

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

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Hearing Stream 12 –  
Upper Clutha Annotations and  
Rezoning Requests

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF WENDY BANKS  
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**TRANSPORT**

**17 March 2017**

---



S J Scott / C J McCallum  
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018  
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023  
Email: [sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com](mailto:sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com)  
PO Box 874  
SOLICITORS  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.	SCOPE.....	2
3.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
4.	BACKGROUND.....	4
5.	URBAN WANAKA.....	6
6.	AREA BETWEEN STUDHOLME ROAD AND WEST MEADOWS .....	7
7.	IRONSIDE DRIVE.....	11
8.	CARDRONA VALLEY ROAD BLOCK .....	13
9.	WANAKA TOWN CENTRE.....	19
10.	OTHER .....	22
11.	HAWEA TOWN.....	22
12.	CORNER OF SH 6 AND SH 84.....	24
13.	STUDHOLME ROAD .....	25
14.	CARDRONA VALLEY ROAD AND STUDHOLME ROAD RURAL LIFESTYLE ZONE	26
15.	MAP 22.....	27
16.	STICKY FOREST (MAP 18).....	27
17.	ALBERT TOWN.....	27
18.	ORCHARD ROAD AND RIVERBANK ROAD .....	28
19.	RIVERBANK ROAD .....	30
20.	RURAL .....	31

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Wendy Banks. I hold the position of Senior Transportation Engineer at MWH, now part of Stantec. I have been in this position since August 2014.
- 1.2 I hold a B.Eng (Hons) in Civil Engineering from The University of Edinburgh. I have 16 years of Transport Planning and Traffic Engineering experience in NZ, UK, Hong Kong and Fiji.
- 1.3 I have been providing the QLDC with my expertise in relation to transport assessment in land development for the network wide area, since 2013. I am familiar with the Upper Clutha area and have undertaken site visits for the rezoning submissions requiring more attention. I am generally familiar with the Clutha Basin area of the Queenstown Lakes District (**District**), I have resided in Queenstown and been employed by MWH, now part of Stantec since 2007. As part of the network management contract I have been involved in projects relating to the District Plan including the review of the Traffic Impact Assessment for Wanaka Ponds.
- 1.4 I have been asked by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) to provide evidence in relation to the impacts of potential rezonings in the Upper Clutha, on the roading network and capacity. These rezoning submissions are on Stage 1 of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**).
- 1.5 Although this is just a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.
- 1.6 References to **[CB]** and **[SB]** are to the Council's bundle of documents and supplementary bundle of documents, respectively. The key documents I have used, or referred to, in forming my view while preparing this brief of evidence are:

- (a) Evidence of Ulrich Glasner for Introduction and Strategic chapters dated 19 February 2016 [**CB37**];
- (b) Evidence of Ulrich Glasner for Residential chapters dated 14 September 2016 [**CB57**];
- (c) submissions seeking rezonings;
- (d) aerial photographs of each site and the wider area, including location of local shops/services, and key access points to the strategic road network;
- (e) public transport and key walking and cycling routes (if available);
- (f) QLDC RAMM, Asset Management Software;
- (g) QLDC Land Transportation Asset Management Plan 2016-2013, February 2016;
- (h) QLDC 2015-2045 Infrastructure Strategy, March 2015 [**SB81**];
- (i) Wanaka Programme Business Case, QLDC, 2015 [**SB83**] (note that this report was not approved by NZTA and has not been formally adopted by QLDC);
- (j) Wanaka Transportation and Parking Strategy, 2008 [**SB85**];
- (k) Draft Queenstown Lakes District On Foot, By Cycle Strategy, 2008; and
- (l) QLDC Operative District Plan (**ODP**).

**1.7** In this Evidence, where I refer to a provision number, I am referring to the 'reply' provision number that is Council's final position as put forward in an earlier Stage 1 hearing (unless stated otherwise).

## **2. SCOPE**

**2.1** My evidence addresses the transport-related effects of Stage 1 rezoning submissions located within the Upper Clutha Basin. My focus is on the impacts of potential rezonings, on the roading network and capacity.

