited to being used as a determinative tool in the way suggested. Owners will not allow outside parties to see its workings, explain its workings nor allow any uncertainty or sensitivity analysis to assess its weaknesses. It poorly represents the effects if mitigations and has not been adequately validated for the soil types it is being used on.

Decision Sought: Replace policy LR P3c with a policy that matches the attenuation of the soil to the land use i.e. a natural capital approach and require that OVERSEER® version 6.2.1 or later is used. Replace the whole approach to determining nitrogen attribution so that it does not rely on OVERSEER® for this exercise.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 14 - 11 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. Concern related to the use of OVERSEER® for a purpose well outside of its intended use, particularly in a situation such as this with very far reaching implications for landholders in the region.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 58: 6 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: This sentence doesn't mean anything in the balance between simplicity and the use of counting and basic arithmetic in the management of nitrogen within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment.

Decision Sought: Amend to read: '(c) stock numbers for allowance and allocation purposes; and'.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 51 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 23 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Overseer® versions are updated regularly. There should be mechanisms to amend figures/data without requiring a plan change.

Decision Sought: Include the following advice note relevant to Policy LR P1(c):  
Overseer® is updated from time to time and previous versions are no longer accessible. Schedule XX outlines the Bay of Plenty District Council's approach to managing Overseer® version upgrades.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 12 - 13 Submission Type: Oppose

Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

**Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management  
Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further  
Submissions – Part 1**

Submission Summary: Oppose in part.  
Support the intent to provide for an adaptive management approach without 'locking in' obsolete numbers.  
OVERSEER® numbers can be expected to change regularly: some may be very small technical changes, others may significantly change both total estimates and relativities across farms, sectors or sub-catchments.  
Changes of any significance must properly be subject to public process to reconsider options and implications.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 15 - 36 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: In order to implement an adaptive management approach, there must be provision for change to occur in response to advancement in science and/or level of understanding. Locking in a particular version of OVERSEER® is inconsistent with an adaptive management approach of PPC 10.  
Ballance supports a mechanism for updating OVERSEER® without the need for a plan change to occur.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 129 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. Provision should be made for developing managed reduction targets at a range of scales and across all contributing sectors (including urban and point source discharges) and sub-catchments.  
The targets for the period to 2032 will properly be considered as part of the Rotorua Lakes WMA.  
The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives, and PC10 policies should be amended to included stronger use of non-regulatory methods.  
We recommend a mechanism for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in OVERSEER®

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Section: LR P3(d)** 1008

**Panel Recommendation**

See Section LR P3 above, noting we have recommended the replacement of "within the Integrated Framework Approach" with "set out in Table LR 2'.

**Submissions**

Submission Number: 49: 96 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: It is not clear why the allocation regime is so heavily weighted on the four principles that STAG added to policy WL5B rather than the principles of the RPS policy itself. Such a system must avoid picking winners. The STAG concepts were supposed to be additional to the RPS direction, but it appears that they have actively displaced them.

Decision Sought: Delete 'the pastoral sector using the Integrated Framework Approach'. Replace with a system what is consistent with:  
- The effects-based philosophy of the RMA and meets the purpose of the RMA.  
- The relevant policies of the RPS.  
- Is consistent with policies 21 and 23 of the RWLP  
- Taking zero-based approach to identifying land use value and efficiency, and not relying on the inherent

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

inequity of the allocation approach.

- Replace at minimum with an allocation system based on natural capital principles. Preferably replace with a system that uses a hybrid of tradable emission units and fees.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 8 - 53 Submission Type: Oppose  
Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
Submission Summary: LUC or Natural Capital was found at StAG to be completely unsuitable to the particular circumstances pertaining to this region. It is untenable to support LUC once the reality of it in Rotorua is understood and if land in Rotorua were designated along these lines it would be a full-scale attack on existing land uses and property rights. LUC is not appropriate for Rotorua as a method to reallocate land use but could be a way forward in the future for directing any future development of land in the catchment.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 14 - 12 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. The approach of the Plan Change is inconsistent with the effects based approach of the Resource Management Act.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 58: 25 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: Max Douglas  
Submission Summary: Support.  
Decision Sought: Support - no change requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 66: 52 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.  
Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 130 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. Provision should be made for developing managed reduction targets at a range of scales and across all contributing sectors (including urban and point source discharges) and sub-catchments. The targets for the period to 2032 will properly be considered as part of the Rotorua Lakes WMA. The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives, and PC10 policies should be amended to include stronger use of non-regulatory methods.  
Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1011

**Section:** LR P4 Policy Four

## Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 25: 1 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: Paul Lyons  
Submission Summary: I support the notion of regular reviews of the science, policies, NMP's, and OVERSEER® in order to ensure the most up to date information is being used. An interactive management approach will ensure science changes and policy will remain in synch to best serve the overall aims of nitrogen reduction.  
Decision Sought: Support - No changes requested.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 26: 37 Submission Type: Support in Part  
Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
Submission Summary: RLC supports the use of adaptive management with a five yearly science reviews and regular reviews of the RPS and regional plan. RLC would like to see this first review occur as soon as possible. RLC is also concerned that the word "may" implies that a full review will not necessarily be completed.  
Decision Sought: Amend LR M2 to replace "these reviews may include" with "these reviews will include"; and to state 2017 as the year the first review will be completed.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 20 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: Supports the increase certainty regarding reviews which was sought by the submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept

Further Submission No: 12 - 18 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept

Submission Number: 37: 1 Submission Type: Support in Part  
Submitter: Ngati Whakaue Tribal Lands Incorporation  
Submission Summary: Support conditional on relief sought.  
Decision Sought: - Regular reviews of the Regional Policy Statement and Regional Water and Land Plan polices, rules and methods  
- Five-year individual on-farm Nitrogen Management Plan review.  
- Object to the full cost of the NMP reviews being borne by the landowner.  
- The use of OVERSEER® reference files and proportional requirements to reduce the variability for individual property nitrogen targets.

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 43: 26 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
 Submission Summary: Ravensdown supports the adaptive management approach and the regular reviews proposed but considers the management plan proposed in (iii) should be called a nutrient management plan.  
 Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Policy LR P4 and in particular the adaptive management approach;  
 Re-name the management plan to a Nutrient Management Plan;  
 Move the use of reference files to outside the plan provisions (as per ECan Plan Change 3);  
 Include the requirement for property/farming enterprises to manage nutrient losses through GMP;  
 This policy should require the use of good management practices (GMP) to manage nutrient losses.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 15 - 4 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited  
 Submission Summary: Good management practices combine the practical experience of land users with scientific development, provide recommendations that can be adapted to suit local conditions, allow for changes to be made to the way some nutrient management activities are carried out, and provide the means for continuous (and innovative) improvement in nutrient management on a property.  
 Nutrient Management Plans better reflect the intent of the Plan Change which regulates more than just nitrogen.  
 Inclusion of the terms "Good Management Practice" and "Nutrient Management Plan" would be consistent with the terminology being adopted in a number of areas around New Zealand.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 53: 18 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.  
 The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives.  
 There are inconsistencies between OVERSEER® 6.2 values in the policies and version 5.4 values used to develop allocation methods and the rules. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values for consistency.  
 Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to read: 'To implement adaptive management in the management of nutrients within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment through:  
 science reviews set out in Method LR M2 and subsequent consideration by Council of recommendations;  
 (i) regular reviews of the Regional Policy Statement and Regional Water and Land Plan objectives, policies, rules and methods under the Resource Management Act 1991;  
 (ii) Implementing the Rotorua Lakes WMA to give effect to the NPS-FW 2014.'

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 53 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.  
 Decision Sought: Amend as follows: '..... in the management of nutrients within.....'

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 56 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.

Decision Sought: Add (v) Implementing the Rotorua Lakes WMA to give effect to the NPS-FW 2014.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 24 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Reference to reviews of the RPS in the proposed Plan Change adds a level of uncertainty for plan users.

Decision Sought: Amend LR P4 as follows:  
Implement adaptive management of nitrogen within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment through:  
(i) Science reviews set out in Method LR M2 and subsequent consideration by Council of recommendations  
(ii) Regular reviews of the outcomes of Regional Policy Statement and Regional Water and Land Plan policies, rules and methods under the Resource Management Act 1991.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 132 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. We recommend a mechanism for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in OVERSEER®

Decision Sought: Amend to read: 'LR P4 To implement adaptive management in the management of nutrients within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment through.'

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 135 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. We recommend a mechanism for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in OVERSEER®

Decision Sought: Add (v) as follows: (v)Implementing the Rotorua Lakes WMA to give effect to the NPS-FW 2014.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 82: 17 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: Stuart Morrison

Submission Summary: I strongly support the commitment to ongoing reviews and adaptive management.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

**Section: LR P4(i)**

1012

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

## Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P4 above

## Submissions

Submission Number:	49: 24	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	Support.		
Decision Sought:	Retain.		

