



TOWARDS A NEW DISTRICT PLAN

ISSUES PAPER VERSION 2

JANUARY 2009



CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	4
2	FRESH IDEAS – COMMUNITY FEEDBACK PHASE 1	5
2.1	THE FRESH IDEAS QUESTIONNAIRE	5
2.2	THE FRESH IDEAS PUBLIC MEETINGS	8
3	FRESH IDEAS – COMMUNITY FEEDBACK - PHASE 2	10
4	FRESH IDEAS – COMMUNITY FEEDBACK – PHASE 3	48
5	FRESH IDEAS FROM COUNCIL STAFF	55
5.1	DISTRICT-WIDE ISSUES	55
5.2	ISSUES WITH SPECIFIC CHAPTERS OR ZONES	60
5.3	ISSUES WITH EXISTING PLANNING MAPS	76
6	FRESH IDEAS FROM ELECTED MEMBERS	79
7	FRESH IDEAS FROM NEIGHBOURING DISTRICT COUNCILS	83
8	CONCLUSION	90

1 INTRODUCTION

This paper presents a summary of the issues that have been raised during public consultation for the review of the Rotorua District Plan, also known as the Fresh Ideas Shaping Rotorua Project.

It is the second version of a document that was released following the first major round of public consultation in early 2008. This version summarises the subsequent rounds of consultation that were undertaken during 2008. While further consultation remains to be done, the release of this version coincides with Council shifting its focus to assessing, rather than identifying, issues.

This paper does not assess the issues. It should be noted that where a 'recommendation' is made it is by the person that has identified the issue, not the author of this paper nor Council's Planning Services Department nor Council's Elected members. Where a departmental comment is considered pertinent it is clearly indicated as such. Council recommendations on policy directions for particular issues contained in this document will be released as standalone discussion papers throughout 2009.

The rest of this paper is broken into six main parts:

Section 2 details the issues that were relayed to Council during the first phase of consultation that was conducted between November 2007 and January 2008.

Section 3 summarises the issues that arose from a series of stakeholder meetings, referred to as Phase 2, which was conducted during February and March 2008.

Section 4 documents the issues that were raised at six Hui held on Marae between March and May 2008.

Section 5 summarises the issues that have been identified so far by staff within Council.

Section 6 summarises the issues raised so far by Council's Elected Members.

Section 7 summarises the issues raised by Planning staff from neighbouring district councils.

2 FRESH IDEAS – COMMUNITY FEEDBACK PHASE 1

Several rounds of public consultation will be undertaken before the proposed new district plan is notified. The first round (phase 1) included:

- A mail drop of information and a questionnaire to all resident ratepayers (early November 2007).
- A newsletter (updated quarterly).
- Establishment of the "Fresh Ideas" website, which provided for electronic responses.
- Public meetings in Reporoa, Ngongotaha, and Rotorua in late November 2007.
- Advertisements in the local newspapers and radio.

2.1 THE FRESH IDEAS QUESTIONNAIRE

The feedback that is reviewed in this section was received up until late January 2008, through the mail (118 responses) and the website (27 responses). They are ordered in terms of the number of written responses on each point, but are not otherwise prioritised. A summary of points made at the public meetings is provided in **Section 2.2**.

The questionnaire mailed to resident ratepayers asked five questions and provided a section for additional comments. The questions were:

1. What do you think are the main environmental issues facing Rotorua in the next 10 years?
2. What do you most like about the Rotorua environment?
3. What do you like most about the places you use in the Rotorua district?
4. What environmental qualities are important to you?
5. What groups and organisations do you think the Council should undertake more consultation with next year?

Respondents commented in different ways, raising issues throughout the questionnaire. Thus this summary makes no attempt to distinguish responses to individual questions. Responses to Question 5 indicated that consultation should be as wide as possible. A summary of responses is given in the table below.

Issues raised by Rotorua ratepayers in response to the Fresh Ideas questionnaire

Issue	No of written responses	Main issues raised
Water Quality	87	Lakes and rivers
Subdivision	36	Rural, strongly positive to strongly negative; Residential, concern about increasing density
Rubbish	35	Recycling, litter, the tip site
Air Quality	33	Pollution from vehicles and fires
Traffic	21	Density and noise, especially main routes
CBD/lakefront	15	Diversity, amenity (especially signs), growth, empty shops, lakefront development, more residents
Non-car Transport	15	Bus, cycle, pedestrian; more needed of all; access for physically challenged
Amenity/Recreation	16	Streetscape, views, housing density, sport facilities; greater diversity of recreational options needed on lakes; treat each lake as separate resource; restrict motorised activity on some

Issue	No of written responses	Main issues raised
Tourism	12	Growth, conflict, economic issues, airport, tourist precinct needed
Forests	11	Management, protection
Growth/Development	10	Economic, population, tourism, balance; ensure land availability for future development
Social	8	Crime, safety, "slum" housing, rentals, affordable housing
Consents	8	Resource and Building consents process is time consuming and obstructive
Conservation	5	Wildlife and ecology: protect wildlife corridors, wetlands, native forests
Geothermal	5	Resource needs better management and more imaginative use
Mt Ngongotaha	5	Better access, walks and view from top needed
Infrastructure	5	Maintenance and further need (see Amenity/recreation)
Climate Change	4	Council must embrace and understand climate change
Dogs	4	Better management, register owners, reward good owners, more dog recreation areas needed

From the above table the most frequently raised issues were water and air quality, subdivision and rubbish management. There was a consistency in responses on some points (e.g. water quality), but there was a broad range of opinions given on others (e.g. rural subdivision). Additional detail on each point raised is given below.

Water quality in lakes and rivers.

This was the most frequently raised environmental issue facing Rotorua. Respondents included suggestions about managing nutrient runoff from the two main perceived sources (sewage – septic tanks; farming - especially dairy), ranging from subsidies for improving septic tanks to the council purchasing all farms around Lake Rotorua for conversion to forestry. Although respondents recognised that water quality is a difficult problem to manage, there was unanimous support for ongoing attempts to improve water quality. Restriction of motorised activities on some lakes was suggested. Many made no specific suggestions beyond identifying water quality as an issue of significant concern.

Subdivision.

Comments about increasing housing density as a result of urban infill in the residential areas were generally negative, ranging from a loss of amenity to complaints about demands from neighbours asking them to sign off on resource consent applications. Suggestions included introducing rules to restrict infill housing, and adjusting zoning to allow higher density housing in the inner city (including very high density – apartments).

Views on subdivision in the rural areas were more wide ranging, with comments about the poor economic utility of lifestyle blocks (further subdivision should be allowed) to protecting rural amenity and productive land (further subdivision should be prevented). Several submitters noted that reverse sensitivity issues can arise when subdivision is allowed close to established land uses (such as industry or forestry), and the new residents object to the previously established use when resource consent applications are being processed. One submission identified the problem of conflict between current rules restricting subdivision in rural areas and opportunities for development of multiply-owned Maori land. With respect to the Lakes A zone (lakes Tarawera and Okareka), the main concern was to prevent further subdivision.

Rubbish and litter.

Most of the respondents requested kerbside recycling collection, seeing it as a logical step already implemented by many other councils. Some raised the question of improved cleaning up of litter and glass from around the city.

However many respondents also complimented the Council on the general tidiness of the city and its parks and reserves.

Air quality.

Respondents were primarily concerned with minimising emissions from traffic and fires, but some also commented on health issues in relation to pollen and dust.

Vehicle traffic.

Increasing traffic was of concern in relation to safety, noise, pollution, density and lifestyle. Submitters frequently commented that they live in Rotorua because they can live close to town yet have ready access to a beautiful landscape. Clogged roads, exhaust fumes and truck-laden state highways within the city were cited as issues that affect those values.

CBD/Lakefront.

Bringing life back to the CBD was the key issue, including comments on empty shops, "scruffy" areas, signs, shops closed after 5.00 p.m., the need for better landscaping, "southward creep" and the poor design of the new "mall". There were fewer comments about the lakefront, and most were positive about the landscaping there. Access to and from the lakefront and integration were the main themes.

Transportation (non-car).

Respondents wanted better infrastructure supporting bus, cycle and pedestrian transportation options. The current bus service is rated as good, but limited. Respondents complimented the council on the proposed Ngongotaha cycle route, but pointed out that cycling was a popular district activity and an important tourism activity that needed further investment. Suggestions included ensuring that road improvements included a cycling margin, and providing better (safer) cycling access to key recreational areas such as the Waipa Valley and around the lakes. Pedestrian and impaired access issues were raised primarily in relation to making the CBD more pedestrian-friendly.

Amenity/recreation.

Many of the 14 comments were specific to local issues, primarily a request for improved maintenance and/or services. However, a common theme was the negative impact of higher housing densities on residential amenity and access to places for recreation (see below, Forestry). One respondent noted that recreational opportunities in neighbourhoods should be improved as residential housing densities increase, due to the decreasing size of gardens. Some written responses requested beautification of the main entryways to Rotorua city.

Tourism.

Comments were wide ranging, including supporting tourism initiatives, ensuring that the city was attractive to tourists, concern about conflict between tourists and residents or tourism development and environmental protection, and the economic impact of decreased tourism due to international awareness of carbon footprint issues. Most respondents supported the airport extension, although a few were concerned about aircraft noise.

Forests.

The main theme was "protect our forests". Protecting biodiversity and conserving and replanting native forests were raised by some respondents, but the main point was that forests of any type were seen as a recreational and visual feature and a key component of the Rotorua lifestyle.

Growth/development.

Managed growth and balanced development are both desirable. Zone boundaries need to be especially carefully managed to protect interests of both sides.

Social Issues.

Eight responses raised concerns about cheap rental housing (including infill housing) and consequent social impacts of higher crime rates and other local impact (e.g. tagging, too many cars parked on a section). Several respondents referred to the development of “slums” in areas such as Fordlands and recommended that council support affordable housing initiatives.

Consents.

The consents process (required under both the Resource Management Act 1991 and Building Act 2004) was perceived by eight respondents to be time consuming and obstructive, particularly in relation to “minor” issues.

Conservation.

Concern was expressed to ensure that wildlife corridors are protected/enhanced, remaining wetlands are protected and native forests are protected.

Geothermal.

The five comments received were non-specific, and simply raised it as an important issue for management. One respondent believes that its current management is poor. While it is seen primarily as a tourism resource in Rotorua, current developments in the energy economy suggest that a review of its use in the district would be timely, and would be supported by these respondents.

Mt Ngongotaha.

Five respondents stated that better access was desirable, with walking access and a view from the top as key objectives.

Climate change.

Although they did not offer specific suggestions, four respondents agreed that the council must embrace and understand climate change issues.

Dogs.

Four respondents wanted better management of dogs, including making suggestions such as registering the owners not the dog, and reward good dog owners. Better dog recreational areas were also suggested.

2.2 THE FRESH IDEAS PUBLIC MEETINGS

Three public meetings were held following the launch of the Fresh Ideas campaign:

- Reporoa, 27 November 2007, community hall, Broadlands Road, Reporoa
- Ngongotaha, 28 November 2007, community hall, School Road, Ngongotaha
- Rotorua 29 November 2007, the district council chambers.

The meetings involved a brief presentation by council staff on what the District plan and review process entails, and a snapshot of some of the issues for people to consider. The rest of the meeting was given over to the audience to ask questions or raise issues.

Many of the points made at these meetings fall into the categories identified in **Section 2.1**. However, a sample of salient points that were raised included:

- Better clarity about development options for properties is needed, particularly in relation to additional houses and property size. The consents process for dairy sheds is cumbersome.
- Encourage industry in the rural zones in order to create employment for rural residents.
- Population growth needs to be monitored carefully and not allowed to spiral out of control.
- Concern was expressed about development towards the top of escarpments, affecting the skyline - needs to be restricted.
- Subdivision in the rural zone should include provision of reserve land, as in the city - rural recreation options are very restricted in the Hamurana area.
- Section sizes and landscape development options might need to be controlled on a smaller scale than district-wide in order to protect local amenity values. Subdivision has taken place on low lying land where drainage issues will become a problem in the future.
- Road safety issues were raised in relation to the increasing frequency of heavy vehicles on the western side of the lake. Ngongotaha village and the Mourea area are particularly affected.
- More work on heritage protection issues is needed, such as unlisted historical Maori sites on the western side of Lake Rotorua, and some buildings in town.
- Consideration should be given to encouraging water tanks as part of residential developments, particularly if charging for water is to be introduced.
- Rotorua is losing its place as a leading tourist destination. Council needs to review tourism marketing and amenity in order to reclaim that place.

3 FRESH IDEAS – COMMUNITY FEEDBACK - PHASE 2

The Phase 2 meetings were held between 21 February and 12 March 2008, with most of the meetings taking place at Council. The organisations/groups that were invited to the meetings were based on the stakeholders that were identified in the communication strategy prepared before the public launch of the Fresh Ideas campaign and as a result of feedback received from Phase 1. All of the groups that were invited to attend a meeting are provided in the following table. Not all groups that were invited chose to attend.

In advance of each meeting the attendees were given a copy of the first version of this issues paper, which at that time included a summary of the phase 1 feedback and the issues identified by Council staff. The main purpose of each meeting was for Council staff to listen to the issues raised by the attendees. The notes from each meeting were prepared in terms of issues raised, rather than by which individual said what.

All of the meeting notes have been merged into a single database. To assist analysis each issue has been coded according to an arbitrarily defined theme (the issues from all meetings fell into 4 major themes – corporate governance, infrastructure, land use, subdivision).

Phase 2 meeting attendees

Grouping	Organisation/Individual	Comments
Central Govt	Department of Conservation	
	Historic Places Trust	
	Mighty River Power	
	Transit New Zealand	
Council Affiliates	Bright Economy Advisory Board	
	Tourism Advisory Board	
Developers or Business owners	Bell Gully (Auckland)	On behalf of the owners of Countdown and Bunnings Warehouse.
	Ngati Whakaue Tribal Lands Inc.	Invited but did not attend
	Bradley Developments	
	Pukeroa Oruawhata Holdings Limited	Follow up meeting requested
	Ray Cook Ryan Holmes, and Darryl Aston	
Non Govt Organisations	Federated Farmers	Two Meetings
	Fonterra	
	Forest Owners Association	
	Lake Water Quality Society	
	New Zealand Forest and Bird	Invited but did not attend
	Rotorua Rotary Clubs Rotorua Chamber of Commerce	3 meetings

Grouping	Organisation/Individual	Comments
Professionals	APR Consultants	
	BSK Engineers	
	Canmap Hawley	
	Luke Martin	
	MTEC Consultants	
	NZ Institute of Surveyors	
	Property Valuers Institute	
	SIGMA Consultants Stamm Surveys	
Ratepayers Associations	Hannah's/Holden's Bay Ratepayers Association	
	Kaharoa Community Association	Request to reschedule meeting
	Lake Okareka Ratepayers association	
	Lake Rerewhakaaitu Community Association	
	Lake Rotoiti Community Association	
	Lake Tarawera Ratepayers Association	
	Mokoia Community Association	Requested further meeting upon release of the Eastern Structure Plan
	Progress Mamaku	Invited but did not attend
	Progress Ngongotaha	
	Reporoa Ratepayers Association	Invited but did not attend
Rotoma Community Association		
Western Heights Community Association	Invited but did not attend	

No strict terms of reference were set at the beginning of each meeting that was held; attendees were given the opportunity to speak about issues that concerned them, and no constraints were placed on whether the issue related explicitly to the district plan. This is in some ways reflected in the broad themes that have emerged from the discussion. The opportunity was taken to highlight a range of issues with Council functions (corporate governance) and infrastructure such as roading and waste management. For brevity those issues not of direct relevance to the purpose and functions of a District Plan have been deleted from the following table.

Issues by theme, Phase 2 Meetings

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
DISTRICT PLAN CONTENT		
De-engineering the Plan	BSK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Probably not a bad idea but one solution does not suit all.
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports it – Appendix W currently a hindrance to innovation. ▪ Starting to run out of easily developable land.
	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get these out of the plan and into stand-alone codes or inventories. ▪ Appendices – remove engineering pieces and place in revised Code of Practice, also treat natural heritage similar. Keep outside of Plan.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Softer engineering solutions. DP could send the signals that they are appropriate. The urban design outcome we want to achieve may not marry with the engineering code. ▪ Roading – mindful that urban design outcome does not fit engineering outcome. ▪ Concerned by the proposal to de-engineer the plan. LGA doesn't give the same level of transparency or ability to debate. ▪ Remove asset management from District Plan – have sympathy, can be accountancy driven. Economic framework that does not align with community expectations. ▪ District Plan may be silent and not deliver outcomes it is trying to achieve.
	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sometimes too onerous on small projects – need a consistent approach.
	Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provision of comment more detail in terms of engineering standards, curious about how this would work outside of the District Plan. ▪ Acknowledgement there is a code – develop into a separate stand-alone document. ▪ WBOP and TCC same issue, code as a notified process. ▪ Transit standards and Council standards may not be the same, how will this be dealt with.
	Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If engineering standards are kept separate – good alignment and rationale will be needed. ▪ Annual review of the District Plan would be helpful. ▪ Need for clear alignment between District Plan and RCEIS code.
Definitions	Canmap Hawley Department of Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development as currently defined: \$250,000 trigger doesn't work. ▪ Stream/river/lake margin definition and reveg. Needs review.
	Mokoia Community Association MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School: Interested in definition of a school as the MCA is the largest provider of adult education. ▪ Definitions would need to get tidied up if zones sorted first, then the definitions sharpened. ▪ Definitions linkage to activity lists and zones. Include shops and offices.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The current definition of home based business needs review; eg machinery and trade, how do these relate. ▪ Some things are suitable some aren't.
Planning maps	Mokoia Community Association MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of on-line maps needs work. ▪ RDC website very slow. ▪ With respect to local body elections, on-line maps not of good quality. ▪ A3 – do not want them smaller ▪ Black and white good for copying and faxing. ▪ Careful of layers – and how much information goes into the maps.
Resource consent process and conditions	BSK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Soak holes don't work for all areas – okay in pumice – not a bad idea to have these constraints on maps. ▪ Diatomaceous – Grey Street / Elizabeth Street area but in a planned manner.
Structure and format	APR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Old plan focuses on what you can't do (Black Plan), not on what you can do (Orange Plan). ▪ Performance standards are a good idea but don't go far enough in stopping undesirables. ▪ List of activities needs attention.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New plan needs a better guide up front on how to use District Plan. Give guidance to document to outsider from a workability perspective. ▪ Kawerau DP – take a look at that. ▪ Format of DP needs work. ▪ Most people who have them don't like them – needs review, needs to be looked at in the broader context of aiming for less tar seal and less roads. People won't develop as long as service lanes are required. ▪ Need to talk to owners of property, an impediment to development, security risk, imposition on urban design. ▪ Look at parking policy and public transport. ▪ Presently used as secondary car park. ▪ Review policy, are they achieving what they should be.
	Bright Economy Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is it something that BEAB can assist the planning department with? ▪ Need to make it easy for activities to start up and have sufficient land zoned. ▪ If they have to apply for resource consent for block of land it makes things difficult. ▪ Be facilitative of consents. ▪ Is it possible for pre-approval within the District Plan. ▪ Clustering of businesses that build off primary industry. ▪ Situate industry near where there is servicing
	Canmap Hawley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refer to email – ties in with desire to have accessible, basic and clear concise plan. ▪ Frustrated with huge amount of resources to prove minor matters. ▪ Resourcing issues need to be assessed to support policy and rule framework, including more than just planners. ▪ Confusion between risks to consent authority as opposed to environmental effect of activities.
	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District Plan still too open to interpretation. ▪ RDC needs an advisory ability. ▪ Need to overcome perception of "us" and "them" approach.
	Department of Conservation Historic Places Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Earthworks an issue. Appendix I – problems with current wording. ▪ Northern region audit of District Plan. ▪ Review of District Plan as part of work programme. ▪ Controlled activity provision where heritage. Look at R6.4.3.2.
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It works better than others. ▪ Certainty absolutely critical, not only for Council but for the public. ▪ Simplify. ▪ Consider transportable zones. ▪ Not a lot wrong with it – been well tested through Hearings and Courts. ▪ Although it is quite prescriptive, in some areas such as Rural it is quite permissive. ▪ Keep Objectives and Policies separate from rules.
	Mighty River Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy framework a bit disconnected across chapters (e.g. Chapter 11 and how it fits with other chapters such as rural). ▪ Needs clear definition of ONFL's and natural heritage features – scheduling provides certainty. ▪ Just as important is the weighting given to certain objectives and policies. ▪ Urban amenity and quality – infill policy needs a complete rethink particularly in older suburbs. ▪ Flatbush design controls probably best example to make use of.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Activity tables should include some of the obvious “permitted’s” particularly in the CBD. ▪ Integrate Lakes A Zone-is challenging at the moment. ▪ Chapter favoured. ▪ Favour activity based. ▪ Trim some zones. ▪ Reformat. ▪ Cull some of the repetition ▪ Better Integration of Lakes A zone to include everything ▪ Try to keep all rules relevant to zones together. ▪ Appendices removal – zoning, integration should be better.
	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall good. ▪ Needs to be clear link between issues, objectives, policies and rules.
	Photoarts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rules too regulated and too many, rules not the only option ▪ Small businesses may not cope with increased compliance costs. ▪ Would like to see a strong statement/emphasis on deregulation in the new plan. ▪ 106 Lake Road cited as example ▪ - needed sign permit, building consent and resource consent – major costs, major time delays. ▪ - concerned by administrative process. ▪ - Culture thing within Council needs to improve. ▪ Other issues with requirements around disabled toilets, etc. ▪ Compliance is not just a dollars issue for SBOs’ but a time issue. ▪ University games – too much regulation stifling events coming to Rotorua – designated staff in Council required to make it happen –Helpdesk. ▪ When do you stop making rules to fix rules? ▪ Establish Committee in RDC to peel back regulations and replace with standards / protocols: ▪ Permitted subject to performance standards ▪ Change in culture and attitude, brave enough to trust people ▪ There are cowboys – put resource into nailing them rather than creating across the board rules. ▪ Should target those doing things wrong. ▪ Adopt a Disputes Tribunal approach. ▪ Need to reduce activities that require consent.
	Ray Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pretty well documented – not seen as a major.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In general sections can work well but don’t want to flick backwards and forwards. ▪ District wide rules should relate to district wide issues. ▪ Lots of sections in the plan you just don’t look at, particularly the front end. ▪ Subdivision is messy with poor links between objectives and criteria and it is too engineering driven. ▪ Some engineering requirements are out of date. ▪ Little opportunity for design amenity, sustainability to be demonstrated, innovation, etc. ▪ Objectives and policies need to be specified to each character area, e.g. not just residential zones – needs to drill down to character of suburb. ▪ Offices in residential zones need to be looked at.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too many sub zones. ▪ Less zones but be more flexible within the zones. ▪ Make more activity discretionary, decide acceptability, people will always push limits, clearly defined rules would help. ▪ Need to think more about this.
	Transit Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support non-complying default status as is. ▪ Tension between certainty and flexibility – RMA / District Plan is enabling but also restrictive. Can be permissive and can be a barrier. ▪ Certainty of performance standards with flexibility of land uses around these. ▪ E.g. CBD painting of buildings controlled activity needs to be linked to outcomes. Done badly it will be an onerous layer of bureaucracy that does not need to be there. ▪ Flexibility of use with certainty of activity.
Noise	Rotoma/Rotoehu Resident and Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lakes getting noisier with boats running open exhausts, noise problem is creeping in. ▪ Noise readings and decibels unenforceable.
Notable Trees	Rotorua Tree Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The current inventory is a foresters perspective of what was important at the time. ▪ People who have trees on their property don't know about them. ▪ Options for management: ▪ Once they get to a certain size they can be protected, needs something better than this. ▪ Assess trees, cut off points at 140 points – landscape, amenity, scientific, rarity, cultural values. ▪ Trees well looked after and protected add to the cityscape ▪ Walter and Mark in Parks and Recreation are doing a great job developing the system and ranking. ▪ Landscape trees at 100 pt. Very good specimens but don't need same level of protection. ▪ Go into the District Plan as part of this process, not so that they are not on the back foot. ▪ Too restrictive regulations for. ▪ Look at Nelson City provisions for notable trees. ▪ Financial implications of managing trees, incentives for management. ▪ Te Ngae Kahikatea and Ngongotaha Kahikatea need recognition. ▪ Key is not to make things too restrictive. ▪ Logical, sensible and workable notable tree management. ▪ Trees of Rotorua – Document to coincide with publication. ▪ List of notable trees – how to move to the next level. ▪ There was only 1 notable tree before the Black Plan.
INFRASTRUCTURE		
Broadband	Chamber of Commerce	Have sea port, have airport, now need IT port which is crucial to knowledge based industry. Linkage to Tauranga very important.
Electricity Supply	Lake Okareka Ratepayers association	<p>Undergrounding of power and telephone cables needs to happen and could happen in tandem with sewer reticulation.</p> <p>Would need this to be in the District Plan.</p> <p>Visually obtrusive, efficiencies to be gained with pipe laying associated with sewerage reticulation.</p> <p>High vegetation area – enhancement of this by underground cabling.</p>

