Document Set ID: 21391473
Version: 1, Version Date: 04/07/2025

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	Charlotte Pedersen. *[Full Name]*

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 reintergration housing activity in the Rural Zone 1a of Rotorua Lakes District council.

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

473 Paraiti 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 totally oppose the application for the reasons detailed on the following pages. Please refer to points detailed within.

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

To decline the application.

Document Set ID: 21400807
Version: 1, Version Date: 10/07/2025

Document Set ID: 21391473
Version: 1, Version Date: 04/07/2025

☑ 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: 24:06:2025
[redacted]	Telephone: [redacted]
	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.

Document Set ID: 21400807
Version: 1, Version Date: 10/07/2025

Document Set ID: 21391473
Version: 1, Version Date: 04/07/2025

CHARLOTTE PEDERSEN

Full Opposition to the Application

I oppose the application in full for the following reasons:

Protection of primary industries and precedent

The Rotorua Lakes Council has clearly stated that primary production is one of the district's key economic drivers. It is therefore essential that rural working environments are protected to support and sustain the primary industry and its associated activities. Maintaining the intended character, activity, and amenity of rural zones is vital to ensuring the long-term viability of farming operations and the future growth of the rural sector.

The proposed facility is inconsistent with the intended land use and rural character of this isolated area. Its introduction promotes an activity that is fundamentally non-rural in nature, which threatens the integrity of the zone and undermines the strategic intent of the District Plan. Allowing non-complying, intensive development in rural zones not only disrupts current land use but sets a concerning precedent for further encroachment into productive, working landscapes.

The introduction of this non-complying activity into a remote and naturally rural environment will have far-reaching consequences for the future of farming and the rural sector locally. This decision will impact the livelihoods of those who rely on rural land for income, food production, and long-term sustainability, in addition to the wider economy. The development poses a real threat to the preservation of the rural environment, not only visually and ecologically, but economically.

The approval of such an intensive, inappropriate activity in a rural zone sets a dangerous precedent. It raises the question: where does it stop? How many more intensive, non-rural developments will be permitted to erode the natural character, amenity value and function of rural land? Once compromised, this land cannot be reclaimed for farming and its amenity value recovered. The cumulative effect of such decisions risks undermining the integrity of the rural industry and the ability of rural communities to support both local and national food supply.

Inconsistency with rural zone purpose and activity

The proposed facility is located in the heart of a Rural Zone 1, which is specifically intended to support farming, forestry, agriculture and other rural practices. This facility represents a non-complying activity that is fundamentally inconsistent and is in conflict with the purpose and objectives of the zone. Its introduction will have adverse effects on the surrounding rural

Document Set ID: 21400807
Version: 1, Version Date: 10/07/2025

Document Set ID: 21391473
Version: 1, Version Date: 04/07/2025

environment and community by disrupting the rural character and amenity values that the zoning is designed to protect.
The Council has a clear responsibility to uphold the integrity of Rural Zone 1 by protecting rural land and ensuring that development aligns with the intended land use.

Lack of access to essential services and emergency risks
This is a remote rural community with no locally available essential services. The nearest town, Rotorua, is approximately 38 kilometres away in one direction, which naturally results in delayed access to emergency services when needed. In addition, cell phone coverage in the area is intermittent and unreliable at best, which further complicates communication in emergency situations. The proposed location of this facility poses a genuine health and safety risk. In the event of an emergency—whether medical, security-related, or involving residents of the facility—response times will be delayed, and access to help is uncertain. This isolation makes the site fundamentally unsuitable for this intensified housing facility and the proposed activity for residents who are legally restricted.

Community and our family safety –This facility provides accommodation for 10 people who have previously been in long term custody for significant and serious offences. We have real concerns for our families safety due to the previous offending of the residents who will be living here and the lack of comprehensive security and surveillance proposed on the site. We are a local family and have young children who like to spend their time at their grandparents which is very close to the proposed facility, they spend time there unassisted outdoors motorbiking, hunting, riding bikes, exploring, building huts and generally spending time outdoors. Should this facility go ahead it will change their lives too, they will no longer be able to explore safety and freely on the land of their descendants. This proposal does not respect or reflect the needs and values of the families who live here. The consequences for our children's safety and wellbeing are significant and cannot be mitigated by the limited measures proposed in the application.

Document Set ID: 21400807
Version: 1, Version Date: 10/07/2025

Document Set ID: 21391473
Version: 1, Version Date: 04/07/2025

CHARLOTTE PEDERSEN

Impact on the environment, roading, and rural amenity

There will be a significant impact on the environment, road's and rural amenity through the increased movements directly related to the visitors and staffing of the site. These roads are windy and often comprised by rural activity and damage due to weather events. The increased traffic through the valley will pose unnecessary additional risk. The long-term impacts on road maintenance, public safety, and conflict with agricultural operations have not been adequately assessed or mitigated. In addition to this there is no sustainable transportation options available to visitors which could be up to 20 vehicles, plus the staff coming and going from the site in one day. The proposal is inconsistent with national objectives to reduce transport-related emissions and undermines broader climate change mitigation efforts. Placement of a car-dependent rehabilitation facility in a rural area without access to public transport will significantly increase vehicle movements and reliance on private cars. Such development should be located within or near existing urban centres to support low-carbon transport options and sustainable land use patterns.

I am deeply concerned about the visual impact this proposal will have on the surrounding landscape and rural environment. This area is remote, open and characterised by a natural rural setting that contributes to its peaceful amenity and visual appeal. The proposed level of built form and artificial lighting is inappropriate in this context and directly undermines the purpose and integrity of the current rural zoning.

The intensification of the site will have a significant adverse effect on the surrounding valley and neighbouring properties, as the facility will be visible from multiple vantage points. The proposed landscaping, intended to mitigate these effects, has not been adequately considered. The plant species and planting scheme chosen rather than softening the development, will accentuate its presence and contribute to visual pollution. Furthermore, the proposed planting scheme fails to provide the level of screening and privacy that has been suggested in the application. Its inability to blend in and contribute to rural environment cannot be mitigated through planting. In particular, there is a complete lack of consideration for privacy on the northern boundary, leaving neighbouring properties more exposed to the adverse effects of this development.

Document Set ID: 21400807
Version: 1, Version Date: 10/07/2025

Document Set ID: 21391473
Version: 1, Version Date: 04/07/2025

CHARLOTTE PEDERSEN

Disruption during school bus pick-up/drop-off times, common in rural zones.
Increased traffic volumes during peak times, particularly morning and afternoon, pose a heightened risk to school buses and children waiting alone at rural pick-up and drop-off points. These areas lack formal bus shelters, footpaths, or safe waiting zones, making them especially vulnerable. The safety of rural children travelling to and from school should be a key consideration in land-use decisions.

Personal Connection and Opposition
This rural area is where I grew up and the home of my parents and grandparents, myself and my children have a deep connection to both the rural environment and the community here. The introduction of such a facility would undoubtedly have a significant adverse effect on the natural surroundings and the way of life for local residents.

I strongly believe that this proposal should not be allowed to proceed, as it threatens both the environmental integrity and the social fabric of our community.

Document Set ID: 21400807
Version: 1, Version Date: 10/07/2025