Panel Recommendations: Accept
-------------------------------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	14 - 13	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd		
Submission Summary:	Hancock Forest Management supports the retention of policies seeking to review policies, rules and procedures over time as further information comes available. The economic impacts on land users in the catchment are far reaching and inequitable, and it is imperative that the catchment transitions over time to a more effects based approach.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part
--------------------------------------

<b>Section: LR P4(ii)</b>
---------------------------

1013

## Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P4 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number:	49: 25	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	Identify purpose of direction of those reviews.		
Decision Sought:	Identify purpose of direction of those reviews.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	14 - 14	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd		
Submission Summary:	Hancock Forest Management supports the retention of policies seeking to review policies, rules and procedures over time as further information comes available. The economic impacts on land users in the catchment are far reaching and inequitable, and it is imperative that the catchment transitions over time to a more effects based approach.		
Decision Sought:	AS above		

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part
--------------------------------------

Submission Number:	75: 131	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency.		

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

We recommend a mechanism for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in OVERSEER®

Decision Sought: Amend to read: '(ii) regular reviews of the Regional Policy Statement and Regional Water and Land Plan objectives, policies, rules and methods under the Resource Management Act 1991.'

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Section: LR P4(iii)**

1014

## Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P4 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 49: 26 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: Support.

Decision Sought: Retain.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 14 - 15 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd

Submission Summary: Hancock Forest Management supports the retention of policies seeking to review policies, rules and procedures over time as further information comes available. The economic impacts on land users in the catchment are far reaching and inequitable, and it is imperative that the catchment transitions over time to a more effects based approach.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 66: 54 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 133 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. We recommend a mechanism for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in OVERSEER®

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Section: LR P4(iv)**

1015

## Panel Recommendation

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

See Section on LR P4 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 49: 27 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: False accuracy. Only use OVERSEER® as a guidance tool to inform and support direction and trend, it has not been properly calibrated for many of the Rotorua soils.  
 Decision Sought: Delete. Replace with a methodology that does not rely on false precision of a black box model that is as yet unvalidated for Rotorua soils.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 58: 7 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Max Douglas  
 Submission Summary: Oppose the use of OVERSEER® for Compliance. The purpose is to reduce N pollution. Requiring us to use OVERSEER® does not do that. Forcing the use of OVERSEER® does increase compliance costs and erode the rural lifestyle with paperwork and consultants.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to read 'the use of counting, addition and perhaps multiplication, for proportional reductions'.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 55 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figures.  
 Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 134 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. We recommend a mechanism for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in OVERSEER®.  
 Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Section: LR P5 Policy Five 1016

### Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendation on this section.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 1: 5 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Lindsay Hugh and Alison Lyndsay Moore  
 Submission Summary: The starting point in determining nitrogen use controls should be land classification by its characteristics and how it drains. We submit that current land use is irrelevant to classification but may be relevant to permitted time within which to adjust to the standard for that class of land.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to reflect concerns raised.

# **Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1**

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

## **Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No:	6 - 21	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	For the reasons given in the original submission.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Reject
------------------------------

Submission Number:	12: 4	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Astrid Coker		
Submission Summary:	Oppose the allocation nitrogen loss range for drystock farms. The plan change limits flexibility in land use and stock class. The allocation is based on current land use and not the ability to manage effects or whether the land use is suitable for the productive capacity of the soil. The current plan change may restrict my flexibility and adaptability to response to changes market signals.		
Decision Sought:	All rural properties should have the same nitrogen discharge/ha/yr.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

## **Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No:	7 - 1	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth		
Submission Summary:	Oppose all rural properties having the same nitrogen discharge/ha/yr. Extensive analysis was undertaken by Council and affected parties to find an allocation system that would allow for the majority of land owners to continue their current farming practice. It was found that sector allocation was the only way for dairy farming to remain in some way in the catchment.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Accept
------------------------------

Further Submission No:	8 - 1	Submission Type:	Oppose
Further Submitter:	Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective		
Submission Summary:	Extensive analysis was undertaken by Council and affected parties to find an allocation system that would allow for the majority of land owners to continue their current farming practice. It was found that sector allocation was the only method which gave dairy farming a chance of remaining viable in the catchment, to some extent or other. Furthermore, there was insufficient benefit to any other sector (other than a windfall gain to forestry) which would justify the decimation of the dairy industry by the use of the alternative allocation method proposed in the submission. The Stakeholder Advisory Group considered nutrient allocation principles and guidelines and the Collective strongly supports these principles and the reasons for using them. If the proposal to give all rural properties (including forestry) the same nitrogen discharge/ha/yr were to be adopted the allowance would fall so dry stock farmers would be no better off, dairy would not be viable and there would be windfall gains for forestry and lifestyle farmers from the proposed trading scheme. If an alternative allocation method is to be looked at, at this stage, then it would require a full economic analysis to determine the true consequences of the system proposed.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Accept
------------------------------

Submission Number:	30: 3	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Fish & Game New Zealand (Eastern Region Fish and Game Council)		
Submission Summary:	The rules have been set by land use categories to more heavily target sectors that leach greater amounts of nutrient. Major changes to farm management practices may be required but the time frame proposed gives a fair and equitable period to plan for and meet objectives.		

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 31: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Patricia Hosking

Submission Summary: I oppose the current load limit for the catchment. I do not understand loads and possible options for managing discharges well enough to be able to restrict farming businesses to their current activities – the costs outweigh the benefits.

Decision Sought: Review the load calculation to focus on priorities for achieving water quality outcomes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 40: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Maraeroa Oturoa 2B Trust

Submission Summary: The Trust opposes the allocation method and nitrogen reductions as outlined in the Integrated Framework.

Decision Sought: Amend how the nitrogen discharge allowance is calculated and applied. Amend the timeframes to determine nitrogen loads and reductions required by landowners. Extend the years over which the calculation of nitrogen baselines are derived and work on the maximum discharge from any one of those years as the baseline.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 43: 27 Submission Type: Support in Part

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: Ravensdown is concerned there is no reference to Schedules LR One or Seven in the policy and one particular version of OVERSEER® is locked in. Ravensdown is not clear where the intent of the policy is taken through into the rules. It seems the intention is to implement the policy by block and not by property as a nutrient budget provider. Ravensdown considers this to be difficult to implement.

Decision Sought:

- Retain the overall intent of Policy LR P5;
- Reference Schedule LR One to determine an NDA and Schedule LR Seven relating to a transfer of an NDA.
- Carry the intent of the policy into the rules;
- Implement the policy on a property basis;
- Delete reference to a particular version of OVERSEER® used;
- Provide for a mechanism for updating when OVERSEER® changes without having to undertake a plan change.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 49: 97 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: The present allocation regime does not have any clear regard to the principles and considerations of RPS policy WL5B. There is no assessment of the policy approach against this policy.

Decision Sought: Delete. Replace with a regime that uses the WL5B criteria to determine the allocation, not one that gives pre-eminence to the StAG additional criteria.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 14 - 16 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd

Submission Summary: Creating an allocation whereby only those who are polluting get any meaningful ability to change land use in the future is inequitable and contrary to the effects based approach of the RMA.

Decision Sought: As above



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendation:	Reject
-----------------------	--------

Submission Number:	53: 19	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Lachlan McKenzie		
Submission Summary:	<p>Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require “best practicable option” or “reasonable, practicable and affordable” measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.</p> <p>The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies between OVERSEER® 6.2 values in the policies and version 5.4 values used to develop allocation methods and the rules. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values for consistency.</p> <p>Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.</p>		
Decision Sought:	<p>Amend to read: 'Managed Reduction Targets. To support achievement of the RWLP TLI objective by allocating nitrogen discharge allowances aspirational managed reduction targets across all contributing sectors; including to dairy and drystock activities within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment in accordance with (Table LR 4) subject to further work on dairy support; and to recognise standard OVERSEER® 5.4 loss rates for plantation forestry, bush/scrub and house blocks. No property/farming enterprise will be required to reduce its nitrogen loss below the bottom of the relevant sector nitrogen loss range.'</p>		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number:	58: 24	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Max Douglas		
Submission Summary:	<p>The integrated framework does not have dual sectors targets. The splitting into two sectors appears to be a decision made later by the Stag. Presenting it as the Integrated Framework is misleading.</p>		
Decision Sought:	<p>Consolidate dairy and drystock into a single sector: pastoral.</p> <p>Pastoral treated as a single sector with a single NDA, with a temporary (20 year) consideration given for high N leaching platforms. e.g. dairy farming.</p> <p>After 20 years, a shift to a more balanced split between pastoral and conservation.</p>		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number:	66: 57	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective		
Submission Summary:	<p>Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.</p>		
Decision Sought:	<p>Amend as follows: To support achievement of the RWLP TLI objective by managed reduction targets across all contributing sectors; including to dairy and dry stock activities within the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment in accordance with (Table LR 4) subject to further work on dairy support; and to recognise standard OVERSEER® 5.4 loss rates for plantation forestry, bush/scrub and house blocks.</p>		

