

**Submissions received for the public notification of the proposed lease of Council land for Commercial Zipline – Southern Landfill**



## Table of Contents

Submission number	Submitters Name	Page number
1	Rob Lee	2
2	Carl Pattron	3
3	Novard Design	4
4	Wreda	5
5	Dave Goodwin and Felicity Close	7
6	Meridian	10
7	Maurice Marquardt	12
8	James Hughes	13
9	Brooklyn Trail Builders	14
10	Brett Sarten	15
11	Ron Minnema	16
12	Pamela Olver and Chris Horrocks	17
13	Shenval Holdings Ltd and Shenval Wind Farms and Develolments Ltd	25
14	Michael Szabo	26
15	Tim and Sarah Watson	27
16	Chris Horne	34
17	Martin Gribble	35
18	Rochelle and Toby Jackson	36

**Joel De Boer**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Sunday, 10 December 2017 12:37 p.m.  
**To:** Brett Smith  
**Subject:** New occupancy agreement (lease/licence) for a commercial zipline operation

Hello Brett

I fully support Wellington City Council granting a new occupancy agreement (lease/licence) for a commercial zipline operation located at the Southern Landfill, Owhiro Bay.

This development will be a fantastic opportunity for what is currently a relatively under-utilised area around the Southern landfill. The proposal for a commercial zipline operation will encourage and promote adventure tourism in Wellington - something that is sorely lacking throughout the Wellington region (and close to the CBD).

The people behind the zipline operation proposal have extensive and longstanding national and international experience and expertise in developments of this type. They understand adventure tourism and the market it serves.

I trust the Council will have the foresight to grant the operators the lease/licence for the many benefits it will bring to the Capital.

Cheers

Rob Lee

Brooklyn Resident

**Joel De Boer**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Sunday, 14 January 2018 10:04 a.m.  
**To:** Brett Smith  
**Subject:** Submission in support of new lease and new licence proposal - zipline operation located at the Southern Landfill, Owhiro Bay.

To whom it may concern

I am writing in support of the proposal for a zipline operation at the Southern Landfill, Owhiro Bay.

I believe the proposed zipline operation will:

- Get more people into the hill and bush
- Provide an adventure tourism activity lacking in Wellington
- Allow people to better appreciate the coast and surrounding ranges
- Promote Wellington as a destination

Sincerely

Carl Patton  
Editor  
New Zealand Mountain Biker Magazine

**Joel De Boer**

---

**From:** Thursday, 25 January 2018 6:21 p.m.  
**Sent:** Joel De Boer  
**To:** commercial zipline operation located at the Southern Landfill, Owhiro Bay.  
**Subject:**

Dear Sirs,

I positively support the proposed zipline for the Wellington City Southern landfill site. Modern long span Ziplines are very exciting recreational facilities that have proven to be very popular overseas. Often queues to ride these can result in waiting times in excess of 4 hours. I personally was involved in the a recent one in Taiwan for Tiger Beer. Please refer to the attached link

<http://www.novaredesign.com/Projects/Outdoor+Adventure+Centres/Tiger+Beer+Zipline+and+Climbing+Wall.html>

These quickly become tourist attractions and often other activities spring up around them. This is a very exciting opportunity for Wellington to develop this site.

Yours Faithfully

Don B McLaren Smith

**DONALD B MCLAREN SMITH**  
**DIRECTOR**

JacksonStone House  
Level 4, 3-10 Hunter Street, Wellington 6011  
PO Box 1117, Wellington 6140  
Phone: +64 4 939 9295  
Fax: +64 4 939 9296  
Cell: +64 21 0558174  
[www.novaredesign.com](http://www.novaredesign.com)



This email (including all attachments) is intended solely for the named recipients. You should only read, transmit, distribute or act in reliance on this email, or communicate all or any part of its content, if you are the intended recipient and are authorised by the sender to do so. This email may contain confidential information and may be subject to legal, professional or other privilege. Any confidentiality or privilege is not waived or lost because this email has been sent to you by mistake. This email may also include personal information which is subject to requirements of Privacy legislation. If you have received this email in error, please let the sender know by reply email, delete it from your system and destroy any copies. Any views expressed in this email are not necessarily the views of Novare Design.

25 January 2018

Brett Smith  
Property Advisor  
Wellington City Council  
PO Box 2199  
Email: [brett.smith@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:brett.smith@wcc.govt.nz)

## **Submission on New Lease and Licence at the Southern Landfill**

### **Introduction**

The Wellington Regional Economic Development Agency (WREDA) supports economic performance throughout the region to enhance prosperity and liveability. We market Wellington as a destination for visitors, migrants and investors; help businesses grow and innovate; advocate for Wellington's economy; attract and promote major events and run civic venues.

As the agency responsible for promoting and developing Wellington as a visitor destination, WREDA believes it is important to make its views known in relation to proposed Council activity that could influence its operations, as well as Wellington's tourism development and marketing in the future.

### **Our Submission**

The zipline proposal will show off Wellington's urban/rural fringe and feature scenic views not currently enjoyed by visitors. A zipline would give active visitors a new and different option to enjoy the city. WREDA also believes the conservation and regeneration projects proposed by the operation would enhance the area, the visitor experience and the visitors' perspective of our city.

The applicants have consulted extensively with WREDA's management and destination experts during their project development. The zipline proposal offers a new and exciting activity for locals and visitors alike. The business case is well researched and widely consulted. WREDA believes the operation could attract visitors from several sectors including Business Events, Education and Leisure.

WREDA supports the granting of a new occupancy agreement for a commercial zipline operation located at the Southern Landfill, Owhiro Bay.

Thank you for considering our submission. We do not wish to be heard in support of our submission but if being heard would be helpful or you require any further information please do contact me.

Yours sincerely,

David Perks  
GM Destination Marketing, Venues & Project Development  
WREDA

## PROPOSED NEW LEASE AND LICENCE AT THE SOUTHERN LANDFILL – COMMERCIAL ZIPLINE OPERATION

We are opposing the lease agreement for the following reasons.

### **1. Access via Hawkins Hill Road**

The proposed lease agreement for the zipline is dependent on access to the activity site via Hawkins Hill Road, which is a council-owned right of way (ROW).

The ROW is currently in very poor condition. It is very narrow, has a number of large potholes, and has limited space for current users (vehicles, walkers, cyclists). It is unsuitable for the current traffic load, let alone an increased traffic load. Council should not allow any activity that increases the traffic on the ROW unless they are willing to upgrade it.

Council's Parks and Reserves Department is well aware of the parlous state of the ROW as, for more than 12 months, personnel have been in communication with the residents of Hawkins Hill and Southernthread Roads to address the rapidly deteriorating road and residents' concerns – to no avail.

As a result of this ongoing dispute with residents, a lease that is dependent on the use of Hawkins Hill Road cannot be considered without addressing and resolving the condition and maintenance of the road. No further development of the area should be considered until these issues are resolved.

### **2. Proximity to houses**

Residents on Hawkins Hill Road have made significant investment to live in a rural area, with the corresponding privacy and quiet living. Existing residents have every right to expect that the council will protect their rural amenity when evaluating any new activity.

There are currently only three houses on Hawkins Hill Road beyond the Brooklyn wind turbine. The zipline goes close to each of these three houses. There appears to have been no assessment of the impact of the lease agreement or the proposed activity on the existing residents who live within 200m of the proposed activity. The effects on existing residents (traffic, noise and visual impact) appear to have been largely ignored by council and the zipline operators. In addition, the proposal does



not outline any measures that could be undertaken to eliminate, mitigate, or minimise any adverse effects.

### **3. Noise**

The reasons given by the applicants for not using other sites in Wellington for the zipline are applicable to this site too. The activity is located within 200m of the nearest residences. The permitted noise levels are lower for rural properties than urban properties, making this activity more likely to cause noise nuisance to the affected rural residences.

