

# TAUPO DISTRICT 2050 DISTRICT PLAN VARIATIONS

*Integrated Planning for Sustainable Growth*

## DECISION REPORT ON GENERAL SUBMISSIONS TO THE TAUPO DISTRICT PLAN







## CERTIFIED COPY OF RESOLUTION

**COMMITTEE:** DISTRICT REGULATORY & HEARINGS COMMITTEE

**APPLICANT:** DISTRICT PLAN  
OFFICERS RECOMMENDED RESPONSES AND RUNNING TEXT ON  
SUBMISSIONS TO VARIATION 19 RURAL LOT SIZES, VARIATION  
20 FUTURE RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT AND VARIATION 21  
GROWTH MANAGEMENT AND LAND DEVELOPMENT.

**DATE:** 28 SEPTEMBER 2007

820 RESOLVED

1. THAT SUBJECT TO SUCH CHANGES MADE BY THE COMMITTEE AND PURSUANT TO SECTION 10 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 THE PLANNERS AMENDED RECOMMENDATIONS DETAILED IN THE AMENDED REPORTS FOR VARIATION 19, VARIATION 20 AND VARIATION 21 BE ADOPTED.
2. THAT THE AMENDED RUNNING TEXT DOCUMENTS BE ADOPTED AND INCORPORATED INTO THE TAUPO PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN.

*Gathergood/McElwee*

***I, Colin R Morrell, do hereby certify that the aforementioned is a true and correct record.***

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Colin R Morrell", is written over a horizontal line.

C R Morrell  
GOVERNANCE & ADMINISTRATION MANAGER

<b>1.</b>	<b>The structure of the Decisions Response Report.</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>The Philosophy of the TD2050 Variations.</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Issues for the general submissions received on TD2050 Variations</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Reference to TD2050	7
3.2	Notification Process of the TD2050 Variations	8
3.3	Local Government Act and Resource Management Act Consultation Processes.	9
3.4.	Effects Based Approach	9
<b>4.</b>	<b>Individual Submission Responses</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>TD2050 Process</b>	<b>10</b>
	Submission TD2050.18.6 by Dr Paul Gregg	10
	Submission TD2050.19.6 by Dr Bryan & Patricia Watts	10
	Submission TD2050.21.6 by J H Williams	10
	Submission TD2050.23.6 by T & A Gebbie, A Gebbie, K Gebbie	10
	Submission TD2050.25.6 by Peter & Beverly Greig	10
	Submission TD2050.26.6 by Eric & Frances Christensen	10
	Submission TD2050.27.4 by Jocelyn Reeve	10
	Submission TD2050.39.7 by R & A Marchant	10
	Submission TD2050.40.6 by K Mahoney	10
	Submission TD2050.41.6 by R & G Jones	11
	Submission TD2050.46.7 by Patrice G Williams	11
	Submission TD2050.59.6 by Lois & Ian Bennie	11
	Submission TD2050.112.6 by Maurice & Mary Costello	11
	Submission TD2050.113.6 by G B & E A Sutton	11
	Submission TD2050.114.6 by Wallace Pettigrew	11
	Submission TD2050.115.6 by Mr & Mrs M Ventham	11
	Submission TD2050.116.6 by Guerin Family P/Ship	11
	Submission TD2050.117.6 by Alex & June Duthie	11
	Submission TD2050.118.6 by Brian & Hilary Jago	11
	Submission TD2050.119.6 by Patricia Ann Hotter	12
	Submission TD2050.120.6 by Harry M H Salmon	12
	Submission TD2050.122.6 by R J & N F Neveldsen	12
	Submission TD2050.125.6 by R A & E A Shaw	12
	Submission TD2050.126.8 by G & K Leslie	12
	Submission TD2050.127.3 by D & R E Huxley-Jones	12
	Submission TD2050.130.6 by Warwick & Julie Wright	12
	Submission TD2050.135.6 by Janet & Patrick Velvin	12
	Submission TD2050.138.6 by Tracey & Michael Ferguson	13
	Submission TD2050.142.6 by Ngaio & Ken Double	13
	Submission TD2050.143.6 by Stewart & Carolyn Gebbie	13
	Submission TD2050.145.6 by DJ & SA Gatland	13
	Submission TD2050.146.2 by Malcom Gilbert	13
	Submission TD2050.146.10 by Malcom Gilbert	13
	Submission TD2050.10.1 by Advocates for the Tongariro River	14
<b>4.2</b>	<b>TD2050 General</b>	<b>15</b>
	Submission TD2050.66.1 by Rimu Tree Limited	15
	Submission TD2050.77.1 by Environment Waikato	15
	Submission TD2050.79.5 by Scenic Ventures Ltd	16
	Submission TD2050.80.1 by Lakeview Ventures Ltd	16
	Submission TD2050.91.1 by Lakes & Waterways Action Group	16
	Submission TD2050.124.7 by Department of Conservation	16
	Submission TD2050.131.1 by Contact Energy Ltd	17
	Submission TD2050.131.2 by Contact Energy Ltd	17
	Submission TD2050.16.1 by Vector Limited	17
	Submission TD2050.29.1 by The Proprietors of Hauhungaroa No 6 Block	17
	Submission TD2050.67.1 by Transpower NZ Ltd	17
	Submission TD2050.11.4 by Mapara Valley Preservation Society Inc	18
	Submission TD2050.12.2 by Sarah Foreman	19

## Decisions on General Submissions to the TD2050 Variations

Submission TD2050.128.3 by Hopper Developments Ltd .....	20
Submission TD2050.137.15 by Environmental Defence Society .....	20
Submission TD2050.148.3 by Tukairangi Trust.....	22
Submission TD2050.11.5 by Mapara Valley Preservation Society Inc.....	23
Submission TD2050.50.2 by Carter Holt Harvey Limited .....	24
Submission TD2050.51.2 by Wendy & Glenn Yorke .....	25
Submission TD2050.52.1 by B Twentyman & Others .....	25
Submission TD2050.99.1 by Bruce Twentyman & others .....	26
Submission TD2050.98.1 by Sheena Twentyman & others .....	27
Submission TD2050.101.1 by Sarah Twentyman & others .....	27
Submission TD2050.100.1 by Michael Twentyman & others .....	28
Submission TD2050.102.1 by Barbara Twentyman & others .....	28
Submission TD2050.103.1 by Kathryn Ida O'Leary & others .....	29
Submission TD2050.104.1 by Kelly Duncan & others .....	29
Submission TD2050.98.3 by Sheena Twentyman & others.....	30
Submission TD2050.107.2 by Ian Charles Smith & others .....	30
Submission TD2050.98.2 by Sheena Twentyman & others.....	31
Submission TD2050.99.2 by Bruce Twentyman & others .....	32
Submission TD2050.100.2 by Michael Twentyman & others .....	32
Submission TD2050.101.2 by Sarah Twentyman & others .....	33
Submission TD2050.102.2 by Barbara Twentyman & others .....	33
Submission TD2050.103.2 by Kathryn Ida O'Leary & others .....	34
Submission TD2050.104.2 by Kelly Duncan & others .....	34
Submission TD2050.98.4 by Sheena Twentyman & others.....	35
Submission TD2050.99.4 by Bruce Twentyman & others .....	35
Submission TD2050.100.4 by Michael Twentyman & others .....	36
Submission TD2050.101.4 by Sarah Twentyman & others .....	37
Submission TD2050.102.4 by Barbara Twentyman & others .....	37
Submission TD2050.103.4 by Kathryn Ida O'Leary & others .....	38
Submission TD2050.104.4 by Kelly Duncan & others .....	39
Submission TD2050.107.1 by Ian Charles Smith & others .....	39
Submission TD2050.111.1 by Tu Mohi & others (The Mohi Family) .....	40
Submission TD2050.111.2 by Tu Mohi & others (The Mohi Family) .....	42
Submission TD2050.111.3 by Tu Mohi & others (The Mohi Family) .....	42
Submission TD2050.111.6 by Tu Mohi & others (The Mohi Family) .....	44
Submission TD2050.132.1 by Tiaho Mary Pilot .....	45

## 1. THE STRUCTURE OF THE DECISIONS RESPONSE REPORT.

This Decisions report has been structured to respond to submissions in a logical order.

Section 2 of this report reiterates the philosophy of the TD2050 Variations (Variations 19, 20 and 21 inclusive) as a whole. This philosophy should be considered as part of all decisions and associated reasons contained in Section 4 of this report. In some cases Section 2 has been referred to directly, but in all cases this philosophy is an important consideration.

Section 3 of this report contains responses to those issues which have been identified by a number of submissions. The appropriate response has been referenced as part of the specific reasons in section 4 of this report, and is considered to be part of the decision.

Section 4 contains all points of submission and associated further submissions relevant to this report. These submissions have been grouped into like issues and responded to accordingly. Each individual or group of submissions will have the following:

- **Council Decision:** This is the decision to either *Accept*, *Accept in part* or *Not Accept* those particular points of original and further submissions. Please note that if a submission is *accepted*, all further submissions in opposition will be *not accepted* and vice versa. If a submission is *accepted in part* this will mean all submissions either in support or opposition will also be *accepted in part*. This rule also extends to further submissions, in that further submissions supporting an original submission which is accepted will also be Accepted, and further submissions opposing such a submission will not be accepted.
- **Reason:** This is the reasons given by the Council for the decision. As outlined above, Section 2 should always be considered as part of this reason. In some cases references will be made to relevant parts of Section 3, these parts should also be considered as part of the Council reason.
- **Resulting Action:** The resulting action follows the Council decision and reasons. Where this has resulted in a change to the text or maps of the variations, this will be shown below in italics with additions to the text shown in green and underlined, e.g. *addition*, and deletions to the text will be shown in red with strikethrough, e.g. *deletion*.

