

TAUPŌ DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW
ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT
RURAL SECTION



Taupō District Plan
REVIEW

Te Arotakenga i te Mahere ā-Rohe o Taupō

Introduction

This report presents the preferred options for dealing with the 'issues' that have been identified for the Rural Environment in the Operative District Plan. The 'issues' have been identified through the 'Issues Report', the review of TD2050, and consultation with the community.

This report:

- Describes each issue and how the issue was identified.
- Outlines the relevant provisions in the Operative District Plan (ODP).
- Outlines the provisions in District Plans of other comparable districts.
- Identifies the desired outcomes, possible options for dealing with the issue and assesses each option.
- Identifies a preferred option, to be used in the development of appropriate District Plan objectives, policies and methods.

We want your thoughts on whether we have the right issues. Have we missed any? Are we heading in the right direction with the outcomes?

Statutory and policy context

VISION AND STRATEGY FOR THE WAIKATO RIVER

The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (V&S) was adopted by the Waikato River Authority (WRA) as part of the Waikato River Settlement. The ultimate vision is: "the Waikato River will be safe for people to swim in and take food from over its entire length." The V&S has 13 objectives that the WRA would like to achieve in order to meet the vision.

Our District Plan is required to give effect to the V&S. As our ODP was adopted before the V&S, it does not currently do so. The proposed District Plan will need to give effect to the V&S for parts of our district that are within the Waikato River catchment.

TE ARA WHANUI O RANGITĀKI - PATHWAYS TO THE RANGITĀKI

The Pathways to the Rangitāki was adopted in 2015 has the vision of "A healthy Rangitāki River, valued by the community, protected for future generations. Tihei mauri ora." The document has 8 objectives, and an action plan describing how the objectives should be achieved. The District Plan is required to give effect to Te Ara Whanui O Rangitāki.

THE NATIONAL PLANNING STANDARDS

The National Planning Standards were gazetted in April 2019. As part of the review of the Taupō District Plan, we will be required to make sure that our Proposed District Plan meets the Planning Standards.

The National Planning Standards sets a template that District Plans must follow. New zones will need to be considered and introduced into the District Plan. The standards identify four rural zones available for use. These are:

- o General rural zone
- o Rural production zone
- o Rural lifestyle zone
- o Rural settlement zone.

We have decided to use the General rural and Rural lifestyle zones in the District Plan. As we do not currently have a Rural lifestyle zone, we will need to develop new planning provisions which don't currently exist within the ODP.

NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENTS

National Policy Statements (NPS) set objectives and policies for matters of National Significance. We are required to ensure that our District Plan gives effect to any NPS. There are national policy statements for: Urban Development Capacity, Freshwater Management, Renewable Electricity Generation, Electricity Transmission and the Coastal Policy Statement.

THE REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENTS

The Taupō District falls within the jurisdiction of four regional councils: Waikato Regional Council (WRC), Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC), Hawkes Bay Regional Council (HBRC) and Horizons Regional Council (HRC). The majority of the rural environment falls within WRC, and only very small portions of the district fall within HBRC and HRC.

The BOP RPS recognises that the Taupō District is not solely located within the BOP region and identifies that strong liaison and joint effort on cross-boundary issue is essential.

Summary of the existing planning framework

The Taupō District Operative Plan, adopted in 2007, had a permissive effects-based approach, with no direction about where future urban growth should go. Each subdivision application was addressed on a case by case basis. This led to the rural environment coming under significant pressure from lifestyle subdivision applications through the early 2000's. TD2050, the Districts Growth Strategy was developed to respond to this pressure and was followed by a suite of changes to strengthen urban growth provisions within the Plan to take a more strategic approach to urban growth.

Plan Change 19 introduced new subdivision rules and included a revision of the minimum lot size in the rural environment to 10 Ha. 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 was the focus of Plan Change 19.

