



Resource Consent Submission Form

Reference Number: REF260212181

Submitted On: 07/02/2026 03:03 p.m.

NOTES TO SUBMITTER:

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.

If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners. You may not make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to an application for a coastal permit to carry out an activity that a regional coastal plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious;
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- it contains offensive language;
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

All submissions (including name and contact details) are published and made available to the public from our offices and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the notified resource consent process. All information collected will be held by Taupō District Council, 46 Horomatangi Street, Taupō, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Resource Consent Applicant Details

Taupō District Council reference number(s):	RM250187
Applicant name	DABB Property Rentals Limited
Application for:	Resource consent

Submitter Details

Full name of submitter:	Laura Dawson
Contact name:	Laura Dawson
Designation:	
Contact phone number:	0212168496
Email address:	ledawson097@gmail.com

Postal address::	41 Rainbow Drive, Rainbow Point, Taupo 3330
Are you a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991?	No, I am not

Do you wish to receive any further correspondence prior to the decision being issued?	Yes
--	-----

Privacy Statement:

Submitters are advised that the information supplied in written submissions may contain personal information within the meaning of the Privacy Act 1993. By taking part in this public submission process, submitters have agreed to any personal information (including names and contact details) which is contained in their submission being made available to the public as part of the consultation and decision making process. All information collected will be held by Taupō District Council. Submitters have the right to access and correct personal information. Following the submission period, copies of all submissions will be available on our website.

Submission

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:	The proposed activity for land use consent for a residential development of 16, 2-3 storey residential units that does not comply with the District Plan with regard to: provisions for - Maximum Plot Ratio - Maximum Total Coverage - Minimum Building Setback (front and other boundaries) - Maximum Building Height - Maximum Height to Boundary - Earthworks - The number of Vehicle Crossings - Vehicle Crossing Distance to intersection - Number of vehicle movements.
---	---

My submission is:	In opposition of the application or specific parts of it
--------------------------	--

Please detail the reasons for making your submission:	As a long-term resident of Rainbow Point I know the neighbourhood well and the sort of activities which currently happen here. I have lived in the area for close to 30 years and have known it since 1959 when my parents bought their section and built a holiday house on the property I now live on with my husband. Rainbow Point is a residential, leafy area where many people come for holidays and others call their full-time home. The proposed activity can best be described as trying to "squeeze a quart into a pint pot". I believe 16 units on 4 sections is not in keeping with the area. The life-style suggested by the plan is simply not realistic within the sections and the adjacent roads. Details of my opposition are set out below.
--	--

Alternatively, please upload document detailing the reasons for making your submission:

I seek the following decision from the Taupō District Council:

I request Taupo District Council decline the proposal. The detailed reasons are:

1. Maximum Plot Ratio and Maximum Total Coverage do not comply.

I request a maximum of 12 units and suggest deleting units 13 - 16 of the current plan.

2. Minimum Building Setback (front and other boundaries). By reducing the number of units more space will be allowed around each one, allow the units to fit within the prescribed setback rules with the result much more in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood.

3. Maximum Building Height and Maximum Height to Boundary.

I request the maximum height be 2 storeys for all units and with more space around the units will address the height to boundary issue. Again, much more in keeping with the neighbourhood.

4. The number of Vehicle Crossings, Vehicle Crossing Distance to intersection and Number of vehicle movements. The plan as it stands has two accesses on to Rainbow Drive opposite the shops, already a busy intersection and the approach to Rainbow Point itself. Also shown are 4 accesses on to Charles Crescent. The two accesses onto Rainbow Drive would be removed by deleting units 13 to 16. This would have the added benefit that there would be no need to shift the current bus stop.

The planning Application document states that "Charles Crescent is 15m wide with a 7m formed carriageway while Rainbow Drive is 20m wide with a 9m formed carriageway." "Both Rainbow Drive and Charles Crescent are generally low volume, low speed roads with Charles Crescent having an ADT of 150 and Rainbow Drive an ADT of 1400". However, this traffic load is based on 2000 data, 25 years ago.

The concern of present residents about the increase in traffic and boat parking on Charles Crescent is minimized in the Application document.

However, the document estimates that with 16 units the proposal is likely to generate 128 vehicle movements per day compared with the 60 vehicle movements associated with the previous motel; more than double the traffic.

The Application document asserts that each unit has at least 2 parking sites; one in a garage and one on the apron adjacent to the unit. My observation is that very few homes actually use their garage for vehicle storage. The garage is storage for "toys" like bikes, jet skis, or even "junk". The

apron outside the units as shown is scarcely enough for one vehicle. So, inevitably the over-flow vehicles and trailers will end up on Charles Crescent. This is totally unacceptable.

Although I was not consulted about the proposal I totally endorse the Charles Crescent residents concern about the increase in traffic and on-street parking as per the proposal.

Do you wish to attend the hearing?

Yes

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

Yes

If others make a similar submission, will you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing?

Yes

Delegation of functions, powers and duties:

I request*, pursuant to section 100A of the Act, that you delegate your functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority (please refer to the Notes to Submitter on Step 1).