**2.2** The individual submissions have been broadly categorised into the following three areas:

- (a) Urban;
  - (b) Rural / Urban Fringe; and
  - (c) Rural.
- 2.3** I have taken a view on the likely transport effects of each rezoning request, and I have stated whether I oppose or do not oppose the rezoning sought for each request.
- 2.4** Based on limited information provided in the submissions, I have had to assess the rezoning requests based on assumptions made with reference to the NZ Transport Agency Research Report 453, Trips and parking related to land use, November 2011.
- 2.5** This evidence is based on desktop analysis and site visits where necessary in assessing each submission.

### **3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 3.1** In conclusion the key findings from my evidence are that:
- (a) The rezonings sought within the urban growth boundary (**UGB**) can potentially have adverse effects on existing transport infrastructure. This is particularly the case in the town centre, where intensification will increase traffic and parking demands, and combined with the growing population and associated traffic growth, the pressures on the town centre road network will be undesirable without appropriate traffic management measures, additional parking supply and attractive alternative transport modes.
  - (b) The introduction of the Local Shopping Centre Zone will provide some relief in the transport network in the Wanaka Town Centre. However, consideration must be given to ensure that the existing transport network can accommodate the LSCZ.

#### **4. BACKGROUND**

- 4.1** My evidence considers QLDC key policy documents from a transport perspective. The PDP and, where relevant, the ODP were the basis for assessing each submission. I have needed to refer to the ODP Transport provisions, for example in relation to parking requirements, in some instances, as the Council has not yet notified a Transport chapter into the PDP, and I understand will be doing this in Stage 2 of its plan review. It is important in my view that the impacts of any future proposed land use developments are considered in terms of integration of existing and future transport infrastructure in the Upper Clutha.
- 4.2** The submissions requiring transportation assessments have been reviewed individually, or collectively where submissions are similar or the same in terms of location.
- 4.3** The first stage in my review was to refer to the PDP for the notified zone and then to review the submission and understand the zone change sought in terms of intensity of development. I have also considered the current ODP zone.
- 4.4** The estimated potential development of each site over and above the notified PDP zoning was provided for most of the sites by Mr Craig Barr of QLDC. I understand this is based on a calculation of the area sought to be rezoned, less 32% to allow for roads and reserves. This provides a 'net' developable area that is considered more realistic than simply calculating the entire area as if it were to be developed. The overall yield was then based on the PDP's zone densities.
- 4.5** I assessed the location of the sites to determine the suitability of the rezoning sought in terms of access to the sites, and considered potential impacts to the surrounding road network. The potential vehicular trips generated by the change in land use was calculated using NZ Transport Agency research report 453 **[SB80]**. This comprehensive New Zealand study provides trip generation rates for

different types of land uses for vehicles per day and vehicles per peak hour. The trip generation rates are provided in Table 8.10 in pages 115 and 116 of that report [SB80].

- 4.6 I have made a high level assessment based on the trips generated and the existing infrastructure and traffic conditions to determine whether I oppose or do not oppose the zoning sought.
- 4.7 Existing public transport, walking and cycling provisions were considered as well as future opportunities.
- 4.8 Wanaka south capacity upgrades have been identified in the QLDC 2015-2045 Infrastructure Strategy [SB81]. However, no further details have been provided in the document in terms of areas requiring upgrades.
- 4.9 My consideration of each submission was predominately a desktop study and site visits were undertaken where necessary for areas that required more attention. This was to understand the existing traffic and parking conditions and identify any potential safety concerns and issues that may arise if the rezone requests were adopted.
- 4.10 The following rezoning submissions concern land with access to the state highways:
  - (a) Lake Mackay Station;
  - (b) Lesley and Jerry Burdon (531);
  - (c) Crosshill Farm (531);
  - (d) Jeremey Bell Investments Ltd (782); and
  - (e) Willowridge Developments Ltd (249).
- 4.11 The road controlling authority, NZTA will require consultation for the change in land-use and potential intersection upgrades that may be required to accommodate the increase in traffic. It should also be noted that the state highways in Upper Clutha are limited access roads (**LAR**).

