

**IN THE MATTER OF            THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF            THE HANMER SPRINGS FLYRIDE APPLICATION, HANMER**

**LOCAL AUTHORITY            HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MINUTE 4**

**TIMEFRAMES AND RIGHT OF REPLY**

- 1     I thought it would be useful to reconfirm, and in some cases establish, timeframes for the receipt additional information related to the hearing so that things do not drift and also to set out some matters the Applicant may wish to address in their right of reply.

Timeframes

1.    Lizard Management Plan
- 2     As per my third minute the peer review of the Lizard Management Plan is to be completed by 30 October and the Applicant or any submitter is to provide a response to any matters raised in the report within 5 working days of receipt of the peer review which would be the 5<sup>th</sup> of November.
2.    Traffic Conditions
- 3     The three traffic engineers were to confer on proposed conditions. At this stage those conditions have yet to be received and I am therefore going to put a timeframe of the 30<sup>th</sup> of October for that to occur. If there is any disagreement on the conditions then that should be noted and the reasons provided.
3.    Right of Reply
- 4     If like if possible to receive the right of reply from the Applicant by the 15<sup>th</sup> of November, however I am conscious there may be reasons why this date cannot be met and therefore I will leave it open to the Applicant to suggest an alternative date should further time be needed.

Right of Reply

- 5     A number of matters were covered during the hearing, and I thought it would be useful if I set out those which the Applicant might wish to address in the right of reply:
- The noise and visual impacts on the amenity of residents and residential properties and mitigation measures proposed.
  - The noise and visual impact on the amenity and quality of the Conical Hill Reserve and its users.
  - The impact of increased traffic movements and parking on residential amenity.
  - The legality of the Acheron Heights access.
  - Commentary on the effects on wildlife including:
    - Discussion/assessment in terms of Section 6c of the RMA;

- The peer review of the Lizard Management Plan and whether changes are proposed (I acknowledge that this might also be addressed in the response to the peer review on the 5<sup>th</sup> of November);
  - A response to the issues raised about the breeding of eastern kārearea/falcons in the area and whether this changes any views expressed; and
  - The processes associated with the Wildlife Act, including the permits and the mitigation package.
- Whether any effects reach the threshold of significant and therefore trigger Cl 6(1)(a) of the Fourth Schedule of the RMA thus warranting consideration of alternative options, noting in particular that Ms Tocher in her summary evidence refers to a significance test being undertaken.
  - Any response to matters raised in terms of the Reserves Act and the Reserves Management Plan.
- 6 This is not intended to be an exhaustive list and I accept there are likely to be other matters the Applicant intends to address.
- 7 Finally, a set of agreed conditions should be provided for me to consider should I be of a mind to grant consent having undertaken my assessment.



Dean Chrystal  
Hearings Commissioner  
21<sup>st</sup> October 2021