



Resource Consent Submission Form

Reference Number: REF260222660

Submitted On: 12/02/2026 10:27 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:	Greg Snelgrove
Contact name:	Greg Snelgrove
Designation:	
Contact phone number:	275520460
Email address:	greg@ripedeli.co.nz

Postal address::	17 Charles Crescent, 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 size of the development being 16 units on a site that allows for 12 units maximum The 3 storey units The number of entry/exit driveways onto Charles Crescent that will be used on a daily basis. The impact it will have on Charles Crescent in regard to parking and additional traffic flow on a 90 degree corner where our house is situated Having a high density development within an established low to medium density residential area
---	--

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

Please detail the reasons for making your submission:	Firstly I would like to share that I do support some type of development on the old Rainbow Point Motel site. In terms of the current proposed development i do not support there being 16 units on a site that ideally allows for 12 units maximum. There are a number of factors that i believe need to be considered with the current proposed development. 1) The 3 storey units are not in keeping with the current Rainbow Point look and feel. 3 storey units are even included in the Kokomea development on the other side of Lake Terrace which is a recent development within the Taupo district. I am aware that the designers believe that 3 storey developments are the way of the future and that may be true in high density developments in other parts of Taupo or other parts of the country, however Rainbow Point is a well established development consisting of a mix of holiday homes and permanent residents. Our house was first built in 1965 being 61 years old now, it is a single level house on a full 820m2 section and it certainly wasn't the first home in the area. We see Rainbow Point as an
--	---

established low density housing development with a few medium density sections that have been developed over the years, it is not a high density development. As an aside we purchased in Rainbow Point because we saw it as a safe sleepy village, where there is not a lot of through traffic, so our children can safely walk or bike to the lake front to enjoy its wonderful walkways with minimal fear of traffic movements.

2) I have watched a number of new developments in recent times in the Hibiscus Coast of Auckland namely parts of Millwater, East Coast Heights in Silverdale and Milldale. Most of these developments have been based on the assumption that people who live in these homes will only have 1 car and that most of the residents will use public transport to move around the city. This assumption is not supported in real life as driving the streets of these developments, you find many of the houses have in fact multiple cars per residence which end up being parked roadside making it difficult to move around and dangerous for children in the area to move about safely. I accept the Taupo District Council may be wanting to promote public transport as an alternative means for families to move around, however there is a lot of work that needs to come first in New Zealand as a whole before this becomes a mainstream practice. This is aspirational / generational change, which may be possible under the right circumstances. However I would question that creating a high density development within an established low to medium density residential area is needed to support such an initiative.

3) During our recent summer holiday period I noted how roadside on Charles Crescent opposite this proposed development was being used and this was from one household at 24b Charles Crescent. They have a 2 car parking space in front of their house, however they had 2 boats parked on the kerbside plus multiple vehicles parked both in their driveway and on the roadside. I realise this was during a peak period however if we were to multiple this example by the number of proposed units it does demonstrate the possible impact that 16 units may have on the neighbouring roadside area and the safety risk it poses as a number of families/children do walk or bike up to the shops situated on Rainbow Drive.

4) We currently have a great view of Mt Tauhara from our property, with the 3 storey units being proposed, this view would be lost.

5) The proposed development has a number of driveway entrances directly onto Charles Crescent, I am aware that the developers believe this is in line with what was previously used by the motel, however the motel had most of these driveways closed and were not used. The proposed number to driveways onto Charles Crescent will have a significant impact on the amount of vehicles and other transported items ie boats, jetskis, etc using this part of the road which will in turn increase the safety risk of families/children in the

area especially around the 90 degree bend outside this development.

6) It is clear that proposed development is not fully compliant with the district rules otherwise this would not have been a publicly notifiable development. I hope the people assessing this proposal consider all the concerns that its neighbours are raising and act in a way that supports the development of this site in line with its neighbours and builds on the community that is Rainbow Point. A question i have asked the people representing the Developers is; What are the Developers drivers? Building community or exploiting this site for what profit they can make. I have not had an answer to this question. Too often profits are prioritised over communities, I believe with a bit of compromise from both sides this site could be developed in a way that reflects the Rainbow Point community and supports both the current and future families that will live here.

7) I have purposely not gone into the detail of what the non compliance items are as I trust the Taupo District Planners are better equipped to assess these items than I. I know 16 units will place more demand of the infrastructure and they will know what spare capacity they have in respect to these items.

Thank you for your time in considering the points i have raised.

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

I seek the following decision from the Taupō District Council:

Not to support the development in its current form,
16 units are too many for this site, maximum of 12 units,
3 storey units are not inline with the developed Rainbow Point community, no greater than 2 storeys per unit
Reduce the number of active driveways onto Charles Crescent
Support a safer space for families / children to walk or bike to the Rainbow Point shops
I believe the developers could change the proposed development to be more congruent with Rainbow Point community although I accept they may not make as much profit in doing so.

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 do not 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.