

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 *

Scott Currie & Angela Renwick

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: *

We seek to have the application for the resource consent declined due to the noise, traffic, and parking breaches. We further propose to have the Flyride moved from Conical Hill to a more suitable location that won't have the detrimental impacts on the Hanmer Residents that the proposed ride will have.

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.

We chose to live on Oregon Heights because of its location, the relative isolation of the site, and the surroundings and wildlife. The fact that the Conical Hill Reserve was protected from commercial activity is perfect for us and gave us confidence to settle in Hanmer. To this date we've not been directly consulted about the proposed Flyride and what impact or intrusion it will have on our life and wellbeing. The lack of consultation, communication, and collaboration with regards to the Flyride project is disgraceful and should add weight to this application being denied.

We are completely opposed to the ride returning over the hill to the proposed stop point. This elevated position looks straight into at least 6 houses. The privacy and noise implications of this will be massive should the ride be erected in its current proposed location. There is no need to direct the 50,000 people per annum to a position that will adversely impact the wellbeing of those living on Oregon Heights. At the second meeting

a position that will adversely impact the wellbeing of those living on Oregon Heights. At the second meeting advising the residents of the Flyride, we were told there would absolutely be no breach of noise. To continue the current layout knowing the WHO noise limits will be breached, would be reckless and irresponsible.

We also have concerns over the traffic, parking, and pedestrian access to the ride. Oregon Heights is already congested during peak times. Two way traffic is already impossible when cars are parked on one side of the road at present. Add an additional 20% of people accessing the hill for the ride and access and traffic flows will become extremely hazardous. For instance, at the bottom of Oregon heights there is regularly a combination of cars, parked vehicles and pedestrians using the very narrow and blind corner of the street. Due to the lack of a foot path the families parking in this area have no choice but to walk down the road. This is a recipe for disaster and needs to be addressed.

The proposal of utilizing residential parking for a commercial operation sets a dangerous precedent.

In regards to the Landscape & Visual Assessment the Flyride contradicts the below points in relation to the noise generated by this activity and the several consent breaches in the new application given the duress this project puts on directly impacted residents.

"Other transient attributes relate to a sense of tranquillity experienced from the walking track on Conical Hill which provides an escape into nature, in contrast to the 'hustle and bustle' of the township in close proximity below"

"Hanmer as a destination for health and wellness is widely recognised in the community"

This assessment also refers to stop station and advises the below.

"The structure is positioned within an open clearing in which native revegetation planting has recently been undertaken. The clearing includes an area of approximately 9,300 m²; trees have been removed for safety reasons and revegetation has been implemented"

However this has never been maintained by the Council with broom being the majority of "planting" so it's inevitable that this area will be an eye saw in the future as it currently is.

As per the Assessment of Environmental Noise Effects the below reinforces the noise concerns and duress the ride will generate on immediate residents.

"Typical ambient noise has energy in the low- and mid-band frequencies (1 kHz and below), whereas screaming has predominate energy in the 2 kHz octave band. This sound will not be masked by ambient noise in the way that lower frequency noise would be. Secondly, neuroscientific research has suggested that this type of sound, in its role as an audible signal to alert others to a situation of calamity, can trigger a subconscious 'fight or flight' reaction in the brain, and can lead to highly emotional impulses.² This type of sound, even at low levels of audibility, could be problematic in this sense."

With these points highlighted in your noise and landscape & visual assessments the resource consent should be declined to protect the original intention of the Conical Hill reserve. The council's recreational effects assessment highlights the following implications should the Flyride proceed.

- 1) The fear that traditional recreation experiences will be damaged, threatened or changed – largely because commercial recreation is 'different' and requires higher levels of service than traditional independent activities.
- 2) Fear that commercial recreation will 'open the floodgates' to commercialisation.
- 3) Dislike of impacts associated with commercial recreation (more people, more facilities, more infrastructure, more noise, etc).
- 4) Commercial clients are 'different' from independent visitors (as per Jacob & Schreyer's (1980) 'lifestyle tolerance').
- 5) Commercial recreation is a reminder of the civilisation that independent wilderness visitors want to escape.
- 6) Philosophical objections to commercial recreation on conservation lands (private gain from public land).

Why blemish an iconic Hanmer experience, move the ride somewhere else!

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

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

Decline the Flyride resource consent based on the above information and move the ride somewhere else where parking, traffic issues, noise, and privacy wont burden residents and put their health and wellbeing at risk.

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:*

22 Oregon Heights

Phone Number:*

021 2811 661

Email:*

scurrie75@gmail.com

Date*

04/08/2021

Note to submitter

- o By using this electronic form, a copy of the submission will be sent to the address for service of the applicant automatically.
- o 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).
- o If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in [Part 11A](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- o If you make a request under [section 100A](#) 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.
- o 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.