## 2. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE TD2050 VARIATIONS.

Council has notified a series of variations to the District Plan (DP) signaling the implementation of Taupo District 2050, the District's Growth Management Strategy (TD2050 GMS). The intent of each variation is:

Variation 19: Rural Lot Sizes: Proposes new Objectives, Policies and rules in respect to subdivision in the rural environment, and a revision of the minimum lot size in the Rural Environment

Variation 20: Future Residential Environment: Proposes a strategic zoning of areas suitable for urban development

Variation 21: Land Development and Growth Management: Provides a policy framework for unfolding identified future growth areas in the Taupo District

Whilst these are three variations, they are by no means to be considered as separate or unrelated. Each variation implements a separate aspect of the overall philosophy of TD2050 being:

1. Protecting the rural environment from inappropriate urban development; and
2. Providing for urban development in the short term; and
3. Providing for urban development in the identified parts of the rural environment in the longer term through an appropriate process.

This proactive approach to the management of urban growth will assist the Council and community in achieving the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

By taking a District wide look at the issues associated with urban growth the Plan can better provide for and manage the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables the Plan to provide for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of the District as a whole.

Prior to the variation the philosophy of the Plan meant that it was not as well equipped to deal with the cumulative effects of urban growth within the Rural Environment. TD2050 GMS has introduced a philosophy of actively identifying future areas of urban growth. This change in turn will allow the Council and Community more sustainably manage the effects of urban growth. Ongoing structure planning will still need to be undertaken before the identified growth areas can be carried through into the District Plan by way of plan changes. This process of identified growth areas and specific structure planning will mean that there needs to be tighter controls over the remainder of the rural environment to prevent urban sprawl and maintain the rural character and amenity values.

This approach at a district level is directive as it is intended to provide the community, developers and infrastructure providers with greater certainty about the location of future urban growth so that its effects, particularly cumulative effects, can be managed in a sustainable manner. It is considered that this clearer direction and certainty provided through the TD2050 Variations means that the Council is better able to meet the purpose and principles of the RMA and achieve the sustainable development objectives of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Land Transport Management Act 2003.

It is important to note that the primary assessment of the sustainability of these variations was undertaken through the section 32 analysis that was notified with these variations. That report assesses the costs benefits and alternatives to these variations on a wider level and on a provision by provision basis. The assessment contained within that report also needs to be taken into account when considering the Council decisions. On review, it is noted that no submissions in opposition to aspects of the variations respond to or contest the underlying philosophy of the variations or the section 32 analysis. Whilst specific points are identified which require amendment, the overarching context does not change.

Council considered that many of the submissions in opposition to the variations did not appear to fully consider the wider context and the implications of the variations to the District as a whole. For instance, a large number of submissions stated that increasing the minimum lot sizes in the Rural Environment would prevent any type of urban development in the rural environment. Those submissions appear not to have considered that Variation 20 and 21 will provide new areas for urban growth in what was (before notification) the Rural Environment. Further to this, it is intended that the planning for these growth areas, will include a provision for a range of differing lot sizes, to provide for a diversity of living styles including rural residential. Conversely a number of submitters on Variation 21 objected to the TD2050 Urban Growth Areas urbanising the Rural Environment. These submissions did not consider the minimum lot sizes introduced through Variation 19 which will provide a much stronger framework for protecting the rural character and amenity and preventing urban growth outside the identified urban growth areas.

### 3. ISSUES FOR THE GENERAL SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED ON TD2050 VARIATIONS

#### 3.1 Reference to TD2050

In several instances, the variations refer to 'TD2050'. This is either an internal cross reference, such as referring to section 3e.7 the TD2050 Structure Plan Process, or a reference to the TD2050 GMS. Cross references to other parts of the DP are in no way *ultra vires* and will assist the user in their understanding of how the DP operates. It is appropriate that such references remain to facilitate the implementation of the Plan.

References to TD2050 GMS within Objectives, Policies and Methods of the variations is a different issue, and as identified by a number of submitters, this is an external document which sits outside the Plan. The submission by Hopper Development Ltd for instance, identifies that to

correctly reference such an external document then the date of the adoption of that document should be added to appropriately identify which document and which version of that document is being brought into the Plan for the purposes of that provision. It is anticipated that in the future, aspects of the TD2050 GMS document may be revised, so referencing to a dated version of the TD2050 GMS may not be appropriate. Given that there is only one occasion where the TD2050 GMS document is referenced within a provision of the Plan, being Objective 3e.2.1, then it is considered necessary to amend this Objective to make it *vires*. Objective 3e.2.1 refers to the growth of the Taupo District in accordance with TD2050. This objective could be rephrased to refer to section 3e.6 of the Plan that actually maps out how TD2050 GMS sees growth occurring. 3e.6 only refers to the 'Stage 2' growth areas, but as Variation 20 has zoned the 'Stage 1' areas, it is not anticipated that the objective would be used in respect to these areas.

The TD2050 GMS is also referenced in the explanatory text associated with a number of objectives and policies. As the explanatory text are not statutory provisions (statutory provisions are considered to be objectives, policies and methods) it is appropriate that these contain references to the TD2050 GMS to facilitate the understanding and use of the provisions being explained. The TD2050 GMS is an important document which has gone through the Local Government Act special consultative process. The TD2050 GMS has been adopted by the Taupo District Council to direct and manage growth in the Taupo District. It is appropriate that this document is referenced within the explanatory text to assist plan users. It is not considered good practice for developers and decision makers alike, to ignore the pre-eminent growth management tool that exists in the Taupo District. It is also important to note that the TD2050 GMS document forms part of the Notified section 32 document associated with these variations.

### **3.2 Notification Process of the TD2050 Variations**

The notification of the TD2050 Variations was undertaken in accordance with the 1<sup>st</sup> schedule of the RMA. It is important to remember that the notification itself was not the first part of the consultation process, which is described in section 1.2 of the associated Section 32 document. Whilst the preconsultation is detailed in the Section 32 document, the actual notification consisted of:

1. Public notices appearing in the Taupo Times, the Dominion Post, the Rotorua Daily Post and the New Zealand Herald on 12 January 2007, the Turangi Chronicle on 11 January 2007 and the South Waikato Times on 10 January 2007;
2. Articles in the Environmental Services newsletter 'Without Prejudice'.
3. Media releases being sent to all media outlets;
4. A public notice and associated letter being sent to every ratepayer in the Taupo District with a brief description of the variations on 30 February 2007;
5. A copy of the actual variation being sent to every party who had actively participated in the drafting on the TD2050 Variations document at notification;
6. An extended period for submissions, substantially longer than that legally required by the Act (34 working days as opposed to the required 20)
7. All documentation being made available at all council offices, all libraries in the district and on the Council website.

Once this was done, it is the responsibility of all who have an interest or think they have an interest to pursue the matter further if they require more information on the subject matter of the variations. When undertaking variations Council must decide on the most practical and effective manner to consult on all such matters and it is considered that the consultation methods employed for the TD2050 Variations were undertaken in such a manner. Some submitters refer to a lack of signs being erected on land affected by the variations. Given that the entire rural environment, and numerous areas around Taupo, Turangi, Motouapa, Whareroa and Kuratau were affected by the variations, such a method would not have been an effective nor practical undertaking. It is also noted that a requirement for a sign to be placed on site has

been removed as a statutory requirement from the resources consent process (and was never in place for the variation/plan change process).

It is considered that the notification process followed went further than the minimal legal obligations detailed in the RMA, and in combination with the pre consultation process detailed in the Section 32 document, was an open and inclusive process.

### **3.3 Local Government Act and Resource Management Act Consultation Processes.**

It is considered that the process followed for determining the growth areas which is identified in the TD2050 GMS document was robust and appropriate. TDC consulted on the TD2050 GMS document on through the Local Government Act special consultative process, where by the community had the ability to submit and speak to the document being consulted on. The document was then adopted by Council. Further to this in the drafting of the TD2050 variations, not only were parts of the TD2050 GMS brought into the variations but the TD2050 GMS formed part of the Section 32 document that accompanied Variations 19-21. The implications of this was that those aspects of the TD2050 GMS that were brought into the variations were available for submissions and further submissions under the Resource Management Act process. And as the GMS document formed part of the notified Section 32, then this document was also up for submission as part of this process.

Both processes under both acts provide for a high degree of public input and further to this the RMA process allows for appeal to the Environment Court if parties are not satisfied with the Council decisions. Another important consideration in respect to the development of the TD2050 Urban Growth Areas is that the plan change process will need to be followed for the associated rezoning of these areas (as identified in section 3e.7 of the plan). This will provide for another chance for community input through submissions and further submissions of this change, particularly in respect to the form of these urban growth areas.

### **3.4. Effects Based Approach**

As expressed in the amendments to section 1.5 of the DP through Variation 20. It is considered that the TD2050 variations still enable the DP to be an effects based document, however the incorporation of TD2050 strategic growth zoning within the DP will allow for greater certainty for the community, improved management of the cumulative, future and potential effects of urban development and more efficient and sustainable management of resources.

## 4. INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSION RESPONSES

### 4.1 TD2050 PROCESS

#### **Submission TD2050.18.6 by Dr Paul Gregg**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

#### **Submission TD2050.19.6 by Dr Bryan & Patricia Watts**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

#### **Submission TD2050.21.6 by J H Williams**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

#### **Submission TD2050.23.6 by T & A Gebbie, A Gebbie, K Gebbie**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

#### **Submission TD2050.25.6 by Peter & Beverly Greig**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

#### **Submission TD2050.26.6 by Eric & Frances Christensen**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

#### **Submission TD2050.27.4 by Jocelyn Reeve**

**Submission:** Finally I would like to draw your attention to the lack of consultation with the rural, landowning sector both prior to and during the publication of Variation 19. Some way of informing this sector needs to be developed, particularly when the issue affects the whole sector.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

#### **Submission TD2050.39.7 by R & A Marchant**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

#### **Submission TD2050.40.6 by K Mahoney**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.41.6 by R & G Jones**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.46.7 by Patrice G Williams**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.59.6 by Lois & Ian Bennie**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.112.6 by Maurice & Mary Costello**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.113.6 by G B & E A Sutton**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.114.6 by Wallace Pettigrew**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.115.6 by Mr & Mrs M Ventham**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.116.6 by Guerin Family P/Ship**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.117.6 by Alex & June Duthie**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.118.6 by Brian & Hilary Jago**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.119.6 by Patricia Ann Hotter**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.120.6 by Harry M H Salmon**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.122.6 by R J & N F Neveldsen**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.125.6 by R A & E A Shaw**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.126.8 by G & K Leslie**

**Submission:** We believe that any re-zoning/subdivision/development needs to be addressed in detail by TDC and the opportunity to comment and speak be afforded to all those affected. We wish our objection to be heard, and to have opportunity to speak to it.