Panel Recommendations:	Reject in part
------------------------	----------------

Submission Number:	75: 136	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	<p>Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency.</p> <p>Provision should be made for developing managed reduction targets at a range of scales and across all contributing sectors (including urban and point source discharges) and sub-catchments.</p>		
Decision Sought:	<p>Amend title from 'Nitrogen allocation' to Managed Reduction Targets' and amend wording of Policy LR P5 to say: 'To support the achievement of the RWLP TLI objective managed reduction targets may be allocated'.</p>		

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 22 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. Language is important at it is inappropriate to be suggesting that nitrogen discharge should be "allowed" when the purpose of the exercise is to reduce nitrogen discharges in a staged way.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 75: 138 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. Provision should be made for developing managed reduction targets at a range of scales and across all contributing sectors (including urban and point source discharges) and sub-catchments.

Decision Sought: Delete text under Table LR5: 'No property/farming enterprise will be required to reduce its nitrogen loss below the bottom of the relevant sector nitrogen loss range'.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 83: 13 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Bushlands Estate Limited and Adolle Farms Limited

Submission Summary: I do not support the nitrogen discharge allowance process and the requirement that land owners reduce nutrient loss by way of regulation, there is so much uncertainty about the efficacy or necessity of those rules.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Section: Table LR4 Allocated Loss Rates

1017

### Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P5 above.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 12: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Astrid Coker

Submission Summary: PC10 discriminates against drystock farms which are already farmed sustainable. The plan change limits flexibility in land use and stock class. The allocation is based on current land use and not the ability to manage effects or whether the land use is suitable for the productive capacity of the soil. Anyone using best practical science in farm practice is being penalised. The current plan change may restrict my flexibility and adaptability to response to changes market signals.

Decision Sought: All rural properties should have the same nitrogen discharge/ha/yr.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 13: 4 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Alister Snodgrass

Submission Summary: Farm targets should remain practical and affordable and option to adoption of best science.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 15: 2 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Murray and Robyn Pearce  
 Submission Summary: Table LR4 is sector based and not linking at all to the quality of land and its ability to hold or leach nutrients.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 43: 28 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
 Submission Summary: Table LR 4 should sit outside the plan to avoid locking in a version of OVERSEER® and the nitrogen losses determined by the older version.  
 Decision Sought: Remove Table LR 4 from Policy LR P5.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 58 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: That Table LR 4 Allocated nitrogen loss rates to sectors be corrected to show OVERSEER® 5.4 values.  
 Decision Sought: That Table LR 4 Allocated nitrogen loss rates to sectors be corrected to show OVERSEER® 5.4 values.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 25 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Table LR 4 should sit outside the Plan Change as a reference document.  
 Decision Sought: Table LR 4 should sit outside the Plan Change as a reference document.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 137 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies. Amendments are proposed for internal consistency.  
 Provision should be made for developing managed reduction targets at a range of scales and across all contributing sectors (including urban and point source discharges) and sub-catchments.  
 Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Section: LR P6 Policy Six

1018

#### Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing, noting we have recommended a minor wording change for consistency across the policies.

#### Submissions

Submission Number: 43: 29 Submission Type: Oppose

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: Ravensdown is unclear what the policy is addressing and what the implications are. It seems to only require a NDA to be determined for activities that are controlled or non-complying, which seems contrary to Policy LR P5.

Decision Sought: Delete Policy LR P6; or if retained clarify its intent.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 45: 5 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Wendy and John Roe

Submission Summary: I do not support the nitrogen discharge allowance process and the requirement that land owners reduce nitrogen loss by way of regulation.

Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 48: 16 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Parekarangi Trust

Submission Summary: The timeframe is too tight. This will result in farmers suffering considerable financial pressure.

Decision Sought: This should be an aspirational target by 2032 not an NDA that must be achieved.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 8 - 42 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 49: 29 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: False accuracy. Only use OVERSEER® as a guidance tool to inform and support direction and trend. To use OVERSEER® as the primary tool for allocation is deeply flawed.

Decision Sought: Delete. Replace with a methodology that does not rely on false precision of a black box model that is as yet unvalidated for Rotorua soils.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 53: 20 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses. The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives. There are inconsistencies between OVERSEER® 6.2 values in the policies and version 5.4 values used to develop allocation methods and the rules. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values for consistency. Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1019

**Section: LR P7 Policy Seven**

## Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendation on this section.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 26: 21 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
 Submission Summary: Resource efficiency is not adequately maximised if trading of nitrogen is not provided for until 2022. PC 10's moratorium on nitrogen trading until 2022 does not facilitate the preservation of value from existing on-farm capital investment. Provision for earlier trading will enable more efficient resource allocation.  
 Decision Sought: Amend LR P7 and LR R10 to enable the commencement of authorised transfer of nitrogen loss entitlements from the date on which Rule LR R10 becomes operative.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 43: 30 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
 Submission Summary: The policy is confusing and is not consistent with Policy LR P5. It is not clear what the policy is trying to address, and what the term 'authorised' means. It is also not clear how this this policy is carried through into the rules. There is also no reference to Schedule LR Seven.  
 Decision Sought: Delete Policy LR P7; or if retained clarify its intent and its relationship with the rules; re-write it to be enabling and consistent with Policy LR P5; and reference Schedule LR Seven.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 49: 30 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: This institutionalises incentives and windfall gains to the largest polluters which is directly contrary to the stated objectives of the plan change. The use of the term "Nitrogen loss entitlements" is a very strange choice, when the purpose should be to require land use enterprises to internalise their externalities. Not to send a message that the highest polluting are somehow entitled to be polluting, in such a way that other land uses are heavily constrained in their actions to benefit those few.  
 Decision Sought: Delete. Replace with "to provide for the authorised trading of "Nitrogen discharge liability units" between all properties, from July 2022, to encourage water resource use efficiency.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 14 - 17 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd  
 Submission Summary: While we support the ability to transfer N entitlements between properties in principle (to enable some flexibility and thereby transition to a more optimal use of the catchment) when combined with a grand parenting approach this effectively further rewards polluters, by allocating them a right that they can then trade to other parties for a direct financial windfall gain. To incentive the right behaviors a trading regime must be underpinned by an allocation based on natural capital that is fair and equitable.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 53: 21 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the

---

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

---

effects of nutrient losses.

There are inconsistencies between OVERSEER® 6.2 values in the policies and version 5.4 values used to develop allocation methods and the rules. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values for consistency.

Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.

Decision Sought: Amend to read: To enable the development of flexibility mechanisms to encourage efficient outcomes, e.g., transferable development rights, offset mechanisms, baseline-and-credit trading schemes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

---

Submission Number: 66: 60

Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.

Decision Sought: Amend as follows: To enable the development of flexibility mechanisms to encourage efficient outcomes, e.g., transferable development rights, offset mechanisms, baseline-and-credit trading schemes.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 70: 27 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: FANZ considers that the transfer of consents would appear to work in principal, and will likely provide the efficiencies being sought. However, FANZ is concerned that there are still too many uncertainties in the N loss assessments. These uncertainties would cause some obstacles to the N transfer process.  
Decision Sought: Retain as worded but note comments.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

Submission Number: 75: 140 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: We acknowledge the role of the Incentives Fund in supporting land use change; and strongly support provision for flexibility mechanisms, e.g., offsets, transfer, trading, to enable development while maintaining or reducing nutrient losses.  
We recommend a mechanism for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in OVERSEER®  
Decision Sought: Amend as follows: LR P7 To enable the authorised transfer of nitrogen loss increases between properties/farming enterprises from 1 July 2022 through flexibility, transfer and trading mechanisms to encourage efficient outcomes, e.g., transferable development rights, offset mechanisms, baseline-and-credit trading schemes; mechanisms for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in Overseer; and making provision for collective consents for multi-property nutrient reduction proposals.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 23 Submission Type: Support in Part  
Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: Language is important and it is inappropriate to be suggesting that nitrogen discharges is in any way an "entitlement". Support the change from "entitlement" to "increases", as this more accurately describes the policy purpose.  
Support the intent to use transfer and trading mechanisms but seek an addition allowing any landowner to participate rather than restricting it to "properties/farming enterprises".  
Decision Sought: Amend as follows: LR P7 To enable the authorised transfer of nitrogen loss increases between properties/rural enterprises from 1 July 2022 through flexibility, transfer and trading mechanisms to encourage efficient outcomes, e.g. transferable development rights, offset mechanisms, baseline-and-credit trading schemes; mechanisms for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in OVERSEER®; and making provision for collective consents for multi-property nutrient reduction proposals.

