

Further Submission on Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management - Proposed Plan Change 10

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Please send your submission to be received by **4:00 pm, Monday, 1 August 2016.**

Further Submission Number **ES 13**
Office use only

TO: The Chief Executive
Bay of Plenty Regional Council
PO Box 364
Whakatāne 3158

FAX: 0800 884 882

EMAIL: rules@boprc.govt.nz

Name: Christopher James Read Meban

[Full name of the person or organisation making the submission]:

This is a further submission in support of or opposition to a submission on Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management - Proposed Plan Change 10 to the Bay of Plenty Regional Water and Land Plan.

1. I do wish to be heard in support of my further submission. *[Delete as required].*
2. If others made a similar submission I would or would not be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing. *[Delete as required].*
3. I am: *[Please tick one]*
 - A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. *(Specify on what grounds you come within this category).*
 - A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has. *(Specify on what grounds you come within this category).*

On the following grounds:

I am a land owner, I am a Rural Real Estate Agent

Signature *[of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission. A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means].*



Address for Service *[Provide full postal details]:*

21 Tauranga Direct Road, RD 6, Rotorua 3073

Telephone:

Daytime: 027 484 4574

After Hours: 07 332 3503

Email:

chris.meban@gmail.com

Fax:

Contact person *[Name and designation if applicable]:*

Note: A copy of your submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after making this further submission.

FURTHER SUBMISSION POINTS:

Submission number <i>[Submission number of original submission as shown in the "Summary of Decisions Requested" report]</i>	Submitter name <i>[Please state the name and address of the person or organisation making the original submission as shown in the "Summary of Decisions Requested" report]</i>	Section reference (Submission point) <i>[Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposed plan change]</i>	Support/oppose	Reasons <i>[State in summary the nature of your submission giving clear reasons]</i>
61-14	Beef & Lamb New Zealand	<i>I support the reference to the N plan should be changed and replaced by a nutrient plan</i>	Support	I believe that P is a far greater impact on the lake water quality and should be taken into account included in the lake dynamics.
81-3	Jamie & Chris Paterson	<i>Attenuation has changed now means that there are new options to mitigate nutrient between source and lake</i>	Support	The Council needs to take into account new science before proceeding with any plan changes
70-7	The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand	<i>Proposed plan changes are inconsistent in the use of the term and nutrient would encompass the management of P</i>	Support	Suggest replacing the term 'Nutrient Management Plan' with 'Nutrient Management Plans & Nitrogen Plans with Nutrient Budgets'.
75-116	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	<i>Recent science shows that PC10 should include P as a key contributor to lake algal dynamics.</i>	Support	I believe that P has a far greater impact on the lake water quality and should be included in a incorporated Nutrient Budget.

Note: A copy of your submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after making this further submission.

1 August 2016

The Chief Executive
Bay of Plenty Regional Council
PO Box 364
Whakatane 3158
Email: rules@boprc.govt.nz

Since the submission process closed, I have been through the process of obtaining a PNDA for my property. This process has motivated me to add a further submission.

I wear a number of hats

- 1) Land Owner
- 2) Rate Payer
- 3) Rural Real Estate Agent
- 4) Tax Payer
- 5) Retailer

Firstly as a land owner I believe that there should be emphasis put on phosphorous. Farmers will turn to phosphorous as their main fertilizer because of restrictions on nitrogen. As we all know P is lost via surface run off and will enter the lake of a far greater rate than N. In time we will all need to go through this whole process again to include P and (a total nutrient Plan). In the process of obtaining a PNDA there were major and significant assumptions made without good due diligence, no farm visit as such just a talk around the kitchen table, major form policy, with huge economic implications, made on assumptions I believe that every farm in the catchment should have an updated nutrient status (up to date soil test). Overseers should not be using default values to make huge farm economic implications.

In my capacity as a Rural Real Estate Agent I have seen huge drops in farm values to the extent that it is almost impossible to sell larger properties inside the lake catchment.

The other concern I have is the \$40 million dollars that is to be used for the purchase of 100 ton of N at the lake, will more than likely be spent out of the catchment area and not be used in the district. The Incentives Board at the meeting strongly indicated that pine trees would be planted from the farms selling the nitrogen to the board to qualify for the reduction of N required.

As a retailer we would like to see the \$40 million used to grow Rotorua.

I look forward to speaking to you during the further submission process.

Regards



Chris Meban
21 Tauranga Direct Road, Hamurana, Rotorua