**Relief Sought:** As there has been ineffective consultation by TDC to date on the proposal to re-zone/subdivide, we ask that the proposal is re-advertised effectively and personally to all those affected so that all can have the opportunity to comment and submit.

**Submission TD2050.127.3 by D & R E Huxley-Jones**

**Submission:** We were at Kuratau last weekend (24th and 25th Feb. 2007) and were very surprised to learn of this proposed alteration that would affect D2 and D3 blocks Kuratau. In our February rates notice, there was no mention that Kuratau would be affected. In fact it appears that the intention to rezone is very vague and does not mention Kuratau or the environment. In earlier correspondence with you, we were advised that the Council would keep us informed of any developments. To date all we have had is an acknowledgement of our correspondence.

There was no signage erected in the proposed area to inform us or any of the general public about the rezoning, and we only became aware of this as the result of the discussion with a neighbour.

**Relief Sought:** The notification process has not been as open as it should have been and due process was not followed as there was no signage in the area to notify interested parties.

**Submission TD2050.130.6 by Warwick & Julie Wright**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.135.6 by Janet & Patrick Velvin**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.138.6 by Tracey & Michael Ferguson**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.142.6 by Ngaio & Ken Double**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.143.6 by Stewart & Carolyn Gebbie**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.145.6 by DJ & SA Gatland**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.146.2 by Malcom Gilbert**

**Submission:** It has been drawn to our attention that there was one advertisement of this proposed change on 18.01.07, which we missed. The notice supplied with our rates bill in February did not make it clear that Kuratau and its escarpment area environment were to be affected, and to our knowledge, no notices of intent to re-zone have been placed directly on the land.

For a change with such major implications for Kuratau, we consider it inappropriate that so little effort has been made to publicise the proposed change – an approach that we feel is contrary to the intent of the Resource Management Act and TDC’s duty to its ratepayers and the public. In response to an earlier letter we wrote to TDC when we first noticed unannounced signs of surveying this block of land, we were assured correct process would be followed, with an opportunity for consultation. We consider this undertaking has not been adequately met.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Submission TD2050.146.10 by Malcom Gilbert**

**Submission:** There is concerns as to the manner of the public notification of variations 20 and 21 and aspects of the public consultation.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Council Decision**

Not accept submissions TD2050.18.6, TD2050.19.6, TD2050.21.6, TD2050.23.6, TD2050.25.6, TD2050.26.6, TD2050.27.4, TD2050.39.7, TD2050.40.6,TD2050.41.6, TD2050.46.7, TD2050.59.6, TD2050.112.6, TD2050.113.6, TD2050.114.6, TD2050.115.6, TD2050.116.6, TD2050.117.6, TD2050.118.6, TD2050.119.6, TD2050.120.6, TD2050.122.6, TD2050.125.6, TD2050.126.8, TD2050.127.3, TD2050.130.6, TD2050.135.6, TD2050.138.6, TD2050.142.6, TD2050.143.6, TD2050.145.6, TD2050.146.0,TD2050.146.2 and TD2050.146.10.

**Reason:**

The notification of the TD2050 Variations was undertaken in accordance with the 1<sup>st</sup> schedule of the RMA. It is important to remember that the notification itself was not the first part of the consultation process, which is described in section 1.2 of the associated Section 32 document.

Whilst the preconsultation is detailed in the Section 32 document, the actual notification consisted of:

1. Public notices appearing in the Taupo Times, the Dominion Post, the Rotorua Daily Post and the New Zealand Herald on 12 January 2007, the Turangi Chronicle on 11 January 2007 and the South Waikato Times on 10 January 2007;
2. Articles in the Environmental Services newsletter 'Without Prejudice'.
3. Media releases being sent to all media outlets;
4. A public notice and associated letter being sent to every ratepayer in the Taupo District with a brief description of the variations on 30 January 2007;
5. A copy of the actual variation being sent to every party who had actively participated in the drafting on the TD2050 Variations document at notification;
6. An extended period for submissions, substantially longer than that legally required by the Act (34 working days as opposed to the required 20)
7. All documentation being made available at all council offices, all libraries in the district and on the Council website.

Once this was done, it is the responsibility of all who have an interest or think they have an interest to pursue the matter further if they require more information on the subject matter of the variations. When undertaking variations Council must decide on the most practical and effective manner to consult on all such matters and it is considered that the consultation methods employed for the TD2050 Variations were undertaken in such a manner. Some submitters refer to a lack of signs being erected on land affected by the variations. Given that the entire rural environment, and numerous areas around Taupo, Turangi, Motuoapa, Whareroa and Kuratau were affected by the variations, such a method would not have been an effective nor practical undertaking. It is also noted that a requirement for a sign to be placed on site has been removed as a statutory requirement from the resources consent process (and was never in place for the variation/plan change process).

It is considered that the notification process followed went further than the minimal legal obligations detailed in the RMA, and in combination with the pre consultation process detailed in the Section 32 document, was an open and inclusive process.

#### **Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the Plan as a result of these submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.10.1 by Advocates for the Tongariro River**

**Submission:** Support in principle variations 19-21 but have our concerns over some key issues.

The rural environment encompasses more than just land. The term Rural Environment is too narrowly used. A key part of the Rural Environment of this District is its lakes and rivers.

**Relief Sought:** A redefining of 'Rural Environment'.

#### **Council Decision**

Not Accept submission TD2050.10.1

#### **Reason:**

The Plan currently describes the 'Rural Environment' in 3b.1 Introduction and in the Explanation of the associated objectives. The first paragraph of the description includes elements of the Rural Environment such as: predominantly characterised by dispersed buildings, rural roads, non-urban infrastructure supporting farming, horticulture and forestry land use. Also significant development associated with the generation of electricity, tourist activity and recreation.

The description reflects the diverse variety of land uses in Taupo District's Rural Environment, and does not only focus on minimal buildings as one feature. It would not be feasible to include

the 'full range' of rural type activities as the list would include activities that have little or no relevance to the variation. Rather the variation aims to be succinct and focus on matters and issues that are relevant to the Variation 19 Goals, which are the protection of the Rural Environment, its land uses, amenity and character and ensuring efficient and sustainable resource use by concentrating growth within identified areas.

The Variations already include reference to the Districts lakes, rivers and margins as being the key part of the Rural Environment. This is included in Section 3b.1 Introduction. Further reference to lakes and rivers is included in sections 3b generally, 4b.2, 4e.1 and section 3e of the DP.

The Rural Environment comprises all that land within the District that is not identified as an urban environment (Residential, Industrial and Town Centre Environments). While the Rural Environment is made up of different land formations, landscape characteristics and environmental sensitivities, and contains many different land use activities, it is nevertheless a non-urban environment.

The Rural Environment is characterised by its spatial landscape with dispersed buildings, predominantly farming and forestry land use, and reserve land providing flora, fauna and landscape protection along with recreational opportunities.

While the actual level or identified quality of the amenity values of the Rural Environment can be debated, there are some clear and identifiable common attributes that determine rural land for the purposes of identifying the Rural Environment. The first of these is that clearly the Rural Environment is not an urban environment.

The Rural Environment is also characterised by the existing level of infrastructure. Because the rural area has a dispersed pattern of settlement, the level of infrastructural services is less than those provided in the urban environments.

#### **Resulting Action**

Note the support and no amendments to the Variations as a result of this submission.

## 4.2 TD2050 GENERAL

### **Submission TD2050.66.1 by Rimu Tree Limited**

**Submission:** Rimu Tree Limited commends Council for implementing, by way of Variations 19-21, a proactive strategic zoning regime which zones the TD2050 growth areas in general, and the Brodie Block in particular, for residential development. In supporting this general thrust of the Variations, Rimu Tree Limited considers that there are several improvements that can and should be made to the detailed provisions, and these are the basis of this submission.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

#### ***Further Submission by Acacia Views Limited TD2050.49.F004 in Support***

**Reason:** The submission recognises the previous planning studies undertaken (2001, 2004 and Taupo 2050) and the appropriateness of the land now proposed for a new Environment Area zoning.

The matters raised in the submission TD2050.66 accord with the purposes and principles of the Resource Management Act and will create an appropriate framework within which future resource consent applications can be assessed.

### **Submission TD2050.77.1 by Environment Waikato**

**Submission:** In general Environment Waikato is supportive of the intention of these Variations. Taupo District Council is to be commended for its proactive approach to growth management within the District.

Environment Waikato is supportive of Taupo District taking the steps to incorporate this strategy into statutory documents such as the Proposed Taupo District Plan through this variation process.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

***Further Submission by TrustPower Limited TD2050.82.F086 in Opposition***

**Reason:** However, the Objectives, Policies, Rules and explanatory text within the variations will not achieve the intent of Taupo District Council, that is, the sustainable management of the Rural Environment, as they are written. The amendments proposed by the Submitter as outlined within this further submission are inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 and do not promote sound planning practice.

**Submission TD2050.79.5 by Scenic Ventures Ltd**

**Submission:** Scenic Ventures Limited considers that the variations will assist to achieve sustainable management of the Taupo District land resource, and the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources.

**Relief Sought:** Subject to the submitters other submissions, the confirmation of the proposed variations.

**Submission TD2050.80.1 by Lakeview Ventures Ltd**

**Submission:** Lakeview supports in principle the implementation of TD2050 via the District Plan, but considers that the particular provisions proposed by the Variations to achieve that are inefficient and disabling, and do not promote the sustainable management principles of the RMA.

