

**From:** [Ainsley McLeod](#)  
**To:** [RPS](#)  
**Cc:** [Peter Casey](#)  
**Subject:** PORPS Further Submission - New Zealand Carbon Farming  
**Date:** Friday, 12 November 2021 8:49:32 a.m.  
**Attachments:** [image001.jpg](#)  
[NZCF Otago Regional Policy Statement Further Submission \(final\).pdf](#)

---

Please find attached a further submission made by New Zealand Carbon Farming on submissions in respect of the Proposed Otago RPS.

Please acknowledge receipt in due course.

Ngā mihi

Ainsley

**Ainsley McLeod**

Director // Planner

Ainsley McLeod Consulting

Mobile +64 27 215 0600

[ainsley@amconsulting.co.nz](mailto:ainsley@amconsulting.co.nz)

Logo cropped



## Form 6

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on notified proposed policy statement or plan, change or variation

*Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991*

To Otago Regional Council (“the Council”)

**Name of person making further submission:** New Zealand Carbon Farming (“NZCF”)

**This is a further submission in support of, and in opposition to, a number of submissions on the proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement.**

NZCF has an interest in the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement (“Proposed ORPS”) that is greater than the interest the general public has, because NZCF is has an interest as a landowner and/or occupier in respect of existing and possibly future permanent carbon forests that are potentially affected (directly or indirectly) by the relevant submissions.

### **NZCF’s further submission**

NZCF’s support of, or opposition to, a particular submission including the reason for NZCF’s support or opposition and the relief sought are detailed in the table attached as Appendix A.

NZCF seeks that the submissions it supports be allowed or disallowed respectively for the reasons given (or such further alternative relief or amendments as may be necessary to achieve the outcome sought).

**NZCF wishes to be heard in support of its further submissions.**

**If others make a similar submission or further submission, NZCF will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.**



Date: **12 November 2021**

Electronic address for service: **ainsley@amconsulting.co.nz**

Telephone: **+64 27 215 0600**

Postal address: **8 Aikmans Road, Merivale, Christchurch 8014**

Contact person: **Ainsley McLeod**

## Appendix A – New Zealand Carbon Farming Limited: Further Submission on Submissions Made on the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement

The following table sets out the decisions sought by NZCF, including the reasons for NZCF’s support or opposition and the specific amendments to the provisions of the Proposed ORPS as a result. Proposed ORPS text is shown without underlining; the relief sought in primary submission is shown as black; and the further amendments sought by NZCF are shown in red.

Submission Reference	Provision and Relief Sought	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Allow/Disallow
<b>Port Blakely NZ Ltd (submission number 00033)</b>				
00033.005	<p>General Submission</p> <p>Amend the RPS21 to recognise that forestry provides a long-term net-positive ecosystem service, including the sequestration of carbon and that afforestation will bring multiple ecosystem services and benefits, if managed correctly.</p>	Support	NZCF generally supports the relief sought in the submission. NZCF considers that the positive effects of permanent forests are significant. This is because, in the case of permanent forests such as those developed by NZCF, the planted forests are deliberately managed to regenerate over time into a 100% indigenous and biodiverse conservation estate.	<b>Allow</b> the submission.
<b>Queenstown Lakes District Council (submission number 00138)</b>				
00138.039	<p>ECO – Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity ECO – New provision</p> <p>Amend to add a new policy as follows:  <u>“ECO – PX – Carbon sequestration</u>  <u>Control the impact of carbon sequestration on indigenous biodiversity by:</u>  <u>a) Avoiding planting species which are invasive or a naturalised weed (I recommend including list of species in this part of the policy), or likely to become either</u>  <u>b) Supporting carbon sequestration planting initiatives which improve or enhance indigenous biodiversity.”</u></p>	Support in part	<p>NZCF does not oppose the relief sought but considers that the proposed policy wording lacks clarity and fails to reflect NZCF’s science-based approach to establishing and managing permanent indigenous forests through the use of a nurse crop (that is also vital in providing the short-term carbon reductions). Modelling has demonstrated that permanent regenerating forestry can remove between 5 and 10 times more carbon over 70 years than planting a native forest from scratch.</p> <p>NZCF seeks limited amendments to the relief sought to better reflect practice in respect of the planting and management of permanent forests.</p>	<p><b>Allow</b> the submission subject to the following further amendments:  <u>“ECO – PX – Carbon sequestration</u>  <u>Control the impact of carbon sequestration on indigenous biodiversity by:</u>  <u>a) <del>Requiring Avoiding planting to be established and managed so as to not cause the spread or invasion of pest plants or pest animals; species which are invasive or a naturalised weed (I recommend including list of</del></u></p>

