

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*

John Clarence Edmund Mercer and Shirley Loas Mercer

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

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

Traffic, Car parking, Noise, Visual effects, and Preservation of natural resources

5. 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.

Please refer to separate sheet

6. I seek the following decision from the consent authority: *

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

For the above reasons we ask that the consent to construct and operate the flyride be declined.

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

- I do wish to be heard
- I do not wish to be heard

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

- Yes
- No

9. 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:

Address for service: *

289 Memorial Ave.,
Burnside,
Christchurch 8053

Phone Number: *

0278431407

Email: *

johnmercer@slingshot.co.nz

Date *

03/08/2021 

Note to submitter

- By using this electronic form, a copy of the submission will be sent to the address for service of the applicant automatically.
- The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is 5pm on the 20th working day after the date on which public notification is given (5th August 2021).
- If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A (<https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1991/0069/latest/DLM2421544.html#DLM2421544>) of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- If you make a request under section 100A (<https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1991/0069/latest/DLM2416444.html#DLM2416444>) of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners.
- Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):
 - it is frivolous or vexatious:
 - it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
 - it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
 - it contains offensive language:
 - it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Submit

Form 13 continued

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

Clause 5. Opposition to the Application:

1) TRAFFIC - Oppose

The flyride business will generate a lot of additional traffic along streets close to Conical Hill turning a relatively quiet neighbourhood into a busy area – affecting current and future property owners.

Of particular concern is the potential additional traffic along Lucas Lane where we own a property. The road is currently unsealed and we have it on good authority that there are no plans to seal this road in the foreseeable future. Cars travelling through churn up a considerable amount of dust and this will be an increasing issue with flyride traffic using the walkway starting at the end of our street. Additionally our privacy would be affected by increasing foot traffic.

2) CAR PARKING - Oppose

Although the District Plan requires on-site car parking, no car parking is provided for in the Resource Consent application. This will generate more car parking demand, affecting residents living in homes in close proximity to this activity. Compounding this issue is the duration of the flyride activity (10.00am to 6.00pm (nearly) every day with possible extensions during summer months. If no car parking is to be provided the application should be declined.

3) NOISE - Oppose

There has been no consideration of the noise of visitors on the surrounding streets and accessing the site. The assessment has focussed on the noise from the operation of the flyride and the people on the ride only.

As to the noise effect on nearby residents a guestimate has been made of the levels of noise in the form of screams and shouts from the flyriders and this could be below the level experienced – particularly with certain wind directions and velocities. High-pitched noise from a height can travel a considerable distance.

A quiet walk up Conical Hill to take in the serene view from the lookout would never be the same again while the flyride was in operation as screams and shouts from the riders despoil the experience.

4) VISUAL EFFECTS – Oppose

Conical Hill, the predominant visual feature of the town, has always been a beautiful and inspiring presence. The proposed flyride venture will see this view tarnished by the removal of many trees (over

70) and the pruning back of others. Also, the poles and other structures which are planned for this site will be visible from some distance and substantially detract from the visual beauty of Conical Hill.

An assessment by Rough & Milne landscape architects on the visual effects likely from the Flyride paint a picture of a low to moderate impact from different viewing angles. This is still a negative outcome from an activity that adds to the other negative outcomes of a Flyride operation. It is also quite possible that the report could also unwittingly understate the visual impacts. If the Flyride does go ahead it would be too late to turn back the clock if the visual impact turned out to be far greater than originally envisaged.

5) PRESERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES - Oppose

The removal of indigenous trees and vegetation for a commercial operation would be very unfortunate.

Also, disturbing the habitat of geckos and skinks with the potential loss of many of these creatures goes against the objectives of protection and preservation of native wildlife incumbent on an authority managing a reserve.

The only way to preserve this special natural environment is to turn down the Flyride application.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons we strongly believe that the Flyride proposal should be declined.

Conical Hill needs to be kept as an unspoiled, passive resource without the imposition of commercial activity. The natural beauty should be retained for current and future generations.

The quality of life of residents and holiday home owners who have made a serious financial commitment to Hanmer should not be detrimentally affected by a commercial operation which would impose the above negative impacts.

We are not opposed to a Flyride operation in Hanmer – just the Conical Hill location.

We request that this application be **declined**.

John & Shirley Mercer