**Relief Sought:** Lakeview's submissions provide for the specific relief sought in respect to our overall submission.

**Submission TD2050.91.1 by Lakes & Waterways Action Group**

**Submission:** LWAG supports these variations. The intent of the variations is to protect the Districts Rural environment particularly its landscape, amenity and character.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F353 in Opposition***

**Reason:** This submission is opposed as it is inconsistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited' s primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F353 in Opposition***

**Reason:** This submission is opposed as it is inconsistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited' s primary submissions.

***Further Submission by TrustPower Limited TD2050.82.F271 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The Objectives, Policies, Rules and explanatory text as they are written within the variations will not achieve the intent of Taupo District Council as put forward by the Submitter, that is, the protection of the Rural Environment.

The amendments proposed by the Submitter as written within this further submission are not consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 and do not promote good planning practice.

**Submission TD2050.124.7 by Department of Conservation**

**Submission:** The Department of Conservation supports the initiative by Council in carrying out a form of growth planning (TD2050). However the department would like to reiterate that we identified some aspects of concern during the submission process for the TD2050 document. This point is raised due to the implication throughout the variations that the content of the TD2050 document, including the growth nodes, have been accepted.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

### **Submission TD2050.131.1 by Contact Energy Ltd**

**Submission:** Contact supports the planning initiatives included in the Growth Management Strategy ("GMS") and the variations to the District plan giving effect to the GMS.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

### ***Further Submission by Federated Farmers of NZ (INC) TD2050.123.F008 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** No reason stated

### **Submission TD2050.131.2 by Contact Energy Ltd**

**Submission:** Contact supports the intent of Variation 19 to the District Plan. Contact views the adoption of tighter subdivision controls over the District's geothermal resources as being an entirely appropriate means of protecting these unique and valuable resources from reverse sensitivity issues. We also believe that this approach is consistent with Policy 2 of 3.7.3 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement,

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

### ***Further Submission by TrustPower Limited TD2050.82.F021 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** TrustPower agrees with the Submitter that it is appropriate that Taupo District Council ('TDC') gives regard to the District's geothermal resources and provides a definition of these resources within the District Plan.

In addition, the Objectives, Policies, Rules and explanatory text within the District Plan will not achieve this goal without further amendments to protect these valuable resources from restrictive planning policies, and conflicting development within the Rural Environment.

### **Submission TD2050.16.1 by Vector Limited**

**Submission:** Vector wishes to ensure that Variations 19- are not contrary too and will promote sustainable management of resources, and will achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA").

To the extent that Variations 19-21 meets those criteria, it is supported by Vector. To the extent that it does not, it is opposed.

**Relief Sought:** Vector seeks that:

(a) Variations 19-21 be adopted, subject to some specific amendments that are sought below, or amendments which give effect to Vector's concerns as set out in this submission (to Vector's satisfaction).

(b) Any other necessary or consequential amendments be made.

### **Submission TD2050.29.1 by The Proprietors of Hauhungaroa No 6 Block**

**Submission:** The submitter supports the identification of additional residential zoning for land where it is appropriate that residential development be allowed.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

### **Submission TD2050.67.1 by Transpower NZ Ltd**

**Submission:** Transpower generally supports Variations 19, 20 and 21, with minor amendments.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

### **Council Decision**

Accept submissions TD2050.66.1, TD2050.77.1, TD2050.79.5, TD2050.80.1, TD2050.91.1, TD2050.124.7, TD2050.131.1 TD2050.16.1, TD2050.29.1 TD2050.67.1 and TD2050.131.2 and

further submission TD2050.49.F004, support in part further submissions TD2050.123.F008 and TD2050.82.F021 and not accept further submissions TD2050.82.F271, TD2050.43.F353, TD2050.42.F353 and TD2050.82.F086.

**Reason:**

The submissions support the overall intent of Variations 19-21, with further comments addressed in other specific points of the variations.

**Resulting Action**

Note the support and make no amendments to the plan as a result of these submissions.

**Submission TD2050.11.4 by Mapara Valley Preservation Society Inc**

**Submission:** We question the strong association between the variations and the District Growth Management Strategy (TD2050) and believe the first stages of growth should be concentrated around existing centres. Prematurely identifying and sending such strong signals about other centres of growth within the current rural environment tends to result in them becoming self-fulfilling planning prophecies.

We feel all references to TD2050 should be removed as, as a plan, the DP should be a stand-alone document, and not be so strongly skewed by the influence of a document that lies outside the RMA process. Within these references we are particularly concerned with the large blob in the Mapara Valley and the suggested associated infrastructure – in particular the proposed West Kinloch Arterial road.

**Relief Sought:** That all references to TD2050 should be removed from the plan.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F002 in Opposition***

**Reason:** TVP does not support the removal of all references to TD2050 from the plan. This document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. Given that it is the base study that Council will implement in the District Plan to manage growth it needs to be referenced in the District Plan.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F209 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050 document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. Given that it is the base study that Council will implement in the District Plan to manage growth it needs to be referenced in the District Plan.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine the land areas and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F226 in Opposition***

**Reason:** TVP does not support the removal of all references to TD2050 from the plan.

This document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. Given that it is the base study that Council will implement in the District Plan to manage growth it needs to be referenced in the District Plan.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F274 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is opposed on the basis that it is contrary to the relief sought by Kaipō Yuki Limited in its primary submission. Whilst Kaipō Yuki Ltd does not support the reference to TD2050 in the District Plan, it is for different reasons to the submitter. Kaipō Yuki Limited believes that the reference to TD2050 limits growth to specified areas within the District, without the opportunity to consider the actual and potential environmental effects, including positive environmental effects, of enabling further subdivision and development outside of specified growth areas.

***Further Submission by Kaiapō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F274 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is opposed on the basis that it is contrary to the relief sought by Kaiapō Bay Limited in its primary submission. Whilst Kaiapō Bay Ltd does not support the reference to TD2050 in the District Plan, it is for different reasons to the submitter. Kaiapō Bay Limited believes that the reference to TD2050 limits growth to specified areas within the District, without the opportunity to consider the actual and potential environmental effects, including positive environmental effects, of enabling further subdivision and development outside of specified growth areas.

***Further Submission by Rimu Tree Limited TD2050.66.F002 in Opposition***

**Reason:** Rimu Tree opposes the relief sought as it is entirely appropriate for the district plan to refer to, and be based on, the TD2050 strategy notwithstanding that this was prepared under LGA processes. The Growth Management Strategy (TD2050) was based on considerable research, investigations, consultation and the application of sound planning principles. It is accepted that where the district plan incorporates aspects of the TD2050 strategy then its findings and conclusions may be "tested" through RMA processes (as is happening now). However, that is no reason to delete references to a sound "non-RMA" integrated strategic planning document.

***Further Submission by TrustPower Limited TD2050.82.F134 in Support***

**Reason:** It is appropriate that Taupo District Council delete all references to TD2050 to enable the District Plan to act as a stand alone document. Should the Council wish to provide reference to any part of TD2050, this should be included within the District Plan rather than requiring the reader to refer to a separate document.

Further, as stated by the Submitter, the TD2050 document lies outside of the Resource Management Act 1991 process. This document should be utilised solely as a reference tool, and not as an integral part of the District Plan.

The amendments proposed by the Submitter are consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 and promote good planning practice.

***Submission TD2050.12.2 by Sarah Foreman***

**Submission:** All reference to the Taupo District Growth Management Strategy should be removed. The District Plan should be a 'stand alone' document subject to the rigours of the RMA processes.

**Relief Sought:** Remove all references to the Taupo District Growth Management.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F004 in Opposition***

**Reason:** TVP does not support the removal of all references to TD2050 from the plan. TVP also opposes the submitter's view that the TD2050 is outside the process. This document is a

fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. Given that it is the base study that Council will implement in the District Plan to manage growth it needs to be referenced in the District Plan.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F200 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050 document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. Given that it is the base study that Council will implement in the District Plan to manage growth it needs to be referenced in the District Plan.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine the land areas and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F262 in Opposition***

**Reason:** This TD2050 document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

***Further Submission by Hugh Christopher Gallagher TD2050.151.F002 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission details the values that I hold dear to Lake Taupo and it environs.

**Submission TD2050.128.3 by Hopper Developments Ltd**

**Submission:** It is noted by Hopper Development's that there are a number of 'loose' references to the TD2050 documents throughout the Proposed Variation.

**Relief Sought:** It is important that as a consequential amendment to Submission Point 2, that all references to the TD2050 document are amended to read, "TD2050 (June 2006)", unless the reference relates to a specific section that is the subject matter of the Proposed Variation (i.e. reference to TD2050 Urban Growth Areas or TD2050 Structure Plan Process).

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F272 in Support***

**Reason:** TVP support the submitters request to amend references to the TD2050 document to read "TD2050 (June 2006) unless the reference relates to a specific section that is the subject matter of the Proposed Variation e.g. reference to TD2050 Urban Growth Areas or TD2050 Structure Plan Process".

**Submission TD2050.137.15 by Environmental Defence Society**

**Submission:** It is not appropriate for objectives or any other provisions to refer to the TD2050 document. That document lies outside the district plan and, apart from defined areas, is not intended to be part of the district plan.

**Relief Sought:** Delete reference to non-regulatory documents such as TD 2050.

Such further or other relief that may achieve the relief sought in this submission.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F018 in Opposition***

**Reason:** TVP does not support the removal of all references to TD2050 from the plan. This document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. Given that it is the base study that Council will implement in the District Plan to manage growth it needs to be referenced in the District Plan.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F255 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050 is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. Referring to it provides the public with guidance on the background to the District Plan measures.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F214 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050 document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. It provides future development that is coordinated, staged and facilitated by infrastructure. Having completed the LGA process it is now Council's duty to implement.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

***Further Submission by The Trustees of Pukawa D2 TD2050.6.F006 in Opposition***

**Reason:** Up until the Taupo Proposed District Plan was notified in 2000 the further submitters undeveloped land at Kuratau carried a residential zoning. The Council by placing a "Stage 1 Growth Area" status over the land has confirmed that a portion of the required urban growth in the south-western part of the District should be accommodated at this location. Variation 21 seeks to implement TD2050 and the amendments requested by the submitter would compromise that objective.