Panel Recommendation: Reject

## Section: LR P8 Policy 8

1020

### Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 39: 7 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Eileen Campbell  
Submission Summary: I do not support the requirement of land owners to complete farm management plans that will be part of a compliance process. It is impossible to develop a plan committing one's self to actions up to 15 years in the future.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject



## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 43: 11 Submission Type: Support  
 Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
 Submission Summary: Ravensdown supports the use of property/farming enterprise specific Management Plans and reliance on good management practices.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 43: 31 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
 Submission Summary: Ravensdown supports the intent of the policy. However the management plan should be called a Nutrient Management Plan to properly reflect its purpose. This policy should require the use of good management practices (GMP) to manage nutrient losses. The plan already defines Managed Reduction Targets and so it is not necessary to include the definition in the policy.  
 Decision Sought:
 

- Retain the intent of Policy LR P8;
- Re-name the management plan to a Nutrient Management Plan;
- Include the requirement for property/farming enterprises to manage nutrient losses through GMP;
- Delete "(five-yearly nitrogen loss reduction targets)".

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 24 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 15 - 5 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. The changes will provide clarity and make the provisions read more clearly.  
 Good management practices combine the practical experience of land users with scientific development, provide recommendations that can be adapted to suit local conditions, allow for changes to be made to the way some nutrient management activities are carried out, and provide the means for continuous (and innovative) improvement in nutrient management on a property.  
 Inclusion of the terms "Good Management Practice" and "Nutrient Management Plan" would be consistent with the terminology being adopted in a number of areas around New Zealand.  
 PPC 10 provides a definition of "Managed Reduction Targets" within the definitions section of the Plan Change, it is not necessary to repeat the definition within Policy LR P8.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 45: 7 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Wendy and John Roe  
 Submission Summary: I do not support the requirement for land owners to complete farm management plans that will be part of a compliance process. It is impossible to develop a plan committing ourselves to actions up to 15 years in the future.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 48: 20 Submission Type: Oppose

---

## **Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1**

---

Submitter: Parekarangi Trust

Submission Summary: Amend this rule to require NDA plans to achieve best farming practice for each 5 year target.

Decision Sought: Amend this rule to require NDA plans to achieve best farming practice for each 5 year target.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 48: 28 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Parekarangi Trust  
 Submission Summary: No point in reducing NDA further is the Target TLI is being achieved or bettered.  
 Decision Sought: Link this rule to TLI and only phase if further reduction if the 5 year rolling TLI is over 4.2.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 7 - 33 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Alistair and Sarah Coatsworth  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Further Submission No: 8 - 38 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 49: 31 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: This policy seeks to manage phosphorus loss. To do so through a vehicle named a "nitrogen management plan is misleading and confusing. The purpose of the plan is to manage excess nutrients that are causing water pollution.  
 Decision Sought: Subject to the change in title to reflect that the purpose is to manage a range of pollutants. Rename "nitrogen management plans" as "water pollution management plans".

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 53: 22 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.  
 The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives.  
 Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to read: To encourage whole-of-community engagement by enabling sub-specific Nutrient Action Plans and support the implementation of mitigation actions to achieve and maintain Managed Reduction Targets.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 61: 8 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Beef + Lamb New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Council's current approach to on farm management through potentially prescriptive farm plans is counterintuitive to achieving action at a sub catchment level, through coordinated, well supported and prioritised actions.  
 Decision Sought: Acknowledgement needs to be given to a whole farm approach to managing the potential impacts on water quality, not just limited to Nitrogen.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 25 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Accept in part
-----------------------	----------------

Submission Number: 66: 6 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: The Collective support the concept of Managed Reduction targets, but do not agree with the target numbers, which will be subject to changes from recommendations from the 2017 science review and ROTAN review. It is the mechanism of measurement & enforcement of the managed reduction targets that we wish Council to change.  
 Decision Sought: We request that they are not subject to conditional consent but are part of a permitted activity.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number: 66: 61 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.  
 Decision Sought: Amend as follows: To encourage whole-of-community engagement by enabling sub-catchment specific Nutrient Action Plans and support the implementation of mitigation actions to achieve and maintain Managed Reduction Targets.

Panel Recommendations:	Reject
------------------------	--------

Submission Number: 70: 28 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: The term 'Managed Reduction Targets' is already defined. The definition does not need to be included within the policy.  
 Decision Sought: Amend Policy LR P8 as follows: To require property/farming enterprise specific Nutrient Management Plans and require the implementation of mitigation actions to achieve and maintain Managed Reduction Targets and Nitrogen Discharge Allowances.

Panel Recommendations:	Accept
------------------------	--------

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 15 - 38 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. The amendments proposed assist in making the provision clearer while providing greater assistance as to what is intended.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation:	Accept
-----------------------	--------



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 26: 26 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: Rotorua Lakes Council  
 Submission Summary: RLC supports LR P9 and its accompanying rules (LRR1 - R7 and LRR13) in principle as far as they allow for reduced and more appropriate compliance costs for smaller land holders, PC 10 must allow the Rotorua communities to continue to provide for their social, cultural and economic well-being.  
 Decision Sought: Amend LR P9 and LR R1 to R7 and R13 to give effect to RLC's submissions.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 43: 32 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
 Submission Summary: The policy has no purpose as it simply mirrors the rules.  
 Decision Sought: Policy LR P9 be deleted.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 49: 35 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: Without a definition of intensive land use LR 9 policy is meaningless.  
 Decision Sought: Define "intensive land use".

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 56: 2 Submission Type: Support  
 Submitter: Bay of Plenty Regional Council  
 Submission Summary: Need to provide clarification about what intensive use is considered to be.  
 Decision Sought: Alter to refer to "(commercial dairying, cropping or horticulture)" in LR R9(c) and "(commercial cropping or horticulture)" in LR P9(d).

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 58: 27 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Max Douglas  
 Submission Summary: Change the land area limits to only consider pastoral land. Seems like an oversight in the wording of the rules. Does anyone really want to categorise a block with 50 hectares of bush a 3 hectare house site into the 40+ pastoral category requiring resource consents, etc.  
 Decision Sought: Amend policy for example: LR P9 (c) The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises with 5 hectares or less in area in pasture from 1 July 2017 provided there is no intensive land use.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 29 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: The policy reads like a method as it refers to activity status and rules. Policies such as this effectively remove one of the 'gateway' tests under s104. If a policy is effectively worded the same as a rule, an activity that cannot meet a rule, is likely to be contrary to the policy. This means that the activity must meet the second gateway test: effects must be minor.FANZ is concerned that this would be difficult in terms of nutrient discharges. Policies should be a statement of intent. The rules are the methods of achieving that intent.  
 Decision Sought: Delete and Replace LR P9 with the following or similar.:  
 Enable low intensity land use activities, plantation forestry, bush/scrub or activities that can demonstrate no increase in nitrogen loss.  
 Advice note: it is intended that permitted activity would apply to the following property / farm enterprises:

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

- < 10 ha effective area with 'low intensity farming activity'.
- 10 - 40 ha until 2022, and no increase in nitrogen loss.
- in the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment but not previously managed by Rules 11 to 11F.
- with low nitrogen loss.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 26 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 30 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Policy LR P9 is very confusing and provides mixed signals. It uses the terms 'no intensive land use' in (c) and (d) and 'low nitrogen loss' in (g). These terms do not appear to be defined. It is suggested that the terms 'no intensive land use' and 'low nitrogen loss' are replaced with 'low intensity land use activity' and a definition. When LR P9 (c), (d) and (g) are considered in combination this policy is ambiguous and confusing. FANZ supports, in principle, that farms with low intensity farming activities should be a permitted activity.  
Decision Sought: If Policy LR P9 is retained combine condition (g) with (c) and (d) to provide for all low intensity land use activities or  
Alternatively combine condition (c) and (d) and retain (g) as a separate matter to provide for intensive farms with low N loss by defining 'low N loss'.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 27 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

## Section: LR P9(a)

1022

### Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P9 above.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 49: 32 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: Unenforceable.  
Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1023

**Section:** LR P9(b)

## Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P9 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number:	49: 33	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	Support.		
Decision Sought:	Retain.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No:	14 - 18	Submission Type:	Support
Further Submitter:	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd		
Submission Summary:	Support the policy to make plantation forestry a permitted activity, in recognition of the lesser effects of this land use on water quality.		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Reject

Submission Number:	53: 23	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Lachlan McKenzie		
Submission Summary:	Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.		
Decision Sought:	Amend to read: The use of land for plantation forestry and bush/scrub and constructed wetlands and sediment detainment bunds.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number:	66: 62	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective		
Submission Summary:	Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.		
Decision Sought:	Amend as follows: '(b)The use of land for plantation forestry .and bush/scrub and constructed wetlands and sediment detainment bunds.'		