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
Entranceways into Rotorua	APR	Needs to be followed through with. Entranceways need focus, particularly on landscaping associated with activities. Eastgate really needs to be looked at. Fairy Springs Road needs attention. Use of rail corridor as a nice landscaped road into town, acknowledge it is into the future.
	Bradley Developments	Need to be looked at.
Rail	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pity Rotorua has lost railway.
Roading	Dominion Funds Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the main routes that the District Plan proposes to upgrade? ▪ Victoria Street arterial - relationship between NOR and review? ▪ Concerned if the District Plan pre-supposes the Victoria Street arterial going ahead. ▪ Mindful of designation timing and impacts and relationship to District Plan Review.
	Lake Rerewhakaaitu Ratepayers Association Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Heavy vehicles a major issue on Republican Road, particularly with chip liners – forestry related- safety issues – very busy and difficult for push bikers ▪ Heavy traffic through Ngongotaha – by-pass and four-laning serious issue. ▪ Traffic issues will only get worse with more rural subdivision.
	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upgrading Tauranga Direct Road will have major impact. ▪ Has a special character that needs to be maintained. ▪ Will continue to grow and provide ▪ Not take off ahead of city, slow and steady. ▪ Victoria Street Arterial will have a significant impact on land patterns both positive and negative – whether it is still required is a major issue. ▪ Will negatively impact a lot of people, is it really justified.
	Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needs to be built sooner rather than later. ▪ Eastside not yet to level of congestion of Ngongotaha.
Strategic	Bright Economy Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need infrastructure to support transport hubs. ▪ Forestry support services need to be consolidated – reflect in zoning and easier approval processes. ▪ Attractive entranceways required. ▪ Currently looks disconnected – hard for visitor to make choices – transport hub where tourist can tour around, hop-on / hop-off bus. ▪ Transport corridors not well defined routes, also not legible. Traffic demand management issue. ▪ Lack of connectivity within the industry, difficult for those coming in, difficult to decide what to do. ▪ Will the new district plan state a vision for Rotorua? ▪ International Stadium needs a major bus park. ▪ Transportation to each – hop-on, hop-off bus service – connectivity like this would be advantageous to tourism industry. ▪ Open up access to all areas. ▪ Transport hub needs attention, is disjointed area. ▪ Defined transport hub, mindful that a lot of tourists don't use vehicles. ▪ Not just transport – putting all tourism things together. ▪ A lot more people coming in/through district.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strong fast links needed between airport and CBD – express lane for buses, and accommodation. ▪ Within 2025 growth population projection will put significant strain on infrastructure. ▪ Funding constraint on provision of infrastructure. ▪ Challenge is predominance of Tauranga in terms of development of the Bay of Plenty. ▪ Make sure infrastructural development is region-wide not just district focussed. ▪ Victoria Street, Eastern arterial, Tauranga Direct Road projects need to be brought forward. Need to be proactive/ rather than reactive
	Tourism Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Entranceways need to be improved. ▪ Transport infrastructure in place for airport and appropriate zoning. ▪ Certainty for development is the key. ▪ Impact of the Rotorua Eastern Arterial and Airport on other future roading. ▪ Linkage to Tauranga and Western BOP very important to maintain in ease of use. ▪ Auckland is still the gateway for international visitors – so will still be bussing to Rotorua. ▪ Market Rotorua as Trans-Tasman hub.
	Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for integrated planning frameworks – infrastructure provision at time of development. ▪ Concerns at the cumulative effect of the conversion of residential zoned sites to offices etc on sites with direct access to the State highway e.g. Old Taupo Road.
	Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alignment with infrastructure provisions will be critical –REA and other roading development (structure plans). ▪ Gives more certainty for developers and encourage growth. Example Eastern arterial motorway.
Traffic Demand Management	DHB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promote alternative active environments to counter obesegenic environments. ▪ Costs of use of public transport have an impact.
	Dominion Funds Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refer 3.2.7 of Issues Paper – endorse move to enhance pedestrian-friendly movement and public transport modes/routes. ▪ Bunnings and Countdown – high visitation flows, public transport is more a route management issue.
	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for physically disabled people access and planning. ▪ Very supportive of cycleway Ngongotaha to City.
	Ray Cook Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good to see cycle lanes happening, great idea. ▪ TDM/public transport needs to be reflected in Plan. ▪ Provision of footpaths in industrial premises. ▪ Strengthen provision for walking and cycling and public transport for subdivisions and other development (where possible) where it should happen. ▪ Transit has a new manual - Anne Carruthers key contact within Transit.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A lot more opportunities to link areas. Cycle lanes around lake. May not be District Plan matters, but if this infrastructure was in place where would be flow-on effects/growth. Don't under estimate the value some people place in these types of assets, as it is a determinant in where some people choose to live / work / play. ▪ Cycle friendly cities – Nelson / Christchurch, we can learn from. ▪ Lifestyle options need to be made available for these people. ▪ A lot of strategic things that make Rotorua an attractive place to come. ▪ Tourism is very important and we need to recognise this as much as providing for residents. ▪ Investigation into optimal location required for transport hub. ▪ Congestion issues at present. ▪ Has positives for CBD.
Water Supply	Bright Economy Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supply in rural area – potability of water should be proven at time of land use consent. ▪ Need to be mindful of future use of property. ▪ Roof water and tanks should be permissible, these are barriers in District Plan. We should perhaps be interpreting national issues differently. ▪ Cummins Corp running trial on Lake Rotorua. To get trial needs to be pre-budgeted in the plan, should become familiar with this as it has a chance for lake quality remediation.
	BSK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flexibility of dual systems – potability for drinking. ▪ Water off roofs still viable for laundry, toilet and garden.
	Holmes capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potable water – huge lack of availability and forward planning which is restricting growth. ▪ A lot of consultants employed on status of water and recommendations have not been followed. More of a concern now that there seems to be a shift away from private water supply. ▪ Issue addressed by many reports 10 years ago and still no response. ▪ Not much progress made with eastern water supply, water unavailability is an impediment. ▪ Also non-support for private scheme, therefore no options – very restrictive. ▪ Reporoa or Mamaku supplies are also heavily restricted. ▪ What has not happened – lack of impetus, lack of funding. ▪ Are options to improve water quantity – Council needs to look at this.
	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about draw-off especially for other parts of Rotorua and problems. ▪ Draw-off from Taniwha Springs, just because it is available doesn't mean you can have it. Find other sources – is about education. ▪ There are other avenues for promotion of conserving, re-using grey water, this should be explored. ▪ Ngongotaha get water restrictions but gutting that other parts of the district are not subject to them, or conserving it at the same time. ▪ Clever conservation of water throughout the district required.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Taniwha Springs is a case in point, more direction and clarity needed.
LAND USE		
Affordable Housing Bill	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the availability of lower cost housing an issue that Chambers needs to be involved in? ▪ Affordability of housing is an issue that the District Plan will need to respond to.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Another avenue for Ngongotaha/RDC to explore.
Air quality	Bright Economy Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make sure there are no conflicts/obstacles for recommendations coming out of Clean Air working Group (size of wood sheds). Talking about 3-sided buildings – not a dwelling.
	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing zoning may be able to limit industries that contribute to air pollution– Clayton Road / Western Heights area. New development has to be with non-emitting source.
	Federated Farmers MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burning of rubbish is an issue. May be more of a regional issue.
	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Quality Testing at Ngongotaha Mill is a challenge. EBOP role – there are a legacy of issues that need to be addressed and improved. Industries not damaging environment if located correctly – is about zoning.
CBD	APR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why promote alfresco dining when the air quality is so poor due to vehicles. Need to relook at this – strengthening of the Street, make it pedestrian, remove vehicles. Move craft market up to and into Tutanekai Street. Would be a start to pedestrianise all of Tutanekai Street. Need to do something to help shops. Businesses creeping out of CBD - Ranolf Street a case in point, shouldn't be allowed. Present lake front configuration wrong. Commercial activities on public open space is wrong. Toot 'n Whistle should be on lakefront. Look at Water Sports Trust and Soundshell should be developed into water-based centre. Would be a focus for lake users. Is a clutter of lakefront operators who block view of lake for the public. Pier out from shore with all commercial at end of it.
	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very keen to have it redeveloped but need an enabling plan to facilitate. Perception of District Plan / Council does not enable development. 100% supportive of CBD residential living. Needs to be mixed opportunities available for the market. Residents in CBD will take ownership of the “suburb” and start to manage CBD. Need to get life in CBD. There are properties in the CBD we can do without – property owners make investment in property – provide incentive for this. Tutanekai Street – old single storey retail outlets, questionable rental. If able to develop retail at bottom, apartments up top, then this is an issue. Enabling of inner city living. Top floor of Hinemoa Street car park – has to be solutions. Suggestion of pedestrian precinct in Tutanekai block – add to the challenge. Change in Amohau Street will be beneficial. Rotorua Central extension of car parking building. Not support lower floor area commercial on the Rotorua Central proposed car park. Not CBD vs. Rotorua Central, wanting CBD to be vibrant and cohesive. Concentrate on Tutanekai Street and make it strong. Once strong it will have a flow-on effect to finger streets. Current/Natural location detracts from achieving goals of CBD rejuvenation, transport hubs, lakefront development.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needs to be shifted. ▪ In terms of future of Tutanekai precinct, Victoria Street – Haupapa Street – five block precinct becomes an attraction in its own right rather than a service. Becomes part of what people come to Rotorua for. ▪ City focus has benefit in terms of function and location, better building and traffic up/down Hinemoa Street. Emerson Street in Napier – good parallels can be drawn between the two. ▪ Function of City Focus, and CBD Manager important. ▪ Information kiosks dispersed are another model that could be used. ▪ Is there an opportunity to control and facilitate development to have a specific zone for Tutanekai Street – lakefront as specific tourism and retail zone. Include and exclude specific activities such as commercial activities. ▪ Lakefront and CBD integrated zone needed. ▪ Haupapa Street parking area logical location for parking and transport hub ▪ Provide northern and parking facility (perhaps with Kuirau Park option) ▪ Haupapa Street – transport hub will need to include car parking.
	Holmes Capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rotorua Central did not majorly impact CBD initially, only impacted on some of the key tenants, in the last few years. ▪ Population demographically has remained constant, more product – retailers not working. ▪ Again comes back to the issue of different quality rentals to other areas. ▪ Other commercial developments are ad hoc – best means to grow. ▪ Inner-city living should be encouraged – any new residents should be aware of noise/reverse sensitivity issues. Noise/activity part of the CBD and shouldn't be discouraged/curbed. Residents need to insulate, and acoustically treat. ▪ No easy answer to how you revitalise/consolidate CBD – most need knocking down. Unless people are able build the offices they want you are never going to solve problem which is a huge issue. Need to be mindful of CBD spread, and vacancy of internal CBD major deterrent ▪ Rents are so low they don't want to spend money on their buildings – no design guides will change that. Hard to follow design protocol as cannot afford to comply. ▪ Building cost will always determine/drive external quality of buildings. Needs to be significant rejuvenation of some of the key buildings. ▪ Same applies to Industrial zoned areas – we don't have critical mass of good quality renters unlike Hamilton where rentals are national/international, though building costs are the same across New Zealand. ▪ There are challenges unique to Rotorua and this which needs to be reflected in the District Plan as an issue. ▪ Queenstown have solved the problem.
	Lake Rerewhakaaitu Ratepayers Association Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Looks good. Tourist businesses need to come to the party ▪ Don't go building anything else. Clean up what we have, well worth keeping as activities work well there.
	Photo Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lots of old buildings with no architectural merit – renewal needs incentives – don't know if design guide is the answer.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why can't Rotorua aspire to being a Brisbane / Southbank type setting. ▪ Market needs to be a focus of any revitalisation. ▪ New attitude required to bring these to fruition. ▪ Give a lot of thought to 'market' needs to look smart. ▪ Need to be mindful of 1 hours drive away from Rotorua there about 250,000 people. ▪ Needs a catalyst but everything is too hard.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Property Valuers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too much ribbon development will impact on CBD. ▪ Vibrant CBD – put tough rules around ribbon development. ▪ Suburban centres just existing. ▪ All comes down to financials and return on investment. Need for coordination of property, get people all working together. ▪ Rotorua unique attributes. Population can get into CBD in 5 minutes. ▪ Why residences in CBD needed, people want to live in lake areas. ▪ Noise and reverse sensitivity issues. ▪ Need to allow for it somehow. ▪ Consolidation of CBD. ▪ Rotorua Central - led to improvement in CBD. Might be good not to encourage further development.
	Ray Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Railway land yet to integrate effectively with CBD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Causing shrinkage / deterioration of northern end. - City Focus in wrong location. ▪ Areas of CBD looking shabby ▪ Revitalisation of CBD, City Focus is another road block to integrating CBD ▪ Should encourage residential living - containment of noise an issue. ▪ Major bottleneck to major renewal projects is multiple owners / ownership. ▪ Proposed Multiplex redevelopment could have a major positive impact on the CBD if done correctly.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On-site parking issues. Provisions need to be 'fairer' across the CBD zones. ▪ Better management of parking on/off site matters.
	Tourism Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support lake development. ▪ Scope for 5-star development accommodation, self contained high end apartments Targeted at different market types. ▪ Acknowledges southward creep of retail – see north end going to apartments, restaurants and specialist retail. ▪ Sustainability problem to hold things back – needs to be managed. ▪ Visitors stay in Rotorua longer – impact in Plan, apartment living. ▪ Just outside CBD, lake views, or other views – important that Rotorua does become a point of difference. ▪ Visitors – friends and family, corporate, domestic and international visitors. ▪ Transport needs and visitor services are inter-linked. ▪ Growth – unstructured travel more so than group basis. ▪ Unstructured traveller use i-site / visitor centre. ▪ May need purposely built visitor centre at the lakefront – most composite area. ▪ Lakefront development, retailers should be getting maximum benefits. ▪ Coaches, campervans in CBD. Campervans getting larger, carparks do not equate to this. Secure area to be helpful – combined with Park and Ride situation. ▪ Good transport system very important. ▪ Interaction Lakefront – café, restaurants – other retailers, be able to see traffic flow. At the moment it is disjointed, can't actually get to shops. ▪ Spread of souvenir shops – coaches. ▪ Uniformity in opening hours, communication of events to retailers, not linking as well as it could, develop ways of developing relationship between retailers and tourism. ▪ Lakefront end of town – apartments, duty free, ground floor retail will be a change in CBD. ▪ Difference between targeting local / vehicle owners and other end of Tutanekei – lake end, no vehicles. ▪ Need for direction to find shops. ▪ Lakefront / visitor / apartments / retail / Rotorua Central. ▪ Greater access, greater contribution to economy.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Linkage with Rotorua Central is important. ▪ Problem with over-supply of retail. ▪ Residential apartment living should be promoted but managed well. Need for flexibility around this. ▪ Revitalisation of private sector and Council investment needs to meet halfway – can't be all Council or vice versa. ▪ CBD revitalisation is a long term goal and need to be mindful of scarcity of financial input. ▪ Need to think about materials and design. ▪ Courthouse needs to go somewhere.
Dairy farming	Federated Farmers Fonterra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do they really need resource consent? Probably not. ▪ Very difficult to buy into farming, which may explain the age profile data presented by Council for the southern part of the district. ▪ The dairy shed data that was presented - does it take into consideration the impact of farm amalgamations?
Earthworks	Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarity of management for earthworks – do not want multiple effects.
Financial Contributions	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financial contributions, development of Rotorua and growth. Fine line between getting revenue and dampening things down.
Forest to Farm Conversion	Bright Economy Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forest to farm – major concern. Major impact to bio-fuels / biomass production ▪ Need to foster industry as much as we can. ▪ Looking at setting up biomaterials innovation centre – Rotorua ideally located – SCION Biomaterials Futures.
	Department of Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential sites within district.
Forestry	Forestry Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not mandatory for Forest owners Association members to follow Code of Practice- however most major operators do. Promoting the inclusion of the code by reference in the Second Generation plan. ▪ Current district plans do not actively promote the code- there needs to be more positive reinforcement.
Geothermal	Department of Conservation Mighty River Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rules are ultra vires. ▪ Much more a plan issue – renewable policy nationally. ▪ Will be looking for policy lead in our plan – comfortable with discretionary approach currently taken.
	Tourism Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is a unique resource – save and manage it. ▪ Concept of Rotorua as spa destination is growing, is a point of uniqueness. ▪ Rotorua promotions section – supportive. ▪ Spa promotions – look at limitations and regulation. ▪ Assist spread through winter months of visitors. ▪ Spa development will happen-the plan needs to make provision for this.
Green Belt	APR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No policy in Rotorua for a “green belt”. ▪ Need to look at more integrated housing, not gated community.
	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Buffer between city and Ngongotaha needs to be maintained. Reinforcement of separation from town – don't want city to run into Ngongotaha.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
Growth management	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Airport trans Tasman capability will have fundamental change to tourism patterns in New Zealand. ▪ Look at future commercial/industrial needs for tourism hub ramifications for Rotorua. Will be platform for growth opportunities. ▪ Rezoning of areas outside and around airport will have positive impact on property values. ▪ Look at possible impact of airport in 30-40 years. ▪ DP needs to be more responsive to business growth. ▪ Healthy business community = tremendous contribution to a healthy society. ▪ Encouragement of business as much as possible through District Plan, developed around outcomes rather than rules. ▪ District Plan should not be prescriptive – the number of car parks should not determine whether activities are suitable or not. ▪ Treks backpackers used as an example of over-prescriptiveness – parking spaces/service lanes. ▪ District Plan should be more enabling. ▪ Specifically development of lakefront/Sulphur Point, what role can the District Plan play to facilitate. ▪ Eco Lodge development, ripe for other development. ▪ Multiple agencies seen as a constraint – agree that lifestyle subdivision is not the single answer. ▪ Business community needs to get involved. ▪ Airport going Trans-Tasman has potential to broaden range of commercial options to address lake water quality. ▪ A lot of talk about bio-materials, crops. ▪ Opportunities for business to be involved, not overly restrictive District Plan, so that they can happen in an unobstructive manner. ▪ Visitors increase but not visitor night increase. ▪ Growing affluence of China/India and impact this will have on district. Need platform to develop business/industrial opportunities in Rotorua to respond to this. ▪ Need opportunity without destroying the environment. ▪ Encouraging growth that is reflective of the rest of the Bay of Plenty – aim for higher population growth. Should have a growth of higher than 2% per year.
	Ray Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Airport trans Tasman capability is single biggest change to Rotorua, bigger than tourism and will attract investment, including holiday home market. ▪ Success for development is being able to fly directly in. ▪ Bit of activity around Eastgate as spill-on effect. ▪ Not huge impact initially but will have positive effect. ▪ Opportunities down track for freight opportunities.
	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commercial / Industrial key element / driver for Rotorua. Need to be proactive in growing Rotorua but in a sustainable manner. ▪ Rotorua has been an innovator tourist wise but there must be other things we can do for other sectors. ▪ Need to recognise commercial developers assisting the city ▪ Proactive and increasing growth in district in a good way, need to promote innovation and creation. ▪ City is smart and looks good. ▪ Kaharoa / Hamurana predominant area for lifestyle subdivision, ▪ Around lakes still popular, recognise this.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Look at Tauranga, there can be lessons learnt. ▪ Make Rotorua an attractive place.
	Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Airport trans Tasman capability will have influence on land use planning. ▪ Be mindful of both positive and negative impacts. ▪ Opportunities will arise and need to be mindful that CAA infrastructure is in place. May be other industries that locate. ▪ Strategic relationship of airport and EEC and accommodation.
Hazardous substances	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The screening procedure is impenetrable – needs to be clarified. Very difficult to follow.
Helicopters	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to be responsive to this. Needs to be some facilitation of this, particularly high interest to tourists. ▪ Need to recognise this in the wider scheme of the district economy. ▪ It is an expected activity.
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Place for controlled tourism related activities but needs development of guidelines, strict times and limits.
	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Look at being able to apply for a consent for this should not be prohibited.
	Tourism Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase of luxury lodges and requirement for Helicopter as a means of transportation.
Hydro	Mighty River Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ohakuri dam – land use spin off through the water allocation debate. Maintaining storage capacity has downstream impact on land use (e.g. water won't be available for irrigation in Reporoa). ▪ Tabled set of operating easements for MRP assets. Will provide CD version shortly. Reverse sensitivity issues outside of easements and restrictions on activities if you are within. ▪ MRP can't designate therefore very reliant on what goes into District Plans, e.g. identification of sites. ▪ Flood levels may be good to have these reflected in mapping for District Plan. Want to see it reflected that MRP is an affected party for activities within operating easement. ▪ In July may be in good position to talk in greater detail about PMF/inundation modelling. ▪ Starting to get lifestyle lot pressure on full length of river system. ▪ The easements may be a useful complement to the 'special map' series being considered by planning and LIS. ▪ MRP progressively registering the operating easements onto individual titles. ▪ Riverbank stability and erosion a risk. ▪ Easements, etc/mapping a useful subject for next meeting. ▪ Very keen for a 'hydro zone' or scheduling or something similar. ▪ Also interested to hear that council will be continuing with activity table approach.
Kaituna River	Department of Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emerging issues for both DOC and RDC re zoning.
Land use and lake water quality	Bright Economy Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Farming still the major earner. ▪ 15ha rule keeping a lot of unproductive farm land in farming. ▪ Water quality is a major issue and changed land use, based on scant evidence suite of responses not just one. ▪ Opportunity for farmers to change land use in accordance with strategy. 15ha rule keeping land in unproductive farming.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	BSK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subdivision not core business for BSK. ▪ Incentive to retire land through subdivision – not the only solution. ▪ Agree it is not the “silver bullet”. ▪ Need to be careful not to put more intensity on land use. ▪ Need to be mindful of matching activities to appropriate areas.
	Department of Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incentive to protect – Principle is sound but needs more vigour. There is a need to look at this. ▪ Effect of activities on lake water quality – catchment wide approach. ▪ DOC has interest in improving water quality and improving lake margin public access. ▪ Public accessibility is important.
	DHB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lake and potable water – high priority. ▪ Need to review standards.
	Federated Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Biggest issue regarding what to do with land in terms of alternative land use. ▪ Rule 11: ▪ Subdivision is not the only answer. ▪ Need to be flexible enough to cater for options we may not know about. ▪ Ability in Oturoa / Dalbeth Roads to subdivide. ▪ Future land uses flexibility. ▪ Dairying-Doing best with technology available. ▪ Lifestyle lots take out productive land ▪ Where are people going to work ▪ Certainly a place for it out in Kaharoa/Hamurana but needs to be controlled. ▪ There needs to be infrastructure in place first and acceptance of the rural environment. ▪ School infrastructure needs assistance to meet demand if more lifestyle lots come on line is a community focal point. ▪ Who is going to pay? Buy out, but price needs to reflect level of investment. ▪ 23 farms in catchment area need to focus on solutions for these. ▪ Subdivision an answer but market will dictate best bits for subdivisions – not all farms can deliver that. ▪ How much subdivision is required, can lose rural productive land – negative impact.
	Homes Capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Okareka – minimum 40 ha usable to subdivide is perhaps better use of the land. Provisions need to be made for good development that would benefit the lake ▪ If water quality tips over, property values will plummet. ▪ Look at Lake Ohakuri. ▪ Needs to have environmental benefits for subdivision. ▪ Not the market for broad scale change to lifestyle lots. ▪ Playne’s property - won’t change land use practices unless there is economic benefit. ▪ Need to allow subdivision in rural zone to occur if there will be a benefit for lake water quality. ▪ Needs to be good comprehensive subdivision – this needs to allow for in the rural zone. ▪ Need to take into account planting and revegetation in order to benefit community.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Lake Okareka Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to manage run-off, needs to be something easy to be able to develop land. ▪ Crater Lake - Application will be a positive for the development of the land. ▪ Forestry, revegetation, cycling/walking tracks alternative land use. ▪ Legacy problems with pollution – an awful lot of unknowns. Science is constantly throwing up new issues, contrary to LOCMAP and NIWA results. Needs to be transparency and communication of data. ▪ Nutrient footprints of farms – information not gathered, information not obtained. ▪ 5xlakes, 5xfarms concept for all of Rotorua lakes. Impact on groundwater and impacts on different lakes. ▪ Top of everyone’s list at Okareka is lake water quality deterioration, will impact on property values. ▪ Okareka about 50% resident, 50% non-resident. ▪ Solution simple – livestock has to go – land use change - there are a number of options. Cattle within 10 metres of lake, topdressing nonchalance and non adhesion to target application. ▪ Okareka has an action plan but unfortunately has failed as it has no legal/statutory grounds. ▪ Change of land use will require hard decisions. ▪ Shallow lake and water levels in Okareka are at their lowest level since living memory and susceptible to degradation. ▪ Removal of all stock from Okareka catchment is absolutely critical. ▪ The ability to subdivide would be a trade-off. ▪ Problem solved if EBOP were just to acquire it (Playnes Property).
	Lake Rerewhakaaitu Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get rid of cows or change way you farm? Akin to blackmail. ▪ Again who pays either way. ▪ A lot of money to RDC and EBOP for rates and taxes to DOC – difficult to see cost/value of rates. ▪ We need to respect water far more than we do. We pay rates, we want results/outcomes. ▪ Water extraction licences - over-extraction of water is becoming an issue. ▪ Key focus for community. ▪ We need to be clear who is doing what. ▪ Overlaps of jurisdiction – water quality/quantity supreme importance. ▪ Need to state specifics of what topics are the responsibility of which agencies – needs better coordination. ▪ Weed infestation and wilding pines around lake management – need action. ▪ Need responsible management of water resource. ▪ Continually paying more money in rates. ▪ People need to know what their options are but septic tanks is a complicating issue. ▪ Everyone’s issue, should not shirk from it.
	Lake Tarawera Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major issue at Tarawera: ▪ Concerned by delays in waste water reticulation and the fact that it has become political – note date of 2012. ▪ Appreciate it is totally dependant on funding. ▪ Action to date is reactive, examples of proactive activity from Tarawera people, funded by Tarawera fold \$30K ▪ Action Plan is a non-action plan.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of response from Council dating back to August 2006. ▪ Clear to Association that a stop has been put on the process. ▪ Okareka further up time line. Need to look at Tarawera/Okareka holistically, seems to be fire-fighting. ▪ Okareka decision will lead Tarawera outcome, this is not wise. ▪ Asset Planners haven't looked at the waste water issue holistically. ▪ Lack of due diligence on type of reticulation that is right for Tarawera. ▪ Grinders may be right, but also may be wrong. ▪ Will now be addressing through Community Board. No response from meeting of December 2007.
	Lakes Water Quality Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land use. Rotorua / Rotoehu Action Plan, Key issue Council Staff must read it. ▪ Not happy with Action Plan process, however, happy with the science that has gone into it. ▪ Would like nutrient reduction expedited quickly.
	Lakes Water Quality Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land use key drive for what happens in the lakes. Dairy farms add 60-100 kg nutrients into the lakes. ▪ Dairy farming worst contributor followed by sheep and beef. Need to get 1/3 nutrients out of the system. ▪ Options are change farming practices or let them exit through subdivision. ▪ Scientific input, factual situation fine, how we are cleaning it up that is the problem. ▪ Compromise built into plans.. ▪ Farming reduce nutrient discharges by 1/3 to 1/2 - must be taken out of system. 1/3 big ask, farmers say can only take 4-5%. Issues about farmers saying can't meet targets, this needs to be revised. ▪ No-one has the right to pollute the environment, community will pick up legacy costs. ▪ Encourage farming to change the way it farms, farmers take on more responsibility. ▪ Allow subdivision that results in retirement of land, and farmers to get something back. ▪ Lake Rotorua – 24 dairy farms – wintering stock goes onto lifestyle blocks around Ngongotaha. ▪ Banning of wintering stock would send strong statement. ▪ Fonterra have plans to increase stock numbers, this should not be allowed. ▪ District should have nutrient sensitive zones identified on planning maps.
	Lakes Water Quality Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Believes Rotorua has turned its back on Lake Rotorua, e.g., tourism operators also reflected in trout operators moving to Taupo. ▪ 24 dairy farms on Lake Rotorua, 3-4 kms back from lake – huge loadings on land. ▪ Need to understand farming practices in the lake catchments. ▪ Rule that dairy farmers not allowed wintering off in district, there are other areas that can cope with it.
	Lakes Water Quality Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Science is clear – lakes can be turned around. Land use determines what happens in the lake. Lakes Action Plans and district plan need to work together. ▪ Poor understanding of lakes water quality. There needs to be restoration of lakes to agreed levels. ▪ Plan needs to incorporate how lakes restored and tools to do this.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to get it right now – sets up the framework for the future. ▪ Need to be open and honest about the problem. ▪ RPS not clear enough in terms of lake water quality. ▪ RMA and responsibility for non-point discharges very difficult. ▪ Reliance on subdivision in District Plan – major way of reducing pollution. ▪ WBOP TDRs –to look at in detail. ▪ Bush Settlement example in Waitakere may be applicable.
	Lakes Water Quality Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RMA does not give ability to just say 'stop'- that is what is needed. ▪ EBOP advocating sub division- more than just one answer. ▪ Pick best spots for subdivision cluster of 5 properties of an exclusive nature that brings \$ into district, to get this retired 50 ha of land. ▪ Understand legacy costs. ▪ Location of dairy farms distance from lake. ▪ Within 10 years would achieve targets if we retired farming. Is most extreme example but most readily achieved. ▪ People not wanting to see more houses, most living around lakes and most came here because of lakes. If we see more houses will get more degraded lake, is a balancing equation. At the end of the day people/the community will need to make the decision. ▪ How sacrosanct is Rural A? From water quality perspective would say Rural A important to keep and retain. If want to subdivide you will retire land of benefit or go through TDR. ▪ Water quality goal important – goal that will influence land use. ▪ Water quality key principle in planning process. ▪ More and more New Zealanders say water quality is an issue, nationally and internationally important. ▪ Need to think sustainability and resources.
	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce farming and have more vegetation. ▪ Support further lifestyle lot subdivision but there are issues with this – could impact caldera rim, lighting, traffic. ▪ Proud of water quality from streams this is important to the Ngongotaha community. ▪ Want to extend water restrictions beyond Ngongotaha onto other streams. ▪ Concern of group for Ngati Rangiwewehi. ▪ Ngongotaha and Awahou going well, Waiteti Stream. Plan for Ngongotaha greenbelt from mountain to lake.
	Rotoiti Community Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Farming is a real challenge to New Zealand clean green image – major impact to tourism. ▪ Have to make decisions now and say no more intensive farming and state we are going to put the environment first. ▪ Intensive farming needs to be restricted – sole issue is water quality. ▪ Land retirement; the major issue is who pays? Is it solely the farmers' responsibility? ▪ Assistance provided to Maori Land Trusts to enable smarter use of land to assist in improving water quality. ▪ How to get from farming to lowering nutrient input and maintaining value in the land. ▪ If going to retire land (vegetation) then there needs to be incentives/compensatory means. ▪ Is a loss of land area that potentially is adding to farming operation.