TD2050 was revised in 2018. In 2006 Council had anticipated residential growth would continue for the foreseeable future. This meant land could be identified for future urban growth and it would then be a matter of time before it was utilised. The information from the Census in 2006 and 2013 resulted in Statistics New Zealand significantly changing their projections. The district's usually resident population is expected to peak in the late 2030's before going into decline. This has forced a rethink on how much land might be required for urban growth. A number of areas that were identified as growth areas in TD2050 2006 have been removed in the revised version of TD2050. This includes growth areas within the rural environment.

TD2050 signalled that through the District Plan Review we would look to:

- Prevent the urbanisation of the rural environment.
- Protect functional activities within the rural environment.
- Consolidate rural lifestyle opportunities within existing areas.
- Ensure that the District Plan allows for appropriate and sustainable alternatives to farming.

If you would like to find out more, TD2050, the Demographic Snapshot (population projections) and documents relating to Plan Change 19 can be viewed at our website www.taupo.govt.nz.

Tangata Whenua Issues

There are likely to be issues that Tangata Whenua have experienced that are relevant to the Rural Chapter. One issue that Council is aware of is the need to allow for Tangata Whenua to live on their ancestral land. Council would like to work with our Iwi Partners to identify the relevant issues, and the options available for addressing the issues.

The issues

Six issues have been identified for the Rural Environment. For each issue we have:

- Outlined the outcomes we are seeking to achieve
- Undertaken an assessment against provisions in other District Plans (if appropriate),
- Identified the potential options available for addressing the issue and assessed these options.

We have then identified the preferred option/s available for dealing with the issues.

ISSUE ONE: Pressure for subdivision within the Rural Environment

There is pressure for subdivision and urban development in the Rural Environment which can lead to:

- ***Higher infrastructure costs***
- ***Inefficient land use***
- ***Loss of rural character and amenity***
- ***Loss of flexibility of large land holdings.***

This issue was identified through TD2050, the Issues Document, and was raised extensively through the rural engagement sessions.

The backlog of lifestyle blocks, which were created prior to the introduction of Plan Change 19, appears to have since been filled. There is anecdotal evidence that the choices within this market are becoming limited. There is recognition that people like to live within the rural environment without necessarily undertaking a productive rural activity. This desire needs to be balanced with the protection of the productive use, the amenity that the rural environment provides the District, and the costs of dispersed living patterns. TD2050 has given us the direction that we need to ensure that there is an appropriate supply.

The ODP has a tiered approach to managing lot sizes using direction from objectives, policies and activity status.

- Creation of lots greater than 10ha is a Controlled Activity
- Creation of lots between 4 and 10ha is a Discretionary Activity
- Creation of lots 4ha and below is a Non-Complying Activity

Property Economics have prepared a report, that indicates that there is currently a shortage of lifestyle lots in the Taupō District. They also determined how many lots will be required to meet demand over the next 15 years, and what the costs and benefits in providing these lots will be.

As mentioned earlier in the report, we have decided that we will apply the Rural Lifestyle zone to our existing lifestyle areas. In light of the findings of the Property Economics report, we need to determine:

- Whether we would like to make changes to the planning framework to ensure that the demand for lifestyle land can be met over the life of the Plan.
- If so, where should the additional lifestyle lots be allowed.

In doing so, we need to ensure that we take account of infrastructure constraints, efficiency of land use, rural amenity affects and the requirements of the Regional Policy Statement.

Outcomes we are seeking to achieve:

- **Protect the character and amenity of the Rural Environment**
- **Use rural land efficiently**
- **Avoid unnecessary reverse sensitivity effects between different activities within the Rural Environment**
- **Avoid fragmentation of the Rural Environment**
- **Provide choice and meet demand for rural lifestyle living**
- **Avoid inefficient and unnecessary provision of infrastructure within the Rural Environment.**

Options for achieving these outcomes:

1. **Allow for some additional rural lifestyle blocks in areas where rural lifestyle is already occurring**
2. **Allow for some additional rural lifestyle blocks in a specified area**
3. **Keep current provisions which limit potential for additional rural lifestyle blocks (status quo).**