Panel Recommendations: Reject



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 75: 142 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: We recommend permitted activity status for all landuses which are not increasing nutrient losses; supported by appropriate monitoring.  
Decision Sought: Amend to (b)The use of land for plantation forestry and bush/scrub and constructed wetlands and sediment detainment bunds.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Section: LR P9(c)

1024

### Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P9 above.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 12: 6 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Astrid Coker  
Submission Summary: Oppose as a permitted activity the use of land less than 5ha and 5-10ha without a nutrient discharge plan (nutrient management plan).  
More often blocks less than 10ha do undertake commercial activities. Owners of these properties more often are least experienced in farming practices.  
Decision Sought: Include information keeping, reporting conditions and nutrient discharge plan for all land used for agriculture, horticulture etc.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 21: 1 Submission Type: Support in Part  
Submitter: Brown Owl Organics Incorporated  
Submission Summary: Small-scale intensive organic market gardens are able to provide vegetables for approximately 166 families per acre. Such enterprises usually start at below 1 acre and can be profitable at half an acre. We would like to see small organic market gardeners and orchardists being able to start a business to feed local people.  
Decision Sought: We seek for this to be changed to: "The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises 5 hectares or less in area from 1 July 2017 provided there is no commercial horticulture nor cropping over 0.4 hectares in area."

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

Submission Number: 65: 2 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: Peter Reed  
Submission Summary: Some lower limit to the size of property is required otherwise the proposed changes will become very impractical and require huge resources for both compliance and enforcement. The 5 hectare limit is a good demarcation, between what are most likely un-intensive non-commercial properties. Any reduction to the limit will also demand new consideration of the practicality of many of the compliance requirements of these rules ( e.g. OVERSEER®).  
Decision Sought: Support the intention to allow as a permitted activity. "The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises 5 hectares or less in area from 1 July 2017 provided there is no intensive land use."

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1025

**Section: LR P9(d)**

## Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P9 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number:	12: 7	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Astrid Coker		
Submission Summary:	Oppose as a permitted activity the use of land less than 5ha and 5-10ha without a nutrient discharge plan (nutrient management plan). More often blocks less than 10ha do undertake commercial activities. Owners of these properties more often are least experienced in farming practices.		
Decision Sought:	Include information keeping, reporting conditions and nutrient discharge plan for all land used for agriculture, horticulture etc.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number:	75: 143	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Property sizes should be based on total area, not "effective" area; consistent with guidelines for the use of OVERSEER® as whole farm averages; and to respect existing investments in planting or setting aside areas for reducing nutrient losses and improving biodiversity and other outcomes.		
Decision Sought:	Delete word 'Effective'.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Section: LR P9(e)**

1026

## Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P9 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number:	49: 36	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	False accuracy. Only use OVERSEER® as a guidance tool to inform and support direction and trend. To use OVERSEER® is deeply flawed because: 1. it is so poorly calibrated to Rotorua soils, 2. there are still a number of assumptions that need refining, 3. changes to the algorithms in versions and subversions change not only the total quantity leached, but also the relativity between land uses.		
Decision Sought:	Replace with an input measure rather than relying on an OVERSEER® assessment of "no increase in nitrogen loss".		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number:	75: 144	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Property sizes should be based on total area, not "effective" area; consistent with guidelines for the use of OVERSEER® as whole farm averages; and to respect existing investments in planting or setting aside areas for reducing nutrient losses and improving biodiversity and other outcomes.		
Decision Sought:	Delete word 'effective'.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1027

**Section: LR P9(f)**

**Panel Recommendation**

See Section on LR P9 above.

**Submissions**

Submission Number:	49: 37	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	<p>False accuracy. Only use OVERSEER® as a guidance tool to inform and support direction and trend. To use OVERSEER® is deeply flawed because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. it is so poorly calibrated to Rotorua soils,</li> <li>2. there are still a number of assumptions that need refining,</li> <li>3. changes to the algorithms in versions and subversions change not only the total quantity leached, but also the relativity between land uses.</li> </ol>		
Decision Sought:	Replace with an input measure rather than relying on an OVERSEER® assessment of “no increase in nitrogen loss”.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No:	12 - 15	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Further Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	<p>Support the recommendation that policy and methods need to acknowledge the imperfect precision and accuracy of OVERSEER® estimates. Oppose the recommendation to replace OVERSEER® estimates with input measures.</p>		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Reject

1028

**Section: LR P9(g)**

**Panel Recommendation**

See Section on LR P9 above.

**Submissions**

Submission Number:	49: 38	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	<p>False accuracy. Only use OVERSEER® as a guidance tool to inform and support direction and trend. To use OVERSEER® is deeply flawed because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. it is so poorly calibrated to Rotorua soils,</li> <li>2. there are still a number of assumptions that need refining,</li> <li>3. changes to the algorithms in versions and subversions change not only the total quantity leached, but also the relativity between land uses.</li> </ol>		
Decision Sought:	Replace with an input measure rather than relying on an OVERSEER® assessment of “no increase in nitrogen loss”.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Further Submission(s)**

Further Submission No:	12 - 16	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Further Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	<p>Support the recommendation that policy and methods need to acknowledge the imperfect precision and accuracy of OVERSEER® estimates. Oppose the recommendation to replace OVERSEER® estimates with input measures.</p>		
Decision Sought:	As above		

Panel Recommendation: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 49: 39 Submission Type: Not Applicable  
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: Forestry is constrained to (b), which has tighter constraints than (g). This locks forestry into no flexibility. There should be the capability for forestry to become other productive enterprises. The present policy is utterly inequitable and unfair.  
Decision Sought: Change to read "The use of land for farming activities that can demonstrate low nitrogen loss".

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 14 - 19 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd  
Submission Summary: Allow existing farming only.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

## Section: LR P9(h)

1029

## Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P9 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 49: 40 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: All land uses should be operating at BMP or BPO.  
Decision Sought: Add in a requirement that they meet a test of BMP or BPO.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 31 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: FANZ notes that LR R8 – LR R11 are controlled activities and so cannot be permitted activities. If LR P 9 (h) is intended to apply to land use other than farming activities, forestry/ bush/ scrub then it should be clear that is the case.  
Decision Sought: If Policy LR P9 is retained delete LR P9(h). Farming activities, plantation forestry/ bush /scrub land use are provided for by LR P9 (a)–(g).

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 28 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1030

**Section: LR P10 Policy 10**

## Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendation on this section.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 21: 3 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Brown Owl Organics Incorporated  
 Submission Summary: This appears to directly contradict rule LR R3 which allows properties of under 5 hectares to carry out any farming activities that are not commercial. It also contradicts the Rule Summary Flowchart.  
 Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 43: 33 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
 Submission Summary: The policy has no purpose as it simply mirrors the rules.  
 Decision Sought: Policy LR P10 be deleted.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

Submission Number: 48: 19 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Parekarangi Trust  
 Submission Summary: This is a blunt approach that will cost every farm \$10-20k per annum to administer. 1st July 2017 is too tight a timeframe.  
 Decision Sought: Remove requirement for resource consent for all properties.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 49: 41 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: Merely requiring them to state "for the use of land of farming activities" with no direction as to what the intent of the use would be is insufficient.  
 Decision Sought: Add to this policy what the matters the resource consents would consider.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 53: 24 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses. The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives.  
 Decision Sought: Amend first sentence to read: To allow as a permitted activity provided properties do not exceed their 2001-2003 bench mark and farmers participate in sub-catchment nutrient action plans.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 58: 28 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Max Douglas

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Summary: Change the land area limits to only consider pastoral land. Seems like an oversight in the wording of the rules. Does anyone really want to categorise a block with 50 hectares of bush a 3 hectare house site into the 40+ pastoral category requiring resource consents, etc.

Decision Sought: Amend policy for example 'The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises with 5 hectares or less in area in pasture from 1 July 2017 provided there is no intensive land use.'

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 66: 63 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.

Decision Sought: Amend first sentence to: To allow as a permitted activity provided managed reduction targets set in accordance with Table LR 4 are met.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 70: 32 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: These policies read like methods. Policies such as this effectively remove one of the 'gateway' tests under s104. Policies should be a statement of intent.