	Rotoma/Rotoehu Resident and Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advocating plan rules about limiting intensification of dairying for example. ▪ Monitoring / enforcement will be an issue. ▪ Changes in density, intensity of land use, impacts of this on rateable values. ▪ Rotoma - Lake more and more popular, more events, getting earlier and earlier- We need to protect qualities of the lake so it is not depreciated. ▪ Ensure Lake Action Plans will be implemented. ▪ Don't reinvent the wheel, don't start again. ▪ Make sure there are no delaying tactics. ▪ Retirement of Lake Margins - EBOP / RDC working together on this- make sure there is not duplication or a waste of rates. ▪ Manage discharges on all activities (rule 11)- permanent issue ▪ To offset/fund lake water quality. ▪ A lot was good about permit system under the old Town and Country Planning Act, introduction of "consents" is totally restrictive of people's rights. ▪ A way to return to old permit system, have lost knowledgeable skill set and practicality. ▪ Need subdivision opportunities and an easy process.
Mokoia Island	Department of Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the zoning – needs clarification.
Multiple owned Maori land	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of understanding by a lot of people. ▪ Untapped resource for development, protection and conservation. ▪ Area difficult to progress ▪ Require further empowerment. ▪ An area that will take off; have to be mindful of aligning development rights of Maori. ▪ Te Tura Whenua Maori Land Act 1993 Act puts some strong tests on development. ▪ Recognition of Land Trusts aspirations is important. ▪ All rules should coalesce- TTWMLA and RMA ▪ The various statutes need alignment and needs to be reflected in District Plan if possible. What the Maori land Court will allow and what the district plan will allow are sometimes two different things. The result is nothing happens at all. ▪ District Plan needs to be more accommodating of what the MLC is decreeing/making decisions on. ▪ Range of proposals coming in, not just residential. ▪ Papakainga provisions, TTWMLA constraints on development of Maori land.
	Rotoma/Rotoehu Resident and Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to land development – problems / constraints / compliance cost.
Natural hazards	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geothermal areas identification –affects development and need to be identified accordingly. ▪ Of all the hazards, probably the one that needs looking at and fed into the District Plan. ▪ Groundwater areas not identified on planning maps – dependent on data and data accuracy.
	Rotoma/Rotoehu Resident and Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landslips common and a major issue. ▪ Deposits and bonds taken seem nonsensical for crossings not exercised or inspected therefore are left with deteriorated crossings. ▪ Run-off from road onto sections, storm water and surface water run-off is an issue that needs better management. ▪ Mud on road, no decent kerbing channelling which becomes an issue.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
Natural/cultural heritage	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to be careful. Some properties identified as having heritage value don't have merit. Needs to be given major consideration before they are embedded in the District Plan. ▪ Not all about heritage protection, there are alternatives. ▪ If buildings inhibit development of Rotorua then there would be a concern – need to be mindful of CBD revitalisation and lakefront development with heritage assessment.
	Federated Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Again issue is who is going to pay for management/protection and who is going to say what is significant. ▪ Rhyolite knobs in Mamaku – planted and fenced. ▪ Inconsistency in approach with regard to wetlands ▪ Wetlands turning into subdivisions is a big issue.
	Historic Places Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enabling provisions for new registrations to feed more directly into the District Plan without need for plan change ▪ Registration process more detailed and more in-depth. ▪ Disjoint between what is scheduled and what is registered. ▪ The annual district plan update proposal being considered for engineering may be a possible solution for this. ▪ Talk to NZHPT about new protocols re site records. ▪ At Rotoma can't farm right up to lake, looking to develop housing up to lake edge and a lot of archaeological sites that may be impacted. ▪ Maori land blocks – development of could have major impacts to archaeological sites. ▪ Aligns with broader debate over ability of subdivision to silver bullet water quality issues. ▪ Broader infrastructural/servicing issues will probably determine scale of development. ▪ Will be covered in resource consenting. ▪ Historic areas – may need to be reregistering (e.g. Govt Gardens). Will need clear definition of boundaries. Audit of historic area, go through registration process again. ▪ Periphery coming under significant development pressure. ▪ Will happen over the coming year. ▪ Will need to be a separate statutory process to District Plan Review but will dovetail.
	Mokoia Community Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supported. Key features of Eastside should also be protected, including notable trees.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amenity values of caldera rim need to be maintained, possibly through such a mechanism as view shafts. ▪ An offer to plant helpful but needs to be carefully looked at. ▪ Views down main key streets and hills, keep uncluttered. ▪ Protection of notable and heritage trees. ▪ Look at heritage on Marae.
Ngongotaha	APR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opportunity to become a village. ▪ Rotorua focus beyond CBD and should look at what other shopping centres need. ▪ Needs to be attractive and theme, think of a way to manage traffic – need to be sensible approaches. ▪ By-pass route given serious consideration. ▪ Need to assist small dairy owners, tidy up graffiti and cobbling, and tidy up backyards. Design solution not just engineering solution.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Bradley Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ngongotaha Rd needs strategic planning (PF Olsen site) and cars onto State Highway. Needs consistency of approach. Look longer term for Fairy Springs Road so all developments contribute to it. Be flexible and work with the people.
	Federated Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convenience Centre Traffic is an issue Use of rail line Encourage extension of bus service to Hamurana Rates – huge issue which needs to be addressed Rat racing down Oturoa Road noted.
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buffer between city and Ngongotaha maintained. Intensive development of terrace not favoured. Relax provisions around the Caldera rim but not wholesale development. Deferred zoning feasible but tends to breed false hope.
	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council should look at buying land around Tauai Street and make it investor ready. Currently an eyesore and needs improving.
	Ray Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ngongotaha has some opportunities, theme approach – boutique type arrangement – souvenir, art, etc.
Noise	Mighty River Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keen to dovetail MRP requirements with whatever rural zone noise standards RDC adopts.
	Mokoia Community Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition of noise, not just dBA but also types of noise – low level woofer noise – defined residentially and industrially and protect against this. Don't just look at high noise levels, needs focus.
	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires review. Don't like background level 5dBA, needs to be specific and measurable. (Refer hand-out provided by John Sholl)
Old Taupo Road	APR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current residential zonings probably not feasible. Old Taupo Road – don't know answer – traffic too high for good residential living. Look at non-residential activities along Old Taupo Road.
	DHB Holmes capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality – align with Transit. Spread of commercial buildings, the driver again being car park and profile. Old Taupo Road attractive for these reasons. Morphed into Cameron Road – there is a place for it. Res D Zone works because it is market driven. Always low density due to groundwater issues. Provides good area for business wanting / needing on-site parking.
	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council needs to make the call on this, or rezone it and make it clear where activity should occur. May not be the need for it.
	Property Valuers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial occupancy in CBD still high. Careful planning of commercial areas outside of CBD. A lot of empty space in CBD, not serviced by tenants – car parking also an issue. Recreating investment – need confidence.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strip development on Old Taupo Road like beginning of Cameron Road in Tauranga. ▪ Situation a bit unfortunate. Taking opportunities for reinvestment in Ranolf, Amohau, Pukuatua Streets. ▪ Old Taupo commercialisation is improving quality of residences, but is more dispersal of commercial activity. ▪ Diminishing integrity of CBD. ▪ Commercial D – logical for accommodation but horse has probably bolted. ▪ Limit retail options.
Open space/reserves	DHB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smarter planning and location of open spaces. ▪ Policies that drive healthy communities in the Plan. ▪ What is our response to health and wellbeing. ▪ Support policies on affordable safe secure housing.
	Federated Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should be provided in and around Kaharoa School – constrained by Ministry of Education ▪ Require a standard formula for design ▪ School is a community centre.
	Lake Rerewhakaaitu Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Redwoods well used, support its protection – major asset. Number of tourist buses a concern, perhaps provision of Bus Park.
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reserves in rural areas needed, but within reason. ▪ Does Brunswick Park need public open space, probably not. ▪ Certainly around lake edges – protection reserves – not wholesale recreation reserves. ▪ What mechanisms used for protection areas, comes down to best use.
	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public Access to Streams and Lake needs to be maintained. Don't want houses built right on edge and cutting it off from the community. Need to start strengthening linkages to lake especially public access. ▪ More plantings along lake and maintenance needs to be ongoing. ▪ Lake edge barren and needs work. ▪ Ngongotaha youth issues are significant. ▪ Playground too small as soon as it was built. ▪ No netball/tennis court, ▪ Youth need Community Centre to be set up. ▪ Ngongotaha needs more green space. Currently under-represented. ▪ Keeping ecological corridors for birds, keeping skyline. ▪ Keep Ngongotaha caldera basin as a reserve,
	Ray Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Village Green: ▪ Sideshows carve it up reserve opposite the Novotel. Needs to be better use of this. ▪ Needs permanent tourism activities. ▪ Needs transport hubs there, bigger and better than existing ▪ Redevelopment of QE site also important.
	Rotoma/Rotoehu Resident and Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Riparian rights on freehold property bound by lake – survey of property into lake. ▪ Would like to reclaim land- this needs to be an easy process.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Rotorua Tree Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tokorangi Triangle Management - Really interesting discussions on what to do with this. ▪ Where is this at, is it out for consultation. Need to get it out and discussed for public comment. ▪ Pines stay as conservation reserve. ▪ Research trees / trials there. ▪ Would be good to see strong public debate. ▪ Should be treated as a reserve in the Plan. ▪ Is an iconic landscape for Rotorua and should be treated as a reserve.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Difficulties of interpreting rules for these areas.
Papakainga	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of them ▪ Papakainga provisions do not work, need a zoning change, and requires full-blown standards review. ▪ Issues with Maori Land Court apportioning land, Council density provisions require review for papakainga. Easier provision for development. ▪ Consideration of how this could occur in an easier fashion.
	Rotoma/Rotoehu Resident and Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rules will be looked at in review.
Reverse Sensitivity	Federated Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An issue for townspeople coming out to the rural area is they need to be mindful of reverse sensitivity. ▪ People like looking at rural area but don't have to work it.
	Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit proposals in handout similar to what is coming from RDC engineers via Rotorua Urban Transportation Strategy (RUTS). ▪ Better to be written in as rules rather than as conditions. ▪ Vaughan Road is salient example. ▪ Building code will shortly align with new NZS standard on noise. ▪ RDC needs to decide what method they may want to employ and whether they want to partner with Transit on development of noise contour mapping. ▪ Transit open to ideas also – may be a combination of approaches. ▪ Transit will need something in writing. Try and have a letter by 2nd/3rd week March.
Rural settlements	Rotoma/Rotoehu Resident and Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rural E to residential lakeside – restrictions imposed, more infrastructure needs to be provided and footpaths upgraded. ▪ How will any rezoning/renaming affect us, and how will it impact provision of services. ▪ Why require crossings when no kerb and channel and footpaths anyway. ▪ Crossing deposits for Maori leasehold land.
	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reporoa a huge rural area, not a lot of development, cows profitable at the moment but this will change, however too far out to make it too attractive for lifestyle. May be lifestyle blocks, but it will basically remain dairy. ▪ Rerewhakaaitu – too far out to be a major goer for major increase in lifestyle lots. ▪ Mamaku slow to develop, worth keeping in good condition, need to keep an eye on this.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
Signs	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commercial/industrial operators – concerned about new “Signs on Road Bylaw”. ▪ Existing Hoardings Bylaw – incorporation in District Plan. ▪ Not one central point of access to rules about specific issue. ▪ Bylaws and District Plan rules – creation of confusion.
	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tidy up in plan ▪ Be a bit more practical and flexible particularly in commercial zones.
	Rotoiti Community Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plethora of signs - needs standardising – radical improvements needed. ▪ Tourists need to be able to see what they can do and where.
	Sigma Tourism Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to fix so that we are not relying on transitional plan. ▪ Consistency, tidiness, strategic location – future of electronic signs. ▪ Wooden boards and graphics will become obsolete. ▪ Visitors need to know where to go. ▪ One in Tauranga works well along Cameron Road. ▪ Transit present challenges. ▪ Good location for events, signage electronic signage.
	Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less is more.
State Highways	Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make sure all sites have adequate on-site parking, turning and are mindful of State Highway and intersections. ▪ Aim for synergy with Transit. ▪ Increase requirement for 2 car spaces on-site, especially where adjoins State Highway. ▪ Sight lines in District Plan? Need to reflect these so people are aware. Include “appropriate sight lines as per the code” – as an assessment criteria or performance standard component, or making it clear they are a criteria. (10.4) ▪ Getting access diagrams as criteria in the plan. Needs to be in there. ▪ All activities from State Highways (NZ Transport Agency) all discretionary and above. ▪ Activities fronting State Highway may be a discretionary activity. ▪ Is there any way of incorporating within District Plan – may be difficult from a technical legal perspective.
Strategic planning/ vision for future	APR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintenance of caldera ‘greenhills’. What happened to the protection of these. Need for a policy for a green belt. ▪ Gated communities not supported. ▪ Encouraging green ring around CBD. ▪ Policies should encourage integrated housing, with social mix etc. ▪ Need for two residential zones, one general residential and the other high rise. ▪ Side and front yards an anachronism – people don’t want this any more. ▪ Need to be mindful of public transport. ▪ Focus on ventilation and natural light. Rights that cannot be imposed upon.
	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Perception that we need a 50 year vision, with a doubling of the population and that this is not outside the bounds of reality. ▪ If population grows, how and where it will grow is the question. ▪ Staged approach may be required to achieve population growth. ▪ Conversion of rural land to reduce growth. ▪ Don’t see a vision as a city. ▪ If vision based on 0.25% growth per year that is all you will achieve.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Lake Rerewhakaaitu Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Airport Trans Tasman capability is a concern – will it be a success? Could be an issue for the ratepayers.
	Lakes Water Quality Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the vision for the region and Rotorua? Doesn't think there is enough of this fundamental foundation setting, Council should be doing this. ▪ Don't see vision statement, what are core values for district, region, and development turns it back on the lake. Need to define vision. ▪ Legacy of government/bureaucratic imposition of district. ▪ Lakes have to be embraced and have to be factual. ▪ Land use therefore must be more flexible.
	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The review is the good time for conversations around whether we continue with "traditional" engineering solutions. Peter Dine might be appropriate to respond. ▪ Debate should be had in the District Plan, its not just an engineering response. ▪ Deal predominantly at a micro level on a daily basis – we need a plan that delivers at the macro level – clear vision needed on what we are trying to achieve. ▪ Need for a 'big' plan for urban catchments. ▪ Management of impervious surfaces and overland flow paths, cannot be done on individual basis. ▪ Clear vision of what we are trying to achieve in terms of settlement of district. ▪ Urban fence will be challenged. ▪ Required in an environment where demand drives the market – sustainability should be the bottom line. ▪ A strong plan would assist. ▪ Demand is also dependent on what the rules allow. May need to move away from looking at rules and zone and look more at what the land is suitable for. (Scrubby Corner rule.) ▪ View must be long term – land is a finite resource and subdivision/survey/ is forever. ▪ Training pitched toward land development engineering. ▪ Concern nationally – need to ask tough questions, business as usual no longer the answer. ▪ Rotorua does have the chance to take a leading role and challenge the norms.
	Photo Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to understand culture and history of town – tourist centre – Council hasn't moved with times. ▪ Waterfront should have been developed 10 years ago. ▪ If we want to be an events city, the look and feel of the city has to change. ▪ What the city lacks is vision and leadership
	Rotorua Community Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Selling Rotorua lifestyle to others – retirement subdivisions into bush, huge demand. ▪ Sell lifestyle vision nationally and internationally. ▪ If you sell the lifestyle concept along with the traditional tourism platforms, Rotorua could reduce its reliance on economic value of farming solving multiple ownership issues along with it and it would be a major step forward.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Longer term vision for future of Rotorua needed. ▪ Look at things in a more innovative manner. ▪ Alignment with land use/environmental outcomes and growth/development. ▪ If dairy removed then need to look at alignment of other land use activities, including subdivision. ▪ There is a need for an attractive environment for people to live in.
Subsidiary household units	Canmap Hawley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subsidiary household units - Strong demand in Rotorua for this and sleep outs. ▪ Definition and criteria need review and strengthening.
	Federated Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subsidiary household unit – 72 m2, needs to be reviewed. ▪ As long as they are smaller than main house, what is the problem?
	Holmes capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minor issue of insignificant merit. What really are the impacts? ▪ The need to provide subsidiary household units is a driver for rural properties. ▪ Who cares? So what if garages become laundries, etc, to the subsidiary household. Certainly a demand for these types of arrangements. Put a limit to garaging if that is a real issue. Rules should be about what you're trying to achieve. ▪ Focus should be on site coverage and residential activity.
Sustainable Buildings	Mokoia Community Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support these and energy efficiency measures.
Temporary Activities	Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Still generate significant activities, access will need to be fit for purpose, irrespective if located on State Highway or not. ▪ Want ability to require standards and requirements are met. ▪ Realities of network need to be fed in, look at location, triggers, frequency, multiple events. ▪ Necessity for decline, discretionary with opportunity to decline.
Tourism	APR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Te Puia – town – Government Gardens, lakefront – Fairy Springs, would be very successful!
	Lake Okareka Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Utilisation of tourist facilities – some adverse comments but on the whole okay. ▪ Duck Tours prime example of range of events held on Lake Okareka. Playground for a lot of people, particularly as more resident houses become holiday houses. ▪ Tolerant of situation – use of lake for events, etc but this tolerance will diminish.
	Lake Tarawera Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council participation and buy-in required on the walking track concept. ▪ Toilets, jetties, etc, infrastructure will be required. ▪ End March detailed consultation commencing.
	Lakes Water Quality Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tourism most valuable asset for region (Nimmo Bell Economic report). Need to change visitor stays from 2 nights to a week – related to that is giving lake region more emphasis compared to Maori and geothermal assets. ▪ Attitudinal problem. Businesses turned their backs on Lake Rotorua, non-reliance on quality of lake. ▪ Compared to 50's/60's number of visitors dependent on lake has diminished. ▪ Rotorua one of 3 top destinations – not many environments like this around world.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Ray Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ability to market lakes – tourism needs to recognise this. Tourism industry must focus on lakes. ▪ Rotorua has more tourists than Queenstown but visitors stay longer in Queenstown. ▪ Need to bring lakes into play, in future will become key selling point. ▪ Landscape driven, want green belt around them. Probably will see another 6 over the term of the next plan. ▪ Bring a lot of business to the community.
	Tourism Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needs to be a choice of destination. Kaikoura an example. ▪ Investment Newmans/Intercity in Rotorua is key distribution centre for visitor populace. ▪ Linkages Waitomo – Tongariro – Hawkes Bay – BOP, Waikato, Coromandel. Rotorua hub for strategic development of “Great NZ Tourism Route”. ▪ Airport may bring major tourism operators into district. ▪ Still premier regional destination in NZ. ▪ Attractiveness of airport for potential accommodation. ▪ Increasing desire to meet growing expectations of “green tourism”. ▪ Whole of NZ tourism strategy approach required. ▪ Visitor enhancement requires total community buy-in. ▪ Need to maintain marketing edge. ▪ Natural and cultural environmental management needed. ▪ Growing visitors, numbers, length of stay, visitor spend – improve emphasis on DRTM. ▪ Rotorua as a destination is competing with other destinations, promoting strongly – we need to be up in this league – require resources. ▪ Greater Rotorua community get to see these benefits. ▪ Get visitor flow through winter months – challenge. ▪ Farm stay, cultural, meeting people – market increasing potential to increase this. ▪ People travel the world to walk, trek and bike. ▪ Walking is an important attractor – Tarawera trail – and encompasses all lakes would be great. ▪ Comes down to sustainability. ▪ Incorporate zero waste and carbon neutrality. ▪ Eco matters Environment Trust – Waitakere City Council. ▪ Future generations important. ▪ Natural assets need to be well managed – linkage to economic growth. ▪ Campervan sewerage dumping areas are required.
Treaty Land Claims	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mindful of this – the impact that this will have on Ngongotaha land use will be interesting.
Urban design	APR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Big box development – requires careful management, e.g. Bunnings. ▪ More architectural controls for Rotorua Central needs to be more user friendly, needs to think about pedestrian movement. ▪ Economic damage to CBD. ▪ Energy Events Centre – bad location, bad design – opportunities lost. ▪ Council needs to be a champion of good architectural design, not quash opinion. Needs to set good example, at the moment it is not. ▪ Possible solution – Urban Design Guides – follow European example. ▪ Biggest criticism total lack of aesthetic controls. ▪ Use urban design protocol beyond CBD. ▪ Jump through hoops for something small – need to concentrate on the larger more complex applications. ▪ Urban Design: Total lack of aesthetic controls need to extend design guide to beyond CBD for management of space and buildings.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Canmap Hawley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continued dominance of the private motor car – need to move away from this while recognising they will play a future role – ties in with discussions about the street being more than just a place for cars – it is a place for people, amenity, trees, etc. ▪ Too much urban planning comes down to the car. ▪ Principal link getting people off land into movement corridors. ▪ Disempowerment if a condition of consent is “to satisfaction of District Engineer” (Up to the workability of the district plan.) ▪ Possible conflict between asset engineering and planning. (Up to the workability of the district plan.) ▪ Same for subdivision and development. ▪ Largely driven by roading hierarchy – need to distinguish between corridors and streets. ▪ Difficulty in applicability to PPK.
	DHB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Urban design – lighting issues / fencing heights / daylighting. ▪ Regulatory or non regulatory tools the best? ▪ New buildings and retrofitting of existing.
	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Open space amenity issues, reluctant to see tree height/landscaping provisions – probably non-regulatory. ▪ Not support fence height or restrictions on landscaping and tree height. Look at enforcement of these provisions.
	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The hard questions need to be asked and answered – urban sprawl, unrestricted rural development. World is changing quickly and there is potential for major changes over the life of the next plan. Rotorua has the opportunity to challenge/lead these types of issues. ▪ Compact urban form – compact rural villages, accommodate apartments and higher densities. ▪ Challenges to tenure –Review of Unit Titles Act before parliament. ▪ Urban design is a big issue – whether Council signs up to Protocol is not that important – what is important is getting the principles into the plan. ▪ District Plan as a key vehicle to progress / promote key principles of urban design.
	Tourism Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safer Community, an important issue requires attention. Can all work toward ensuring crime reduced. Council to be supportive of safer community initiatives. ▪ Crime stats influence investments.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outdoor living areas / private space is an aspect not done well in the Black Plan ▪ Heat pumps next to recreation areas of adjoining property are an issue. ▪ Residential B, one lot into two. Make use of traditional planning tools. ▪ Makes plans as easy as possible for people to use. Breaking into types of activities important. ▪ Activity list and effects is the most helpful. ▪ People need some certainty of standards.
Waikato River	Environment Waikato	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ River settlements – Vision Statement by June 2008 – draft by April. Tuwharetoa, Te Arawa, Maniapoto, Raukawa involved. Strong link to NPS for freshwater sustainability. ▪ No statutory acknowledgement at this stage. ▪ May also set up Waikato River Statutory Board. ▪ About co-management more than iwi ownership. ▪ Raukawa in direct negotiations about this river claim. ▪ Concerns re water quality in Lake Ohakuri, especially forestry changes. ▪ Sustainable agriculture above Karapiro. Declining water quality emerging issue (forestry conversions a part of that). National Policy Statement for freshwater.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Mighty River Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Climate change policy. ▪ Light pumice soils and effects of removal of forest is unknown – infrastructure issue. ▪ Boundary definition along Waikato River needs resolution and the zoning of the river (e.g. the Riverjet land use consent issue). ▪ Where is the boundary and what is the zoning, river, hydro lakes, Whirinaki arms. ▪ Water, buffer and setbacks natural hazard ▪ Not opposed to development adjoining lakes though need to be mindful of how this impacts. How do we deal with it in the plan – topic for a second meeting ▪ Hydro Electricity Zone/Schedule would be a preference.
Zones	APR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refer attachment – Chamber of Commerce have looked at length at Mamaku as being suitable for industrial area. Not toward SH1 and destroy unique landscape, but could be developed well. ▪ Revive light rail system in future – Mamaku – Ngongotaha – Te Puia. ▪ Air quality is of concern. EBOP doing good monitoring, need to be stringent on polluters ▪ Control emitters or shut-down operators. ▪ Ranolf, Amohau, Pukuatua – Change zones. ▪ Depreciate values over many years, not good. ▪ Commercial activity squeezed people out. ▪ Appearance changing re car parks and signage. ▪ All commerce out of CBD into this area – very unfortunate. ▪ Difficulty of tenants being secured in CBD. ▪ Building fabric in CBD poor – needs to be redeveloped. ▪ Introduction of development levies a disaster, is stopping development. Commercial interest in new developments dried up as a result of commercial development. Is a need for a subsidy. ▪ Creeping of commercial use along Old Taupo Road needs management. ▪ Areas should be residential and have occupation type businesses. ▪ Probably only need two residential zones – one general and one for high density. ▪ Urban infill should still be encouraged. ▪ Rights of ancient lights – European example – first come first served (refer 10.4 of handout) ▪ Zones need to be more liberal in what is allowed, more vigorous in terms of control.
	Bradley Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need flexibility / range of commercial options. ▪ Marguerita Street – still a big demand for this type of commercial / professional development just off the fringe of the CBD- Easy due to car parking- Maori lease a constraint to renewal in CBD. ▪ Dated zone – need to review – need consistency of approach. ▪ High profile sites need to be looked at. ▪ Perhaps Commercial E to Industrial A. ▪ Older buildings in Riri Street ▪ Not enough big land parcels. Eastgate now disappointed – storage sheds? Started out a good concept but too permissive.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Bright Economy Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major problem with turning requirements – disjoint between the amount you can put on and the turning requirements – probably don't need to expand the area. ▪ Getting stricter on this. ▪ Residential C probably at its extreme ▪ Large blocks of land difficult to secure. ▪ Plastics industry moves over for wood based industry, build on history of SCION. ▪ New plastics strong most industry don't want it to have negative impact on water/air quality within Rotorua catchment. ▪ Needs careful management, perhaps more stringent than in the past. ▪ Can't have polluters in the basin. ▪ No reason why modern factory can't operate within confines. ▪ Need good transportation infrastructure to support growth ▪ Need forestry but also have to be mindful of air/water quality issues (e.g. Tachikawa) – to support Waipa. ▪ Lakes A reviewed, needs to be looked at.
	BSK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shortage of light industrial land. ▪ Disjoint between Ngongotaha sale yards and adjoining land uses. ▪ There is land currently zoned residential that may not be suitable – Vaughan Road (groundwater constraints), Parklands (wind design), building on questionable soil.
	Canmap Hawley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Still a struggle for good lots between 1-2 hectares in size. ▪ Probably opportunities for other higher density areas around existing nodes – need to look at it further. ▪ Consider areas outside basin. ▪ Opportunities in Waipa Valley. ▪ Scion is a great example of cluster park.
	Holmes Capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eastgate - surprised by need for full review - is the tidiest commercial/industrial area in the city. ▪ Has morphed out from what it initially was thought to be. Can't condone what has happened along highway frontage. Can't change rules now that all the sections have been bought. ▪ Zone is unique so rules cannot be changed. ▪ However, unique issues/challenges of Rotorua apply to the speed of take-up. RDC has been burnt by Rerewhakaaitu industrial land issue. ▪ Landscaping has happened and achieved from EDL point of view. Have asked for landscape plans and given approval, and have asked for revisions to meet standards. ▪ Commercial H in principle could be replicated elsewhere in the district. ▪ Careful when rezoning or allocating industrial land – there is the demand and that the "right" land is available. ▪ Unique drivers that are very fragile. Strict conditions can be good but not necessary, in combination with other matters. ▪ How to implement development contributions without killing off development. ▪ Riri Street area – age of buildings, would not build something new in there. ▪ Building cost will always determine/drive external quality of buildings.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As applies to CBD – we don't have critical mass of good quality renters unlike Hamilton where rentals are national/international, though building costs are the same across New Zealand. ▪ Land reasonably priced, construction costs standard are issues particular to Rotorua. Some challenging issues from a market perspective need to be considered when formulating a plan. ▪ Ranolf wedge – market was there, quick take-off, proximity to CBD. Ease of access and street parking. ▪ On-site parking in CBD a contributing factor for area coming about. ▪ Too much land zoned resort more so CBD than Fenton Street which has overly restricted development. Some of the locations are not appropriate. Bayley's office an example of this. ▪ Review Resort D Zone requirements.
	Lake Okareka Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tarawera has 8 different groundwater sources. Okareka shallow lake and susceptible to pollution but will live with bigger picture (i.e. appreciative Lakes A not a focus of this review).
	Lake Tarawera Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree that there are some areas where the rules could be tweaked without wholesale change to the Lakes A Zone rule. ▪ Water quality certainly needs to be addressed and better reflected in the Lakes A rules – 380 contour rule relaxation needed. ▪ Any changes to the rules should be aimed at improving water quality – comfortable with everything else. ▪ Land use change can't be carte blanche – will need to be case by case. ▪ Really important issue, few blocks, Crater Lake Farm helpful to water quality issue. ▪ If have tools to utilise land better then we should use them. ▪ Revegetation can filter water coming through. ▪ Water data collected over last 18 months showing it's the farms introducing most of the nitrates into the lake.- need to focus on this. ▪ Needs to be more flexibility in Lakes A Zone to allow tools to address lake water quality. ▪ Is restrictive for Lakes A Zone.
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree with reducing number of Zones, they need rationalising. ▪ Careful rules and default provisions. ▪ Default status – may be use more limited discretionary or state it up front as non-complying, rather than not refer to it at all. ▪ Floating zones – some of Waikato Councils using this approach. ▪ Residential D and Residential C are two areas that need review, reconsideration. ▪ Commercial B1 could be refined. ▪ Keeping heights down in town – social issues need addressing. ▪ May be not big enough for residential living in town centre. ▪ Needs activity rules – provides certainty with land use and development. ▪ Genesis of Lakes A Zone predicated on landscape, later on water quality built in. ▪ Liquor licensing issues for Lakes A Zone.
	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduction in the number of zones and zone inconsistencies. ▪ Pointless having separate zones when activities the same. ▪ Rural E settlements – is mostly residential types ▪ Consolidation and extension.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
	Progress Ngongotaha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The minimum lot sizes don't dovetail with performances such as height/daylighting – very difficult to comply if developing a 150 m2 site. ▪ May be a need to review standards for Residential C Zone. ▪ Unclear what direction RDC wants here. ▪ Sale yards – light industry okay but not heavy industry. ▪ Trees to screen street residents, noise is an issue. ▪ Subletting to others and there is a problem. ▪ Difficult with industry so close to housing, need for buffer zones between. ▪ Needs to be fairness, people aware of areas when they shift in.
	Ray Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contaminated area needs to be improved. Council can invest and hold it, or develop it. ▪ Commercial activity needs to be encouraged in the Ranolf Street/residential D area. ▪ Block of land from Ranolf Street to the Boys High needs to be more defined. ▪ Encourage Commercial activities in there. ▪ Professionals, office with gardens etc, office development with greenbelt to soften. ▪ Slow down in commercial sector, next two years will be interesting. ▪ Needs large land areas – difficult to find suitable area. ▪ Existing regulations are firm. ▪ A lot of people trying to get CBD land – difficult to find. ▪ People want to be close to activity going on. ▪ Industrial zoning to be quite fine, problem is unlocking pieces of land without going too far out.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lakes A Zone too prohibitive, particularly with Rule 11 implications ▪ Interesting to see how Crater Lake Farm adopts rules. ▪ Issues of helicopters landings at luxury lodge properties. Luxury lodge activities will grow, there needs to be a provision for this ▪ Some of the requirements are restrictive – there seems to be an inconsistency in the application of Lakes A rules. ▪ Understand intent but practicality is difficult. ▪ Long term perspective, road zone makes life difficult, designations would make things easier. ▪ Allow more consistent approach taken throughout zones. ▪ Road designated with underlying zones. ▪ Think about zone boundaries. ▪ Unclear and unhelpful. ▪ Zone matching – recognised tourist areas such as Fairy Springs or more specific rules and performance s. standards for these areas. ▪ Development plans and Resort zones need to be more responsive. ▪ Opportunity to allow "minor activities" that can occur, anything to do with outdoor recreation- commercial. ▪ Generic minor – envelop applicability to suit – things can happen as long as not within X metres of boundary. ▪ Anything bringing more people to a site needs a consent. ▪ Education, use of DP and Bylaws and Harbourmaster management for activities on surface of lakes.
	Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the District Plan the most appropriate mechanism for this. ▪ Vision Rotorua supportive of concept particularly around Waipa. ▪ Commercialisation of forest wood products.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
SUBDIVISION		
15 Usable Hectares	Federated Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bit of a red-herring. Very few productive 15 ha blocks. ▪ Lifestyle block size needs review.
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needs review / change.
	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The arbitrary nature of this needs review – a lot of anecdotal evidence that 15ha not economically viable.
Boundary Adjustments	Homes Capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Careful consideration of this. People have bought lots in the belief that boundary adjustments can occur. ▪ Need to look at environmental effects not just rules especially in regard to large farm blocks. ▪ Smaller production units have got to be better for the environment.
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Boundary adjustments – change the plan. ▪ Balance is there, minimum size, no maximum size. ▪ 20m frontage a good tool.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rules need to be reviewed and clarified as to the intent of what council is wanting to achieve.
	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Needs to be flexibility, case by case assessment required rather than blanket rule ▪ Relevant assessment on specific situations especially where applications make sense. ▪ Rules can be counter-productive to district.
Consent conditions	BSK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There needs to be a link between what planning is trying to achieve with conservation covenants and matching this with rates remission of the policy. ▪ Long-term maintenance costs associated with protection areas need to be looked at. ▪ 12 hour storage (Kaharoa Scheme)– bit of a grey area when signing off a subdivision.
	Department of Conservation New Zealand Institute of Surveyors Rotoma/Rotoehu Resident and Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May be could look at conditions regarding cat and dog management for subdivisions adjacent to scenic reserves. ▪ Will need to look at process needed if the new plan makes existing consent notices redundant. ▪ Shared driveways – minimum requirements need to be stated and adhered to.
Consent process	BSK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protection of easements always get lost on consents.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stormwater flow paths - same issue as with storm water – can say it can be treated, but not necessarily detailed design treatment system provided at consent stage. ▪ CP Engineering, knocking out those who choose to become chartered.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chicken before the egg, signing off building platform design before built. Test and satisfy that S106 can be built on, asked to go beyond section 106 matters commonly should be triggered at building consent stage. ▪ To provide building platform designed up front is not suitable – Rotorua specific issue.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
Lakes A Zone	Lake Okareka Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Association aware of a broad range of opinions. If the 44 new lots come on stream, and Crater Lake Park, that would probably be enough. The Environment Court decision on Lakes A Zone was pretty tough. ▪ Any major subdivision would change the make-up and feel of Okareka. ▪ Lake area very much sought after. ▪ Subdivision may not be the only answer – there will be stormwater management issues.
Lifestyle lots	Lake Rerewhakaaitu Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lifestylers not highly participative part of the community. ▪ Oppose the village concept or turning it into a village. Don't like the Brunswick Park model either. ▪ Trend happening and will continue: farms amalgamating and flicking off lifestyle lot. ▪ Will probably come on later than Waikite/Ngakuru. ▪ Expectations from lifestylers that RDC will supply water.
	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors Vision Rotorua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Also need review – thresholds too inflexible. ▪ Flexibility required around lifestyle developments. ▪ Subdivision activity that does not diminish quality of rural environment.
Lot sizes	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A lot of controlled activities have subjective words (e.g. "to the satisfaction of") – should be more objective. ▪ Why have sizes defined, need to concentrate on effects of activities. ▪ Magical numbers should not drive things, need to focus on outcomes achieved and needs to be flexibility in sizes, shapes, etc. ▪ Rules determine development capacity and result in 'mini' structure plans. ▪ Lifestyle lot – default density provisions. ▪ Look at capacity for density, and assumptions that inform this. ▪ High density provisions unworkable – everything is non-complying. Refer to measurable standards discussion.
	Property Valuers Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Certainty is important, simpler and clearer. ▪ In town lot sizes 900m² into 450m² in Residential B is reasonable, ▪ Rural A15 ha is it viable? Is it arbitrary? ▪ A lot of pressure for lifestyle blocks – quite restrictive. There may be a willingness to let go of the Rural A character, e.g., Hawthornden Drive. Review of lifestyle lot allocation – outdated and more thought needed.
Multiple owned Maori land	Rotoiti Community Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lot of Maori multiply owned land at Lake Rotoiti caught up in Rule 11 constraints. Need to find some way of making land able to be used. ▪ Need to find ways of unlocking potential of multiply owned Maori land. ▪ Whatever is required to improve lake water quality the community would be prepared to support. ▪ Preference for bush and Revegetation of sites ▪ Houses okay but there has to be other options. ▪ EBOP advocated subdivision as prime mechanism to reduce nutrient – support this.
Natural hazards	BSK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Positives to spreading out and using more land. ▪ Overland flow paths are one of the major considerations. ▪ Hardest engineering issue is the overland flow path, sufficient space around building to allow for sufficient treatment.
Protection lots	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opotiki District Council's "scrubby corner" rule – may be applicable to RDC.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
Rural	Bright Economy Advisory Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to be wary that carve off of lifestyle lots is a one-off capital gain – mindful of other impacts such as traffic congestion – Brunswick Park. ▪ Be wary of taking 15 ha of productive land out of production. ▪ Need to plan for fact that anything with lake views will want to be subdivided – need to manage that. ▪ Lifestyle choice / variety needs to be facilitated. ▪ Productive land out of agriculture into houses in a hamlet – more rewarding – rest of land remains in income earning capacity. ▪ Need to think about economic growth to community. ▪ Problems with Council provision of infrastructure. ▪ Subdivision imposition-What is the effect, what do we want in future?
	Fonterra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do not want “holus bolus” lifestyle lot subdivision- particularly around Fonterra factory (reverse sensitivity issue). Reverse sensitivity- major issue-looking to district plan to give effect to. ▪ Woolvern Crescent-rezone thru district plan? ▪ RDI there are no appropriate sites. Lease running out and they will need a new site in a couple of year's time. District plan review may be a good opportunity to explore appropriately zoned land for such activities around Reporoa. Need highway access and need to be close to Reporoa
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brunswick Park a problem – reticulation may trigger desire for further subdivision.
	MTEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interest in seeing something new. ▪ EBOP pressuring farmers – farmers looking at alternative options, some looking at subdivision, needs to be more reflection of this. ▪ Incentives for retirement lots. ▪ Not keen on TDR's – need to be looked at before council goes down that track. ▪ What came out of structure plans to guide this. ▪ Is own land but now has a community interest in this.
	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Problem with rural character and amenity, difficult to apply in practice. ▪ Unclear what the district is trying to achieve. ▪ Huge pressure for lifestyle blocks, largely because of lack of choice for people where they want to live. ▪ Huge turnover. ▪ Productive land / environmental lots – bush protection etc, had to fight pretty hard to achieve good environmental outcomes – lots of missed opportunities. ▪ What is the vision for rural living? ▪ Existing plan does not seem to deliver a good environmental outcome, instead it tries to be fair to all landowners – but popularity of lifestyle lots has impacted implementation. ▪ If there is a net environmental gain, would be supportive. ▪ Land taken out of agricultural production needs to be an incentive to do this. ▪ Huge part of economy is rural based. Needs to be other options rather than lifestyle. Not one size fits all. ▪ Not responding to informed driver – cannot rely on real estate agents perceived demand.
	Property Valuers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Using subdivision as a tool to generate income – turnover of lifestyle blocks. ▪ Population growth outflow.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
Strategic	DHB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potable water, sanitation, needs to be best fit. ▪ Concerns over mixed land use areas, where day care facilities may be right next to motorways. ▪ Pro-reticulation ▪ Urban infill – still needs to provide for private open space ▪ No connectivity- this requires attention ▪ Open public space still required – linked to subdivision rules. Increased density can impinge on individual space. ▪ Connectivity often compromised, need open public space. ▪ Promote alternative active transport ▪ Mindful of future development potential of development.
Subdivision and lake water quality	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In 1993 may have been able to hold the fort – those areas not developed, ring fence now, going to have to fight rear guard action in relation to lake water quality. ▪ Would like to see a change in emphasis around subdivision so it is environmentally enhancing – not just about fencing off – need incentives around environmentally positive outcomes. ▪ Balance subdivision with environmental enhancement, not just revegetation and planting.
Tarawera Road	Lake Okareka Ratepayers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development would be attractive if it goes some way to reducing ratepayer costs of reticulation. ▪ Further development would need to address cycleway traffic and cyclist safety – carriageway is quite narrow and very busy already with variety of vehicle types/users.–. buses, campervans, people with boats, etc. ▪ Subdivision along Tarawera Road would also impact.
Transferable Development Rights(TDR's)	Department of Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TDR's do have a role if Council is happy with trade-offs. ▪ More restrictive criteria for TDR's – not so many "credits".
	Federated Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unless Council is going to retrospectively assess already retired areas, there is not much point. ▪ Public access issues – happy to retire/protect land but do not want people tramping through uninvited. ▪ Retire areas that can't be used, fenced. ▪ Offer retirement credits for the land.
	Holmes Capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have been working with Western Bay. ▪ Pitfalls are the compliance issues especially around revegetation. ▪ Mechanism that recognises developers and landowners protecting native forest. Protect as a trade-off. Way to the future and good to see it in the new plan. ▪ Aligns with principle of developers and developer regime of enhancing the environment.
	Luke Martin New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Doesn't favour TDR's. Need to be mindful of flow-on effects, for other areas. ▪ Should be looked at. ▪ Have been good in WBOP, could be room for improvement. ▪ Confusion between conservation lots and TDRs.
	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WBOP example – may be a possibility.
	Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit has some concerns. Note Transit comments. No certainty, randomness and inappropriate location. ▪ Need to actually do the assessment, need monitoring and administrative support.