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1: Allow for some additional rural lifestyle blocks in areas where rural lifestyle is already occurring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would provide choice • Many landowners with a desire to subdivide would be able to. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supply would likely overtake demand. • Would create pressure on infrastructure in a number of areas. • Would result in the inefficient use of rural land. • Would impact on the amenity and character in a number of areas. • A greater potential for reverse sensitivity effects.
Option 2: Allow for some additional rural lifestyle blocks in a specified area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would provide choice • Could be limited to meet the projected demand • Would result in less rural land being used up. • Infrastructure could be managed more efficiently than dispersed rural lifestyle subdivision. • Reverse sensitivity effects could be more easily managed than dispersed rural lifestyle subdivision. • Character and amenity effects limited to a specific area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would involve “picking a winner” which would mean some landowners with a desire to subdivide would not be able to.
Option 3: Keep current provisions which limit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional rural land used up for rural lifestyle subdivision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional choice for the rural lifestyle market.

potential for additional rural lifestyle blocks (status quo).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional infrastructure costs. No additional reverse sensitivity issues. No loss of rural amenity and character. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prices on rural lifestyle blocks will continue to inflate.
---	---	--

Option 2 is the preferred option, as it would allow additional lifestyle blocks to be provided, while protecting the productive uses of rural production land.

ISSUE TWO: Uncertainty over the planning framework for the Mapara Valley

TD2050 has directed the Mapara Valley Structure Plan Area be removed from the District Plan. There is uncertainty about what planning framework it should be replaced with.

This issue was identified through TD2050 and the rural engagement sessions.

The Mapara Valley Structure Plan, and provisions in the ODP relating to the Mapara Valley were developed in response to the growth that the district was experiencing in the mid-2000s. The population projections for the District have been revised and show population projections that are more subdued than those of the mid-2000s. To review the most recent population projections, please review the 'Demographic Snapshot' on our website www.taupo.govt.nz

TD2050 has signalled that the Mapara Valley Structure Plan will be removed. We need to consider what the most appropriate planning framework is for this area. The area has been identified as appropriate for growth for some time. Because of the revised population projections, the Mapara Valley is no longer required to meet growth. However, it may not be appropriate to simply return this area to a Rural zoning.

Landowners within the Mapara Valley have been restricted by provisions which were reliant on the development of the West Kinloch Arterial route. This route was designated but following the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) and revised population projections, was never constructed. In addition, provisions which were part of the structure plan, including forest and valley clusters, have created confusion both for landowners and those implementing the Plan when trying to develop them in the absence of the rest of the Structure Plan.

Outcomes we are seeking to achieve:

- Remove the Mapara Valley Structure Plan Area from the District Plan
- Provide landowners within the Mapara Valley certainty about what development can happen
- Protect the landscape and natural character features that were identified through the Mapara Valley Structure Plan.

Options for achieving the outcomes:

- Remove the Mapara Valley Structure Plan Area and apply the General rural zone
- Review the Mapara Valley Structure Plan to meet rural lifestyle demand projections

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1: Remove Mapara Valley Structure Plan Area and replace with Rural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would provide certainty for landowners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been the expectation that the Mapara Valley would accommodate some growth for some time. Reverting to Rural would be a significant reduction in development potential for many landowners.
Option 2: Review the Mapara Valley Structure Plan to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would provide certainty for landowners. It would mean that some development could occur rather 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would involve another planning exercise with the community which can be time consuming.

meet rural lifestyle demand projections

than reverting back to Rural provisions.

- It would allow rural lifestyle demand to be met.

Option 2 is the preferred option, as it would provide certainty and allow for rural lifestyle demand to be met.

ISSUE THREE: Changes in Rural Industry

Rural land owners want the ability to diversify their farming operations, while protecting the productive capacity and the amenity of the rural environment.

Higher order policy documents such as the National Policy Statement for Freshwater, The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River, regional policy statements and regional Plans are placing restrictions on land use, particularly within the Rural zone. Some land owners are looking at ways to diversify their farming operation, while protecting the productive capacity as well as the amenity of the Rural Environment. This issue has been identified through TD2050.