There has been no assessment of noise impacts from the multiple sources of noise that will be generated by the activity – mechanical, human, traffic.

There is a buffer zone described for the landfill (currently the only permitted commercial activity in the area). This is to protect neighbouring properties from adverse effects of the landfill, including noise. The zipline (and any other commercial activity) should not be located in or near the buffer zone for the same reason. It seems ludicrous to site the activity so close to houses.

There is evidence that these sorts of activities can cause conflict with neighbouring residences. For example, it is understood that a relatively short (50m) flying fox in Christchurch recently had to be removed because it was in close proximity to houses, the noise was considered excessive, and reducing the noise to an acceptable level was not possible.

### **4. Conflict of interest**

There is a conflict of interest in this process. The council owns the land for which the lease is being sought. It is also the authority that will make the decision on the lease, from which it stands to gain financially.

It is important that there is no misuse of council authority during this process. The council should not be able to interpret rules in a way that protects or favours its own current or future interests (financial or otherwise). All decisions and rulings must comply with current plans and policies.

The zipline is being described as eco-tourism and Council seems to believe this is the case. However, this is wrong. Just because it is located in the outer green belt and a percentage of the takings goes to planting and pest control does not make it eco-tourism.

### **5. Inconsistency of WCC processes/decisions**

Residents have had rigorous, unrelenting and, at times, overzealous demands made on them to comply with council guidelines and policies. We expect the same rigour to be applied to this application, particularly in view of the conflict of interest raised above.

Residents are not permitted to park or allow their visitors to park on council easements. However, the zipline activity proposes to use a council easement for dropping off and picking up participants, as well as parking.

In addition, local residents are not permitted to build any structures, even those as small as a mailbox or a gate. However, there are significant structures required for the zipline – four dual ziplines (one of which is 575m long) and eight platforms. These structures are large, visible and elevated above the green bush canopy.

Both of the above examples illustrate inconsistency and bias. The same rules should apply to all. The activity operators should not expect to use the easements for any parking of its vehicles for the same reasons residents have been given ie, it obstructs public use of public land. If the zipline is approved, local residents should be permitted to build structures such as mailboxes and gates.

## **6. Overstatement of agreement**

The zipline business plan states that we are in agreement with the activity. This is an exaggeration of what we said and may indicate that other statements of support may not be correct. When we were consulted about the zipline we were given so little information about the specifics of the activity that we neither agreed nor disagreed to the proposal.



meridian

6

29 January 2018

Brett Smith  
Property Advisor – Property Services  
Wellington City Council  
P O Box 2199  
WELLINGTON 6140

Via email: [brett.smith@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:brett.smith@wcc.govt.nz)

Dear Brett

### **Proposed New Lease and Licence at Southern Landfill**

#### **Lease for land and car parking being part of or surrounding the Brooklyn Wind Turbine the Premises) dated 18 December 2012 between Meridian Energy Limited (Meridian) and the Wellington City Council (the Council) (the Lease)**

Thank you for your letter of 5 December 2017 addressed to our Community Engagement Manager, Carly Andersen, regarding the proposed new occupancy agreement for a commercial zipline operation located at the Southern Landfill, Owhiro Bay (the Zipline proposal).

While the operation of the zipline is unlikely to have an effect on our Brooklyn Turbine, due to the distance between both activities, we do have a concern regarding the current and likely increase in the public using the access way and how the operation of the two gates located along the access way would be carried out.

#### **Use of the Access way**

By way of background, under the Lease you will be aware that Meridian and its invitees including the public are able to access the wind turbine, public visitor facilities and parking using the formed access way over the Council's adjoining land (the access way). This right is subject to various obligations including the requirement that Meridian will meet a reasonable proportion of the wear and tear based on such use which is additional to the annual rental charge. It is our understanding that no other parties using the access way are required to make such a contribution. Obviously each additional activity or dwelling permitted should contribute to those maintenance costs.

#### **Gates on the access way**

Meridian maintains and operates a gate at the access entrance from Ashton Fitchett Drive as a condition of our consent and a gate was installed further up the right of way which was previously operated by the residents and Council are considering taking over.

Issues around the Ashton Fitchett Drive gate is of concern to Meridian due to the conditions of Meridian's consent requiring us to operate a time controlled gate at Ashton Fitchett Drive. There is no information provided within the Zipline proposal regarding how this gate would operate given that the hours of operation of this gate are restricted. Nor is there any advice within the proposal regarding the gate located further along the access way. With the continuing increase in the public using this access way for recreational activities and the potential for the zipline operation we believe it may be timely to consider removal of the gate at Ashton Fitchett Drive and would be happy to meet with Council to discuss.

However, in the interim we request that prior to making a decision on the Zipline proposal that the Council consider:

- (a) how the costs of maintenance of the access way for all users would be apportioned; and
- (b) how the operation of the Ashton Fitchett gate would fit in with the operation of the Zipline activity.

Kind regards



Roseanne Hohepa

Land & Property Advisor

DDI: 03 3579792

Mobile: 021 756 306

**Joel De Boer**

---

**From:** Wednesday, 31 January 2018 8:27 p.m.  
**Sent:** Joel De Boer  
**To:** Submission on new lease and new licence proposal  
**Subject:**

Hi Joel,  
I support the submission for a commercial zipline at the Southern Landfill.

Many thanks and kind regards,  
Maurice

**Maurice Marquardt**  
Principal Consultant - Sustainability

**AECOM**  
Level 23, Majestic Centre, 100 Willis Street, Wellington  
PO Box 27277, Wellington 6141  
T +64 4 896 6000 F +64 4 896 6001  
[aecom.com](http://aecom.com)

**Imagine it. Delivered.**

[LinkedIn](#) [Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [Instagram](#)



**Joel De Boer**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 31 January 2018 7:23 a.m.  
**To:** Joel De Boer  
**Subject:** Commercial Zipline Operation (Wellington Zipline Adventures) at the Southern Landfill

Hello

My name is James Hughes,

With reference to the proposed new lease and licence at the Southern Landfill - Public Input -

*"Wellington City Council for the site at 50 Landfill Road, CFR WN21D/612, Lots 1 DP29398 and Lots 1 & 2 DP29742. The zipline will operate from the Hawkins Hill Road access to the land"..*

I fully support this proposal and think it is a brilliant idea that has the potential to become a very popular attraction for both locals and tourists alike in a similar way to the bungee jumping or luge facilities in other parts of the country.

Thank you and regards

James

**Joel De Boer**

---

**From:** Thursday, 1 February 2018 2:37 p.m. Joel  
**Sent:** De Boer  
**To:**  
**Cc:** . Dave Preece  
**Subject:** Submission on new lease and new licence proposal - supported by Brooklyn Trail Builders

Hi Joel

Hopefully you remember us at Brooklyn Trail Builders (BTB) from several previous submissions?

To recap, BTB has a long standing relationship with the land over which the occupancy agreement for a commercial zip line is proposed. BTB comes under the umbrella of WMTBC which holds an MOU over the green spaces from Aro St to the south coast. BTB has built tracks in the immediate area and maintains a trapping network to control pests.

BTB actively supports the zip line operation. Why? The experience (and success) of Polhill is a prime example of what happens when people are able to access space that wasn't previously open for general widespread access (BTB built the network of tracks in Polhill and further south that has resulted in an extraordinary involvement of people with nature that wasn't previously possible). The game changer was getting people into an area.

The zip line will assist in getting more people into an area that currently only has Barking Emu (a BTB initiated track) in it. Both BTB and WCC are keen to get people into green spaces and the zip line will assist. This is complimentary with the OGBMP and BTB will be making further submissions with respect to the pending master plan for this area. Enabling public access is key to the success of the master plan and the zip line will assist in this. The land is currently of very poor quality so any conservation activity will be an improvement over the current.

