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Location overview

Fly-Inn Cafe

Fly-Line Lifter Shuttle Transport

Fly-Line Start

Fly-Line
Length: 450m
Elevation loss: 55 m
App. ride time: 3-4 min

Historical Site Tahunaati

Walking Track to Lookout & Fly-Line Start
First Name: jenni
Last Name: turnell
On behalf of: 
Postal Address: 105 Huka Falls Road, RD 4
Suburb: rd4
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3384
eMail: * jenni@serendipitybeauty.co.nz
Daytime Phone: 0274.929084
Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

○ Yes
☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

○ SUPPORT
☒ OPPOSE

General Comment
To whom it may concern. I would like to oppose against the zip line going in where they have cleared an area at Huka Falls Reserve. I believe it isn't the right place for this company, and would like to suggest a bit further away on Huka Falls Rd opposite Huka Lodge where the have better grounds, steeper slop and stronger trees. Or cut by the Craters of the moon.
My reason for not having it at current location where they been working is, being right next door to the area, I can already see a lot of cars parking on the road. People standing on the road talking, I can hear everything they say from my house and I am worried if he is expecting 160 people per day plus friends watching and people using the proposed lookout I will have a lot of noise and cars parked on the road making it unsafe for the traffic, people biking from red woods and so on.

I believe he need to set up this further away from residential area.

Mr alex Schmit said this was supposed to be a quiet ride to listening to birds and enjoy the native landscape. I don’t believe there will be any bird life left after he set up coffee shop, lookout and a pathway for people to walk around on right next door the ride. Of course people on this ride will scream to each other whilst the doing this ride. It won’t be a quiet ride at all. And this is absolutely not something I would like to listen to day or night!!!

I moved out to this area 10 years ago to be able to enjoy a quiet neighbourhood and enjoy my animals. I am sick and tired of picking up beer bottle and rubbish from people walking past and I believe introducing more activities and more people passing my paddocks my problem of rubbish will be greater.

Jenni Funnell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attached Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a near commercial licence at Millipatus Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Name: Richard

Last Name: Hoadley

On behalf of: 

Postal Address:
36 Stanley Street
Suburb: Whakewaka
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3330

eMail: hoads@xtra.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes

☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT

☒ OPPOSE

General Comment

The proposed use is permanent and is contrary to the Reserves Act 1997 and the current Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan.

Refer also my attached submission.
## Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>TDC - 2019 Hepatitis Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hepatitis Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Name: Richard
Last Name: Hoadley
On behalf of: 
Postal Address: 36 Stanley Street
Suburb: Wharewaia
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3330
eMail: hoads@xtra.co.nz
Daytime Phone: 3768939

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRReD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?

Support/Oppose Granting of License
☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE
General Comment

Please add the attached summary to my earlier submission.

The attached addenda is a consequence of the offensive work that has already been done on the Reserve by the applicant and others.

### Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDC - 2019 Hipapatu Reserve - addenda 1</td>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapatu Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taupo District Council

Submission – Hipapatua Reserve

Further to my submission dated 19 March I wish to add the following comments;

- It has come to my notice that related works have been started within the Reserve for the purpose of installing the applicant’s Fly-Line equipment.
  
  I have photographs as evidence of tracks that have been cut through the undergrowth under the pine trees, plus survey pegs indicating the potential path of the Fly-Line.

- In the event 4Nature does not have a licence to start work it must be assumed that Council has given them permission to enter the Reserve and start the planned destruction of the existing environment. This is clearly a breach of the Reserves Act 1997 and the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan.

- Council does not have the prior consent of the Minister to exceed the stated 6 consecutive days.
  
  The Act Clause 54(1) d states; “provided also that the prior consent of the Minister shall not be required to a lease or licence under this paragraph where the trade, business, or occupation is to be carried on in the reserve only temporarily and the term of the lease or licence does not exceed 6 consecutive days”.
  
  Council is wrong in stating (Feb 2019) the Licence to Occupy can be granted for 10 years without the Minister’s approval.

- Taupo District Council has failed to provide evidence that the applicant has complied with Clause 6.2.4 of the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan. Namely the applicant has not demonstrated to TDC, and the public, that the proposed activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose. Further there is no evidence of appropriate remedial processes agreed between TDC and the applicant “to restore any damage to the reserve that may result from the activity”.

- The persons instrumental in allowing the breach of willful intent must be identified and be held responsible. That intent shall be presumed until the contrary is shown. The same persons must now be formally charged in accordance with the provisions of the Reserves Act. Clause 94 (Offences on Reserves) of the Act refers.

- Council should also note Clause 102 B, of the Act - Penalties for offences committed for commercial gain or reward.

Conclusion,

The application from 4Nature NZ Limited for a Licence to Occupy and construct and operate their proposed Fly-Line on Hipapatua Reserve must be declined.

Damage to the Hipapatua Reserve must be reinstated, in accordance with the Management Plan.

Offenders must be identified, questioned and held to account in accordance with the Act, Sections 94 and 102.

Richard Hoadley
2 April 2019.
Taupo District Council  

Submission – Hipapatua Reserve

Considering the Concept Plan and Policies contained in Sections 5 and 6 of the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan then the commercial activity proposed is not permitted.

The proposal from 4Nature NZ Ltd. for a licence to be issued does not comply with respect to the following issues:

- The activity contravenes sections of the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan and is therefore not permitted.
  The statutory provisions noted in the Plan have been developed to ensure that the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve;
  - is used and managed in a manner that best protects the important values associated with the reserve.
  - implements the vision (Section 5) for the reserve, and
  - is consistent with the statutory framework associated with the reserve.

- Section 5 of the Plan notes that the policies and implementation statements in the management plan will provide the direction for the future of Hipapatua Recreation Reserve.
  The Concept Plan identifies the location for specific activities, assets and infrastructure to be located on the reserve.
  A commercial activity such as the Sky-Line has not been identified in the Plan.

- Section 6 states the aspects of Hipapatua Recreation Reserve which the management plan intends to maintain.
  As such the types of recreation activities that are considered most appropriate are those that do not have detrimental effects on these features. Examples are noted in section 6 and they do not include the activity that is the subject of this licence application.

- Section 6.2.4 Events and Commercial Activities includes the Policy and Implementation requirements.
  Namely, Taupo District Council will consider commercial and other organised formal events and activities in Hipapatua Recreation Reserve that are compatible with the provisions of this management plan, the Taupo District Plan, Section 53 of the Reserves Act 1977 and any Bylaws.
  This application is not compatible in my view.

- Further 6.2.4 states that:
  ii. Any application received by Taupo District Council for short term (six days or less) events will be assessed on its merits to determine its suitability and appropriateness to the reserve.
  The application is for longer than the allowed six days and is not appropriate for this Reserve.

- Further 6.2.4 states that:
  iv. All applicants must demonstrate to Taupo District Council that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose, and that appropriate remediation processes are agreed prior to restore any damage to the reserve that may result from the activity.
v. Taupo District Council will only grant applications for commercial activities where evidence has been supplied demonstrating that the activity that will not adversely affect the values of the reserve and its primary purpose.

The applicant has not demonstrated that they can or would comply with either condition.

- All applications will be subject to the provisions of Section 53 and 54 of the Reserves Act 1977. That means that the Management Plan needs to be rewritten to include a commercial activity, as is proposed. I would doubt that will be possible, given the result of the recent TDC plans for commercial activities on the Tongariro Domain.

- The Plan has provision to allow for applications to be periodically received by Council from both commercial and non-commercial groups, to hold events on reserves that are short term and one-off. The planned activity is not “short term”. Granted that such an application may also be viewed favourably so long as there were no adverse effects to the reserve and it is compatible with the main purposes and values of the reserve.

I do not see the activity planned is compatible with this provision.

- Refer also clause 6.4.2 Facilities - Policy and Implementation. “Taupo District Council will restrict facilities on the reserve to those types and locations identified on the Concept Plan necessary to protect the natural environment and to facilitate the use of the reserve for its primary purpose.

The application does not fit with this condition.

- Further the explanation states; Hipapatua Recreation Reserve is adjacent to the Waikato River and has relatively high natural and open space values. A large number of built structures are inappropriate and largely unnecessary on this reserve. However, there is usually an expectation by visitors for some basic facilities such as toilets, the availability of water, shelter, rubbish bins, tables, and walking tracks originating at the reserve.

The application does not comply with this condition either.

Conclusion.

The application from 4Nature NZ Limited for a licence to install and operate their proposed Fly-Line on Hipapatua Reserve should be declined. The intent of the Reserves Act 1997 must be respected and not abused.

Richard Hoadley
19 March 2019.
Please click on the link below to view the document


Organisation: Taupo Business Chamber

First Name: Jeremy

Last Name: Bright

On behalf of: Taupo Business Chamber

Postal Address: 32 Roberts Street

City: Taupo

Country: New Zealand

PostCode: 3330

eMail: info@tauopovchamber.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☒ Yes
☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☒ SUPPORT
☒ OPPOSE

Attached Documents

File

Fy-Lite submission

Proposal to grant a new commercial licence at Hipapuatu Recreation Reserve
20 March 2019

TAUPō BUSINESS CHAMBER support for Licence to Occupy at Hipapatua Recreation Reserve by Fly-Line

The Taupō Business Chamber fully supports 4nature NZ Ltd. and its application for a license to occupy Hipapatua Reserve / Reid's Farm in order to construct and operate a Fly-Line operation.

The Taupō Business Chamber exists to support business growth and vitality throughout the district, and is the only independent voice for business in the region. We represent over 200 businesses in the district, which collectively employ over 4000 people.

We see the proposed development of the Fly-Line as contributing to our goals through the direct creation of jobs, as well as through expanding Taupō’s tourism offerings which greatly benefits other tourism and hospitality businesses and the wider community as a whole.

Fly-Line not only will provide jobs when fully developed (estimated between 15-20) but valuable investment into the local economy through the use of local trades and businesses in the development phase, and beyond.

Taupō Business Chamber also believes this activity will grow the reputation of the Taupō District, attracting more high value tourists to the area, again contributing to the growth of the local economy. The license fee paid to the District Council is also of benefit as an alternative revenue stream to increasing rates.

We believe that Fly-Line is a suitable operation for this site with minimal impact to the environment & vicinities when built. The proposed café will give another dimension to the area that is currently lacking.

The development will enhance a derelict site by building walkways and tracks to be enjoyed by all, enhance the local flora by the landscaping and replanting of native trees and bushes and open up historic sites so tourists can learn about the history and culture of the district. This is important in promoting our local and national culture to the world, and aligns with Tourism New Zealand’s objectives.
We understand there are some concerns from local residents about noise, traffic and car parking. However from attending the workshop hosted by the applicant and the answers to questions he provided, we feel that the impact of these will be mitigated & that Council is able to put in place appropriate conditions to manage these through the licensing & consenting processes.

Nga mihi,

Cafle Noble
Organisation: Legend

First Name: Sarah

Last Name: Matheson

On behalf of:

Postal Address:
PO Box 311

Suburb:

City:
Taupo

Country:
New Zealand

PostCode:
3330

eMail: 
sarah.m@legendhasit.co.nz

Daytime Phone:
07 281 2501

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

- SUPPORT
- OPPOSE

General Comment

Please see the attached letter.

Attached Documents

File
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend Fly Line submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hjapulua Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21 March 2019

LEGEND's support for Licence to Occupy at Hipapatua Recreation Reserve by Fly-Line

Legend fully supports 4nature NZ Ltd and its application for a license to occupy Hipapatua Reserve / Raids Farm in order to construct and operate a Fly-Line operation.

Legend is a Taupo based design, marketing, and web agency with many local, national, and international clients. We employ six full time staff and several contractors. All our staff have expressed verbal support and back this application.

We see the proposed development of the Fly-Line as a great opportunity for Taupo. As a local business, we rely on a strong local economy to be successful. New developments such as Fly-line means new business opportunities for Legend, and many other businesses in Taupo. Fly-Line will not only provide jobs when fully developed (estimated between 15-20) but valuable investment into the local economy through the use of local trades and businesses in the development phase, and beyond.

We work closely with many businesses in the neighbouring Wairakei Tourist Park and believe this attraction adds to the appeal of the area. Legend also works with many other tourism clients. We believe this activity will grow the reputation of the Taupō District, attracting more high value tourists to the area, again contributing to the growth of the local economy. The alignment with Tourism New Zealand’s objectives (to have activities that attract high net worth visitors) continues to promote Taupo on the international stage.

Nga mihi,

Sarah Matheson, director, Legend
Organisation: Towncentre Taupo
First Name: Julie
Last Name: McLeod
On behalf of: 
Postal Address: PO Box 2231
Suburb: 
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3351
eMail: julie@towncentretaupo.co.nz
Daytime Phone: 021415231

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
☑ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRRd Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?

Support/Oppose Granting of License
☑ SUPPORT
C OPPOSE

General Comment

Te Aerator Taupo fully supports Flyline in their efforts to bring to Taupo the very first flyline in New Zealand. After reading all the documentation, we believe that Flyline is a great fit for Taupo and the Hapupakiau Reserve. It is suitable for people of all ages, connects them with our natural environment and provides a unique skillor experience that is likely to attract visitors to Taupo. This can only be good for all of our Te Aerator Taupo members and the region as a whole.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial lease at Hapupakiau Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Name:
ian

Last Name:
Chamberlain

On behalf of:

Postal Address:
PO Box 2232
Suburb:

City:
Taupo
Country:
New Zealand
PostCode:
3351

eMail: *
ian@ianchamberlain.co.nz

Daytime Phone:
073783222

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
○ Yes
○ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRReD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?


Support/Oppose Granting of License
○ SUPPORT
○ OPPOSE
General Comment

From my understanding Rebel Parks was gifted to the people of Taupo to use as a venue. Over the last few years access has been closed to some of these areas due to overuse, and access to the kayak course has been closed more recently – resulting in no use by local taxpayers due to the inability to gain access. Now the council has decided to lease part of the site to commercial operators. This will impact definitely villains on public use of this site and will create even more users in a site the council has claimed was being overused in the first place. The best place for this proposed course is operation in Whakatane/Featherstone Park which was purposely set up for this type of operation.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial licence at Hapapatu Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Name:
Andrew & Sharon

Last Name:
Welch

On behalf of:

Postal Address:
99 Huka Falls Road, RD 4

Suburb:

City:
Taupo

Country:
New Zealand

PostCode:
3384

eMail: *
aswelch@xtra.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRReD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?

Support/Oppose Granting of License
☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE
General Comment

Please see attached letter.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial licence at Hipapalau Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial licence at Hipapalau Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18 March 2019.

Andrew and Sharon Welch
99 Hoaka Falls Road
R.D.A
TAUPO 3384

The Chief Executive Officer
Taupo District Council

PRIVATE Bag 2005
TAUPO 3352

ATTENTION: Nathan Morrie, Senior Reserves Planner

Dear Sir,

PROPOSAL TO GRANT A NEW COMMERCIAL LICENCE AT HIPAPATUA RECREATION RESERVE

We are neighbours living in a residential area adjacent to this reserve. On Sunday 17 March 2019 we attended a meeting on site with representatives of the company 4Nature NZ Ltd and other persons either affected by or promoting this proposal.

The Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan was adopted by Taupo District Council (TDC) in April 2012.

The site is Crown land vested in TDC and is Recreation Reserve. Relevant matters from the Plan that we wish to outline to you are:

1. This is an amenity landscape area and the public shall have freedom of entry and access; of course, subject to TDC discretion. However under this proposal an area of the Reserve will have restricted access.

2. Under Section 6 TDC will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties. We understand that we may be at the start of that process.

3. Under Recreational Values the Plan comments on the fact that the current use contracts with the nearby busy and highly modified areas. E.g. Intensive tourism and development on adjacent land – referring to the Wairakei Tourist Park. The current use was a feature to be retained not to be affected by such commercial amusement activities proposed by the applicant.

4. In the Primary Purpose of the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan there is no mention of the type of activity proposed by the applicant company.

5. Area B is referred to as the overflow camping area to be used when the main camping area, Area A, is full. With the proposed use of Area B by the applicant, that will no longer be available to contain overflow camping. That is contrary to the provisions in the current Plan.
6. Under the proposal part of the Reserve will be closed for camping. TDC may close part or all of the Reserve for overnight camping but that discretion the Plan suggests, is only for safety and management issues resulting from the activity of camping. Not for the introduction of an amusement commercial activity. So closing Area B is contrary to the Plan.

7. The Plan does allow the area to be closed for the protection and remedial works to the Reserve.

8. TDC can consider a commercial activity if it is compatible with the Hipapatau Reserve Management plan but can only give consent if it is aligns with the primary purpose of the Recreation Reserve. Is not the primary purpose camping? By removing Area B for the proposed commercial use the area for camping is reduced and that does not align with the primary purpose.

9. Under Vegetation in the Plan there is a comment that non-native vegetation, such as wilding pines will gradually be removed. The applicant is seeking to establish an activity that retains the wilding pines and in fact will use the pines to support structures.

10. At the meeting the applicant suggested that vegetation such as blackberry will be retained to be used as a natural security barrier; for example along the road frontage. The Plan states where necessary introduced species will be removed and the re-establishment of native vegetation will be promoted. The blackberry along the road frontage is an eyesore.

11. The Plan states that the wilding pines present a health and safety risk and that they will be removed and replaced over time with native species. The applicant seeks to retain the pines and utilise them to support structures.

12. In the Plan TDC will restrict facilities in the Reserve to those types and locations identified in the Concept Plan. There is nothing in the Concept Plan about the type of commercial amusement activities suggested by the applicant.

13. TDC will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in the Hipapatau Reserve Management Plan. There is nothing in the Plan that refers to a policy that may approve the type of activity proposed by the applicant.

14. The Management Plan refers to the opportunity to undertake a review under Section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977. That in our submission may be the place to commence consideration of the proposal.

15. The type of activity proposed would be better located in the Wairakei Tourist Park or perhaps on the other side of the Waikato River in the TDC Reserve at Spa Park where there are proper toilets and other existing infrastructure and there is no conflict with camping.

We wish to be kept informed of any developments or matters associated with the proposal put forward by the applicant.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew and Sharon Welch
First Name: Robert Douglas & Elizabeth Ann
Last Name: Bleakley
On behalf of: 
Postal Address: 103 Huka Falls Road, RD 4
Suburb: 
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
Postal Code: 3384
Email: rdbleakley@gmail.com
Daytime Phone: 07 378 8716
Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License
☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE

General Comment
See attached letter.

Attached Documents
File
R06 TDC Reid Farm
| File | Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hepatitis Recreation Reserve |
PROPOSAL TO GRANT A NEW COMMERCIAL LICENCE AT HIPAPATUA RECREATION RESERVE.

This submission is being made by individuals

Robert Douglas & Elizabeth Ann BLEAKLEY

103 Huka Falls Road (adjoints Hipapatua Recreational Reserve)
TAUPO
New Zealand
Postcode: 3384

Email: rdbleakley@gmail.com

Daytime Phone: 378 8716

We do not wish to speak in support of this submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission points:
We OPPOSE the proposal to grant a new commercial licence at Hipapatua/Reid’s Farm Recreational Reserve.

Our opposition to this proposal covers two main areas:

1. The building of a Flyline does not meet the objectives of Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan.
2. We do not oppose the building of a Flyline in the Taupo area, but believe there are better areas to site it than in the Hipapatua Recreational Reserve.

With regard to 1, we comment specifically:

6.1.v. The council must consider the effect of the proposed Flyline on neighbouring properties. Nowhere in the information are details of car parking and traffic management. During busy holiday periods vehicles overflowing from Huka Falls Carpark reduce the road to a single lane at best. Also there is no information that there has been research on noise levels from this activity. These are two examples where the proposed activity could have adverse effects on neighbouring properties.

6.2.1.i. This reserve is a place for outdoor nature based recreational activities. We do not believe that a Flyline meets these criteria.

6.2.2.ii. Area B is designated for overnight camping when area A is full. The predominate use of Hipapatua Recreational Reserve is overnight camping. This area will be lost for camping if the licence is granted.

6.2.2.v. No permanent or semi-permanent structures will be permitted. A flyline, café and associated structures do not meet the provision of this clause.
6.2.3.i. The reserve will be accessible to the public. The granting of this licence will restrict public access to at least part of this reserve.

6.2.4.iv. Any activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose. The primary purpose, in terms of the management plan, is overnight camping. Removing area B from overnight camping will reduce the area available for the primary purpose.

6.3.1.i. Non-native vegetation will gradually be removed from the reserve as resourcing allows. The granting of this licence will reduce the council ability to meet its obligations under this clause. We understand that many of the existing non-native trees will be used to hold up the Flyline.

6.3.1.vii. This clause covers management of vegetation and promotion of safety. The trees in this reserve are self-sown pine and as such have a limited lifespan. There is ample evidence on the bush floor of these trees falling in strong winds. Suspending a Flyline from them may constitute a safety risk.

6.4.1.1. Vehicles are not permitted off formed road or in areas designated for overnight camping. Area B is designated for overnight camping and therefore should not be used as a carpark.

With regard to 2, we are not opposed to the construction of a Flyline but consider that there are better areas within the Wairakei Tourist Park for such a venture, away from residential areas.

Conclusions:
There is a statutory requirement under section 41(11) of the Reserves Act 1977 for the Taupo District Council “to comply with the management plan for the reserve”. This application does not meet several provisions of the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan. It appears to us that this application does not contain enough specific information, particularly in the areas of traffic control, parking, noise and effect on adjoining properties for the council to make an informed decision on this application. For these reason we oppose the granting of a commercial licence at the Hipapatua Recreational Reserve.
First Name: Peter

Last Name: Gardner

On behalf of: The New Zealand and international travelling comm

Postal Address:
17 Epsom Road
Suburb: Hokowhitu
City: Palmerston North
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 4410

eMail: pelegygardner@gmail.com

Daytime Phone: 0274742474

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing? Yes
I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

© SUPPORT
© OPPOSE

General Comment

I am born and raised in New Zealand and living in Palmerston North. My family regularly travels to keep for holidays and events and love the scenic camping opportunities that Rexile Park provides. It is the ONLY free camping site in the area and is a very rare and lovely place to relax and swim away from the harsh and busy of town. I think this is a tremendous resource and I believe granting a commercial license here will be a huge loss to the local and International community in Town.

Yes Tourism is on the rise but I believe we need to keep grand places like this to remain as treasures reserves in a fast growing busy and commercialistic country. Also, I believe this reserve was donated to the council for reserve purposes. What a shame if the face to the person who generously donated this Council members. Pull your heads in, unless you are willing to offer free free free camping space in your own homes then keep Managing and providing this resource. Rexile Farm is a truly excellent place and shouldn’t be lost.
### Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Lipoapatia Recreation Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
First Name: Tony and Corrie

Last Name: Berg

On behalf of:

Postal Address: 97 Huka Falls Road, RD 4

Suburb:

City: Taupo

Country: New Zealand

PostCode: 3384

eMail: berg97@xtra.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 07 378 9300

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
- [ ] Yes
- [x] I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License
- [ ] SUPPORT
- [x] OPPOSE

General Comment

Please see attached letter.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony and Corrie Berg Proposal to grant a new commercial licence at Hapapapa roadside farm recreation reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipagatia Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Nathan Mouri, Senior Reserves Planner
Taupo District Council
Private Bag 2006
TAUNO 3352

PROPOSAL TO GRANT A NEW COMMERCIAL LICENCE
AT HIPAPUA/ REID'S FARM RECREATION RESERVE.

Dear Sir,

We are neighbours living in a residential area adjacent to the above Reserve.
We have attended a meeting in the Council Chambers and at the meeting where we met the applicant, Mr Alex Schmid of Flyline.

We are aware of some of the provisions of the Hipapua Reserve Management Plan, which was adopted by the Taupo District Council in April 2017.
We understand that two areas are reserved as camping areas, areas "A" and area "B", with the former camping area on the river bank now designated as a public picnic and swimming spot.
There is free public access to all of these areas.
We are regular visitors to this recreation area. We take to the spot often with our grandchildren.

Under the proposal, camping area "B" will no longer be available for camping. There has been a considerable increase in the number of people using the camping areas and this trend is likely to continue. Desperate campers who cannot find a suitable spot will "help themselves" and camp in other spots. This has already happened.

There is a serious danger that the recreational area by the river will be used for parking by visitors to the proposed Flyline, especially for campervans and buses, which will have problems parking in the former area "B". That would totally destroy the popular day-time area, where people pic-nick, swim and where the kayaks (private, school parties and commercial) arrive at the end of their river foray.
A lot of tourists driving campervans are quite ignorant. They can drive forward, but often have problems reversing or joining. We have a lot of bad experiences with these tourists on our short, narrow private road.

We are also concerned with the claims made by Mr Alex Schmid in the flyer: "Learning about Maori history, culture of this place, nature; eco-tourism, superb sustainable tourism, temporary retreat into nature to free and expand the mind, support general wellbeing, protecting natural flora and fauna".

The area involved carries ageing trees — Lobolly Pine or Pinus Taeda — with an undergrowth mainly blackberries, which Mr. Schmid intends to keep and promote as a "security fence". 
We believe that the area is really unsuitable for the proposed Fly-Line operation. We think that the only reason this area was selected is to catch the Huka Falls visitors on their way in or out. This Huka Falls is the most popular visitor site in the country.