Submission Reference	Provision and Relief Sought	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Allow/Disallow
				<del>species in this part of the policy), or likely to become either</del> b) Supporting carbon sequestration planting initiatives <del>which that</del> improve or enhance indigenous biodiversity.“
<b>Waitaki District Council (submission number 00140)</b>				
00140.002	TERP – Definitions (New) Amend to add new definition of ‘carbon forestry’ as follows: “The practice of planting and growing trees to sequester atmospheric carbon into the soil, wood, leaves and roots.”	Neutral	NZCF does not oppose the relief sought in this submission. However, NZCF suggests that a cautious approach should be taken to including a definition of ‘carbon forestry’ such that the necessity for, and consequences of, the definition are clearly understood.	<b>Give</b> careful consideration to the consequences of the definition being included Proposed ORPS.
00140.011	SRMR – Significant resource management issues for the region SRMR – I2 Amend to include reference to carbon forestry as a resource management issue for Otago (p.67)	Oppose	NZCF does not oppose the inclusion of provisions in the Proposed ORPS that relate to the establishment of permanent forests/carbon forestry. However, NZCF does not consider that the submission provides sufficient rationale for, or evidence to suggest that, the establishment of permanent forests is a significant resource management issues.	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.
00140.012	SRMR – Significant resource management issues for the region SRMR – I3 Amend to include reference to carbon forestry as a resource management issue for Otago (p.70, 71).	Oppose	The submission is incorrect in its suggestion that permanent forests ‘bypass’ regulations relating to forestry (including the NESPF). NZCF considers that permanent forests are explicitly excluded because such forests are not harvested and therefore do not give rise to the same adverse effects.	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.
00140.014	SRMR – Significant resource management issues for the region SRMR – I10 Amend to include reference to carbon forestry as a resource management issue for Otago (p.83). ...	Oppose	The submission notes that “recent public meetings in North Otago have highlighted the current issue that carbon forestry poses”, but does not set out what ‘the issue’ is and whether it is a RMA matter or a matter that properly falls as a section 30 function of the Council.	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.

Submission Reference	Provision and Relief Sought	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Allow/Disallow
			<p>The submission includes a number of assertions in respect of carbon forestry. In response, NZCF notes that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. there is no evidence to suggest that carbon forestry has a discernible impact on rural economies;</li> <li>2. permanent forests are not typically established on land that is particularly productive;</li> <li>3. it is not clear what reverse sensitivity effects are created by carbon forestry;</li> <li>4. appropriate management practices can address fire risk and wilding tree spread;</li> <li>5. the establishment of a permanent indigenous forest is more likely to have positive impacts on recreational, landscape, hydrological and conservation values (as opposed to the negative impacts suggested);</li> <li>6. there is no evidence provided in respect of impacts on water quantity or water quality.</li> </ol> <p>As a final matter, it is noted that the submission fails to consider the positive impacts of permanent forestry/carbon forestry, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the contribution to climate change mitigation, New Zealand's climate change commitments and carbon reduction targets (particularly in the context of SRMR-I2);</li> <li>2. the use of marginal agricultural land in a manner that protects waterbodies through reduced run-off and accelerated erosion;</li> <li>3. the ultimate creation of a biologically diverse, indigenous forest.</li> </ol>	
00140.015	<p>RMIA – Resource management issues of significance to iwi authorities in the region RMIA – MKB – I1</p> <p>Amend last bullet point to include reference to carbon forestry as follows:</p>	Oppose	<p>NZCF opposes the relief sought on the basis that the submission gives no reason for seeking the proposed amendment. It is not clear why the submitter considers that the establishment of permanent forests</p>	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.