To provide a measure of independence, I'd suggest that a per head fee is charged to the zip line clients that is paid to WMTBC to ensure the money is spent on conservation efforts and/or supporting enjoyment of the green spaces in that area.

We are keen to understand how the commercial operation will impact on users of BE (points 1A, 1B, 2A and 4B) so would welcome a chat about this but expect its easily resolvable. Note that the zip line operators were generous in giving us a heads up about their plans many months ago but some details had not been sorted.

We are aware that local residents are against the proposal due to the ongoing maintenance issues that they have with Hawkins Hill road. It's unfortunate that the zip line operation is being used as leverage for the road maintenance debacle. They are separate issues and should be dealt with accordingly (its acknowledged that the operation will result in more traffic (marginal increase?) but this should not be a show stopper for this commercial operation).

I'd be happy to talk to the councillors in support of this occupation agreement.

Cheers Craig

PS keen to catch up with Bec to progress the master plan.....

Sent from my iPad

**Joel De Boer**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Thursday, 1 February 2018 10:34 a.m.  
**To:** Joel De Boer  
**Subject:** Submission : Proposed new lease and licence at the Southern Landfill - Support

Joel De Boer  
 Recreation and Parks Planner  
 Wellington City Council

I support the proposal for a number of reasons:

- I believe this great area is under underutilised and this project would enhance the area particularly as the operators will maintain the immediate area.
- As there is nothing similar locally this Zip Line would be a fabulous asset to the city.
- I have ridden a similar completed Zip Line on Waiheke Island and it is an amazing experience to take.
- As a Licensed Building Practitioner and having experienced working with Karl Ratahi on a professional basis, I have 100% confidence that the site will be cared for and the completed work will be to the absolute highest standards.

Kind regards,  
 Brent

**Brent Sarten**  
 Director, Licensed Building Practitioner



**m** 021 793 931  
**t** 04 9796633  
**e** [brent@capitalbuilders.co.nz](mailto:brent@capitalbuilders.co.nz)  
**w** [capitalbuilders.co.nz](http://capitalbuilders.co.nz)



**Joel De Boer**

---

**From:** Friday, 2 February 2018 11:25 a.m.  
**Sent:** Joel De Boer  
**To:** Submission on new lease and new licence proposal  
**Subject:**

Joel

I think this a fantastic idea and that it would be a great addition to the Wellington Region. It will add another dimension to the existing outdoor activities that exist in Wellington and will be another reason to attract tourists and locals alike.

Regards

Ron Minnema

Find the latest transport news, information, and advice on our website:

[www.nzta.govt.nz](http://www.nzta.govt.nz)

---

This email is only intended to be read by the named recipient. It may contain information which is confidential, proprietary or the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you must delete this email and may not use any information contained in it. Legal privilege is not waived because you have read this email.

---

## SUBMISSION

Pamela Olver and Chris Horrocks

The submitter requests to have the submission heard by way of an oral submission at the council meeting on 22 February 2018

### PROPOSED NEW LEASE AND LICENCE AT THE SOUTHERN LANDFILL - COMMERCIAL ZIPLINE OPERATION

**We oppose the lease agreement for the proposed activity for the following reasons:**

#### 1. Access via Hawkins Hill Road

The operation of the proposed activity is entirely dependent on the use of Hawkins Hill Road, a council owned private ROW. The council and the councillors are well aware of the unacceptable state of the road and have been on public record admitting to this.

The proposal to grant this lease should not be considered until a road Management Plan is agreed to and in operation. The Council's failure to establish a plan for this road<sup>1</sup> whilst permitting development has resulted in conflict with residents and an increasingly unsafe multi user access way. Council should not permit any activity that increases the traffic on this road unless it is prepared to upgrade it.

Hawkins Hill Rd is a private Right of way (ROW). The council must ensure that unauthorised access by public vehicles consequent to any commercial lease is able to be restricted and controlled. The gate must be re-commissioned at the turbine car park to control unauthorised public vehicle access if the council is to consider leasing this land for a commercial activity.

The council has stated its opposition to occasional mountain bike shuttling yet it seems to be quite happy to consider allowing a commercial shuttle service to operate all day, every day.

#### **<sup>1</sup>Outer Green Belt Management Plan 2004, Section 7 - Carey's Gully:**

##### *5.7.2.2 Access*

- ...but there is as yet no clear policy about the status of the road as a key recreation access route. The status of various right-of-way agreements for private users is unclear and needs to be resolved,
- ...the need for a clear plan for the management of this road.
- ... To clarify all existing access rights to the Hawkins Hill Road, establish a clear policy on the provision of private access and to ensure current vehicle use is consistent with public use of the road.

**The use of the road in the manner proposed is not compliant with the district plan (see below 17.3.2.8)**

## 2. Noise and siting of proposed zipline

**NOTE: The council should ensure that it has the correct maps available as the maps presented with WZA's proposal failed to indicate the proximity (200m) of the nearby dwellings to the activity.**

Rural noise tolerance limits are notably lower than those in the city.

There has been no consideration by the council or the applicants of the possible noise nuisance that would be generated by the proposed activity (traffic, mechanical, participant, spectator). As we are the existing permitted activity (noise recipient), the onus is not on us to mitigate noise effects of a new activity.

Noise management is a requirement under the RMA ( see below). It would be foolish to ignore the need for thorough assessment. There are multiple ziplines in NZ and around the world that have failed to comply with noise policies to their detriment. The most effective noise buffer is distance, yet this activity has been located as close as is possible to the 3 nearest residences. The reasons given by the applicants that other sites were not suitable apply equally to their current proposed site. The applicants have stated that they cannot control the noise generated by their activity. This is in breach of RMA:

*'Under s31, territorial authorities have the primary responsibility for managing the effects of land uses and noise (including the mitigation of noise.). Territorial Authorities also have a responsibility under the RMA to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use , development , or protection of land use associated with natural and physical resources. This includes effects on amenity values that may be affected by noise.'*

*'Section 16 of the RMA requires all noise generators to adopt the best practicable option to avoid the emission of unreasonable noise. This is additional to the duty to comply with the permitted noise levels included in a district plan.'*

*'For new noise generating activities, control can be achieved by incorporating appropriate buffer distances. New noise generating activities need to consider the distance to the nearest neighbours, traffic routes and other relevant factors when determining the layout, design and operation of their activities.'*

<http://www.qualityplanning.org.nz/index.php/planning-tools/air/noise-management-in-mixed-use-urban-environments>

## 3. Does not fit with objectives the OGBMP 2004 generally, and specifically to this area

**A zipline is an inappropriate use/activity for this land as part of the Outer Green Belt.**

[ref: 3.4.2 Access issues and opportunities : eco tourism

4.2.2.1 Council relationship with adjoining landowners: conflicted as a result of council 'dragging the chain' and failing to communicate in a timely and respectful manner

4.5.2.1 Appropriate forms of recreation (a), (f): a zipline is not an activity based on quiet enjoyment of the area and the OGBMP states that the Outer Green Belt will not be used as a place for locating those activities which, because of their effects, are unable to be accommodated elsewhere

5.7.2.2 Access - as above]

There is no provision in council policy for commercial activity in this sector (other than that specifically defined in appendix M of the district Plan). Any use not provided for by council policy cannot be allowed as adjacent landowners would need to have been informed of such plans at the time their properties were purchased.

This proposal intrudes on the buffer zone that is specifically mentioned as a mechanism for protection of adjacent properties from adverse effects of activities on this land.

The council already views the zipline proposal as an opportunity to promote enjoyment of open spaces and ecotourism (email from Joel De Boer). Bias in favour of the activity by the council is already evident. A zipline in this location is NOT an ecotourism activity.

