

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES
PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Stream 13 – Queenstown Mapping

AND

IN THE MATTER Submissions 494 (Gertrude's Saddlery Limited) and 527
(Larchmont Developments Limited)

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF JASON BARTLETT
9 August 2017**

- 1 My name is Jason Bartlett.
- 2 My Evidence in Chief dated 9 June 2017 outlines my experience and qualifications relevant to this evidence in respect of the Queenstown Mapping Hearings of the Proposed District Plan.
- 3 Since preparation of my Evidence in Chief I have also reviewed:
 - (a) The rebuttal evidence of Ms Wendy Banks for QLDC;
 - (b) The peer review undertaken by Mr Andrew Carr on behalf of the Submitters.
- 4 I agree with the conclusions reached in Mr Carr's peer review, and do not otherwise repeat those matters in this Summary.
- 5 I refer to the rebuttal evidence of Ms Banks, which considers the traffic surveys undertaken in my Evidence in Chief were under-representative. In light of this, I carried out a further survey on 26 & 27 July 2017 which showed a slightly lower peak traffic flow of 1100vph (compared to 1300vph as stated in my Evidence in Chief), although there did appear to be a higher proportion of bus and coach type vehicles.
- 6 This updated observation does not change my conclusion that the existing Edith Cavell single lane bridge is already operating significantly beyond its operational capacity. I have discussed this matter with the QLDC Road Network Team and have been informed that the next Land Transport Programme to be released in June 2018 is likely to include improvements to Edith Cavell Bridge before 2028.
- 7 I consider that the Atley Road intersections with Arthurs Point Road and Mathias Terrace will be able to efficiently accommodate additional traffic from 89 possible new residential dwellings.
- 8 In respect of the Atley Road proposed width, I consider that the proposed 5.5m - 5.7m movement lane can efficiently accommodate the traffic for up to 200 residential dwellings¹.

¹ Based on the minimum movement lane requirements of a road type Figure E12, refer QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice, Table 3.2 Road design standards.

- 9 The access alignment through the area of restricted road width is flat and straight for approximately 80m. The alignment of this section does not restrict visibility sight distance to a point which raises safety concerns.
- 10 It is noted that the section of restricted road width is over an 80m length only. Beyond this length the road carriageway width could widen to accommodate parking or indented parking bays provided. Alternatively, parking controls can be provided to prevent parking in the length of restricted road width and to retain the efficiency of the road and access for all vehicle types including emergency vehicles.
- 11 A single 1.5m footpath² is to be provided through the restricted width section. This is a reduced provision for pedestrians for the road type. With appropriate crossing facilities pedestrians can be channelised towards to single footpath through the restricted width section and therefore pedestrian safety would not be compromised. Outside of the length of restricted width, footpaths can be provided on both side of the road to serve adjacent residential lots.
- 12 I have considered the further concerns of Ms Banks provided in her Rebuttal Evidence. The concerns raised do not change my initial opinion expressed in my Evidence in Chief. The assessment that I have undertaken suggests that traffic, as a result of the proposed rezoning, can be accommodated within the local road network.

Jason Bartlett

9 August 2017

² Updated to reflect the peer review undertaken by Mr Andrew Carr. Previously I recommended 1.4m was recommended.