## **URBAN WANAKA AND LAKE HAWEA**

### **5. URBAN WANAKA**

#### **Wanaka Kiwi Holiday Park and Motels Ltd – 592**

- 5.1** Wanaka Kiwi Holiday Park and Motels Ltd has sought that the Visitor Accommodation Sub Zone be included over 3 lots with a combined area of 2.06 ha of land located on Studholme Road, which were notified as Large Lot Residential (**LLR**) zone.
- 5.2** The full extent of Studholme Road has not been constructed, and the subject site can only be accessed via Mount Aspiring Road.
- 5.3** I have reviewed the Section 32 Evaluation Report (by Southern Planning Group, October 2015) provided with the submission. The existing buildings currently operate as visitor accommodation as they form part of Wanaka Kiwi Holiday Park and Motels Ltd. My understanding is that the submitter has sought to formalise the existing use of the Wanaka Kiwi Holiday Park and Motels Ltd land.
- 5.4** However, an additional 8,000m<sup>2</sup> could potentially be redeveloped and this could have the same density as the existing Oakridge Resort on the other side of Studholme Road, where there is a range of hotel accommodation provided from hotel rooms to apartments. For this reason, the Visitor Accommodation Sub Zone would enable a significant intensification of the land. The main trips would be made via Cardrona Valley Road and Ardmore Street through residential areas and no transport assessment to support the inclusion of the Sub Zone was provided in the submission.
- 5.5** I have therefore assumed that the impacts on the transport network could be significant, particularly with any increase in tourist bus trips. Consequently, I oppose this rezoning.

## **6. AREA BETWEEN STUDHOLME ROAD AND WEST MEADOWS**

**Nick Blennerhassett – 335**

**Willowridge Developments Limited – 249**

**John Blennerhassett – 65**

**John & Jill Blennerhassett – 773**

- 6.1** These submissions relate to the area between West Meadows and Studholme Road and have sought that the notified LLR be rezoned to Low Density Residential (**LDR**) zone.
- 6.2** Submitters 335, 65 and 773 have sought for a realignment of the zone boundary between West Meadows Drive and Studholme Road. The adjustment would change 1.5274 ha from LLR zone (2000m<sup>2</sup> net site area) to LDR zone.
- 6.3** The request would result in an additional yield of 18 residential units based on a lot size of 2,000m<sup>2</sup>. Access to the lots would be made via West Meadows Drive and is posted 50km/h immediately after the turn off from Cardrona Valley Road. The area is residential with LDR zoning on the north side of West Meadows Drive. The rezoning sought lies to the south of West Meadows in the LLR zone.
- 6.4** Willowridge Developments Ltd has sought for LDR zoning, which could yield an additional 39 lots. The area would be accessed via West Meadows Drive.
- 6.5** The combined submissions equate to approximately 57 lots and are expected to generate an estimated 74 additional trips in the peak hour with the rezoning from LLR to LDR.
- 6.6** From a transport perspective and without traffic modelling to support the rezoning I oppose the rezone to LDR. The intensification of turning movements at the West Meadows Drive / Cardrona Valley Road intersection will likely create potential capacity issues when combined with the notified zoning of the Local Shopping Centre zone directly opposite West Meadows Drive.

**Iain Weir – 111**

- 6.7** This property was zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone in the ODP, with a Visitor Accommodation Sub Zone. The adjoining site is the Oakridge visitor accommodation activity. The site was zoned LDR in the PDP without any Visitor Accommodation Sub Zone. Mr Weir supports the LDR zoning but seeks that a Visitor Accommodation Sub Zone is ‘reinstated’. I note that the notified PDP did not have any provisions relating to visitor accommodation in the LDRZ.
- 6.8** The area of land is 1.1651ha, of which the maximum building density is 40% based on PDP Low Density Residential Chapter 7 and assuming 450m<sup>2</sup> per lot, this would yield 13 residential units as per the notified zoning. However, the submitter wishes to develop these into chalet style buildings. From a transport perspective, the impacts of traffic and parking could be significant depending on the number or rentable rooms/units. On that basis and without modelling information, I oppose the rezone request.