**Ecotourism** is: "Responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people." ( TIES, 1990) Principles of **Ecotourism**: **Ecotourism** is about uniting conservation, communities, and sustainable travel. Ecotourism Definition | The International Ecotourism Society.

A zipline is nothing more than an amusement park ride. Just because it is in a Green Space and the applicants plan to do a bit of pest control, plant a few trees and have participants pay a 'conservation levy', doesn't make it eco-tourism. It is called 'greenwashing' its proposal. [GreenWash is advertising, PR or spin that presents a government, company or its products as more environmentally friendly than is true].

What we have here is an attempt to create the illusion of being an ecotourism activity in order to curry favour with council and try to fit its OGBMP. The primary intention is for an adventure tourism business, not a conservation activity. It is not the ecological or conservation aspects of the area that will be promoted and attracting tourists - it is the the thrill of the zipline adventure that will be the attraction. Wellington already has has Zealandia on the boundary of this proposed adventure activity and it completely fulfills any tourist need for ecotourism and conservation activities in this area.

An ecotourism activity should fulfil the accepted definition of ecotourism. If an activity has a negative impact on surrounding neighbours it is then in conflict with the aims of eco tourism and thus the activity cannot be called an ecotourism activity. There is absolutely no benefit on the surrounding neighbours or community from this activity. The council's admitted desire to have this activity does not give it preferential consideration outside its OGBMP.

The council has a responsibility to the existing neighbours first and foremost.

#### 4. Protection of rural amenity of adjacent rural properties

There has been negligible consideration and no assessment of the impact of the lease agreement or the proposed activity on the existing rightful land users/ residents who live within 200m of the proposed activity (as required in rule 17.3.2.).

The council should disregard the appendix presented with WZA's proposal to show stakeholder engagement. It is incomplete, inaccurate and grossly misrepresents key stakeholder views. It grossly overstates support and is misleading.

The residents have made a significant investment in a quiet rural lifestyle provided for and protected by the district plan. Resource consents for residents in the rural areas are complex and applications undergo rigorous and often overzealous scrutiny to insure adherence to the council rules in order that the rural amenity is preserved.

*Its (the District Plan) intention is to provide for sustainable rural living while enhancing and protecting rural character and amenity. (1.0; pg2; Rural design guide)*

Due diligence at the time of property purchase did not show any plans or intentions for any use of this land for any purpose other than as already described and permitted in the district plan and the OGBMP. Existing rural residents have the right to expect that the council protects their rural amenity as a priority decision when evaluating any new activities especially where they are non complying activities that have the potential to have a substantial negative impact (ie more than minor) on nearby rural residences.

Open Space B Rules, as they currently stand, complement the OGBMP so that the outer green belt spaces and rural areas continue to enhance and complement each other. Where Open space B and OGBMP interpretation is exercised within the discretionary powers of the authority (WCC) the decisions must be in keeping with the rural design intent and principles, particularly when there are existing rural dwellings that have the potential to be adversely affected by such discretionary decisions.

## 5. Conflict of interest

There is an obvious COI in this process. The councillors must make certain that the process is fair and does not favour the applicant because the council wants the activity to be established.

The council owns the land, makes the rules and then is also the authority that will make the decision about whether this application should be approved. The council also stands to gain financially (both directly and indirectly) from a commercial lease agreement that is a non complying activity, and so utmost rigour needs to be applied to ensure that the consent process is transparent, compliant and unbiased. The applicants refuse to disclose the fees that users will be charged. The council has not disclosed its financial and other benefits from this commercial arrangement. There is no provision in the current district plan for commercial arrangements to be established in Open Space B apart from appendix M Ch 24 which is very specific in its conditions. The OGBMP makes no special provision for this arrangement in section 7 - Carey's Gully.

The council must be certain that it does not misuse or abuse its authority during this process and must remain impartial as the assessment and approval process is worked through. The council however has already expressed its desire to have the zipline and is already showing its bias in favour of the applicant before due process has taken place. Decisions and rulings must comply with current plans and policies. The rules and policies must be applied equally to all applicants and cannot be waived or altered dependent on who the applicant is. Decisions cannot be made on the basis of any anticipatory changes to council plans and policies.

I am aware that compliance with Open Space B rules in the district plan is dealt with by way of Resource and building Consent Processes. The non compliance with the district plan is significant, cannot be ignored and needs to be considered at this stage of the application so that the applicant is fully aware of what would be required from them to reach possible compliance.

### The proposed activity is a Non Complying activity for Open Space B zoning

The agreement for a lease for the proposed activity is not consistent with the objectives, intentions and rules of the current district plan Chapters 16 and 17

Any activity in Open Space B must be consistent with the rules and intentions of the district plan at the time the application is assessed.

#### 16.3 Open Space B

##### 8(Natural environment)

Open Space B land is valued for its natural character and informal open spaces. ***It involves areas that are used for types of recreation that, in the broadest sense, do not involve buildings or structures. The intention is to keep such areas in an unbuilt or natural state.*** This type of open space encompasses both formal and informal open space elements. It includes walkways, scenic areas and open grassed areas where ***buildings are inappropriate.*** Its characteristics are ***minimal structures,*** largely undeveloped areas and open expanses of land. Most Open Space B areas are vegetated and often have ecological values or may buffer Conservation Sites.

Also

Council has an important role in ***administering open space on behalf of the public.*** People go to open spaces to escape the urban setting or their normal surroundings. The environmental qualities of open space such as openness, sunlight and tranquillity all contribute to its character and success. These should be

as *equitably and as easily enjoyable by older people and all others with mobility restrictions* as by the rest of the public.

**Questions needing clear and unambiguous answers by council:**

- How does the council define 'in its broadest sense' in the context of the intention of the plan to not involve buildings or structures given that a platform is neither necessary, desirable or accessible for the public of Wellington to enjoy this area?
- How does the council define and assess the size of structures ie what dimensions /size would be the maximum acceptable in council policy so as to constitute a 'minimal structure'?

**Assessment Criteria**

**In determining whether to grant consent and what conditions, if any, to impose, Council will have regard to the following criteria:**

17.3.2.1 [Whether the structure is designed and located so as to be visually unobtrusive.]<sup>PC33</sup>

The information provided by the applicant shows photographs and plans indicative of the size of the proposed structures. There are 8 of them. At some locations the take off and landing platforms are very close to each other effectively enlarging the building platform. These platforms each have a footprint of 20-40m<sup>2</sup>. And the area surrounding these platforms will require wider excavation still. The proposed height is at least 4m. There are also the ziplines themselves which are elevated above the natural canopy with 8 lines up to over 500m in length. Each line has 3 cables. These are large not minimal structures. (a gate would be a minimal structure).

The assessment of visual impact has not taken into account any effects on the closest adjacent neighbours. The assessment presented by WZA says this explicitly and also minimises effects based on assumptions that have not been tested or verified. The applicants have made no effort to show or assess the effects of their proposed activity on adjacent rural properties. (Landscape architect report )

17.3.2.2 [The extent that buildings and structures within identified ridgelines and hilltops are sited and designed in ways that avoid visually obtrusive development by:

- ensuring visual continuity is achieved on the upper slopes up to the apex of the ridgeline or hilltop
- ensuring that the visibility of buildings, structures and earthworks is mitigated by appropriate siting and design, and planting and/or screening when viewed from district wide, community wide *and neighbouring land*.
- minimising skyline effects by ensuring that buildings and structures will be seen against a landform backdrop when viewed from district wide, community wide *and neighbouring land*]<sup>PC33</sup>

There has been no assessment of effects on neighbouring rural residential properties. The assessments presented by the applicants have briefly glossed over and speculated on potential effects but these have not been validated appropriately and lack appropriate detail. The document that was presented to the council by the applicant representing "stakeholder engagement" should be disregarded. It is incomplete, grossly inaccurate and attributes support and opinions where this was not expressly sought or given and excludes key stakeholders.