Our main concerns are the following:

**PARKING**

Concrete footpath/cycling track

The new concrete footpath/cycle track is used a lot. We use it for cycling and walking. In the area concerned, there is just a narrow strip of tarmac between the road (Huka Falls Road) and the concrete footpath. Even at this stage, the track is used for parking by campervans. A dotted yellow line and "no parking" signs may help, but it would not stop some of the drivers using it for parking.

Road reserve in front of 105 Huka Falls Road

This area is already used for parking from time to time. The proposed activity would cause more people to park here. It is interesting to note that this strip has also been used for camping.

Lower recreational area

Our main concern is that the lower recreational area by the river will turn into a parking lot. We believe that this is part of the plan. The applicant has set out 62 numbered markers which follow a proposed track, going from the bus area, past the Fly-Line ticket office, down an easy slope to the river area. Anytime parking there would have to walk just a very short distance to reach the proposed Fly-Line ticket office, Cafe and Toilet facilities. It will double the applicant's parking capacity at no expense to him. It will totally destroy a very popular public entertainment area.

**CAMPING OUTSIDE DESIGNATED AREAS**

The number of people using the area for camping has drastically increased over the last few years. Removing area "B" will add to the problem of finding space for additional campers. This will result in people camping in other spots in the area.

**NIGHT-TIME OPERATION**

We strongly object to any proposed night time operation of a commercial activity in our residential area.

Yours faithfully,

Tony and Carrie Berg
First Name:
Shona & Ken

Last Name:
Bleakley

On behalf of:

Postal Address:
101 Huka Falls Road, RD 4
Suburb:
City:
Taupo
Country:
New Zealand
PostCode:
3384

eMail:
bleakleyfamily@xtra.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
☑ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRReD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?

Support/Oppose Granting of License
☐ SUPPORT
☑ OPPOSE
General Comment

Please see attached letter.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Fly Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapatua Recreation Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission: Hipapatua/Reids’ Farm Recreation reserve, 157 Huka Falls Road

8 April 2019

Name Shona & Ken Bleakley
Address 101 Huka Falls Road, Taupo 3384
Email bleakleyfamily@xtra.co.nz
Phone 027 474 1994
Present Yes I wish to speak at the submission hearing
Status We oppose the Fly-line proposal

Introduction

As neighbours we wish to oppose the building of a fly-line tourism adventure experience at 157 Huka Falls Road. We have no objection to the proposal in principle, it is the location we object to.

Our reasons for objecting are

I. Lack of integrity of process
II. Proposal does not comply with Management Plan of Hipapatua/Reids’ Farm
III. Minimal detail of proposal
IV. Traffic

I. Lack of Integrity of Process

i. In 2016 we were invited, as neighbours of Hipapatua/Reids’ Farm, to have input into the management plan of the area. We attended meetings, had discussions about the Council’s vision of the area, reviewed proposals and generally felt consulted and involved in the process of the Taupo District Council forming a policy to create a Management Plan. This reserve management plan was adopted in mid-2017, with a life of ten years.

ii. It was with some dismay we saw as part of the Agenda of Ordinary Council Meeting, 26 February 2019, the statement on p 10 “the location is considered by officers to be an appropriate one at this time.” (Referring to the proposed Fly-Line location.) By whose measure is this appropriate? Do the council officers have the authority to ignore a plan that has been formally adopted by the Taupo District Council?

iii. The proposal is contrary to the Management Plan in a variety of ways:

II. Management Plan – numbers as used in the plan

i. The general tenor of the proposed use of Hipapatua is that of quietness, informal use (3.2), “in contrast with nearby busy and highly modified areas.” (6.2) It is difficult to see how up to 200 people per hour fits in with a vision of quietness. (Information about number of people from Fly-Line.)

ii. The management plan states (6.2.2) that “No permanent or semi-permanent structures will be permitted.” It is unlikely that the Fly-Line could exist without these structures.

iii. Management Plan 6.2.3 says “The reserve will be accessible to the public.” A commercial venture will, by its nature, have locked and inaccessible areas to reduce vandalism and for health and safety reasons.
iv. Management Plan 6.2.4 mentions the possibility of commercial ventures in Hipapatua, with the explanation that the events envisaged will be “short term and one-off.” Although this is part of the Explanation and not the policy, it should be noted that the policy refers to any activity will “not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose...” The reserve’s primary purpose is for freedom camping, day activities and quiet enjoyment of the environment. This commercial venture is not within the parameters mentioned in the Management Plan.

v. Management Plan 6.3.1 Explanation mentions that the presence of the pines on Hipapatua “presents a health and safety risk to users and neighbouring properties.” We acknowledge that this information is part of the Explanation and not part of the policy but if it is true, then how can this proposal even be considered? The Fly-Line proposal site is in amongst the pine trees. How could Council Officers eighteen months ago write in the Management Plan that the pine trees are a health and safety risk and now say the pines are suitable for structures to run through them and put up to 200 people a day at risk?

III. Minimal Detail of Written Information

i. There is no detail about the boundaries of the proposal. How far is it set back off the road? Where and what size will the signs be? What is the size of the proposed launch area? What materials will it be built with? How is the Fly-Line to be attached, to poles or to the existing trees? Has there been an ecological analysis, do we know if there are any bats, geckos, glow-worms or anything else in the area?

ii. The inadequacy of the information available makes it difficult for the TDC to make an informed decision about the proposal. Perhaps there is information which we, as neighbours are not aware of?

IV. Traffic

i. On-site parking is required for any commercial venture. Where is this going to be? If it is proposed that Area B on the plan is used, then once again it is contrary to the Management Plan, which allows for Area B to be used for overflow freedom camping.

ii. Traffic at Huka Falls quite clearly demonstrates the possible problems that will occur with another tourist attraction on Huka Falls Road. The overflow from the Huka Falls carpark creates a hazard, with ears perched on the roadside and people walking along the road. The presence of a café and the possibility of night flights at the Fly-Line will increase numbers of vehicles and the timing of the problem each day.

Conclusion

We acknowledge that tourism is important for Taupo’s economy and we think the concept of the venture is a good fit with Wairakei Park, but not at Hipapatua.

This proposal impacts on the character of the residential neighbourhood, we have chosen to live here to enjoy a quiet lifestyle. We should be able to rely on the Council to act within the vision and policies in its own Management Plan; the proposal for the Fly-Line does not conform with the plan in a variety of ways mentioned in this submission.
Organisation: Wairakei Tourist Park

First Name: Sam

Last Name: Clemerson

On behalf of: Wairakei Tourist Park

Postal Address: PO Box 311

Suburb:

City: Taupo

Country: New Zealand

PostCode: 3351

eMail: sam@legendhasit.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 021 178 4891

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes

☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☒ SUPPORT

☐ OPPOSE

General Comment

Please see the attached letter.

Attached Documents

File
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yarravel Tourist Park Fly Line submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hpapalua Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 April, 2019

**Wairakei Tourist Park operators support for Licence to Occupy at Hipapatua Recreation Reserve**

Wairakei Tourist Park (WTP) operators support 4nature NZ Ltd’s application for a license to occupy Hipapatua Reserve / Reids Farm and bid to construct and operate a Fly-Line operation.

The WTP group consists of 14 commercial operators, and exists to increase the number of visitors, increase visitor time, and increase the overall spend in the area. This is achieved through collaborative marketing and events.

Data collected in 2018 shows that:

The **14 commercial businesses employ approximately 255 FTEs.**
The approximate wage bill for these operators combined is $7.7m per annum.
The turnover for the operators within the park is approximately $46m per annum.

**Compliance fees accumulated for each business is approximately $1.94m per annum.**

This collaborative group contributes a significant amount to the Taupō district and economy. As a collective voice, we would like to demonstrate our support for the Fly-Line operation (please see footnote for a full list of operators who support this initiative).

An attraction such as Fly-Line will attract more visitors to Hipapatua Reserve / Reids Farm, and we believe many of those visitors will go on to visit businesses in the neighbouring WTP area — increasing time spent in the Park and visitor spend.

WTP operators support this venture as it will not only will provide jobs when completed (estimated between 15-20) but valuable investment into the local economy through the use of local businesses in the development phase, and throughout its ongoing operation.

WTP understands Fly-Line plans to open up historic sites so tourists can learn about the history and culture of the district. We believe this is important for promoting our local and national culture to the world, and aligns with Tourism New Zealand’s objectives. However, we would like to see evidence that proper consultation has or will take place with mana whenua.

Fly-Line will attract high value tourists to the area, again contributing to the growth of the local economy. The alignment with Tourism New Zealand’s objectives (to have activities that attract high net worth visitors) continues to promote the Taupō district on the international stage.
Kind regards,

Sam Clemerson
On behalf of WTP operators

Operators which support this submission:

- Craters of the Moon
- FOUR B
- Helicopter Tours
- Huka Falls Jet
- Huka Falls River Cruise
- Huka Honey Hive
- Huka Prawn Park
- Rock N Ropes
- Taupo Wake Park
- Wairakei Golf & Sanctuary
- Wairakei Natural Thermal Valley
- Wairakei Resort
First Name: Shirley
Last Name: Arden

On behalf of: 

Postal Address: 95 Huka Falls Road, RD 4
Suburb: 
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3384

Email: shryls@hotmail.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 02041377791

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRReD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?


Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE
General Comment

Please see attached letter

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Aiden Fly line submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapahia Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re: Hipapatua / Reid's Farm Recreation Reserve

I'm against any licence being granted for fly-line activity on the southern end of the reserve as I feel I would be adversely affected by this.

1/ As I live above Reid's Farm, the noise of voices would carry along way, and with the view to have 45,000 people per year would be very disruptive and invade on my peaceful, quiet surroundings.

2/ If this was to be a seven day a week operation, it would be constant with activity and noise.

3/ At your February '19 Council meeting it was suggested the operation fly-line would perhaps put a proposal forward so they could also extend the operation to weekends as well, compounding my concerns.

4/ I also believe it will have a negative effect on the value of my property and surrounding properties. I myself purchased my property for its rural aspects on my lifestyle block.
5/ I'm having difficulty with the fact that a Public Reserve grounds can be used for commercial use and profit. As I do not know the legality around these matters, I feel this should be explained fully.

I appreciate the opportunity to put my submission forward.

Thankyou.
Shirley Arden.
2nd April 2019.
First Name:
Barry and Anne

Last Name:
Findlay

On behalf of:

Postal Address:
124 Clearwater Lane, RD 4

Suburb:

City:
Taupo

Country:
New Zealand

PostCode:
3384

eMail: *
bfindlay@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
• Yes

• I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRReD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g., access, technology)?

Support/Oppose Granting of License

• SUPPORT

• OPPOSE
### Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feletay Submission to Taupo District Council 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipahatua Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission to Taupo District Council from Anne Findlay and Barry Findlay regarding the proposal to grant a commercial licence at Hipapatua / Reid’s Farm Recreation Reserve

We, Anne and Barry Findlay, have reservations about the Flyline development that T.D.C. proposes to grant a commercial licence for (subject to consultation). Three things bother us about this application – the lack of information about the proposal in general (and particularly about the safety risk presented by the pine trees), possible ecological effects, and noise.

I will cover each of these in turn.

1 Lack of information

The consultation with neighbours occurred on Sunday the 17th of March. This was a one hour session for locals to ask questions. We had a list of over 40 questions but because of the short time available only 14-15 were replied to, mainly by Kylie Hawker Green and Scott Davenport from the Council. Most of the questions couldn’t be answered. When asked about the hours of operation the reply was starting at 9.00am but no finishing time. The answers are too vague. Jenni Funnell asked how was the site going to be kept safe from vandalism? Alex Schmid’s reply was the blackberry along the roadside would remain to keep people out but there would be a gate or entrance at the tower for maintenance. Jenni also said she was concerned that viewers would drive along Huka Falls Road near the tower entrance and park there to watch their children or family and congest the area. Contrary to the presentation to the T.D.C. meeting on February the 26th it appears that the area is not going to be remediated at all, but that the blackberry will remain to keep people out.

We were told at the end of the consultation that any questions we had could be emailed to Alex Schmid. I sent an email to him to find out if his Arborist had checked all the trees in the vicinity of the proposed Flyline and did he need to cut down any unsafe trees?

His reply to me:

Alex Schmid | Fly-Line <schmid.alex@fly-line.co.nz> 18, 2019, 10:00 PM (3 hours ago)

Hello Barry,

Thank you for your email.
Any questions or requests are a part of the official process and thus they have to be sent directly to the council.

I hope you understand.

Many thanks.

Kind regards.

As I couldn’t get an answer from Alex Schmid, I phoned several listed Taupo Arborists. Even after many phones calls and messages left not one has returned my call. Treescape was recommended by the D.O.C. They replied telling me they had been asked to quote to remove limbs and any unsafe timber/trees in the reserve. I asked the Treescape Arborist if he knew what variety of pine tree they were. He didn’t know. I also asked Alex at the consultation meeting if he knew what variety they were. He told me it was a Latin name and I wouldn’t understand it. The Treescape Arborist also said even after testing, pine trees can still fail.

Quite apart from an objections we have to the Flyline we are also concerned about the quality of the trees and possible injuries that these trees may cause.

First how many Councillors have been to view this piece of forestry?

You as Councillors need to ask yourselves “Would I want these trees near my house?”

The answer is most definitely NO! So we ask you why would you want 45,000 people a year at risk beneath them? It’s crazy. Even if you opened walking tracks for the public it would be a huge unnecessary risk. They need to be removed, that is the only safe option. They are past their use by date. That fact is acknowledged in Section 6.3 (page 19) of Council’s own Reserve Management Plan where it says:

“The presence of these pines presents a health and safety risk to users and neighbouring properties. The nature of the pine tree growth also inhibits the establishment of a significant understory to support native regeneration. They will be removed and replaced overtime with native species appropriate to the area.

It would be part of due diligence I would expect, to take test core samples or use radar to check for rot, and get an idea of the strength of each tree being used. I am not aware that this will be done. Research also shows that mature pine plantations should not be thinned. Thinning at this stage causes dieback on the root systems of the surrounding trees. The other consideration is how much load will the tree tops take when the Flyline has a lot of riders close together? It could be sufficient to cause stem failure when the foliage is loaded
with water. An Engineer is needed to assess the load on these old pine trees and assess the stress the trees will manage, bearing in mind a worst case scenario. My conclusion is that if the reserve management plan has already identified that these trees are a health and safety risk (and should be removed) then they are not suitable for this type of activity. We would be less concerned if the trunks were straight and had larger circumspheres but that is only found in other varieties of pines.

Not all pine varieties are equal. There are large differences in strength and characteristics.

After an internet search we believe that the majority of the trees are Loblolly pines in the reserve. [Pinus Taeda]. This variety of pine grows to 50m tall growing at approx. half a metre a year. Another feature of this tree is that it sheds its lower limbs as it grows. Not just dead branches but also some that are green which is quite normal. The trees lean due to wind and cold temperatures. The trees in the Reserve mostly lean to the northwest. The crown is probably 1.5 - 2 metres overhanging the base of the trunk on some trees. The trees are shallow rooted in the pumice and it takes a 90m.ph wind to flatten the average tree in good soil conditions. Because of the tall thin trunk these trees are susceptible to trunk failure at much lower wind speeds. If they are Pinus Taeda you will find the growth rings on the southern side are so close together you will not be able to count them. On the northern side the rings are widely spaced and easily counted. It is colder temperatures that cause the tree to lean like this at this altitude. If you have been into this stand of trees you will find the snapped trunks from previous wind events. [see photos attached]. This occurs when the needles at the top of the tree carry a great weight of water after rain and when the soil is wet. A gust of wind can break the stem [trunk] in these conditions. If one of the trees that cables are attached to fails, it is likely to bring down those close to them by way of the cables attached. This is serious risk for the whole venture. Who will be at fault if a top blows out, let alone a stem failure? It's an accident waiting to happen. Besides this there is the danger of cones dropping from a great height as the canopy is at the apex of the tree. If the ride is at a height of 15m the cones will be falling 25m so they will do damage.

2 Impacts on Birdlife

In the 15 years we have lived here at 124 Clearwater Lane, there has always been a resident Ruru, [Morepork—probably a pair]. They inhabit the rough area in the reserve across from our residential area and they occasionally roost
and call in both residential areas at night. It’s something residents talk about. Once its habitat is lost it will move on. Even though this bird is not endangered in New Zealand, loss of habitat means reduced numbers. The reserve is also the breeding ground of the Californian Quail. Our subdivisions are the feeding ground for this bird. Up to 40 at a time feed on our lawn throughout the year. As the site is in a vegetated river corridor area, I would expect there may be other fauna and flora of value that needs to be considered. That does not appear, though, to have been thought about at all.

3 Noise

Another annoyance that will affect us will be noise [from traffic, people shouting]. We moved to Clearwater Lane 15 years ago to a quiet rural-residential property. We would expect to have the same quality of life here even if the T.D.C allows the development of the Flyline. [See Management Plan for Hipapataua Reserve, Policy 6.1.1: “Taupo District Council will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties”]. To be able to have the same quiet enjoyment the T.D.C must take steps to ensure this happens by putting in place conditions in the lease if it is given the green light. Although we are further back than the houses fronting Huka Falls Road we have a clear open view of about 200 metres and the noise travels up through there. We will look down on the area where it seems that the tower will be built plus the return mechanism. As yet we don’t have a clear idea of where the return pipeline for harnesses will run. Will it be visual to us? Will it be close to the road? How will it be kept safe so it doesn’t interfere or cause injury to the other users of the reserve? It all seems a very rushed, poor consultation, very few facts, no in depth of study of the trees that are going to be used. This is a vital consideration!

Other Points

There are areas where there are no trees where the Flyline is predicted to go and it will mean manmade structures will have to be built to carry it. This would extend over the upper area where the overflow campsite is. How is this going to appear? It certainly will not be in keeping with the aims of the Hipapataua management plan. What we are going to have here is an amusement park ride, not a reserve as is detailed in the management plan.

We also question the 15-20 employees. We suspect that there will be one person selling tickets and coffee, one person loading harness’s to the return line and one working on the tower. All probably on the minimum wage. At the
consultation meeting we were told there would be 5 employees. Not 15-20 as Councillors were told at the presentation.

We think the benefits of the Flyline were overstated at the presentation to Council. There is not going to be any native forest to see, perhaps scenes of the river, but nothing except blackberry and old pine trees. In the summary brochure about the Flyline it states that it will be a “memorable experience discovering New Zealand’s nature and scenery from a unique perspective”. Section 4 the Hipapatau management plan sets out the vision for the reserve and this is expanded on in the concept plan (showing this area as “restoration area” and the policies in the plan. We are strongly of the opinion that an amusement ride is not consistent with the vision, concept plan, or policies of the plan.

There is also the problem of the visibility of the return line for the harness. It will not look natural. At the T.D.C. meeting in February it was stated that a Resource Consent would not be needed. Although the very general site plan that has been circulated doesn’t even show the boundaries of the site, from looking at the pegs marking the line and tower and return line they would be inside the 25m mark and that means that a Resource Consent would be needed – but of course there is no guarantee that us neighbours would be involved in that process.

I do not expect this to go ahead but if it does, I would like to see these conditions to the Lease:

1. The Flyline will be a straight downhill run not having a roller coast type Flyline but a steady downhill run. The roller coaster is what gives people excitement. This is the reason people yell /whoop! Contrary to what the developer says, we have viewed video of northern hemisphere Flylines and the beginning gradient on those can give clients sufficient buzz to shout and yell. In the case of this site, next to residential properties, we would like to see a gradient that works for the system without causing people to shout and yell.

2. No music.

3. No generator running all day/night.

4. No night use and strict hours to between 9.00am and 5 pm.

5. That the tower will be built sufficient distance away from the road so that people are not tempted to stop along the side of the road/footpath and watch. Cars already pull up on the footpath and most mountain
bikers leaving the redwoods track ride on this footpath for safety as the road is narrow plus a small number of camper pedestrians from the reserve use it.

6 That the tower be built (ie colour, height, distance from boundary) so that is not visible at all from beyond the site.

Further, before any lease or licence is signed the T.D.C should ensure that the developer of this site pays for sufficient toilets, water supply, and any site works, paved car parks, upgraded entrance onto Huka Falls Road, and rubbish removal and meets all Work Safe requirements. The rate payers should not be asked to contribute to any of these.

The T.D.C needs to also state that they will not be responsible for damage to the Developers infrastructure in the case of storm damage.

We believe that that if the matters that we have raised in our submission (and the other issues raised by our neighbours), had been presented to the Parks and Reserve Committee first, instead of being placed on the Council agenda at the February 26th meeting, a lot of time and energy and financial cost would have been saved by both the Flyline supporters and the local residents.

If the Parks and Reserve Committee had viewed the application for a licence to occupy initially, they would have referred to the reserve management plan and looked at the trees in the reserve and noted how dangerous they were.

We also think that as the Flyline proponents opened up this reserve the T.D.C should put up warning notices as the bulldozed tracks now allow the public access to a dangerous area [until the blackberry regrows preventing access].

Please note one of us would like time to speak at the submission hearing on the 16th of April.

Anne Findlay and Barry Findlay
124 Clearwater Lane, Taupo
Dated 28th March 2019
The following pages show photographs taken recently showing the weakness of these trees.

Figure: Staining tree marked for use by flyline
Figure 7: Trees fall across line of the proposed flyline a few years ago near the lake.
Figure 5: tree to be used as aged stock by digger Compress casts the tree.
First Name: Graham

Last Name: Dewes

On behalf of: SG & PK Dewes

Postal Address:
265 Clearwater Lane
Suburb: RD 4
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
Postal Code: 3384

eMail: gdewes@xnet.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 64211322847

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes

☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT

☒ OPPOSE

General Comment

We feel that the proposed commercial venture would negatively affect us and the area where we live due to increased traffic in the area, inefficient parking, noise pollution, additional rubbish in the area and we are hoops the Operator and the Taupo District Council would manage these issues.

Attached Documents

File
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapiatua Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Name:
Yubo

Last Name:
Liu

On behalf of:

Postal Address:
16 Chateau Crescent
Suburb:
Rangatira Park
City:
Taupo
Country:
New Zealand
PostCode:
3330

eMail:
yubo@nzg.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE

Attached Documents

File
Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapaia Recreation Reserve
First Name: Hamish
Last Name: Funnell
On behalf of: 
Postal Address: 105 Huka Falls Road, RD 4
Suburb: 
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3384
eMail: hamish@tls.net.nz
Daytime Phone: 021920084
Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing? ☐ Yes
☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License
☐ SUPPORT
☒ OPPOSE

General Comment
I oppose the proposal in its current form.

There has been inadequate consideration of how Flyline and the council will manage traffic and parking around the proposed launch site. I accept that the intention is to have customers park in the “overflow” section of Hipapatua reserve and walk up through the trees, however the proposed
launch platform will be in full view of the road. It is natural to assume that onlookers and supporters will stop to watch the activity, preventing pedestrians and cyclists using the footpath. If the proposal is allowed to proceed I would want consideration to be given to moving the platform further from the road to obscure it from views well as immediate controls – planting and barriers – put in place to limit visual exposure to the road and footpath along with measures to prevent parking on the footpath and grass verge directly to the south of the reserve, as well as the grass verge on the western side of the road.

In addition to the visual impact, noise from the participants in the activity is also likely to represent a significant degradation to the amenity value of the reserve. Adding to this is the fact that the applicant is either unable or unwilling to give an indication of the proposed operating hours, other than the application indicating an intention/proposal to operate on occasion at night. I am concerned for the impact on our quality of life if the application is successful, perhaps looking to the current operating hours of the Bungy might provide guidance for how this has been addressed in the past.

While I am largely supportive of the Flyline business coming to Taupo, I am concerned that there is insufficient information available to demonstrate the impact on the affected parties has been adequately considered or how these issues will be managed to minimise impact on the affected parties.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hapipahau Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Name: Lesley

Last Name: Beacock

On behalf of: Lesley Beacock

Postal Address: 184 Ferndale Way

Suburb: Rangatira Park

City: Taupo

Country: New Zealand

PostCode: 3384

eMail: * lesleybeacock@gmail.com

Daytime Phone: 0273300228

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing? 
☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRReD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?

I will have an advocate speaking on my behalf.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE
General Comment

Please find my submission Opposing the Preliminary Proposal on Hippsala Reserve attached below and the submission presented by Joanna Lewis also attached.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. Besock - Submission Against Hippsala Reserve Fly Line April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Lewis - Planner - Hippsala Reserve Management Plan Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial lease at Hippsala Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
184 Ferndale Way
Taupo
3384

This objection submission is to be delivered at the public meeting, by an advocate of the submitter, on their behalf.

My name is Jennifer Jones and I am delivering this opposition on behalf of Lesley Beacock. The opinions contained within are those of Mrs Lesley Beacock.

