

24 June 2021

REF: Conical Hill Switchback™ Flyride
TO: Jane Whyte – Response Planning Consultants Ltd
FROM: Angie Nelson – Rough & Milne Landscape Architects
SUBJECT: LVA Addendum to Accompany RC Application for Conical Hill Switchback™ Flyride

INTRODUCTION

The following provides a comment on the amendments to the proposal and the potential landscape and visual amenity effects resulting from the changes, to accompany an application for Resource Consent for the Conical Hill Switchback™ Flyride, located at Conical Hill Reserve in Hanmer Springs.

This comment shall be read in conjunction with the updated Graphic Attachment (Rev 2) dated 24/06/2021, referred to as the 'GA-REV 2'. Viewpoints discussed in the visual effects section of this addendum correspond to the original Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment Report dated 15/02/2021 and Graphic Attachment dated 15/02/2021, referred to in this comment as the 'LVA' and 'GA'. An updated package of visual simulations has also been prepared, dated 12/06/2021.

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND TIMELINE

The proposed development seeks to establish a passenger zipline, called the Conical Hill Switchback™ Flyride starting from the top of Conical Hill and traversing around the west side of Conical Hill. This will consist of the establishment of one ride line, seven poles to support the ride line, and two structures providing platforms for rider access. An application for resource consent was submitted to Hurunui District Council in February 2021. Documentation of the proposal has continued in the background while the original consent application was being reviewed by HDC and notified to the public. During this time there were several aspects of the proposal which evolved in greater detail and as a result the consent application was put on hold. The amended proposal as documented in the GA-REV 2 includes updated plans and elevations which document the proposed changes. These are described in the next section of this addendum.

AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSAL

Through the detail design process, a greater level of detail has been explored and as a result there have been several key changes to the proposal. These include:

- Amendments to pole heights and fixtures such as antennas and cameras
- Design of the solar panel roof system and aerial power/data cable

- Amendments to the start station platform
- Amendments to the stop station platform
- Further understanding of the scope for tree removal
- Development of construction access routes

Pole Heights and Fixtures

As documented on Sheet 14 of the GA, the heights of the proposed ride poles which support the ride track cable, have been reviewed and revised. The revision to the proposed pole heights is due to the required rider clearances above the ground. It is noted the associated ‘Materials’ dimensions outlined for each tower are indicative and subject to minor change during the final detailing on the project. Changes have been informed through the process of surveying the ground level under the ride path which has required an increase in several tower heights to achieve the necessary clearances. As per the original design, there are three pole designs (refer to Sheet 15-17 of the GA), but the heights of these now vary between 6.4 to 11.5 m high. The proposed location of each pole on the hill has not changed, although micro-siting with 10 m of each location is still sought to address ground conditions and avoid gecko habitat. The table below compares the pole heights in the original proposal to the current proposal.

Table 1: Proposed Revised Pole Height Comparison

Pole	Height in Original Application	Proposed Revised Height	Increase
T1	6.0 m	6.4 m	0.4 m
T2	10.2 m	11.0 m	0.8 m
T3	7.4 m	8.5 m	1.1 m
T4	8.7 m	9.8 m	1.1 m
T5	7.3 m (2 towers)	11.5 m	4.2 m
T6	6.8 m	8.5 m	1.7 m
T7	7.3 m	7.3 m	0 m

In addition to the proposed height changes, greater detail for the ride, maintenance and communication elements of the tower design have been explored. This includes addition of elements including cameras, Yagi-Uda antennae, glide plate and fixed ladder rungs.

As per the original proposal, poles will have a paint or powder coat finish in a dark recessive colour with LRV less than 10%. Recommended colour options, selected from the Hanmer Springs Design Standards roof colour options, are ColorCote - Karaka, Grey Friars or Ironsand or Resene - Pine Tree, Rangoon Green, or Maire.