17.3.2.3 Whether the structure is needed for the public enjoyment of the site's recreational potential

The public has no need for these structures to enjoy the the site's recreational potential of a green, open and tranquil space. The access is restricted to those who can pay to participate. The applicants have stated their target

market is visitors to the city. They will not disclose the cost of the activity to participants. The proposed activity is not intended to enhance the recreational potential of the area for Wellington residents and ratepayers.

17.3.2.4 Whether the site's open space character is maintained.

The number and size of the structures disrupts the open space character. The structures and associated ziplines lines are not minimal in either dimension nor number.

17.3.2.5 Any relevant provisions of:

- Reserves Act 1977 and any amendments to that Act
- Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977 and any amendments to that Act
- any management plan prepared for the site e.g. Belmont Regional Park Management Plan and the Wellington Town Belt Management Plan
- the Town Belt Deed 1873.

The land under consideration has no provision in the district plan or in the OGBMP or in the draft Open Space Access plan 2016 to allow for use outside of the Rules for Open Space B (other than as specifically described in appendix M chpt 24). Any special provisions would need to have been available to residents at the time of purchase of their properties.

7.3.2.6 Whether established public access or the possibility of such access is maintained.

The areas to be used for the proposed activity will have restricted public access.

17.3.2.7 Where the activity is within a Maori precinct, the outcome of consultation with tangata whenua and other Maori.

17.3.2.8 The extent to which any adverse effects of any new accessway or carparking, or change in use of any existing accessway or carparking, can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

The access to the activity is via Hawkins Hill Rd. It is a private ROW. This activity is a change in use of the ROW to benefit a new commercial arrangement between the council and a private business requiring a specific lease agreement in order for the activity to be established. The council is promoting increased public use of this roadway without any plans and policies in place for repairs and maintenance required in order for the road to be safe for all users

The council has failed to observe its own plans (dated 2004) where it was specifically identified that a plan for Hawkins Hill Rd was required - the council has dragged the chain (in a councillor's own words) and there is now an exponentially growing issue that needs urgent and prioritised council attention. The conflict with residents as discussed on national television news recently is a direct consequence of the Council's failure to manage the road in a timely manner.

Until this issue is satisfactorily addressed and resolved, the council has no mandate to facilitate a commercial lease agreement with a private business where the operation of the business is dependent on the use of the road and at a significantly higher rate of use than the current residential use and where there is financial benefit for the council but no commitment to addressing the issue of the road and its ongoing maintenance.

The council must fulfil its obligation to ROW holders to establish a clear repair and management plan for Hawkins Hill Rd. The council has permitted increased use of the land by permitting subdivision and building in line with the district plan and so the council must insure it has a plan in place to insure access to these properties is maintained at an acceptable level for everyday driving by ordinary vehicles.

The residents are contributing significant urban rates payments ie no rural rebate. They do not get any regular council household services that all other ratepayers get (road maintenance, safe sidewalks, curbside refuse collection, street lights, water, sewerage).

Ref above :Outer Green Belt Management Plan 2004, Section 7 - Carey's Gully:

[17.3.2.9 Where a structure or building is located within a Hazard (Fault Line) Area, the degree to which measures have been adopted to mitigate the potential adverse effects from a fault rupture hazard event.]<sup>PC22</sup>

***In general, structures on Open Space B or Open Space C are viewed unfavourably unless there is a need for public facilities that cannot reasonably be satisfied by using other land. Council will pay particular attention to this point in decisions on the use of Inner Town Belt land. Any new building works will also be governed by the provisions of any relevant management plans (for example the Wellington Town Belt Management Plan).***

The proposed activity will not be open to the public for free recreational use (undisclosed and likely substantial fee). The public has no need for such an activity for the enjoyment of this open space. The activity does not meet the accessibility requirements for Open space B public land. The draft Open Space access Plan 2016 notes 'opportunities for free, accessible recreational activity for a broad section of the community'. WCC is the custodian of Open Space B for the benefit of all Wellingtonians not for its own benefit or for the benefit of a commercial operator where access is limited by fees that are expected to be out of the range of the average ratepayer.

### **Reference documents**

- **District Plan**
- **The Draft Open Space Access plan 2016**
  - has no plans or policies permitting the activity being proposed. It speaks of 'opportunities for free accessible recreational activity for a broad section of the community'.
  - There is no provision for commercial partnerships and user pays restricted recreational activities
- **The Outer Green belt management plan and the plan for Te Kopahou**
  - remain under review.
  - Anticipatory changes in these plans cannot be used in evaluating this application unless there is a council policy in place that provides specifically for this.
  - There is no provision in the current district plan or Outer Green Belt Management Plan for the council to approve commercial partnerships in Open space B areas of Carey's Gully.
- **"Our Natural Capital"** - Wellington's biodiversity strategy and action plan.
  - Te Kopahou is not mentioned.
- **Appendix M , Ch 24 :Designation 61** ('Refuse disposal and Associated works') covers the entire site. However, the actual area of filling for this designation may only occur in the area defined under Appendix M, chapter 24. A landfill operation is not a permitted activity under Open Space B rules other than as specifically defined in Appendix M.
  - There is no special rule or designation permitting any other commercial activity in this Open Space B area.

## SUMMARY

Any lease consent (if granted) must be conditional on

Submission.zipline.Olver/Horrocks.020218



1. An Operational Road management plan for Hawkins Hill being passed by council
2. The applicant meeting the assessment criteria as laid out in the the council's district plan and must be conditional that it complies with all relevant council policies and the RMA. Any mitigation and management plans required by the applicants to assure compliance with the criteria and policies should be reviewed by the nearest affected neighbours and agreed that the effects on them will be less than minor.
3. Appropriate plans for monitoring AND managing conditions imposed on the applicant at no cost to residents and enforceable in a timely manner.
4. If it is to be considered as an ecotourism activity a significant portion of the activity fee must go directly to conservation and must be disclosed publicly and accounted for before any RC is granted and must be a condition for continued operation.
5. Any educational component (which must be a condition of the consent if it is eco tourism) must be delivered by suitably qualified and educated staff and objectively assessed as being of sufficient standard for an ecotourism activity.
6. Any Resource Consent for a zipline activity must be notified and open for submissions.
7. A limitation on future expansion of this and any other commercial activities of a similar nature in this area must be a condition of any resource consent.

**Joel De Boer**

---

**From:** Karrie Franklin on behalf of Paul Andrews  
**Sent:** Joel De Boer; Bec Ramsay  
**To:** FW: proposed zipline  
**Subject:** image001.jpg  
**Attachments:**

FYI

Karrie

---

**From:** Barbara Mckerrow  
**Sent:** Friday, 2 February 2018 1:07 p.m.  
**To:** Paul Andrews  
**Subject:** Fwd: proposed zipline

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Brian Willman  
**Date:** 2 February 2018 at 12:43:12 PM NZDT  
**To:** "[barbara.mckerrow@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:barbara.mckerrow@wcc.govt.nz)" <[barbara.mckerrow@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:barbara.mckerrow@wcc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** proposed zipline

Barbara

Shenval Holdings Ltd and Shenval Wind Farm and Developments Ltd. strongly object to the issuance of a lease on many grounds for the proposed zip line at Hawkins Hill Wellington.

Yours faithfully

B Willman  
Director

**Brian Willman**  
Aztec Finance  
[www.aztecfinance.co.nz](http://www.aztecfinance.co.nz)



*Cash Loans Made Easy*

---

**From:** Stephanie Mills  
**Sent:** Friday, 2 February 2018 4:50 p.m.  
**To:** Joel De Boer  
**Subject:** Application to use Outer Green Belt Reserve network land for commercial Zipline/Flying Fox operation

### **Application to use Outer Green Belt Reserve network land for commercial Zipline/Flying Fox operation**

WCC is considering granting a new occupancy agreement (lease/licence) for a commercial Zipline operation located at the Southern Landfill, Owhiro Bay (publicly notified on the WCC website).

