

Objection to Proposed High Density Development – Residential Zone, Taupō

To:

The Resource Consents Team, Taupō District Council

From:

David McPherson, 13 Kowhai Road, Rainbow Point. dvdmc1@gmail.com 0204 128 2211
10th February, 2026

Subject: **Resource Consent Application for High Density Development at 29 Charles St, Rainbow Point**

I hereby lodge an objection to the above-noted development proposal on the grounds that it materially conflicts with key planning controls and performance standards in the Taupō District Plan and relevant planning instruments. I begin with a general discussion about the nature of the proposal and then move to cite specific technical grounds for refusal of the proposal as it stands.

General Discussion

I write as a property owner living relatively close to the site of the proposed development. I walk and/or drive past it most days. I support and welcome development on this site as a worthy addition to the housing stock in the area.

However, as currently framed, this proposal is a surely cynical attempt at asking for far more than expected in the hope that it will end up with something reasonable. Whilst this may be a standard developer strategy, it suggests that, for this group, profit alone is everything. It seems that little or no responsibility has been taken to propose an appropriate development that integrates well with existing standards.

It irks me that citizens have to object to such a cynical proposal when it breaks so many regulations which are all there for a clear purpose. It is as though the applicant is in a 100km speed zone and seeing how fast they can go and not get caught. The District Plan should not be a minimum starting point.

I question whether these developers are the best fit for this community if the only thing they seem to care about is maximising density and congestion for profit. Approving this application would also set an undesirable precedent for overdevelopment in a neighbourhood that has historically and intentionally remained low-density.

Therefore I request that the Council throw out this application without spending any more time and money on it and request the developers either substantially revise their application or sell to another developer. Someone who can see past profit and personal gain alone and who recognises and accepts the need for a more balanced development that respects wider community and amenity values.

So what is so wrong with this development?

Visual Dominance and Scale

This proposal is wholly inappropriate for the existing character of the area, which is a low-density, quiet residential neighbourhood. The scale, massing, and density of the development are out of keeping with the surrounding homes and would fundamentally alter the established character of the street and wider area.

As proposed, the building is too 'heavy' for the site, creating an unreasonable sense of enclosure for other properties in the street. It does not fit the 'vibe' of the neighbourhood with its land cover and high density.

Pressure on Infrastructure

I do not know but wonder whether the area has the capacity to support a development of this intensity, including sufficient parking and increased pressure on water, stormwater and sewage infrastructure. Roads in the area are narrow and already experience congestion and

on-street parking issues. The additional traffic generated by a high-density scheme would exacerbate these problems, creating safety concerns for residents, pedestrians, and cyclists.

Visual Amenity

Furthermore the proposal would result in a loss of residential amenity for neighbouring properties. Issues such as increased noise, reduced privacy due to overlooking, overshadowing, and loss of natural light have not been adequately addressed. These impacts would significantly diminish the quality of life for existing residents.

Specific Technical Elements

1. Maximum Plot Ratio and Maximum Total Coverage

- The proposal exceeds the **permitted or intended building coverage and plot ratio thresholds** for residential environments in the Taupō District Plan.
- High density proposals must demonstrate compliance with coverage limits designed to preserve **amenity, open space, daylight access, and landscape values** in established residential areas.
- Exceeding these limits undermines objectives in the Plan relating to visual amenity, neighbourhood character, and liveability.

2. Minimum Building Setbacks (Front and Other Boundaries)

- The development does not comply with the **minimum building setback requirements** that form part of the permitted activity standards. These are to ensure appropriate spatial separation, interface with streets, and protection of adjacent properties
- Inadequate setbacks result in excessive building bulk at the boundary interface, resulting in shading, loss of privacy, and adverse effects on neighbouring properties.

3. Maximum Building Height

- The proposed building height **exceeds the applicable height standard** for the residential zone.
- Excessive height without adequate design mitigation can create dominance effects on adjacent lower-scale residential properties, contrary to the objectives of the Plan. We cannot find any 3-storey buildings in Rainbow Point other than where the natural landscape contours permit.

4. Maximum Height in Relation to Boundary

- Buildings in the proposal intrude beyond the **height in relation to boundary (HIRB) controls**, which require that structures do not project beyond a recession plane measured from boundaries to manage bulk effects.
- Failure to comply with HIRB standards increases overshadowing and adverse effects on privacy and sunlight access to neighbouring properties.

5. Vehicle Crossing Distance to Intersection

- The locations and spacing of proposed vehicle crossings relative to nearby intersections do not comply with safe access and egress standards.
- Inadequate vehicle crossing distance to intersections increases potential for traffic congestion and safety hazards, contrary to the Plan's transport safety objectives.

6. Number of Vehicle Movements

- The scale and intensity of the proposed development will result in a **significant increase in vehicle movements** that exceed typical thresholds appropriate for a residential street environment.
- Excessive vehicle movements can degrade **local road capacity, safety for vulnerable road users, and residential amenity**.

Summary of Effects

Collectively, the above matters result in adverse effects that are **more than minor** on the local environment and neighbouring properties, including but not limited to:

- Overdevelopment beyond permitted density and coverage,
- Adverse visual dominance and loss of sunlight/privacy,
- Increased traffic and transport safety risks,
- Overly intrusive built form inconsistent with the character of the existing residential area.

Relief Sought

I request that Taupō District Council:

- **Decline the application** in its current form; and
- **Require substantive revisions** to ensure relatively full compliance with relevant District Plan standards and objectives, particularly those relating to coverage, height, setbacks and transport access; and
- **Require the applicants to justify their revised proposal** to include an acknowledgement of, and measures to address, the need for a neighbourhood-sensitive, balanced development.

David McPherson