Solar System and Overhead Power/Data Cable

Through the detail design period, the solar design potential of the site has been analysed. It was determined that solar panels could be sited on the roof structure of the Start Station. However, the potential for solar on the Stop Station was ruled out as an option due to the location of the structure on the south face of the hill, which would provide insufficient solar levels. As a result, the proposed design of the roof structure for the Start Station has been amended, discussed further in the ‘Start Station’ section of this report. In addition, an overhead power/data cable has been proposed to run from the Start Station to the Stop Station via the tops of the ride poles, as shown on Sheet 13 of the GA-REV 2.

Start Station

Several changes have been made to the design of the Start Station. These have evolved in response to the solar system design, storage requirements and operations / rider safety. Refer to Sheets 18 – 22 of the GA-REV 2.

As described above, the proposed solar system, which will provide power for the operation of the ride, will include solar panels on the roof structure of the Start Station. A minimum of 20 solar panels are required based on the power requirements for the ride operation, with a minimum angle of 20 degrees, facing North. As a result, the design of the roof of the Start Station has been redesigned as a mono-pitch roof at 20 degrees, measuring 8.1 m x 5.7 m. The original design had an asymmetrical gabled roof. This change has resulted in an increase in the roof height by approximately 1.0 m, although the height remains under 8.0 m from existing ground level as per the District Plan rules.

In addition to roof design and height, the proposed finished floor level has been amended to 547.57 masl. This change has resulted from use of the existing benchmark at the top Conical Hill. The ride elevation and platform were set relative to this point which was previously interpolated from available LINZ and contour information. Following the physical survey of this point, the elevation of the ride and platforms were revised to correspond to the measured elevation.

The storage for the platform has been revised as there has been further development of the ride operational system requirements including storage for an operation system, solar system batteries, first aid and rescue equipment, fire extinguisher, staff belongings, cleaning supplies and rubbish. At the Start Station, this has meant an increase in the required storage space which has taken the form of a 3.8 m long built-in timber storage bench which can double as rider waiting/seating and a 2.2 m high by 3.8 m long timber cabinet. The proposed storage will be secure and weatherproof.

A briefing screen has also been proposed within the briefing area to be utilised for a video briefing and may also be used to provide information relating to the ride, including promotional information. The remainder of the changes to the Start Station are primarily minor refinements including design of balustrading, decking and access gates to the platform. In addition to gates, a tensioned safety net is proposed below the launch ramp to mitigate fall risks from the end of the platform while the end gates are open.

The proposed earthworks around the Start Station platform have also been refined including smoothing of levels to the back of the platform to provide vehicle access for removing the trolleys at the end of the day. The revised earthworks include a total of 36 m³ cut, 2.0 m³ fill and covers an area of 129 m². Refer to Sheet 19 of the GA-REV 2. This is a slight increase from the original application of 12 m³ more cut and an additional 33 m² in area.

Stop Station

The proposed changes to the Stop Station are primarily minor refinements including changes to the roof design and storage. Other minor changes have been made to the design of balustrading, decking and access gates to the platform. In addition to gates, a tensioned safety net is proposed below the landing ramp to mitigate fall risks from the end of the platform while the end gates are open. Refer to Sheets 24 – 28 of the GA-REV 2.

The roof design has also been amended. As solar panels are no longer proposed for the roof of the Stop Station, the roof pitch has been set to 25 degrees and made to be symmetrical. The height of

the roof has not changed and remains under 8.0m above existing ground level as per the District Plan rules

In addition to roof design, the proposed finished floor level has been amended to 487.57. This change has resulted from use of the existing benchmark at the top Conical Hill. The ride elevation and platform were set relative to this point which was previously interpolated from available LINZ and contour information. Following the physical survey of this point, the elevation of the ride and platforms were revised to correspond to the measured elevation.

The storage for the platform has been revised as there has been further development of the ride operational system requirements. At this Stop Station, this has meant a slight restructuring of the proposed storage across the back of the platform to provide a gap for the tensioned cable to pass through. The proposed storage will be secure and weatherproof.

