

# 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 \*

Dave Harwood

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: \*

My proximity to the base of the zipline being one of the 6 closest properties to the base and the zipline overall is a reason to me resubmitting my submission.

The parking and the proposed use of a generator to run the zipline are my main concerns. My own privacy is all facing the town and I believe the people noise level will not be of major concern to myself.

### 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.

While I support the proposed zipline I am concerned with the proposed parking plan. There are already insufficient spaces during busy times at the base of the hill and the town and including people parking up Oregon Heights and walking the shortcuts to the Conical walking track. There are a lot of people who will not walk from the town or up the steep part at the base of Conical Hill and the proposed zipline will add to this issue. There needs to be a specific car parking area for this type of recreation. Look at the mess at the base of the hill at Queenstown. If a Hanmer business was to build or alter their business they would be required by the council to supply off street parking and councils all over New Zealand are working towards less parking on streets - not adding to areas already congested in busy times. Signage would also need to be installed by the council on Oregon Heights including the higher areas where people are already starting to illegally park to prevent this and prohibit campervan parking on Oregon Heights for safety reasons. Secondly if a generator is being used it would need to be large in size that is totally unacceptable due to the continual noise factor this would create. I do not believe there would be the continual amount of noise from people as some are saying having been to the Christchurch adventure park that has a large flying fox etc and the Rotorua zipline that both include rides to the top so more activity. My own privacy is all facing the town so I believe the people noise level will not be of major concern to myself.

It is also a concern that some people in Hanmer are not respecting the decisions of others and continue to ostracise those including myself who do not agree with their own zipline choice.

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

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

Consent should only be given subject to a suitable separate parking area off the main streets and to no continual noise from a commercial size generator.

Although there will be some impact on the environment I believe this would be minimal once the zipline is built and with the zipline being mostly on the west side of Conical Hill and not down the south side facing the town as some believe. I believe the people noise factor will also be minimal. I am surprized at the number of people who have not been to the top of the hill to see where the zipline is actually starting from.

**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: \***

15 Oregon Heights

**Phone Number: \***

0272070740

**Email: \***

caninspect@xtra.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](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 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.
- 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.