Submission in objection to the Taupo District Council Re: Application for a license to occupy Hipapatua Reid’s Farm Recreation Reserve for private commercial tourism activity - Fly line

My submission in objection to the Taupo District Council approving this application is on the basis of the following aspects:

- Contamination on the site
- Instability of pine trees
- The effect of native wildlife in the area
- Inconsistencies in the information provided in the proposal by interested parties
- Development concepts which are contrary to the intentions identified in the Hipapatua Reid’s Farm Reserve Plan

Contamination on the site

On the 26th of February 2019 at the Taupo District Council Hearing, in her introductory speech to the councillors, the applicants’ spokeswoman from Enterprise Great Lake Taupo stated that “to refer to the site as a neglected shambles would be an understatement” and went on to state that they “found two abandoned cars and lots of other tipped rubbish whilst they were examining the suitability of the site for the proposed activity”. I do hope they were wearing sufficient PPE as having lived directly facing the proposed site, across Huka Falls Road, for 17 years - I can only agree with that statement, however the severity of the of the neglect and misuse of the land has been severely underestimated.

I would think it is highly probable that all manner of serious contaminants, including but not limited to farming, building and demolition waste, which potentially contain hazardous substances such as asbestos and other materials that contain chemicals that can endanger human health or the environment if not properly disposed.

Drug paraphernalia, farming waste, cars, washing machines, who’s to say what else could be present in the illegally fly tipped materials that have built up over the past few decades?

Given the history of the sites “long term neglect” (as confirmed by the applicants’ spokeswoman from Enterprise Great Lake Taupo) and subsequent fly tipping, a full and detailed site investigation under the Resource Management National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (NESCS) Regulations 2011 should be required prior to consideration of any such commercial activity by the Taupo District Council to ensure the health and safety of the public on the site.
Instability of pine trees

My second point, equalling the first in its severity, is that pine trees are a dangerously inappropriate location in which to immerse the general public. The pine trees in this particular reserve have been referred to by the Senior Reserves’ Planner as “grisly old pines which should be ripped out”. A view which is shared by DOC and Greening Taupo, who are working hard to eradicate these wilding species which “threaten to permanently alter the unique landscapes that are only found in New Zealand”.4

This particular area of trees is dangerously unstable. The trees have been falling over and or snapping off for several years. Looking at the area you can see that the majority of the trees are already growing at somewhat precarious angles, suggesting that the risk of them becoming unstable is drastically increased. This presents an extreme risk to the public if they are under them. If the trees were to fall onto the fly line then a very serious accident could occur.

Will the Taupo District Council be indemnified against claims arising from a death or serious injury on the reserve caused by lack of sensibility toward activity in a hazardous area?

The recent and unconsented “exploratory” earth works on the site undertaken by the applicant, have clearly and quite extensively damaged the root systems of several remaining trees.

A tree care company with more than 30 years of Certified Arborist experience says the following of pine trees: (abridged)

“What causes pine trees to fall over? You may be surprised. There are two reasons why pine trees are susceptible to falling over.

Pine trees + damaged roots = death sentence for pines

Pines grow best in a forest setting, not as standalone trees. If you disturb the soil around a pine’s root base, it can easily damage the root system and start the deterioration process. A damaged root system is often a death sentence for a pine tree. Even compacting the soil around a pine tree can sometimes be enough to damage its roots.

Pine trees + shallow soil = no depth for stability

Pine trees also need deep soil to sink its roots into for stability. A pine tree’s root system can extend away from the tree at a distance as much as twice the height of the tree. Pines tend to have a deep tap root with a much shallower (300mm or shallower from the ground surface level) root system. The shallower roots follow cracks and water spots for the pine to quench its thirst.

If the tap root does not have at least two feet of penetrable ground, its strength is only found in the shallow roots extending away from the tree base. Shallow roots and no firm tap root depth is a recipe for toppling under high winds. A certified arborist can determine the best course of action to protect your tree, your property, and especially your family from any potential fall...”.4

It is common knowledge, and as anyone with a garden and a spade in the Taupo District will know, there is very little topsoil on top of the pumice substrate, which in most places is impenetrable to roots.

Have these trees been declared safe and healthy for long term public access?
Was resource consent granted for the applicant to operate earthmoving machinery on this public reserve? As noted in the Hipapataua Reid’s Farm Reserve Management Plan under section 6.3 “Reserve management policy and implementation - Environmental Values” it is noted that;

6.3.1.vi. “Any person(s) found damaging or removing plants from the reserves without authorisation may be asked to leave the reserve and face prosecution under Reserves Act 1977”

Has any action been taken to reprimand the applicant for his unlawful willful damage to the reserve?

The Hipapataua Reid’s Farm Reserve Management Plan also notes under 6.3 Environmental Values, 6.3.1.i. “Non-native vegetation will gradually be removed from the reserve as resourcing allows”.

How will this be achieved whilst a commercial activity relies on that same non-native vegetation?

How will the applicant prevent the spread of wilding conifers on land they manage?

Native wildlife in the area

In very close proximity to the proposed “tourism adventure” we have the New Zealand Falcon, Morepork and Quail breeding. I am very concerned about the impact on these species imposed by the proposed activity.

6.3.2 of the aforementioned plan states under Wildlife Management “Indigenous wildlife and wildlife habitat will be protected, and enhanced to an extent compatible with the reserve’s primary purpose of recreation”.

Has any study been completed to ensure that the indigenous wildlife will not be adversely affected by the proposed activity?

Inconsistencies in the information provided in the proposal

An almost total lack of information has been provided to date, and the “rushing through” of the application without sufficient detail of the activity or indeed of the hazards present on the site, is another concern. Little information has been provided so far by the applicant and what has been divulged is completely inconsistent and at times contradictory. On several instances the applicant and the spokeswoman for Enterprise Great Lake Taupo have been found to provide inconsistent information and can therefore only be regarded as completely unreliable.

For example, during the Taupo District Council hearing on 26th February it was stated by the applicant that 15 to 20 full time jobs would be created by the activity, however at the public meeting on site on 17th March when the applicant was asked what these 15 to 20 full-time jobs would be and where all these employees would park, he said that there would only be 3 to 5 jobs created.

Another example of arises from the public meeting on site 3pm Sunday 17th March 2019.

A flyer posted in our letter boxes by the applicants’ spokeswoman from Enterprise Great Lake Taupo invited us (residents) to meet with Fly line Developer, Alex Schmid, stating “an opportunity to meet Alex and ask any questions you have about Fly line” however, and although many residents were able to attend the meeting, very few of our questions were answered, either by Alex or his spokeswoman other than with “I don’t know” type answers.

The whole of the meeting was recorded (with permission from Alex verbally given beforehand) disproving the racial accusations made by the applicant and another example of the applicant’s questionable trustworthiness.
The applicant admitted at a meeting with nearby residents that he had no intention of clearing the blackberry from the site adjacent to Huka Falls Road, indeed he stated at the public meeting on the reserve that he is planning to leave the blackberry as a “natural fence” contradictory to the applicants summary of the fly line as being “a memorable experience discovering New Zealand’s nature and scenery from a unique perspective, a gentle and silent experience discovering New Zealand’s forest.” A Fly-Line over fly-tipping, through a patch of dangerous wilding pines, looking out over blackberry, doesn’t sound like a memorable experience for any of the right reasons.

Council needs to be confident that they are presented with the full and truthful facts from the applicant, to ensure that if approved, the activity will be conducted in accordance with a full and detailed agreement as part of any license to occupy.

The applicant’s spokeswoman closed by saying what a great place the activity would transform this unused area of the reserve into. This translates as a somewhat naive and overly simplistic approach to attempting to clean up the area after decades of misuse simply by installing a roller coaster amusement for commercial gain, very little, if any, of which will benefit the local economy.

The Hipapatua Reid’s Farm Reserve Management Plan section 3.1 states “The reserve is also within the community of people who reside along Huka Falls Road, and consideration of this community is also important when managing the reserve and activities on the reserve.” However, it is my feeling and it is shared by many other residents, that comments made by the EGLT and also made by selected Councillors, were frankly intimidation tactics designed to stifle our willingness to oppose their pet project. Those comments include but are not limited to suggestions that “failure to accept this plan will only result in something much less preferable for you being set up” and “If you don’t like it you can always move house”.

Development concepts which are contrary to the intentions identified in the Hipapatua Reid’s Farm Reserve Plan

I refer now to section 6 “Reserve management policy and implementation”

6.2.2 “Only relocatable accommodation such as tents, caravans, campervans, and house trucks will be permitted on the reserve. No permanent or semi-permanent structures will be permitted.”

It seems quite unachievable to run an operation of this scale without requiring permanent structures.

6.4.3.1 “Taupo District Council will provide and maintain roads and car parking to a level appropriate for the level of use that is necessary to accommodate the anticipated needs up to a level which the reserve can sustain without diminishing the reserve’s outdoor recreational values.”

Has any study been completed to ascertain how the proposed activity will diminish the reserves in order to handle the visitor numbers forecast by the applicant? And further to that, has a traffic management plan been developed to consider how the traffic introduced by the additional visitors will be managed on and around the site?

Further unanswered questions

Many unanswered questions need to be considered by Council as part of their decision-making process, to ensure operational compliance and that no adverse effects are created should the proposed activity be consented. In addition to those raised earlier, additional questions include but not necessarily limited to:
• What ablution facilities will be provided?
• Staff parking and visitor parking, who will be funding and providing this?
• How will safe access be provided to the proposed commercial activity for all vehicle types likely to be associated with the activity, including coaches?
• How will potential overflow parking blocking the new pedestrian footpath be mitigated?
• How will Regional Policies be complied with so close to the Waikato River?
• Will approved revegetation of the site be required prior to commencement of the activity?
• What operational noise restrictions will the proposed activity be limited to?
• What operational lighting/illumination restrictions will the proposed activity be restricted to?
• How will glare from reflective surfaces be mitigated?
• What are the proposed operational hours of the activity?
• Will financial transparency of all council costs towards and revenue from the activity be publicly available?
• Will the business fully mitigate the TDC and its rate payers for all loss and damages caused by the activity?
• Will such mitigation cover council if their approval is given for suspending the fly line from the unstable pine trees?
• What complaints procedure will be provided and enforced?
• Will the general public have unrestricted pedestrian access to the reserve?
• Will the reserve be fenced off in any way?
• How will the cultural significance of the site be protected?
• How does the proposed fly line reflect the area’s cultural heritage?
• Does the fly line proposal reflect understanding and the desires of Local kaumatua, Hapu and the Ngati Tawahere toa Marae working group?
• Does the fly line proposal reflect the historical importance of the reserve and the connection to the Waikato River?
• Does the fly line proposal more effectively enhance the important community, environmental, cultural and recreational values of the reserve?

Conclusions
I urge the Taupo District Council to fully consider the application with regard to all potential adverse effects and risks presented to this culturally and environmentally sensitive area, and to consider my submission in opposition.
Thank you,

Lesley Beacock

References:

5. Recordings from public meetings held on 26th February 2019 and March 17th 2019.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bruce McCullagh, Jim and Lynne Veitch, Anne and Barry Findlay, Lesley and Nick Beacock, Steve and Leann Murray, and Dean and Joan Lawson

FROM: Joanne Lewis

SUBJECT: Proposed "Fly-Line" tourism activity at Hipapatua Recreation Reserve

DATE: 4th April 2019

As a group you have asked me to provide planning advice regarding the proposal for a commercial activity to establish at the southern part of Hipapatua Recreation Reserve (Huka Falls Road) adjacent to your residential properties.

On 8th March 2019 Taupo District Council placed a public notice in the Taupo Times inviting submissions on a proposal to issue a commercial licence “to allow the establishment of an aerial eco/adventure tourism activity, called a Fly-Line, through trees on the southern end of the reserve”. I understand that each of you is intending to lodge a submission with Taupo District Council on this proposal, and that you will each include this memorandum with your submission. Further, I understand that each of you has indicated in your submission that you intend to be present at the hearing on the 16th April to speak to your submission and respond to any questions that councillors may have. In the case of reserve management planning matters addressed in this memorandum, I will attend the hearing and, likewise, be available to address councillors and respond to questions.

In relation to the proposal for a “licence to occupy” the Hipapatua Reserve for a Fly-Line activity, the following matters are considered below:

- The Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan (HRMP) - status, brief overview and significance;
- Is the proposed activity allowed by the Reserve Management Plan (RMP)?
- The proposal, information available, and potential adverse effects;
- Conclusions.

1 THE HIPAPATUA RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

As you are aware, the HRMP is a public policy document required under the Reserves Act. The Taupo District Council manages the reserve on behalf of the community and the reserve management plan is for the purpose of “setting out the management and development requirements of the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve” (page 5, HRMP). The Plan was prepared in consultation with the Taupo community and I understand that many of you were involved in the consultation/submissions/hearing process that the draft management plan went through, resulting in the current HRMP which became operative in June 2017.

Those details are important – ie that the HRMP is a community-based policy document which has only recently been adopted by Taupo District Council (ie it is less than 2 years old).
1.1 RMP Structure

The “Introduction” section of the HRMP (page 6) explains that:

“The Concept Plan and Policies contained in Section 5 and 6 of this reserve (sic) are considered to have statutory weight, and activities are not permitted that contravene these sections.”

Further, the “Introduction” states that the concept plan and policies of the HRMP have been developed to ensure, among other things, that the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve “is used and managed in a manner that best protects the important values associated with the reserve.”

Accordingly, I conclude that the particularly important parts of the HRMP are under the headings of “Values” (Section 3), “Concept Plan” (Section 5), and “Policies” (Section 6). I note, consistent with that approach, that “Administration and Control” policies in the RMP state:

- “Taupo District Council will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in this management plan” (Policy 6.5.1ii), and
- “Any significant change of objectives and policies will require a plan review as per the process set out in section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977” (policy 6.5.1iii).

1.2 “Values” (Section 3 of the HRMP)

The “Values” section of the HRMP explains that the site has “important cultural, social, recreation and environmental values associated with it” and that these values have underpinned the development of the RMP. The RMP notes the following values (which I have summarised):

- Community and Cultural Values: the reserve is important to visitors as well as hapu and the wider community (specifically noting those residing in the Huka Falls Road area);
- Recreation Values: main uses are nature based / outdoor activities (kayaking, picnic, camping). Valued because of proximity to river and vegetation, for informal uses. Different areas of the reserve are for different uses. Currently there is a range of recreational and passive uses. Important for freedom camping;
- Environmental Values: river margin and vegetation is part of the unique Taupo-Wairakei ecological corridor. Values of naturalness and recognised scenic and amenity values (identified in the District Plan). Water quality of the river contributes to visual amenity of the reserve.

In my view the values of the Hipapatua Reserve (explained in Section 3 of the HRMP and which the RMP specifically seeks to protect) are those which arise from the existing range of uses and activities there.

The emphasis is on recognising the range of informal and passive activities there, identification of specific areas for specific activities (through the concept plan which provides for those activities), and an over-riding concern for the natural, landscape and amenity values of the reserve because of its location as part of the Waikato River ecological corridor.

Leaving aside consideration of the concept plan and policies (below) at a broad level it appears to me that introducing a tourism activity (and associated infrastructure, buildings, and servicing components) which is anticipated to attract 45,000 users per year is unlikely to sit comfortably with the stated purpose of the HRMP to ensure that the reserve “is used and managed in a manner that best protects the important values associated with the reserve”.

1.3 “Concept Plan” (Section 5 of the HRMP)

Section 5 of the RMP explains that the Concept Plan (at page 14):
The concept plan, which the RMP says has statutory weight, identifies that it is the northern and middle parts of the reserve only where various activities will take place (ie related to camping, day use, kayak/river access). The rest of the reserve (including the southern part) are identified as "restoration areas" (with specific reference in the RMP to removing pine trees as they are a safety risk).

In my view it could not reasonably be held that the proposed Fly-Line activity is consistent with the concept plan as it is not proposed to be located in a part of the reserve where the concept plan provides for activities (other than for vegetation restoration).

1.4 RMP “Policies”

Section 6 of the HRMP contains the policies which, in combination with the concept plan, are intended to protect the values associated with the reserve. The policies are grouped under six headings and an “Explanation” section beneath each set of policies provides insight as to what is intended. Below is a comment on the specific policies which appear to be relevant to the Fly-Line proposal.

Policies “6.1 Community and Cultural Values”

This set of policies acknowledges the importance of the reserve to the local community, hapu and neighbouring properties. Policy 6.1v states that “The cultural values associated with the reserve should be protected and where possible enhanced”, and policy v states that “TDC will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties”. Both policies require that adequate information is available to make such assessments (ie about cultural values and how they will be protected and/or enhanced, and about what the potential effects on neighbouring properties are likely to be). In this case, as discussed later in this memorandum, the required information is not available and a range of potential effects on neighbouring properties has been identified.

Policies “6.2 Recreation Values”

The “6.2.1 Recreation Use” policies include that “TDC will manage Hipopatura Recreation Reserve to maximise recreation opportunities that are consistent with the values and vision of the reserve” (Policy 6.2.1i), and that the reserve “…is a place for outdoor nature based recreation activities that do not diminish the values of the reserve and are consistent with the vision” (Policy 6.2.1.i1). Although both policies contemplate recreational activities this policy support is subject to consistency with the values identified in the HRM. In this case, as discussed in Section 1.2 above, it is not considered that the Fly-Line activity is consistent with the stated values of the reserve. That view is supported by the “Explanation” discussion beneath policies 6.2.1 which notes that the reserve offers a “quiet natural area close to town suitable for a range of day use and overnight camping”, and “contrasts with nearby busy and highly modified areas (eg intensive tourism development on adjacent land)” – a reference to Wairakei Tourist Park. A range of recreation activities which are suitable for the reserve is provided. All of these are informal, passive type activities which the reserve is currently used for. In that context, the proposed Fly-Line is not consistent with recreational uses which the HRMP provides for at that location.

The “6.2.4 Events and Commercial Activities” policies provide for commercial activities on the Reserve with a clear expectation (particularly from policy 6.2.4ii and the “Explanation” section) that these will
be short-term and one-off events. Nonetheless policy 6.2.4i states that "TDC will consider commercial and other organized events and activities in Hipapatau Recreation Reserve that are compatible with the provisions of the management plan...". Although the Fly-Line is a commercial activity in terms of this policy, because it is not compatible with numerous provisions of the HRMP (specifically the Values, Concept Plan, and various Policies), in my view it does not comply with the policy.

Significantly, other parts of that policy direct that applicants for commercial activities need to "demonstrate" and provide "evidence" about the potential effects of their proposals:

- Policy 6.2.4iv: "All applicants must demonstrate to Taupo District Council that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose..."
- Policy 6.2.4v: "Taupo District Council will only grant applications for commercial activities where evidence has been supplied demonstrating that the activity will not adversely affect the values of the reserve and its primary purpose".

Section 3 below discusses the information available to TDC to consider the proposal and, most importantly, the potential effects of it. The information is in my view inadequate and does not enable the Council nor the community (which has been invited to provide feedback on the proposal) to fully understand what the specific proposal is, and what the potential effects of it are likely to be.

Policies “6.3 Environmental Values”

The importance of removing non-indigenous and of restoration planting, is emphasized and also the ecological corridor based on the Waikato River (policies 6.3.1). Further, the “Explanation” section (page 19) acknowledges the safety risk, to reserve users and neighbouring properties, which the pine trees present. The Fly-Line, however, proposes to utilize these pine trees, and there is no detail about vegetation management or ecological effects. It is not considered, therefore, that the proposal is consistent with these policies.

The 6.3.2 policies ("Wildlife Management") recognise the ecological values of the reserve which is predominantly a vegetated riparian environment. Policies 6.3.2i and ii (concerned with indigenous vegetation and habitats) require, in my view, that an applicant consider the ecological values of the site and assess how a proposed activity may impact on them. The information available provides no basis for consideration of the matters which these policies address.

Policies “6.4 Asset and Infrastructure Management”

The policy direction in Section 6.4.2 allows necessary facilities associated with recreation activities permitted by the HRMP (policy 6.4.2iii) but states that "TDC will restrict facilities in the reserve to those types and locations identified on the Concept Plan necessary to protect the natural environment and to facilitate the use of the reserve for its primary purpose" (Policy 6.4.2i). The Fly-Line proposal involves several structures (including lookout and start tower and associated elevated wire system) in a part of the which the Concept Plan shows is for "restoration area" only. The proposal is therefore inconsistent with this policy.

Policies in Section 6.4.4 are concerned with signs and information. Signage is to be restricted to a minimal number (Policy 6.4.4i) because “too many signs can be a detriment to the visual amenity of the reserve” (page 22). Although the February 2019 TDC agenda item states that "roadside signage will probably be required" there is no information about proposed signage (such as location, number, size, design, appearance etc) to enable an assessment against this policy.

4
Policies “6.5 Administration and Control”

Relevant policies in the HRMP concerned with administration and management of the reserve are addressed in Section 4 below.

2 IS THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY ALLOWED BY THE HRMP?

Based on consideration of the HRMP provisions in Section 1 above (ie the Values, Concept Plan, and Policies) in my view the Fly-Line proposal is contrary to the HRMP as:

- It does not accord with the values identified for the reserve and which the HRMP seeks to protect;
- It is not located in a part of the reserve where the concept plan provides for activities (other than vegetation restoration) and it is therefore contrary to the concept plan;
- It is contrary to numerous HRMP policies concerned with the adequacy of information about the proposal and its effects, the location of structures and nature of the activity, and provides insufficient information about other policies (including about ecological and cultural matters).

3 THE PROPOSAL AND POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS

3.1 What the HRMP says

As referred to in Section 1.4 above, several HRMP policies clarify that “effects” of activities are a primary concern when considering proposals for the Hipipatua Recreation Reserve:

- Policy 6.1v: “Taupo District Council will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties”;
- Policy 6.2.4iv: “All applicants must demonstrate to Taupo District Council that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose...”
- Policy 6.2.4v: “Taupo District Council will only grant applications for commercial activities where evidence has been supplied demonstrating that the activity will not adversely affect the values of the reserve and its primary purpose”.

The HRMP sets a high bar in terms of the level of adverse effects acceptable (ie “will not have any adverse effects”, and “will not adversely effect...”), and puts the onus on an applicant to demonstrate that threshold can be met. This requires an assessment of effects of a proposal, the scope of which is determined by considering the specific proposal, the site/surroundings and its environmental characteristics.

3.2 Adequacy of Information

An appropriate and adequate effects assessment requires that sufficient information about a site and a specific proposal is known (so that in turn the effects of the proposal can be assessed). An assessment should be undertaken from an objective position and, depending on the nature and scale of a proposal and the issues involved, may require expert input (for example from a traffic engineer if there are potential traffic related effects, a landscape architect if there are potential landscape/visual effects, an ecologist if there are potential ecological effects, etc).

Given the obligation of an applicant as set out in the HRMP (eg “to demonstrate that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve...”), the quality and quantity of information provided about
the proposed Fly-Line is deficient in my view, such that neither Council nor the community could fully understand what the specific proposal is, and therefore what the potential effects of it are likely to be. That is reflected in the concerns raised by you all (as nearby residents) about the lack of information which has been made available.

From my own enquiries of Council officers I was advised there was "no official proposal document" and, like yourselves, was in due course provided with a copy of the presentation that the applicant made to Council. That included what could only be described as a general concept plan showing the location of a lookout, a café, a start area, walking track etc (but with no site boundaries shown, no scale, no details as to the location, height, bulk etc of buildings and structures). There were also various photo images. There was not the usual level of detailed information that would inform a proper understanding of exactly what is proposed or an assessment of the effects of the proposal on the reserve, the wider river corridor, or neighbouring residents. For example, there was little or no detail about the physical elements (such as buildings, access, parking, tracks, signage earthworks, vegetation removal etc) or how the actual activity would be undertaken (hours of operation, management of site, safety issues, details of café/souvenir and beverage etc kiosk).

3.3 What Effects?

Based on the little information available, the following range of potential effects (many of which you have raised in your submissions) need to be considered in this case:

- **Visual and landscape effects**: The HRMP explains that the site is part of an important scenic and landscape area. What are the visual effects from various viewpoints (within reserve, from the Waikato River, from Huka Falls Road, from neighbouring residential properties)? What buildings and structures are exactly proposed (what height, bulk, exact location, exterior materials/colours and their reflectivity levels)? If the pine trees are removed because they present a safety risk, what will support the Fly-Line (how high will any pole or tower structures be, what will they look like)? What signs are proposed exactly (number, location, size, design etc)? What are the effects of the changed landscape characteristics (ie from a quiet vegetated bush area to an intensively used tourist site)? Will there be effects from reflection in the surface of the Waikato River? Will there be glare effects visible off-site? What, if any, night-lighting is proposed and what are the visual effects of that?

- **Ecological effects**: The HRMP explains that the reserve is part of an important ecological corridor along the edge of the Waikato River. I would expect, given its riparian environment and vegetated state that the site may be a habitat for indigenous fauna and flora. Submitters have commented about birdlife there (including ruru). There is no information available about these values and the potential adverse ecological effects that the proposal may generate.

- **Noise effects**: There is insufficient information to understand about potential noise effects (such as from the device/machinery itself, people calling out in excitement and to each other, traffic-related noise effects, use of generators, night use, music, etc). What noise effects will be generated by the proposal (including on the adjoining river environment)?