Issue	Stakeholder	Comment
Urban infill	Canmap Hawley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Urban renewal / Residential C. Is Residential C in the right place? Yes, fits within classic urban design model – structure plans for each block may be a way to go – has benefits but may be some issues. ▪ Perth 'liveable cities' in floating zones- may be able to be used ▪ Higher amenity and higher density – remove minimum lot size; have bulk / location rules that are outcome focussed. ▪ Replace minimum lot size with something that provides more flexibility which will possibly go some way to addressing some of the amenity issues it throws up. ▪ Defining development / demand - more about meeting certain standards, these should be specified. ▪ It is a struggle to find land and a struggle to use provisions to make this work. ▪ Increased involvement in this. Opportunities are very limited. ▪ Need to consider increased height rules. ▪ Opportunity to have more permissive rules with different sets of assessment criteria – rule incentives for replacement of buildings. ▪ Design principles around high density residential activities.
	Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trend to lower density of housing, don't see same amenity value of garden and lifestyle. ▪ Otonga/Springfield – all concrete, need to be changed. ▪ May be subdivision regulation based on amenity value as opposed to minimum lot sizes. ▪ Provide for lower density, requirement for space about buildings – important.
	Luke Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Urban infill going to occur anyway – fuelled by demand for smaller sites. ▪ On saying that, the subdivisions out along Western / Pioneer Roads have proved the point re the opposite.
	Sigma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Controlled activity tends to downplay the need to consider neighbours effects. Criteria needs to be beefed up and used more. ▪ Design and lay-out needs to be more specific.
	Stamm Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is it a good thing in character areas such as Lynmore? ▪ Sections high density development in those older areas. The more it is subdivided the more the character depreciates.