The proposed earthworks at the Stop Station platform have also been refined including smoothing of the proposed track to a continuous grade of 6.5%. The batter slope grades have also been refined with a maximum slope of 1:1 proposed. This will be stabilised with geogrid and planted. The revised earthworks include a total of 88 m³ of cut, 2.0 m³ fill and covers an area of 200 m². Refer to Sheet 25 of the GA-REV 2. This is an increase from the original application of 17 m³ more cut and an additional 24 m² in area.

Tree Removal

In the original application, a minimum of eight trees were identified to be removed along the ride track and at tower locations, acknowledging that further investigations would be required. Since lodgement of the original application, an Arborist has been engaged and further site investigations have been undertaken to better understand the requirements for tree removal and pruning. Refer to the Arborist's notes on Sheets 29-30 of the GA-REV 2 which documents tree, species, size, general location and those to be removed or pruned. The majority of trees are wilding pine species including Larch, Monterey Pine and Douglas Fir; the following table provides a summary of the proposed tree removal. This list is not exclusive as this investigation was focused on the tree removal required for the pole locations and clearances for the ride cable path. Additional pruning and tree removal may be required for the construction access tracks and clearances for the power/data cable.

Table 2: Tree Removal Summary

Span	Remove (number & species)	Prune (number & species)	Heights
1	4 – Larch & Douglas fir	0	12-13 m
2	6 – Larch	1 – Douglas fir	12-14 m
3	30 – Larch, Monterey Pine, Douglas fir	several - Kanuka	8-18 m
4	5 – Douglas fir, Monterey Pine	1 – Douglas fir	10-20 m
5	4 – Monterey Pine	several - Kanuka	5-20 m
6	8 – Monterey Pine, Douglas fir	several - Kanuka	6-24 m
7	15 – Larch, Mountain Ash, Monterey Pine, Leyland Cypress, Kanuka	2 – Mountain Ash	6-22 m

Construction Access

A preliminary construction access program has been prepared in coordination with a Lizard Expert in an effort to minimise disturbance to Rough Geckos and high-quality lizard habitat on the hillside. As

a result, the construction access will primarily be from existing tracks and forestry cuttings on the hill, as shown on Sheet 12 of the GA-REV 2. These tracks are overgrown in some places and will be reinstated where necessary. Poles 1, 4 and 7 are generally accessible from existing tracks with only a short section of new track or levelling around the base of the pole required for construction.

New tracks of 2.5 m width will be constructed to access the pole locations for poles 2, 3 and 6. These tracks are shown diagrammatically as the best alignment will be determined on site to minimise felling of trees or removal of areas of native vegetation where possible. This has not been addressed in the Arborist's notes described previously. Access to pole 5 will either be via a new track extending from the track constructed to pole 3 or via helicopter access, this methodology will be confirmed with the Contractor. Following construction, a 1.5 m path will be preserved for maintenance access to the towers while other disturbed areas including tracks and earthworks around the base of each tower will be planted with native planting at revegetation grades, refer to Sheet 31 of the GA-REV 2.

LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

The landscape character of the receiving environment and the site have previously been described within the LVA. The receiving environment of the township is described as a 'low-key alpine village' and the site is described as having a forested character with high sensory and perception values, as well as being popular for recreation.

As described in the LVA, the proposal will introduce a new recreation activity and associated poles and platforms within the Open Space Zone on Conical Hill. Regarding the amended proposal, the primary changes contributing to potential landscape effects are the increased tree removal and the amended design of the start station roof. The other amendments to the built form including the increased tower heights and minor amendments to the platforms such as gates, netting and storage, are not anticipated to contribute to increased effects on landscape as they are not considerably different to the original proposal and are of a small scale in the context of both the site and the receiving environment.