Submission Reference	Provision and Relief Sought	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Allow/Disallow
	“The impact of inappropriate forestry developments <u>including carbon forestry</u> , conversion of tussock lands and other intensification of farming on indigenous flora and fauna values, including ecological disturbance and displacement of species.”		is a resource management issues of significance to iwi authorities in the region.	
00140.023	<p>LF – Land and freshwater LF – LS – M12</p> <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>“(1) manage land use change by:</p> <p>(a) controlling the establishment of new or any spatial extension of existing plantation forestry activities <u>including carbon forestry</u> where necessary to give effect to an objective developed under the NPSFM...”</p> <p>- Amend to add new subclause (1)(c) as follows:</p> <p>“<u>Managing land uses practices that may have adverse effects on the flow of water in surface water bodies or the recharge of groundwater.</u>”</p> <p>- Amend to add a new subclause (1)(d) as follows:</p> <p>“<u>Prioritise the use of highly productive land for primary production ahead of other land uses including carbon forestry</u>”</p>	Oppose	<p>NZCF opposes the relief sought in the submission because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submission does not provide sufficient evidence or rationale in respect of potential adverse effects on water quantity (and conversely acknowledges the Council’s conclusion that “dry catchment provisions have not been included in the PRPS due to the ‘inability to define significant reduction in water yield in dry catchments’”).</li> <li>2. The submission does not provide any examples of situations where highly productive land has been used for carbon farming such that the reference to ‘carbon farming’ in suggested clause (1)(d) is justified.</li> </ol>	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.
00140.026	<p>ECO – Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity</p> <p>ECO – M5 Amend - [Specific changes not identified] The PRPS is not stronger than National Direction</p> <p>- Amend (6) as follows:</p> <p>“Within areas identified as significant natural areas, prohibit the planting of <del>wilding</del> conifer species as listed in APP5 that have the ability to spread, including those <u>associated with carbon forestry</u>”</p> <p>- Amend to add new subclause (7) as follows:</p> <p>“<u>Provide buffer zones adjacent to significant natural areas where it is necessary to protect the significant natural area</u>”</p>	Neutral	<p>NZCF does not oppose the management of planting in SNA’s, particularly where this is in relation to the spread of pest plants caused by a proposed activity. NZCF generally supports the amendments to clause (6), but does not consider that the additional clause (7) is necessary or appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Allow</b> the amendments to clause (6) only, subject to the following further amendments:</p> <p>“Within areas identified as significant natural areas, <u>include rules to regulate</u><del>prohibit</del> the planting of <del>wilding</del> conifer species as listed in APP5 that have the ability to spread, <u>including those associated with carbon forestry</u>”</p>

Submission Reference	Provision and Relief Sought	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Allow/Disallow
00140.031	NFL – Natural features and landscapes NFL – P5 Amend as follows: “(1) avoiding afforestation, <del>and</del> replanting of plantation forests <u>and carbon forestry activities</u> with wilding conifer species listed in APP5....”	Neutral	NZCF does not oppose the management of planting in NFL’s, particularly where this is in relation to the spread of pest plants caused by a proposed activity. NZCF generally supports the amendments to clause (1), subject to limited further amendments.	<b>Allow</b> the submission subject to the following further amendment: “(1) <del>avoiding</del> <u>controlling</u> afforestation, <del>and</del> replanting of plantation forests <u>and carbon forestry activities</u> with wilding conifer species listed in APP5....”
<b>Kāi Tahu ki Otago / Aukaha (submission number 00226)</b>				
00226.209	LF – Land and freshwater LF – LS – M12 Amend as follows: “Territorial authorities must prepare or amend and maintain their district plans no later than 31 December 2026 to: (1) manage land use change by: (a) controlling the establishment of new or any spatial extension of existing plantation forestry activities <u>or carbon farming activities</u> where necessary to give effect to an objective developed under the NPSFM, and ...”	Oppose	NZCF opposes the relief sought in the submission because the submission does not identify the “significant” adverse impacts that the establishment of a permanent forest may have on freshwater outcomes directed by the NPSFM.	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.
<b>OWRUG (submission number 00235)</b>				
00235.031	SRMR – Significant resource management issues for the Region SRMR – I2 Amend SRMR – I2 to recognise the risk on water resources due to afforestation of plantation forests for carbon sequestration	Neutral	NZCF does not oppose the relief sought in the submission but considers that an evidence-based approach should be taken to any provisions to regulate the establishment of permanent forests on the basis of possible impacts on water yield.	<b>Allow</b> the submission, subject to any provision being based on robust evidence.
00235.058	SRMR – Significant resource management issues for the Region (New) Include the following: “ <u>The Food and Fibre Sector is facing a significant period of change due to climate change and the need to improve environmental outcomes.</u> ... <u>Environmental</u>	Oppose	NZCF agrees that some land (and certainly not all land or highly productive land) is suited to carbon forestry and generally supports an integrated approach managing potential effects of land use change. That said, NZCF does not consider that the establishment of permanent forests is significant threat to the food and fibre sector such that explicit mention is necessary.	<b>Allow</b> the submission, subject to the following further amendments: “... <u>There needs to be a considered and integrated approach to land – use change so that it does not give rise to unintended consequences. For <del>example, widespread</del></u> ”

