

---

## Summary of Evidence

# Hanmer Springs 'Flyride' Resource Consent

**Prepared for:** Hurunui District Council  
**Job Number:** HRNDC-J005  
**Revision:** Final  
**Issue Date:** 5 October 2021  
**Prepared by:** Dave Smith, Technical Director

---

### Introduction

1. My name is David John Robert Smith. I have prepared a Statement of Evidence as an advisor to Hurunui District Council with respect to the Hanmer Springs 'Flyride' resource consent application. My qualifications and experience are set out in that statement.
2. I can confirm that I have undertaken a site visit on the weekend of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> September 2021

### Summary of Evidence-in-Chief

3. I reviewed the Parking Assessment prepared by Novo Group and considered submissions on the Plan Change. I have concluded that the parking assessment is considered generally satisfactory however there are several areas of uncertainty in relation to the parking assessment. These include the current level of parking demand whilst New Zealand is under travel restrictions, the vehicle mode share for visitors and the extent of use of the various accesses to the reserve.
4. I also note that the proposal does not comply with Hurunui District Plan 8.4.3.5 On-site Parking Standards as no on-site parking is proposed.
5. I concluded in my evidence-in-chief that traffic effects associated with the proposal are considered acceptable subject to five matters being addressed through proposed condition 4-8 as follows:
  - a. Monitoring of on street parking associated with the Flyride activity to be undertaken by an independent suitably qualified transportation engineer before the attraction opens (as a baseline) and twice annually for two years after opening, and to coincide with a school or public holiday weekend.
  - b. Monitoring should extend to the extent of parking associated with the activity on Acheron Heights.
  - c. A formal crossing facility should be installed to provide for safe pedestrian movement across Conical Hill Road on the south side of Thomas Hanmer Drive.

- d. It is recommended that pedestrian improvements to the Conical Hill access (programmed to be delivered by Council in 2021/22 financial year) be completed prior to the Flywire activity being open to the public which will improve the safety and accessibility of Conical Hill for pedestrians.
- e. It is recommended that a Wayfinding Plan be prepared including signage to encourage the use of the Conical Hill access for Flyride activity visitors, coupled with signage to discourage the use of private accessways, Lucas Lane and Acheron Heights.

#### Comments on Mr de Verteuil's Evidence

6. I have read the evidence prepared by Mr De Verteuil and have focused my comments below in relation to the Traffic Conditions set out in the Proposed Conditions of Consent.
7. I observe that Mr de Verteuil accepts the monitoring and wayfinding conditions recommended by Ms Bewley (these are conditions 4, 5 and 8). The monitoring conditions as they are currently stated do not provide guidance as to what constitutes adverse effects that may be observed through monitoring, and what action would be taken if such an adverse effect related to the activity were to occur. I note that there is a review condition 17 included in the proposed conditions of consent and recommend that advice notes be added to conditions 4 and 5 as follows:

**Condition 4 advice note** – “An adverse effect that triggers review condition 17 would occur if parking associated with the activity was observed to consistently extend beyond a 150 metre walk distance from the Conical Hill pedestrian entrance during the monitoring period.”

**Condition 5 advice note** - “An adverse effect that triggers review condition 17 would occur if parking associated with the activity was observed to extend to both sides of the Acheron Heights corridor during the monitoring period.”
8. I also note that Condition 5a is proposed by the applicant such that monitoring results would be provided to Council within an 8 week period of monitoring. Whilst I support the inclusion of a condition requiring the timely supply of monitoring results, I consider that this can be reasonably delivered to Council by the applicant within 2 weeks of monitoring. This recognises the importance of addressing any adverse effects that may be identified through monitoring as quickly as practicable.
9. Mr de Verteuil does not consider a formal pedestrian crossing of Conical Hill Road (proposed condition 6) is required due to the low volumes and low speed of traffic in the vicinity. I acknowledge the current relatively low traffic and speed environment, and am of the view that the current lack of pedestrian facilities at this location is an existing safety risk given vehicles turning into and out of side roads on Conical Hill Road come into conflict with pedestrian movements. If parking associated with the activity were to spill onto Thomas Hanmer Drive or Conical Hill Road to the south of Thomas Hanmer Drive, the existing safety risk would in my view be exacerbated by the additional vehicle movements and pedestrian volumes in the vicinity.
10. On this basis I have proposed an alternative to condition 6 to reflect the extent to which the activity may exacerbate risk to pedestrians as follows:

---

**Proposed Alternative Condition 6** - "If monitoring under condition 4 indicates that vehicles associated with the activity are consistently parking along Thomas Hanmer Drive or along Conical Hill Road on the south side of Thomas Hanmer Drive during the monitoring period, a formal crossing facility should be installed to provide for safe pedestrian movement across Conical Hill Road on the south side of Thomas Hanmer Drive. The specific location, form and design of the crossing should be agreed and approved by Council. It is recommended that pedestrian improvements to the Conical Hill access be completed prior to the activity opening."