**Terry Drayron – 9**

- 6.9** Terry Drayron has requested the notified LLR along Studholme Road be rezoned to Rural Residential, with a minimum lot size of 4,000m<sup>2</sup>.
- 6.10** The Council's proposed net site area for the LLR lots along Studholme Road is 2,000m<sup>2</sup>. The maximum residential unit in the LLR zone is one per lot, this would mean that the rezoning would result in a halving in the expected number of trips generated from the site.
- 6.11** There will be no negative impacts on the transport network as a result. For this reason, I do not oppose the rezone request from a transport perspective.

**Christopher Jopson, Jacqueline Moreau, Shane Jopson – 287**

- 6.12** Submission 287 has sought that the 4 lots on Terranova Place be rezoned from notified LLR zone to LDR zone. The combined total of Lots 1-4 DP304376 is 1.8909 ha.
- 6.13** Terranova Place is a cul-de-sac off Anderson Road. With a yield of 42 residential lots based on the LDR zoning, assuming 450m<sup>2</sup> per lot, the generated trip rate would be 55 trips per peak hour and 449 trips per day.
- 6.14** The LLRZ minimum lot size of 2,000m<sup>2</sup> would generate 12 trips per peak hour and 107 daily trips.
- 6.15** The estimated peak hour and average daily traffic along Anderson Road is 347 and 3955 vehicles respectively.<sup>1</sup> In terms of additional traffic increase, the LDR zone would contribute an increase of 16% in peak hour traffic on Anderson Road and is unlikely to create traffic issues because the volumes are relatively low. However, the intersection at Terranova Place is not formalised and will require some treatments to prioritise the intersection due to the increase in trips. Also, I consider that the intersection will require potential widening at the left entry angle to allow a smoother entry and reduce potential conflict with vehicles waiting to exit Terranova Place.
- 6.16** A footpath should also be provided on Terranova Place to cater for the increase in dwelling numbers from the LDR zoning.
- 6.17** From a transport prospective, I do not oppose the rezoning. However, I also recommend that improvements to the intersection and provision of a footpath be considered.

---

<sup>1</sup> QLDC Ramm, 2015 traffic count data on Anderson Road between Reece Crescent and Anreca Lane.

### **Wanaka Central Developments Ltd – 326**

- 6.18** Wanaka Central Developments Ltd has sought to rezone Lots 9 and 10 DP300374 with a combined total of 8.3266 ha of land from notified LDR zone to Medium Density Residential (**MDR**) zone.
- 6.19** The rezoning request will yield an additional 77 residential units (inclusive of the Building Restriction Area (**BRA**)) or 131 (with the BRA rejected).
- 6.20** Access to the two sites will primarily be made from Kirimoko Crescent with access available off Clearview Street. The increase in peak hour trips would be 62 trips (plus BRA) and 105 trips (exclusive of BRA) based on MDR trip rate.
- 6.21** Medium density development should be connected to public transport linkages, and have easy access to commercial areas by cycling, walking or public transport, which is not the case in this area. The Holy Wanaka School, Wanaka Primary School and Mt Aspiring College are accessible from the site by walking and cycling if the infrastructure that is currently being built includes provisions for non-car modes such as footpaths, crossings and cycle facilities.
- 6.22** I do not oppose the rezone to MDR, providing that non-vehicular modes of transport such as cycling and walking are included in the development.

### **Anzac Trust – 142**

- 6.23** Anzac Trust has sought to reconfigure the zoning on 361 Beacon Point Road from notified part LLR and Rural to solely LLR, to allow for two lot subdivision on the land.
- 6.24** In my view, the creation of an additional lot in this location will not create any transport or traffic issues, therefore I do not oppose the request.

### **Alistair Munro – 3**

- 6.25** Alistair Munro has sought to rezone notified Rural land with a Building Restriction Overlay (or presumably a BRA) to LLR between Lots 3, 4 and 5 DP300734 and Peak View Ridge with access off Aubrey Road.
- 6.26** It is estimated that an additional 8 residential units (based on one residence per 2,000m<sup>2</sup>) be developed. In my view this will not present traffic and safety issues given the development is in line with existing residential activity in the neighbourhood. Therefore I do not oppose this rezoning.