The Operative District Plan (ODP) takes an 'effects based' approach. The Rural Environment has objectives and policies around protecting the character and amenity of the environment. In addition, the ODP uses performance standards to manage effects. This means, providing that effects such as noise are mitigated, then a wide range of land uses (including agri-business, tourism and recreational opportunities) are able to establish in the Rural Environment. However, the ODP lacks objectives and policies to support this approach.

Summary of alternative management responses – Other Districts

A review of the approaches taken in the Matamata-Piako, Hastings, Rotorua and South Waikato District Plans were considered. These districts were taken into consideration because they are seen as being of a similar size and demographic to our district.

District Plan	Approach
Matamata-Piako	Focused on protecting primary production activities
Hastings	Focused on protecting primary production activities
Rotorua	Provides for and encourages a change in land uses/rural activities if it will achieve a reduction in nutrient losses, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policy 9.3.1.2 Encourage land use and land management changes that achieve a reduction in nutrient losses and provide for restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity and ecological functioning.”• Policy 9.3.1. “Promote the change from high nutrient producing activities to other rural activities.
South Waikato	Combination of an activity based and effects-based plan. Contains a policy which focuses on addressing the possible effects from activities in rural areas in catchments in the district, and on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River and its catchment.

Outcomes we are seeking to achieve:

- **The productive capacity of rural land is protected**
- **Rural character and amenity is protected**
- **Landowners have the ability to diversify their farming operations**

The options available for addressing issue four are:

1. **Status quo – permissive, effects-based approach**
2. **Specific provisions supporting reduction in nutrient losses**

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1: Permissive, effects-based approach (the status quo).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has allowed for a wide variety of land uses in the rural environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not contain objectives and policies to provide guidance when assessing resource consent applications.
Option 2: Provide objectives and policies supporting change in land uses which have lower nutrient losses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would provide land owners with the ability to diversify their farming operations. • Would encourage land uses that have lower nutrient losses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be perceived to be taking on responsibilities of Regional Councils.

Option 2 is the preferred option, as it would provide land owners with the ability to diversify their farming operations.

ISSUE FOUR: Pressure for second dwellings

There appears to be some demand for second dwellings on smaller lots (less than 20ha in size) in the Rural Environment. However, we need to consider the implications of this on:

- ***the infrastructure network***
- ***efficiency of land use and***
- ***Rural character and amenity.***

There is some pressure for second dwellings on lifestyle lots within the Rural Environment. This pressure seems to primarily be for use family members e.g. elderly parents and for visitor accommodation such as Air BnB.

One dwelling is allowed as a Permitted Activity. Any additional dwellings are a Discretionary Activity. The provisions in the ODP require that second and subsequent dwellings or accommodation units shall be sited within its own 10 hectare “nominal allotment”. These provisions aim to protect the rural amenity of the environment. It also means that if subdivision is to occur in the future, each dwelling is able to accommodate its own 10ha lot.

This was an issue that was raised by local resource management consultants and consent planners during the engagement on District Plan ‘issues’. There is some limited information held by Council to support this issue:

- Between 2013 – 2017 there had only been one resource consent granted for a second dwelling on a lot smaller than 20ha in the Rural Environment.
- We monitored the enquires received by our resource consent team over the period 7 March – 10 May 2018. Over this period of time, the resource consents team received 6 enquiries about people wanting to build a second dwelling in the Rural Environment.

The demand for additional dwellings on existing lifestyle lots in the Rural Environment was raised consistently throughout the rural consultation sessions held. This feedback was similar to that received from consultants and consent planners, indicating a higher demand for second dwellings in lifestyle areas and/or land closer to town.

This rule in combination with objectives and policies, was developed to avoid unplanned urbanisation of the rural environment through an increase in the density of dwellings greater than that anticipated in a rural setting. The effects associated with such development include increased levels of

urbanisation of the rural zone, pressure on rural infrastructure and greater opportunity for incompatible land uses and reverse sensitivity situations to occur.

Another key issue is the risk of retrospective subdivision after the second dwelling has been created. This is where land use consent has been granted for the development of the second dwelling and the owner then seeks to subdivide off a new lot containing the second dwelling. This increases the risk of fragmenting areas of the Rural zone further.