Submission Reference	Provision and Relief Sought	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Allow/Disallow
	<p><u>The Food and Fibre sector cannot operate on a business as usual basis. Even in locations where water availability and water quality issues are not of concern adaptations will be necessary so that the sector is contributing to New Zealand’s carbon zero 2050 commitments. However, demand for the products produced by the Food and Fibre Sector are likely to continue to increase and the ability of the sector to meet this demand will be critical to the wellbeing of the community, particularly with respect to the provision of nutrient dense food. It will be necessary for the sector to innovate to ensure it can meet the demands of the community while working within environmental limits. There needs to be a considered and integrated approach to land – use change so that it does not give rise to unintended consequences. For example, widespread establishment of carbon forestry may adversely affect water availability, and irreversibly remove land from food production. ...”</u></p>			<p><u>establishment of carbon forestry may adversely affect water availability, and irreversibly remove land from food production. ...”</u></p>
<b>Beef &amp; Lamb NZ and Deer Industry NZ (submission number 00237)</b>				
00237.004	<p>TERP – Definitions (Primary Production) Amend the definition of primary production to specifically exclude forestry or the purposes of carbon sequestration.</p>	Neutral	<p>NZCF does not oppose the relief sought in this submission. However, NZCF suggests that a cautious approach should be taken to explicitly excluding ‘carbon sequestration’ in order to prevent unintended consequences (or policy gaps) in provisions elsewhere in the Proposed ORPS.</p>	<p><b>Give</b> careful consideration to the consequences of an explicit exclusion being included in the definition.</p>
<b>Federated Farmers of New Zealand (submission number 00239)</b>				
00239.021	<p>SRMR – Significant resource management issues for the region SRMR – I2 ... Amend ‘Impact snapshot – Economy – Regional Industry’; add the following or similar: “<u>Some of the responses to mitigate climate change such as increased afforestation for carbon offsetting, lead to other risks, such as further drying out of catchments, increased</u></p>	Oppose	<p>NZCF does not consider that the submission provides sufficient rationale for, or evidence to suggest that, the establishment of permanent forests is a significant resource management issues.  The submission includes a number of assertions in respect of carbon forestry. In response, NZCF notes that:</p>	<p><b>Disallow</b> the submission.</p>



