

FORM 13

**SUBMISSION ON A PUBLICLY OR LIMITED NOTIFIED
APPLICATION CONCERNING RESOURCE CONSENT**

**ROTORUA
LAKES COUNCIL**

Section 96 Resource Management Act 1991

(Rotorua Lakes Council is the operating name of Rotorua District Council)

To: Chief Executive Rotorua Lakes Council Private Bag RO3029 ROTORUA	Name of Submitter: Julie Catherine Antony <i>[Full Name]</i>
---	---

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]*:

Application for Land Use Resource Consent to establish and operate a reintegration facility on Puati Road, Ngakuru.

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

473 Puati Road, Ngakuru [Lot 1 DP 585350]

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

The part relating to "(a) adversely affects the environment"

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

Reintegration facility proposal on Puati Road

I oppose this proposal and application because of the following reasons:

It ‘...(a) adversely affects the environment.’

First and foremost, the location is fundamentally unsuitable given its remoteness and limited infrastructure. Puati Road is characterised by rural roads that are often narrow and poorly maintained, increasing the risk of vehicular accidents or access issues, particularly during adverse weather conditions. The isolation of the site raises serious concerns about how quickly emergency services, such as ambulances, fire, or police, could respond in the event of an incident—not only at the proposed facility but also for the broader community who rely on these same resources.

The current low-density volume of traffic into the area, brings a higher risk of accidents on narrow country roads. Locals are mindful of the farming practises associated with on-road movement of stock, feed, cropping machinery, tankers, trucks, cyclists/walkers, school buses and associated services to the farming, schools and business community. Visitors to the proposed facility may not be aware of these hazards.

This lack of adequate access amplifies worries about safety, especially considering the nature of the proposed facility and the potential for situations requiring urgent, specialised intervention. Additionally, the daily operations of such an establishment could further strain existing emergency response capacity, which is already minimal in our district.

If emergency services are required due to an accident in the local vicinity, there is a significant delay in attendance of these services, potentially resulting in less-than-ideal outcomes meanwhile putting pressure on locals to support victims until professional help arrives.

Such is the closeknit community we live in. While we don’t necessarily live near each other, we enjoy a neighbourly support network and value the level of trust that is built through knowing your neighbours and supporting each other. We also value the local amenities which enable us to gather regularly e.g. Hall, church, lake reserves with public toilets maintained by our local Council. Our local hall was built by fundraising in the community and locals working together to provide building materials and labour to enable the community to have a place to gather on a regular basis. We care about and actively support each other, our community and our way of life.

Furthermore, the fabric of our rural community is tightly woven, shaped by generations of shared responsibility and a deep sense of belonging. Any significant change to the area—particularly one that brings unfamiliar dynamics—has the potential to unsettle the delicate balance we have worked so hard to maintain. The introduction of a facility

that neither reflects the needs nor the aspirations of those who already call this place home may have far-reaching social consequences. There is a very real concern that our collective identity, forged through cooperation and tradition, will be diluted. Our rural tranquillity depends not just on the landscape, but on the deep-rooted trust among residents and the continuity of customs that have long defined life here.

In light of these considerations, it is also essential to acknowledge the profound implications this proposal may have on the cohesion and continuity of our community. The establishment of a rehabilitation facility represents not merely a change in land use, but a fundamental shift in the social and environmental landscape to which residents are accustomed. The rural setting, defined by its relative tranquillity and the bonds forged among its inhabitants, is uniquely sensitive to alterations that introduce unfamiliar dynamics or increased demand on limited resources.

Concerns extend beyond the immediate logistical and safety challenges. The establishment of such a facility—particularly without comprehensive consultation or demonstrated community support—could result in unintended consequences that reverberate throughout the district. The risk of undermining the established social fabric, with its emphasis on mutual trust, neighbourliness, and stewardship, cannot be understated. There is a legitimate apprehension that the introduction of a specialised institution, with attendant operational and oversight complexities, may not only strain existing services but also erode the very qualities that attract and retain residents in this rural locality.

It is therefore incumbent upon decision-makers to weigh not just the practical and logistical considerations, but also the long-term ramifications for the collective identity and well-being of our district. The preservation of our community's character and values must remain a paramount consideration when evaluating such significant proposals.

██████████ my concern is for my safety and that of my children and grandchildren who live 10mins drive from me and the potential impact that would have on our day-to-day life.

Allowing a rehabilitation facility in this setting introduces an element of uncertainty and risk that feels incompatible with our rural lifestyle. The steady rhythm of daily life, underpinned by familiarity and mutual reliance, could easily be disrupted by the influx of new individuals—some of whom may not share our values or understanding of the local context. Concerns also arise around the adequacy of the management and supervision proposed for facility participants, especially in a region where support services are already stretched thin. The lack of robust oversight mechanisms only heightens anxieties regarding both safety and accountability.

The Manager's plan to vet weekend visitors is unconvincing. There will be minimal monitoring of associates who are banned from visiting the facility, as the Police lack sufficient resources.

Moreover, increased traffic and the presence of unfamiliar individuals could disrupt the peaceful atmosphere we currently experience. Many of us chose to settle here precisely because of the sense of security, privacy, and tranquillity that rural living affords. The thought of this proposal jeopardising these qualities is deeply unsettling.

Beyond the practical challenges, I believe such a development risks eroding the unique character of our community. Our shared values are rooted in mutual respect, stewardship of the land, and a commitment to preserving the rural environment for future generations. Introducing a facility of this nature does not align with these long-standing values nor the vision we hold for our district.