4 FRESH IDEAS – COMMUNITY FEEDBACK – PHASE 3

Six Hui were organized to talk about the project and were held at:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| ▪ Hinemoa Point Marae, Owkata | Saturday, 15 March 2008 |
| ▪ Waiteti Marae, Ngongotaha | Saturday, 29 March 2008 |
| ▪ Te Pakira Marae, Whakarewarewa | Saturday, 5 April 2008 |
| ▪ Te Waititi Marae, Rotoiti | Sunday, 6 April 2008 |
| ▪ Te Papaouru Marae, Ohinemutu | Saturday, 19 April 2008 |
| ▪ Te Takinga Marae, Mourea | Saturday, 3 May 2008 |

At each Hui, staff from Council gave a presentation on the key aspects of the district plan and the review process. The presentation concluded with 'conversation starters' that were tailored around a number of issues considered relevant to attendees. For example:

- Future development options for multiple-owned Maori land.
- Papakainga-style living
- The possible resource consent requirements when building work is proposed on the Marae.

A broad range of issues emerged from the discussions. Attendees had the opportunity to speak about issues that concerned them, and no constraint was placed on whether it had to be strictly about the District Plan. All of the meeting notes from the six Hui have been combined into a single database and presented in the following table. It is evident that there were a range of different opinions and perspectives given on the same topic or theme, irrespective of which Hui the issue was raised. The opportunity was taken to highlight a range of issues with Council functions (corporate governance) and infrastructure such as roading and waste management. For brevity those issues not of direct relevance to the purpose and functions of a District Plan have been deleted from the following summary.

Issues raised at the Fresh Ideas Marae Hui

Theme/Topic	Comment Summary	Host Marae
Community health/safety	Need to look at reasons for crime. Mental health, alcohol, drug abuse by young. Need stable healthy community to make sure these issues are managed.	Te Waititi (Rotoiti) 6 April 2008
Consultation	Council must get serious and give all the discussion some practical application, and not just tick the consultation box and then go and do what you want.	Hinemoa Point (Owhata), 15 March 2008
	Hope that someone will listen, a lot that has not been done in the past. Want to be part of the process. Maori need to be involved in the process.	Hinemoa Point (Owhata), 15 March 2008
	We cannot complain that we have not been consulted. Commends communication approach – particularly the involvement of Mauriora Kingi and Bella Tait.	Te Pakira (Whakarewarewa) 5 April 2008
	Council may wish to speak with Gloria Hughes who is a representative of the Elders of Marae Council of Pukenga Koeke o Te Arawa. The Council meets 4 times a year and September may be the ideal time to speak with her.	
	Council should have come to Marae first – not at Stage 3. Council needs to listen and act. Council staff are more active and responsive to Maori than they used to be. However, there is still a lack of 'real' Maori political representation. Existing feedback and interconnection with Council is not working for us. Te Arawa Standing Committee up for review – other alternative is to look at Maori representation on Council and address properly. At EBOP level, starting to have a real sway on how they are operating. Also starting to see this at a national level, people now have to listen to Maori.	Te Waititi (Rotoiti) 6 April 2008

Theme/Topic	Comment Summary	Host Marae
	<p>Influence over local authority is marginalized: need to be brought into the centre. Need for own representative at Council level and better representation.</p> <p>At Ratepayer Association level, Community Board represents Pakeha interests, not effective for Maori.</p> <p>Lake Rotoiti is just one for them, needs to be more inclusive. Rotoma/Rotoehu Ratepayers Association effective but land is all Iwi.</p> <p>Also need different pathways into council. Trusts and Incorporations need to be at the seat with Council. This is important – there needs to be a relationship at this level.</p> <p>Working with Howard Broad, looking at impact of Police on Maori. Ministry of Health, whanau-ora, Health Impact Assessment. Impact of Maori well-being on whole community. Emphasis put on cars/trucks not on the community.</p> <p>How do we continue to dialogue with people? Perhaps through the Runanga. Perhaps a MOU at a political level.</p> <p>None of the issues being discussed here today are new. Some should have been ticked off by now. Council needs to do more than listen, needs to act.</p>	<p>Waiteti (Ngongotaha) 29 March 2008</p>
Development	<p>Hearing something about developing multiple-owned land since 1955, as yet nothing has happened. Need to cater for Maori householders. Advantage to have Mana Whenua in community – adds considerable value to an area because Maori families are not going to leave (Housing is intergenerational). Housing is also integral to good health and development of the community. Must enable Maori who have land to develop.</p> <p>Banks do not provide loans for Papakainga. Council needs to be more responsive.</p> <p>Density of housing in Rural Zone needs to be looked at in relation to multiple owned Maori land.</p> <p>Should not take reserve contributions/development contributions from Mana Whenua.</p> <p>Create new zone for ancestral Maori land.</p> <p>History and culture is all about lakes.</p> <p>Perhaps working in with Maori Land Court, to utilise land that is vacant in a better way. Huge undeveloped tracts of land in urban area.</p> <p>Council has been aware of these issues for a number of years. We want to see some progress - regress on these issues. Will support any attempt by Council to resolve Papakainga issues.</p> <p>Looking to develop Cookson Road (9B13 Block) – have Maori Land Court consent to partition.</p> <p>Maori land should not be treated the same way as general land, because Maori will not get a fair deal.</p> <p>The only land that is left for development is in Maori ownership. There is pressure placed on Maori to use the land now.</p> <p>Multiple owned land – need to look at whether reserve contribution should be levied on these areas.</p>	<p>Hinemoa Point (Owhata), 15 March 2008</p> <p>Te Pakira (Whakarewarewa) 5 April 2008</p>

Theme/Topic	Comment Summary	Host Marae
	<p>Need to think sustainably and the role Maori land could play in this. Take for example the subdivision along Vaughan Road, there is a 1 acre property next door to it that is used to graze horses. Its Maori land - consider using these areas for greenbelt, set land apart for oxygen producing purposes – carbon credit value. Council should recognise, assist, and reward such initiatives.</p> <p>Rub between millionaires and Tangata Whenua out in areas like Hinemoa Point and other lakeside areas, and its obvious who becomes the victim of development. Consider plight and options of landowners.</p>	Te Papaouru (Ohinemutu) 19 April 2008
	<p>Nothing has changed past Owata – this side of town always misses out.</p> <p>The current District Plan has restricted development. Need to improve economic output of District Plan.</p> <p>Free up land around district to provide more development opportunities.</p> <p>Other side of coin is how this may impact rural areas and people living there now. Especially how it impacts on Iwi and hapu. If it becomes too freed up we may get inappropriate activities. Maintaining environmental balance around Rotoiti. Need to look at objectives for future land use. Marama Point – a lot of debate and discussion around impacts of this on the environment of the area. Some say it is good, others say it is bad.</p> <p>Lake environs are the important issue. We would like to see a higher level of protection.</p> <p>Council need to be aware of papakainga aspirations.</p> <p>Water supply for Mourea has taken 16 years. Water and sewerage major issues facing development projects in Mourea. Also very expensive. Our people don't come home to build here and use their land for this reason. Hope/want the water to be available and affordable. Trying hard to get infrastructure.</p>	Te Takinga (Mourea) 3 May 2008
	<p>Council has never been committed to papakainga – too scared they will end up as “Maori slums”.</p> <p>Current standard of housing very bad for health/social impacts.</p> <p>Yes to more policy, no to more regulation.</p> <p>How serious is Council in helping/assisting the development of Maori land and Papakainga? If serious, then we need to address/overcome the barriers. Funding/mortgage a key issue – banks do not want to put money into multiple- owned Maori land. A lot of children living with grandparents or going to Australia; need to keep them home. This is the right time to talk though, with central government putting through the law about affordable housing.</p> <p>Rotoiti has one of the few operating papakainga – but it was hard. Struggle to get it up and running. Land cannot be sold. Houses not for sale outside the Tipuna. License to occupy stays with that Tipuna. Land stays with descendants – house can be moved. Rotoma, Totara, and Waitangi are all areas set aside for Papakainga but nothing happening.</p> <p>Papakainga – 2000 m² size lots. Need to look at this to make sure there is no wastage.</p> <p>Need to bring all the agendas together to get effective change.</p> <p>Limited Access highways a major barrier to development.</p>	Te Waiiti (Rotoiti) 6 April 2008

Theme/Topic	Comment Summary	Host Marae
	<p>Landscape assessments being undertaken by Council are the opportunity for the Incorporation to get together to plan out what is required for the area. Look at areas for new settlements, rest homes for the area. See area suitable for a lakeside village that can create employment for itself. Start off with vision and develop this alongside Council.</p> <p>Infrastructure support will be required if land beyond Gisborne Point is developed as papakainga. Development contributions need to be reviewed. Waiver for contribution levies – could land be placed in Maori Reserve not Council reserve?</p> <p>Ngati Pikiaio runanga survey shows level of housing is shocking. What is RDC doing for us as a Maori community – not much, need to do better. No input into community, what is the Council there for? Maori need to have influence to make sure it is delivering.</p> <p>Most kids off to Australia as there is nothing here – housing, employment, health, transport wise – Council needs to address this. Community not getting services that it requires.</p> <p>All Maori land should be regarded as having heritage value</p> <p>Always a consent cost – sometimes prohibitive to developer.</p> <p>Eastern Arterial Motorway: will this be reassessed? Will this reduce heavy traffic flow? Bulk of traffic goes to lakes district. Re-evaluate this with Transit, Ngapuna holding tight saying “no motorway”. Threat to health and environment</p>	<p>Waiteti (Ngongotaha) 29 March 2008</p> <p>Te Papaouru (Ohinemutu) 19 April 2008</p>
District Plan	<p>Please think about the district plan and how long Maori have been around, when it was first mooted it was challenged. Could use it to hold Whakapapa and stories.</p> <p>Lengthy complex document and commend effort to make it easier to use for ordinary folk. Words/language has impact on how it is interpreted.</p> <p>How does the Council take all the issues and turn them into a District Plan that reflects all community views?</p> <p>How successful has the current plan been in achieving Maori objectives? Probably not that successful.</p> <p>Make the resource consent process as simple as possible. Plan needs to be clearer about what does and does not require consent.</p> <p>Ngati Rangiwewehi will be in touch re progressing its Iwi Management Plan.</p>	<p>Hinemoa Point (Owhata), 15 March 2008</p> <p>Te Takinga (Mourea) 3 May 2008</p> <p>Waiteti (Ngongotaha) 29 March 2008</p>
Issues affecting Marae	<p><u>Hinemihini and Hurunga Marae.</u> Road noise starting to affect Marae. Also noise from Airport. Also concerns about smells from Ngapuna – waste water plant right next to Marae. Hona Road speed limits need to be looked at.</p> <p><u>Hinemoa Point.</u> Hinemoa Point is a special character area, and if the district plan doesn't reflect this it should. Also a concern about Marae and Marae boundaries. Marae is a place of peace. Activities on other side of fence/boundary can affect that.</p>	<p>Hinemoa Point (Owhata), 15 March 2008</p>

Theme/Topic	Comment Summary	Host Marae
	<p>Roads – Te Roro o terangi, Galvins, Hinemoa Point, all part of Whenua. Hinemoa Point Road is most accessible and used in the community. Roadway speed needs to be addressed, safety for children. Owhata Road – big open drain – needs to be sorted. Should be covered up, grate on end to stop rubbish getting into lake. There have been major accidents. Road sealing needs to be completed. Drainage reserve being used to park cars. Streetlights, judder bars and traffic calming should be investigated. Street numbering needs to be looked at, whole picture as a residential area.</p> <p>Early Bird Childcare Centre – resource consent, other owners need to be involved in consultation process. With childcare centre being established – there will be a lot more traffic</p> <p>Pleased sewerage is going through – this is a positive.</p>	
	<p>Would like to have the ability to close the road when a tangi is on. Is it something we can manage through the District Plan?</p> <p>There is an opportunity - could be solved through having another access into the village, may be through FRI campus.</p>	<p>Te Pakira (Whakarewarewa) 5 April 2008</p>
	<p><u>Ohinemutu</u>. Status as Special Character Area – we weren't consulted about it – don't know what it means.</p> <p>Meeting house of huge significance to Te Arawa. No money comes into Marae to provide for visitors. Might be time to fence area to stop people coming through. May result in ban of visitors to maintain privacy of Marae. Council only pays for cleaning of toilets.</p> <p>Geothermal bores turned off 1.5 km from Whaka. How does Iwi get involved in the new bores? Ngati Whakaue Geothermal Committee – Iwi need to be informed. When decision made to cap bores, it was just when finished decorating, Ngawha blew up under whare. This is an ongoing problem with no money coming to replace/repair. Worried about ngawha under Marae – live with problems.</p> <p>There should be a special reduction and waiver for building fees due to high cultural and tourism values.</p> <p>8 entrances/exits to this pa. Roads have remained as they have for many years yet now there are more and more vehicles. Ohinemutu streets – Empowering Bill 1972 – until this time roads not good. If anything is to be looked at – look at this Bill first. Roads are very narrow, major problem, fortunately there are no buses that visit.</p> <p>If tangi, Hui, wedding – parking and getting in or out is terrible. Need to have a look at alternate access ways. Need to put a stop to double parking</p> <p>Every time that the craft market is here the road is blocked – Cars cannot get in or out. Important that our entrance to the Marae is fully maintained as it is the only entrance to the Marae and community.</p> <p>Wheelbarrows full of broken beer bottles – linkage to liquor ban, drop bottles on outskirts.</p> <p>When St Faiths becomes cathedral it will increase usage.</p> <p>Kiharoa Street – one person has key to post.</p>	<p>Te Papaouru (Ohinemutu) 19 April 2008</p>
	<p><u>Ngapuna Marae</u>. High noise levels from industry around Ngapuna affects the Marae and houses around it. Vibrations can pierce through walls. Noise goes through pane of glass. Noise levels do exceed District Plan levels and needs to be dealt with. Protect Ngapuna village – continual intrusiveness of noise.</p>	

Theme/Topic	Comment Summary	Host Marae
	<p>Before the submissions to the 2008 Annual Plan close have a meeting at Awahou to talk about the support for a community sewerage scheme. From this meeting it is hoped there could be a submission to the Draft Annual Plan.</p>	<p>Waiteti (Ngongotaha) 29 March 2008</p>
Lakes/lake water quality	<p>Important Council talks to people about lakefront development. Need to talk to the right people.</p>	<p>Te Papaouru (Ohinemutu) 19 April 2008</p>
	<p>The weed along the lakefront needs sorting. Only need to go along Ohinemutu, between the gate and the church - very smelly.</p>	
	<p>Hugely difficult juggling act getting a resolution that meets the people's needs. There needs to be a happy medium.</p>	<p>Te Takinga (Mourea) 3 May 2008</p>
	<p>Kaituna floodgates – when the scheme was undertaken downstream flood gates were not removed to maintain access to boats. If floodgates removed the water would flow faster. The problem is the control gates – a faster flow is needed. Consent comes up in 2012 – Maori should push for gates being opened.</p>	
	<p>Scientific study on Okere floodgates needed as a result of activities on the land, opening floodgates would need to consider other river users (e.g. rafters) – may cause a lot of objection. Too many studies done and not enough talking to local people. Is a major issue.</p>	
	<p>Paru into Rotoiti needs to be cleaned up.</p>	
	<p>Interested to hear Council's view on options to improve water quality.</p>	
	<p>A lot being done but more can be done. Require action at this end of the lake when the problem is in Lake Rotorua. Fish in Rotorua are always covered in pollution. Sewerage waste is a problem in city but solutions are usually put somewhere else. History of night soil being dumped at Sulphur Point – should be dredged. It wouldn't be too much of a problem to achieve. Sulphur Point and silt on the bottom - need to be careful how it is dredged if that is pursued as an option.</p>	
	<p>Dredging Sulphur Point has merit but have to be mindful of what it could/would stir up.</p>	
	<p>Why isn't Mourea being reticulated (and Marae)?</p>	
	<p>Lake Rotoiti - rising levels, lost beaches, when can we have the beaches back? About 12 yards of lakeshore not there now.</p>	
	<p>What are the implications of floodgates? Hear a lot about Ohau Channel. Where is the recent funding from Government going to go (\$74m)?</p>	
	<p>Council will circulate issues paper around lake water quality to hopefully clarify some of these issues. Treasury are coming to Council to establish roll-out of \$72m funding. Build up of nutrients and Lake Siltation is the issue – needs funding.</p>	
	<p>The wall is acknowledgement that the main issue is Rotorua. Wall is an immediate fix type situation, it is a start. Hopefully wall will assist in showing positive signs. Okawa Bay showing signs of recovery.</p>	

Theme/Topic	Comment Summary	Host Marae
	<p>Lake too high – beaches lost. Level has to go back to normal and want this minuted. Beaches important – Maori heritage, but where is the foreshore at Rotoiti? Lakes Rotoma and Rotorua have beaches. Lake has to go down to what it used to be. Rotoiti lakebed should be lowered by 2m – Kaituna/Maketu Strategy Group to come out and have a look.</p> <p>Need to use water properly; lake degradation has caused many problems to koro and kuia. How many more of our kaumatua have to die because of the lake?</p> <p>Are there any plans to close off Lake Rotorua and stop Ohau Channel? The Ohau Channel wall is a farce.</p> <p>Looking after Maori land and water is the key priority for Maori.</p> <p>Council should make it a priority to remove the stop gates.</p> <p>There is an issue of when permits run out on jetties. The whole lakeshore has many jetties; there is a need to manage this.</p>	<p>Te Waiiti (Rotoiti) 6 April 2008</p>
	<p>How does water and lake water quality link into the District Plan?</p>	<p>Waiteti (Ngongotaha) 29 March 2008</p>
<p>Streams/stream water quality</p>	<p>Utuhina Stream is filthy – does this come from Lee Brothers. Springfield clear – Utuhina at the mouth is not.</p>	<p>Te Papaouru (Ohinemutu) 19 April 2008</p>
<p>Waahi Tapu</p>	<p>Owhatiura Hill, tractor was seen there going down the hill and ploughing/excavating – koiwi on sides of hill. Compliance issues.</p>	<p>Te Papaouru (Ohinemutu) 19 April 2008</p>

5 FRESH IDEAS FROM COUNCIL STAFF

Council staff have for some years been compiling issues with the existing district plan in preparation for a major review.