- **Effects on Cultural values**: the RMP notes that the reserve is of importance to local hapu but the information available does not outline consultation undertaken with tangata whenua, nor provide a cultural impact assessment of the proposal.

- **Safety**: The HRMP acknowledges that the pine trees (on which the Fly-Line relies for support) "present a health and safety risk to users and neighbouring properties" (page 19). How has that acknowledged safety risk been considered and addressed?
• **Traffic and access related effects:** The proposal assumes up to 45,000 users per annum will access the site from Huka Falls Road via the existing southern overflow camping area. No assessment of access and traffic related effects is available however. Is the entrance and access road suitable (design, gradient, sight distances, formation, etc) for the volume and type of likely vehicle use? Where and how many on-site carparks will be provided for the activity and a café (with kiosk as referred to)? Is there a likely risk of over-flow parking along Huka Falls Road and what is the impact of that on existing road users (including pedestrians and cyclists)? Is the access and parking area capable of accommodating buses? Will the additional traffic be accommodated without adverse effects on Huka Falls Road? Would turning bays and/or road widening be required and if so, could that be safely provided within the Huka Falls Road corridor? What are the potential impacts of the additional anticipated traffic volume on the road network? To what extent will the required parking encroach into and displace existing reserve uses allowed by the HRMP (e overflow camping, vegetation restoration areas) and what are the effects of that? Will driver distraction along Huka Falls Rd (from signage and noticing structures and activity in the trees) create safety issues?

• The combination of this range of potential adverse effects are likely to result in potential changes to the amenity and character of the reserve, the neighbouring residential area, and the Waikato River corridor and these effects also need to be taken into account.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussion above, in my view the Fly-Line proposal is contrary to the HRMP (including the concept plan and policies contained in it) to the extent that the integrity of the current HRMP, which is a very recently adopted community-based policy document, would be compromised if the proposal proceeded. In my opinion the appropriate course would be that the intention to offer a commercial licence for the Fly-Line activity not proceed further. If the proposal is pursued, then the HRMP (including the concept plan) should be reviewed to enable wider public engagement about commercial tourism activities locating on the reserve. Indeed, that is what the HRMP itself explains is the appropriate course of action when it states:

• "Taupo District Council will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in this management plan" (Policy 6.5.1ii), and

• "Any significant change of objectives and policies will require a plan review as per the process set out in section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977" (Policy 6.5.1iii).

If it was decided that consideration of the proposal could proceed without the need to review the HRMP, it is noted that the HRMP requires that Council considers the effects of proposed activities. Further, the HRMP places a clear obligation on an applicant "to demonstrate that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve...". In this case the quality and quantity of information provided about the proposed Fly-Line falls well short of the required standard to inform such decision-making. That is because, based on the information made available, neither Council nor the community can fully understand what the specific proposal is, nor reasonably know what the potential effects of it are likely to be. In terms of process, that is a serious and fundamental omission in my view because the absence of sufficient information about the proposal and its effects compromises the opportunity for an appropriately informed decision-making process. For these reasons I consider the proposal should not proceed at this time.

Joanne Lewis  BRP(Hons), M Phil (Regional Planning), MNZPI
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Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE

General Comment

My wife and I are opposed to the Fly Line at Reid's Farm. Our property is directly across the road from the pine trees.

When we first saw our section on Ferrendale Way the first thing that attracted us was that it was a private and tranquil area.
We understand that there will be a tower constructed. This would be visible from our bedroom window. We believe this would be an invasion of our privacy.

We were shocked by the lack of consultation by the applicants of the fly line before earthworks commenced.

The noise level will be increased by extra traffic and noise from the general public while riding on the line.

Health and Safety issues. It was my understanding, when attending meetings on the management of Reid’s farm that the trees the line will be in was deemed to be a hazard and that the council did not want people in the area. In the area you will find numerous trees that have already fallen down. With the age of the trees this will continue. These trees really need to be cut down and replaced with natives which I believe is the long term plan for the area.

Traffic: The extra traffic on the road would be noisy. Turning into the area will cause a traffic hazard as not far from the corner.

Parking: With the amount of vehicles they are talking about where will all the vehicles park.

Freedom Camping: The area they are looking at is also the freedom camping overflow area for busy periods. If this area is not available it would seriously cause overcrowding in the bottom area.

We support the idea of the line but feel that Reid’s Farm is inappropriate for the siting of this. Why not put it at the area of the lookout of the Wairakei Drive, Huka Falls look out. There would be no houses close by. It would also be in the middle of the tourist area.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapatau Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Name: Dean

Last Name: Lawson

On behalf of: 

Postal Address: 218 Ferndale Way
Suburb: Rangataira Park
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3384

eMail: deanl@crts.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 0274776270

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE

General Comment

We enjoy a semi rural lifestyle and built here because of the natural outlook and recreational reserve. I do not want to now be looking down upon a commercial operation that does not aesthetically look pleasing or fit within the council plan. The reserve is enjoyed freely by everyone and this proposed activity will stop this. I also have concerns as to the operations safety. I have spent most of my employment in the forestry industry and the pines within the specified area have
reached their full maturity and have crowned and are in decline. This is evident by the amount of wind fall and crown blow outs which is easily discerned even for people who don’t know about tree form and growth.

We have opposite the most walked track in NZ and now visitors and locals who enjoy this for it’s natural beauty will now be seeing an amusement park. Taupo does not need this operation on this property so close to residential and in a public reserve so enjoyed freely by many. I want a council who puts Taupo first not profit. We have a unique town and a special opportunity to keep our natural resource and beauty accessible for all. Commercial operations like this don’t need to be invasive and encroach onto our boundaries.

There are plenty of area outside out beautiful river banks and why take up public reserve, people will still visit this activity if it is located elsewhere. Please refer to attachment.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Management Plan Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hepapatus Recreation Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bruce McCullagh, Jim and Lynne Veitch, Anne and Barry Findlay, Lesley and Nick Beacock, Steve and Leann Murray, and Dean and Joan Lawson

FROM: Joanne Lewis

SUBJECT: Proposed "Fly-Line" tourism activity at Hipapatua Recreation Reserve

DATE: 4th April 2019

As a group you have asked me to provide planning advice regarding the proposal for a commercial activity to establish at the southern part of Hipapatua Recreation Reserve (Huka Falls Road) adjacent to your residential properties.

On 8th March 2019 Taupo District Council placed a public notice in the Taupo Times inviting submissions on a proposal to issue a commercial licence “to allow the establishment of an aerial eco/adventure tourism activity, called a Fly-Line, through trees on the southern end of the reserve”. I understand that each of you is intending to lodge a submission with Taupo District Council on this proposal, and that you will each include this memorandum with your submission. Further, I understand that each of you has indicated in your submission that you intend to be present at the hearing on the 16th April to speak to your submission and respond to any questions that councillors may have. In the case of reserve management planning matters addressed in this memorandum, I will attend the hearing and, likewise, be available to address councillors and respond to questions.

In relation to the proposal for a “licence to occupy” the Hipapatua Reserve for a Fly-Line activity, the following matters are considered below:

- The Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan (HRMP) – status, brief overview and significance;
- Is the proposed activity allowed by the Reserve Management Plan (RMP) ?
- The proposal, information available, and potential adverse effects;
- Conclusions.

1 THE HIPAPATUA RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

As you are aware, the HRMP is a public policy document required under the Reserves Act. The Taupo District Council manages the reserve on behalf of the community and the reserve management plan is for the purpose of “setting out the management and development requirements of the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve” (page 5, HRMP). The Plan was prepared in consultation with the Taupo community and I understand that many of you were involved in the consultation/submissions/hearing process that the draft management plan went through, resulting in the current HRMP which became operative in June 2017.

Those details are important – ie that the HRMP is a community-based policy document which has only recently been adopted by Taupo District Council (ie it is less than 2 years old).
1.1 RMP Structure

The “Introduction” section of the HRMP (page 6) explains that:

“The Concept Plan and Policies contained in Section 5 and 6 of this reserve (sic) are considered to have statutory weight, and activities are not permitted that contravene these sections.”

Further, the “Introduction” states that the concept plan and policies of the HRMP have been developed to ensure, among other things, that the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve “is used and managed in a manner that best protects the important values associated with the reserve”.

Accordingly, I conclude that the particularly important parts of the HRMP are under the headings of “Values” (Section 3), “Concept Plan” (Section 5), and “Policies” (Section 6). I note, consistent with that approach, that “Administration and Control” policies in the RMP state:

• “Taupo District Council will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in this management plan” (Policy 6.5.1.ii), and
• “Any significant change of objectives and policies will require a plan review as per the process set out in section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977” (policy 6.5.1.iii).

1.2 “Values” (Section 3 of the HRMP)

The “Values” section of the HRMP explains that the site has “important cultural, social, recreation and environmental values associated with it” and that these values have underpinned the development of the RMP. The RMP notes the following values (which I have summarised):

• Community and Cultural Values: the reserve is important to visitors as well as hapu and the wider community (specifically noting those residing in the Huka Falls Road area);
• Recreation Values: main uses are nature based / outdoor activities (kayaking, picnic, camping). Valued because of proximity to river and vegetation, for informal uses. Different areas of the reserve are for different uses. Currently there is a range of recreational and passive uses. Important for freedom camping;
• Environmental Values: river margin and vegetation is part of the unique Taupo-Wairakei ecological corridor. Values of naturalness and recognised scenic and amenity values (identified in the District Plan). Water quality of the river contributes to visual amenity of the reserve.

In my view the values of the Hipapatua Reserve (explained in Section 3 of the HRMP and which the RMP specifically seeks to protect) are those which arise from the existing range of uses and activities there. The emphasis is on recognising the range of informal and passive activities there, identification of specific areas for specific activities (through the concept plan which provides for those activities), and an over-riding concern for the natural, landscape and amenity values of the reserve because of its location as part of the Waikato River ecological corridor.

Leaving aside consideration of the concept plan and policies (below) at a broad level it appears to me that introducing a tourism activity (and associated infrastructure, buildings, and servicing components) which is anticipated to attract 45,000 users per year is unlikely to sit comfortably with the stated purpose of the HRMP to ensure that the reserve “is used and managed in a manner that best protects the important values associated with the reserve.”

1.3 “Concept Plan” (Section 5 of the HRMP)

Section 5 of the RMP explains that the Concept Plan (at page 14):
• “Identifies the location for specific activities, assets and infrastructure to be located on the reserve” and
• “... also identifies potential works, such as environmental restoration, new tracks and roads...”

The concept plan, which the RMP says has statutory weight, identifies that it is the northern and middle parts of the reserve only where various activities will take place (ie related to camping, day use, kayak/river access). The rest of the reserve (including the southern part) are identified as “restoration areas” (with specific reference in the RMP to removing pine trees as they are a safety risk).

In my view it could not reasonably be held that the proposed Fly-Line activity is consistent with the concept plan as it is not proposed to be located in a part of the reserve where the concept plan provides for activities (other than for vegetation restoration).

1.4 RMP “Policies”

Section 6 of the HRMP contains the policies which, in combination with the concept plan, are intended to protect the values associated with the reserve. The policies are grouped under six headings and an “Explanation” section beneath each set of policies provides insight as to what is intended. Below is a comment on the specific policies which appear to be relevant to the Fly-Line proposal.

Policies “6.1 Community and Cultural Values”

This set of policies acknowledges the importance of the reserve to the local community, hapu and neighbouring properties. Policy 6.1v states that “The cultural values associated with the reserve should be protected and where possible enhanced”, and policy v states that “TDC will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties”. Both policies require that adequate information is available to make such assessments (ie about cultural values and how they will be protected and/or enhanced, and about what the potential effects on neighbouring properties are likely to be). In this case, as discussed later in this memorandum, the required information is not available and a range of potential effects on neighbouring properties has been identified.

Policies “6.2 Recreation Values”

The “6.2.1 Recreation Use” policies include that “TDC will manage Hipopatua Recreation Reserve to maximise recreation opportunities that are consistent with the values and vision of the reserve” (Policy 6.2.1.i), and that the reserve “… is a place for outdoor nature based recreation activities that do not diminish the values of the reserve and are consistent with the vision” (Policy 6.2.1.ii). Although both policies contemplate recreational activities this policy support is subject to consistency with the values identified in the HRM. In this case, as discussed in Section 1.2 above, it is not considered that the Fly-Line activity is consistent with the stated values of the reserve. That view is supported by the “Explanation” discussion beneath policies 6.2.1 which notes that the reserve offers a “quiet natural area close to town suitable for a range of day use and overnight camping”, and “contrasts with nearby busy and highly modified areas (eg intensive tourism development on adjacent land)” – a reference to Wairakai Tourist Park. A range of recreation activities which are suitable for the reserve is provided. All of these are informal, passive type activities which the reserve is currently used for. In that context, the proposed Fly-Line is not consistent with recreational uses which the HRMP provides for at that location.

The “6.2.4 Events and Commercial Activities” policies provide for commercial activities on the Reserve with a clear expectation (particularly from policy 6.2.4ii and the “Explanation” section) that these will
be short-term and one-off events. Nonetheless policy 6.2.41 states that “TDC will consider commercial and other organized events and activities in Hipatua Recreation Reserve that are compatible with the provisions of the management plan...”. Although the Fly-Line is a commercial activity in terms of this policy, because it is not compatible with numerous provisions of the HRMP (specifically the Values, Concept Plan, and various Policies), in my view it does not comply with the policy.

Significantly, other parts of that policy direct that applicants for commercial activities need to “demonstrate” and provide “evidence” about the potential effects of their proposals:

- Policy 6.2.4iv: “All applicants must demonstrate to Taupo District Council that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose...”
- Policy 6.2.4v: “Taupo District Council will only grant applications for commercial activities where evidence has been supplied demonstrating that the activity will not adversely affect the values of the reserve and its primary purpose”.

Section 3 below discusses the information available to TDC to consider the proposal and, most importantly, the potential effects of it. The information is in my view inadequate and does not enable the Council nor the community (which has been invited to provide feedback on the proposal) to fully understand what the specific proposal is, and what the potential effects of it are likely to be.

Policies “6.3 Environmental Values”

The importance of removing non-indigenous and of restoration planting, is emphasized and also the ecological corridor based on the Waikato River (policies 6.3.1). Further, the “Explanation” section (page 19) acknowledges the safety risk, to reserve users and neighbouring properties, which the pine trees present. The Fly-Line, however, proposes to utilize these pine trees, and there is no detail about vegetation management or ecological effects. It is not considered, therefore, that the proposal is consistent with these policies.

The 6.3.2 policies ("Wildlife Management") recognise the ecological values of the reserve which is predominantly a vegetated riparian environment. Policies 6.3.2i and ii (concerned with indigenous vegetation and habitats) require, in my view, that an applicant consider the ecological values of the site and assess how a proposed activity may impact on them. The information available provides no basis for consideration of the matters which these policies address.

Policies “6.4 Asset and Infrastructure Management”

The policy direction in Section 6.4.2 allows necessary facilities associated with recreation activities permitted by the HRMP (policy 6.4.2iii) but states that “TDC will restrict facilities in the reserve to those types and locations identified on the Concept Plan necessary to protect the natural environment and to facilitate the use of the reserve for its primary purpose” (Policy 6.4.2i). The Fly-Line proposal involves several structures (including lookout and start tower and associated elevated wire system) in a part of the which the Concept Plan shows is for “restoration area” only. The proposal is therefore inconsistent with this policy.

Policies in Section 6.4.4 are concerned with signs and information. Signage is to be restricted to a minimal number (Policy 6.4.4i) because “too many signs can be a detriment to the visual amenity of the reserve” (page 22). Although the February 2019 TDC agenda item states that “roadside signage will probably be required” there is no information about proposed signage (such as location, number, size, design, appearance etc) to enable an assessment against this policy.
Policies “6.5 Administration and Control”

Relevant policies in the HRMP concerned with administration and management of the reserve are addressed in Section 4 below.

2 IS THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY ALLOWED BY THE HRMP ?

Based on consideration of the HRMP provisions in Section 1 above (ie the Values, Concept Plan, and Policies) in my view the Fly-Line proposal is contrary to the HRMP as:

- It does not accord with the values identified for the reserve and which the HRMP seeks to protect;
- It is not located in a part of the reserve where the concept plan provides for activities (other than vegetation restoration) and it is therefore contrary to the concept plan;
- It is contrary to numerous HRMP policies concerned with the adequacy of information about the proposal and its effects, the location of structures and nature of the activity, and provides insufficient information about other policies (including about ecological and cultural matters).

3 THE PROPOSAL AND POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS

3.1 What the HRMP says

As referred to in Section 1.4 above, several HRMP policies clarify that “effects” of activities are a primary concern when considering proposals for the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve:

- Policy 6.3v: “Taupo District Council will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties”;
- Policy 6.2.4iv: “All applicants must demonstrate to Taupo District Council that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose…”
- Policy 6.2.4v: “Taupo District Council will only grant applications for commercial activities where evidence has been supplied demonstrating that the activity will not adversely affect the values of the reserve and its primary purpose”.

The HRMP sets a high bar in terms of the level of adverse effects acceptable (ie “will not have any adverse effects”, and “will not adversely effect…”), and puts the onus on an applicant to demonstrate that threshold can be met. This requires an assessment of effects of a proposal, the scope of which is determined by considering the specific proposal, the site/surroundings and its environmental characteristics.

3.2 Adequacy of Information

An appropriate and adequate effects assessment requires that sufficient information about a site and a specific proposal is known (so that in turn the effects of the proposal can be assessed). An assessment should be undertaken from an objective position and, depending on the nature and scale of a proposal and the issues involved, may require expert input (for example from a traffic engineer if there are potential traffic related effects, a landscape architect if there are potential landscape/visual effects, an ecologist if there are potential ecological effects, etc).

Given the obligation of an applicant as set out in the HRMP (eg “to demonstrate that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve…”), the quality and quantity of information provided about
the proposed Fly-Line is deficient in my view, such that neither Council nor the community could fully understand what the specific proposal is, and therefore what the potential effects of it are likely to be. That is reflected in the concerns raised by you all (as nearby residents) about the lack of information which has been made available.

From my own enquiries of Council officers I was advised there was “no official proposal document” and, like yourselves, was in due course provided with a copy of the presentation that the applicant made to Council. That included what could only be described as a general concept plan showing the location of a lookout, a café, a start area, walking track etc (but with no site boundaries shown, no scale, no details as to the location, height, bulk etc of buildings and structures). There were also various photo images. There was not the usual level of detailed information that would inform a proper understanding of exactly what is proposed or an assessment of the effects of the proposal on the reserve, the wider river corridor, or neighbouring residents. For example, there was little or no detail about the physical elements (such as buildings, access, parking, tracks, signage earthworks, vegetation removal etc) or how the actual activity would be undertaken (hours of operation, management of site, safety issues, details of café/souvenir and beverage etc kiosk).

3.3 What Effects?

Based on the little information available, the following range of potential effects (many of which you have raised in your submissions) need to be considered in this case:

- **Visual and landscape effects**: The HRMP explains that the site is part of an important scenic and landscape area. What are the visual effects from various viewpoints (within reserve, from the Waikato River, from Huka Falls Road, from neighbouring residential properties)? What buildings and structures are exactly proposed (what height, bulk, exact location, exterior materials/colours and their reflectivity levels)? If the pine trees are removed because they present a safety risk, what will support the Fly-Line (how high will any pole or tower structures be, what will they look like)? What signs are proposed exactly (number, location, size, design etc)? What are the effects of the changed landscape characteristics (ie from a quiet vegetated bush area to an intensively used tourist site)? Will there be effects from reflection in the surface of the Waikato River? Will there be glare effects visible off-site? What, if any, night-lighting is proposed and what are the visual effects of that?

- **Ecological effects**: The HRMP explains that the reserve is part of an important ecological corridor along the edge of the Waikato River. I would expect, given its riparian environment and vegetated state that the site may be a habitat for indigenous fauna and flora. Submitters have commented about birdlife there (including rural). There is no information available about these values and the potential adverse ecological effects that the proposal may generate.

- **Noise effects**: There is insufficient information to understand about potential noise effects (such as from the device/machinery itself, people calling out in excitement and to each other, traffic-related noise effects, use of generators, night use, music, etc). What noise effects will be generated by the proposal (including on the adjoining river environment)?

- **Effects on Cultural values**: the RMP notes that the reserve is of importance to local hapu but the information available does not outline consultation undertaken with tangata whenua, nor provide a cultural impact assessment of the proposal.

- **Safety**: The HRMP acknowledges that the pine trees (on which the Fly-Line relies for support) “present a health and safety risk to users and neighbouring properties” (page 19). How has that acknowledged safety risk been considered and addressed?
- Traffic and access related effects: The proposal assumes up to 45,000 users per annum will access the site from Huka Falls Road via the existing southern overflow camping area. No assessment of access and traffic related effects is available however. Is the entrance and access road suitable (design, gradient, sight distances, formation, etc) for the volume and type of likely vehicle use? Where and how many on-site carparks will be provided for the activity and a café (with kiosk as referred to)? Is there a likely risk of over-flow parking along Huka Falls Road and what is the impact of that on existing road users (including pedestrians and cyclists)? Is the access and parking area capable of accommodating buses? Will the additional traffic be accommodated without adverse effects on Huka Falls Road? Would turning bays and/or road widening be required and if so, could that be safely provided within the Huka Falls Road corridor? What are the potential impacts of the additional anticipated traffic volume on the road network? To what extent will the required parking encroach into and displace existing reserve uses allowed by the HRMP (ie overflow camping, vegetation restoration areas) and what are the effects of that? Will driver distraction along Huka Falls Rd (from signage and noticing structures and activity in the trees) create safety issues?

- The combination of this range of potential adverse effects are likely to result in potential changes to the amenity and character of the reserve, the neighboring residential area, and the Waikato River corridor and these effects also need to be taken into account.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussion above, in my view the Fly-Line proposal is contrary to the HRMP (including the concept plan and policies contained in it) to the extent that the integrity of the current HRMP, which is a very recently adopted community-based policy document, would be compromised if the proposal proceeded. In my opinion the appropriate course would be that the intention to offer a commercial licence for the Fly-Line activity not proceed further. If the proposal is pursued, then the HRMP (including the concept plan) should be reviewed to enable wider public engagement about commercial tourism activities locating on the reserve. Indeed, that is what the HRMP itself explains is the appropriate course of action when it states:

- “Taupo District Council will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in this management plan” (Policy 6.5.1i), and
- “Any significant change of objectives and policies will require a plan review as per the process set out in section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977” (Policy 6.5.1iii).

If it was decided that consideration of the proposal could proceed without the need to review the HRMP, it is noted that the HRMP requires that Council considers the effects of proposed activities. Further, the HRMP places a clear obligation on an applicant “to demonstrate that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve”. In this case the quality and quantity of information provided about the proposed Fly-Line falls well short of the required standard to inform such decision-making. That is because, based on the information made available, neither Council nor the community can fully understand what the specific proposal is, nor reasonably know what the potential effects of it are likely to be. In terms of process, that is a serious and fundamental omission in my view because the absence of sufficient information about the proposal and its effects compromises the opportunity for an appropriately informed decision-making process. For these reasons I consider the proposal should not proceed at this time.
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Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing? 
☐ Yes 
☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered. 

Support/Oppose Granting of License 
☐ SUPPORT 
☒ OPPOSE 

General Comment 

I would like to Oppose the proposed Fly-Line at Hipapatus Reserve. I often walk the track from Spa Park to Huka Falls. This activity looks to have a shiny pipe attached to the trees and I feel that this would look unnatural and not in keeping with the unspoiled environment. Lisa 

Attached Documents
Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipatua Recreation Reserve
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Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?  

☐ Yes 
☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered. 

Support/Oppose Granting of License 

☐ SUPPORT 
☒ OPPOSE 

General Comment 

Please confirm receipt of my submission. 
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File: 
Steve Murray Submission on Fly-Line LTO at Hipopatas Reserve
File
Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hepalilla Recreation Reserve
SUBMISSION ON PROPOSAL TO GRANT A NEW COMMERCIAL LICENCE TO 4NATURE NZ LTD AT HIPAPATUA RECREATION RESERVE

To: Nathan Mourie
Senior Reserves Planner
Taupō District Council
Private Bag 2005
Taupō 3352

Name of submitter: Steve Murray

1. Introduction

1.1. I am making a submission opposing the proposal that Taupō District Council grant a new commercial licence to occupy (LTO) to 4nature NZ Ltd to operate an aerial adventure operation, Fly-Line, at Hipapatua Recreation Reserve (the Reserve).

1.2. I am a Taupō resident and member of the Huka Falls Road community. I have lived with my family in Taupō for the past seven (7) years, and we have greatly appreciated the Reserve for its natural scenic qualities overlooking the Waikato River, and its tranquil setting with the regenerating native forest.

1.3. I am opposing the proposed LTO because of the significant and long-term impacts it will have on the natural and scenic qualities of the Reserve and the public’s ability to enjoy the Reserve. Those impacts are in my view are incompatible with the core values that are intended to be preserved and maintained, as described in the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan (the Reserve Management Plan).