The description of the land is 50 Landfill Road, CFR WN21D/612, Lots 1 DP29398 and Lots 1 & 2 DP29742. The commercial Zipline is proposed to operate from the Hawkins Hill Road access to the land and the occupancy agreement has been requested by Mark O'Connor and Karl Ratahi, who propose to operate the commercial Zipline operation there, if the lease/licence is granted.

Please accept this as my submission on this matter.

I submit in opposition to WCC granting a new occupancy agreement (lease/licence) for a commercial Zipline/Flying Fox operation on this land, which is owned by WCC and part of the Outer Green Belt Reserve network.

Allowing a commercial development on this land would undermine the council's stated goal in relation to the Outer Green Belt Reserves network of creating: "a continuous green belt following the ridges west of the city from the south coast to Colonial Knob, in which indigenous vegetation is restored and an informal recreation network is widely accessible."

There are other sites in the vicinity of the capital where this sort of commercial activity could be located without having to use land that is designated as part of the Green Belt Reserve network.

Yours Sincerely,

Michael Szabo

## SUBMISSION

Tim and Sarah Watson

The submitter requests to have the submission heard by way of an oral submission at the council meeting on 22 February 2018

### PROPOSED NEW LEASE AND LICENCE AT THE SOUTHERN LANDFILL - COMMERCIAL ZIPLINE OPERATION □



### **We oppose the lease agreement for the proposed activity for the following reasons:**

#### 1. Access via Hawkins Hill Road

The operation of the proposed activity is entirely dependent on the use of Hawkins Hill Road, a council owned private ROW. The council and the councillors are well aware of the unacceptable state of the road and have been on public record admitting to this.

The proposal to grant this lease should not be considered until a road Management Plan is agreed to and in operation. The Council's failure to establish a plan for this road<sup>1</sup> whilst permitting development has resulted in conflict with residents and an increasingly unsafe multi user access way. Council should not permit any activity that increases the traffic on this road unless it is prepared to upgrade it.

Hawkins Hill Rd is a private Right of Way (ROW). The council must ensure that unauthorised access by public vehicles consequent to any commercial lease is able to be restricted and controlled. The gate must be re-commissioned at the turbine car park to control unauthorised public vehicle access if the council is to consider leasing this land for a commercial activity.

The council has stated its opposition to occasional mountain bike shuttling yet it seems to be quite happy to consider allowing a commercial shuttle service to operate all day, every day.

#### **<sup>1</sup>Outer Green Belt Management Plan 2004, Section 7 - Carey's Gully:**

##### *5.7.2.2 Access*

- ...but there is as yet no clear policy about the status of the road as a key recreation access route. The status of various right-of-way agreements for private users is unclear and needs to be resolved,
- ...the need for a clear plan for the management of this road.
- ... To clarify all existing access rights to the Hawkins Hill Road, establish a clear policy on the provision of private access and to ensure current vehicle use is consistent with public use of the road.

**The use of the road in the manner proposed is not compliant with the district plan (see below 17.3.2.8)**

## 2. Noise and siting of proposed zipline

**NOTE: The council should ensure that it has the correct maps available as the maps presented with WZA's proposal failed to indicate the proximity (200m) of the nearby dwellings to the activity.**

Rural noise tolerance limits are notably lower than those in the city.

There has been no consideration by the council or the applicants of the possible noise nuisance that would be generated by the proposed activity (traffic, mechanical, participant, spectator). As we are the existing permitted activity (noise recipient), the onus is not on us to mitigate noise effects of a new activity.

Noise management is a requirement under the RMA ( see below). It would be foolish to ignore the need for thorough assessment. There are multiple ziplines in NZ and around the world that have failed to comply with noise policies to their detriment. The most effective noise buffer is distance, yet this activity has been located as close as is possible to the 3 nearest residences. The reasons given by the applicants that other sites were not suitable apply equally to their current proposed site. The applicants have stated that they cannot control the noise generated by their activity. This is in breach of RMA:

*'Under s31, territorial authorities have the primary responsibility for managing the effects of land uses and noise (including the mitigation of noise.). Territorial Authorities also have a responsibility under the RMA to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use , development , or protection of land use associated with natural and physical resources. This includes effects on amenity values that may be affected by noise.'*

*'Section 16 of the RMA requires all noise generators to adopt the best practicable option to avoid the emission of unreasonable noise. This is additional to the duty to comply with the permitted noise levels included in a district plan.'*

*'For new noise generating activities, control can be achieved by incorporating appropriate buffer distances. New noise generating activities need to consider the distance to the nearest neighbours, traffic routes and other relevant factors when determining the layout, design and operation of their activities.'*

<http://www.qualityplanning.org.nz/index.php/planning-tools/air/noise-management-in-mixed-use-urban-environments>

## 3. Does not fit with objectives the OGBMP 2004 generally, and specifically to this area

**A zipline is an inappropriate use/activity for this land as part of the Outer Green Belt.**

[ref: 3.4.2 Access issues and opportunities : eco tourism

4.2.2.1 Council relationship with adjoining landowners: conflicted as a result of council 'dragging the chain' and failing to communicate in a timely and respectful manner

4.5.2.1 *Appropriate forms of recreation (a), (f):* a zipline is not an activity based on quiet enjoyment of the area and the OGBMP states that the Outer Green Belt will not be used as a place for locating those activities which, because of their effects, are unable to be accommodated elsewhere

5.7.2.2 Access - as above]

There is no provision in council policy for commercial activity in this sector (other than that specifically defined in appendix M of the district Plan). Any use not provided for by council policy cannot be allowed as adjacent landowners would need to have been informed of such plans at the time their properties were purchased.

This proposal intrudes on the buffer zone that is specifically mentioned as a mechanism for protection of adjacent properties from adverse effects of activities on this land.

The council already views the zipline proposal as an opportunity to promote enjoyment of open spaces and ecotourism (email from Joel De Boer). Bias in favour of the activity by the council is already evident. A zipline in this location is NOT an ecotourism activity.

**Ecotourism** is: "Responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people." ( TIES, 1990) Principles of **Ecotourism: Ecotourism** is about uniting conservation, communities, and sustainable travel. Ecotourism Definition | The International Ecotourism Society.

A zipline is nothing more than an amusement park ride. Just because it is in a Green Space and the applicants plan to do a bit of pest control, plant a few trees and have participants pay a 'conservation levy', doesn't make it eco-tourism. It is called 'greenwashing' its proposal. [GreenWash is advertising, PR or spin that presents a government, company or its products as more environmentally friendly than is true].

What we have here is an attempt to create the illusion of being an ecotourism activity in order to curry favour with council and try to fit its OGBMP. The primary intention is for an adventure tourism business, not a conservation activity. It is not the ecological or conservation aspects of the area that will be promoted and attracting tourists - it is the the thrill of the zipline adventure that will be the attraction. Wellington already has Zealandia on the boundary of this proposed adventure activity and it completely fulfills any tourist need for ecotourism and conservation activities in this area.

An ecotourism activity should fulfil the accepted definition of ecotourism. If an activity has a negative impact on surrounding neighbours it is then in conflict with the aims of eco tourism and thus the activity cannot be called an ecotourism activity. There is absolutely no benefit on the surrounding neighbours or community from this activity. The council's admitted desire to have this activity does not give it preferential consideration outside its OGBMP.

The council has a responsibility to the existing neighbours first and foremost.

#### 4. Protection of rural amenity of adjacent rural properties

There has been negligible consideration and no assessment of the impact of the lease agreement or the proposed activity on the existing rightful land users / residents who live within 200m of the proposed activity (as required in rule 17.3.2.).

