Doc No: IT-2044 (1 June 2005)

FORM 13

SUBMISSION ON A PUBLICLY OR LIMITED NOTIFIED APPLICATION CONCERNING RESOURCE CONSENT

Section 96 Resource Management Act 1991
(Rotorua Lakes Council is the operating name of Rotorua District Council)

ROTORUA LAKES COUNCIL

To:	Name of Submitter:
Chief Executive Rotorua Lakes Council Private Bag RO3029 ROTORUA	Gregory John Sandrey *[Full Name]*

Received
25 JUN 2025
Rotorua Lakes Council
Customer Centre

This is a submission on an application from *[name of applicant]:*

Tikanga Aroro charitable trust

for a Resource Consent to *[Briefly describe the type of consent, proposed activity, and location of the resource consent]*:

to establish and operate a reintegration housing activity in the Rural zone 1A of the Rotorua district plan

at *[The location of the resource consent]*:

473 Puaiti road , Waikite Valley

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are *[Give Details]*:

the application in its entirety

My submission is *[include whether you **support or oppose** the specific parts of the application or wish to have them amended; and the reasons for your views]:*

I wish to oppose the application for the following reasons

-lack of consultation, applicant and council ,(no intereaction from applicant)

- existing facilty , why is this existing facility relocating? , is council not moving an existing potentail problem to another communtiy to deal with , seems a lack of transparecy

I seek the following decision from the consent authority *[Give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought]*:

to decline the application

☐ **I wish to be heard in support of my submission**

☐ **I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission**

☐ **If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing**

Signature of submitter *(or* person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter): 	Date: 16/06/25
Address for service of Submitter: [redacted]	Telephone: [redacted]
Contact person: *[name and designation, if applicable]*	Fax/email:

Note to submitter:

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

To whom this concerns

I wish to oppose this application reintegration facility on 473 Puaiti Road, Waikite Valley, Rotorua

- **Lack of consultation this facility was being considered**

-lack of consultation, the community engagement plan appendix 3 and consultation responses appendix 4 have not been followed as per documents submitted as indicated in application, I was not aware of the proposed facility so late to the party, seems to very minimalistic approach has been undertaken with community to try and fly under the radar

Looks like there has been some consultation with the local school but as far a consultation with the wider community, it just feels like a tick and flick box for approval with a very minimalistic approach to the broader community.

Appendix 8: Subdivision Consent RC17688

(a) Pursuant to Section 95A of the Resource Management Act 1991, the Rotorua District Council has decided in its discretion not to publicly notify the application. Council is satisfied after due consideration of Section 95D that the adverse effects on the wider environment will be or are likely to be no more than minor. Council is also satisfied that no special circumstances exist that require notification of the consent application in accordance with Section 95A(4). (b) The Council has decided after taking into due consideration the requirements of Sections 95B and 95E of the Resource Management Act 1991 that the adverse effects of the activity on the owners and occupiers of adjacent land are less than minor and at the time of making this decision no persons are considered affected. Therefore, limited notification is not required.

- **Very vague about why this existing facility is relocating from its original location**
  Puwhakamua application presented to council/ alternative site evens acknowledges issues (see below, those same concerns are still there at new proposed site) at present location so is council just moving a potentially existing problem on to another poor community to deal with, I oppose moving this existing facility to a remote rural area due to the lack of supports, emergency services and infrastructure at the proposed site . This is not the right location for the proposed activity

- Has there been any request for an extension of stay at present location?

A rural setting is preferred for the quality of life of residents, to best provide for a culturally immersive setting and enable the privacy and space that supports the reintegration of residents to society. A location in a denser urban area does not give this environment and likely presents more interested parties and potential challenges. The facility provides a critical service and a positive contribution to communities. Unfortunately, people's perceptions of DoC facilities do not always align with community support and can lead to a contentious resource consent process, which the Applicant sought to address as best possible through locating in a more remote area

- Locating this is the proposed remote area will place undue burden on those who are occupied in farming, agriculture or other primary industries. The intensified nature of this proposal in not aligned with the rural activities or the rural character of Waikite Valley.

The social impact assessment by applicant acknowledges

The cost of additional security in host communities has not been explored as an impact in the research, but the heightening of safety and security measures has been acknowledged. Even though evidence has shown that perceived risk to safety and security does not usually come to fruition It is fair to assume that many households and businesses would take on a cost to implement some of these measures, and costs may be higher for large properties with several buildings potentially including workshops and storage.

- I believe the assessor seems to have misunderstood or not heard community concerns correctly and again is very subjective

- **Security impact assessment by applicant acknowledges**

There is always potential for something to happen, and if it does, the Police will respond accordingly and communicate with the community to give them assurance. People need to trust the process (Pūwhakamua), trust that these people (participants) are ready for the next

- Have seen the risk matrix submitted in the security impact assessment which is very subjective to interpretation and don't reflect the genuine community concerns.

- I understand the occupants of the facility are permitted to drive to work programs (some supervised and some not supervised) during the week with visitors allowed over the weekend. I'm concerned about the real potential of gang affiliated members driving past the property during commutes to and from the facility.

- Unfortunately, I believe it's not a matter of "if something adverse is going to happen", it's a matter of "when something unacceptable will happen" and feel there needs to be some liability/responsibility with either the council or the Tikanga Aroro Charitable trust if this consent application is granted.

- I have my house rented out in the valley to a young family with 3 young kids and I am now going have the conversation with them about occupants from the facility and visitors over the weekend driving past the house every day and see if they still want to live there. I feel this feeling of being safe in your own community has not been addressed adequately.
- There will be a heightening level of anxiety with every car driving past the entrance now and added stress with kids commuting with local bus route.

District plan

- How does a facility like this align with a rural district plan? have lived in Waikite most of my life and my family have lived there over 50 years.
- Waikite valley has always been fantastic place to grow up so can speak to the tradition and sanctity of way of life in the valley. Seen a lot of changes over the years, now Waikite has a lot of lifestyle blocks where residents want a safe special place to live and raise kids.
- With this facility like being now proposed it's sad for anyone who has ever had anything to do with Waikite Valley, this is not place for such a facility and it breaks my heart that it has even got this far with the application. I urge Rotorua Lakes Council to decline this application in order to protect the rural character of this site and uphold the integrity of the rural plan (Feel Poor Waikite valley has been blindsided by this application)

- The way of life as indicated in the social impact statement by applicant states

(*Research findings suggest that impacts related to safety and security are usually over estimated as submitted by applicant),*

- I would suggest the author of this report has not actively listened to the raft of concerns made by the community for the genuine reasons as to why the proposed activity is a significant mismatch with the rural character and amenity of this remote, rural isolated community