2. Key impacts

The key impacts on the qualities of the Reserve as I see them are:

(a) The noise generated by the expected number of visitors;
(b) Car parking and traffic;
(c) Visual amenity value;
(d) Not aligned with the Reserve Management Plan;
(e) Potential safety issues;
(f) The increased commercialisation from the presence of the buildings and other facilities to serve the expected visitors; and
(g) Overall, the permanent loss of the natural scenic qualities of the Reserve.
3. **Qualities of the Reserve**
   - The Reserve Management Plan describes the qualities of the Reserve to be preserved as the "pleasantness, harmony and cohesion of the natural environment and to the better use and enjoyment of the Reserve."\(^1\)
   - A part of the Reserve is already affected by tourist-related activities, in particular the camping area and the associated facilities such as car parking. The part of the Reserve that this proposal will most directly affect is the part which has to date been least impacted by development, and retains a relatively pristine, scenic environment that is highly prized for those natural qualities.
   - Fly-Line is a commercial development, which will obviously impact on the enjoyment of the Reserve’s natural features for myself, other community members and outside visitors.
   - The Reserve will no longer provide a space where people can appreciate the natural scenic qualities of the Reserve, but instead become a commercial tourist hub.

4. **Noise**
   - The Reserve Management Plan describes the Reserve as offering "a quiet natural area"\(^2\)
   - Traffic associated with cars and buses driving to and from Fly-Line, turning and parking will generate significant amounts of noise.
   - With an anticipated 45,000 users per annum and the Fly-Line course being able to cater for 200 visitors per hour, the sheer numbers of people using the Reserve will also disturb the tranquility that that part of the Reserve currently provides.
   - The Reserve will change from being a quiet, natural space to a noisy, commercialised tourist location.

5. **Car parking and traffic**
   - Inevitably, there will need to be construction of a car park large enough to accommodate 45,000 users per annum. This will detract enormously from the natural scenic value the Reserve currently holds.
   - However, there is little information about the proposed location or size of the carparking area needed for the numbers of visitors expected.

---

\(^1\) Hapuhapua Reserve Management Plan, Taupō District Council at page 5
\(^2\) Hapuhapua Reserve Management Plan, Taupō District Council at page 16
• The associated traffic with Fly-Line (cars and tour buses) will ruin the quiet and tranquil environment and blight the public’s enjoyment of the Reserve.
• The Proposal indicates there could be further investment into car parking as Fly-Line grows in popularity, and with this will come more traffic. Once the first car park is built, there will be less reason to constrain the provision of more car parking.
• As a result, gradually the Reserve’s natural values will be further eroded.

6. Visual amenity value
• The Reserve Management Plan outlines that the Reserve has been identified in the Taupō District Plan as an Amenity Landscape Area due to its high scenic and amenity value and its natural setting.  
• While Fly-Line is described as having minimal visual impact and being able to blend into the environment, it is still a man-made structure that will be in a previously untouched part of the Reserve.
• With the potential for further investment into additional car parking and expansion into food and beverage sales and a souvenir store, the natural and scenic features the Reserve Management Plan seeks to preserve would be lost.

7. Increased Commercialisation
• There will be a significant commercial impact on the Reserve if Fly-Line is built.
• The location overview (see map attached to my submissions as Appendix A) indicates that there will be a café (“Fly-Inn café”) and “Fly-Line Lifter Shuttle Transport” from the end platform to the starting platform. The Proposal does not outline mention a shuttle or café service (except for a brief mention of potential future expansion into food and beverage sales).
• Fly-Line will mean that there will be more people, cars and buses and it will necessitate construction of a car park. Combined with the potential for expansion and special events such as “night flights,” the Reserve will no longer be a low-key, pristine space.
• Currently, this part of the Reserve is a passive recreation area where people can enjoy activities such as walking, picnicking, fishing, and appreciation of the Waikato River views and natural forest environment. This commercial tourist development will discourage people from using the Reserve for those activities.
• Natural spaces such as the Hipapatua Reserve cannot be replaced once they are lost. We need to protect them against creeping commercialisation to preserve what

3 Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan, Taupō District Council at page 12.
4 Council Agenda at page 12.
Is best about our beautiful country – its outstanding nature and the ease of being able to immerse yourself in it.

- Once this Reserve has been altered in this way, it will never be able to return to its previous relatively pristine state.

8. Incompatibility with Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan values

8.1. The Reserve is not the place for intensive tourism development

- The Reserve is described as offering "contrast with nearby busy and highly modified areas (e.g. intensive tourism development on adjacent land)."\(^5\)
- This is clear indication that the proposed LTO is contrary to the Reserve Management Plan. The development of Fly-Line is a tourist development and with the potential for expansion, this would become more intensive.
- While I accept that other natural spaces around Taupō are used for tourism and that this contributes to our community vitality, we need to protect our remaining untouched spaces before we lose them forever.

8.2. No longer a local space, instead a tourist destination

- The wider Taupō community has shown an active interest in the management of the Reserve and there is a desire to reconnect with the Reserve as a place for locals to use. My family frequently rides past and walks through the Reserve and value it for its natural qualities.
- Fly-Line will result in the Reserve becoming a popular tourist destination.
- The Reserve will therefore no longer be a 'local' space for the community to use as the Reserve Management Plan intended, especially as large volumes of tourists are likely to deter locals from using it.

8.3. Forest restoration

- A key environmental value of the Reserve Management Plan is the restoration of native vegetation.
- As Fly-Line would be within the restoration area of the Reserve, the need to keep vegetation trimmed to facilitate the safe operation of the Fly-Line will inevitably affect the ability to carry out that restoration in the future. While the Taupō District Council notes in the Agenda that it does not have the resources to restore this area in the short to medium term, I believe the consequence of the Fly-Line proposal is that the restoration will further restricted and deferred. Moreover, I understand there are

---

5 Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan, Taupō District Council at page 16.
entities within Taupō that will assist in the restoration process of the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve.

- Again, this is a case where we need to protect our valuable natural landscapes from commercialisation.

9. Safety

9.1. Attached, the WPS Opus report also raises several safety issues that need careful consideration.

9.2. Also, a question is raised as to whether the zip line can be considered as a structure under Section 8 of the Building Act under item 1) a), d) and e) and therefore will require compliance with the Building Act.

10. Conclusion

10.1. For all the above reasons, I am strongly opposed to the LTO as it will result in the permanent loss of the natural scenic qualities of the Reserve to a commercial venture that is incompatible with the values in the Reserve Management Plan. Information available is also insufficient as to truly ascertain the safety in regards to the safe operation of the structure for both flyline users, the general public accessing the reserve and the trees.

10.2. The Reserve was never intended to be used for commercialised tourist developments. Once we change it to be used in this way, its natural value can never be restored.

10.3. I will personally be affected as a member of the Huka Falls Road community, and the local community who uses the Reserve will also be heavily impacted.

10.4. Unfortunately, I will be out of town working on opportunities to bring real GDP growth to Taupō and therefore are unable to be heard in respect of my submission.

DATED at Taupō this 8 day of April 2019

Steve Murray
288 Clearwater Lane
Taupō
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3 April 2019

Steve Murray

Ref: 2-37656.00

Comments on proposal for Fly Line at Hipapatua - Reid's Farm

Dear Steve,

We refer to your instruction to consider potential safety risk of the License to Occupy - Flyline at Hipapatua/ Reid’s Farm. We have read the Ordinary Council Meeting Agenda dated on the 26th February 2019.

Our main concern in regard to safety would be the safe operation of the structure for both flyline users and for the general public accessing the reserve. We believe the following should be addressed:

- “Trees are biological structures and the material properties are both variable and subject to degradation if attacked by disease or fungus, and their structural performance cannot be guaranteed”. James, K., “A dynamic Structural Analysis of Trees subject to wind loading”, PhD thesis, University of Melbourne, 2010. Even if a suitably qualified forestry engineer assesses the trees and fixing structures, there is inherently a high-risk of collapse due to the nature of trees (high risk when compared to normal risk of injury or death when occupying a building). Structural performance of trees cannot be guaranteed over long- periods of time due to possible disease, decay, wind damage, etc.
- One common cause of failure of trees is due to wind action. Wind speeds that cause trees to fail have a higher likelihood of occurring when compared to standard return periods for the design of structures. We recognize that the trees in question are not part of a forest, and therefore are at higher exposure to wind than trees in a forest. There is further potential of a wind channel in this area due to the valley environment and nearby Waikato River. It would be our expectation that an in-depth investigation of the proposal in this unique area is undertaken.
- Oscillating behaviour of trees under wind loading will create differential movement between trees. This differential movement will decrease or increase the distance between anchor points, relieving or increasing tension in cables that needs to be assessed and minimised. Additional tension due to relative displacement between trees might be critical when connected to trees of different height/size and it is not clear how this is considered in the design of the system.
- The area is a reserve. It is expected that a proposed mitigation by the applicant would be not to operate during risky periods, such as high winds. However, if cables are damaged and ultimately break, they could pose a significant hazard to other reserve users. Safety of other reserve users must be guaranteed during the operation of the line.
• Access to the top of the fly line will require additional infrastructure such as walkways from the carpark to the platform to guarantee the safety of the visitors and to protect the area from erosion due to human traffic. If the existing walkway alongside Huka Falls Road is used as main access to the area, it will likely require additional barriers for traffic as groups of people are likely to visit the attraction.

• Whether the zip line can be considered as a structure under Section 8 of the Building Act under Item 1(a), d) and e) and therefore will require compliance with the Building Act. The applicant is requesting a license to occupy for 10 years.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Julian Benito  
Senior Projects Engineer (CPEng - Structural)
Hipapatua Reserve, Huka Falls Road, Taupo, New Zealand

Adverse Safety Effects - Proposed Commercial Activity

We have been asked by Members of the Public to suggest some of the possible Adverse Safety affects for the proposed Flyline activity at Hipapatua Reserve, 157 Huka Falls Road, Taupo. All comments in this report are a matter of opinion and are not a matter of fact.

Although little actual technical information is available it is understood that a roller coaster like device will slowly carry riders sitting in a sling down a guide rail at approximately 10km/hr. The guide rail is constructed of a 100mm diameter x 2.5mm thick stainless-steel pipe welded in sections that is suspended approximately 15m (5 stories high) and 10m (3 stories high) above the ground. The pipe is held from above by a series of 8mm wires tied back to collars around the existing wilding pine trees. As such it is assumed that the trees themselves will form part of the structure.

Trees marked for use by the device.

These Wilding Pine Trees may pose a Health and Safety risk

The Wilding Pine Trees are likely to of the Pinus Lobliolty family and include Ponderosa, Pinaster and Taeda. These are very tall and slender trees approximately 25m high (8 story building).

These trees have poor form

https://hort.ifas.ufl.edu/woody/leaves-weak.shtml
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Leaning trees can fall

Most of the pine trees in the Hipapatua Reserve are leaning.

Photos supplied show a yellow plumb bob that is the vertical.
An Arborist is not qualified to comment on the suitability of these trees
An Arborist may comment on tree health but is not qualified to comment on the suitability of these trees to support such a structure. Also, there are at least 17 healthy trees that have fallen over (failed) due to wind in the southern end of Hipapatua Reserve.

Further, “because trees are biological structures and the material properties are both variable and subject to degradation if attacked by disease or fungus, their structural performance cannot be guaranteed”. James, K., “A dynamic Structural Analysis of Trees subject to wind loading”, PhD thesis, University of Melbourne, 2010.

Even if a suitably qualified forestry engineer assesses the trees and fixing structures, there is inherently a higher risk of collapse due to the nature of trees. Structural performance of trees cannot be guaranteed over long periods of time due to possible disease, decay, wind damage, etc.

Healthy trees can fail by Stem Break
At least 17 trees in Hipapatua Reserve have failed from probable wind induced stem break. There is a recent stem break near the overflow camping (as indicated below)
The most common cause of failure of trees is due to wind action. Wind speeds that cause trees to fail have a higher likelihood of occurring when compared to standard return periods for structures.

We recognise that the trees in question are not part of a forest, and therefore are at higher exposure to wind than trees in a forest. It would be our expectation that an in-depth investigation of the proposal in this unique area is undertaken.

The area is also a reserve. It is expected that a mitigation of the applicant would be not to operate during risky periods, such as high winds. However, if cables are damaged and ultimately break, they could pose a significant hazard to other reserve users.
Forked Trees can fail
Due to the growth pattern in the union area failure is more likely to occur in trees that are forked.

Trees with one sided canopy can fail
With wind and extra weight from rain water in the canopy of a one sided or leaning tree there is a greater risk of failure.
Double Trunk Trees are weaker and could fall
Due to the growth pattern in the base of the tree there is a greater risk that a weakness may exist on double trunked trees.

Pine trees drop hard cones that can injure members of the public

*Personal protective equipment (PPE) must be enforced for people beneath the canopy.*
Large branches can fall to the ground near the ride or track.
Even after pruning – I understand that this species of pine will continue to drop newly grown branches from the crown of the tree.
Tree bulging can indicate possible poor health
Compression can cause bulging at the base of a tree and may make failure from blow out more likely.

Brittle tree failure is more common in older trees
As trees age they may become brittle and are more likely to fail.

Tree’s on sloping ground appear to have collapsed
The southern part of the Hipapatua Reserve is steep and undulating and may be susceptible to erosion. This may undermine the stability of any trees that are on or near the sloping ground. At least two trees within the southern end of Hipapatua Reserve may have failed in this way.
Structure Wind Funnel effect
The river valley may be within a wind funnel effect zone.

Wind induced Tree sway can affect the structure
Consideration should be given to the possible dynamic effects of wind loading on the trees and how that could affect the structure and how the structural 100mm pipe may initiate the Domino Effect mentioned above.

Multiple trees could fail by the Domino Effect
There is an enormous amount potential energy stored in an upright tree. It is the equivalent to the energy required to lift that tree from its fallen position back up to its vertical upright position. The Domino effect is a phenomenon where the energy released from a falling tree can cause the next tree to also fall. The next tree falling can then cause the next tree to also fall, and so on...

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YXn08b5ll1q
Launch Tower structure may affect health of nearby trees
Effect on surrounding trees

Fallen trees roots may cause problems to other trees and the sloping ground
When a tree falls the roots of the tree may rot and a hollow tunnel may be left behind. Rain water may pass through these tunnels and could speed up ground erosion and subsidence around the other trees.

Collars may affect tree health
Inadequate information

Unknown ground material may affect the stability of trees supporting the structure
Recent excavation work by the Applicant shows loose pumice to at least a depth of 2 metres. *Loose remoulded pumiceous soils characterize by a lower density than normal sedimentary soils and a lower cohesion (when compared to lightly welded ignimbrite deposits).*

This area has been a dumping ground for vehicles and building products going back many years which may also create a high variability in the mechanical properties of the underlying soils.
Effect on Structure if tree supporting the structure fails
If a supporting tree of the structure fails, this could affect the overall integrity of the structure. Minor damage could affect the connections and welds in the stainless pipe that go undetected.

Effect on Structure if a nearby tree fails
(similar affects as described above)

Effect on Structure with tree sway due to wind
Oscillating behaviour of trees under wind loading will create differential movement between trees. This differential movement will decrease or increase the distance between anchor points, relieving or increasing tension in cables that need to be assessed and minimised. Additional tension due to relative displacement between trees might be critical when connected to trees of different height/size and it is not clear how this is considered in the design of the system.

Additional potential hidden costs to council.
Access to the top of the fly line will require additional infrastructure such as walkways from the carpark to the platform to guarantee the safety of the visitors and to protect the area from erosion due to human traffic. If the existing walkway alongside Huka Falls Road is used as main access to the area, it will likely require additional barriers for traffic as groups of people are likely to visit the attraction.
Failure of welds in Stainless Steel Pipe

The pine trees may move backwards and forwards with the wind. The structure would move with the trees and riders using the device. The welds in the 100mm diameter x 2.5mm thick stainless-steel pipe could fail through fatigue or the stress caused by such movement. Earthquakes could also affect the welds.

Earthquake (seismic) Effect

_Taupo and New Zealand sits in a moderate to high seismic hazard zone and earthquake effects should be considered in the design of the supporting structure and new structures._
Amusement Device Certification

The Applicant does not appear to be registered on the Amusement Device - New Zealand database.

It would be good practice to register this activity with WORKSAFE as an Amusement Device and gain a certificate. i.e. Taupo Bungy (Certificate No 766) and Lion Express Train (Certificate No 469)

https://worksafe.govt.nz/datasources/44388-amusement-device-register

The Applicant appears to not have any experience in building this particular structure/device.

It appears that this device has not ever been installed in this country. Local government will have to accept the fly line is safe.
Conclusion

Due to the brief and insufficient information at the time of writing - this report is only to serve as a guide. Many of the Adverse Safety affects mentioned in this report may be present within the southern end of the Hipapatua Reserve.

All comments in this report are a matter of opinion and are not a matter of fact.
First Name: Brett

Last Name: Cameron

On behalf of: 

Postal Address:
21 Glen Mohr
Suburb: Acacia Bay
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3385

eMail: * breit@cpf.net.nz

Daytime Phone: 

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
☐ Yes
☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT
☒ OPPOSE

General Comment

I would like to Oppose the proposed Fly-Line at Hapatake Reserve. I had similar pine trees on my farm and several of them blew down in wind without any warning.

Attached Documents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial licence at Hipaipadua Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organisation: Enterprise Great Lake Taupō

First Name: Murray

Last Name: McCaw

On behalf of: 

Postal Address: Type in your address. Eg. 100 Queen St, 1 Willis St

Suburb: 

City: 

Country: New Zealand

PostCode: 

eMail: * kyle@greatlakeataupo.biz

Daytime Phone: 

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes

☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRRoD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT
C OPPOSE

General Comment

Please see attached letter

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB&amp;L TDC Submission April 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hepgatus Recreation Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 April 2019

Gareth Green & Nathan Mourie
Taupo District Council
Via Email

Dear Gareth & Nathan

SUBMISSION ON FLYLINE PROPOSAL AT HIPAPATUA RESERVE

On behalf of the Board of Enterprise Great Lake Taupo, we are writing to submit in support of the proposed Licence to Occupy for 4Nature NZ Ltd to operate a Flyline at Hipapatua Reserve.

Enterprise Great Lake Taupo is the economic development agency for the Taupo district, and we are charged with growing the local economy. Our strategic objectives are closely aligned to those of Taupo District Council, in that we wish Taupo district to be the home of competitive, innovative and sustainable business.

We believe there are many significant areas of positive impact that will realised if this development proceeds.

Our organisation has worked alongside Alex Schmidt, Director of 4Nature NZ Ltd, on this development since he was first introduced to us by NZ Trade and Enterprise (NZTE) in late 2018. We have supported him with this project in several ways and we are excited with his proposal to bring this new and innovative world class visitor activity to our district.

We believe Taupo District Council should grant a Licence to Occupy to 4Nature Ltd for the following reasons;

- We believe this project is genuinely synergistic with the aims and aspirations for this area as defined in the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan, namely; "The Hipapatua Recreation Reserve provides for a range of high quality and well managed outdoor nature based land and water recreation activities and river access experiences to locals and visitors."
- After reviewing six different potential sites for the Flyline operation, this site proved to be the most conducive to a successful operation as it has the ideal mix of; existing trees, vista, gradient, proximity to CBD, proximity to other synergistic tourism operators, and ability to enhance the current environment.
- Alex has an impeccable reputation for delivering high value, eco-tourism ventures and we are confident in his ability to deliver on this project. His ‘Redwoods Treewalk’ business in Rotorua has won numerous awards and received Gold Qualmark Status. The Redwoods Treewalk has strong connections with iwi (the land it sits on is privately owned through CNI Iwi Holdings Ltd) and was fully consented and approved by Rotorua Lakes Council.
- We believe the Flyline development will be a catalytic activity with regards to attracting new visitors to our district and encouraging them to stay longer. We reference an article published by Rotorua Lakes Council in May 2016 about the Redwoods Treewalk as a direct example. (https://www.rotorulakescouncil.nz/our-council/news/Pages/default.aspx?newsItem=709c).

"Since Rotorua attraction Redwoods Treewalk opened in December last year, numbers through the Redwoods i-Site has more than doubled in the first quarter of this year. Redwoods i-Site has seen a 70 percent increase in visitor numbers compared to the same period last year - with 35,000 visitors for January and 30,000 for February; compared to just 12,000 for the same periods last year. Rotorua i-Site manager, Graham Brownrigg says they had anticipated a moderate increase this year"
of around 18,000 visitors per month with the opening of the Redwoods Treewalk, however they have been astonished with the large number of visitors and bookings through the i-Site. “We anticipated that during the warmer months the Redwoods Forest would see an increase in visitors. It’s an iconic attraction - offering beautiful walking tracks and scenic surroundings and since the Treewalk opened we are seeing more visitors. People want to see the beautiful forest from a different viewpoint.”

- Taupo district urgently requires development of new tourism activity – we are falling behind due to lack of investment in this area. We have recently been working with NZTE to prioritise investment opportunities to bring new tourism activity to our district, and this project was identified as a national priority through their programme.
- We believe this development creates an opportunity to bring forward infrastructure improvements in the immediate area, including developing walking tracks.
- Extending and enhancing the tourism offering in a wider Wairakei corridor is an identified priority in your District Economic Strengthening Study and in our Strategic Plan.
- This development will directly create new jobs and generate GDP for our local economy,
  - At the minimum of five FTE jobs, paying a median rate of $45,000 p/a and using the standard 5x multiplier effect, an additional $1.125m is generated for our local economy annually.
  - A estimate of 5000 extra bed nights created from this development would generate upwards of $2.8m per annum into our economy. [For y/e Dec 2018, our total visitor spend was $653,000,000 over 1,160,591 nights = $563 per night/avg].

We would like to speak to our submission at the hearing if possible.

Yours faithfully

Murray McCaw
Chairman
Enterprise Great Lake Taupo
Organisation: Rive Gauche B&B Lodge

First Name: Lynne

Last Name: Fauchelle

On behalf of:

Postal Address:
128 Ferndale Way, RD 4

Suburb:

City: Taupo

Country: New Zealand

Postal Code: 3384

eMail: fauchelle.lynne@gmail.com

Daytime Phone:

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
* Yes
○ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRRoD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?

Support/Oppose Granting of License
○ SUPPORT
General Comment

Please see attached letter

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hapupatu Reserve Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hapupatu Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hipapatua Reserve Proposal submission

Firstly, I would like to state that in principle I have nothing against the Fly-Line activity proposed by Alex Schmid, other than the location he has chosen to develop this activity.

There appear to be a number of issues and concerns which indicate that the chosen site is not a suitable option.

On two sides the proposed area is bordered by residential subdivisions which will be considerably affected by environmental factors such as loss of privacy, noise pollution and traffic congestion, and possibly even night time activity if the proposed development goes ahead.

The third side is an amenity landscape area to which the public currently has freedom of access. The setting up of a such an activity would limit free public access for walking, camping and picnicking.

The fourth side, the Waikato River, is designated as an area of outstanding natural beauty due to it the colour of the water, the vegetation cover and the significant bird life, as well as its significant cultural and historic value. A Fly-Line activity in or near this area would impact on its natural beauty, as viewed from both sides of the river and the river itself. The river is increasingly popular with kayakers as a ‘float trip’ experience. Both this and the walkway from Huka Falls to Spa Park are peaceful activities allowing users to appreciate the beauty of the area. A Fly-line activity would also discourage native bird life in the area.

Other concerns I have in relation to the Fly-Line proposal are as follows:

1. Overall the Reserve Management Plan does not contemplate commercial activities of the nature and scale proposed at the southern end of the reserve. This is very clear from the “Explanation” section relating to Policy 6.2.4 (page 18), and the concept plan on page 14 which shows that the southern area is a “restoration area” and confines activities to other areas designated in that plan. Furthermore, section 6.2.1 of the Management Plan outlines the recreational values of the reserve and states that it is “a quiet natural area close to town...” and “a contrast with the nearby busy and highly modified areas (eg. intensive tourism development .... /).” Both quotations are from page 16. It seems obvious that the suggested 45,000 people per year using the site would not be consistent with these values and therefore not satisfy the requirement in Policy 6.2.4i.

2. The Council’s own policy states that the applicant must demonstrate to Council that the activity will have no adverse effects. No-one in the neighbourhood knows what the effects will be since the applicant has not provided adequate information. Some, but not all, people living in the vicinity received an invitation to meet with the applicant on-site. Nathan suggested in his email that this meeting with Alex might “go a long way to provide answers” to our questions, but when questions were
asked about operational and construction details few answers were forthcoming. The subsequent release of mis-information has left neighbours with a sour taste and a sense of distrust in the application procedure. I refer to an article in the Taupo & Turangi Weekender headed “Racial Slurs at Meeting”. Those present at the meeting can categorically state that no such slurs occurred, and for this inflammatory article to appear just days after the Christchurch mosque attacks was extremely irresponsible and insensitive.

