

Date	5 March 2026
To	Winstone Aggregates, Department of Conservation
From	Rob Greenaway
Project advice provided for	Belmont Quarry – land exchange
Documents referred to	Comments provided by the Friends of Belmont Regional Park (FoBRP), the Wellington Conservation Board (WCB) and the New Zealand Conservation Authority (NZCA)
Qualifications	See Rob Greenaway & Associates report dated December 2025, Executive Summary and Appendix 4
Code of Conduct	Confirmed below.
Signature	

1. I have received the comments made by the Friends of Belmont Regional Park (FoBRP), the Wellington Conservation Board (WCB) and the New Zealand Conservation Authority (NZCA). I respond to the points made as they relate to the recreation values and opportunities of the exchange lands.

2. I confirm that I have the qualifications set out in my Recreation Assessment. In preparing this addendum, I agree to adhere to the Environment Court Code of Practice.

Original assessment framework

3. The NZCA (para 21) and the FoBRP (paras 51 – 53, for example) consider the potential to develop new public tracks in the OBDA areas.
4. I understand that Winstone has been in conversation with the GWRC regarding new track development opportunities in the proposed DoC-Get areas and has been advised that there is no appetite for new access development and a general unwillingness to facilitate or maintain new access to the DoC-give land via lands managed by GWRC.
5. The GWRC Toitū Te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-2030 – reviewed by Xyst in the Recreation Assessment – notes no development proposals for new access in the OBDA area or nearby.
6. Proposals in the Network Plan are limited to (for the Dry Creek area):
 - A180: Enhance Dry Creek picnic area with facilities such as nature play, storytelling or dog agility equipment.
 - A187: Investigate and identify a number of short loop trails at all entrances for families and others. Support with interesting features such as weta hotel, storytelling where appropriate.
7. In my opinion, the OBDA is too far from the Dry Creek picnic area to be suitable for a family-oriented “short loop”.
8. My assessment has been, therefore, that there is no existing demand for recreational track development in the exchange areas. Hence my original assessment of low recreation value in both the DOC-Gets and DOC-Gives areas.
9. However, as identified in the Network Plan, there may be demand for a new short walk in the Dry Creek area, subsequent to the completion of the park master planning proposed by the Network Plan. Based on my reading of the Network Plan, and Winstone’s communications with

GWRC, there is no expectation for development of any of the exchange lands, in this manner, but there may be for areas nearby.

10. The Wellington Conservation Board in their comment identify opportunities for engagement in wider park restoration activities as a potential mitigation should the proposal be approved (para 9), and - I assume - residual effects on recreation identified. However, it is my understanding that improvements offered in the exchange process must focus on the parcels of land being exchanged.
11. The existing environment - which is the focus of my assessment - reflects no expectations for new recreation developments in the parcels under consideration.

Assessment of recreation use

12. FoBRP suggest that the Recreation Assessment is based on only two data sources – Strava and online tramping club notices (para 50). However, the Assessment also relies on the Xyst review which uses interviews, track counter data and literature review.
13. Strava is an excellent tool for identifying the main types and relative levels of use of all public recreation settings, and the assessment recognises its limitations.
14. Off-track opportunities are common in most areas within the Regional Park and there are no indications that the study area is particularly unusual.
15. I note that the track counter data is very likely to have counted all those accessing this area of the park via Buchanan's Road, including those not using Strava. The Assessment has accurately captured usage for this area of the park, although the counter cannot differentiate between, for example, walkers, runners or botanists.

16. In my site visit – where I had a good look around the OBDA – I did not see any “well marked connecting paths” as referenced by FoBRP (para 49) and remain of the opinion that it is not developed for general recreation, as per my original assessment. These were also not identified in the Xyst review. Well marked paths should be patently obvious. I remain of the opinion that the recreational value of both the DoC-Give and DoC-Get is low.
17. FoBRP also note 12 botanical trips to the DoC-Give land “since July last year” (para 50). I would be more interested in the number of visits in the previous 12 months, prior to the land exchange proposal being publicised. Considering Winstone’s consultation summary, I expect that much of this visitor activity appears to have been generated by interest in Winstone’s Fast-track proposal, and by parties involved in the Fast-track proposal visiting the area.
18. Notably, in the years leading up to the Fast Track application, this area was not identified by Greater Wellington or the FoBRP as a priority area in the Park’s Network Plan, including for restoration (see the reproduced Network Plan schemes in the Xyst review appended to the Recreation Assessment).
19. The FoBRP suggest that future recreation opportunities for the DoC-Give land should not be ruled out. However, any such development is conjecture and does not represent park-wide priorities for the costly development and maintenance of recreation access.
20. I have carefully considered the comments and material received and confirm that nothing raised alters the conclusions reached in my original report.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rob Greenaway'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial 'R' and 'G'.

Rob Greenaway