The council should disregard the appendix presented with WZA's proposal to show stakeholder engagement. It is incomplete, inaccurate and grossly misrepresents key stakeholder views. It grossly overstates support and is misleading.

The residents have made a significant investment in a quiet rural lifestyle provided for and protected by the district plan. Resource consents for residents in the rural areas are complex and applications undergo rigorous and often overzealous scrutiny to insure adherence to the council rules in order that the rural amenity is preserved.

*Its (the District Plan) intention is to provide for sustainable rural living while enhancing and protecting rural character and amenity. (1.0; pg2; Rural design guide)*

Due diligence at the time of property purchase did not show any plans or intentions for any use of this land for any purpose other than as already described and permitted in the district plan and the OGBMP. Existing rural residents have the right to expect that the council protects their rural amenity as a priority decision when evaluating any new activities especially where they are non complying activities that have the potential to have a substantial negative impact (ie more than minor) on nearby rural residences.

Open Space B Rules, as they currently stand, complement the OGBMP so that the outer green belt spaces and rural areas continue to enhance and complement each other. Where Open space B and OGBMP interpretation is exercised within the discretionary powers of the authority (WCC) the decisions must be in keeping with the rural design intent and principles, particularly when there are existing rural dwellings that have the potential to be adversely affected by such discretionary decisions.

#### 5. Conflict of interest

There is an obvious COI in this process. The councillors must make certain that the process is fair and does not favour the applicant because the council wants the activity to be established.

The council owns the land, makes the rules and then is also the authority that will make the decision about whether this application should be approved. The council also stands to gain financially (both directly and indirectly) from a commercial lease agreement that is a non complying activity, and so utmost rigour needs to be applied to ensure that the consent process is transparent, compliant and unbiased. The applicants refuse to disclose the fees that users will be charged. The council has not disclosed its financial and other benefits from this commercial arrangement. There is no provision in the current district plan for commercial arrangements to be established in Open Space B apart from appendix M Ch 24 which is very specific in its conditions. The OGBMP makes no special provision for this arrangement in section 7 - Carey's Gully.

The council must be certain that it does not misuse or abuse its authority during this process and must remain impartial as the assessment and approval process is worked through. The council however has already expressed its desire to have the zipline and is already showing its bias in favour of the applicant before due process has taken place. Decisions and rulings must comply with current plans and policies. The rules and policies must be applied equally to all applicants and cannot be waived or altered dependent on who the applicant is. Decisions cannot be made on the basis of any anticipatory changes to council plans and policies.

I am aware that compliance with Open Space B rules in the district plan is dealt with by way of Resource and building Consent Processes. The non-compliance with the district plan is significant, cannot be ignored and needs to be considered at this stage of the application so that the applicant is fully aware of what would be required from them to reach possible compliance.

### The proposed activity is a Non Complying activity for Open Space B zoning

The agreement for a lease for the proposed activity is not consistent with the objectives, intentions and rules of the current district plan Chapters 16 and 17

Any activity in Open Space B must be consistent with the rules and intentions of the district plan at the time the application is assessed.

#### 16.3 Open Space B

##### 8(Natural environment)

Open Space B land is valued for its natural character and informal open spaces. ***It involves areas that are used for types of recreation that, in the broadest sense, do not involve buildings or structures. The intention is to keep such areas in an unbuilt or natural state.*** This type of open space encompasses both formal and informal open space elements. It includes walkways, scenic areas and open grassed areas where ***buildings are inappropriate.*** Its characteristics are ***minimal structures***, largely undeveloped areas and open expanses of land. Most Open Space B areas are vegetated and often have ecological values or may buffer Conservation Sites.

##### Also

Council has an important role in ***administering open space on behalf of the public.*** People go to open spaces to escape the urban setting or their normal surroundings. The environmental qualities of open space such as openness, sunlight and tranquillity all contribute to its character and success. These should be as ***equitably and as easily enjoyable by older people and all others with mobility restrictions*** as by the rest of the public.

#### Questions needing clear and unambiguous answers by council:

- How does the council define 'in its broadest sense' in the context of the intention of the plan to not involve buildings or structures given that a platform is neither necessary, desirable or accessible for the public of Wellington to enjoy this area?
- How does the council define and assess the size of structures ie what dimensions /size would be the maximum acceptable in council policy so as to constitute a 'minimal structure'?

#### Assessment Criteria

**In determining whether to grant consent and what conditions, if any, to impose, Council will have regard to the following criteria:**

17.3.2.1 [Whether the structure is designed and located so as to be visually unobtrusive.] <sup>PCS3</sup>

The information provided by the applicant shows photographs and plans indicative of the size of the proposed structures. There are eight of them. At some locations, the take-off and landing platforms are very close to each other effectively enlarging the building platform. These platforms each have a footprint of 20-40m<sup>2</sup>. And the area surrounding these platforms will require wider excavation still. The proposed height is at least 4m. There are also the ziplines themselves which are elevated above the natural canopy with 8 lines up to over 500m in length. Each line has three cables. These are large not minimal structures. (a gate would be a minimal structure). The assessment of visual impact has not taken into account any effects on the closest adjacent neighbours. The assessment presented by WZA says this explicitly, and also minimises effects based on assumptions that have

not been tested or verified. The applicants have made no effort to show or assess the effects of their proposed activity on adjacent rural properties. (Landscape architect report )

17.3.2.2 [The extent that buildings and structures within identified ridgelines and hilltops are sited and designed in ways that avoid visually obtrusive development by:

- ensuring visual continuity is achieved on the upper slopes up to the apex of the ridgeline or hilltop
- ensuring that the visibility of buildings, structures and earthworks is mitigated by appropriate siting and design, and planting and/or screening when viewed from district wide, community wide *and neighbouring land* .
- minimising skyline effects by ensuring that buildings and structures will be seen against a landform backdrop when viewed from district wide, community wide *and neighbouring land* <sup>PC33</sup>

There has been no assessment of effects on neighbouring rural residential properties. The assessments presented by the applicants have briefly glossed over and speculated on potential effects but these have not been validated appropriately and lack appropriate detail. The document that was presented to the council by the applicant representing “stakeholder engagement” should be disregarded. It is incomplete, grossly inaccurate and attributes support and opinions where this was not expressly sought or given and excludes key stakeholders.

17.3.2.3 Whether the structure is needed for the public enjoyment of the site’s recreational potential

The public has no need for these structures to enjoy the the site’s recreational potential of a green, open and tranquil space. The access is restricted to those who can pay to participate. The applicants have stated their target market is visitors to the city. They will not disclose the cost of the activity to participants. The proposed activity is not intended to enhance the recreational potential of the area for Wellington residents and ratepayers.

17.3.2.4 Whether the site's open space character is maintained.

The number and size of the structures disrupts the open space character. The structures and associated ziplines lines are not minimal in either dimension nor number.

17.3.2.5 Any relevant provisions of:

- Reserves Act 1977 and any amendments to that Act
- Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977 and any amendments to that Act
- any management plan prepared for the site e.g. Belmont Regional Park Management Plan and the Wellington Town Belt Management Plan
- the Town Belt Deed 1873.

The land under consideration has no provision in the district plan or in the OGBMP or in the draft Open Space Access plan 2016 to allow for use outside of the Rules for Open Space B (other than as specifically described in appendix M chpt 24). Any special provisions would need to have been available to residents at the time of purchase of their properties.

7.3.2.6 Whether established public access or the possibility of such access is maintained.

The areas to be used for the proposed activity will have restricted public access.

17.3.2.7 Where the activity is within a Maori precinct, the outcome of consultation with tangata whenua and other Maori.



17.3.2.8 The extent to which any adverse effects of any new accessway or carparking, or change in use of any existing accessway or carparking, can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

The access to the activity is via Hawkins Hill Rd. It is a private ROW. This activity is a change in use of the ROW to benefit a new commercial arrangement between the council and a private business requiring a specific lease agreement in order for the activity to be established. The council is promoting increased public use of this roadway without any plans and policies in place for repairs and maintenance required in order for the road to be safe for all users.