3. Recommendation for the application has been made on a total lack of information in relation to the following: noise, hours of operation, parking allocation, traffic congestion. Following the on-site meeting Alex stated in an email to a neighbour that “any questions or requests are part of the official process and thus they have to be sent directly to the council”. We neighbours need answers! Further questions relate to the height of the proposed tower and the distance from boundaries. It appears both differ from what is permissible.

4. Safety issues: The Reserve Management Plan states that the pines present in the reserve present a health and safety risk to users and neighbouring properties. It must be noted that these pines entertain high risk factors due to stem fractures and the dropping of branches. Numerous fractures are evident and some of the trees are likely to fall due to age and wind pressure. Trees in the Wairakei Valley corridor have in the past suffered from south-easterly blows, inflicting considerable damage.

In conclusion: Due to the number of issues mentioned above, and no doubt others not outlined in this submission, I am against the Fly-Line proposal in this location. I feel that if a Fly-Line is to be constructed in the Taupo area there are more suitable sites for this activity, such as Spa Thermal Park where there is plenty of available parking, and plenty of visitors. Impact on the environment would not be a concern in this location.

My husband and I have been residents in Ferndale Way for over 12 years, developing our property into an award-winning lodge catering mostly to international visitors who appreciate the peace and tranquillity of the area. Our European visitors say they prefer to seek out peaceful locations rather than overcrowded tourist spots in order to have a quality holiday experience. We have been able to cater to their preference. (View our French and German language reviews on TripAdvisor).

Options for the area:
Greening Lake Taupo contributes much to the beautification of the Wairakei corridor, supported by the help and contributions of the residents of Taupo. The ideal scenario would be for the Hipapatua reserve to be developed in accordance with their vision for the area, as provided for in the Park Management Plan. Planting has already been initiated in areas that the Fly-Line would impact on and endanger.

A gradual process of re-vegetation with native species, planned and overseen by Greening Lake Taupo would guarantee a protected habitat for the native birds that thrive there now.
and create a peaceful place for walkers to enjoy in addition to the picnic area along the riverside. It is my wish to see this area protected from activities such as the one proposed which would put undue stress on the environment. The right plan needs to be implemented so that future generations can enjoy the natural beauty of this special area right on our doorstep.

Lynne Fauchelle
Rive Gauche B&B Lodge
128 Ferndale Way
RD4 Taupo 3384

Please note that I wish to be heard in person
Organisation: Destination Great Lake

First Name: Jane

Last Name: Wilson

On behalf of: 

Postal Address: Type in your address. Eg. 100 Queen St, 1 Willis St

Suburb:

City:

Country: New Zealand

PostCode: 

eMail: * maggie@lovotaupo.com

Daytime Phone: 07 376 0400

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes  ☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT  ☐ OPPOSE

General Comment

Please see attached letter
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DGLT Submission on Fry Lite April 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapalua Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nathan Moule - Senior Reserves Planner
Taupō District Council
Private Bag 2005
Taupō 3352

08 April 2018

Dear Nathan

New commercial licence proposal at Hipaputia Recreation Reserve

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the proposed new commercial licence to be granted for the Hipaputia Recreation Reserve.

As you will be aware, Destination Great Lake Taupo (DGLT) is the tourism marketing and promotion agency for the Taupo District. We also have a function to support, promote and assist in activities and projects which will increase the opportunities for employment in the tourism and visitor industries in the district.

We have reviewed the marketing material provided and we believe the activity has the potential to significantly add to the mix of tourism activities and attractions in the district. We believe the proposed activity will compliment other adjoining attractions/activities, and most importantly, will provide an additional ‘soft adventure’ activity which can run all year round. Based on the success of other similar activities around New Zealand, we believe the operation will be appealing both to a mix of domestic and international visitors.

We also believe that this development will assist with infrastructure improvements required in the area, including roading, development of public facilities and walking and mountain biking tracks.

We SUPPORT the granting of the commercial licence.

We do not wish to speak to our submission.

Kind regards

Jane Wilson
General Manager
First Name: Bruce

Last Name: McCullagh

On behalf of: 

Postal Address: Type in your address. Eg. 100 Queen St, 1 Willis St

Suburb: 

City: 

Country: New Zealand

PostCode: 

eMail: femdale_way@xtra.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 07 378 6873

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing? 
☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRReD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?

May show PDF or PowerPoint via laptop

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE
General Comment

Please see attached 2 pdf files:

1) Bruce_submission.pdf
2) Joanna_Lewis_memorandum_4th_April_2019.pdf

Bruce McCullagh
formulaemeye@live.co.nz
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Submission

Bruce McCullagh
ferndale_way@xtra.co.nz

Date: 6th of April 2019

Hipapatua Reserve Restoration

I oppose the proposal to grant a new commercial license for a Fly-Line activity.

In my opinion this proposal directly conflicts with the ongoing plans of Taupo District Council and Greening Taupo to completely restore the Hipapatua Reserve.

About me

About 15 years ago I sold my company in Europe and moved back to Taupo to retire with my wife and two children. People who know me will confirm that I am a very generous person and have donated and supported Hospice and many other local community charities. In the last year I have become very much involved with the charity Greening Taupo.

Last year I personally sponsored 1000 native trees.

Greening Taupo

The objective of Greening Taupo is to improve the Taupo environment for people and native wildlife. This involves undertaking restoration planting and pest control to create ecological corridors to allow the number of native birds to flourish. Particular attention is focused on access routes in and out of Taupo that will help create a sense of arrival for visitors to Taupo.

www.greeningtupo.org.nz
Restoration of Native Trees is important

The community and the Taupo District Council are custodians of this unique and precious reserve. We have a “duty of care” to ensure that this reserve is completely restored for this and future generations.

Enjoying nature in a calm and educational way.

(photograph courtesy of the Department of Conservation)

www.kidsgreeningtaupo.org.nz

Recent successful native tree planting at the Hipapatua Reserve held last year

9th September 2018 with picnic area in the background
Hipapataua Reserve Concept Plan

This restoration plan completely aligns itself with the restoration goals of Hipapataua Reserve Management Concept Plan.

As shown on page 14 of Hipapataua Reserve Management Plan

Recent native tree planting at the Hipapataua Reserve 100% native trees in years to come....
Large Wilding Pine Trees Hipapatua Reserve

There are many tall wilding pine trees in the southern area of the reserve. There also a line of about 23 in-between the overflow campsite and the picnic area.

Facts from the Department of Conservation

Wilding Pine Trees are a member of the Conifer family and are:

- invasive weeds
- woody plants that have cones instead of flowers
- overwhelming our native landscapes and killing our native plants
- spreading across the landscape are self-sown and unwanted
- declared an unwanted organism under the Biosecurity Act 1993

I feel that the plans to remove the Wilding Pines and restore Hipapatua Reserve are aligned to the core values of the Department of Conservation.

Native trees do not thrive beneath Wilding Pine Trees

Pine needles continuously fall from the pine trees and form a carpet which discourages regeneration of native forest floor species. Wilding Pines modify the natural ecosystems so much that the unique New Zealand landscape is lost, and native plants and animals are evicted or die.


Hipapatua Reserve - Blackberry and a carpet of pine needles
The ongoing plan is to completely restore Hipapatua Reserve

Taupo District Council in conjunction with Greening Taupo has an ongoing plan for the complete restoration of Hipapatua Reserve.

All Wilding Pines, Vine weeds and Blackberry will be completely removed. This removal will allow the native trees beneath to start to thrive.

I have and will continue to personally provide with other sources, funds for the purchase of new native trees. I will continue to be personally hands and focused on the complete restoration goal.

Greening Taupo must remain impartial about other parties. However, both Robyn Ellis and Shawn Vennell of Greening Taupo have confirmed that they give their full support to the restoration plan described in this document.
Stage 1 - Chop down Pine Trees near picnic area and overflow campsite

In conjunction with the Taupo District Council and Greening Taupo, Stage 1 started in 2018 with the planting of native trees near and around the picnic area.

For Health and Safety reasons as mentioned in the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan and due to the proximity to the overflow campsite and picnic area, it would be desirable to have all 23 pine trees chopped down.

Stage 1 - As viewed from overflow campsite

Pine Trees chopped down - cut into “rings”.

These are then picked up and disappear within days by the “Firewood Fairy’s”

The next public native tree planting day at Hipapatua Reserve has already been scheduled for the 14th of September 2019 so it would desirable to have these pines removed before that date.
Stage 4 onwards - Pine Trees Poisoned

Applying poison inside the base of the pine trees in the southern area of the reserve would be an easy and safe method of removal.

Procedure:
A downwards sloping hole is drilled to the centre of the trunk base. Poison is then poured into this hole. Within a few months the green pine needles die and fall to the ground leaving a bare tree that is no longer capable of producing pine needles or pine cones.

As the shade has now gone, the existing native trees very quickly start to thrive.

The decay of a Poisoned Pine Tree

Over time the tree dries out and decays. Dry and dead branches fall to the ground. The trunk dries and decays in a safe vertical manner.

The timber matter that falls to the ground is ideal for the native trees and subsequent self-seeding seedlings.
One Billion Trees Programme
The Government has set a goal to plant one billion trees by 2028. The One Billion Trees Programme will deliver improved social, environmental, and economic outcomes for New Zealand.

Tourism Infrastructure Fund
Hipapatau Reserve has successfully been receiving funding in past years. It is hoped that continued funding to speed up the restoration plan and tourist camping initiatives will be granted.


Totara Gut Track and Valley - Case Study
Andrew Hilton and his children together with Greening Taupo have been selflessly restoring Totara Gut Track and Valley (located north of the Hub Café running down to the Waikato River and Hot Water Beach).

This work only started in October 2018, but huge progress has already been made. The 1 to 2-year plan will see this valley completely restored with native trees.

Successfully poisoned Pine Trees can be seen in the background.

The Fly-Line will have an adverse effect on this restoration plan
The proposed Fly-Line is intended to attach and be supported by the existing wilding pine trees.

The granting of the new commercial licence to the Fly-Line applicant, will therefore not allow any of these trees to be removed for at least the next 10 years (and more than likely beyond). This would greatly hinder the complete restoration work goals as started in the Hipapatau Reserve Management Plan.

Conclusion
I ask that you consider my submission and I would be happy to speak to my submission and answer any questions you may have.

Hipapatau Reserve Management Plan talks about "community values being important" and I am already personally involved in the Hipapatau Reserve restoration, as are many others. Please also refer to the memorandum 4th April 2019 attached from Joanne Lewis of Lewis Consultancy Ltd.

I ask that the agreement [in principle] with the Fly-Line applicant be cancelled and the application to grant a "commercial license to occupy" be denied.

I am a progressive member of the Taupo community and I would support the Fly-Line activity at another suitable location.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bruce McCullagh, Jim and Lynne Veitch, Anne and Barry Findlay, Lesley and Nick Beacock, Steve and Leann Murray, and Dean and Joan Lawson
FROM: Joanne Lewis
SUBJECT: Proposed “Fly-Line” tourism activity at Hipapatua Recreation Reserve
DATE: 4th April 2019

As a group you have asked me to provide planning advice regarding the proposal for a commercial activity to establish at the southern part of Hipapatua Recreation Reserve (Huka Falls Road) adjacent to your residential properties.

On 8th March 2019 Taupo District Council placed a public notice in the Taupo Times inviting submissions on a proposal to issue a commercial licence “to allow the establishment of an aerial eco/adventure tourism activity, called a Fly-Line, through trees on the southern end of the reserve”. I understand that each of you is intending to lodge a submission with Taupo District Council on this proposal, and that you will each include this memorandum with your submission. Further, I understand that each of you has indicated in your submission that you intend to be present at the hearing on the 16th April to speak to your submission and respond to any questions that councillors may have. In the case of reserve management planning matters addressed in this memorandum, I will attend the hearing and, likewise, be available to address councillors and respond to questions.

In relation to the proposal for a “licence to occupy” the Hipapatua Reserve for a Fly-Line activity, the following matters are considered below:

- The Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan (HRMP) – status, brief overview and significance;
- Is the proposed activity allowed by the Reserve Management Plan (RMP)?
- The proposal, information available, and potential adverse effects;
- Conclusions.

THE HIPAPATUA RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

As you are aware, the HRMP is a public policy document required under the Reserves Act. The Taupo District Council manages the reserve on behalf of the community and the reserve management plan is for the purpose of “setting out the management and development requirements of the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve” (page 5, HRMP). The Plan was prepared in consultation with the Taupo community and I understand that many of you were involved in the consultation/submissions/hearing process that the draft management plan went through, resulting in the current HRMP which became operative in June 2017.

Those details are important – ie that the HRMP is a community-based policy document which has only recently been adopted by Taupo District Council (ie it is less than 2 years old).
1.1 RMP Structure

The “Introduction” section of the HRMP (page 6) explains that:

“The Concept Plan and Policies contained in Section 5 and 6 of this reserve (sic) are considered to have statutory weight, and activities are not permitted that contravene these sections.”

Further, the “Introduction” states that the concept plan and policies of the HRMP have been developed to ensure, among other things, that the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve “is used and managed in a manner that best protects the important values associated with the reserve”.

Accordingly, I conclude that the particularly important parts of the HRMP are under the headings of “Values” (Section 3), “Concept Plan” (Section 5), and “Policies” (Section 6). I note, consistent with that approach, that “Administration and Control” policies in the RMP state:

- “Taupo District Council will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in this management plan” (Policy 6.5.1.ii), and
- “Any significant change of objectives and policies will require a plan review as per the process set out in section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977” (policy 6.5.1.iii).

1.2 “Values” (Section 3 of the HRMP)

The “Values” section of the HRMP explains that the site has “important cultural, social, recreation and environmental values associated with it” and that these values have underpinned the development of the RMP. The RMP notes the following values (which I have summarised):

- **Community and Cultural Values**: the reserve is important to visitors as well as hapu and the wider community (specifically noting those residing in the Huka Falls Road area);
- **Recreation Values**: main uses are nature based / outdoor activities (kayaking, picnic, camping). Valued because of proximity to river and vegetation, for informal uses. Different areas of the reserve are for different uses. Currently there is a range of recreational and passive uses. Important for freedom camping;
- **Environmental Values**: river margin and vegetation is part of the unique Taupo-Wairakei ecological corridor. Values of naturalness and recognised scenic and amenity values (identified in the District Plan). Water quality of the river contributes to visual amenity of the reserve.

In my view the values of the Hipapatua Reserve (explained in Section 3 of the HRMP and which the RMP specifically seeks to protect) are those which arise from the existing range of uses and activities there. The emphasis is on recognising the range of informal and passive activities there, identification of specific areas for specific activities (through the concept plan which provides for those activities), and an over-riding concern for the natural, landscape and amenity values of the reserve because of its location as part of the Waikato River ecological corridor.

Leaving aside consideration of the concept plan and policies (below) at a broad level it appears to me that introducing a tourism activity (and associated infrastructure, buildings, and servicing components) which is anticipated to attract 45,000 users per year is unlikely to sit comfortably with the stated purpose of the HRMP to ensure that the reserve “is used and managed in a manner that best protects the important values associated with the reserve”.

1.3 “Concept Plan” (Section 5 of the HRMP)

Section 5 of the RMP explains that the Concept Plan (at page 14):

2
- "Identifies the location for specific activities, assets and infrastructure to be located on the reserve" and
- "... also identifies potential works, such as environmental restoration, new tracks and roads."

The concept plan, which the RMP says has statutory weight, identifies that it is the northern and middle parts of the reserve only where various activities will take place (ie related to camping, day use, kayak/river access). The rest of the reserve (including the southern part) are identified as "restoration areas" (with specific reference in the RMP to removing pine trees as they are a safety risk).

In my view it could not reasonably be held that the proposed Fly-Line activity is consistent with the concept plan as it is not proposed to be located in a part of the reserve where the concept plan provides for activities (other than for vegetation restoration).

1.4 RMP “Policies”

Section 6 of the HRMP contains the policies which, in combination with the concept plan, are intended to protect the values associated with the reserve. The policies are grouped under six headings and an “Explanation” section beneath each set of policies provides insight as to what is intended. Below is a comment on the specific policies which appear to be relevant to the Fly-Line proposal.

Policies "6.1 Community and Cultural Values"

This set of policies acknowledges the importance of the reserve to the local community, hapū and neighbouring properties. Policy 6.1v states that "The cultural values associated with the reserve should be protected and where possible enhanced", and policy v states that “TDC will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties”. Both policies require that adequate information is available to make such assessments (ie about cultural values and how they will be protected and/or enhanced, and about what the potential effects on neighbouring properties are likely to be). In this case, as discussed later in this memorandum, the required information is not available and a range of potential effects on neighbouring properties has been identified.

Policies "6.2 Recreation Values"

The "6.2.1 Recreation Use" policies include that "TDC will manage Hipopatau Recreation Reserve to maximise recreation opportunities that are consistent with the values and vision of the reserve" (Policy 6.2.1i), and that the reserve "... is a place for outdoor nature based recreation activities that do not diminish the values of the reserve and are consistent with the vision" (Policy 6.2.1ii). Although both policies contemplate recreational activities this policy support is subject to consistency with the values identified in the HRM. In this case, as discussed in Section 1.2 above, it is not considered that the Fly-Line activity is consistent with the stated values of the reserve. That view is supported by the "Explanation" discussion beneath policies 6.2.1 which notes that the reserve offers a “quiet natural area close to town suitable for a range of day use and overnight camping”, and “contrasts with nearby busy and highly modified areas (eg intensive tourism development on adjacent land)” – a reference to Wairakei Tourist Park. A range of recreation activities which are suitable for the reserve is provided. All of these are informal, passive type activities which the reserve is currently used for. In that context, the proposed Fly-Line is not consistent with recreational uses which the HRMP provides for at that location.

The "6.2.4 Events and Commercial Activities" policies provide for commercial activities on the Reserve with a clear expectation (particularly from policy 6.2.4ii and the "Explanation" section) that these will
be short-term and one-off events. Nonetheless policy 6.2.4i states that “TDC will consider commercial and other organized events and activities in Hipatua Recreation Reserve that are compatible with the provisions of the management plan…” Although the Fly-Line is a commercial activity in terms of this policy, because it is not compatible with numerous provisions of the HRMP (specifically the Values, Concept Plan, and various Policies), in my view it does not comply with the policy.

Significantly, other parts of that policy direct that applicants for commercial activities need to “demonstrate” and provide “evidence” about the potential effects of their proposals:

- Policy 6.2.4iv: “All applicants must demonstrate to Taupo District Council that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose…”
- Policy 6.2.4v: “Taupo District Council will only grant applications for commercial activities where evidence has been supplied demonstrating that the activity will not adversely affect the values of the reserve and its primary purpose”.

Section 3 below discusses the information available to TDC to consider the proposal and, most importantly, the potential effects of it. The information is in my view inadequate and does not enable the Council nor the community (which has been invited to provide feedback on the proposal) to fully understand what the specific proposal is, and what the potential effects of it are likely to be.

Policies “6.3 Environmental Values”

The importance of removing non-indigenous and of restoration planting, is emphasized and also the ecological corridor based on the Waikato River (policies 6.3.1). Further, the “Explanation” section (page 19) acknowledges the safety risk, to reserve users and neighbouring properties, which the pine trees present. The Fly-Line, however, proposes to utilize these pine trees, and there is no detail about vegetation management or ecological effects. It is not considered, therefore, that the proposal is consistent with these policies.

The 6.3.2 policies ("Wildlife Management") recognise the ecological values of the reserve which is predominantly a vegetated riparian environment. Policies 6.3.2i and ii (concerned with indigenous vegetation and habitats) require, in my view, that an applicant consider the ecological values of the site and assess how a proposed activity may impact on them. The information available provides no basis for consideration of the matters which these policies address.

Policies “6.4 Asset and Infrastructure Management”

The policy direction in Section 6.4.2 allows necessary facilities associated with recreation activities permitted by the HRMP (policy 6.4.2i) but states that “TDC will restrict facilities in the reserve to those types and locations identified on the Concept Plan necessary to protect the natural environment and to facilitate the use of the reserve for its primary purpose” (Policy 6.4.2i). The Fly-Line proposal involves several structures (including lookout and start tower and associated elevated wire system) in a part of the which the Concept Plan shows is for “restoration area” only. The proposal is therefore inconsistent with this policy.

Policies in Section 6.4.4 are concerned with signs and information. Signage is to be restricted to a minimal number (Policy 6.4.4i) because “too many signs can be a detriment to the visual amenity of the reserve” (page 22). Although the February 2019 TDC agenda item states that “roadside signage will probably be required” there is no information about proposed signage (such as location, number, size, design, appearance etc) to enable an assessment against this policy.
Policies “6.5 Administration and Control”

Relevant policies in the HRMP concerned with administration and management of the reserve are addressed in Section 4 below.

2 IS THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY ALLOWED BY THE HRMP?

Based on consideration of the HRMP provisions in Section 1 above (ie the Values, Concept Plan, and Policies) in my view the Fly-Line proposal is contrary to the HRMP as:

- It does not accord with the values identified for the reserve and which the HRMP seeks to protect;
- It is not located in a part of the reserve where the concept plan provides for activities (other than vegetation restoration) and it is therefore contrary to the concept plan;
- It is contrary to numerous HRMP policies concerned with the adequacy of information about the proposal and its effects, the location of structures and nature of the activity, and provides insufficient information about other policies (including about ecological and cultural matters).

3 THE PROPOSAL AND POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS

3.1 What the HRMP says

As referred to in Section 1.4 above, several HRMP policies clarify that “effects” of activities are a primary concern when considering proposals for the Hipapua Recreation Reserve:

- Policy 6.1v: “Taupo District Council will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties”;
- Policy 6.2.1v: “All applicants must demonstrate to Taupo District Council that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose…”
- Policy 6.2.4v: “Taupo District Council will only grant applications for commercial activities where evidence has been supplied demonstrating that the activity will not adversely affect the values of the reserve and its primary purpose”.

The HRMP sets a high bar in terms of the level of adverse effects acceptable (i.e. “will not have any adverse effects”, and “will not adversely effect...”), and puts the onus on an applicant to demonstrate that threshold can be met. This requires an assessment of effects of a proposal, the scope of which is determined by considering the specific proposal, the site/surroundings and its environmental characteristics.

3.2 Adequacy of Information

An appropriate and adequate effects assessment requires that sufficient information about a site and a specific proposal is known (so that in turn the effects of the proposal can be assessed). An assessment should be undertaken from an objective position and, depending on the nature and scale of a proposal and the issues involved, may require expert input (for example from a traffic engineer if there are potential traffic related effects, a landscape architect if there are potential landscape/visual effects, an ecologist if there are potential ecological effects, etc).

Given the obligation of an applicant as set out in the HRMP (eg “to demonstrate that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve...”), the quality and quantity of information provided about
the proposed Fly-Line is deficient in my view, such that neither Council nor the community could fully understand what the specific proposal is, and therefore what the potential effects of it are likely to be. That is reflected in the concerns raised by you all (as nearby residents) about the lack of information which has been made available.

From my own enquiries of Council officers I was advised there was “no official proposal document” and, like yourselves, was in due course provided with a copy of the presentation that the applicant made to Council. That included what could only be described as a general concept plan showing the location of a lookout, a café, a start area, walking track etc (but with no site boundaries shown, no scale, no details as to the location, height, bulk etc of buildings and structures). There were also various photo images. There was not the usual level of detailed information that would inform a proper understanding of exactly what is proposed or an assessment of the effects of the proposal on the reserve, the wider river corridor, or neighbouring residents. For example, there was little or no detail about the physical elements (such as buildings, access, parking, tracks, signage earthworks, vegetation removal etc) or how the actual activity would be undertaken (hours of operation, management of site, safety issues, details of café/souvenir and beverage etc kiosk).

3.3 What Effects?

Based on the little information available, the following range of potential effects (many of which you have raised in your submissions) need to be considered in this case:

- **Visual and landscape effects:** The HRMP explains that the site is part of an important scenic and landscape area. What are the visual effects from various viewpoints (within reserve, from the Waikato River, from Huka Falls Road, from neighbouring residential properties)? What buildings and structures are exactly proposed (what height, bulk, exact location, exterior materials/colours and their reflectivity levels)? If the pine trees are removed because they present a safety risk, what will support the Fly-Line (how high will any pole or tower structures be, what will they look like)? What signs are proposed exactly (number, location, size, design etc)? What are the effects of the changed landscape characteristics (ie from a quiet vegetated bush area to an intensively used tourist site)? Will there be effects from reflection in the surface of the Waikato River? Will there be glare effects visible off-site? What, if any, night-lighting is proposed and what are the visual effects of that?

- **Ecological effects:** The HRMP explains that the reserve is part of an important ecological corridor along the edge of the Waikato River. I would expect, given its riparian environment and vegetated state that the site may be a habitat for indigenous fauna and flora. Submitters have commented about birdlife there (including ruru). There is no information available about these values and the potential adverse ecological effects that the proposal may generate.

- **Noise effects:** there is insufficient information to understand about potential noise effects (such as from the device/machinery itself, people calling out in excitement and to each other, traffic-related noise effects, use of generators, night use, music, etc). What noise effects will be generated by the proposal (including on the adjoining river environment)?