Decision Sought: Delete LR P10 and replace with the following:  
Nitrogen loss from land use activities within the Lake Rotorua Catchment shall be minimised through the use of both regulatory and non-regulatory methods following an adaptive management approach based on stepped time frames for the introduction of controls from 2017 and 2022 to achieve the sustainable lake nutrient load by 2032.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part
---------------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 29 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part
--------------------------------------

Submission Number: 75: 149 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: We recommend permitted activity status for all landuses which are not increasing nutrient losses; supported by appropriate monitoring.

Decision Sought: Add (e) The discharge of nutrients onto or into land provided the land use associated with the discharge is authorised under Rule LR xx to LRxy.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 14: 5 Submission Type: Support

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submitter: Warren Webber

Submission Summary: The Oturoa Agreement (Feb 2013) resolved RPS appeals by Fed Farmers and the Collective and agreed target dates to achieve sustainable catchment loads; 70% by 2022; 100% by 2032.

Decision Sought: Support- No changes requested..

Panel Recommendations: Accept

## Section: LR P10(a)

1031

### Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P10 above.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 70: 33 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: LR P9 (g) and LR P10 (a) are in direct conflict, unless Policy 10(a) provides for farms not permitted under LR R9 (g).

Decision Sought: If LR P10 is retained, amend as follows:  
LR R10 (a) The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises over 40 hectares in effective area from 1 July 2017, where not addressed by Policy RP 9.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 145 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: We recommend permitted activity status for all landuses which are not increasing nutrient losses; supported by appropriate monitoring.  
Property sizes should be based on total area, not "effective" area; consistent with guidelines for the use of OVERSEER® as whole farm averages.

Decision Sought: Amend introduction to policy and (a) as follows;  
LR P10 To allow as a permitted activity:  
(a) The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises over 40 hectares in area from 1 July 2017 provided there is no increase in nitrogen loss and the information keeping and reporting conditions are met.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Section: LR P10(b)

1032

### Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P10 above.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 75: 146 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: We recommend permitted activity status for all landuses which are not increasing nutrient losses; supported by appropriate monitoring.

Decision Sought: Amend as follows: (b) The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises between 10 and 40 hectares in area from 1 July 2022 provided there is no increase in nitrogen loss and the information keeping and reporting conditions are met.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1033

**Section: LR P10(c)**

## Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P10 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number:	70: 34	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	LR P10 (c): applies to farming activities on properties less than 5 ha or that are 5 to 10 ha in effective area, not in low intensity land use. This wording can be simplified to 'less than 10 ha in effective area'.		
Decision Sought:	If LR P10 is retained, amend as follows: 'LR R10 (c) The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises less than 10 hectares in effective area that are not low intensity land use activity from 1 July 2022'.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number:	75: 147	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	We recommend permitted activity status for all landuses which are not increasing nutrient losses; supported by appropriate monitoring. Property sizes should be based on total area, not "effective" area; consistent with guidelines for the use of OVERSEER® as whole farm averages; and to respect existing investments in planting or setting aside areas for reducing nutrient losses and improving biodiversity and other outcomes.		
Decision Sought:	Amend as follows: (c) The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises less than 5 hectares in area or that are between 5 hectares and less than 10 hectares in area that are not low intensity land use from 1 July 2022 provided there is no increase in nitrogen loss and the information keeping and reporting conditions are met.		

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Section: LR P10(d)**

1034

## Panel Recommendation

See Section on LR P10 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number:	70: 35	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	LR P9 (c) and (d) uses the term 'no intensive land use', and LR P10(c) uses the term 'not low intensity land use'. Rule LR R7 uses the term 'low intensity farming activity'. It would be helpful if the Plan uses consistent terms.		
Decision Sought:	If LR P10 is retained, amend as follows: LR R10 (d) The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises in the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment not previously managed by Rules 11 to 11F that are not low intensity land use activity from 1 July 2022.		

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number:	75: 148	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
Submission Summary:	Property sizes should be based on total area, not "effective" area; consistent with guidelines for the use of OVERSEER® as whole farm averages; and to respect existing investments in planting or setting aside areas for reducing nutrient losses and improving biodiversity and other outcomes. We recommend permitted activity status for all landuses which are not increasing nutrient losses; supported by appropriate monitoring.		



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Decision Sought: Amend as follows: (d) The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises in the Lake Rotorua groundwater catchment not previously managed by Rules 11 to 11F that are not low intensity land use from 1 July 2022 provided there is no increase in nitrogen loss and the information keeping and reporting conditions are met.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Section: LR P11 Policy 11

1035

## Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 40: 7 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Maraeroa Oturoa 2B Trust  
Submission Summary: Extend the timeframe to set rules, meet nitrogen reduction targets and measure progress towards reductions.  
Decision Sought: The Trust requests a longer timeframe for Regional Council to invest in better science, research, modelling before setting the allocation methodology, rules, timeframes to meet targets and resource consents.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 12 – 40 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 43: 34 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
Submission Summary: The policy has no purpose as it simply mirrors the rules.  
Decision Sought: Policy LR P11 be deleted.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 53: 25 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie  
Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.  
The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives.  
Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.  
Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 66: 64 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.  
Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 70: 36 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: Certainty can be provided through clear controlled consent conditions, where consent is required. The mitigations required to achieve the 2032 NDA may not be immediately known. Hence the policy should focus on the process and the outcomes. Policy LR P11 needs to be reworded to provide clarity for the reader, to focus on outcomes and to ensure consistency with LR P12.  
Decision Sought: Either replace policy LR P11 entirely or amend as follows or similar:  
To manage farming activities on properties / farming enterprises greater than 40 ha, or from 2022 if less than 40 ha; where the farming activity is not low intensity land use activity through the use of Nutrient Management Plans that demonstrate the achievement of Managed Reduction Targets and Nitrogen Discharge Allowances for the purpose of meeting sustainable lake nutrient loads by 2032.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 30 Submission Type: Support in Part  
Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission with an additional amendment to replace the term "Nitrogen Discharge Allowances" NDA, with "Residual Nitrogen Discharge" RND.  
Decision Sought: Same as the original submission with additional amendments to replace the term "Nitrogen Discharge Allowance" or NDA with "Residual Nitrogen Discharge

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

---

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

---

Submission Number: 75: 150 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: The targets for the period to 2032 will properly be considered as part of the Rotorua Lakes WMA. Regulation cannot be used to require nutrient losses beyond the requirements of RPS Policy WL 6B, i.e., reducing losses as far as is reasonably practicable by implementing on-farm best management practices. Resource consents are not required to drive uptake of industry best practice to meet the 2022 pastoral managed reduction targets. The reduction required from the pastoral sector is relatively modest in this period and achievable without the controlled activity status.  
Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

---

Submission Number: 83: 11 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Bushlands Estate Limited and Adolle Farms Limited  
Submission Summary: I do not support the requirement for land owners to complete farm management plans that will be part of a compliance process. At StAG the framework was designed to avoid this, but following the end of StAG the rules have diverted into this pathway. It is impossible to develop a plan committing myself to actions up to 16 years in the future.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

---

### Section: LR P12 Policy 12

1036

#### Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing, noting we have recommended a minor wording change to provide clarity.

#### Submissions

---

Submission Number: 43: 35 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
Submission Summary: The policy has no purpose as it simply mirrors the rules.  
Decision Sought: Policy LR P12 be deleted.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

---

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 53: 26 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require “best practicable option” or “reasonable, practicable and affordable” measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.  
 The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives.  
 Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.  
 Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 65 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.  
 Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 37 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: The policy should be reworded to be more directive and state what outcomes the Council requires to be achieved. Under the current policy provisions, any farming activities which cannot show how it can meet the significant N loss will immediately be non-complying. Flexibility to provide for adaptive management should be provided through Discretionary activity status.  
 Decision Sought: Either replace policy LR P12 entirely or amend as follows or similar:  
 To as provide for non-complying activity status for farming activities that require a land use consent application to be made and that do not submit a Nitrogen Management Plan and provide for discretionary activity status where the Nitrogen Management Plan is not demonstrating the achievement of Managed Reduction Targets and Nitrogen Discharge Allowances for the purpose of meeting sustainable lake nutrient loads by 2032.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 31 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 75: 151 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: It is our submission that resource consents are not required to drive uptake of industry best practice to meet the 2022 pastoral managed reduction targets. The required reduction from the pastoral sector is relatively modest in this period and achievable without the controlled activity status. We oppose a default rule making farming a non-complying activity.  
 Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1037

**Section: LR P13 Policy 13**

## Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 17: 6 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: D & A Trust  
Submission Summary: PC10 proposed to use OVERSEER® for applications far beyond what it is designed for or capable of. OVERSEER® is a software tool that is capable of making complex calculation very quickly. It cannot make allowances for changed circumstances. Until the software is informed by a considerably larger dataset it can only give generalised outcomes.  
We have seen significant variation from different models of OVERSEER® and this can be expected to continue. In general OVERSEER® can have a variation from the model to an individual farm of plus or minus 30%. This is far too much for a compliance tool and therefore should not be relied upon.  
Decision Sought: Not specified.