In the LVA, it was assessed that in the context of the receiving environment, the addition of built form on the site will have adverse effects on the naturalness of Conical Hill to a very low degree. This rating was attributed to the small scale of the built form and minimal modification of vegetation on the landform. While the built form is still of a small scale, even considering the changes in heights and form, there has been an increase in the scope for tree removal on the west side of the hill. This will result in a reduction in the number of mature trees on the hillside, which forms a backdrop to the township. This removal of trees will potentially contribute to an increased perception of the built form and activity from the wider receiving environment, as a result I consider adverse effects on the naturalness and scenic quality to be low.

Regarding the design of the start station, the Hanmer Springs Design Standards recommend that buildings have a gabled roof form with a minimum angle of 25 degrees, as this form contributes strongly to the alpine character of the area. The proposed start station roof, as described previously, has been amended to a mono-pitch roof form. While this form is inconsistent with the guidelines, I consider this form to maintain an alpine character though in a more modern form. In the context of both the receiving environment and site, this form complements the recreational use, creates the opportunity to harness solar energy and will be constructed with high quality materials and finishes consistent with the design standards and the character of the site and surrounds. As a result, I do not consider this change to contribute to adverse effects on the alpine character of the setting.

In the LVA, in the context of the site, an assessment of landscape effects has been undertaken, finding adverse effects of a moderate level on the tranquillity experienced by users of the lookout area due to the introduction of a new hub of activity around the start station and the proximity of the first span of the ride. In addition, the changes at the start station including earthworks and addition of built form will contribute to adverse effects on naturalness of the landform to a low degree. I do not consider the amendments to the proposal to result in any change to this original assessment.

Regarding the site's character, the site is predominantly forested and enclosed except for clearings on the south face of the hill and around the summit. Despite the proposed tree removal, the forested character of the site will be maintained as trees will be removed selectively within the ride corridor and this will not result in a significant change to the overall landcover of the hillside. Further, the land cover is already highly modified with a prevalence of exotic planting and this tree removal will provide opportunities for revegetation with native planting, which in time will improve the ecological quality and naturalness of the hillside. As a result, I consider potential adverse effects on the forested character and naturalness of the site to be low in the short term and easing to very low in the long term as native planting becomes established on the cleared areas.

VISUAL AMENITY EFFECTS

The following viewpoints were previously assessed in the original application, refer to the LVA for descriptions of the viewpoint location, sensitivity, and existing view. Viewpoint locations are depicted on Sheet 32 of the GA-REV 2.

The following assessment describes the visibility and visual effects of the revised proposal. Visibility of the proposal has been assessed using 3D modelling tools which were used to assess the visual change as a result of tree removal, the increased height of some towers and the changes to the roof design of the start station, as well as the other more minor changes discussed previously. The effects on visual amenity resulting from the proposal were then assessed utilising the methodology and terminology described in the original application.

Viewpoint 1 (Sheet 33 of the GA-REV 2)

In the LVA it was assessed that pole 7 and the stop station will be visible from this viewpoint. Regarding the changes to the application, some of the tree removal will be visible, primarily the large conifers and those near the stop station.

These changes will not be visually prominent and are unlikely to be noticed by the casual observer given the distance from the site and the angle of the view. As a result, I do not consider the proposed amendments to contribute to adverse effects on visual amenity to a greater degree than assessed in the original LVA. To restate my assessment from the LVA, from this viewpoint, visual effects are primarily associated with the visibility of the stop station in the clearing which will have short term adverse effects assessed as very low while revegetation planting establishes, and which will be fully mitigated in the long term.

Viewpoint 2 (Sheet 33 of the GA-REV 2)

As described in the LVA, pole 7 and the stop station will be visible from this viewpoint. Regarding the changes to the proposal, some of the tree removal will be visible, primarily the large conifers. It is also possible that the top of pole 5 will be visible due to both tree removal and its increased height.

These changes will not be visually prominent and are unlikely to be noticed by the casual observer given the distance from site, angle of the view and recessive colour of the pole. As a result, I do not consider the proposed changes to contribute to adverse effects on visual amenity to a greater degree than assessed in the original LVA. To restate my assessment from the LVA, from this viewpoint, visual effects are primarily associated with the visibility of the stop station in the clearing which will have short term adverse effects assessed as very low while revegetation planting establishes, and which will be fully mitigated in the long term.