- **Effects on Cultural values:** the RMP notes that the reserve is of importance to local hapu but the information available does not outline consultation undertaken with tangata whenua, nor provide a cultural impact assessment of the proposal;

- **Safety:** The HRMP acknowledges that the pine trees (on which the Fly-Line relies for support) “present a health and safety risk to users and neighbouring properties” (page 19). How has that acknowledged safety risk been considered and addressed?
• **Traffic and access related effects**: The proposal assumes up to 45,000 users per annum will access the site from Huka Falls Road via the existing southern overflow camping area. No assessment of access and traffic related effects is available however. Is the entrance and access road suitable (design, gradient, sight distances, formation, etc) for the volume and type of likely vehicle use? Where and how many on-site carparks will be provided for the activity and a café (with kiosk as referred to)? Is there a likely risk of over-flow parking along Huka Falls Road and what is the impact of that on existing road users (including pedestrians and cyclists)? Is the access and parking area capable of accommodating buses? Will the additional traffic be accommodated without adverse effects on Huka Falls Road? Would turning bays and/or road widening be required and if so, could that be safely provided within the Huka Falls Road corridor? What are the potential impacts of the additional anticipated traffic volume on the roading network? To what extent will the required parking encroach into and displace existing reserve uses allowed by the HRMP (le overflow camping, vegetation restoration areas) and what are the effects of that? Will driver distraction along Huka Falls Rd (from signage and noticing structures and activity in the trees) create safety issues?

• The combination of this range of potential adverse effects are likely to result in potential changes to the amenity and character of the reserve, the neighbouring residential area, and the Waikato River corridor and these effects also need to be taken into account.

4 **CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the discussion above, in my view the Fly-Line proposal is contrary to the HRMP (including the concept plan and policies contained in it) to the extent that the integrity of the current HRMP, which is a very recently adopted community-based policy document, would be compromised if the proposal proceeded. In my opinion the appropriate course would be that the intention to offer a commercial licence for the Fly-Line activity not proceed further. If the proposal is pursued, then the HRMP (including the concept plan) should be reviewed to enable wider public engagement about commercial tourism activities locating on the reserve. Indeed, that is what the HRMP itself explains is the appropriate course of action when it states:

• "Taupo District Council will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in this management plan" (Policy 6.5.1ii), and

• "Any significant change of objectives and policies will require a plan review as per the process set out in section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977" (Policy 6.5.1iii).

If it was decided that consideration of the proposal could proceed without the need to review the HRMP, it is noted that the HRMP requires that Council considers the effects of proposed activities. Further, the HRMP places a clear obligation on an applicant "to demonstrate that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve...". In this case the quality and quantity of information provided about the proposed Fly-Line falls well short of the required standard to inform such decision-making. That is because, based on the information made available, neither Council nor the community can fully understand what the specific proposal is, nor reasonably know what the potential effects of it are likely to be. In terms of process, that is a serious and fundamental omission in my view because the absence of sufficient information about the proposal and its effects compromises the opportunity for an appropriately informed decision-making process. For these reasons I consider the proposal should not proceed at this time.

Joanne Lewis  BRP(Hons), M Phil (Regional Planning), MNZPI
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Item 4.10- Attachment 2
First Name: Rachael

Last Name: Webber

On behalf of: 

Postal Address: Type in your address. Eg. 100 Queen St, 1 Willis St

Suburb: 

City: 

Country: New Zealand 

PostCode: 

eMail: * info@110laketerrace.co.nz 

Daytime Phone: 0212410061 

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes 
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered. 

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT 
☐ OPPPOSE 

General Comment

See attached

Rachael_submission.pdf
Opus_Structural_Engineer_report.pdf
Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rachael_submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open_Site structural Engineer_report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial licence at Hipatua Recreational Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission
Date: 6 April 2019
Rachael Webber
info@110laketerrace.co.nz

I oppose the proposal to grant a new commercial license for the Fly-Line activity at Hipapatua Recreational Reserve.

Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan
I have read the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan and I think there are many conflicts with values and policies within the plan and the proposed activity.

The plan is a very recent document being less than 2 years (22 June 2017)

As I understand, this plan is an agreement with the New Zealand Government and the Taupo District Council (TDC) on behalf of the Taupo Community that sets out how the reserve is to be managed by the TDC.

6.5 Administration and Control
6.5.1 Administration & Control
Policy and Implementation:
1. Taupo District Council will administer Hipapatua as a Recreation Reserve under Section 129 of the Reserves Act 1977 and in accordance with this management plan and any other relevant Taupo District Council plans, policies or bylaws. Where the policies in this plan conflict with any other Taupo District Council plans, policies or bylaws, the management plan policies will prevail unless specifically identified as overriding the management plan in the relevant plan, policy or bylaw.
2. Taupo District Council will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in this management plan.
3. Any significant change of objectives and policies will require a plan review as per the process set out in section 10 of the Reserves Act 1977.
Evidence to be supplied by the Applicant

As I read the plan, evidence would need to be supplied by the Applicant to demonstrate that the activity does not adversely affect the values of the reserves and its primary purpose. This would apply to every affect that is raised by the public submission.

Note: The Applicant has never installed this structure/activity before so it is unclear as to how the Applicant can know the general affects or the specific affects for this reserve.

Cultural Values (UNKNOWN)

The Applicant should provide evidence that these important Cultural Values have been discussed and agreed with local hapū?
Health and Safety risk

The Hipapataua Reserve Management Plan has already identified that the existing large pine trees (that this proposed activity relies on for support of the Fly-Line device) "present a health and safety risk".

---

5.3 Environmental Values
6.3.1 Vegetation Management
Policy and Implementation:

... Explain Box...

The existing large pine trees provide shelter and shade. However, they are shading key areas of the reserve and their removal would ensure a more-efficient use of the reserve. As these species have a limited lifespan, particularly when compared to native species of a similar size, the presence of these pines presents a health and safety risk to users and neighboring properties. The removal of the pines would facilitate the establishment of a significant understory to support native vegetation. They will be removed and replaced overtime with native species appropriate to the area.

...
Adverse Affects

Some of the known affects are as follows:

- Health and Safety of pine trees to members of the public
- Health and Safety concerns of pine trees as the device support structure
- Conflicts with the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan
- Effects on Cultural Values (UNKNOWN)
- Effects on existing Picnic Area in general (UNKNOWN)
- Effects on existing Campsite in general (UNKNOWN)
- Noise - Culling to other riders or spectators
- Type of Noise - effects of unpredictable distressed/screaming/crying sounds
- Environmental Non-Natural/Visual effects in general
- Sun glare on the long horizontal shiny Stainless-Steel Pipe
- Disturbance from the Electricity Generator
- Values conflict of passive to intensive tourist area (45,000) visitors
- Start Platform distance to front boundary (UNCERTAIN)
- Height of Start Platform (UNKNOWN)
- Operating hours (UNKNOWN)
- Car Parking (UNKNOWN)
- Bus parking (UNKNOWN)
- Motorhome parking (UNKNOWN)
- Outstanding Landscape Area OLA56
- Amenity Landscape Areas ALA09
- Foreshore Protection Area
- No easy access for visitors with disabilities/wheelchairs
- Loss of designated Overflow Camping Area (B) (Camping being a primary purpose)
- Activity/Business Failure – Risk of burden on Rate Payers
- Risk of collapse/death/injury of Proposed Activity to New Zealand Tourism
- Risk of collapse/death/injury of Proposed Activity to Taupo Tourism
- Conflicts with any Restoration Plans

How these Adverse Affects are treated will vary depending on the location within or outside the reserve - from the:

- Campsite
- Picnic area
- Waikato River
- Huka Falls track
- Beneath the Fly-line
- Neighbouring Properties
- Vehicle drivers on the Huka Falls Road
- Pedestrians on the Huka Falls Road
- Outstanding Landscape Area OLA56
- Amenity Landscape Areas ALA09
- Foreshore Protection Area
Adverse Safety Effects - Proposed Commercial Activity

I am not personally qualified to assess the suitability of the wilding pines to hold up this device. I have however read the Structural Engineers Safety Report (by WSP Opus attached to my submission)

This mentions that at least 17 healthy trees have been known to have been blown over by the wind in the southern end of the reserve. It also provides a detailed list of possible Adverse Effects:

- These Wilding Pine Trees are a Health and Safety risk
- These trees have poor form
- Leaning trees can fail
- An Arborist is not qualified to comment on the suitability of these trees
- Healthy trees can fail by Stem Break
- Forked Trees can fail
- Trees with one sided canopy can fail
- Double Trunk Trees are weaker and could fail
- Pine trees drop hard cones that can injure members of the public
- Large branches can fall to the ground near the ride or track
- Tree bulging can indicate possible poor health
- Brittle tree failure is more common in older trees
- Tree’s on sloping ground appear to have collapsed
- Structure Wind Funnel effect
- Wind induced Tree sway can affect the structure
- Multiple trees could fail by the Domino Effect
- Start Platform structure may affect health of nearby trees
- Fallen trees roots may cause problems to other trees and the sloping ground
- Collars may affect tree health
- Unknown ground material may affect the stability of trees supporting the structure
- Effect on Structure if tree supporting the structure fails
- Effect on Structure if a nearby tree fails
- Effect on Structure with tree sway due to wind
- Additional potential hidden costs to council.
- Failure of welds in Stainless Steel Pipe
- Earthquake (seismic) Effect
- Amusement Device Certification
- The Applicant appears to not have any experience in building this particular structure/device
Appropriate Recreation Activities

Similar Aerial Eco/Adventure tourism activities existed in June 2017 when the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan was written. But the plan does not mention anything like this type of adventure tourism activity. The Plan only refers to these types of informal, and largely passive activities:

- picnicking and relaxing
- riverbank activities such as fishing (licensed)
- kayak/canoe use
- walking and cycling
- nature appreciation
- free & accessible public day use

I have watched several videos on YouTube and these differ from the video that the Applicant played at the council meeting. Both adults and children on the Fly-Line seem more focused on the ride itself as opposed to any nature experience. Some riders made noise as they left the start platform (height unknown but could be anywhere from 3 to 5 stories off the ground) and also called out to other riders that where on or near the device.

https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=10154833952049849
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8FhOgeQm5s0&t=32t
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L64d8o2eMI&t=65s
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KKeWd4KQg0E

Overflow Camping Area (Area B)

The proposed activity would use the area already allocated in the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan for overflow camping (area 2600m2)

Operating hours (UNKNOWN)

The Applicant has not been able to confirm the intended operating hours.
Is this Structure a “Building”?
This could be important: The Applicant and TDC would not confirm if the proposed structure would be processed as a “Building” and therefore could:

- Avoid the Resource Consent process
- Avoid the 25m set back from front boundary restriction
- Avoid the 10m height restriction
- Avoid the written permission required from the Minister

Building Act 2004 Reprint as at 12 November 2018

8 Building: what it means and includes

(1) In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, building—

(a) means a temporary or permanent movable or immovable structure including a structure intended for occupation by people, animals, machinery, or equipment;

(b) includes the non-moving parts of a mobile car attached to or servicing a building; and

(c) after 26 March 2008, includes the moving parts of a mobile car attached to or servicing a building.

There is a strong argument that the device should be treated as a building/structure Cable Car/Passenger Lift system.

Building Act 2004 Reprint as at 12 November 2018

9 Building: what it does not include

In this Act, building does not include—

(a) any of the following, whether or not incorporated within another structure:

(i) ski tow;

(ii) other similar standalone machinery systems, or

I know of a similar case in Queenstown where an Applicant was unsuccessful at having a similar device excluded from the definition of a building. A Passenger Lift System does not fall within any of the exceptions.

**Process as a Building**

Confirmation that this structure will be treated as a “Building” should be made before Councillors vote as this may greatly affect how the activity will processed.

```
Application for Commercial Activity received by TDC
  Agreement in Principal Agreed by TDC
  Public Consultation with Submissions
  Summary of Adverse Affects
  Applicant to supply evidence against Adverse Affects
  Councilors Vote
  Grant Right to Occupy
  Encourage the activity at another Taupo District site
  Resource Consent
    Design Accepted by TDC
    Construction
    WorkSafe Approval
    Activity Open to Members of the Public

Hipapatua Management Plan
```
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Written consent from the Minister

Schedule 1 page 148 of the Reserve Act states written consent in writing will be required by the Minister prior to the erection of any building.

Please note: 1 copy of my submission will be sent to the Minister of Conservation the Right Honourable Eugenie Sage.

https://www.beehive.govt.nz/minister/eugenie-sage

Permanent structures will NOT be permitted

It could be argued that Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan is not expecting any structures to be built.

Start Platform Height (UNKNOWN)

The Applicant cannot confirm the height of the Start Platform other than to say approx. 10m to 15m (3 to 5 stories high). Any height over 10m would normally trigger resource consent.
Start Platform distance to front boundary (UNCERTAIN)

The Applicant has had pegs placed to mark the location of the Start Platform. The Applicant has indicated that this cannot now be easily changed as the preliminary design has already been carried including a straight line of sight of the mechanically driven return line.

The set out to pegs measures 15m (approx.) from the front boundary which is inside the minimum of 25m that would normally trigger resource consent.

The 1225_001.pdf (image in part below) was emailed to TDC by the Applicant on 20th February 2019 and clearly shows 15m. (This drawing was released to the public website)
Materials used on any structure

The large diameter pipe used as the main mono track for the roller carriages will never blend into the natural environment. Being made from stainless-steel this will never corrode or dull and will look like new even after many years.

6 RESERVE MANAGEMENT POLICY

6.4 Asset and Infrastructure Management

Policy and Implementation

- The location, design, colours and materials of any structure will be in harmony with the natural environment.

A ECO – TOURISM EXPERIENCE LIKE NO OTHER

Blending seamlessly into its natural surroundings Fly-Line® makes little to no impact on the environment.

(As advertised)

Note: This image was created by a member of the public and was not supplied by the Applicant

Sun glare will also be a factor
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Long term commercial activities are not mentioned as a separate item

In the March 2015 issue of the Reserve Act - Schedule 1 talks about the ability to grant a long-term license for up to 33 years.

However, the Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan that was written in June 2017 (two years after that date) does not discuss specifically the granting of any long-term licenses.

The Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan only specifically talks about events of 6 days or less so it could be assumed that long term commercial license(s) were not even an option.
Contrast with tourism

- Recreation Values conflict with passive to intensive tourist area (45,000 visitors)

Outstanding Landscape Area OLA56

Parts of the Hipapatua Reserve lies within Outstanding Landscape Area OLA56. The eastern river boundary of the Hipapatua Reserve is adjacent to Outstanding Landscape Area OLA56 an area considered significant due to the Landscape Attributes listed in the Schedule 7.1.

The reserve is recognised in this way (and the Reserve Management Plan also recognises its scenic qualities), there has been no appropriate assessment of the effects of the proposal on these recognised visual and landscape qualities.
Amenity Landscape Areas ALA09

Hipapatua Reserve completely lies within Amenity Landscape Area ALA09 in the district plan and forms part of the larger – Huka Falls Scenic Reserve.

Amenity Landscape Areas are considered significant due to their Landscape Attributes.

The reserve is recognised in this way (and the Reserve Management Plan also recognises its scenic qualities), there has been no appropriate assessment of the effects of the proposal on these recognised visual and landscape qualities.

Foreshore Protection Area

The eastern river boundary of the Hipapatua Reserve overlaps the Foreshore Protection Area. 20m measured horizontally from the landward boundary to the ‘bed’ (as defined in the Act) of any identified lake or river, or for Lake Taupo, measured from the Nui-a-Tia boundary, whichever is the further inland.
Neighbouring Residential Properties

It would appear that at least 23 neighbouring residential properties could be affected in a variety of ways. Insufficient information is known at this stage to make an informed decision.

3 VALUES

3.1 Community and Cultural Values

The reserve is also within the community of people who reside along Falls Road, and consideration of this community is also important when managing the reserve and activities on the reserve.

6 RESERVE MANAGEMENT POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION

6.1 Community and Cultural Values

Policy and Implementation

1. Yackandah County Council would consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties.
Visitor Parking

Insufficient information provided by the Applicant.

Conclusion

I would ask that you consider the comments raised in my submission and vote not to grant this commercial license at Hipapatua Reserve.

I would support the Fly-Line activity at another suitable location.
Dear Steve,

We refer to your instruction to consider potential safety risk of the License to Occupy - Flyline at Hipapatua/ Reid's Farm. We have read the Ordinary Council Meeting Agenda dated on the 26th February 2019.

Our main concern in regard to safety would be the safe operation of the structure for both flyline users and for the general public accessing the reserve. We believe the following should be addressed:

- "Trees are biological structures and the material properties are both variable and subject to degradation if attacked by disease or fungus, and their structural performance cannot be guaranteed". James, K., "A dynamic Structural Analysis of Trees subject to wind loading", PhD thesis, University of Melbourne, 2010. Even if a suitably qualified forestry engineer assesses the trees and fixing structures, there is inherently a high-risk of collapse due to the nature of trees (high risk when compared to normal risk of injury or death when occupying a building). Structural performance of trees cannot be guaranteed over long-periods of time due to possible disease, decay, wind damage, etc.

- One common cause of failure of trees is due to wind action. Wind speeds that cause trees to fail have a higher likelihood of occurring when compared to standard return periods for the design of structures. We recognize that the trees in question are not part of a forest, and therefore are at higher exposure to wind than trees in a forest. There is further potential of a wind channel in this area due to the valley environment and nearby Waikato River. It would be our expectation that an in-depth investigation of the proposal in this unique area is undertaken.

- Oscillating behaviour of trees under wind loading will create differential movement between trees. This differential movement will decrease or increase the distance between anchor points, relieving or increasing tension in cables that needs to be assessed and minimised. Additional tension due to relative displacement between trees might be critical when connected to cables of different height/size and it is not clear how this is considered in the design of the system.

- The area is a reserve. It is expected that a proposed mitigation by the applicant would be not to operate during risky periods, such as high winds. However, if cables are damaged and ultimately break, they could pose a significant hazard to other reserve users. Safety of other reserve users must be guaranteed during the operation of the line.
- Access to the top of the fly line will require additional infrastructure such as walkways from the carpark to the platform to guarantee the safety of the visitors and to protect the area from erosion due to human traffic. If the existing walkway alongside Huka Falls Road is used as main access to the area, it will likely require additional barriers for traffic as groups of people are likely to visit the attraction.
- Whether the zip line can be considered as a structure under Section 8 of the Building Act under item 1(a), d) and e) and therefore will require compliance with the Building Act. The applicant is requesting a license to occupy for 10 years.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Julian Benito  
Senior Projects Engineer (CPEng – Structural)
Hipapatua Reserve, Huka Falls Road, Taupo, New Zealand

Adverse Safety Effects - Proposed Commercial Activity

We have been asked by Members of the Public to suggest some of the possible Adverse Safety affects for the proposed Flyline activity at Hipapatua Reserve, 157 Huka Falls Road, Taupo. All comments in this report are a matter of opinion and are not a matter of fact.

Although little actual technical information is available it is understood that a roller coaster like device will slowly carry riders sitting in a sling down a guide rail at approximately 10km/hr. The guide rail is constructed of a 100mm diameter x 2.5mm thick stainless-steel pipe welded in sections that is suspended approximately 15m (5 stories high) and 10m (3 stories high) above the ground. The pipe is held from above by a series of 8mm wires tied back to collars around the existing wilding pine trees. As such it is assumed that the trees themselves will form part of the structure.

Trees marked for use by the device.

These Wilding Pine Trees may pose a Health and Safety risk

The Wilding Pine Trees are likely to of the Pinus Lobloilly family and include Ponderosa, Pinaster and Taeda. These are very tall and slender trees approximately 25m high (8 story building).

These trees have poor form

https://hort.ifas.ufl.edu/woody/irrev-weak.shtml
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Hipapatua Reserve, Huka Falls Road, Taupo, New Zealand – Adverse Safety Effects - Proposed Commercial Activity

Leaning trees can fall
Most of the pine trees in the Hipapatua Reserve are leaning.

Photos supplied show a yellow plumb bob that is the vertical.
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An Arborist is not qualified to comment on the suitability of these trees
An Arborist may comment on tree health but is not qualified to comment on the suitability of these trees to support such a structure. Also, there are at least 17 healthy trees that have fallen over (failed) due to wind in the southern end of Hipapatua Reserve.

Further, “because trees are biological structures and the material properties are both variable and subject to degradation if attacked by disease or fungus, their structural performance cannot be guaranteed”. James, K., “A dynamic Structural Analysis of Trees subject to wind loading”, PhD thesis, University of Melbourne, 2010.

Even if a suitably qualified forestry engineer assesses the trees and fixing structures, there is inherently a higher risk of collapse due to the nature of trees. Structural performance of trees cannot be guaranteed over long periods of time due to possible disease, decay, wind damage, etc.

Healthy trees can fail by Stem Break
At least 17 trees in Hipapatua Reserve have failed from probable wind induced stem break. There is a recent stem break near the overflow camping (as indicated below)
The most common cause of failure of trees is due to wind action. Wind speeds that cause trees to fall have a higher likelihood of occurring when compared to standard return periods for structures.

We recognise that the trees in question are not part of a forest, and therefore are at higher exposure to wind than trees in a forest. It would be our expectation that an in-depth investigation of the proposal in this unique area is undertaken.

The area is also a reserve. It is expected that a mitigation of the applicant would be not to operate during risky periods, such as high winds. However, if cables are damaged and ultimately break, they could pose a significant hazard to other reserve users.
Forked Trees can fail
Due to the growth pattern in the union area failure is more likely to occur in trees that are forked.

Trees with one sided canopy can fail
With wind and extra weight from rain water in the canopy of a one sided or leaning tree there is a greater risk of failure.
Double Trunk Trees are weaker and could fall
Due to the growth pattern in the base of the tree there is a greater risk that a weakness may exist on double trunked trees.

Pine trees drop hard cones that can injure members of the public

Personal protective equipment (PPE) must be enforced for people beneath the canopy.
Large branches can fall to the ground near the ride or track. Even after pruning – I understand that this species of pine will continue to drop newly grown branches from the crown of the tree.
Tree bulging can indicate possible poor health
Compression can cause bulging at the base of a tree and may make failure from blow out more likely.

Brittle tree failure is more common in older trees
As trees age they may become brittle and are more likely to fail.

Tree's on sloping ground appear to have collapsed
The southern part of the Hipapatua Reserve is steep and undulating and may be suspectable to erosion. This may undermine the stability of any trees that are on or near the sloping ground. At least two trees within the southern end of Hipapatua Reserve may have failed in this way.
Structure Wind Funnel effect
The river valley may be within a wind funnel effect zone.

Wind induced Tree sway can affect the structure
Consideration should be given to the possible dynamic effects of wind loading on the trees and how that could affect the structure and how the structural 100mm pipe may initiate the Domino Effect mentioned above.

Multiple trees could fail by the Domino Effect
There is an enormous amount potential energy stored in an upright tree. It is the equivalent to the energy required to lift that tree from its fallen position back up to its vertical upright position. The Domino effect is a phenomenon where the energy released from a falling tree can cause the next tree to also fall. The next tree falling can then cause the next tree to also fall, and so on...

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VXnO8b5illq
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Launch Tower structure may affect health of nearby trees
Effect on surrounding trees

Fallen trees roots may cause problems to other trees and the sloping ground
When a tree falls the roots of the tree may rot and a hollow tunnel may be left behind. Rain water may pass through these tunnels and could speed up ground erosion and subsidence around the other trees.

Collars may affect tree health
Inadequate information

Unknown ground material may affect the stability of trees supporting the structure
Recent excavation work by the Applicant shows loose pumice to at least a depth of 2metres. *Loose remoulded pumiceous soils characterize by a lower density than normal sedimentary soils and a lower cohesion (when compared to lightly welded ignimbrite deposits).*

This area has been a dumping ground for vehicles and building products going back many years which may also create a high variability in the mechanical properties of the underlying soils.
Effect on Structure if tree supporting the structure fails
If a supporting tree of the structure fails, this could affect the overall integrity of the structure. Minor damage could affect the connections and welds in the stainless pipe that go undetected.

Effect on Structure if a nearby tree fails
(similar affects as described above)

Effect on Structure with tree sway due to wind
Oscillating behaviour of trees under wind loading will create differential movement between trees. This differential movement will decrease or increase the distance between anchor points, relieving or increasing tension in cables that needs to be assessed and minimised. Additional tension due to relative displacement between trees might be critical when connected to trees of different height/size and it is not clear how this is considered in the design of the system.

Additional potential hidden costs to council.
Access to the top of the fly line will require additional infrastructure such as walkways from the carpark to the platform to guarantee the safety of the visitors and to protect the area from erosion due to human traffic. If the existing walkway alongside Huka Falls Road is used as main access to the area, it will likely require additional barriers for traffic as groups of people are likely to visit the attraction.
Failure of welds in Stainless Steel Pipe
The pine trees may move backwards and forwards with the wind. The structure would move with the trees and riders using the device. The welds in the 100mm diameter x 2.5mm thick stainless-steel pipe could fail through fatigue or the stress caused by such movement. Earthquakes could also affect the welds.