**Panel Recommendations: Reject**

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 32 Submission Type: Support  
Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission. CNI supports relegating the use of OVERSEER® from being the tool to determine nitrogen loss, to being a decision support tool.  
Decision Sought: Delete Policy LR P13.

**Panel Recommendation: Reject**

Submission Number: 32: 16 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Kaitao Rotohokahoka 2D Trust  
Submission Summary: The Trust opposes the use of OVERSEER® 6.2.0 and subsequent versions. OVERSEER® is a decision support tool and should be used as such.  
Decision Sought: The Trust requests that the Council provides an alternative process to determine nitrogen loss to the catchment, rather than OVERSEER® as the first point of call.

**Panel Recommendations: Reject**

Submission Number: 40: 11 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Maraeroa Oturoa 2B Trust  
Submission Summary: The Trust opposes the use of OVERSEER® 6.2.0 and subsequent versions to determine the nitrogen loss from the land.  
Decision Sought: OVERSEER® is a decision support tool and should be used as such. The Trust requests that the Council provides an alternative process to determine nitrogen loss to the catchment, rather than OVERSEER® as the first point of call.

**Panel Recommendations: Reject**

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 43: 36 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The policy has no purpose and locks in a version of OVERSEER® that has already been updated and will therefore not be available for use. Ravensdown considers a definition of OVERSEER® could be included in the plan, and a mechanism for updating OVERSEER® when there are changes without having to undertake a plan change.

Decision Sought: Policy LR P13 be deleted and for the plan to include for a mechanism for updating when OVERSEER® changes without having to undertake a plan change.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part
---------------------------------------

Submission Number: 48: 21 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Parekarangi Trust

Submission Summary: Each version of OVERSEER® released can result in major differences to output with the same input.

Decision Sought: Allow science more time to develop robust models that are capable of high degree of predictive ability.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 49: 42 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: False accuracy. OVERSEER® is not capable of being used to accurately determine the nitrogen loss from land. Only use OVERSEER® as a guidance tool to inform and support direction and trends.

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 53: 27 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require “best practicable option” or “reasonable, practicable and affordable” measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.  
The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives.  
Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.

Decision Sought: Amend to read: To use OVERSEER® version 5.4 consistent with the catchment load estimates to determine the nitrogen loss from land. Any future version changes will need to retain consistency between catchment and farm estimates; and may necessitate a variation to the RPS.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 58: 8 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Max Douglas

Submission Summary: Oppose the Use of OVERSEER® for Compliance. The purpose is to reduce N pollution. Requiring us to use OVERSEER® does not do that. Forcing the use of OVERSEER® does increase compliance costs and erode the rural lifestyle with paperwork and consultants.

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 66: 66 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective  
 Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to: To use OVERSEER® version 5.4 consistent with the catchment load estimates to determine

the nitrogen loss from land. Any future version changes will need to retain consistency between catchment and farm estimates; and may necessitate a variation to the RPS.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 70: 38 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: FANZ is concerned with locking in one specific version of OVERSEER® in the Plan Change.  
 Decision Sought: Amend LR P13: To use the most current version of OVERSEER® to determine the nitrogen loss from land.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part
---------------------------------------

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 15 - 39 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited  
 Submission Summary: The latest version of OVERSEER® should be used to determine nutrient loss from the land.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part
--------------------------------------

Submission Number: 75: 152 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Amendments are proposed for internal consistency. Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA.  
 Decision Sought: Amend as follows:  
 LR P13 To use OVERSEER® version 5.4 consistent with the catchment load estimates to determine the nitrogen loss from land. Any future version changes will need to retain consistency between catchment and farm estimates; and may necessitate a variation to the RPS.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 78: 12 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Tony and Joanna Carr  
 Submission Summary: That the OVERSEER® model is the farm decision support tool in determining nutrients for both planning and compliance.  
 Decision Sought: That the OVERSEER® model is the farm decision support tool in determining nutrients for both planning and compliance.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------





## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 43: 37 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
 Submission Summary: The policy has no purpose. The statement that specific land uses cannot be readily modelled in OVERSEER® is misleading and subjective, and it is unsure who has the final say as to whether OVERSEER® cannot be readily used.  
 Decision Sought: Policy LR P14 be deleted.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in Part

Submission Number: 49: 43 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: Making provision for an alternative methodology is wise otherwise the whole plan is at the mercy of one model and its techniques.  
 Decision Sought: Retain the concept of using alternative models.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 58: 9 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Max Douglas  
 Submission Summary: Oppose the Use of OVERSEER® for Compliance. The purpose is to reduce N pollution. Requiring us to use OVERSEER® does not do that. Forcing the use of OVERSEER® does increase compliance costs and erode the rural lifestyle with paperwork and consultants.  
 Decision Sought: Amend to read: Allow commercial operations that want to optimise the use of their land by engaging more advanced tools, where they pass a science due diligence tests the prove they are fit for purpose.

Panel Recommendations: Reject in part

Submission Number: 70: 39 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: FANZ considers the definition for 'nitrogen budget' in the Proposed Plan Change to be inadequate and has no clear recognisable meaning. A generic nitrogen budget could be provided in many different ways without necessarily being robust. Part of the Policy LR P14 would be better suited as a Schedule.  
 Decision Sought: Amend LR P14: To consider alternative models for determining nitrogen loss if OVERSEER® cannot be readily used for a specific land use. Consideration of whether alternative models may be used will take into account ...  
 (b) the acceptability of information inputs, for example a robust and verifiable process for estimating leaching rates; and  
 (c) the potential of suitably qualified and experienced persons  
 Any alternative to OVERSEER® for nutrient budgeting purposes must be authorised by the Regional Council.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

### Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 – 34 Submission Type: Support  
 Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
 Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.  
 Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept in Part

Further Submission No: 15 - 40 Submission Type: Support in Part  
 Further Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited  
 Submission Summary: Ballance supports alternative methods for determining nitrogen loss if OVERSEER® cannot be readily used for a specific land use.  
 Ballance is unsure, however, who determines when it may be necessary to trial an



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

1039

**Section:** LR P14(b)

## Panel Recommendation

See Section LR P14 above.

## Submissions

Submission Number: 49: 44 Submission Type: Support

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: The data quality is crucial. This means it can be used in more than one model, which could be cross-checked against each other for verification of accuracy, and used for trend analysis.

Decision Sought: Retain.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 53: 28 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require "best practicable option" or "reasonable, practicable and affordable" measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.  
The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives.

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 66: 67 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 40 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: It remains unclear why an alternative nutrient budget or alternative model is needed to estimate nutrient loss, if it relies on already having verifiable leaching rates. Rather it is a robust and verifiable process for estimating leaching loss which is required.

Decision Sought: Amend LR P14: '(b) the acceptability of information inputs, for example a robust and verifiable process for estimating leaching rates; and'.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

## Further Submission(s)

Further Submission No: 6 - 35 Submission Type: Support

Further Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: For the reasons given in the original submission.

Decision Sought: As above

Panel Recommendation: Accept

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 75: 153 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: We recommend a mechanism for recognising management practices and innovations which are not in OVERSEER®. Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent, including to give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and the overall purpose of the RMA.  
Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Section: LR P14(c)

1040

### Panel Recommendation

See Section LR P14 above.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 70: 41 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: It is supported that any alternative model for nutrient budgets must be authorised by Regional Council.  
Decision Sought: Amend to (c) the potential of suitably qualified and experienced persons.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

## Section: LR P15 Policy 15

1041

### Panel Recommendation

We concur with the Regional Council reporting officers' recommendations as contained in their s42A report and additional evidence presented during the hearing.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 43: 38 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
Submission Summary: The policy has no purpose and the information requirements to be supplied as part of a consent application is usually included in the administration section of a district plan.  
Decision Sought: Policy LR P15 be deleted and the information requirements be listed in the administrative section of the district plan.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 49: 45 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd  
Submission Summary: This information is vital for any form of nutrient management process.  
Decision Sought: Retain.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 58: 29 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Max Douglas  
Submission Summary: Change the land area limits to only consider pastoral land. Seems like an oversight in the wording of the rules. Does anyone really want to categorise a block with 50 hectares of

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

bush a 3 hectare house site into the 40+ pastoral category requiring resource consents, etc.