***Further Submission by The Trustees of Pukawa D3 TD2050.7.F006 in Opposition***

**Reason:** Up until the Taupo Proposed District Plan was notified in 2000 the further submitters undeveloped land at Kuratau carried a residential zoning. The Council by placing a "Stage 1 Growth Area" status over the land has confirmed that a portion of the required urban growth in the south-western part of the District should be accommodated at this location. Variation 21 seeks to implement TD2050 and the amendments requested by the submitter would compromise that objective.

***Further Submission by The Proprietors of Hauhungaroa No 6 Block TD2050.29.F006 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The Proprietors of Hauhungaroa No 6 Block are involved in a Structure Plan Process for the Whareroa North Growth Area in accordance with TD2050. They will, in due course, seek a Change to the District Plan to enable implementation of the structure plan.

***Further Submission by Rimu Tree Limited TD2050.66.F023 in Opposition***

**Reason:** Rimu Tree opposes the relief sought as it is entirely appropriate for the district plan to refer to, and be based on, the TD2050 strategy notwithstanding that this was prepared under LGA processes. The Growth Management Strategy (TD2050) was based on considerable research, investigations, consultation and the application of sound planning principles. It is accepted that where the district plan incorporates aspects of the TD2050 strategy then its findings and conclusions may be "tested" through RMA processes (as is happening now). However, that is no reason to delete references to a sound "non-RMA" integrated strategic planning document.

***Submission TD2050.148.3 by Tukairangi Trust***

**Submission:** All references to TD2050 should be removed as, as a plan, the DP should be a stand-alone document, and not be so strongly skewed by the influence of a document that lies outside the RMA process. Within these references we are particularly concerned with the large blob in the Mapara Valley and the suggested associated infrastructure – in particular the proposed West Kinloch Arterial road.

**Relief Sought:** - that all references to TD2050 should be removed from the plan.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F016 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050/GMS is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas.

TVP oppose this submission in opposition to growth management zones as identified, as they will not protect the sensitive areas.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extent of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas TVP does not support the removal of references to the TD2050 document in the plan variation.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F213 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050 document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. It provides future development that is coordinated, staged and facilitated by infrastructure. Having completed the LGA process it is now Council's duty to implement.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F258 in Opposition***

**Reason:** TVP opposes the submitter's view that Variation relies on that TD2050 and that is outside the process. The document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. Given that, it needs to be referenced in the District Plan.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

TVP does not support the removal of references to the TD2050 document in the plan Variation

**Council Decision**

Accept in part submissions TD2050.148.3, TD2050.137.15, TD2050.128.3, TD2050.12.2 and TD2050.11.4 and further submissions TD2050.1.F002, TD2050.1.F209, TD2050.1.F214, TD2050.1.F226, TD2050.42.F274, TD2050.43.F274, TD2050.66.F002, TD2050.82.F134, TD2050.1.F004, TD2050.1.F200, TD2050.1.F262, TD2050.151.F002, TD2050.1.F272, TD2050.1.F018, TD2050.1.F255, TD2050.6.F006, TD2050.7.F006, TD2050.29.F006, TD2050.66.F023, TD2050.1.F016, TD2050.1.F213, TD2050.1.F258

**Reason:**

As discussed in section 3.1 of this report, in several instances the variations refer to 'TD2050'. This is either an internal cross reference, such as referring to section 3e.7 the TD2050 Structure Plan Process, or a reference to the TD2050 Growth Management Strategy (TD2050). Cross references to other parts of the Plan are in no way *ultra vires* and will assist the user in their understanding of how the plan operates. It is appropriate that such references remain to facilitate the implementation of the Plan.

References to TD2050 within Objectives, Policies and Methods of the variations is a different issue, and as identified by a number of submitters, this is an external document which sits outside the Plan. The submission by Hopper Development Ltd for instance, identifies that to correctly reference such an external document then the date of the adoption of that document should be added to appropriately identify which document and which version of that document is being brought into the Plan for the purposes of that provision. It is anticipated that in the future, aspects of the TD2050 document may be revised, so referencing to a dated version of the TD2050 may not be appropriate. Given that there is only one occasion where the TD2050 document is referenced within a provision of the Plan, being Objective 3e.2.1, then it is considered necessary to amend this Objective to make it *vires*. Objective 3e.2.1 refers to the growth of the Taupo District in accordance with TD2050. This objective could be rephrased to refer to section 3e.6 of the Plan that actually maps out how TD2050 sees growth occurring. 3e.6 only refers to the 'Stage 2' growth areas, but as Variation 20 has zoned the 'Stage 1' areas, it is not anticipated that the objective would be used in respect to these areas.

The TD2050 GMS is also referenced in the explanatory text associated with a number of objectives and policies. As the explanatory text are not statutory provisions (statutory provisions are considered to be objectives, policies and methods) it is appropriate that these contain references to the TD2050 GMS to facilitate the understanding and use of the provisions being explained. It is more appropriate that these references be clarified so that they refer to the correct dated TD2050 GMS and the variations need to be updated accordingly. It is anticipated that this change will increase the ease of reference for readers of the District Plan as well as facilitating the implementation of the TD2050 GMS document.

The TD2050 GMS is an important document which has gone through the Local Government Act special consultative process. The TD2050 GMS has been adopted by the Taupo District Council to direct and manage growth in the Taupo District. It is appropriate that this document is referenced within the explanatory text to assist plan users. It is not considered good practice for developers and decision makers alike, to ignore the pre-eminent growth management tool that exists in the Taupo District. It is also important to note that the TD2050 GMS document forms part of the Notified section 32 document associated with these variations.

**Resulting Action**

It has been recommended to amend Objective 3e.2.1 as a result of submissions on that Objective, and no change should be made as a result of these submissions.

**Submission TD2050.11.5 by Mapara Valley Preservation Society Inc**

**Submission:** We feel the inclusion of earthworks provisions to prevent excessive pre-consent earthworks and controls to ensure minimal disturbance should be included in the Variations.

**Relief Sought:** - that the Variations include earthworks provisions to prevent excessive pre-consent earthworks and controls to ensure minimal disturbance.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F275 in Opposition***

**Reason:** This submission is opposed on the basis that it is contrary to the relief sought by Kaipō Yuki Limited in its primary submission. The proposed changes are considered to be an inappropriate pre-determination of the potential quantum of adverse effects, without any opportunity to evaluate whether the adverse effects will be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F275 in Opposition***

**Reason:** This submission is opposed on the basis that it is contrary to the relief sought by Kaipō Bay Limited in its primary submission. The proposed changes are considered to be an inappropriate pre-determination of the potential quantum of adverse effects, without any opportunity to evaluate whether the adverse effects will be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

**Council Decision**

Not accept submission TD2050.11.5 and accept further submissions TD2050.42.F275 and TD2050.43.F275

**Reason:**

The adverse effects associated with earthworks, are assessed by the appropriate regional council where they relate to erosion and land instability. Dust and nuisance issues and performance standards for buildings are currently provided for in the District Plan. Outside these areas the DP remains silent given the lack of identified affects associated with the activity. Introducing earthwork provisions into the rural environment further than these can have wide reaching implications to all those that live and work in the Rural Environment, such as farmers, forestry etc and it would be inappropriate to introduce such provisions with out consulting with them first. However, it is anticipated that earthwork associated with development in the Rural Environment will decrease with the new provisions in Variation 19 and 21.

Whilst this is not part of the TD2050 Variation process, Council staff are working on an assessment of the scale of the Earthworks issue to determine if a plan change is required to address this issue. It is anticipated that a report will be bought to the Committee before the end of 2007.

**Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the plan as a result of this submission.

***Submission TD2050.50.2 by Carter Holt Harvey Limited***

**Submission:** We note that urban development at Ohakuri has not been included as part of the new variations.

**Relief Sought:** We seek that Ohakuri is clearly identified as a location planned for future lakeside settlement as part of the variations and that this be reflected on the appropriate maps and plans.

***Further Submission by Mighty River Power Ltd TD2050.62.F014 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The requested change is beyond the scope of the proposed variation. In addition, potential urban development at Ohakuri is not in accordance with TD2050 Growth Management Strategy.

***Further Submission by TrustPower Limited TD2050.82.F104 in Support***

**Reason:** No reason stated

**Council Decision**

Not accept submission TD2050.50.2 and further submission TD2050.82.F104 and accept further submission TD2050.62.F014

**Reason:**

TD2050 Growth Management Strategy focussed on establishing a policy framework for managing urban growth. In conjunction with this it identified a preferred settlement pattern. While it was recognised that there is the potential for a new lifestyle settlement at Ohakuri, future development of this isolated area was considered to have minimal effect on the overall pattern of growth. TD2050 GMS noted that further evaluation of this site was unnecessary, i.e.:

*"The exception to these areas of minimal incremental growth is Lake Ohakuri where there is potential for a significant new lifestyle settlement. Future development of this relatively isolated area will have a minimal impact on the overall pattern of growth of the District. Further evaluation of this location is considered unnecessary given the relatively small scale and lack of alternative locations. Furthermore, future development in this location is likely to be assessed as a non-complying activity under the rural provisions of the Proposed District Plan"*

**Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the plan as a result of this submission.

**Submission TD2050.51.2 by Wendy & Glenn Yorke**

**Submission:** Not enough info is available on the new structure plan to make an informed decision, as we do not know what areas it will affect. The structure plan is not finalised therefore we feel the decision to change is too premature.

**Relief Sought:** We ask that (the new lot size) be reviewed once the new structure plans are put into place. This will allow the public to have an overall view on the entire plan.