Summary of alternative management responses – Other Districts

The following table shows how other comparable districts have approached the second dwelling issue.

District Plan	Second dwellings
Ruapehu	Two dwellings on a site less than 100 ha. Maximum density is one dwelling per ha net site area. Up to 4 dwellings on a site with an area between 100 and 1000ha
South Waikato	Rural Zone – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One dwelling allowed on sites less than 4ha. • Two dwellings allowed on sites 4-70ha. • Three dwellings allowed on sites 70-150ha • 5 dwellings allowed on sites larger than 150ha Rural Lifestyle – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One dwelling as a Permitted Activity • Second dwelling as a Controlled Activity
Western Bay of Plenty	Rural Zone – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One dwelling as a Permitted Activity • One minor dwelling as a secondary dwelling
Queenstown	Rural Zone - All buildings (except for additions or alterations of existing buildings that meet certain performance standards) require a consent as a Discretionary Activity. Rural Living Zone – All buildings require a consent as a Controlled Activity
Rotorua	Rural – One household per site except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites larger than 30ha are allowed one householder per 15 useable ha • One additional household unit not exceeding 72m² is allowed as a Permitted Activity Rural 2 – Controlled Activity. No more than one house per 8000m ² site access.
Hastings	Rural Zone – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One residential building permitted per site 20ha or less • Two residential buildings are permitted on sites 20ha or above • One Secondary Residential Building is permitted Rural Residential Zone – • One residential building is permitted per site over 2500m² • One residential building is permitted per site in a residential farm park • One Supplementary Residential Building is permitted per site on a residential farm park

Most of the plans considered have a similar approach to Taupō where the number of dwellings allowed is dependent on the size of the property. Western Bay, Rotorua and Hastings utilise a supplementary dwelling approach where a subsidiary dwelling is specifically provided for.

Outcomes we are seeking to achieve:

- The productive capacity of rural land is protected
- Rural character and amenity is protected
- Landowners have the ability to use their land to accommodate extended family members and small scale accommodation

The options available for addressing issue four are:

1. Status quo – permissive, effects-based approach
2. Specific provisions supporting reduction in nutrient losses

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1 - One dwelling allowed per 10 nominal allotment (status quo)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anecdotal evidence appears that this is working well for lots over 20ha • Protects Council infrastructure such as the roading network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricts those who may wish to construct a secondary dwelling whether this is for family or an accommodation activity
Option 2 – Increase the density (number of dwellings) you are allowed on a smaller lot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will allow those living on lots less than 20ha in size flexibility to accommodate extended family or to generate an additional income through accommodation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional pressure on Council’s roading network • Additional rural land fragmentation effects and potential to ‘go in the back door’ to subdivision, further fragmenting land • Could result in a more ‘urbanised’ look and feel
Option 3 - Allow ‘secondary dwellings¹⁷ on lots smaller than 20ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will allow those living on lots less than 20ha in size flexibility to accommodate extended family or to generate an additional income through accommodation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance standards could manage amenity effects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional pressure on Council’s roading network • Additional rural land fragmentation effects and potential to ‘go in the back door’ to subdivision, further fragmenting land • Could result in a more ‘urbanised’ look and feel

Option 3 is the preferred option, as it would provide land owners with flexibility, while managing effects.

¹ A ‘secondary’ dwelling is one that is ancillary to the use...eg close, uses same entrance way etc. which supports the principal dwelling on the site and shares its vehicle access and services.

ISSUE FIVE: Understanding the wide range of activities that happen in the Rural Environment

The Rural Environment is currently any land that is located outside the urban and industrial environments. There is a wide range of land uses that occur in the Rural Environment, including tourism activities and outdoor recreational facilities. We need to consider:

- *If the current approach is a problem or whether some of these non-rural land uses may be better suited to an alternative zoning.*
- *We need to understand what the 'look and feel' of the Rural Environment is.*
- *How conflict between the diverse range of activities in the Rural Environment can be avoided.*

In the Operative District Plan, the Rural Environment applies to all land outside the urban environment such as Industrial and Commercial. There are areas such as the Wairakei Tourist Park, power stations and commercial activities which are located within the Rural Environment, however the activities occurring on site are not of a rural nature. This means that the planning framework may be somewhat more onerous than necessary when activities want to establish. We have looked at the different land uses occurring within the Rural Environment to determine whether it may be more appropriate to rezone some areas.

