

Before an Independent Hearing Commissioner at Hurunui District Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: application RC210098 for land use consent to install
and operate a Gravity-Based Recreation Activity within
the Conical Hill Reserve, Hanmer Springs

between: **Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa**
Applicant

and: **Hurunui District Council**
Consent Authority

Summary of evidence of Rob Greenaway

Dated: 7 October 2021

REFERENCE: J M Appleyard (Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com)

Chapman Tripp
T: +64 3 353 4130
F: +64 3 365 4587

60 Cashel Street
PO Box 2510, Christchurch 8140
New Zealand

www.chapmantripp.com
Auckland, Wellington,
Christchurch



ROB GREENAWAY SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Robert James Greenaway. I am a consultant recreation and tourism planner with more than 30 years' experience.
- 2 My evidence assesses the effects of the Flyride proposal on existing recreation and tourism values at Conical Hill. It also reviews the proposal's compliance with the Reserves Act and the Reserves Management Plan.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 3 The Flyride will be based entirely within one land parcel gazetted as a recreation reserve under the Reserves Act. My assessment finds that, *a priori*, the proposal is consistent with the primary purpose for a recreation reserve as defined by the Act. This is particularly the case when considering the precedents set by other commercial recreation developments nationally on recreation reserves (including the Hanmer Springs Thermal Pools & Spa).
- 4 By reviewing national research on recreation conflict my analysis identifies a set of assessment matters appropriate to review the effect of the proposal on existing recreation values. These are:
 - 4.1 Will the proposed activity on Conical Hill represent a significant change in existing activity modes?
 - 4.2 Will the commercial component of the activity be sufficiently evident to change the experience of existing users?
 - 4.3 Will the new activity increase the patronage of Conical Hill to the point where crowding becomes an issue or overwhelms the capacity of facilities on the Reserve, leading to more conflict between visitors?
 - 4.4 Is the current visitor experience on Conical Hill dependent on a specialised resource that will be compromised by a commercial development?
 - 4.5 Will commercial recreation on Conical Hill be considered generally incompatible in the context of Hanmer Springs as a visitor destination?
- 5 My opinion is that of the five assessment matters, only one raises the potential for concern – that is whether the Flyride will 'dominate' the recreation experience on Conical Hill. The tracks to the summit

from both the north and the south are well-separated from the Flyride by the contours of the Hill and by mature vegetation, and the walking experience will largely remain as it is. The start station will be obvious from summit, but will not dominate the key experience, which is the view to the south from the viewing structure. Vegetation may be used to screen the start station, but sounds of activity being heard is likely. Considering that the main visitor experiences on the Conical Hill walk are the track and the view to the south from the summit, the Flyride is unlikely to 'dominate'. The Officer's s42A response is in line with my assessment. In my response to submissions I note that regular users of the Conical Hill walking tracks may experience a step-change in activity on the tracks and that for some this may be experienced as an adverse effect.

SUBMITTER EVIDENCE

Vicki Barker – Friends of Conical Hill

- 6 Ms Vicki Barker has provided planning evidence on behalf of the Friends of Conical Hill.
- 7 In paragraph 9.18 of Ms Barker's notes an uncertainty as to whether I have concluded that the application is "necessary" considering section 54 of the Reserves Act.¹ In response I reiterate my discussion in paragraph 46 of my primary evidence. The concept of what is "necessary" is entirely subjective in nature. For example, is the miniputt at Kaiteriteri Recreation Reserve "necessary"? Is the Hanmer Thermal Pools & Spa "necessary" on the Hanmer Springs Recreation Reserve? The reference point for whether an activity is "necessary" on a particular recreation reserve is the reserve's primary purpose as defined in section 17 of the Act. As I describe in my paragraph 43, this includes, "... the purpose of providing areas for the recreation and sporting activities and the physical welfare and enjoyment of the public."
- 8 In summary, while not directly contemplated by the Hurunui District Council Reserves Management Plan, I maintain my opinion that the development is able to be contemplated within it. The Reserves Act does not provide any direct impediment. Broadly, it can be considered an appropriate development for a recreation reserve. The site-specific issue is whether the proposal sustains and enhances recreation values on Conical Hill. My assessment finds that – considering the obvious role of Hanmer Springs as a developed tourism destination, and the ability to sustain existing recreation

¹ Paragraph 9.18 – Evidence of Vicki Barker in reference to paragraphs 56-60 of my primary evidence.

values on the Conical Hill track – the proposal is acceptable from a recreation and tourism development perspective.

Dated: 7 October 2021

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rob Greenaway', is centered on the page. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial 'R'.

Rob Greenaway