

Before the Hearing Panel

---

*under:* the Resource Management Act 1991

*and:* submissions and further submissions in relation to the  
Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan

Hearing Stream 13  
Queenstown mapping

*and:* **NZ Transport Agency**  
*Submitter*

Summary of Evidence of Anthony Stuart MacColl

---

Dated: 6 September 2017

S0719-NZ Transport Agency-T13-MacColl A-Evidence Summary

---

REFERENCE: J M Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)

J R Cross (jessie.cross@chapmantripp.com)

**Chapman Tripp**  
T: +64 3 353 4130  
F: +64 3 365 4587

60 Cashel Street  
PO Box 2510, Christchurch 8140  
New Zealand

www.chapmantripp.com  
Auckland, Wellington,  
Christchurch



## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF ANTHONY STUART MACCOLL

### INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Anthony Stuart MacColl (Tony). I am a Principal Planning Advisor with the Dunedin Regional Office of the NZ Transport Agency (*Transport Agency*).
- 2 This summary provides a brief overview of my evidence in chief and rebuttal evidence prepared for Hearing Stream 13, and summarises the outstanding issues for the Transport Agency.

### EVIDENCE SUMMARY

- 3 My evidence in chief outlines the role of the Transport Agency and discusses objectives, policies and rules proposed for the Medium Density Residential (*MDRZ*), High Density Residential (*HDRZ*) and Local Shopping Centre (*LSCZ*) zones. It also responds to a number of site specific submissions.
- 4 The Transport Agency generally agrees with the position reached by Council's reporting officers Kimberley Banks, Wendy Banks, Ruth Evans and Vicki Jones, as recorded in the Transport Agency's legal submissions presented by **Ms Jo Appleyard**. The outstanding matters raised by Council officers and submitters that the Transport Agency does not agree with are outlined below.

### OUTSTANDING ISSUES

#### **MDRZ policies and rules**

- 5 **Ms Appleyard's** legal submissions discuss the responses of the Council's experts to my evidence on MDRZ and HDRZ policies and rules (as the Council's rebuttal evidence was not available when my rebuttal was prepared). The outstanding issues are:
  - 5.1 The notification rules for MDRZ (Rule 8.6) should be amended so they are consistent with HDRZ Rule 9.6 (as amended by Kimberley Banks) if any MDRZ land is to remain along State Highway 6;
  - 5.2 Policy 8.2.9.6 (MDRZ) should include a note recording the requirement to consult with the Transport Agency (as recommended by Kimberley Banks for Policy 9.2.8.5 HDRZ) if any MDRZ land is to remain along State Highway 6.

#### **W & M Grant - submitter 455**

- 6 It makes sense from an integrated planning perspective to have residential development concentrated on the Frankton Flats area. If it is not concentrated here, then it will lead to urban sprawl which increases the demand to travel. The Transport Agency therefore supports a higher density residential zone in the Hansens Road area, provided that access is obtained from Hansen Road and development is preceded by the reconfiguration/upgrade of the intersection of Hansen Road and State Highway 6.

#### **Otago Foundation Trust Board – submitter 408**

- 7 Otago Foundation Trust Board has sought rezoning of an area along State Highway 6 from Rural to Medium Density Residential (*MDRZ*). The Transport Agency has had discussions with the Trust Board regarding access to their proposed development site, and supports the proposed MDRZ zoning on this basis.

- 8 The Transport Agency's view is that MDRZ zoning is more appropriate than Rural Zoning as it enables reasonable development opportunities within the framework of constraints on the land.

**Jardine Family Trust and Remarkables Station Limited - submitter 715**

- 9 In response to various statements of rebuttal evidence, including mine and Tony Sizemore's, Mr Jason Bartlett provided a statement of supplementary evidence to the Hearing Panel. This addressed many of the Transport Agency's concerns around the lack of information that had been provided about the additional State Highway access proposed by Jardine Family Trust and Remarkables Station Limited to service the proposed Jacks Point Zone expansion. While the Transport Agency will still need to assess and approve any additional State Highway accesses through the Government Roothing Powers Act 1989 (*GRPA*) at the time of development, the Transport Agency is, in theory, supportive of the access options proposed by Mr Bartlett.
- 10 The Transport Agency has discussed the access issues with Mr Bartlett and Ms Wendy Banks via teleconference in response to the minute issued by the Hearing Panel. The Transport Agency reiterated that its preference is for the development to be accessed via an upgraded Maori Jack Road. If this is not possible then the Transport Agency could support a new access to serve the development. However, a new State highway access will have downstream effects on the safety and efficiency of the existing State Highway accesses to the larger zone. The Transport Agency therefore suggests that the intensification of Homestead Bay should be a discretionary activity and that any application to intensify development should be required to assess the efficiency and safety of the other State Highway accesses so that these can be upgraded by the developer if necessary.
- 11 Ultimately, while the Transport Agency retains the ability to grant or refuse additional State Highway accesses under the GRPA, from an integrated planning perspective it is preferable that the developments envisaged by the District Plan align with the safe and efficient functioning of the State Highway network. The supplementary evidence provided by Mr Bartlett and conversations with Mr Bartlett have given the Transport Agency confidence that access to the State Highway to service the proposed expansion of the Jacks Point Zone can be achieved in a way that promotes safe and efficient functioning of the State Highway network.

**CONCLUSIONS**

- 12 The Transport Agency is generally supportive of the evidence produced on behalf of the Council in relation to transport and assessment of the rezoning submissions mentioned above.
- 13 The Transport Agency opposes any rezoning to business, industrial or commercial zones along the northern side of the State Highway between the west side of the Shotover River and the State Highway 6/State Highway 6A roundabout.
- 14 The Transport Agency is generally supportive of the State Highway access options proposed in Mr Bartlett's supplementary evidence on the Jacks Point Zone expansion, however the Transport Agency will still need to approve any proposed accesses under the GRPA prior to development, and the Transport Agency would strongly oppose any District Plan provisions that attempt to override or confuse this process.

Tony MacColl  
NZ Transport Agency  
6 September 2017