Section 5.1 details the district-wide, or 'big picture' issues that have been put up for consideration in the review phase.

Section 5.2 details the issues that have been raised with specific chapters or zones in the existing district plan.

Section 5.3 details the issues that have been raised with specific planning maps.

5.1 DISTRICT-WIDE ISSUES

The following issues are considered district-wide, or major, as they are considered relevant to more than one zone. Where possible the same groupings used in Section 2 have been adopted.

5.1.1 *Water quality*

5.1.1.1 *General.* Amendments to the District plan are needed to better address issues such as water quality and the surrounding environment.

5.1.1.2 *Buffers from streams.* There are no specific requirements under the district plan to set buildings back from natural streams or watercourses that are less than 3 metres wide - consider appropriateness of imposing a setback requirement from any drainage channel.

5.1.1.3 *Buffers from lake edges.* Within the Rural zones there is a 25 metre buffer for buildings; however, this is reduced to 10 metres or 2.5 metres in other zones. The new district plan should consider a buffer along the lake margin where no man-made structures, decking, buildings etc can be built without resource consent. To go with the rules, strong policies about retaining the landscape, habitat and natural character of the lake margin are needed. Council should consider how it can encourage sympathetic landscaping/earthworks that complement the natural character.

5.1.1.4 *Protection of groundwater and groundwater recharge areas.* Groundwater resources and recharge areas are important resources and should be protected. The land use activities in and around groundwater systems need to be managed in a way that will not lead to deterioration of the resource. Need to discuss how the district plan can support that process.

5.1.1.5 *Potable water supply.* A major issue for Council's Regulatory department when assessing subdivision applications. Water tanks, particularly for rural areas, are an emerging issue in relation to sustainable housing. Potable water will need a clear definition in the new plan.

5.1.2 *Amenity*

5.1.2.1 *Buffers.* The requirements in relation to the reduction of yard buffers as a resource consent activity needs to be addressed. Currently, if neighbours' approval is given, yard buffers can be reduced as controlled activities, which Council has no powers to decline. Yard encroachments have the potential to significantly alter residential character and affect amenity values. Investigate the appropriateness of tightening up current provisions to allow yard encroachments only in exceptional circumstances. Links to housing density must be considered, as encroachment on buffers is a consequence of increasing densities and reduced section sizes.

- 5.1.2.2 *Brothels*. Is a Brothel a 'Home Based Business' under current district plan provisions? If so, is this appropriate? Does the district plan need to develop objectives/policies/rules relating to the location and operation of brothels to avoid, remedy or mitigate their potential adverse environmental effects, or is this addressed effectively within Council Bylaws? Clarification required. Consider feasibility of introducing a minimum distance from educational institutions; special controls on signage etc.
- 5.1.2.3 *Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED)*. The district plan does not currently contain Objectives/Policies/Rules relating to CPTED. The RMA provides for Council to incorporate such provisions into the district plan. However, there needs to be a decision made as to whether CPTED is better addressed through regulatory or non-regulatory means. Rules may be appropriate for subdivisions (e.g. restrictions on fencing off reserve areas, walkways, street layout, landscaping etc and layout for industrial/business parks also). It is noted that the Ten Year plan states that CPTED principles will be incorporated into the district plan policy framework to meet community outcomes (eg 'a safe and caring community').
- 5.1.2.4 *Open spaces*. Investigate accessibility to reserves and open spaces from rural and urban zones.
- 5.1.2.5 *Urban Design Protocol (UDP)*. Council should give consideration to becoming a signatory to the UDP.
- 5.1.2.6 *Infill housing and parking*. As section size decreases in the urban area, an increasing proportion of a section is used for hard surface development for driveways, turning and parking. Issues arise in relation to water runoff, amenity (reduced garden/green space/trees), increasing amounts of 1.8 m fencing, encroachment on neighbour space (especially for turning), safety (especially for children and pets) and roadside parking. Review the rules on parking and turning in relation to the above issues.
- 5.1.2.7 *Trees*. With smaller section sizes, trees are more restricted to boundaries, and consequently are increasingly likely to affect neighbour amenity. While trees are desirable for amenity purposes, their effects on neighbours are potentially increasing in terms of shading, leaf fall, overhang, root invasion, etc. Currently trees with such effects are not subject to setback rules, despite their effects overlapping with the effects of buildings (which setback rules are designed to manage). Discuss the options for allowing neighbours to influence tree size and shape on adjacent land.
- 5.1.2.8 *Piggeries*. Establish buffer distances with plan rules? E.g. to mitigate effects of odour, dust and noise. There may be a national standard for piggeries by the time the district plan is reviewed.
- 5.1.2.9 *Signs*. Rules need to be addressed in all zones.
- 5.1.2.10 *Green Belt*. The green belt between Ngongotaha and Rotorua should be maintained.

5.1.3 **Natural Hazards**

- 5.1.3.1 *General*. A function of Council is to control the actual or potential effects of the use and development of land, including for the purposes of avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards. Councils can achieve this by including rules to manage subdivision or other development proposals on the rural/urban interface in relation to fire hazard (e.g. a district plan could require residential units not within the normal water supply area to provide water storage for fire fighting; access issues could also be addressed). Investigate existing district plan provisions and the appropriateness of strengthening these or developing additional provisions to address the points raised by the National Rural Fire Authority. The district has earthquake-prone lands (for example Rotoma) for which geotechnical survey needs to be carried out. Requirements for relocatable buildings in hazard areas need to be researched.
- 5.1.3.2 *Groundwater*. The eastern area from Ngapuna to the airport, and particularly northwest of Vaughan Road and the higher ground beyond, has high ground water levels and flows that can have a significant impact

on subdivision development. The area of high water table is currently being defined, and we should consider how the issue can be addressed in the district plan.

- 5.1.3.3 *Geothermal bores.* There are many old and unmapped bores in the geothermal parts of Rotorua that represent a potential hazard. Mechanisms for ensuring that they are located and made safe need to be explored, particularly if any redevelopment of a site is proposed.
- 5.1.3.4 *Subsoil issues in the Western Road locality.* The implications are being investigated and more research may be necessary on the spatial extent of these hazards, particularly in the context of future growth scenarios being proposed through the structure planning exercise.
- 5.1.3.5 *Global Warming.* Review options to address its effects in the next district plan.

5.1.4 *Utilities and Infrastructure*

- 5.1.4.1 *District plan content.* There have been discussions on the possibility of removing engineering and other technical standards from the district plan. This is a discussion that will need to be progressed and an agreement reached throughout the development of the district plan review. The review will need to encompass network utilities and designations as well as associated issues related to roads, network utilities and engineering standards.
- 5.1.4.2 *Transpower.* The New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP34:2001) sets out separation distance requirements for works and construction of buildings near lines and poles. A number of Councils are adopting rules within their district plans to align with the required separation distances. Investigate the appropriateness of adopting provisions within the plan to ensure that safe distances are maintained where subdivision and development occurs in close proximity to electricity lines and poles.

5.1.5 *Land use management considerations*

- 5.1.5.1 *Temporary activities.* The district plan does not currently provide for 'temporary activities'. Investigate the appropriateness of including a definition for 'temporary activities' in the plan along with rules/policies/objectives. Temporary activities range from cultural 'events' to filming for movies or advertisements. Temporary activities could be provided for as permitted activities, but subject to performance standards (e.g. limits on length of time of activity and use of amplified music). Auckland City Council Isthmus Rule 4A.C is a good reference to start. See also Tauranga City Council rules. The district plan needs to provide for and recognise that temporary activities will occur in the district, and if they are undertaken in a manner that does not compromise the environment then they may not require a resource consent. Need to look hard at the environmental effects that will stem from temporary activities, and the degree of control over these effects that Council will need to exercise.
- 5.1.5.2 *Private Schools.* A request was received from the Ministry of Education and Catholic Diocese of Hamilton to include provisions relating to catholic schools in the district plan. The Minister of Education can designate public schools; a Diocese cannot. Also applies to Kohanga and Kura that are not within Ministry of Education management. Investigate appropriateness of including provisions for private schools in the plan, as all schools have same effects on the environment irrespective of who is managing. Need to think about activity classification status for schools so that those education institutes without designating powers can be adequately provided for.
- 5.1.5.3 *Sustainable buildings/energy efficient buildings.* The district plan may be able to better promote sustainable building/energy efficient buildings [e.g. by promoting designs that go further than the Building Act towards sustainability, small scale renewables (e.g. photovoltaic roof panels, solar water heating), grey water

recycling, and water harvesting], and controlling development that does not meet sustainability criteria. Design Guides produced in the UK promote sustainable design and domestic renewables. Investigate appropriateness of promoting sustainable/energy efficient building.

- 5.1.5.4 *Helicopters.* Review the prohibited activity status for helicopter landing areas, particularly where this relates to activities of a commercial nature that may be located in the Residential Zone. The plan should recognise that helicopter activity can occur safely and with a minimum of noise impact if it is sympathetic to surroundings. There is also a need to look at the location of boutique lodges and such that may attract helicopter transport for clientele, and where appropriate landing locations either in or out of residential zones could be supported.
- 5.1.5.5 *Sleepouts.* Sleepouts are not specifically defined by the current district plan. They are instead treated as 'accessory buildings', which are permitted if they meet the performance standards for the zone. However, many are verging on being full-blown household units. As well as definitions, density and site coverage rules need to be reviewed; the size and function of accessory buildings need to be reviewed.
- 5.1.5.6 *Affordable Housing.* The Affordable Housing ACT (2008) provides enabling powers for territorial authorities to develop and implement an affordable housing policy. Housing affordability is better in Rotorua than in most other regional centres in New Zealand due to relatively low property prices relative to income levels. While that may shift the target group for affordable housing relative to other centres, it may not remove the need for and benefits of affordable housing. However, affordable housing needs to be distinguished from social housing, which tends to cater for those at the bottom end of the socio-economic distribution. An assessment of affordable housing needs and options for Rotorua needs to bear that distinction in mind.
- 5.1.5.7 *Transferrable Development Rights.* Do they have a role to play in the district? Transferable Title Rights (TTRs) or Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) are a mechanism used to focus subdivision development on more suitable areas, and provide environmental protection for areas less suitable for residential allotments. In New Zealand, they are already being used by several districts. In essence, a land title (or development right) is transferred from one location to another. With TTRs the number of titles in a district does not change, but the cost (environmental loss) and benefit (more suitable development) relationships are improved. With TDRs, the number of titles is likely to increase as development opportunities given up are traded for subdivision consents. As pressure for more rural subdivision increases, Rotorua should explore this mechanism in the local context.
- 5.1.5.8 *Carbon Trading.* Carbon trading is now a reality, as a direct result of the Kyoto protocol. The two areas of direct relevance to Council are forestry and waste, although Council may also have some direct interest in geothermal and an indirect interest in agriculture because of effects on the local economy. The carbon cost of energy for transportation, electricity and heating will be hidden in the purchase cost of the relevant energy source. However, we may be able to minimize those costs by improving efficiencies within the RDC operation, and for the broader community through policy and planning regulations. Forestry entered the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) on 1 January 2008, Waste and agriculture are proposed for 1 January 2013 and Geothermal for 1 January 2010. There is a possibility that our planning rules will generate carbon costs in relation particularly to forestry harvesting, and Council will need to be aware of that possible liability which could devolve to councils. MAF led a process in consultation with the agriculture and forestry sectors, local government, and Maori through 2008 to identify activities to be included under a 5-year adaptation programme to focus on:
- Building capacity to respond to climate change
 - Generating and sharing tools and knowledge related to climate change and its effects
 - Preparing science-based risk assessments relevant to land management and decision making
 - Mainstreaming environmental change adaptation information into policies, plans and development strategies
 - Monitoring and evaluating adaptation activities to re-assess risk and response capabilities over time
 - Establishing funds and research programmes
 - Establishing a technology transfer strategy
 - Establish actions such as emissions trading and a permanent forest sink initiative

Information sheets on each of the above are available at www.maf.govt.nz. The recent change of government appears likely to result in some changes to the ETS established by the Labour coalition. However, under the Kyoto protocol, some form of carbon trading or accounting is inevitable.

Rules in the existing plan could generate carbon costs for forestry operations – e.g. if setback rules prevent replanting of land that was previously forested. If so, then carbon liability could rest with the council that established the rule. While this issue is of bigger concern for Regional than District councils (due to their management of waterways), Council needs to be aware of the possibility.

- 5.1.5.9 Cumulative effects. Current rule structures are static, and assume that cumulative effects will be avoided. More dynamic rule structure needed that responds to effects as they accumulate.

5.1.6 *Existing district plan rule framework*

- 5.1.6.1 *Land parcels that have multiple zones.* Currently there are 253 parcels affected. These are chopped up into 631 'bits' for 109 different reasons.

- 5.1.6.2 *Zone rationalisation.* There is a need to rationalise the number of zones that presently *exist* in the district, and to give special recognition to some areas of the district that to date have been managed in a more generalised sense. Suggested changes:

- A zone that recognises the character of lakeside settlements (currently zoned Rural E), perhaps by reclassifying as a residential zone which is closer to their character.
- Combine industrial A and B zones, as the current key distinction based on amenity is ineffective and has already been removed in some areas.
- Simplify the many commercial zones.

- 5.1.6.3 *Rule where default status of an activity is non-complying.* Current status in most zones is that an activity is non-complying unless it is specifically listed and given another status. This rule may not need to be quite so broad and sweeping as it is in the current plan. For example, a zone-specific approach could be taken to the default status of unlisted activities. Similarly, when a controlled or discretionary activity does not meet the performance standards, it also defaults to a non-complying activity. District plan does not stipulate this default.

- 5.1.6.4 *Coverall permitted activity rule.* The general rule that if all performance standards of the Zone are met then the activity is permitted can lead to inconsistencies, especially when set *against* the default non-complying activity rule for unlisted activities. The rules can become circuitous and do not provide certainty for plan users. This issue needs to be discussed and clarified in the revised plan.

- 5.1.6.5 *Form and layout of existing plan.* Issues that have been raised with the overall form and content of the current plan include:

- A section of district-wide rules would be useful.
- The first five sections of the district plan are too verbose and say little.
- Maori issues are pigeon-holed up the front of the district plan.

5.1.7 *Natural and cultural heritage*

- 5.1.7.1 *All geologic and historic sites in Ngongotaha, Mamaku and Kaharoa* should be protected. Consider issues such as landscape, heritage protection and important sites in the District for inclusion in the plan.

- 5.1.7.2 *Notable trees.* Needs to be recognition of the notable trees work already undertaken by the Reserves Dept. There will need to be a revisit of those presently in the plan and to see if there are any more to insert.

5.1.7.3 Indigenous vegetation clearance allowances as permitted activities. Should be made more restrictive.

5.2 ISSUES WITH SPECIFIC CHAPTERS OR ZONES

The existing district plan has 20 Parts. Issues that have been identified for parts of the existing plan are tabulated below. A distinction has been made between those that are considered major or minor/technical. Each of the tables summarises the issue and the recommendation that has been put forward by the group or individual that has raised the issue.

The 'Recommendation' in each of the tables is not to be interpreted as the recommendation of the author of this report or Planning Services in general.

The issues are presented below in the order that they appear in the existing plan.

5.2.1 *The Resort Zones (Part 6 of the plan)*

Currently the district plan identifies four main zones in which tourism (or Resort) activities can be undertaken (Resort A through to D). The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation to the Resort zones are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Major Issues	
Spa Services as Activities in the Resort Zones. In the mid 1990's Council developed an initiative to promote Rotorua as a spa resort, based on the geothermal resources that are available in the district. The existing plan does not currently deal with spa activities. Accordingly, it was recommended (see planning & Bylaws Committee minutes, 22 July 2002) that changes be made to the rules for the Resort zones and definitions of the plan.	Spa services to be included as Permitted activities in the Resort A, B and C zones. Spa services to be included as Controlled activities in the Resort D zone.
Technical Issues	
The use of accessory activities at hotels/motels (restaurants, conference rooms etc) by non-guests needs to be well defined – i.e. what is acceptable use by the public, and what is not?	Investigate the appropriateness of amending rules/definitions to clarify.
No parking requirement for household units or restaurants/fast food takeaways etc	Amend Resort zone rules and relevant provisions of Appendix F to require on-site parking for these activities.

5.2.2 The Residential Zones (Part 7 of the plan)

Most people in Rotorua live in suburbs that are zoned residential by the existing district plan. The current district plan defines five broad residential sub-zones referred to as the Residential A, B, C and D zones. The TD (Transitional Development) zone is an area east of Fairy Springs Road that is close to land zoned Industrial. The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation to the Residential zones are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Major Issues	
<p>Need to revisit the density provisions for residential activity. Firstly, to make sure that the density provisions align with the subdivision requirements. Secondly, to make sure that any changes in demand and living patterns etc are adequately reflected and provided for in the district plan.</p>	<p>Review density provisions</p>
<p>Space and landscaping around buildings are just as important as the building itself. Conditions may be imposed in relation to screening etc, but the impact of such rules may be more negative than positive. For example, the impact of stretches of 2 m high panel fencing on the urban streetscape? Few or no street trees? Encourage planting of indigenous plants or create new habitat areas? Higher density development can be at the expense of green spaces and trees, which has long term impact on character of the urban landscape. Any larger trees that are left tend to be on boundaries, and represent both amenity values and amenity costs (shading, roots) for the immediate neighbourhood, especially on south side in winter.</p>	<p>Give consideration to how the plan can deal with the non built environment.</p> <p>Consider whether trees should be subject to height and setback restrictions as they are for buildings? Consider whether to provide a mechanism for controlling trees on neighbouring properties.</p>
<p>Additional Household Units. There are no criteria within the district plan that require, where additional household units are proposed, to demonstrate how the two houses are developed in relation to each other. More thought needs to be given, at the time of assessing proposed additional household units, to ensuring that the shape of potential boundaries, services, landscaping etc is proposed practically to support a potential future subdivision.</p>	
<p>Subsidiary Household Units. At present a 72 m² subsidiary plus any amount of garaging can be built according to the definition (up to a stipulated % site coverage). Garages frequently become home to the laundry, storage etc.</p> <p>The plan provides for a subsidiary household unit on a rural property. This is consistently used as an argument for approving a non-complying 'lifestyle lot' subdivision, as the only effect is a slightly larger house than a subsidiary. The applicant often suggests a consent notice permitting only one house per lot.</p>	<p>Consider removing subsidiary household units from the plan or strengthen/sharpen assessment criteria. Simplify by specifying a 'house per m²' density with an appropriate site coverage rule for the zone and remove reference to 'subsidiaries'.</p>
<p>Plan allows felling of trees without controls in most cases. This could have an impact on amenity values as well as long term effect on the quality of the environment.</p>	<p>Greater control over felling of trees. Renew and update list of "Notable Trees".</p>

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Protection of indigenous species and habitat	Provide clearer rules regarding protection and enhancement.
Objectives and policies are aimed at 'residential amenity' and do not have wider scope. Results in homogenous landscapes and poor design.	Landscape provisions to promote/protect biodiversity, enhance indigenous planting, enhance road corridors etc
Design standards for dwellings in high density zones (Residential C) – an amenity issue	Draft minimum design requirements as performance standards in order to protect amenity.
Need to include the Utuhina Stream modelling data in relation to increase urban infill in the Utuhina catchment.	
Old Taupo Road: Increasing number of non-residential activities established fronting the road and its vicinity	Decision required from Council as to how/what they see as the future for that area. Transit New Zealand will want to have a say.
Technical Issues	
Additional Household units to provide 'Open Space' area. The plan does not require an 'open area', within which a 10 m diameter (or other) circle can be drawn, not including driveways, when it is proposed to establish a dwelling on a site.	Investigate the appropriateness of having an 'open space' rule in residential areas. (See also requested amendments to subdivision rules).
Storage of vehicles on residential sites There appears to be a growing number of residential property owners storing and displaying a large number of cars on their residential sites. These may be for sale via the internet, or from home etc. The plan appears to contain no rules to restrict this and there is the potential for it to adversely affect amenity values.	Investigate the appropriateness of imposing rules etc to address this.
Rule R7.3.3.2.2 (c): Engineering understands, and previous planning advice tends to confirm, that the reference to 1.5 m in (c) refers to the front yard encroachment when the garage is at right angles to the entry so that vehicles are off the road. This should be clarified in the review.	Clarify

5.2.3 *The Commercial Zones (Part 8 of the plan)*

The Commercial A (CBD core), B (CBD fringe), and B1 (Rotorua Centre) are the three zones that comprise what most people regard as the Central Business District. They provide a focus for retail activities in the town centre.

Suburban shopping centres are zoned Commercial C, and include the Ngongotaha, Te Ngae Road and West End Shopping Centres. Smaller suburban centres are zoned Commercial D. Sites for service stations are zoned Commercial E. The Commercial F Zone provides for commercial activities in rural areas, such as at Okere Falls.

The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation to the Commercial zones are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Major Issues	
The district plan is silent on whether painting the exterior of a building within the CBD constitutes an 'external alteration' and therefore requires Controlled Activity resource consent.	Amend the rule or include a definition of 'external alteration' within Part 19 to clarify.
Signage is ruining the character of the central area. Design - how much control can be exercised?	Proactive enforcement, tighter rules on signs
CBD Design Guide does not give clear guidance to achieving quality design. There may be a need for activities which are presently controlled to become discretionary activities.	Design Guide issues should be provided with discretionary status; Sign up to New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
Broadband Infrastructure	Incorporate requirements into engineering standards for subdivision and development.
Entertainment / night club noise levels need to be managed, particularly if residential living in the CBD is to be actively promoted.	
Odour from exhaust stacks may also become an issue for the same reason if residential living is promoted.	
Technical Issues	
Rule 8.1.4.10. When comparing this rule with rule 11 it can be concluded that the words "...and/or Off..." have been inadvertently omitted from rule 10. If you look at the similarly intended rules in the district plan, page 8.19 Activity 4, and page 8.24 Activity 16, you will see the rule in its completed form.	Correct intent of rule by amending to include the words "...and/or Off..." in accordance with similarly worded rules relating to the Sale of Liquor.
Rule 8.4.3.3. Discretionary activity resource consent is required for 'activities otherwise permitted or controlled in the zone on sites which contain an historic building, historic church, historic structure, historic site, arch. Site, Marae or natural heritage site listed in Appendix A'.	Create linkage.
The plan requires assessment in terms of the potential to modify, destroy or adversely affect the protected item or to affect the natural and cultural heritage values of the item, however there is no reference made to assessment against the Design Principles. There is reference to assessment criteria for items listed in Appendix A under the Controlled Activity Assessment Criteria however there is no linkage between this section and the Discretionary activity section! It appears that items protected under Appendix A do not need to consider, or be consistent with, the CBD Design Principles.	
CBD service lanes, public and private: Provide as a requirement that these be used, where they exist	Review

COMMENT**RECOMMENDATION**

Needs to be a complete review of the Commercial H Zone. It was established to be permissive – and it is. There is a need to review the landscaping required to make sure that this happens. Should be a lesson to other sections of the new plan not to rely upon third party documentation as a means to manage environmental effects.