Submission Reference	Provision and Relief Sought	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Allow/Disallow
	<p><u>risk of wildfire, fragmentation of pastoral systems, increased pest numbers, and a resultant decline in rural communities.</u> “</p> <p>Amend ‘Impact snapshot – Social’; add the following or similar:</p> <p>“<u>There is also the potential for inequality between rural and urban dwellers, as responses to climate change may focus on the areas with greatest population density, and climate change mitigation strategies such as increased afforestation for carbon offsetting may directly impact rural communities.</u> “</p>		<p>1. there is no evidence to suggest that carbon forestry has a discernible impact on rural communities;</p> <p>2. appropriate management practices can address fire risk and wilding tree spread;</p> <p>3. there is no evidence provided in respect of impacts on water quantity or water quality;</p> <p>4. it is not clear how carbon forestry causes the fragmentation of pastoral systems.</p> <p>Conversely, the submission does not consider positive impacts such as:</p> <p>1. the contribution to climate change mitigation, New Zealand’s climate change commitments and carbon reduction targets (particularly in the context of SRMR-12); and</p> <p>2. the use of marginal agricultural land in a manner that protects waterbodies through reduced run-off and accelerated erosion.</p> <p>It is NZCF’s conclusion that there is not sufficient evidence to identify possible adverse impacts of carbon farming as a significant resource management issue.</p>	
00239.027	<p>SRMR – Significant resource management issues for the region SRMR – I8</p> <p>Amend ‘Context’ as follows:</p> <p>“Activities occurring ... plantation <u>and carbon</u> forestry, .... “</p>	Oppose	<p>NZCF considers that the submission does not provide sufficient rationale, or examples, of how and where the establishment of permanent forests has impacted on the coastal environment.</p>	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.
00239.095	<p>LF – Land and freshwater LF – LS – M12</p> <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>(1) manage land use change by:</p> <p>(a) controlling the establishment of new or any spatial extension of existing plantation <u>or carbon</u> forestry activities where necessary to give effect to an objective developed under the NPSFM, and... “</p>	Oppose	<p>NZCF opposes the relief sought in the submission and notes that the rationale given in the submission relates to “impacts on land” whereas the Method M12 relates to giving effect to the NPSFM.</p> <p>Further, NZCF does not agree that the impacts of carbon forestry on land and water are similar to plantation forestry, primarily due to carbon forests not being harvested.</p>	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.

Submission Reference	Provision and Relief Sought	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Allow/Disallow
			On this basis, NZCF does not consider the amendment sought is necessary.	
00239.111	<p>ECO – Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity ECO – E1 Amend as follows: ... <u>In addition to the threats from pests and weeds, wilding conifers are a particular issue for biodiversity in Otago. Although plantation forestry is managed under the NESPF a gap remains around carbon forestry, and the NESPF allows plan rules to be more stringent if they recognise and provide for the protection of significant natural areas. The policies adopt this direction by requiring district and regional plans to prevent inappropriate plantation or carbon afforestation within significant natural areas and establish buffer zones where they are necessary to protect significant natural areas. The policies recognise that managing ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity requires active management by landowners, and ...”</u></p>	Neutral	NZCF does not oppose the relief sought, subject to further amendments sought in response to other submissions – set out elsewhere in this document.	<b>Allow</b> the submission, subject to NZCF’s relief sought elsewhere.
<b>Ernslaw One (submission number 00412)</b>				
00412.013	<p>General Submission Recognise the long-term provision of positive ecosystems services that plantation forestry can provide, including the sequestration of carbon. ORPS 2021 currently fails to recognise that afforestation and the spatial extension of new plantation land area, as well as the consequent displacement of pastoral agriculture, will bring multiple eco-system services and benefits.</p>	Support	NZCF generally supports the relief sought in the submission. NZCF considers that the positive effects of permanent forests are significant. This is because, in the case of permanent forests such as those developed by NZCF, the planted forests are deliberately managed to regenerate over time into a 100% indigenous and biodiverse conservation estate.	<b>Allow</b> the submission.
<b>Jim Hopkins (submission number 00420)</b>				
00420.013	<p>ECO – Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity ECO – New provision Amend RPS either be more prescriptive when it comes to carbon forestry conversions or give councils greater powers to restrict their expansion in unsuitable areas</p>	Neutral	NZCF does not oppose the inclusion of provisions in the Proposed ORPS that relate to the establishment of permanent forests. However, NZCF does not agree with the assertion made in the submission that permanent forests ‘exacerbate global warming’ and do	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.

Submission Reference	Provision and Relief Sought	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Allow/Disallow
00420.023	General Submission Amend RPS to be more directive in managing and constraining the loss of productive soils, particularly in dry catchment zones, when they are used for carbon forestry planting.	Neutral	not benefit humans. NZCF considers that the reasons given in the submission are incorrect and do not provide sufficient rationale to restrict the planting of permanent forests. On this basis, the relief sought cannot be considered to achieve the purpose of the RMA.	<b>Disallow</b> the submission.