## **7. IRONSIDE DRIVE**

### **Queenstown Lakes District Council – 790**

**Iain Weir - 139**

- 7.1** Submissions 790 and 139 have sought to rezone 1.8040 ha of land on Ironside Drive, known as Kellys Flat from notified LDR to MDR.
- 7.2** Ironside Drive is a short cul-de-sac approximately 150m in length and serves the Wanaka Primary School situated at the end of cul-de-sac. It provides access to 7 residential properties, and is connected to Kings Drive by a 3-arm roundabout.
- 7.3** The change in zone is expected to yield an additional 22 residential units. I do not oppose the request from a transport perspective, provided that access to the residential lots do not affect the operation of vehicles traveling to and from the school (i.e. school buses and safety of children walking to and from school are not compromised). It is recommended that one access off Ironside Drive is provided to serve the residential lots to reduce the conflicts with the existing traffic. Therefore I do not oppose this rezoning.

**Infinity Investment Group Limited – 729**

**Noel Williams – 795**

- 7.4** Infinity Investment Group has sought to reduce the MDR zone at Scurr Heights by at least 50%.
- 7.5** Noel Williams opposes the MDR zoning for the 10.69ha of land in the area known as Scurr Heights, located to the south of Aubrey Road.
- 7.6** The submitters seek a less intensified zone, such as LDR. In terms of transport there are no safety or capacity issues raised with reducing the density levels in the area.
- 7.7** However, in my opinion, I support the PDP notified zoning of MDR, given that it is situated close to schools, particularly Wanaka Primary School. This is because as the site is located in a residential area with a close proximity to schools, it makes it attractive and safer for pupils to walk or cycle to school. Reducing the density will reduce the number of pupils who could walk or cycle to school.
- 7.8** Furthermore, the notified Business Mixed Use area in Anderson Heights is located less than 650m away, and the higher residential density will encourage less reliance on vehicles for employment and commercial activity trips.
- 7.9** Overall, based on my high level assessment, I oppose the rezone sought by the two submitters.

## **8. CARDRONA VALLEY ROAD BLOCK**

**Wanaka Lakes Health Centre – 253**

**Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village – 709 and 1101**

**Susan Meyer – 274**

**Wanaka Lakes Health Centre 1212**

*21 and 23 Cardrona Valley Road*

- 8.1** The existing Wanaka Health Centre on 23 Cardrona Valley Road and proposed hospital site on 21 Cardrona Valley Road are both notified LLR zones and both share driveway access. To the south of the health centre the site is zoned LSCZ in the notified PDP and is addressed below in this evidence.
- 8.2** Wanaka Lakes Health Centre and Susan Meyer have sought for the LSCZ to be extended to the Wanaka Health Centre site.
- 8.3** Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village and Wanaka Lakes Health Centre have sought for a more appropriate zoning other than LLR for the hospital site and suggest LSCZ.
- 8.4** Current parking demand for the medical centre exceeds on-site capacity. This is evident as car parking is spilling out onto the road reserve. Rezoning to LSCZ could lead to intensification of use that will exacerbate the parking demands and will increase the number of cars parked along Cardona Valley Road either on the verge or on the narrow shoulder. I do not consider this acceptable for the following safety reasons:
  - (a) there is a risk of collision with parked vehicles and personnel accessing vehicles from the live lane;
  - (b) the horizontal curvature at the Stone Street intersection combined with parked vehicles will reduce visibility for motorists; and
  - (c) the attraction of more services will draw more pedestrians from the opposite site of the road and there are no pedestrian crossing provisions.

- 8.5 The ODP's Transport Chapter 14, requires 1 parking space per 25m<sup>2</sup> GFA for commercial activities, and the PDP LSCZ enables up to 75% building coverage. Both sites are currently developed with the medical centre and the hospital. If the rezoning should occur both sites could potentially maximise the building coverage allowance or convert to commercial activities within the existing building.
- 8.6 From a transport prospective, any changes within the existing two sites to enable commercial activities will make the existing parking and traffic issues listed above worse. Furthermore, Cardrona Valley Road is a primary route into and out of Wanaka and it is critical that any new developments do not affect the function of the road, therefore I oppose the rezoning to LSCZ.