**Council Decision**

Accept in part submission TD2050.51.2

**Reason:**

Further to section 2 (Philosophy) of this report, whilst no structure plans have been written as yet, these plans will have to undergo comprehensive consultation process under the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act. These structure plans will be in relation to specific parts of the Taupo District, whilst these structure plans have yet to be drafted inappropriate urban development in the Rural Environment is still an issue which needs addressing. It is also important to note that section 79 of the RMA places an obligation on the Council to review its District Plan regularly following the plan becoming operative.

**Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the plan as a result of this submission.

**Submission TD2050.52.1 by B Twentyman & Others**

**Submission:** We oppose V19-21 to the proposed Taupo District Plan, in particular V19 relating to subdivision. It is considered that the objectives, policies and rules do not reflect the principles of sustainable management under the RMA 1991.

**Relief Sought:** That the plan change be withdrawn or that the objectives, policies be amended to reflect the matters raised above.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F025 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The Plan Change/Variation process is more appropriate to enable Council and the community to consider holistically the whole growth area rather than individual parts by way of resource consents.

## Decisions on General Submissions to the TD2050 Variations

Council's duty to manage how sustainable development manifests from the TD2050 document to the District Plan. The conversion of lands to urban purposes requires a comprehensive research and consultative process over the identified growth modes. This goes beyond fragmented ownership patterns and aspirations.

The Plan Change/Variation process is more appropriate to enable Council and the community to consider holistically the whole growth area rather than individual parts by way of resource consents.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F201 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The Plan Change/Variation process is more appropriate to enable Council and the community to consider holistically the whole growth area rather than individual parts by way of resource consents.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F252 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The Variations are considered important to guide future growth within the district.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F302 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported as it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

### ***Further Submission by Kaiapō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F302 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported as it is consistent with Kaiapō Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### ***Further Submission by TrustPower Limited TD2050.82.F255 in Support***

**Reason:** TrustPower is in agreement with this submission. As it stands, the Objectives and Policies are overly restrictive and will result in the inefficient use of land. Whilst it is clear from the Objectives, Policies and explanations within Variation 19 that the reasoning behind minimum lot sizes is to prevent the urbanisation of the rural environment, Section 4e.1 seeks to apply this rule to all activities taking place within the rural environment.

Further, it is appropriate that Variation 19 is amended according to the relief sought by the Submitter's to reflect the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 and to promote good planning practice.

### **Council Decision**

Not accept submission TD2050.52.1 and further submissions TD2050.42.F302, TD2050.43.F302 and TD2050.82.F255 and accept further submissions TD2050.1.F025, TD2050.1.F201 and TD2050.1.F252.

### **Reason:**

Further to Section 2 (Philosophy) of this report the submitter has not identified how the TD2050 Variations are inconsistent with the principles of sustainable management under the RMA 1991. It is considered that the variations are consistent with these provisions and this is identified and assessed accordingly in the associated section 32 documentation.

### **Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the plan as a result of this submission.

### **Submission TD2050.99.1 by Bruce Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

## Decisions on General Submissions to the TD2050 Variations

The GMS is faulty in respect to the growth projections, the areas of development and the process followed.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F232 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050/GMS was developed using quality research from a range of sources. Council has used independent advisers.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F234 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F234 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.98.1 by Sheena Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

The GMS is faulty in respect to the growth projections, the areas of development and the process followed.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F231 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050/GMS was developed using quality research from a range of sources. Council has used independent advisers.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F233 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F233 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.101.1 by Sarah Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

## Decisions on General Submissions to the TD2050 Variations

The GMS is faulty in respect to the growth projections, the areas of development and the process followed.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F234 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050/GMS was developed using quality research from a range of sources. Council has used independent advisers.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F236 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F236 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.100.1 by Michael Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

The GMS is faulty in respect to the growth projections, the areas of development and the process followed.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F233 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050/GMS was developed using quality research from a range of sources. Council has used independent advisers.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F235 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F235 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.102.1 by Barbara Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

## Decisions on General Submissions to the TD2050 Variations

The GMS is faulty in respect to the growth projections, the areas of development and the process followed.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F235 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050/GMS was developed using quality research from a range of sources. Council has used independent advisers.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F237 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F237 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.103.1 by Kathryn Ida O'Leary & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

The GMS is faulty in respect to the growth projections, the areas of development and the process followed.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F236 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050/GMS was developed using quality research from a range of sources. Council has used independent advisers.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F238 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F238 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.104.1 by Kelly Duncan & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

The GMS is faulty in respect to the growth projections, the areas of development and the process followed.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F237 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050/GMS was developed using quality research from a range of sources. Council has used independent advisers.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F239 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F239 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.98.3 by Sheena Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Environment Waikato's Variation 5 has implications for those in who own blocks of land inside the Taupo catchment. There needs to be much more flexibility for those landowners to diversify the landuses in these areas.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F247 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions. Kaipō Yuki Limited particularly supports the need for landowners whose land is subject to Environment Waikato's Variation 5 to have flexibility to diversify land uses in these areas.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F247 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions. Kaiapo Bay Limited particularly supports the need for landowners whose land is subject to Environment Waikato's Variation 5 to have flexibility to diversify land uses in these areas.

**Submission TD2050.107.2 by Ian Charles Smith & others**

**Submission:** TD2050 is based on population growth related to the resident population on census night and other aspects of growth have not been taken sufficiently into account. As a result the provision for growth is insufficient and the extent of land area for growth is insufficient.

## Decisions on General Submissions to the TD2050 Variations

Otherwise there needs to be more provision than 6550 HEU's for growth or allowance should be made for a period greater than only 20 years.

**Relief Sought:** To make a greater provision than 6550 HEU's for growth or allowance should be greater than for only 20 years.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F327 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050 process has determined the appropriate location and extent of urban growth nodes.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F373 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions. Any reference to TD2050 is not supported, and growth should be evaluated on its own merits.

### ***Further Submission by Kaiapō Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F373 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapō Bay Limited's primary submissions. Any reference to TD2050 is not supported, and growth should be evaluated on its own merits.

### **Council Decision**

Not accept submissions TD2050.99.1, TD2050.98.1, TD2050.101.1, TD2050.100.1, TD2050.102.1, TD2050.103.1, TD2050.107.2 and TD2050.104.1 and further submissions TD2050.43.F234, TD2050.42.F234, TD2050.42.F233, TD2050.43.F233, TD2050.42.F236, TD2050.43.F236, TD2050.42.F235, TD2050.43.F235, TD2050.42.F237, TD2050.43.F237, TD2050.42.F238, TD2050.43.F238, TD2050.42.F239 and TD2050.43.F239 accept in part further submissions TD2050.42.F373 and TD2050.43.F373 TD2050.98.3 and accept further submissions TD2050.1.F232, TD2050.1.F231, TD2050.1.F234, TD2050.1.F233, TD2050.1.F235, TD2050.1.F236, TD2050.1.F237 TD2050.1.F327 TD2050.42.F247, TD2050.43.F247.

### **Reason:**

Section 3.3 of this report addresses the relief sought by these submissions.

In adopting the TD2050 GMS the Council adopted these growth projections as the best available estimate at the time. With ongoing monitoring these will be adjusted over time. The exact rate of growth within the identified growth areas will adjust with population demands and market forces. In utilising the TD2050 growth projections the Council is planning for growth using the best available knowledge. Future reviews of TD2050 GMS, plan changes linked to structure plan and the ten year review of the District Plan will all provide opportunities to adopt the amount of strategically zoned land to the changing circumstances.

Taupo District 2050 predicts an increase in population of between 5200 and 7500 by 2026. It also anticipates between 6150 and 7470 new lots will be required. This range has an additional 15% added to reflect the need for a surplus of lots within the market place.

The TD2050 GMS responds appropriately to these factors by determining the best possible locations for future growth to accommodate such growth.

### **Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the plan as a result of this submission.

## **Submission TD2050.98.2 by Sheena Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Historically bigger blocks were tried by Taupo County Council years ago and dropped because of fragmentation and the inability to plan further growth amongst that fragmentation. This is also happening when 4HA blocks are approved as can be seen in Blueridge.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F240 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F240 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.99.2 by Bruce Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Historically bigger blocks were tried by Taupo County Council years ago and dropped because of fragmentation and the inability to plan further growth amongst that fragmentation. This is also happening when 4HA blocks are approved as can be seen in Blueridge.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F241 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F241 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.100.2 by Michael Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Historically bigger blocks were tried by Taupo County Council years ago and dropped because of fragmentation and the inability to plan further growth amongst that fragmentation. This is also happening when 4HA blocks are approved as can be seen in Blueridge.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F242 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F242 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.101.2 by Sarah Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Historically bigger blocks were tried by Taupo County Council years ago and dropped because of fragmentation and the inability to plan further growth amongst that fragmentation. This is also happening when 4HA blocks are approved as can be seen in Blueridge.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F243 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F243 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.102.2 by Barbara Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Historically bigger blocks were tried by Taupo County Council years ago and dropped because of fragmentation and the inability to plan further growth amongst that fragmentation. This is also happening when 4HA blocks are approved as can be seen in Blueridge.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F244 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F244 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.103.2 by Kathryn Ida O'Leary & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Historically bigger blocks were tried by Taupo County Council years ago and dropped because of fragmentation and the inability to plan further growth amongst that fragmentation. This is also happening when 4HA blocks are approved as can be seen in Blueridge.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

#### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F245 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

#### ***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F245 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.104.2 by Kelly Duncan & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Historically bigger blocks were tried by Taupo County Council years ago and dropped because of fragmentation and the inability to plan further growth amongst that fragmentation. This is also happening when 4HA blocks are approved as can be seen in Blueridge.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

#### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F246 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

#### ***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F246 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

#### **Council Decision**

Not accept submission TD2050.98.2, TD2050.99.2, TD2050.100.2, TD2050.101.2, TD2050.102.2, TD2050.103.2 and TD2050.104.2 and further submissions TD2050.42.F240, TD2050.43.F240, TD2050.42.F241, TD2050.43.F241, TD2050.42.F242, TD2050.43.F242, TD2050.42.F243, TD2050.43.F243, TD2050.42.F244, TD2050.43.F244, TD2050.43.F245, TD2050.43.F246, TD2050.42.F246, TD2050.42.F245, TD2050.43.F245, TD2050.42.F246, and TD2050.43.F246.