11. Mr de Verteuil does not support proposed condition 7 which seeks for the pedestrian access improvements to the Conical Hill Reserve to be completed prior to opening on the basis that these works are planned. I understand from Ms Bewley that these works are programmed by Council for completion around March 2022 and that the 'flyride' activity is aiming to open in March/April 2022. On this basis there is every likelihood that the upgrade will be completed prior to the 'flyride' being open to the public. If circumstances changed (such as changing funding priorities or delays to the improvement works), I note that this would require occupants of vehicles parked along the north side of Oregon Heights to continue to walk along the road to access the current pedestrian entrance. Whilst I consider that this is an existing pedestrian safety risk, I am of the view that this would be exacerbated by the higher traffic and pedestrian volumes associated with the activity. I consider that despite the low likelihood of the improvements not being in place, proposed Condition 7 should be retained as a condition of consent.

#### Comments on Mr Edwards' Evidence

12. Mr Edwards has prepared transportation evidence on behalf of Friends of Conical Hill. I note that Mr Edwards agrees with much of my evidence and would like to comment on several matters.
13. I agree with Mr Edwards concerns in paragraph 49 that staff parking is not well explained and is not addressed within the applicant's parking assessment. Further details from the applicant as to how this will be managed are sought and it is noted that any future monitoring under conditions 4 and 5 (should consent be granted) should extend to observe both staff and visitor parking associated with the activity.
14. In paragraphs 59-60, Mr Edwards suggests a dedicated car parking facility or a shuttle bus operation. I support running regular shuttle buses as a means of mitigation but note that dedicated parking would need to be located at a suitable and convenient location which would be desirable enough to mitigate the adverse parking effects. I understand from Ms Bewley that depending on the location and underlying zoning of the site, this may require a separate resource consent. I also consider that reducing the scale of the activity in terms of the maximum number of riders per hour is another mitigation measure which would be considerably easier to implement and could be 'right-sized' based on the extent of adverse effects observed through monitoring.
15. Mr Edwards requests more precisely worded review conditions in paragraphs 66-67 and I agree that this is desirable to remove uncertainty and provide transparency around how adverse effects will be identifying and adequately mitigated. I have recommended advice notes be added to the monitoring conditions in paragraph 7 of this summary statement to specify observations through monitoring which would correspond to an adverse effects, and to link the monitoring to the review condition 17. This ties directly back to my assessment of the parking assessment and consideration of issues raised through submissions. I reiterate that the 'right-sizing' of

the maximum scale of the activity is the simplest form of mitigation however supplying shuttle buses and/or dedicated parking are also options available to the applicant and could be addressed by giving effect to review condition 17.

16. Throughout Mr Edwards' evidence concerns are raised relating to unsubstantiated claims and assumptions including the base parking analysis undertaken by Mr de Verteuil. Mr Edwards also states his concerns about my reliance on Mr de Verteuil's assessment. I reiterate that these assumptions collectively result in a substantial degree of uncertainty on the extent and location of parking associated with the activity. There is frequently a level of uncertainty in the assessment of transport planning matters where engineering judgement is applied to determine the most likely outcome, and as Mr Edwards acknowledges in paragraph 25 the nature of this activity is unique. For this reason I consider that the monitoring conditions 4 and 5 (with the inclusion of the advice notes proposed in paragraph 7) are suitable and necessary mechanisms to address any potential adverse effects relating to parking associated with the activity.

### **Conclusion**

17. I conclude that the 'Flyride' resource consent application can be supported from a transportation perspective subject to:
- a. the addition of advice notes to monitoring conditions 4 and 5 which clearly state what constitutes an adverse effect and links this to the review condition 17;
  - b. the alteration of condition 5a to a shorter two-week period for monitoring reporting back to Council;
  - c. adopting a revised condition 6 requiring a pedestrian crossing if parking due to the activity extends beyond the Thomas Hanmer Drive / Conical Hill Road intersection; and
  - d. retaining proposed condition 7 which seeks to ensure safe pedestrian access is available prior to the activity opening to the public.

**Dave Smith**

**5 October 2021**