Summary of alternative management responses – Other Districts

It was decided that for this issue, it was not appropriate to assess other district plans. This is because this issue relates to ensuring that individual sites have the appropriate zoning, rather than discussing the specific provisions of the zone.

There is no 'one size fits all' response to this issue as the appropriateness of each planning response will need to be considered against the nature of the site being assessed.

Outcomes we are seeking to achieve:

- **The productive capacity of rural land is protected**
- **Rural character and amenity is protected**
- **Unnecessary bureaucracy is avoided through the provision of appropriate planning provisions.**

The options available for addressing issue four are:

1. **Do nothing**
2. **Undertake an assessment of all 'non-rural' sites and determine what the appropriate zoning should be in the future.**

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1 – Do nothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Landowners are familiar with the existing zoning. ● All properties outside urban areas are treated equally using the same planning framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● May be restrictive for some activities which aren't typically considered to be 'rural' eg tourism activities.
Option 2 – Re-zoning to better reflect the existing use of the site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Allows for each 'non-rural' site to be assessed and zoned appropriately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Could result in 'spot' zoning, which can result in 'winners' and 'losers'. ● Could be a challenge to find another zone that is 'more' appropriate.

Option 2 is the preferred option, as it will allow for each site to be appropriately zoned.

ISSUE SIX : The management of reverse sensitivity

There is a wide variety of activities in the Rural Environment. Some activities may generate effects such as odour or noise, which may cause conflict with different activities. There is a need to consider how the provision of the Plan can protect sensitive activities in the Rural Environment, and how to prevent ‘reverse sensitivity’ uses occurring in the future.

This issue has been identified in the ‘Issues Report’ and the community engagement sessions.

Reverse sensitivity generally occurs when productive uses of rural land, such as intensive farming operations, are located near more sensitive land uses, such as rural lifestyle blocks. The productive uses generate effects such as noise (eg tractors, dogs barking) and odour.

The ODP uses setbacks to prevent/manage reverse sensitivity. However, these setbacks are less stringent than other District Plans.

Outcomes we are seeking to achieve:

- The productive uses of rural land is protected
- Rural character and amenity is protected
- Sensitive land uses are protected

There are a range of tools that can be considered to address reverse sensitivity. These include:

1. Zonings – by grouping activities together there are more “like with like” boundaries.
2. Setbacks – these create a buffers between activities to reduce the effects of reverse sensitivity.
3. Activity based rules for activities with significant effects including noise, smell and visual.

These options are not mutually exclusive. We can choose to use either one, some, or all of the available options.

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1 Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages similar land uses to be located near each other. • Helps to ‘separate’ sensitive land uses from those that generate effects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementation of different zoning may not align with the aspirations of some landowners.
Option 2 – Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a “buffer” between where different activities can occur and neighbouring tool. • Relatively easy tool to administer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It gets difficult to determine what the appropriate setback distances should be. It is likely that different distances would be appropriate for different activities. • Setbacks that are too large will impose on property rights.
Option 3 -Activity based rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides certainty on where different activities can locate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not provide direction for activities that are not listed eg new activities/changes in technology. • Does not allow each application to be assessed on its effects.

Options 1 and 2 are the preferred options, as they will provide direction on where certain activities should occur.

CONCLUSION

The Rural Environment covers all of the Taupō District outside of the urban areas. There are a wide range of activities occurring in the environment.

To align with the National Planning Standards, we will need to replace our 'Rural Environment' with a 'General Rural zone' and 'Rural Lifestyle zone'. This will mean that we will need to develop new provisions for these two zones.

This report has identified six 'issues' with the current Rural Environment and options for dealing with these issues. These options will form the basis of developing new provisions.