Earthquake (seismic) Effect
Taupo and New Zealand sits in a moderate to high seismic hazard zone and earthquake effects should be considered in the design of the supporting structure and new structures.
Amusement Device Certification

The Applicant does not appear to be registered on the Amusement Device - New Zealand database.

It would be good practice to register this activity with WORKSAFE as an Amusement Device and gain a certificate. I.e. Taupo Bungy (Certificate No 768) and Lion Express Train (Certificate No 469)

https://worksafe.govt.nz/chsdocument/A338-amusement-device-register

The Applicant appears to not have any experience in building this particular structure/device.

It appears that this device has not ever been installed in this country. Local government will have to accept the fly line is safe.
Conclusion

Due to the brief and insufficient information at the time of writing - this report is only to serve as a guide. Many of the Adverse Safety affects mentioned in this report may be present within the southern end of the Hipapatua Reserve.

All comments in this report are a matter of opinion and are not a matter of fact.
First Name:  
Peter

Last Name: 
Roberts

On behalf of: 

Postal Address:  
Type in your address. Eg. 100 Queen St, 1 Willis St

Suburb:

City:

Country:  
New Zealand

Postal Code:

eMail:  
peterroberts@xtra.co.nz

Daytime Phone:  
021993395

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?  
☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE

General Comment

I don’t think this type of commercial activity is in keeping with the values of the Hikapataua (Reid's Farm) Reserve

Attached Documents
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapiatua Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Name: Joan
Last Name: Lawson
On behalf of: 
Postal Address: 218 Ferndale Way
Suburb: Rangatira Park
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3384
eMail: joanlawson@pi.co.nz
Daytime Phone: 0274584601
Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing? ☑ Yes
☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License
☑ SUPPORT
☒ OPPOSE

General Comment
I oppose strongly to having a commercial activity adventure across the road from where we reside. We bought our property 18 years ago, falling in love with the beautiful natural vista from our home. The rural, quiet outlook is what attractive us to live here and we wish to remain at Ferndale for a very long time to come. I believe there are always other options that you can consider, please consider us. Thank you.
### Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to grant a new commercial licence at Hapataua Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Name: Mia
Last Name: Lawson
On behalf of: 
Postal Address:
  218 Ferndale Way
Suburb: Rangatira Park
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3384
eMail: mia.hl@hotmail.com
Daytime Phone:
Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
  Yes
  ☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License
  ☐ SUPPORT
  ☐ OPPOSE

Attached Documents
File
Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapihua Recreation Reserve
First Name: Dean

Last Name: Lawson

On behalf of: 

Postal Address: 218 Ferndale Way
Suburb: Rangatira Park
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3384

eMail: deanl@crts.co.nz

Daytime Phone: 0274776270

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
O Yes
H I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License
O SUPPORT
H OPPOSE

Attached Documents

File
Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hepaapaua Recreation Reserve
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First Name: Brodie

Last Name: Lawson

On behalf of: 

Postal Address: 218 Ferndale Way

Suburb: Rangatira Park

City: Taupo

Country: New Zealand

PostCode: 3384

eMail: joanlawson@xtra.co.nz

Daytime Phone:

Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?

☐ Yes

☒ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Support/Oppose Granting of License

☐ SUPPORT

☒ OPPOSE

Attached Documents

File

Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hepaplataa Recreation Reserve
First Name: Jim
Last Name: Vetch
On behalf of: 
Postal Address: 128 Ferndale Way, RD 4
Suburb: 
City: Taupo
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 3384
eMail: lynnejmv@hotmail.com
Daytime Phone: 
Would you like to present your submission in person at a hearing?
☐ Yes
☐ I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

The hearing will be held on 16 April 2019 as part of the FRRD Committee meeting. Do you have any additional requirements for the hearing (e.g. access, technology)?

Support/Oppose Granting of License
☐ SUPPORT
☐ OPPOSE
General Comment

Please see attached documents.

Attached Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Veitch submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Veitch attachment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal to grant a new commercial license at Hipapahu Recreational Reserve
Submission – Hipapatua Reserve proposal

I am opposed to the idea of allowing an amusement device to be installed on part of the above reserve. My wife and I chose to build here 13 years ago, in part because of the peacefulness of the area. The proposal is not in keeping with the character and amenities of the area and approving of the proposal would be out of step with the existing Management Plan for the reserve.

In the reserve planner’s invitation to meet with the applicant it was stated that it was hoped that the arranged on-site meeting would go a long way towards providing information on the operational and construction details. To the contrary. Over the hour long meeting very little information was supplied. In fact, the only useful information I personally gained was a verbal assurance that an electricity generator would not be installed. Further, the applicant when asked about the distance from the proposed tower to Huka Falls Road said he didn’t know. Measuring this distance off the map he provided shows it would be only some 15 metres, compared to the planning requirement of 25 metres. Questions regarding hours of operation, night use, lighting installation were met with replies such as “I don’t know yet”.

In the brochure supplied by the applicant statements were made such as “blends into the natural landscape” and “a gentle and silent experience discovering New Zealand’s forest”. I’m of the opinion that there are hundreds of thousands of hectares in this country that would give a better experience of discovering a New Zealand forest. Further, the Reserve Management Plan refers to the wilding pines in the subject area as a health and safety risk to users and neighbouring properties. In my opinion, therefore, it would of concern to encourage members of the public to access this area.

The applicant, as stated in the previous paragraph, refers to a silent experience. I would find this difficult to believe as I can’t imagine participants not shouting, calling out to others on the device etc, particularly when they leave the tower, go over a dip in the terrain or change direction. Indeed, we can hear ruckus from people in the Hipapatua camping area, which is double the distance from our property compared with the distance to the proposed activity. However, this tends to happen for only short periods of the year. And the camping area was here before us, so we accept this inconvenience. Furthermore, if these wilding pines were deemed to be a health and safety risk
in 2017, what has changed? As the Reserve Management Plan is a public
document, in the event of an accident insurers could deny cover.

At the site meeting with the applicant he was asked if he intended to fence the
boundary with Huka Falls Road. His reply was that vegetation such as the
blackberry would be retained to act as a natural security barrier. However, the
Management Plan states that introduced species will be removed and native
vegetation will be promoted. There is nothing native about wilding pines or
blackberry!

A few days after the on-site meeting with the applicant an article appeared in
the Weekender headed “Racial Slurs at Meeting”. The reporter stated that the
information in the article came from the applicant. The on-site meeting with
the applicant took place only two days after the tragic events in Christchurch.
Personally, I found this accusation by the applicant of racial slurs very
upsetting. I was present for the whole meeting and can categorically state that
no such slurs occurred. The meeting was recorded on at least two different
devices.

My previous involvement with land subdivision in the Taupo district sometimes
meant paying bonds to secure the Council’s position with regard to completion
of works. Who is going to pay for removing the unsightly wires, pipes, tower
etc if the venture doesn’t succeed? It certainly should not be Taupo ratepayers.

In summary, I do not believe that the subject site is the correct place for such a
development. Besides the reasons mentioned above I would point out that of
the four boundaries, two are adjoining developed residential areas, the third is
a river recognised as a place of outstanding natural beauty in the Reserve
management Plan, while the fourth, to the north, is an established freedom
camping and picnic area. Indeed, the applicant has now stated that the subject
proposal requires the overflow camping area, for parking.

Further information regarding the planning aspects of the subject proposal will
be provided by a consultant planner who we have engaged.

Jim Veitch
128 Ferndale Way
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bruce McCullagh, Jim and Lynne Veitch, Anne and Barry Findlay, Lesley and Nick Beacock, Steve and Leann Murray, and Dean and Joan Lawson

FROM: Joanne Lewis

SUBJECT: Proposed “Fly-Line” tourism activity at Hipapatua Recreation Reserve

DATE: 4th April 2019

As a group you have asked me to provide planning advice regarding the proposal for a commercial activity to establish at the southern part of Hipapatua Recreation Reserve (Huka Falls Road) adjacent to your residential properties.

On 8th March 2019 Taupo District Council placed a public notice in the Taupo Times inviting submissions on a proposal to issue a commercial licence “to allow the establishment of an aerial eco/adventure tourism activity, called a Fly-Line, through trees on the southern end of the reserve”. I understand that each of you is intending to lodge a submission with Taupo District Council on this proposal, and that you will each include this memorandum with your submission. Further, I understand that each of you has indicated in your submission that you intend to be present at the hearing on the 16th April to speak to your submission and respond to any questions that councillors may have. In the case of reserve management planning matters addressed in this memorandum, I will attend the hearing and, likewise, be available to address councillors and respond to questions.

In relation to the proposal for a “licence to occupy” the Hipapatua Reserve for a Fly-Line activity, the following matters are considered below:

- The Hipapatua Reserve Management Plan (HRMP) — status, brief overview and significance;
- Is the proposed activity allowed by the Reserve Management Plan (RMP)?
- The proposal, information available, and potential adverse effects;
- Conclusions.

1 THE HIPAPUTUA RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

As you are aware, the HRMP is a public policy document required under the Reserves Act. The Taupo District Council manages the reserve on behalf of the community and the reserve management plan is for the purpose of “setting out the management and development requirements of the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve” (page 5, HRMP). The Plan was prepared in consultation with the Taupo community and I understand that many of you were involved in the consultation/submissions/hearing process that the draft management plan went through, resulting in the current HRMP which became operative in June 2017.

Those details are important — ie that the HRMP is a community-based policy document which has only recently been adopted by Taupo District Council (ie it is less than 2 years old).
1.1 RMP Structure

The "Introduction" section of the HRMP (page 6) explains that: "The Concept Plan and Policies contained in Section 5 and 6 of this reserve (sic) are considered to have statutory weight, and activities are not permitted that contravene these sections."

Further, the "Introduction" states that the concept plan and policies of the HRMP have been developed to ensure, among other things, that the Hipapatau Recreation Reserve "is used and managed in a manner that best protects the important values associated with the reserve."

Accordingly, I conclude that the particularly important parts of the HRMP are under the headings of "Values" (Section 3), "Concept Plan" (Section 5), and "Policies" (Section 6). I note, consistent with that approach, that "Administration and Control" policies in the RMP state:

- "Taupo District Council will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in this management plan" (Policy 6.5.11), and
- "Any significant change of objectives and policies will require a plan review as per the process set out in section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977" (policy 6.5.11i).

1.2 "Values" (Section 3 of the HRMP)

The "Values" section of the HRMP explains that the site has "important cultural, social, recreation and environmental values associated with it" and that these values have underpinned the development of the RMP. The RMP notes the following values (which I have summarised):

- Community and Cultural Values: the reserve is important to visitors as well as hapu and the wider community (specifically noting those residing in the Huka Falls Road area);
- Recreation Values: main uses are nature based / outdoor activities (kayaking, picnic, camping). Valued because of proximity to river and vegetation, for informal uses. Different areas of the reserve are for different uses. Currently there is a range of recreational and passive uses. Important for freedom camping;
- Environmental Values: river margin and vegetation is part of the unique Taupo-Wairakei ecological corridor. Values of naturalness and recognised scenic and amenity values (identified in the District Plan). Water quality of the river contributes to visual amenity of the reserve.

In my view the values of the Hipapatau Reserve (explained in Section 3 of the HRMP and which the RMP specifically seeks to protect) are those which arise from the existing range of uses and activities there. The emphasis is on recognising the range of informal and passive activities there, identification of specific areas for specific activities (through the concept plan which provides for those activities), and an over-riding concern for the natural, landscape and amenity values of the reserve because of its location as part of the Waikato River ecological corridor.

Leaving aside consideration of the concept plan and policies (below) at a broad level it appears to me that introducing a tourism activity (and associated infrastructure, buildings, and servicing components) which is anticipated to attract 45,000 users per year is unlikely to sit comfortably with the stated purpose of the HRMP to ensure that the reserve "is used and managed in a manner that best protects the important values associated with the reserve."

3.3 "Concept Plan" (Section 5 of the HRMP)

Section 5 of the RMP explains that the Concept Plan (at page 34):
The concept plan, which the RMP says has statutory weight, identifies that it is the northern and middle parts of the reserve only where various activities will take place (ie related to camping, day use, kayak/river access). The rest of the reserve (including the southern part) are identified as "restoration areas" (with specific reference in the RMP to removing pine trees as they are a safety risk).

In my view it could not reasonably be held that the proposed Fly-Line activity is consistent with the concept plan as it is not proposed to be located in a part of the reserve where the concept plan provides for activities (other than for vegetation restoration).

1.4 RMP "Policies"

Section 6 of the HRMP contains the policies which, in combination with the concept plan, are intended to protect the values associated with the reserve. The policies are grouped under six headings and an "Explanation" section beneath each set of policies provides insight as to what is intended. Below is a comment on the specific policies which appear to be relevant to the Fly-Line proposal.

Policies "6.1 Community and Cultural Values"

This set of policies acknowledges the importance of the reserve to the local community, hapu and neighbouring properties. Policy 6.1\(v\) states that "The cultural values associated with the reserve should be protected and where possible enhanced", and policy \(v\) states that "TDCC will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties". Both policies require that adequate information is available to make such assessments (ie about cultural values and how they will be protected and/or enhanced, and about what the potential effects on neighbouring properties are likely to be). In this case, as discussed later in this memorandum, the required information is not available and a range of potential effects on neighbouring properties has been identified.

Policies "6.2 Recreation Values"

The "6.2.1 Recreation Use" policies include that "TDCC will manage Hipoputa Recreation Reserve to maximise recreation opportunities that are consistent with the values and vision of the reserve" (Policy 6.2.1\(i\)), and that the reserve "... is a place for outdoor nature based recreation activities that do not diminish the values of the reserve and are consistent with the vision" (Policy 6.2.1\(ii\)). Although both policies contemplate recreational activities this policy support is subject to consistency with the values identified in the HRM. In this case, as discussed in Section 1.2 above, it is not considered that the Fly-Line activity is consistent with the stated values of the reserve. That view is supported by the "Explanation" discussion beneath policies 9.2.1 which notes that the reserve offers a "quiet natural area close to town suitable for a range of day use and overnight camping", and "contrasts with nearby busy and highly modified areas (eg intensive tourism development on adjacent land)" -- a reference to Wairakei Tourist Park. A range of recreation activities which are suitable for the reserve is provided. All of these are informal, passive type activities which the reserve is currently used for. In that context, the proposed Fly-Line is not consistent with recreational uses which the HRMP provides for at that location.

The "6.2.4 Events and Commercial Activities" policies provide for commercial activities on the Reserve with a clear expectation (particularly from policy 6.2.4\(ii\) and the "Explanation" section) that these will
be short-term and one-off events. Nonetheless policy 6.2.4i states that “TDC will consider commercial 
and other organised events and activities in Hipapatua Recreation Reserve that are compatible with the 
provisions of the management plan...”. Although the Fly-Line is a commercial activity in terms of this 
policy, because it is not compatible with numerous provisions of the HRMP (specifically the Values, 
Concept Plan, and various Policies), in my view it does not comply with the policy.

Significantly, other parts of that policy direct that applicants for commercial activities need to 
“demonstrate” and provide “evidence” about the potential effects of their proposals:

- Policy 6.2.4v: “All applicants must demonstrate to Taupo District Council that the activity will 
  not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose...”
- Policy 6.2.4v: “Taupo District Council will only grant applications for commercial activities 
  where evidence has been supplied demonstrating that the activity will not adversely affect the 
  values of the reserve and its primary purpose”.

Section 3 below discusses the information available to TDC to consider the proposal and, most 
importantly, the potential effects of it. The information is, in my view inadequate and does not enable 
the Council nor the community (which has been invited to provide feedback on the proposal) to fully 
understand what the specific proposal is, and what the potential effects of it are likely to be.

Policies “6.3 Environmental Values”.

The importance of removing non-indigenous and of restoration planting, is emphasized and also the 
estuary corridor based on the Waikato River (policies 6.3.1). Further, the “Explanation” section (page 
19) acknowledges the safety risk, to reserve users and neighbouring properties, which the pine trees 
present. The Fly-Line, however, proposes to utilize these pine trees, and there is no detail about 
vegetation management or ecological effects. It is not considered, therefore, that the proposal is 
consistent with these policies.

The 6.3.2 policies (“Wildlife Management”) recognise the ecological values of the reserve which is 
predominantly a vegetated riparian environment. Policies 6.3.2i and ii (concerned with indigenous 
vegetation and habitats) require, in my view, that an applicant consider the ecological values of the site 
and assess how a proposed activity may impact on them. The information available provides no basis 
for consideration of the matters which these policies address.

Policies “6.4 Asset and Infrastructure Management”.

The policy direction in Section 6.4.2 allows necessary facilities associated with recreation activities 
permitted by the HRMP (policy 6.4.2iii) but states that “TDC will restrict facilities in the reserve to those 
types and locations identified on the Concept Plan necessary to protect the natural environment and to 
facilitate the use of the reserve for its primary purpose” (Policy 6.4.2i). The Fly-Line proposal involves 
several structures (including lookout and start tower and associated elevated wire system) in a part of 
the which the Concept Plan shows is for “restoration area” only. The proposal is therefore inconsistent 
with this policy.

Policies in Section 6.4.4 are concerned with signs and information. Signage is to be restricted to a 
minimal number (Policy 6.4.4i) because “too many signs can be a detriment to the visual amenity of the 
reserve” (page 22). Although the February 2019 TDC agenda item states that “roadside signage will 
probably be required” there is no information about proposed signage (such as location, number, size, 
design, appearance etc) to enable an assessment against this policy.
Policies “6.5 Administration and Control”

Relevant policies in the HRMP concerned with administration and management of the reserve are addressed in Section 4 below.

2 IS THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY ALLOWED BY THE HRMP?

Based on consideration of the HRMP provisions in Section 4 above (ie the Values, Concept Plan, and Policies) in my view the Fly-Line proposal is contrary to the HRMP as:

- It does not accord with the values identified for the reserve and which the HRMP seeks to protect;
- It is not located in a part of the reserve where the concept plan provides for activities (other than vegetation restoration) and it is therefore contrary to the concept plan;
- It is contrary to numerous HRMP policies concerned with the adequacy of information about the proposal and its effects, the location of structures and nature of the activity, and provides insufficient information about other policies (including about ecological and cultural matters).

3 THE PROPOSAL AND POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS

3.1 What the HRMP says

As referred to in Section 4 above, several HRMP policies clarify that “effects” of activities are a primary concern when considering proposals for the Hipapatua Recreation Reserve:

- Policy 6.1vi: “Taupo District Council will consider the effect of activities on neighbouring properties”;
- Policy 6.2.4vi: “All applicants must demonstrate to Taupo District Council that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve and its primary purpose…”
- Policy 6.2.4vi: “Taupo District Council will only grant applications for commercial activities where evidence has been supplied demonstrating that the activity will not adversely affect the values of the reserve and its primary purpose.”

The HRMP sets a high bar in terms of the level of adverse effects acceptable (ie “will not have any adverse effects”, and “will not adversely effect…”), and puts the onus on an applicant to demonstrate that threshold can be met. This requires an assessment of effects of a proposal, the scope of which is determined by considering the specific proposal, the site/surroundings and its environmental characteristics.

3.2 Adequacy of Information

An appropriate and adequate effects assessment requires that sufficient information about a site and a specific proposal is known (so that in turn the effects of the proposal can be assessed). An assessment should be undertaken from an objective position and, depending on the nature and scale of a proposal and the issues involved, may require expert input (for example from a traffic engineer if there are potential traffic related effects, a landscape architect if there are potential landscape/visual effects, an ecologist if there are potential ecological effects, etc).

Given the obligation of an applicant as set out in the HRMP (eg “to demonstrate that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve…”), the quality and quantity of information provided about
the proposed Fly-Line is deficient in my view, such that neither Council nor the community could fully understand what the specific proposal is, and therefore what the potential effects of it are likely to be. That is reflected in the concerns raised by you all (as nearby residents) about the lack of information which has been made available.

From my own enquiries of Council officers I was advised there was "no official proposal document" and, like yourselves, was in due course provided with a copy of the presentation that the applicant made to Council. That included what could only be described as a general concept plan showing the location of a lookout, a café, a start area, walking track etc (but with no site boundaries shown, no scale, no details as to the location, height, bulk etc of buildings and structures). There were also various photo images. There was not the usual level of detailed information that would inform a proper understanding of exactly what is proposed or an assessment of the effects of the proposal on the reserve, the wider river corridor, or neighbouring residents. For example, there was little or no detail about the physical elements (such as buildings, access, parking, tracks, signage earthworks, vegetation removal etc) or how the actual activity would be undertaken (hours of operation, management of site, safety issues, details of café/souvenir and beverage etc kiosk).

3.3 What Effects?

Based on the little information available, the following range of potential effects (many of which you have raised in your submissions) need to be considered in this case:

- **Visual and landscape effects**: The HRMP explains that the site is part of an important scenic and landscape area. What are the visual effects from various viewpoints (within reserve, from the Waikato River, from Huka Falls Road, from neighbouring residential properties)? What buildings and structures are exactly proposed (what height, bulk, exact location, exterior materials/colours and their reflectivity levels)? If the pine trees are removed because they present a safety risk, what will support the Fly-Line (how high will any pole or tower structures be, what will they look like)? What signs are proposed exactly (number, location, size, design etc)? What are the effects of the changed landscape characteristics (ie from a quiet vegetated bush area to an intensively used tourist site)? Will there be effects from reflection in the surface of the Waikato River? Will there be glare effects visible off-site? What, if any, night-lighting is proposed and what are the visual effects of that?

- **Ecological effects**: The HRMP explains that the reserve is part of an important ecological corridor along the edge of the Waikato River. I would expect, given its riparian environment and vegetated state that the site may be a habitat for indigenous fauna and flora. Submitters have commented about birdlife there (including kākā). There is no information available about these values and the potential adverse ecological effects that the proposal may generate.

- **Noise effects**: there is insufficient information to understand about potential noise effects (such as from the device/machinery itself, people calling out in excitement and to each other, traffic-related noise effects, use of generators, night use, music, etc). What noise effects will be generated by the proposal (including on the adjoining river environment)?

- **Effects on Cultural values**: the RMP notes that the reserve is of importance to local hapū but the information available does not outline consultation undertaken with tangata whenua, nor provide a cultural impact assessment of the proposal.

- **Safety**: The HRMP acknowledges that the pine trees (on which the Fly-Line relies for support) "present a health and safety risk to users and neighbouring properties" (page 19). How has that acknowledged safety risk been considered and addressed?
• **Traffic and access related effects:** The proposal assumes up to 45,000 users per annum will access the site from Huka Falls Road via the existing southern overflow camping area. No assessment of access and traffic related effects is available however. Is the entrance and access road suitable (design, gradient, sight distances, formation, etc) for the volume and type of likely vehicle use? Where and how many on-site carparks will be provided for the activity and a café (with kiosk as referred to)? Is there a likely risk of over-flow parking along Huka Falls Road and what is the impact of that on existing road users (including pedestrians and cyclists)? Is the access and parking area capable of accommodating buses? Will the additional traffic be accommodated without adverse effects on Huka Falls Road? Would turning bays and/or road widening be required and if so, could that be safely provided within the Huka Falls Road corridor? What are the potential impacts of the additional anticipated traffic volume on the roading network? To what extent will the required parking encroach into and displace existing reserve uses allowed by the HRMP (ie overflow camping, vegetation restoration areas) and what are the effects of that? Will driver distraction along Huka Falls Rd (from signage and noticing structures and activity in the trees) create safety issues?

• The combination of this range of potential adverse effects are likely to result in potential changes to the amenity and character of the reserve, the neighbouring residential area, and the Waikato River corridor and these effects also need to be taken into account.

### 4 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussion above, in my view the Fly-Line proposal is contrary to the HRMP (including the concept plan and policies contained in it) to the extent that the integrity of the current HRMP, which is a very recently adopted community-based policy document, would be compromised if the proposal proceeded. In my opinion the appropriate course would be that the intention to offer a commercial licence for the Fly-Line activity not proceed further. If the proposal is pursued, then the HRMP (including the concept plan) should be reviewed to enable wider public engagement about commercial tourism activities locating on the reserve. Indeed, that is what the HRMP itself explains is the appropriate course of action when it states:

- “Taupo District Council will not permit any activity or development contrary to the policies contained in this management plan” (Policy 6.5.1.II), and
- “Any significant change of objectives and policies will require a plan review as per the process set out in section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977” (Policy 6.5.1.III).

If it was decided that consideration of the proposal could proceed without the need to review the HRMP, it is noted that the HRMP requires that Council considers the effects of proposed activities. Further, the HRMP places a clear obligation on an applicant “to demonstrate that the activity will not have any adverse effects on the reserve...”. In this case the quality and quantity of information provided about the proposed Fly-Line falls well short of the required standard to inform such decision-making. That is because, based on the information made available, neither Council nor the community can fully understand what the specific proposal is, nor reasonably know what the potential effects of it are likely to be. In terms of process, that is a serious and fundamental omission in my view because the absence of sufficient information about the proposal and its effects compromises the opportunity for an appropriately informed decision-making process. For these reasons I consider the proposal should not proceed at this time.

Joanne Lewis  BRP(Hons), M Phil (Regional Planning), MNZPI