5.2.4 *The Industrial Zones (Part 9 of the plan)*

There are three Industrial zones defined in the existing plan:

- Industrial A (Light Industry)
- Industrial B (General Industry)
- Industrial C (Heavy Industry)

The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation to the Industrial zones are tabulated below.

COMMENT**RECOMMENDATION**

Major Issues

Mamaku Sawmill. Submission 121 of the 2004/05 submissions to the Ten Year plan requested that the Mamaku sawmill located at Ngongotaha be rezoned from industrial to light commercial. The submitter believes that this would ensure a healthier environment for local residents as heavy industrial sites operating in the middle of a residential area is no longer safe.

Investigate appropriateness of rezoning the Mamaku Sawmill at Ngongotaha.

Low standard (quality) of buildings in industrial zones

Investigate whether new policies and rules can address this

Technical Issues

Rule 9.1.15: Offices within the industrial zones. The district plan needs to clearly set out what is permitted, controlled and non-complying with respect to offices in the industrial zones. Many industrial activities require a small office area that is directly associated with the on-site running of the industrial process. Under current rules this office requires resource consent. A planning practice note has established that if the office is attached/within the industrial building, is not greater than 15% of the floor area, and a written statement is supplied by the applicant to say that it is exclusively for the running of the industry on-site, then it is permitted. However plan rules/definitions do not confirm.

Amend rules/definitions as necessary to clarify.

Heavy vehicle turning/loading areas. Appendix F of the plan provides a tracking curve for heavy vehicles. However, there do not appear to be any rules within the plan that require turning/loading bays and areas for industrial activities. Where an activity is located close to an intersection or on a particular road; on-site parking and turning is required (for both light and heavy vehicles), but there does not seem to be any particular rules within the plan that require heavy vehicles to be provided for in the first place.

Investigate current provisions and amend plan provisions where necessary.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Residential land on Clayton Rd belonging to Foodstuffs	Rezone industrial as part of review
Requirements relating to the provision of a 5 m landscape strip abutting the road (Industrial A)	Review the provisions

5.2.5 *The Rural Zones (Part 10 of the plan)*

The Rotorua district is predominantly rural. The rural area is divided into seven sub-zones (Rural A through to F). The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation to these zones are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Major Issues	
Is the continued development of rural areas with scattered residential units really sustainable? How harmful is this going to be to the character of the rural landscape? How to maintain rural character?	
Rubbish disposal and backyard burning adversely affecting the amenity values and air quality	Adopt regulatory/non-regulatory methods
Technical Issues	
For the Rural B Zone Rule 10.1.1.17 provides for one additional household unit for each 15 hectares by which the lot exceeds 15 hectares. Rural B lots are almost never large enough to comply with this rule.	Investigate the appropriateness of amending the rule to provide for additional household units in the Rural B Zone where sites are less than 30 hectares.
There is no activity status for Papakainga in the Rural E Zone, therefore requiring Non-complying Activity resource consent.	Investigate the appropriateness of specifically providing for Papakainga within the Rural E zone.
Activities accessory to a Controlled activity. The plan states, within the many zones, that an activity accessory to a controlled activity is a controlled activity. A recent example: application was made for a single garage accessory to an additional household unit. Technically, controlled activity resource consent was required, however in considering the effects, and the permitted baseline (a large farm shed could be constructed as a permitted activity), requiring resource consent seemed onerous and adverse effects less than minor. All performance standards were met.	Is this rule appropriate for activities such as a garage accessory to an additional household unit? Can such activities be considered in assessing applications for resource consent for an additional dwelling or similar?
The same would apply in the residential zone however it appears that this rule has not been consistently implemented.	Should we require consent as a controlled minor for such proposals? Should they be permitted?

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Set back rule for forestry – 20 m from roads. Currently this rule is not being complied with in many areas. The rule dates to 1996 (when the current district plan was made operative), so trees planted within the setback before this time have existing use rights. But if harvested, can they be replaced. If no under the 20 m rule, is council likely to have liability for carbon costs under the ETS (the council rule may prevent replanting, and the forestry company must pay the carbon costs for land not replanted).	Review the rule with a view to making it more flexible.
Glare from buildings in the rural zone. Currently no restrictions on size and/or glare from rural buildings. Buildings can be quite large and reflect considerable light (e.g. glass houses for horticultural use)	Review this issue from an amenity perspective – should there be restrictions, perhaps along the lines of those in the Lakes A chapter (although not as restrictive).
Rule 10.1.1.8a – Clearance or modification of Indigenous Vegetation: Current rule setting does not identify ‘purpose of the rule for vegetation clearance’ - for example, is it for fence line construction, is it for cultivation purposes, or is it for modification of land (wetland)? In addition, size of the trees that are allowed as a permitted activity for clearance?	Clarity in terms of width for fence lines clearance; DBH (Diameter at Breast Height) as a measure for ascertaining size of trees that are allowed or not for clearance; Maximum allowable limit for vegetation clearance for cultivation purposes.

5.2.6 Reserves and Water Bodies (Part 11 of the plan)

Part 11 of the existing plan covers issues relating to the management of reserves, heritage and water bodies in the district. Four zones are defined (Reserve A and B; Water A and B). The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation Part 11 are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Major Issues	
Recognition of the transfer of functions and powers (from Council to EBOP) will need to be given in the new plan in relation to lake structures. There are a number of rules that are presently <i>ultra vires</i> and need some attention. There will also be rules that we potentially will remove from the district plan in the Water A and B zones.	
Method of implementation 2.2.2.4.3 – Zoning. The current plan includes a Reserve A and B zone for public and private reserve land. This imposes a double layer of restrictions on reserve land (particularly reserve A), which is often held in trust subject to legislation such as the Reserves Act or Conservation Act. Although the use of zoning has a practical spin-off in that it readily identifies reserve land, planning maps should not be used by Council for asset management purposes.	A decision needs to be made about whether zoning is the best way to manage the effects of activities on reserve land, or whether it should be done by another method such as designation. If zoning is the best method, then there needs to be a system for updating planning maps to reflect changes brought about by reserve acquisition on subdivision. The zoning layer should not necessarily be based on ownership or current usage, and should take into account the Open Space Strategy.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Methods of Implementation 3.2.1.4.5 – Zoning. The current plan includes a Water A and B zone. The Rotorua Lakes Recreation Strategy about to be adopted by EBOP and the Te Arawa Lakes Joint Committee has identified a number of different zones on the lakes that are intended to manage and reduce conflicts between incompatible activities.</p>	<p>The review of the district plan should be consistent with the Rotorua lakes Recreation Strategy and the Open Space Strategy.</p>
<p>Rule 11.1.1.1 refers to activities consistent with the designation of the site. This assumes that reserves have been designated in the plan. Some have (DOC), but others have not. This creates an inconsistency in the way the rule was intended to work with respect to undesignated reserves, as there is little else to guide staff about what is permitted in the absence of a designation.</p>	<p>Create a consistent approach to reserves, or at least provide clear rules for reserves that are not designated.</p>
<p>Rule 11.1.1.2 is unclear in its intention or interpretation. As a pragmatic approach it has been interpreted (with respect to the Reserves Act) to mean that recreation activities provided for by the Reserves Act and consistent with an operative Reserves Act management plan are permitted. However, this is not clear, and is subject to interpretation with the result that it often seems that nothing at all is permitted in the reserves zone.</p>	<p>Create a clear link in the district plan to activities that are already provided for in an operative reserves management plan, or are authorised under other legislative provisions of the Reserves Act. Such activities can either be permitted, controlled or limited discretionary where off-site effects need to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p>
<p>Any maintenance, upgrading and renovation activities on Marae, big or small, whether to the wharenuī, toilets, wharekai, immersion schools or other associated buildings, requires Discretionary activity resource consent through the plan provision:</p> <p><i>“Activities otherwise permitted or controlled:</i></p> <p><i>(a) on sites which contain an historic building, historic church, historic structure, historic site, archaeological site, Marae or natural heritage site listed in Appendix A”</i></p> <p>In many cases this has meant that the proposed renovation is cheaper than the actual resource consent and the Marae is quite dynamic, meaning that facilities are renovated and upgraded often.</p>	<p>Review of current provisions and consideration of more appropriate control levels.</p>
<p>Technical Issues</p>	
<p>Rule 11.2.9 ‘Water Based Recreation Activities in the Water A & B Zones. It states that water based recreational activities are permitted subject to complying with the specified speed limits and locational and noise requirements of the Rotorua District Lake Water and Rivers Control Bylaw 1991. The Bylaw is outdated and no longer applicable.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 11.2.9 to specify the correct bylaw.</p>

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Launching of boats from the land to the lake without a ramp. The plan requires, as a Discretionary Activity, consent for ramps, slipways etc but does not have a rule that says you need a ramp or slipway to launch, therefore permitting people to drag boats to the waters edge and push them off shore to launch. This has the potential to adversely affect the natural character of the lake margin (through loss of vegetation) and to have a cumulative effect in terms of resulting in a number of 'boat launching areas' around the lake.	Investigate the appropriateness of tightening rules to require consent for launching boats off the shore where no ramp or slipway exists or is proposed.

5.2.7 *The Transportation Zones (Part 12 of the plan)*

Part 12 contains three zones:

- The Road Zone
- Airport Zone
- Airport Protection Zone

The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation to the transportation zones are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Major Issues	
Reliance on cars	Design to encourage easy pedestrian and cyclists' movement in city centre and residential areas; enhance public transport system.
Technical Issues	
Rule 12.6: Service lane acquisition rule	Review

5.2.8 *Natural Hazards, Hazardous Substances (Parts 13 and 14 of the plan)*

Parts 13 and 14 of the existing plan do not describe zones; rather they cover the management of activities or issues.

The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation to Parts 13 and 14 are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Major Issues	
Height of concrete building platforms in areas subject to surface flooding.	Require higher platform than the acceptable solution in the building code, through the resource consents process.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Hazardous Facility Screening Procedure: Part 14.2 and Appendix Y are ambiguous about the effects ratios. One of the key points is that there are 3 total quantity ratios: fire/explosion, human health, and ecosystem. These are compared individually to the triggers in Rule 14.2. Needs clarification that each ratio is compared.	Review

5.2.9 *Subdivision and Development (Part 16 of the plan)*

Part 16 contains the issues, policies, objectives, rules and assessment criteria for subdivision and development in all zones – ‘development’ has a specific definition in Part 19 of the existing plan.

The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation to subdivision and development are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Major Issues	
Broadband. Given the recent and likely future technological changes, optic cabling should be installed in new residential and possibly industrial and commercial subdivisions, before any scheme plan is finally signed off, in much the same way as we have traditionally done in regard to installation and cabling of telephone services and the provision of pipes for water supplies etc	Review.
Boundary adjustment provisions. The provisions need more clarity so that there is a clear understanding of what Council believes a boundary adjustment to be. Further, there will need to be strict criteria surrounding what constitutes a boundary adjustment. It is not re-ordering of boundary lines but ending up with the same number of lots. It is not about a total reconfiguring of boundaries. Should more accurately reflect that boundary has the plain and simple English meaning whereby it is an adjustment of a boundary, not reconfiguration of site.	
Non Complying activities. If a subdivision creates a degree of non-compliance for the land use undertaken on the land, or accentuates already existing non-compliance, then the subdivision needs to be a non-complying subdivision, irrespective of whether the subdivision is a complying lot in terms of minimum lot size in the district plan	
Suitability of the site for subdivision. Needs to be clear criteria that can be used to determine site suitability for subdivision. These criteria would take a lead from Section 106 of the RMA and any other matters that would relate to suitability of the site, in particular to Rotorua would be geothermal matters, and maybe even accessibility to infrastructure resources.	

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Review how the lifestyle lot provisions of the existing plan have been used, and what has been the resultant impact on the rural environment. Need also to be cognisant of how the lifestyle lots provisions will work in the new plan. Whether they will exist at existing permissible levels, what happens if they change, who will be disadvantaged. Also need to look at protection lots and an entitlement.</p>	
<p>Technical Issues</p>	
<p>Policy 2.3.5.6 / Rule 16.3.3.6 / Appendix W.1.2.3.5.</p> <p>There appear to be discrepancies with the extent that the identified plan provisions require electricity and telephone services. The policy indicates an expectation that provision is made but the rule only requires satisfactory arrangements for reticulation. Section 108(2)(c) enables Council to require services to be provided.</p>	<p>Clarify to what extent the Council requires services to be provided at subdivision stage and amend the plan to ensure policies, rules and performance standards are consistent.</p>
<p>R 16.4.3.1.b.iii</p> <p>Division between areas is not continuous – i.e. how many units are allowed on a lot of 100.5 ha? – 2 or 3?</p>	<p>Clarify division</p>
<p>Rule 16.3.3.9 (requirements for width of private access – see Table) appears to be designed for urban environments, and can impose unanticipated restrictions on subdivision in rural environments that would otherwise be permitted activities.</p>	<p>Restrict the rule to urban environments, and/or review options for rural subdivision in relation to access issues, particularly in relation to the word “potential” in the table.</p>
<p>Subdivisions in residential areas create situations where an access to a new lot at the rear can be very close to the side (with perhaps windows and private garden/deck area) of an existing house – poor amenity to occupiers. Generally “tandem” development creates poor amenity</p>	<p>Provide for reasonable protection of amenity from access traffic. Protect adjoining dwellings from overlooking – perhaps standard for window to window distances and height of windows above ground level.</p>

5.2.10 *Scheduled Sites (Part 17 of the plan)*

Part 17 lists eleven scheduled sites.

The major and technical issues that have been raised in relation Part 17 of the existing plan are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Major Issues</p>	
<p>Proposed schedule for Kura Kaupapa</p> <p>A request has been received by Council to develop a schedule to provide for 3 Catholic Schools located in the Residential B and C Zones as a Permitted</p>	<p>Investigate the appropriateness of developing a schedule to provide for Kura Kaupapa within Residential Zones.</p>

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Activity. Kura Kaupapa located within the Residential Zones encounter issues when extending/adding new buildings and structures, which could also be addressed with the development of a schedule.	
Technical Issues	
Scheduled Site 6: Whakapoungakau No. 7D does not exist; replaced by lots 1, 2, 3, 4 DPS 91516	Amend
Scheduled Site 12 Administration Building, Dinsdale Street: Section 12 Blk IV Horohoro SD no longer exists and replaced by Lots 3 DPS 81934.	Amend

5.2.11 The Appendices (Part 18 of the plan)

There are 26 appendices (Appendix A through to AA, with Appendix Q intentionally blank) that make up Part 18 of the existing district plan.

Issues that have been raised with specific appendices are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Appendix A – Natural and cultural heritage inventory	
F.oxycarpa at 46 Rimu Street – the tree is diseased in the crown	No longer a notable tree – remove from schedule.
Appendix B -Designations	
Requiring Authorities have changed since the last plan became operative	Major review required.
Appendix F – Parking and Turning Standards	
Appendix F – f1.2.2 : ‘Roads Requiring Adjacent Sites to Provide on-site Turning Under ‘Other roads’: Amohia Street – Ranolf Street to Fenton Street. Amohia Street does not run between or connect Ranolf Street and Fenton Street.	Amend to correctly reflect which portion of Amohia Street is affected. Also, clarify relationship between f1.2.2 and Appendix M.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Elizabeth Street used to have 68 sections and houses, but now has 43 flats, 32 units and 37 houses on those same 68 sections, therefore effectively doubling the housing population. The residents of Elizabeth Street would like to see Council create parking bays (on existing grassed berm areas between footpaths and roads) along some of these more developed streets to allow off/on street parking.</p> <p>The district plan requires on-site parking and turning for household units, tourist accommodation etc. Are these requirements appropriate in all instances and particularly in this case along Elizabeth Street?</p>	<p>Investigate on-site parking and turning requirements set out in Appendix F with respect to their appropriateness in all zones/streets.</p>
<p>Sub-section F1.2.1 sets out when on-site turning of vehicles must be provided. This is achieved by identifying those streets where backing out of sites is not permitted. The rule does not specify certain activities that require on-site turning where f1.2.1 is not triggered, however it is accepted practice that the dispensation is intended to apply to single urban households only; ROW's, developments and commercial/industrial uses etc also need to provide on-site turning.</p>	<p>Provide clarification of the intent of f1.2.1.</p>
<p>Child care "drop off" areas need to be considered also – rather than just parking numbers.</p>	<p>Consider appropriateness of provisions relating to drop off areas.</p>
<p>18f.1 and 18f.2: Tourist Accommodation - parking requirements are ambiguous: 1 for each unit and only up to 30. It should be 1 for each.</p>	<p>Review</p>
<p>Parking in Commercial Zone: Assessment of parking in commercial areas should also include educational institutes.</p>	
<p>Appendix I – Stockpiling, Earthworks</p>	
<p>The existing Appendix I is not effective in controlling earthworks – overlaps with regional council rules and some of the sub-sections are ambiguous in their wording</p>	<p>Review</p>
<p>Appendix K – Noise Standards</p>	
<p>When plan changes were made, consequential amendments were not made in the text with reference to "Noise Standards"</p>	<p>Verify and correct Appendix K text and tables.</p>
<p>Appendix K needs to be revised in light of modern standards relating to noise</p>	
<p>Currently there are no residential noise limits – there should be in the revised plan.</p>	
<p>Set specific noise standards for child centres?</p>	

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Noise contouring, similar to the airport, is needed for new industrial zone areas where they are adjacent to residential areas.	
Bird scarers – set specific noise standards in the rural zones?	
Heat pumps and their external motors: may need set-backs from boundaries.	
Appendix M – Roading Hierarchy Classification	
In the Development Contributions Policy it is proposed to use 8 vehicle movements a day per household equivalent, as used by Transit NZ. The existing plan refers to 6 vmd.	Change to 8 in the plan to maintain consistency.
Appendix N – Service Lanes	
Block No.12 identifies a service lane associated with the old Farmers building bordering Amohia, Eruera and Hinemoa Streets. This service lane was removed through resource consent, 17 June 1998 (R&B Consultants). However its removal did not flow through to an amendment of Appendix N.	Tidy up Appendix N to correctly identify removed service lane requirement.
Block No. 11: identifies a service lane bordering 1233 Tutanekai Street. This service lane does not exist and a building occupies that area.	Amend Appendix N, Block No. 11 to reflect the lot boundary correctly.
Appendix U – Financial Contributions for Reserve Purposes	
Sub section U1.4 3 is ambiguous – it tends to imply that for residential B sites it only applied to undeveloped lots of 900 m ² or more.	Clarity required.

5.2.12 Definitions (Part 19 of the plan)

Over 100 terms are defined in Part 19 of the existing plan. Issues with terminology etc are tabulated below.

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
There is no definition within the plan for the term 'upgrade'.	Include a new definition
'Agricultural Production Activities'. There is no definition for this activity within the plan and it would be helpful to have some parameters set so that it is clearer what is and isn't considered an agricultural production activity.	Investigate the appropriateness of defining agricultural production activities.
'Heavy Vehicle'. Current definition identifies a heavy vehicle as being a motor vehicle where the gross laden weight exceeds 3400 kg. The Land Transport Act now defines a heavy vehicle as having a gross laden weight of 3500 kg or more.	Adjust definition

COMMENT

RECOMMENDATION

IT Businesses. Not provided for within the district plan and not clear how to define them e.g. commercial activity, offices. Particular example relates to a property within the Commercial A zone.

Investigate the appropriateness of including a new definition and/or rule in the plan to address.

Enclosure of Livestock/Intensive Pig Farming/ Pig Farming.

Streamline definitions and ensure they are reflected in the activity lists for the zones.

The definition of 'enclosure of livestock' includes intensive pig farming. Intensive pig farming is defined as meaning 'keeping of pigs mainly within buildings or outdoors without ground cover being maintained.' Pig Farming is defined as meaning 'the keeping of more than two adult pigs and their progeny up to weaner stage except that two progeny may be kept up to baconer stage.' There appears to be a gap between these two definitions – where does pig farming become intensive? Also, why is 'pig farming' not included as the enclosure of livestock? Pig farming as an activity does not appear to be reflected in the activity tables for any zones, therefore why is it defined as a separate activity? Eg. In the Rural A Zone, 'enclosure of livestock' is a Discretionary activity. 'Pig Farming' is not an activity specified and is not included in the definition of 'enclosure of livestock' – only intensive pig farming is included and as noted above this is different to pig farming generally. So, it could therefore be concluded that because 'pig farming' is not provided for as its own activity, it is a Non-complying activity. This seems non-sensible as more intensive pig farming is a Discretionary activity. The alternative is that 'pig farming' could be considered 'agricultural production activities, except as otherwise regulated' – there is no definition for this activity.

A definition of livestock is needed – for example, would these rules apply to dogs and cats kept in a kennelling operation? If not, then the kennel is non-complying.

It is noted that there is a separate definition also for 'outdoor pig farming'.

Also concerns with the use of the word 'buildings' within the definition of 'intensive pig farming', as often pig farmers will erect covered structures which do not fit the definition of building or require a building consent, but have the same effect as a 'building' would have.

Referencing definitions within Section 2 of the RMA 1991. Some of the definitions within the district plan refer the reader to the definitions of Section 2 of the RAM. There is potential for these to change through RMA Amendments and therefore potential for the plan definitions to become outdated or incorrect in their reference.

Amend the relevant definitions so that the wording is reproduced rather than the RMA section being referred to.

Net-site Area. In the absence of a shape factor for new lots, the current wording within the definition of 'Net-site Area' enables lots of a complying net site area to be of an inappropriate size and dimension given that a substantial amount of site area could be taken up in a narrow driveway – where such is not a ROW, access leg or common area.

Introduce Performance Criteria for subdivision specifying a shape factor and/or alter the definition of net site area to incorporate an exclusion of any land area used for access to the site which is less than a stated dimension.

See example from Auckland CC District plan (Isthmus) below (NB: the definition also contains a diagram):

"Net site Area: in relation to rear site means the difference in area between the total area of the site (gross area) and the area of its entrance strip."

COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
	<p><i>"Entrance Strip: means all that part of the site extending from a road frontage to a point at which it has a minimum width of 7.5m measured at right angles to its course. Course shall be deemed to mean the bisection of the directions of the boundaries forming the side of the entrance strip."</i></p>
<p>Home Based Business. Use of the term 'trade' in the body text of the definition is too general. What is considered a trade and what falls outside this?</p>	<p>Clarify</p>
<p>The temporary stockpiling of reusable goods above the natural ground level in a tidy manner shall be a Controlled Activity in all Zones. The definition needs tightening: is temporary too vague and what exactly are reusable goods?</p>	<p>Review</p>
<p>Suburb definition. It was last defined spatially for the 1996 'Black plan'. Seems to be various versions. Need to consider relationship to Stats Area Units, NZ post codes, planning areas and zones, local feeling and the fact that potentially Ozone (the new database being used by Council as a replacement to Corporate Vision) will not be recording suburbs in the address field. Do we need suburbs at all for addressing?</p>	<p>Review</p>
<p>Need clear definition of 'zones' etc that are not defined by a legal boundary - be it topography, water boundary, contour line, height, line of sight, vegetation etc</p>	
<p>Activity status of motor homes: house bus or caravan used for permanent independent accommodation (i.e. as a household unit or subsidiary household unit). Definition of sleepout.</p>	<p>Adjust definitions of household unit and subsidiary household unit to exclude use of such vehicles for permanent accommodation. Sleepout is not currently defined in the plan, and should be added. Definition should not exclude use of vehicles or portable buildings as sleepouts.</p>
<p>"Permanent surface" needs to be defined in the plan.</p>	<p>Add definition</p>
<p>Service lanes. The trigger for service lanes should not be reliant on the definition of 'Development' in the definitions section of the district plan.</p>	

5.3 ISSUES WITH EXISTING PLANNING MAPS

There are over 100 planning maps that accompany the text of the existing district plan and show the various zones and other features of the district. A number of general issues have been identified, as well as issues with specific maps. These are tabulated below.

Map #	Comment	Recommendation
All	<p>The district plan maps do not identify information held by Council with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of earthquake fault lines • Geothermal/hot ground • Spring recharge zones (currently being worked on). • The 2% AEP flood level (currently being worked on). • Transpower Hi Voltage Lines 	Amend the planning maps to show this information rather than having it identified on the Property Files as caution/hazard notices only.
All	Planning maps are currently black and white. Adding colour may make the maps easier to use, especially for the public.	Consider using colour.
All	Reference is made in the district plan text to certain sites, e.g. reserves, being designated. However, while Council has afforded these sites an underlying zoning they are not technically 'designated'.	Clarify within the plan and on relevant maps that these areas are not formally designated sites.
All	Make certain that where Maori land has been altered to Maori Reservation that this is properly reflected in district plan maps.	
3	Discrepancies in the DOC dataset and the planning map in regard to 'wildlife refuge' and the 'Hamurana stream network'.	Update relevant planning map
6	Inaccuracies in the original Digital Cadastral Database (DCDB) are reflected on planning map 6 – the Maori Reserve and title boundaries.	Spatial repositioning of the parcel boundaries to create an accurate representation.
10	Residents along Manuariki Ave and Tau Street at Ngongotaha have asked that the area represented as Crown Land Foreshore be more accurately represented as private land. There have been a number of accretion applications made in the area over the past few years and the landowners along the avenue have been successful in securing the accreted land, and it has been amalgamated with their land titles. As a result the district plan map incorrectly identifies the land as foreshore reserve.	Amendment to map 10 to reflect correct tenure of the land.
11	Stream corridor going through the Ngati Whakaue block of land shown as Residential B; logical to have it zoned and reflected as Reserve A	Verify
19	The portion adjoining Commercial D Zone (54 Koutu Road) to be widened an additional 4.5m	Update

Map #	Comment	Recommendation
20	Lot 20 (Esplanade Reserve) on Aard Ave: Centre of the lot is zoned as "Road" and the rest as "Rural D". More appropriate would be "Reserve A"	Verify
22	32A Robinson Ave has been reshape. Aerial photos shows development on the adjacent Reserve.	Update
23, 104 and 107	Russell and Thompson, vesting of area Paradise Valley Road for Flood Protection Purposes - See NZ Gazette No.39, p1020, by which part Lot 1 DPS 77326 as shown Section 1 SO 346451 (formally Pt CT 61B/942) was vested in Council for flood protection purposes.	Update the relevant planning map to reflect.
25	Stream reserve at the end of Jarmey Place	Zoning needs to be looked into
25	Map 25 identifies 4 notable trees on the corner of Riverholm Drive and Old Taupo Road. They are identified as 5.3.6, 5.3.14, 5.3.16 and 5.3.17. However, one of these trees has been removed.	Update map 25 and relevant Appendix to reflect removal of one of the notable trees.
26, 31 and 32	See NZ Gazette No.48, 10 March 2005, p1268, by which Part Railway Land has been set apart as a Government Work (vested in the Crown) and then subsequently set apart as Crown Land pursuant to Section 52(1)(d) and Section 42(3) of the Public Works Act 1981 respectively. The area is shown Section 1 on SO 319662.	Update the relevant planning map to reflect. Update of Appendix B required?
34	SP – refer to Rule 10.2.12 & Rule 10.1.1.62 of Part 10 Rural Resources	This is not correct; relate to Rural B1
38	401 Old Taupo road - the hatching should extend on both sides of the road	Update to reflect.
46	Proprty14025 – currently zoned Reserve B (Maori Reserve). Reserve B land is highly restricted in terms of development. Houses are not an activity provided for and would therefore require Non-Complying activity resource consent to establish. There appears to be at least one dwelling on-site. The site was zoned Amenity 3 (Maori Reserve) under the Transitional district plan and this designation appears to have been carried over to the existing plan. This may have been an error, as the block sheet U15 7.4 shows the WHAKAPOUNGAKAU LOT 7E BLK XIV ROTOITI SD is hand annotated "Reservation of Land cancelled in 1985 (Gazetted 201 p4752 1985)." Corporate vision shows the owners as paying rural residential rates so it should probably be zoned Rural B in keeping with the rating data and in the context of Rural B land to the north. This would mean the capability of subdivision down to 8000m ² .	Investigate the appropriateness of re-zoning to Rural B and reflecting on the planning maps.

Map #	Comment	Recommendation
68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75	The specified maps do not identify that State Highway 30 from Hinehopu to the District boundary east of Rotoma is a Limited Access Road (LAR).	Amend relevant planning maps to identify this portion of SH 30 as a LAR.
84	Whirinaki Valley Road: Discrepancies in the DCDB and the planning map	Correct anomalies
102	<p data-bbox="337 632 980 690">Vesting of Area, Penny Road – for road stopping and amalgamation. See NZ Gazette NO.39, p1020-1021, by which:</p> <ol data-bbox="367 722 980 892" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="367 722 980 810">1. Council acquired Pt Section 13 Block V Rotoiti Survey District comprising 75 square metres shown Section 1 SO 346455. <li data-bbox="367 810 980 892">2. Part of the road adjacent to Section 13 as shown Section 2 SO 346455 (1885m²) was stopped as road and amalgamated with Section 13. 	Update relevant planning map if necessary.

6 FRESH IDEAS FROM ELECTED MEMBERS

The first district plan “issues” workshop was held with elected members in May 2007. The questions posed to elected members at the workshop were:

1. What are your top 5 issues facing Rotorua District?
2. What are your top 5 issues facing specific zones?
3. What are your top 5 issues in your interest area and/or neighbourhood?

What are your top 5 issues facing Rotorua District?

Responses broadly included:

- Urban issues such as CBD parking, crime, and air quality.
- Rural issues such as land-use change and size of subdivision section.
- Lake and ground water quality.
- Economic development.
- Multiple-owned Maori land development issues.
- Geothermal energy.

What are your top 5 issues facing specific zones?

Members listed issues that they considered were relevant to the following zones: commercial/resort, rural, industrial, and residential zones and the feedback is tabulated below:

Zone	Comment by Members on what issues they consider are facing the zone
Commercial/Resort Zone	Development Levy Commercial/Residential interface (e.g. noise, reverse sensitivity) conflicts The need for Broadband infrastructure Development constraints on multiple-owned Maori land Delays in building getting consent Height of buildings in commercial and resort lakeside properties – need revision Use of footpath in commercial zones (e.g. for liquor, outdoor dining) Aeroplanes /helicopters in resort zone – Needs revision Lack of quality shopping for women Crime Car parking Courthouse location – is it in the right place
Rural Zone	Dairy conversions/land value/farm size Water supply and use Roading quality Rubbish disposal (backyard burning) EBOP rules (Rule 11 in particular). Truck companies in rural areas Waste water disposal and future reticulation of Lake margins management/protection Building above 380° Contour No diary farming closer to lakes/lake water quality Keeping land rural/productive/change in land use practices Access to all amenities (health/education/social services, etc) for rural residents

Zone	Comment by Members on what issues they consider are facing the zone
Industrial Zone	Adequate land/availability for future Adequate infrastructure (electricity) Zoning conflicts (at the interface) Landscape precisions Low standard of buildings Storm water management Air pollution/LAMA Transportation and roading (to and from sites) Cost of infrastructure/services set-up (access to water and electricity) Ngapuna area needs a major rethink
Residential Zone	Development levy Water supply Pros and cons of infill housing/size of section Adequate infrastructure around neighbourhoods and shared properties Fast track residential development when appropriate Noise pollution Escalating property values/land value too high Crime Schools Size of house Cutting out views to lakes/caldera rim Access to recreational facilities Trees and fences – amenity/neighbour relations Mix of other activities restricted or not defined Traffic

What are your top 5 issues in your interest area and/or neighbourhood?

Elected members listed the following:

- Size of subdivision
- Quality of life for children
- More liaison with EBOP/EW
- Speeding up compliance process
- Urban Fence – Keep or remove?
- Building above the 380° Contour
- Renewable energy – Geothermal in particular
- Lake water quality
- Rates (Zoning Differential)
- Lake Front/ CBD Development
- Water supply
- Sealed roads
- Redwoods (use and management)
- Sustainable communities

A series of workshop were held for Councillors during 2008. The following table contains the date and the topic discussed at each workshop.

Workshop Topics

Workshop	Workshop Date	Topic
1	27 February 2008	District Plan Background
2	17 March 2008	Major research informing the District Plan Review
3	1 May 2008	N/A
4	27 May 2008	District Plan – Look, feel and structure
5	26 June 2008	Lakes A Zone
6	31 July 2008	Ngati Whakaue Master Plan/Significant resource management issues facing the district
7	8 September 2008	Lake water quality
8	10 November 2008	Zoning issues
9	4 December 2008	Growth assumptions

The issues raised during the 2008 workshops are summarised below.

Workshop issues summary

Workshop and date	General Theme/Topic	Issues Raised
1. 27 February 2008	District plan background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficiency of public feedback • Panui for hui • Urban amenity/urban design, particularly in suburbs close to CBD • Land use change/lake water quality • Regional Policy Statement review process
2. 17 March 2008	Major research informing the District Plan Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing of structure plan integration
4. 27 May 2008	District Plan Review – Look, feel and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lakes A Zone – possibility of amendment as part of this review • Effectiveness of existing plan • Need for simplicity of policy • Growth • Standard terms – can see the benefit of • Eco-enhancement zone – pros and cons

Workshop and date	General Theme/Topic	Issues Raised
5. 26 June 2008	Lakes A Zone	<p>Lakes A Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible areas for further analysis • Vegetation provisions • Lakes water quality the major issue • Bush settlements • Complexity of existing lakes A chapter - needs integration with rest of district • On-site parking and turning <p>Draft Parts A and B of the District Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape management and economic growth need greater emphasis in revised draft of chapter A.
6. 31 July 2008	Ngati Whakaue Master Plan/Significant resource management issues facing the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing of the Ngati Whakaue plan change has implications to overall district plan review.
7. 8 September 2008	Lake water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eco landscape development plans and TDRS should be investigated further.
8. 10 November 2008	Zoning issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the concept of "Transitional development" zone • Hinemaru Street and the wide variety of zones in this area needs review • Changing residential areas will be difficult where there is a Marae – Tarawera Road and Ngapuna • Planning needs to look at "Go" or "playground/Tourist" zones • The racecourse area needs to be changed as it is under utilised • Get rid of heavy industry out of Ngapuna. Promote light industrial out at Waipa Valley • Zone change implications and its impact on rates • Legal timelines and what parts of the plan will be operative when the plan is notified.

7 FRESH IDEAS FROM NEIGHBOURING DISTRICT COUNCILS

During February 2009 planning staff conducted meetings with adjacent territorial authorities to get a sense of cross-boundary or shared issues. The Councils that staff met with were Tauranga City Council, Western Bay of Plenty District Council, Taupo District Council, South Waikato District Council, Kawerau District Council, Whakatane District Council.

Key issues emerging:

- Many of the Councils are reviewing their district plans; Western Bay has just notified theirs, Kawerau may notify around July and Tauranga may notify around the same time as Rotorua.
- Papakainga and multiple owned land development are other big issues, with a range of responses being looked at.
- All Councils are grappling with rural subdivision as a major issue going forward.
- Consistency between Councils is topical, everyone recognises the value of similar definitions and baselines.

Issue	Comment	District Council
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warm homes, clean air, and insulation of houses, is a key issue. • Not seen as a major for district plan, more a regional matter. 	South Waikato DC 12 February 2009
CBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hub has had impact but not much vacancy in Strand. • Landscaping strips buffering Industrial Zones owned and maintained by Council have been implemented. • Minimum Residential lot size staying the same, except for new greenfields where SmjartGrowth/RPS 15 dwellings per ha apply. • Linkage to Town Centre Plan criteria. Greater height requirement to increase mixed use. Getting people back into the environment and revitalisation. • Fences in front yards, don't want high fences, etc. 1.2 – 70% permeability to 1.8. Require consent if higher than 1.2m. • Introduction of site coverage requirements. • More 'promotion' of medium density with urban design controls – adjoining off-site amenity to compensate. • Landscape ONFL protection – same but enhanced with colour reflectivity provision. • Stronger controls to manage view shafts. • Inclusion of RAP's – where landowner agreement. If you've listed in district plan lesser provisions to qualify for a protection lot - not dissimilar to eco-plans. • Town Centre Plan approach for Te Puke – residential living. • Urban design controls for commercial/industrial and residential. • Separate additional criteria, could be looked at as sub zones. 	Whakatane DC 13 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different phase to Rotorua re district plan review – Taupo has just been made operative and monitoring kicked off. 	Taupo DC 12 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping an eye on RMA amendments. • Full plan review at least 3 years away for Whakatane District Council. 	Whakatane DC 13 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely close to publication of draft for consultation purposes being prepared by consultants. 	Kawerau DC 13 February 2009

Issue	Comment	District Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notification June/July/August, mindful of amendments. • Rewrite within parameters of what have got. Existing structure will be used but will make it more user friendly. • A direction to start and finish in same election cycle. • Putting together a draft: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preliminary amenity engagement • coincide with LTCCP consultation. • April – August/September (notification anticipated by September). • Sub-regional co-ordination framework. • As consistent with WBOP as possible, especially rules that affect land use at boundaries. • WBOP notified their DP on Saturday. • Review infrastructure code. • Built Environmental Strategy. 	Tauranga DC 11 February 2009
District Plan Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives and Policies needed to be beefed up. Surveyors and Consultants discussions have been helpful. • Joint development of plan construction with Tauranga City Council. • Section 32 analysis in conjunction with WBOP and TCC where appropriate. • Standard definitions – collaborative approach. • Engineering Development code of practice sits outside the district plan. • Road widths in DP. 	Western BOP DC 11 February 2009
Draft RPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a lot of impact from where Kawerau is now. • River management • Air quality issues. • Rail need link Kawerau to the port. • Importance of rail link in next 50 years. • Existing rail line to WBOP. • RDC needs to be just as cognisant of the transport needs/link between Kawerau and Rotorua, rather than Rotorua looking to Tauranga. 	Kawerau DC 13 February 2009
Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle movements are an issue. • Status quo, recognition of key sector of community. 	South Waikato DC 12 February 2009
Growth Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't expect anticipate development/growth on the Taupo/Rotorua boundary in the next 20-50 years. • Mapara – new urbanism feel. • Valley/bush clusters supported. • Status quo in terms of residential. • Significance of Mighty River Power easement. • Reverse sensitivity issues. 	Taupo DC 12 February 2009
Growth Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If large industry close down – what then would you use land for. There is capacity in towns and this needs to be realised. • Corridor study for SH1 underway. 	South Waikato DC 12 February 2009

Issue	Comment	District Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tarawera River a key component to iwi and industry and recreation. • Both Iwi hold statutory acknowledgements. • Needs to be better liaising with Maori Land Court • Approach to papakainga needs to be more flexible; need to be mindful of equity in density. 	South Waikato DC 12 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuwharetoa Accord Joint Management Group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resource Consents./ Private plan change – Maori land. – Option of committee made up of 2 councillors, 2 Ngati Tuwharetoa representatives and 2 independent commissioners 	Taupo DC 12 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papakainga (focus group established with Smartgrowth influence) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ability to develop land based on tenure – Linkage to Part II and Sec.5-8 of RMA. • Archaeological sites – tiered system approach to management. • Marae zones – RDC perhaps could adopt. • Eco loos/solar panels. • Urupa, heritage, cultural, archaeological. • Sight lines from Urupa. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DC's/LGA – removing reserve contribution in Marae zone. 	Tauranga DC 11 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iwi issues are interspersed throughout the plan. • Change of focus – graduated requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Tougher requirements on unsealed roads. – Number of houses managed and community facility is a permitted activity • Provide for increase in Maori population 56/58. • Still charge financial contributions but reserves, down to 50% • Increased flexibility for development provided. 	Western BOP DC 11 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papakainga is a controlled activity in the district plan. • First two houses permitted, above this controlled <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – separation – vehicle access. • Policy in plan for development of Maori land. • No Marae zone specific recognition. 	Whakatane DC 13 February 2009
Outstanding Landscapes / Natural Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community buy-in. • Waikato River / Ohakuri. • Isthmus district wide landscape study. • Majority protected by DoC. • Part funding consultation with iwi. • Introduced rules for vegetation clearance. • Earthworks management rules also included. • Bonus lot rule for SNA's. • Exemptions if regulated already: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Forestry Stewardship Council – Nga Whenua Kahui Kawenata – Landowners protection – Resourcing is an issue. 	Taupo DC 12 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whakatane interested in ONFL work. 	Whakatane DC 13 February 2009

Issue	Comment	District Council
Rural Land Use and Subdivision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Singular farm – Tuwharetoa Ki Kawerau ownership, surrounds 2/3 of district. • Opportunities for lifestyle development, Brunswick type scale of lot, but not major. • May be opening up of land – already currently zoned and permissive to allow this. 	Kawerau DC 13 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More prescriptive rural subdivision rules. Getting same message from consultants about subdivision being silver bullet for nitrification. • Dairy conversions slowing down. • Dairying: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rural Activity - No regulation • Leave nitrification and land discharge issues to Environment Waikato. 	Taupo DC 12 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot on the market in Whakatane, not a lot of movement. • Minimum 5000m², average 2 ha. No non-complying rural subdivision, all defaults to discretionary. • Use of TDR's not likely in Whakatane District Council. • Focus of subdivision on poor quality soils. May look to make this less permissive and less ad hoc, identify more a cluster or structure plan approach. • Potential pressure point of direct relevance to Rotorua. Manawahe – 50 – 65 lots proposed for development. • Murupara – community of interest for Rotorua. • Creation of isolated communities for Civil Defence areas an issue. • Roof water acceptability. • Forestry lifestyle blocks. • Whakatane have received a forestry park subdivision: • No demand yet in Rotorua District Council 	Whakatane DC 13 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural residential plan change last year was notified and works well. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Tightened up subdivision rules. – Provision of more guidance for subdivision. – Not wholesale subdivision into smaller lots. – More directive in terms of lifestyle lots. • Demand for lifestyle lots – demand is coming out of the Hamilton/Waikato area, not Rotorua. Karapiro high demand. • Yet to see the peak of forest to farm conversions. Considered a good thing by elected members. • Impacts not district council business. • Review of RPS – what this might mean. • Guardians of the River. Variation 5 unfurl, what this will mean for the district. • Activity based – landscape and natural values. 	South Waikato DC 12 February 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating new lifestyle zones and restricting current pepper pot approach. • If protecting bush or amalgamate titles, people in lifestyle zones only subdivide through transferable title. • Any existing ability to subdivide in Rural 1 & 2 is recognised through TDR to lifestyle zone. 	Western BOP DC 11 February 2009

Issue	Comment	District Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of economy through protection productive soils. • Clamping down on ad hoc subdivision • Capped number of TDR's – 20 lots per donor site. • Second dwellings Rural Zone to become a non-complying activity. • Minor dwellings – associated with main house, and be within 20m from main dwelling. Also charge 50% financial contributions. • Protection of sites of importance and also reflective of heritage criteria RPS. 	
Shared Economic Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention in economic development opportunities – look at traditional and natural geographical link to RDC and Eastern Bay – not really suited to Whakatane as a result of coastal nature. • Strong arguments for affinity with Rotorua and Taupo, more so than Whakatane and the coast. International airport at Rotorua may accelerate this change. • Potential linkages for economic cooperation and increased security for industrial estate. Utilisation of geothermal resources. Also being a gateway to adventure type activities – international and domestic markets, i.e. gateway to Tarawera Falls by land. • Linkage walking, running, mountain bike tracks. • Greater interest and affinity with Rotorua side than Eastern Bay. Now part of Rotorua electorate. • More examination of potential strategic allegiances/alliance with Rotorua. • Mindful of impact of airport and what that will mean for Kawerau – need to find ways to fit into this. 	Kawerau DC 13 February 2009
Urban Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More focussed on arresting decline in population. • Not an issue of great importance – not great expansion of urban zone. • Infill and accommodation of market desires. • Still have extremely affordable housing, market takes care of what needs to happen. • Potential working with RDC and WDC – what / how urban design means. Kawerau is a suburb of a wider sub-region. • Good infrastructural servicing capacity – can cope with double population presently have. • Mapara Valley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Urban design - Synergies with LTCCP • Landscape values and views protection especially as they sit in urban area. • Infrastructure code incorporates urban design elements. • Residential environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Very permissive historically – Introduce basic amenity controls – Linkage of land use and subdivision – Minimum 1:325m² – 1:180 m² • Overshadowing also needed correcting. • Non residential uses in residential area (Plan change 48) • Subdivision and lots size – legacy of no site coverage requirements. 	Kawerau DC 13 February 2009
		Taupo DC 12 February 2009
		Tauranga DC 11 February 2009

Issue	Comment	District Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensification an issue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – City living; – Around CBD intensification market viability • Height not only solution to density. • Historically has been a relaxed attitude to Commercial development. Tighten up non residential in residential areas. • Consolidation of commercial/sub-commercial areas. • Direction for industrial areas – when non-industrial areas are acceptable. • New areas Tauriko – new provisions design and landscaping. • Special ecological sites - review category: • Protection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Improvement • Subdivision linkage – revegetation of areas. • Whakatane has a residential growth strategy, potential greenfield expansion is key. • Other draft growth strategies – industrial, commercial, retail strategy, all in draft. • Transportation study – for second bridge into town, and realignment potential of S.H. This will impact on residential and commercial. • Offices in residential zone burgeoning activity. 	Whakatane DC 13 February 2009
Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New post harvest sector zone to enable ongoing expansion of existing “strategic” facilities in the rural zones. • New post harvest facilities to be in industrial zone. • All terrain park – now has its own zone focussed on managing external off-site effects. • Innovation Parks – don’t need special zone. 	Western BOP DC 11 February 2009

8 CONCLUSION

The issues raised in the preceding sections demonstrate that producing the next plan is a major task. The issues that have been raised also demonstrate a strong commitment from both community and Council to make the next plan as useful and effective as possible.

It was not the purpose of this paper to evaluate the merits or relevance of the issues raised – this will come later in the form of issue or chapter-specific discussion papers that will recommend policy directions for the next district plan.