

Form 13



Submission on application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by Hurunui District Council

Sections 95A Resource Management Act 1991

Please do not hesitate to phone the planning section at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 8816) if you require any assistance.

To: Hurunui District Council

This is a submission on an application from Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools and Spa (the applicant) for a resource consent to install and operate a gravity-based recreation activity (flyride) on the western face of the Conical Hill Reserve at 54 Lucas Lane, Hanmer Springs.

Submitter details

1. Name of Submitter*

Joanne Adams

Please provide your full name

2. For the purposes of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991: *

- I am a trade competitor
 I am not a trade competitor

3. I am or I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- a) adversely affects the environment; and
b) does not relate to trade competition or effects of trade competition

*

- I am affected
 I am not affected directly

4. The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are: *

Location - significant landscape
Carparking - not a permitted activity with provided carparking
Noise - adverse effects off,

My submission is in *

SUPPORT

OPPOSITION

Include whether you support, oppose or are neutral to specific parts of the application or wish to have them amended and provide reasons for your views. This may be provided on a separate sheet if you need more space.

I oppose the application as it stands but am supportive in principle, See attached letter.

I seek the following decision from the consent authority: *

Give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought

My submission is for the council to consider ways to mitigate adverse effects of this proposal.

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

I do wish to be heard

I do not wish to be heard

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing. *

Yes N/A

No

In pursuant to Section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991: I request / do not request that the council delegate their functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority. *

I request

I do not request

11. Contact details for the submitter:

Joanne Adams

021 1977751

P.O. Box 22

Hammer Springs

To whom it may concern,

Re: Flywire Proposal

I am writing to express my views on this proposal in the hope that they will be considered in your review process. I have views both for and against, but have decided that it is not appropriate to sit on the fence.

I would like to make it clear that I am not opposed to progress and believe that we need to support new enterprise and make sensible decisions in the interests of residents, businesses, community wellbeing and the environment. I applaud the applicants for trying to create something new for Hanmer Springs and believe it would be great to have some activity that is new, (as in different from what you can find elsewhere so we don't have to go head to head with other places that do it better). My personal opinions on the merit of the flywire as a business proposal are not being expressed here because I see that as irrelevant, however if ratepayers money is to be used that is a different argument.

However, I do have some concerns over this project. My chief concerns are;

1. Carparking, I do believe this activity will add to the growing congestion problems for the hill based village residents and I object to the council granting special favours to itself, when it works hard to apply every obscure rule to its ratepayers often at considerable, unnecessary cost and in defiance of commonsense. It appears to the casual observer that this is done to maximise 'clipping the ticket' benefits and I believe the council should be a leader in this area and demonstrate their highest standards as they expect us to. I believe a better solution would be to provide a basic gravel carparking area somewhere off, the 'off road track' that already exists at flax gully. (I presume this would need to be negotiated with the Forest if they are the owners or whoever the owners are). If the council do decide to waive normal conditions and let this proposal go ahead I do hope that they extend this discretion to hard working ratepayers wanting to do things in far less significant landscapes than this.
2. Location, although the amended site is better than the original proposal, my preference is for an activity like this to not be on the front/village side of Conical Hill. I am sympathetic to neighbouring residents and imagine they purchased in the area because it seemed least likely to be impacted by high intensity activity and most likely to be a quiet place. Conical Hill is an icon and the family tradition of walking to the top is special for many people. The shrieks of laughter and cries from falls are quite enough during busy times already without having to compete with the squeals from the fly ride. The fly ride will be closer to residential property from what I can see, than the hyroslides in the village, plus noise carries in the nor wester so the whole village is likely to be impacted by this more than the hydro slides in my opinion. Many like myself enjoy the jacks pass, flax, gully conical hill loop for regular exerise and I would like to know that I could still do this without fear of people dropping missiles from above! I believe that the Conical hill area of Hanmer and the dog stream area are both about peace and tranquility in a crazy high speed world and my preference is to retain this as much as possible. The flywire proposal at conical does not fit this ideal in my opinion. However there are many better places in the surrounding hills that would not be so obtrusive to the tranquility of the village. (eg Chatterton, the look out somewhere near the hilly parts of the forest). Directly behind Conical would also be better from a noise point of view but there would need to additional planting to enhance the experience in my opinion.
3. If this proposal does go through as it is, it will set a precedent and I imagine there will be many applications coming that will seek to have the carparking issue especially waved, the council needs to consider this. It would be wrong going forward to stop anyone else wanting to do the same or similar because of congestion and lack of parking.
4. I am concerned about both the process and amount of trees that may be cut down. I believe Conical Hill has already had too much development and the trees from the front and side of

conical hill need to be preserved. The backside of conical may lend itself to development better but this type of development should stay out of the central village which is already too congested, in my opinion. My great grandfather was head of the forestry here (Clarence McKay) and his life sized picture with a two man saw took pride of place in the old forestry headquarters for many years, I feel a duty of care to preserve my heritage and my family roots are deep in this village. The Forest including the heritage forest and Conical Hill are central to this.

5. Should the proposed flywire operation be sold in the future, I am concerned about the loss of control over an activity that is so central in the village and the potential for it to grow in an adverse way. I would hope the council has considered this and the issues that may arise from such an eventuality.
6. Any proposal should be a win win proposal but I cannot see the win part for the village in the current one. The winners look to be people who want to pay for the rides (visitors) and the submitters but I fail to see any real benefits to the village other than maybe a mildly positive increase in visitors. There is also an argument to say that another paid for attraction (and presumably not a cheap one at that) will mean less money being spent on other businesses.

In support of the applicants.

I respect the applicants motivation to progress Hanmer Springs and for putting in the work and taking advantage of the funding opportunity to enhance the area. I wish I could be more supportive of the proposal as it stands but hope they are supported to make adjustments again to the proposal (hopefully with location!) and that the costs of amendments will not be prohibitive (as I also hope would be the case for the average ratepayer). I am sure it will be deflating to encounter these problems and hope they won't be too disheartened and will continue to work towards a solution to mitigate or avoid these concerns. I see enormous potential to grow our perimeters and believe activities in the wider Hanmer area should be encouraged, as it will elevate congestion in the village. I do hope the submitters will reevaluate the location and In doing so bring the whole village along in support. .

I do not believe the height issues for the poles will negatively impact the landscape to a significant degree, but it is still hypocritical to bypass legislation that the rest of us are bound by but don't have the deep pockets to fight. It will also quite rightly create a precedent that needs to be considered.

The gecko problem. I believe standard mitigation is perfectly adequate and I can't see how this proposal would adversely affect their habitat to a significant degree. This seems to me to be a remote and expensive handbrake on development that often accompanies applications these days to the detriment of development in most cases.

If the flywire proposal were to go ahead, I see potential for things to complement it, for example, a treetop walk section, café and elevated treetop trampoline activity for the kids. A café/ Ice cream bar that you could only walk to would be great behind conical and be accessible to people not wanting the fly ride and also enhance the current walking experience. But once again, anything like this should be behind and away from view of the village and significant, conical landscape features and far enough away from the observation area so as to retain traditional spaces and experiences. I hear there is a lot of support for this to go ahead up the Chatterton track area, this is still quite central really but is not as much a significant landscape area although I do not know what barriers may prevent this from happening.