Decision Sought: Amend policy for example: The use of land for farming activities on properties/farming enterprises with 5 hectares or less in area in pasture from 1 July 2017 provided there is no intensive land use.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 70: 42 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: The words 'in effective area' have been added for consistency with the other policies.

Decision Sought: Amend LR P15 as follows: '...10 and 40 hectares in 'effective area'; and...

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 75: 155 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: We recommend permitted activity status for all landuses which are not increasing nutrient losses; supported by appropriate monitoring.  
Resource consents are not required to drive uptake of industry best practice to meet the 2022 pastoral managed reduction targets. The reduction required from the pastoral sector is relatively modest in this period and achievable without requiring the additional transaction costs associated with controlled activity status.

Decision Sought: Add (d) All permitted farming activities on properties/farming enterprises over 40 hectares in area.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Section: LR P15(a)

1041

### Panel Recommendation

See Section LR P15 above.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 12: 8 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Astrid Coker

Submission Summary: Oppose as a permitted activity the use of land less than 5ha and 5-10ha without a nutrient discharge plan (nutrient management plan). More often blocks less than 10ha do undertake commercial activities. Owners of these properties more often are least experienced in farming practices.

Decision Sought: Include information keeping, reporting conditions and nutrient discharge plan for all land used for agriculture, horticulture etc.

Panel Recommendations: Decline

# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 75:154 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
 Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
 Submission Summary: Property sizes should be based on total area, not "effective" area; consistent with guidelines for the use of Overseer as whole farm averages; and to respect existing investments in planting or setting aside areas for reducing nutrient losses and improving biodiversity and other outcomes.  
 Decision Sought: Delete word 'effective'.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

**Section: LR P15(b)** 1041

**Panel Recommendation**

See Section LR P15 above.

**Submissions**

Submission Number: 56: 3 Submission Type: Support  
 Submitter: Bay of Plenty Regional Council  
 Submission Summary: Need to clarify the intent of the policy and ensure alignment with the rules.  
 Decision Sought: Add text to the end of (b) "in effective area"..

Panel Recommendations: Decline

**Section: P16 Policy 16** 1042

**Panel Recommendation**

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendations on this section.

**Submissions**

Submission Number: 32: 10 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Kaitao Rotohokahoka 2D Trust  
 Submission Summary: A 20-year consent term is not considered long-term by the Trust. It is difficult to make business decisions without a clear understanding of the "nature, scale and robustness" of the expected mitigation options to gain a 20-year consent.  
 Decision Sought: The Trust requests the Council to review the duration of the proposed consent term taking into consideration Maori land ownership structures and business models. Provide further detail and examples of the mitigation options that would result in an operation being granted a 20-year consent duration.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 32: 12 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Kaitao Rotohokahoka 2D Trust  
 Submission Summary: The Trust requests a longer timeframe for Regional Council to invest in better science, research, modelling before setting the allocation methodology, rules, timeframes to meet targets and resource consents in concrete.  
 Decision Sought: Extend the timeframe to set rules, meet nitrogen reduction targets and measure progress towards reductions.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

Submission Number: 40: 6 Submission Type: Oppose  
 Submitter: Maraeroa Oturoa 2B Trust  
 Submission Summary: Length of the consent duration to be extended past 20 years.  
 Decision Sought: A 20-year consent term is not considered long term by the Trust. The Trust requests the Council to review the duration of the proposed consent term taking into consideration Maori land ownership structures and business models.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 40: 9 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Maraeroa Oturoa 2B Trust

Submission Summary: It is difficult to make business decisions without a clear understanding of the “nature, scale and robustness” of the expected mitigation options to gain a 20-year consent.

Decision Sought: Provide further detail and examples of the mitigation options that would result in an operation being granted a 20-year consent duration.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part

Submission Number: 43: 39 Submission Type: Support in Part

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: Farming activities need certainty therefore supports the intent to provide for a twenty-year consent duration. Activities that currently do not meet the controlled activity conditions default to non-complying (Ravensdown’s seeks that this as a Discretionary Activity) under the proposed plan. Ravensdown do not support the intent of the policy to grant this activity for durations less than 20 years, or at least not providing any certainty as to the consent duration. The policy must provide more direction.

Decision Sought: Retain the twenty-year duration for controlled activity consents;  
Amend the policy to provide for a minimum duration of fifteen years for a Discretionary Activity consent.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in part

Submission Number: 48: 23 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Parekarangi Trust

Submission Summary: Allow farmers more time to evolve their business without being shut down by the Council.

Decision Sought: Extend Controlled activity consent for 40 years.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 49: 46 Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: Long term consents are only acceptable if they are required to mirror the direction of the remainder of the activities in the catchment in improving their effectiveness of managing their pollution.

Decision Sought: Require review clauses be included, that require consent performance track the trend of water quality maintenance or improvement for the lake.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part
---------------------------------------

Submission Number: 53: 29 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lachlan McKenzie

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. The RPS and RWLP both set the expectation that landuses can be regulated to control increases in nutrient losses; or to require “best practicable option” or “reasonable, practicable and affordable” measures to reduce the effects of nutrient losses.  
Most of the policies currently read like rules, but need amendment to express higher intent.

Decision Sought: Amend to read: To grant controlled activity consents for a duration of not less than twenty years. The duration of longer consents will reflect the nature, scale and robustness of any on-farm mitigation options proposed to achieve the property/farming enterprise’s 2032 Managed Reduction Target.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 66: 68 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective

Submission Summary: Give better effect to RPS and RWLP objectives and policies and for internal consistency. OVERSEER® 6.2 values should be deleted, and substituted with version 5.4 values to be consistent with the RPS quoted figure.

Decision Sought: Amend to: To grant controlled activity consents for a duration of not less than twenty years. The duration of longer consents will reflect the nature, scale and robustness of any on-farm mitigation options proposed to achieve the property/farming enterprise’s 2032 Managed Reduction Target.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------

Submission Number: 70: 43 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: For non-complying activity “less than 20 years” does not provide any clear direction.

Decision Sought: Amend LR P16 to specify time frames on Non-Complying activity consents.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part
---------------------------------------

Submission Number: 70: 44 Submission Type: Oppose in Part

Submitter: The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Retain the duration of 20 years for controlled consents.

Decision Sought: Retain provision for at least 20 years consent for controlled activity.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part
---------------------------------------



# Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

Submission Number: 73: 6 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: P F Olsen Ltd  
Submission Summary: It is accepted that a transitional period is justified. We believe 20 years is sufficient.  
Decision Sought: It is accepted that a transitional period is justified. We believe 20 years is sufficient.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 73: 7 Submission Type: Support  
Submitter: P F Olsen Ltd  
Submission Summary: It is accepted that a transitional period is justified. We believe 20 years is sufficient.  
Decision Sought: It is accepted that a transitional period is justified. We believe 20 years is sufficient.

Panel Recommendations: Accept

Submission Number: 75: 156 Submission Type: Oppose in Part  
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
Submission Summary: It is also our strong submission that regulation cannot be used to require nutrient losses beyond the requirements of RPS Policy WL 6B, i.e., reducing losses as far as is reasonably practicable by implementing on-farm best management practices. The RPS and RWLP both provide extensive policy direction on non-regulatory methods for meeting TLI and other objectives, and PC10 policies should be amended to include stronger use of non-regulatory methods.  
Decision Sought: Amend to LR P16 To grant controlled activity consents for a duration of twenty years The duration of consents will reflect the nature, scale and robustness of any mitigation options proposed to offset any proposed increase in nutrient losses from the property/farming enterprise's benchmark.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

## Section: P17 Policy 17

1043

### Panel Recommendation

Refer to the body of our report for our recommendation on this section.

### Submissions

Submission Number: 43: 40 Submission Type: Oppose  
Submitter: Ravensdown Limited  
Submission Summary: The policy pre-empts a proper assessment of a resource consent and an assessment of the environmental effects as provided for in the Resource Management Act.  
Decision Sought: Policy LR P17 to be deleted.

Panel Recommendations: Reject

### Further Submission(s)



---

## Plan Change 10 Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management Panel on Provisions with Submissions and Further Submissions – Part 1

---

To decline the re-consenting of activities that have failed to achieve the required reductions in nitrogen loss and are likely to contribute to the Lake Rotorua Water Quality objectives (RPS Objective 28, RWLP Objective 11) not being met.

Panel Recommendations: Accept in Part
---------------------------------------

Submission Number: 75: 157

Submission Type: Oppose

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Regulation cannot be used to require nutrient losses beyond the requirements of RPS Policy WL 6B, i.e., reducing losses as far as is reasonably practicable by implementing on-farm best management practices.

Decision Sought: Delete.

Panel Recommendations: Reject
-------------------------------