The council has failed to observe its own plans (dated 2004) where it was specifically identified that a plan for Hawkins Hill Rd was required - the council has dragged the chain (in a councillor's own words) and there is now an exponentially growing issue that needs urgent and prioritised council attention. The conflict with residents as discussed on national television news recently is a direct consequence of the Council's failure to manage the road in a timely manner.

Until this issue is satisfactorily addressed and resolved, the council has no mandate to facilitate a commercial lease agreement with a private business where the operation of the business is dependent on the use of the road and at a significantly higher rate of use than the current residential use and where there is financial benefit for the council but no commitment to addressing the issue of the road and its ongoing maintenance.

The council must fulfil its obligation to ROW holders to establish a clear repair and management plan for Hawkins Hill Rd. The council has permitted increased use of the land by permitting subdivision and building in line with the district plan and so the council must insure it has a plan in place to insure access to these properties is maintained at an acceptable level for everyday driving by ordinary vehicles.

The residents are contributing significant urban rates payments ie no rural rebate. They do not get any regular council household services that all other ratepayers get (road maintenance, safe sidewalks, curbside refuse collection, street lights, water, sewerage).

Ref above :Outer Green Belt Management Plan 2004, Section 7 - Carey's Gully:

[17.3.2.9 Where a structure or building is located within a Hazard (Fault Line) Area, the degree to which measures have been adopted to mitigate the potential adverse effects from a fault rupture hazard event.]<sup>m22</sup>

***In general, structures on Open Space B or Open Space C are viewed unfavourably unless there is a need for public facilities that cannot reasonably be satisfied by using other land. Council will pay particular attention to this point in decisions on the use of Inner Town Belt land. Any new building works will also be governed by the provisions of any relevant management plans (for example the Wellington Town Belt Management Plan).***

The proposed activity will not be open to the public for free recreational use (undisclosed and likely substantial fee). The public has no need for such an activity for the enjoyment of this open space. The activity does not meet the accessibility requirements for Open space B public land. The draft Open Space access Plan 2016 notes 'opportunities for free, accessible recreational activity for a broad section of the community'. WCC is the custodian of Open Space B for the benefit of all Wellingtonians not for its own benefit or for the benefit of a commercial operator where access is limited by fees that are expected to be out of the range of the average ratepayer.

### Reference documents

- **District Plan**
- **The Draft Open Space Access plan 2016**
  - has no plans or policies permitting the activity being proposed. It speaks of 'opportunities for free accessible recreational activity for a broad section of the community'.
  - There is no provision for commercial partnerships and user pays restricted recreational activities
- **The Outer Green belt management plan and the plan for Te Kopahou**
  - remain under review.
  - Anticipatory changes in these plans cannot be used in evaluating this application unless there is a council policy in place that provides specifically for this.
  - There is no provision in the current district plan or Outer Green Belt Management Plan for the council to approve commercial partnerships in Open space B areas of Carey's Gully.
- **"Our Natural Capital"** - Wellington's biodiversity strategy and action plan.

- Te Kopahou is not mentioned.
- **Appendix M , Ch 24 :Designation 61** ('Refuse disposal and Associated works') covers the entire site. However, the actual area of filling for this designation may only occur in the area defined under Appendix M, chapter 24. A landfill operation is not a permitted activity under Open Space B rules other than as specifically defined in Appendix M.
  - There is no special rule or designation permitting any other commercial activity in this Open Space B area.

## SUMMARY

Any lease consent (if granted) must be conditional on

1. An Operational Road Management Plan for Hawkins Hill being passed by council
2. The applicant meeting the assessment criteria as laid out in the council's district plan, and must be conditional that it complies with all relevant council policies and the RMA. Any mitigation and management plans required by the applicants to assure compliance with the criteria and policies should be reviewed by the nearest affected neighbours and agreed that the effects on them will be less than minor.
3. Appropriate plans for monitoring AND managing conditions imposed on the applicant at no cost to residents and enforceable in a timely manner.
4. If it is to be considered as an ecotourism activity, a significant portion of the activity fee must go directly to conservation and must be disclosed publicly and accounted for before any RC is granted and must be a condition for continued operation.
5. Any educational component (which must be a condition of the consent if it is eco-tourism) must be delivered by suitably qualified and educated staff and objectively assessed as being of sufficient standard for an ecotourism activity.
6. Any Resource Consent for a zipline activity must be notified and open for submissions.
7. A limitation on future expansion of this and any other commercial activities of a similar nature in this area must be a condition of any resource consent.

John Christopher Horne

2 February 2018

Brett Smith  
Property Advisor  
Wellington City Council  
PO Box 2199  
WELLINGTON 6140

Dear Mr Smith

**SUBMISSION: Proposed new lease and licence at the Southern Landfill**

Thank you for the opportunity to present this submission. I wish to speak in support of this submission before the relevant committee of Wellington City Council.

**Opposition**

I oppose the proposal in its entirety.

**Reasons for my opposition**

I oppose the proposal because:

1. It would increase vehicular traffic on the narrow Hawkins Hill Road up to the wind turbine, a route popular with walkers and runners, who would thus be put at increased risk;
2. It would increase unauthorised use of Hawkins Hill Road beyond the turbine car park. This road is popular with walkers and runners, is narrow, with short sight-lines, therefore use by unauthorised vehicles would be hazardous to walkers and runners;
3. The proposed zip line and its supporting structures would be a blot on the landscape and skyline, as enjoyed by visitors to the wind turbine, and as enjoyed by people living beyond the site;
4. Erection of the support structures would involve clearance of indigenous plant species in the upper part of Carey Gully, vegetation I have tramped through in preparation for a field trip by Wellington Botanical Society, and during the field trip.
5. Granting the lease would encourage the use of motor vehicles and the burning of finite fossil fuels, thus increasing the city's emissions of greenhouse gases, and exacerbating the effects of climate change.

**Decision I would like Wellington City Council to make**

I recommend that Wellington City Council decline the proposal in its entirety.

Yours sincerely, Chris Horne

---

**From:** Wednesday, 31 January 2018 8:07 a.m.  
**Sent:** Joel De Boer  
**To:** Zip line proposal  
**Subject:**

- Martin Gribble

## **Proposed new lease and licence at the Southern Landfill**

I am in support of the proposal, I think it will significantly add to the recreational adventure activities in the area and benefit Wellington as a fun destination.

Regards

Martin

---

**From:** Rochelle Jackson  
**Sent:** Monday, 12 February 2018 8:52 a.m.  
**To:** Joel De Boer  
**Subject:** Zip line RC Affected Parties Submission

Hi Joel

My name is Rochelle Jackson and I am writing on behalf of my husband Toby Jackson and family. We live at 465 Southernthread Road Brooklyn and will share our driveway with the potential zip line adventure tourism business.

I'm writing in response to the RC-approval-from-affected-parties letter from Dec last year. Apologies this is a week later than 5th Feb.

What a great idea the zip line will be to utilize this unique landscape and also bring in revenue for the city. We think it's great and will be a fun attraction. However our concern as affected residents is the road structure, maintenance and upkeep.

Already the road along Hawkins Hill is full of potholes from increased use over the last few years and this will no doubt further increase with punters using the zip line (from cars and heavier vehicles).

The pedestrian use has for many years been unsafe and confusing for them as they seem to not consider it a road or used by vehicles so often wander in the middle of it. This is also because there is not a proper path for them to walk on.

If RC is signed off we only approve if Hawkins Hill Rd is widened, (preferably made two lanes) and has a designated pedestrian route.

Many thanks for the opportunity to speak our concerns.

Rochelle and Toby Jackson