Viewpoint 3 (Sheet 34 of the GA-REV 2)

In the LVA it was assessed that pole 7 and the stop station will be visible from this viewpoint. In addition, due to the amendments to the proposal, some of the tree removal will be visible on the west and south faces of the slope. It will also be possible to see some of the poles on the west side of the hill. It is likely that the very top of poles 5 and 6 will be partly visible poking out of the tree canopy due to the increased height of these poles. Poles 1, 2 and 3 will also be partly visible, due to both the proposed tree removal beneath the ride corridor and increased heights of these poles. Several short spans of cable will be visible where trees have been cleared for the ride corridor, potentially allowing brief glimpses of riders.

While the extent of these changes results in increased visibility of the ride, these changes are not likely to be noticeable to the average observer given the distance of this viewpoint from the site as well as the use of dark recessive paint colours for the poles which will help them to blend in with the treed setting of the hillside. As a result, I do not consider the proposed changes to contribute to adverse effects on visual amenity to a greater degree than assessed in the original LVA. To restate my previous assessment, from this viewpoint, adverse visual effects are primarily associated with the visibility of the stop station in the clearing. In the short term, adverse effects are anticipated to be low, easing to very low on establishment of revegetation planting.

Viewpoint 4 (Sheet 34 of the GA-REV 2)

As described in the LVA, pole 7 and stop station will be visible from this viewpoint, as well as the new path connection to the Conical Hill walking track. It was not originally anticipated that the poles on the west hillside would be visible given the treed setting, however, because of the revised pole heights and tree removal scope, it is now expected that all poles will be partly visible as well as part of the start station roof. As in Viewpoint 3, some of the tree removal will be visible and due to this, several short spans of cable will be visible through gaps in the trees, potentially allowing brief glimpses of riders.

An updated visual simulation has been prepared for this viewpoint, refer to the updated visual simulation addendum dated 12/06/2021.

As in Viewpoint 3, these changes do increase the visibility of the ride but are not likely to be noticeable to the average observer due to the distance of this viewpoint from the site as well as the use of dark recessive colours for the poles. As a result, I do not consider the proposed changes to contribute to adverse effects on visual amenity to a greater level than previously assessed. To restate my previous assessment, from this viewpoint, adverse effects are likely to be low, easing to very low on establishment of revegetation planting. These effects are primarily associated with the short-term visibility of the stop station against the clearing on the south face of the hill.

Viewpoint 5 (Sheet 35 of the GA-REV 2)

In the LVA it was assessed that pole 7 and the stop station will be visible from this viewpoint, as well as the new path connection to the Conical Hill walking track. There is also the potential to see the movement of riders on the last span of the ride and on the platform. As most of the ride is located on the west side of the hill, which is not visible from this viewpoint, it is anticipated that the only change visible will be some of the tree removal for the ride corridor behind pole 7 and to the right (east) of the stop station platform. Minor changes such as the earthworks and amendments to the platform are unlikely to be noticeable from this viewpoint given their small scale.

An updated visual simulation has been prepared for this viewpoint, refer to the updated visual simulation addendum dated 12/06/2021.

The proposed changes in this view, being primarily tree removal at the edges of the clearing, may be somewhat noticeable but could be reasonable anticipated as it is consistent with maintenance and revegetation work previously undertaken within this area of the hill. As a result, I do not consider these changes to contribute to adverse effects to a greater level than originally assessed. As in the previous viewpoints discussed, visual effects in the short term are primarily associated with the visibility of the stop station in the clearing. To restate my previous assessment, adverse effects in the short term will be moderate-low, easing to low on the establishment of revegetation planting.