#### **Reason:**

Section 2 (Philosophy) and 3.3 of this report addresses the relief sought of these submissions. The submission is a statement, but the issue of fragmentation and growth planning is managed and provided for through these variations.

**Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the plan as a result of these submissions.

**Submission TD2050.98.4 by Sheena Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Must look at the whole DP and how the variations fit into this and DP and any prescriptive policies of which these variations are an example. Maybe if they wish to bring in these variations the DP philosophy should be changed.

The effects based philosophy is how the DP was sold to the community and these changes go dead against that. And that is my philosophical reason for not accepting these variations.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F238 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F254 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F254 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.99.4 by Bruce Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Must look at the whole DP and how the variations fit into this and DP and any prescriptive policies of which these variations are an example. Maybe if they wish to bring in these variations the DP philosophy should be changed.

The effects based philosophy is how the DP was sold to the community and these changes go dead against that. And that is my philosophical reason for not accepting these variations.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F239 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F255 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F255 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.100.4 by Michael Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Must look at the whole DP and how the variations fit into this and DP and any prescriptive policies of which these variations are an example. Maybe if they wish to bring in these variations the DP philosophy should be changed.

The effects based philosophy is how the DP was sold to the community and these changes go dead against that. And that is my philosophical reason for not accepting these variations.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F240 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F256 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F256 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.101.4 by Sarah Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Must look at the whole DP and how the variations fit into this and DP and any prescriptive policies of which these variations are an example. Maybe if they wish to bring in these variations the DP philosophy should be changed.

The effects based philosophy is how the DP was sold to the community and these changes go dead against that. And that is my philosophical reason for not accepting these variations.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F241 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F257 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F257 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.102.4 by Barbara Twentyman & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Must look at the whole DP and how the variations fit into this and DP and any prescriptive policies of which these variations are an example. Maybe if they wish to bring in these variations the DP philosophy should be changed.

The effects based philosophy is how the DP was sold to the community and these changes go dead against that. And that is my philosophical reason for not accepting these variations.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F242 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F258 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F258 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

**Submission TD2050.103.4 by Kathryn Ida O'Leary & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Must look at the whole DP and how the variations fit into this and DP and any prescriptive policies of which these variations are an example. Maybe if they wish to bring in these variations the DP philosophy should be changed.

The effects based philosophy is how the DP was sold to the community and these changes go dead against that. And that is my philosophical reason for not accepting these variations.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F243 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F259 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F259 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.104.4 by Kelly Duncan & others**

**Submission:** Oppose all the Variations 19-21

Must look at the whole DP and how the variations fit into this and DP and any prescriptive policies of which these variations are an example. Maybe if they wish to bring in these variations the DP philosophy should be changed.

The effects based philosophy is how the DP was sold to the community and these changes go dead against that. And that is my philosophical reason for not accepting these variations.

**Relief Sought:** Re look at all variations and GMS and TD2050. I would like to see totally independent and qualified persons look at the whole planning processes and all those resulting policies and policy documents.

Whether it is the DP Structure Plan, GMS, TD2050 or the LTCCP, I would suggest that an RMA process be followed rather than the LGA model.

I oppose the use of the GMS as being a fully consultative document.

### ***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F244 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

The GMS process has determined the appropriate location and extend of urban growth needed. The Variation is setting up the procedures to refine and determine the exact nature of urbanisation in those areas.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F260 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions.

### ***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F260 in Support***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions.

### **Submission TD2050.107.1 by Ian Charles Smith & others**

**Submission:** The reference to the TD2050 and its parts when the basis of that document and its content has only been through a consultation process under LGA 2002 and has not been based on a full process in accordance with the RMA. Also the proposed prospective variations are at odds with the effects based form of the DP.

**Relief Sought:** In consequence the whole of the DP should be reviewed to a prescriptive base otherwise the variations changed to stay in line with an effects base of the DP.

Review the whole of the DP to a consistent prescriptive base or otherwise change the variations to stay in line with an effects base of the DP.

Subject the whole of the TD2050 to a systematic RMA consultation process.

### ***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F372 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaipō Yuki Limited's primary submissions. Any reference to TD2050 is not supported, and growth should be evaluated on its own merits.

**Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F372 in Support in Part**

**Reason:** This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with Kaiapo Bay Limited's primary submissions. Any reference to TD2050 is not supported, and growth should be evaluated on its own merits.

**Council Decision**

Not accept submissions TD2050.98.4, TD2050.99.4, TD2050.100.4, TD2050.101.4, TD2050.102.4, TD2050.103.4 and TD2050.104.4 and further submissions TD2050.42.F254, TD2050.43.F254, TD2050.42.F255, TD2050.43.F255, TD2050.42.F256, TD2050.43.F256, TD2050.42.F257, TD2050.43.F257, TD2050.42.F258, TD2050.43.F258, TD2050.42.F259, TD2050.43.F259, TD2050.42.F260, TD2050.107.1 and TD2050.43.F260 accept in part further submissions TD2050.42.F372 and TD2050.43.F372 accept further submissions TD2050.1.F238, TD2050.1.F239, TD2050.1.F240, TD2050.1.F241, TD2050.1.F242, TD2050.1.F243 and TD2050.1.F244

**Reason:**

Section 3.3 and 3.1 of this report addresses the relief sought of these submissions.

Further to this, the entire DP was assessed and varied, where appropriate, as a result of the TD2050 variation process. These changes extended to section 1.5 'The Taupo District Plan – its Philosophy' and is reflected through the three variations and the associated Section 32 document. It is considered that the DP retains its effects based philosophy. Prior to the variation the philosophy of the plan meant that the DP was not as well equipped to take such a strategic look at the cumulative effects of urban growth. With the change in philosophy to utilise a macro scale view, the DP seeks to manage the growth of the District's urban areas through the identification of particular urban growth areas. While this process has been partially done through TD2050, ongoing structure planning will still need to be undertaken before all of the identified growth areas can be carried through into the District Plan. Through that process the District Plan identifies where in the District future urban development is expected and correspondingly the Plan signals that the remaining Rural Environment is expected to remain rural. This approach at a macro level is directive as it is intended to provide the community, developers and infrastructure providers with greater certainty about the location of future urban growth so that its effects, particularly cumulative effects, can be managed in a sustainable manner. It is considered that this clearer direction and certainty provided through the TD2050 Variations means that the Council is better able to meet the purpose and principles of the Act.

It is considered that the plan is still an effects based document, however the incorporation of TD2050 strategic growth zoning within the DP will allow for greater certainty for the community, improved management of the cumulative, future and potential effects of urban development and more efficient and sustainable management of resources.

**Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the plan as a result of this submission.

**Submission TD2050.111.1 by Tu Mohi & others (The Mohi Family)**

**Submission:** The Mohi Family opposes variations 19-21 in their entirety, including the proposed objectives, policies, methods (rules etc) and anticipated environmental outcomes.

The reason for opposition is that Council is aware that lands owned by the Mohi Family, generally in the vicinity of the existing red 'dots', are already in the process of being subdivided into what would be classified in the existing Proposed District Plan and Taupo District 2050 as a low density residential environment. In addition, the land west of Omori, and which is suitable for residential development, is in the ownership of the Mohi Family and is further north of than the red 'dot' indicated in the Taupo District 2050. The Mohi Family lands (and others) should be added to the maps contained in Variation 20 as "New Residential Environment".

The Mohi Family opposes the variations because they make no specific provision for the land holdings identified in their submission made on Taupo District 2050. Those lands are suitable for residential and mixed use development and as such should be recognised and provided for in both Taupo District 2050 and any variation to the Proposed District Plan.

**Relief Sought:** The Mohi Family respectfully seeks that Council withdraw variations 19-21.

The Mohi Family respectfully seeks that Council readdress Taupo District 2050 to provide for a more flexible (resource consenting process) and market driven response to land development and include Mohi Family lands more specifically into Taupo District 2050.

The Mohi Family respectfully seeks, as an alternative, to identify the areas of land that the Mohi Family have an interest in (Grace Road and Omori) as residential environment on the District Planning Maps.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F005 in Opposition***

**Reason:** TVP disagrees with the submitter's opposition to Variations 19-21, and their requested withdrawal of the Variations.

TVP also opposes the submitter's request for a more flexible resource consenting process, and the inclusion of their land in TD2050 (to be rezoned as residential).

Council's duty to manage how sustainable development manifests from the TD2050 document to the District Plan. The conversion of lands to urban purposes requires a comprehensive research and consultative process over the identified growth modes. This goes beyond fragmented ownership patterns and aspirations.

The Plan Change/Variation process is more appropriate to enable Council and the community to consider holistically the whole growth area rather than individual parts by way of resource consents.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F211 in Opposition***

**Reason:** TVP support's the Variations subject to the other matters raised in our original submission.

TVP also opposes the submitter's request for a more flexible resource consenting process.

Council's duty to manage how sustainable development manifests from the TD2050 document to the District Plan. The conversion of lands to urban purposes requires a comprehensive research and consultative process over the identified growth modes. This goes beyond fragmented ownership patterns and aspirations.

The Plan Change/Variation process is more appropriate to enable Council and the community to consider holistically the whole growth area rather than individual parts by way of resource consents.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F260 in Opposition***

**Reason:** Council's duty to manage how sustainable development manifests from the TD2050 document to the District Plan. The conversion of lands to urban purposes requires a comprehensive research and consultative process over the identified growth modes. This goes beyond fragmented ownership patterns and aspirations.

The Plan Change/Variation process is more appropriate to enable Council and the community to consider holistically the whole growth area rather than individual parts by way of resource consents.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F400 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is supported in part to the extent that it is consistent with the primary submissions of Kaipō Yuki Limited, although it is considered that development controls other than a minimum lot size specification will more appropriately manage and provide for further development in Taupo District.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F400 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is supported in part to the extent that it is consistent with the primary submissions of Kaiapo Bay Limited, although it is considered that development controls other than a minimum lot size specification will more appropriately manage and provide for further development in Taupo District.

