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	Mr J and Mrs D Brown *[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 reintegration housing activity as a non complying activity in the Rural Zone 1A of the Rotorua Lakes 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 oppose the application for the reasons set out on the attached page.

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

To decline the application in its entirety.

☑ **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: 25-Jun-2025
[redacted]	[redacted]
Contact person: *[name and designation, if applicable]* Mrs D Brown	[redacted]

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.

Submitter: Mr J. and Mrs D. Brown

Attachment for Form 13 Submission on the proposal by the Tikanga Aroro Charitable Trust to establish and operate a reintegration housing activity as a non-complying activity in the Rural Zone 1A of the Rotorua Lakes District Plan.

We are writing to formally oppose the proposed reintegration facility in our rural community. While we recognise the importance of initiatives that support cultural reconnection and rehabilitation, we believe this particular project is unsuitable for our area, and its approval would present unacceptable risks and consequences for residents.

1. Inappropriate Rural Location
The argument that a rural setting provides a better environment for cultural values lacks substantiation. The cultural benefits of kaupapa Māori programming can be achieved without placing them in isolating rural communities. Furthermore, the decision to site this facility in a remote location appears to be driven more by a desire to avoid opposition than by genuine environmental or cultural considerations.

2. Inadequate Emergency Response Capacity
Given the valley's distance from key services, the consequences of any emergency incident would be disproportionately severe. While Police have indicated that response times are factored into call prioritisation, the community still faces a higher burden to maintain self-sufficiency and resilience in the face of potential emergencies. The location of the subject site that any criminal activity can be escaped by 3 significant escape routes, 1. Towards Mangatete Road and onward to Tokoroa, 2. North along Te Kopia Road toward Rotorua and 3. South along Te Kopia Road toward Taupo. Response services from all 3 directions will not be deployed concurrently.

3. Safety Concerns and Risk of Crime
Despite reassurances, the presence of ex-prisoners raises legitimate concerns about crime and antisocial behaviour. The visitors to the residents pose the largest risk of crime to the Waikite valley area. The boundaries identified in the Social Impact Assessment discuss consultation and effects of people within 3km of the subject site. A 3km radius is not a sufficient area considering the subject site is some 20 kilometres from Rotorua. Visible property such as sheds, equipment, and livestock increases vulnerability for a large area where visitors to the residents will travel..

4. Lack of Security and Limited Staffing
The facility is not a secure institution, and having only two staff members on site at all times is insufficient for overseeing residents with complex needs. The long-term

nature of the programme (residents living on site for six months or more) means a continual turnover of individuals, potentially increasing safety risks over time.

5. Psychological and Social Impacts
Even where data does not confirm a direct rise in crime, the perceived risk among residents is real and has adverse effects on health, wellbeing, and quality of life. Anxiety, loss of trust, and fear of antisocial behaviour are serious consequences that should not be dismissed as mere perception. These effects have been observed in the community already, with concerns raised about inappropriate behaviour at public reserves, hot pools, and uninvited visitors seeking assistance.

Conclusion
In light of the above, I urge decision-makers to reject this proposal in its entirety.. While the goals of rehabilitation and cultural reconnection are commendable, this specific project in this location fails to meet the threshold of safety, community trust, and appropriate land use. The concerns raised are not only based on fear or perception but reflect lived experiences, legitimate risks, and the realities of rural life.

I respectfully request that this submission be considered in full and that the project be declined or relocated to a more appropriate setting.