

To Taupo District Council & DABB Property Rentals C/- Cheal Consultants Ltd.

We are a property owner of 3/24 Charles Crescent; Taupo and are writing to object to the resource consent application at 29 Charles Crescent (Ref - RM250187).

The proposal will have unreasonable impacts which are directly caused by proposed non-compliances with the district plan. The main concerns and impacts are:

1. Impacts on parking, traffic and access.
2. Overdevelopment of the site and being out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood.
3. Significant non-compliances with the District plan, which undermines the integrity of the plan and will set a poor precedent for the area and wider district.
4. Insufficient justification to receive approval for the non-complying activity under Rule GRZ-R4.1.

Car parking and access.

It is excessive to have four driveway crossings on Charles Crescent. The previous motel development had three “drive on” crossings to Charles Crescent and the main access from Rainbow Drive. As noted in the Councils notification documentation, only one crossing was actively used. This will not be the case with the new development with a total of 6 crossings.

The proposed driveways and crossings will reduce the on-street car parking to an unacceptable degree. Units 5 and 6 (the detached dwellings on Charles Crescent) do not comply with Standard TRAN-R4.1 which requires that parking areas must be designed to ensure that vehicles are not required to reverse onto or off the street. This is a blatant and unacceptable non-compliance which has direct impacts on availability of car parking and the safety of manoeuvring onto Charles Crescent.



Figure 1: Proposed Site Plan showing the inappropriate driveway crossings

The car parking and access should be provided within the site, reducing the number of crossings.

The Maximum Equivalent Vehicle Movements (EVM) is excessive and directly caused by the substantial non-compliance with the maximum plot ratio. As detailed in the district plan, the limit for the site is 24 EVM - the proposal is for 128, this is 5 times the limit, or a non-compliance of 104 EVM's. It is noted that the Motel had an EVM of 60, even if this was used as a baseline, the proposal is doubling the motel's vehicle movements, which is unacceptable.

These impacts are directly caused by the proposal excessively intensifying the site. The number of units must be reduced, which would reduce the required car parking, vehicle movements and allow provision of parking within the site. The applicant is only able to propose 16 units because of the non-compliant height, maximum plot ratio and total coverage. A compliant proposal would have far less impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood in terms of streetscape character and parking/vehicle movements.

Character of the area

A 16-unit development is out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood. This is exacerbated by the numerous non-compliances with the district plan, including:

- The maximum plot ratio is exceeding the limit by 34.78%, which directly results in the unsuitable intensification of the site when compared with the district plan and the surrounding site context.

The council's assessment of the character of the surrounding area (in the notification decision) demonstrates that the proposal is out of character with the surrounding area

"Overall, the character of the Rainbow Point residential area is a well established residential area with generally detached, single or two storey dwellings with a small number of semi-detached dwellings and some properties with two dwellings, with property sizes which are generally just over 800m² in area. The properties have lawn and garden areas surrounding the dwellings and most contain well established vegetation"

Non-compliances with the district plan

Because the proposal does not comply with multiple standards, it is a non-complying activity. The proposal does not meet the threshold test for demonstrating that the impacts are minor. The proposal is considered contrary to the objectives and policies of the district plan. In conclusion the proposal for 16 units with 6 driveway crossings is unsuitable for this site and it must be significantly reduced, with the car parking provided within the site.

Thank you for considering my submission on this proposal, I trust Council and the applicant will consider and adequately respond to these concerns.

Kind Regards,

M & L Russell, Property owner of 3/24 Charles Crescent, Taupo.