

**FURTHER SUBMISSION ON A LATE SUBMISSION TO THE  
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 10 (LAKE ROTOTUA NUTRIENT  
MANAGEMENT) TO THE BOP REGIONAL WATER & LAND PLAN**

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

**Submission on:** The Proposed Plan Change 10 (Lake Rotorua Nutrient  
Management) to the BOP Regional Water & Land Plan

**Name of Submitter:** Ravensdown Limited  
PO Box 1049  
CHRISTCHURCH

**Address of Submitter:** C/- CHC Ltd  
P O Box 51-282  
Tawa  
WELLINGTON 5249  
Attention: Chris Hansen

Phone: 021 026 45108  
Email: [Chris@rmaexpert.co.nz](mailto:Chris@rmaexpert.co.nz)

1. A detailed further submission is attached.
2. Ravensdown Limited (Ravensdown) is an organisation who has an interest in Proposed Plan Change 10 that is greater than the interest the general public has.
3. Ravensdown wishes to be heard in support of this further submission.
4. Ravensdown would be prepared to consider presenting its submission(s) in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing.



.....  
Chris Hansen  
Authorised Agent for Ravensdown Limited  
19 September 2016

| <b>Submitter ID/<br/>Name</b>                      | <b>Point ID</b> | <b>Plan Provision/Relief Sought</b>   | <b>Support/ Oppose</b>         | <b>Reason</b>   |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|---|
| Bay of Plenty Regional Council<br>Submitter No. 92 | No. 2           | <p>Rule LR R7</p> <p>The submitter seeks a new condition c)</p> <p><i>“There is no increase in effective area or nitrogen inputs from 29 February 2016 that may contribute to an increase in nitrogen loss onto, into or from land.”</i></p> <p>This condition aligns with the conditions in other permitted activities in Plan Change 10, (see Rules LR R1(a), Rule LR R4(c), LR R5(a), LR R6(b)) and should have been carried through to Rule LR R7. Through oversight it was omitted in the notified version of the Plan Change.</p> | Support in part/oppose in part | <p>While Ravensdown supports the intent of the rule, as discussed in Part I of its own submission, Ravensdown opposes an input control approach and seeks for condition (c) to be amended to delete the reference.</p> <p>In its submission Ravensdown sought condition (c) be amended to read</p> <p><i>“there is no increase in effective area, <del>nitrogen inputs or stocking rates or increase in</del> nitrogen loss from <u>the date of notification</u> <del>that may contribute to an increase in</del> nitrogen loss onto, into or from land.”</i></p> |