Viewpoint 6 (Sheet 35 of the GA-REV 2)

As described in the LVA, pole 7 and the stop station will be visible from this viewpoint. It was also anticipated that more detail in terms of the structure and movement of riders will be visible from this location. Regarding the revised proposal, the only change visible will be some of the tree removal immediately around pole 7 and to the right (east) of the stop station platform. Minor changes such as the earthworks and amendments to the platform are unlikely to be noticeable from this viewpoint given their small scale.

As in Viewpoint 5, the visible changes in this view are the proposed tree removal at the edges of the clearing. For the reasons described previously, I do not consider these changes to contribute to adverse effects to a greater level than previously assessed. To restate my previous assessment, from this viewpoint, are associated with the visibility of the stop station platform against the green vegetation of the clearing. Adverse effects are assessed as moderate-low in the short term, easing to low on establishment of revegetation planting.

Viewpoint 7 (Sheet 36 of the GA-REV 2)

In the LVA it was assessed that pole 7 and the stop station will be visible. Of the proposed changes, it is anticipated that from this viewpoint, the proposed tree removal around pole 7 and to the right (east) of the stop station platform will be visible. As described above in Viewpoints 5 & 6, minor changes to the platform and earthworks are of a small scale and not likely to be noticeable from this viewpoint.

An updated visual simulation has been prepared for this viewpoint, refer to the updated visual simulation addendum dated 12/06/2021.

While the proposed tree trimming and removal could be reasonably anticipated given the recent clearing of the lower part of the hillside, the tree removal around pole 7 will potentially create a break in what is currently a consistent tree line viewed against the sky. This may be noticeable to

viewers and direct the eye to pole 7 which will be located at the base of this gap in the trees. Paired with the short-term visual effects of the stop station in the clearing as discussed in the LVA, I consider this minor modification of the treed skyline to contribute to an adverse effects rating of moderate-low.

Viewpoint 8 (Sheet 36 of the GA-REV 2)

In the LVA it was assessed that pole 4 and the stop station would be visible. It was also anticipated that pole 1 would potentially be visible from some locations on Clarence Valley Road and that the start station may be visible with a skyline effect like the existing lookout structure. Regarding the proposed changes, tree removal will be visible from this location, and this will contribute to visibility of sections of the ride cable, potentially allowing visibility of riders and trolleys. Regarding visibility of poles, it is anticipated that poles 1, 2, 3 and 4 will be partly visible as well as the tops or arms of poles 5 and 6. This change is attributed to both the tree removal and the increased heights of these poles. It is also anticipated that the start station roof will be visible. Both the start station, pole 1 and the ride and power cables between them will be visible against the skyline.

From this elevated viewpoint many elements of the ride will be visible including most of the poles, the start and stop stations, and the ride cable which means that it will also be possible to see riders. It is likely that a casual observer will be able to notice the proposed tree removal and built elements on the hillside. These changes are small in the context of the view and mitigation measures such as the small scale and appropriate design style of the stations as well as the dark recessive finish for poles will help settle the proposal into the treed setting. As a result, adverse effects on visual amenity are assessed as moderate and are attributed primarily to the skyline effect created by the start station and pole 1.

Viewpoint 9 (Sheet 37 of the GA-REV 2)

As described in the LVA, from this viewpoint pole 7 and the stop station will be visible, as well as the new path connection to the Conical Hill walking track. It was also anticipated that more detail in terms of the structure and movement of riders will be visible from this location. Of the proposed changes, it is anticipated that from this viewpoint, the proposed tree removal around pole 7 and to the right (east) of the stop station platform will be visible. As described previously, minor changes to the platform and earthworks are of a small scale and not likely to be noticeable from this viewpoint.

While the proposed tree trimming and removal could be reasonably anticipated given the recent clearing of the lower part of the hillside, the tree removal around pole 7 will potentially create a noticeable gap in the tree line which is viewed against the sky. This may be noticeable to viewers and direct the eye to pole 7 which would also then be viewed against the sky. Paired with the visual effects of the stop station in the clearing as discussed in the LVA, I consider this minor modification of the treed skyline and potential increased prominence of pole 7 to contribute to an adverse effects rating of moderate.