**Submission TD2050.111.2 by Tu Mohi & others (The Mohi Family)**

**Submission:** The Mohi Family opposes Key growth management assumptions TD2050 that "all new residential and low density residential development will be fully reticulated (serviced) with water and wastewater services". While the Mohi Family supports the intention to protect water quality, the assumption does not allow for advances in technology in wastewater disposal over time, and gives no reason for reticulating water to low density areas. Because Taupo District 2050 is a long term strategy it should be flexible in its terms to allow for increases in technology. Low density areas are able to be provided with water, particularly in the western lakeshore communities, via roof collection and tank storage. Many existing low density residential areas on the western side of the lake are not used by permanent residents which needs to be considered.

**Relief Sought:** The Mohi Family respectfully seeks that Council withdraw variations 19-21.

The Mohi Family respectfully seeks that Council readdress Taupo District 2050 to provide for a more flexible (resource consenting process) and market driven response to land development and include Mohi Family lands more specifically into Taupo District 2050.

The Mohi Family respectfully seeks, as an alternative, to identify the areas of land that the Mohi Family have an interest in (Grace Road and Omori) as residential environment on the District Planning Maps.

**Submission TD2050.111.3 by Tu Mohi & others (The Mohi Family)**

**Submission:** The Mohi Family opposes reliance on Taupo District 2050 as the founding document for Variations 19-21 because it is rigid in its terms and implies that larger potential residential developments not included in Taupo District 2050 will have significant adverse effect on the environment.

The reason for the opposition is because it is inconsistent with an 'effects based' philosophy and does not provide for specific and unique development opportunities. For instance if a better use for a large parcel of agricultural land was residential or low density residential, it may be stymied through administration of variations 19-21. That would potentially forgo environmental benefits for water quality simply because the land was outside the identified growth management areas.

**Relief Sought:** The Mohi Family respectfully seeks that Council withdraw variations 19-21.

The Mohi Family respectfully seeks that Council readdress Taupo District 2050 to provide for a more flexible (resource consenting process) and market driven response to land development and include Mohi Family lands more specifically into Taupo District 2050.

The Mohi Family respectfully seeks, as an alternative, to identify the areas of land that the Mohi Family have an interest in (Grace Road and Omori) as residential environment on the District Planning Maps.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F006 in Opposition***

**Reason:** TVP disagree with the submitter's opposition to the reliance on TD2050 as the founding document for Variations 19-21 and their request to withdraw Variations 19-21. The document is a

fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. It provides future development that is coordinated, staged and facilitated by infrastructure. Having completed the LGA process it is now Council's duty to implement.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

TVP also opposes the submitter's request to provide for a more flexible resource consenting process and to include their land in TD2050 (to be rezoned as residential). The conversion of lands to urban purposes requires a comprehensive research and consultable process over the identified growth modes. This goes beyond fragmented ownership patterns and aspirations.

The Plan Change/Variation process is more appropriate to enable Council and the community to consider holistically the whole growth area rather than individual parts by way of resource consents.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F212 in Opposition***

**Reason:** The TD2050 document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. It provides future development that is coordinated, staged and facilitated by infrastructure. Having completed the LGA process it is now Council's duty to implement.

The submission fails to understand that the TD2050 is a strategic document stemming from the Local Government Act. Having completed that process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

***Further Submission by Tukairangi Valley Properties Limited TD2050.1.F261 in Opposition***

**Reason:** TVP disagree with the submitter's opposition to the reliance on TD2050 as the founding document for Variations 19-21 and their request to withdraw Variations 19-21. The document is a fundamental Council strategy for the management of the on-going development of the district particularly in the development of urban areas. It provides future development that is coordinated, staged and facilitated by infrastructure. Having completed the LGA process it is now Council's duty to implement the strategy within the District Plan. The current RMA process enables further scrutiny and debate on the growth strategy and the defined process to activate a growth area.

TVP also opposes the submitter's request to provide for a more flexible resource consenting process. The conversion of lands to urban purposes requires a comprehensive research and consultable process over the identified growth modes. This goes beyond fragmented ownership patterns and aspirations.

The Plan Change/Variation process is more appropriate to enable Council and the community to consider holistically the whole growth area rather than individual parts by way of resource consents.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F401 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is supported in part to the extent that it is consistent with the primary submissions of Kaipō Yuki Limited. There is land located outside of identified growth areas that can and should be available for development, subject to adverse environmental effects being avoided, remedied or mitigated. This is more aligned with the enabling intent of the RMA. Any reference to TD2050 in the Proposed Plan is not supported.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F401 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is supported in part to the extent that it is consistent with the primary submissions of Kaiapo Bay Limited. There is land located outside of identified growth areas that can and should be available for development, subject to adverse environmental effects being avoided, remedied or mitigated. This is more aligned with the enabling intent of the RMA. Any reference to TD2050 in the Proposed Plan is not supported.

**Submission TD2050.111.6 by Tu Mohi & others (The Mohi Family)**

**Submission:** The Taupo District 2050 document and the variations are inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA, the current district plan, section 32 of the Act and Part 5 of the RMA.

**Relief Sought:** The Mohi Family respectfully seeks that Council withdraw variations 19-21.

The Mohi Family respectfully seeks that Council readdress Taupo District 2050 to provide for a more flexible (resource consenting process) and market driven response to land development and include Mohi Family lands more specifically into Taupo District 2050.

The Mohi Family respectfully seeks, as an alternative, to identify the areas of land that the Mohi Family have an interest in (Grace Road and Omori) as residential environment on the District Planning Maps.

***Further Submission by Kaipō Yuki Ltd TD2050.42.F403 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is supported in part to the extent that it is consistent with the primary submissions of Kaipō Yuki Limited, although it is considered that development controls other than a minimum lot size specification will more appropriately manage and provide for further development in Taupo District.

***Further Submission by Kaiapo Bay Ltd TD2050.43.F403 in Support in Part***

**Reason:** This submission is supported in part to the extent that it is consistent with the primary submissions of Kaiapo Bay Limited, although it is considered that development controls other than a minimum lot size specification will more appropriately manage and provide for further development in Taupo District.

**Council Decision**

Not accept submissions TD2050.111.2, TD2050.111.1, TD2050.111.3 and TD2050.111.6 accept further submissions TD2050.1.F005, TD2050.1.F211, TD2050.1.F260, TD2050.1.F006, TD2050.1.F212 and TD2050.1.F261 and accept in part further submissions TD2050.42.F400, TD2050.43.F400, TD2050.42.F401, TD2050.43.F401, TD2050.42.F403 and TD2050.43.F403.

**Reason:**

Further to sections 2 (The TD2050 Philosophy), 3.3 (in respect to LGA and RMA process) and 3.4 (Effects based process) of this report, Variation 21 (Growth Management and Land Development) has been prepared in response to the expectations of the community in effectively providing for and managing urban growth. Further management of the District's urban growth reflects the responsibility for the sustainable management of natural and physical resources under the Resource Management Act 1991. It is considered that these variations are not inconsistent with the RMA or the Section 32 and in lieu of the submission providing more information as to how the variations are inconsistent with these documents it is not possible to respond further. Prior to the preparation of Variation 21, Council completed Taupo District 2050 District Growth Management Strategy. This strategy represented a shift in growth management to a more proactive approach. TD2050 provides a comprehensive evaluation of the strategic directions for managing growth and selection of the appropriate growth locations. This process is detailed in section 6 of the TD2050 GMS (which formed part of the Section 32 that was notified with these variations). This evaluative process resulted in limiting the number of locations for future growth due to two main factors; the number of residential lots needed over the next 20 years and a critical mass of people necessary for efficiency in the provision of infrastructure.

It should be noted that Variation 21 identifies TD2050 Urban Growth Areas in both the Omori and Grace Road areas, and the actual extent of these areas will be defined through the TD2050 Structure plan and associated plan change process.

In respect to the submitters comments in relation to key assumption 9 in the TD2050 GMS, it is appropriate for the infrastructure requirements to be fully assessed before development occurs. Further to this, within residential areas onsite waste systems are not appropriate. Nuisance factors can cause an adverse effect in the residential environment. On site waste water systems can potentially create such nuisance effects and are therefore inappropriate in the residential environment. There is also the question of ongoing maintenance of such systems and issues can arise where systems are not maintained and can facilitate nuisance and health issues in the residential environment. With increasing concern about the amount of Nitrogen entering Lake Taupo, it will be important for discharges from urban land uses to be controlled as much as possible. There is also an increasing awareness of the value of water and the allocation of this resource. This issue also requires consideration as part of the servicing issues dealt with in the structure plan.

**Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the plan as a result of this submission.

**Submission TD2050.132.1 by Tiaho Mary Pilot**

**Submission:** I oppose all plan modifications and numbers in Variations 19, 20 and 21.

All three variations being proposed are solely for the purpose of supporting Taupo's financial economy at the expense of local traditional landowners - who by now must have most of their land taken over by Landcorp - in preparation for future rural and residential or urban areas to be sold.

In Variation 19 - you propose to protect the rural environment, its land use but at the same time ensuring the area's sustainability in relationship to its growth in population. Your future planning is for the next 20 years which no doubt means that land development and growth management are inevitable and therefore the inclusion of "varying variations" along the way.

In my opinion, the damage to Lake Taupo's waters has already been done - thanks' to the importance of Taupo's growing economy and satisfying the demands of city people who are opting for what used to be the country life. More people - more pollution and exploitation of what used to be a beautiful environment.

**Relief Sought:** No stated relief sought.

**Council Decision**

Not accept submission TD2050.132.1

**Reason:**

Further to Section 2 of this report the TD2050 variations have been drafted to effectively manage the effects of growth on the Taupo District. It is considered that a degree of growth is inevitable and the council has an obligation to provide for this growth.

**Resulting Action**

Make no changes to the plan as a result of this submission.