Viewpoint 10 (Sheet 37 of the GA-REV 2)

In the LVA it was assessed that the start station and pole 1 will be visible from this viewpoint, as well as a proposed toilet. Regarding the amended proposal, some tree removal will be visible between spans 1 and 2 which, paired with amendments to tower heights, means pole 2 will also be visible. In terms of the structure, the revised start station roof and addition of the briefing screen are notable changes, while other amendments such as storage, netting and gates are not likely to be significantly

noticeable compared to the previous design. Other amendments to the start station area, including revised earthworks, revegetation planting, and the proposed lizard habitat areas will also be visible from this location.

For the most part, the proposed changes are in keeping with the original proposal. The primary changes are the visibility of pole 2, the change to the roof design of the start station and addition of the briefing screen. Pole 2 is located below the viewer and will be finished in a dark recessive colour, which will minimise the degree of contrast with the surrounding vegetation. The roof of the start station has been amended to be a mono-pitch roof and its height increased, while this is not in keeping with the Hanmer Springs Design Standards, as discussed previously, the materials and form are consistent with an alpine setting and the character of the building is appropriate in the context. Regarding the briefing screen, this will be viewed on an angle and at 85 m, so while it may be noticeable it will not be a significant distraction from the surrounding views. There will also be temporary effects during construction and while vegetation becomes established.

Overall, the proposed changes when considered cumulatively with the original proposal and in the context of the scene will contribute to a slight increase in the level of effects. The building height, visibility of the ride and operations have increased, and the construction access will also have a short-term impact. Therefore, adverse effects on visual amenity are assessed as moderate. In many ways the proposed changes around the start station will provide visual improvements to the hilltop through improvements to tracks, revegetation, and creation of lizard habitat areas, therefore it is likely that effects may be reduced to moderate-low in time as vegetation becomes established.

CONCLUSION

To summarise, the amendments to the proposal include changes to the tower heights, tree removal scope, construction access, solar panels, start station roof design and minor changes to the platform design. These changes have been assessed in the context of landscape effects, finding that, on comparison to the original application, there are some slightly increased effects, primarily associated with the proposed tree removal scope which will contribute to adverse effects on the naturalness and scenic quality of the hillside as perceived from the township and short-term effects on the forested character and naturalness of the site itself. These effects fall within the range of low to very low and can be appropriately absorbed by the site. In addition, the proposed revegetation has potential to contribute to positive effects by improving the naturalness and ecological quality of the site.

Regarding effects on visual amenity, the changes to the proposal have been assessed and, for the most part, visual effects are consistent with the assessment in the LVA, due largely to distance and limited visibility of the hillside from many of the key viewpoints (Viewpoints 1 – 6). From the remaining viewpoints which are in closer proximity to the site, an increased level of visual effect has been assessed as a likely outcome, attributed primarily to the tree removal, potential skyline effects and increased visibility of the ride and platform elements. This increase in adverse effects level is assessed as moderate to moderate-low with potential for positive effects resulting from revegetation planting, track improvements and gecko habitat to partially offset the adverse effects in the long term.

In addition to reviewing landscape and visual amenity effects, I have also reviewed my original assessment against relevant statutory provisions. I do not consider the changes to the proposal to result in any issues with my previous evaluation.

Following this assessment landscape and visual amenity effects for the amended proposal, I maintain the opinion that the Conical Hill Switchback™ Flyride has been appropriately designed and sited, taking into consideration the character and values of the application site and surrounds. I consider that on the whole, the proposal will not be at odds with the surrounding environment and will represent a level of change that is acceptable within this setting.

ROUGH AND MILNE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS



Angie Nelson

Landscape Architect

Email: angie@roughandmilne.co.nz

Reviewed by



Tony Milne

Director / Landscape Architect

Email: tony@roughandmilne.co.nz