**JA Ledgerwood 507 (supported by Willowridge Developments Limited FS1012)**

**Susan Meyer – 274**

**Willowridge Developments Limited – 249 (opposed by Trustees of the Gordon Family Trust FS1193)**

*Trustees of the Gordon Family Trust land zoned LSCZ in the notified PDP*

- 8.7 Susan Meyer has requested an increase to the permitted site coverage by buildings from 75% (Rule 15.5.1) to 80% for the LSCZ site opposite the corner of Stone Street and Cardrona Valley Road.
- 8.8 I refer to the Peter Gordon Development Access Assessment, Cardrona Valley Road, Wanaka report prepared by Bartlett Consulting, March 2015.<sup>2</sup> The assessment based the traffic generation on 30% site coverage of the 2.7ha of land that was assessed to range from 150vph to 250vph.
- 8.9 The LSCZ enables up to 75% maximum building coverage. Realistically, based on the trip rates used in Bartlett Consulting's report, traffic generated could range from 375 to 625vph.

---

<sup>2</sup> QLDC Section 32 Evaluation Report, Local Shopping Centres (formerly Corner Shopping Centres).

- 8.10** From a transport perspective, the requested 5% increase in building density (from 75% to 80%) could generate an additional 42 trips per peak hour.
- 8.11** I consequently oppose the request to increase the building coverage based on the information in the Bartlett Consulting report. A priority T-intersection is proposed between Stone Street and West Meadows Drive based on traffic flows for a 30% developed site. The PDP's maximum ruling of 75% is likely to trigger an upgrade of the proposed T-intersection to a roundabout.
- 8.12** Any additional site coverage in the subject site should not be encouraged from a transport perspective for parking and traffic reasons.
- 8.13** I note that as per ODP Transport Chapter 14 Rules, 14.2.4.1 Parking and Loading, the development will be required to provide 1 parking space per  $25m^2$  GFA.
- 8.14** Willowridge Developments Ltd and JA Ledgerwood oppose the size of the notified LSCZ (on the Trustees of the Gordon Family Trust land) and request that the area is reduced in size.
- 8.15** The submissions have not provided alternative zoning for the reduced LSCZ. I have assumed a rezone to LDR based on the neighbouring sites. From a transport perspective, the rezone from LSCZ to LDR would have a different effect on the traffic patterns (e.g. AM peak would see more trips exit the site and return in the PM peak).
- 8.16** In my view, I oppose the request to intensify the PDP's notified LSCZ by increasing the site coverage by buildings to 80%.
- 8.17** However, reducing the size of the LSCZ and replacing with LDR would result in better outcomes from a traffic perspective. First, LDR zone (40% maximum building density) has far less intensification compared to LSCZ (75% maximum building density), therefore less trips for an LDR zone. Comparing 1ha land zoned LDR versus LSCZ, the difference would be 12 trips per peak hour for LDR and 187 trips

per peak hour for LSCZ. Assumptions based on the maximum developable land and using 1.3/dwelling for LDR with 450m<sup>2</sup> lot size and 2.5/100m<sup>2</sup> for commercial premises.

- 8.18** Based on the assumptions in paragraph 8.17, reducing the size of the LSCZ and rezoning the balance with LDR could substantially reduce the number of vehicle trips. I therefore do not oppose the rezoning to LDR zone.

**Trustees of the Gordon Family Trust – 395**

**Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village – 1101 (oppose)**

**Wanaka Lakes Health Centre – 1212 (oppose)**

- 8.19** Trustees of the Gordon Family Trust have requested that a portion of the notified LDR be rezoned MDR on the corner of Golf Course Road and Cardrona Valley Road.

- 8.20** The rezone to MDR would enable 23 lots on top of the 29 enabled under the LDR, this equates to a total estimated yield of 52.

- 8.21** I do not oppose the zoning request because the proposed LSCZ south of the site will promote walking and cycling to the local amenities. However, I recommend that vehicular access to the development is located off Golf Course Road and footpaths / cycle paths connecting to the local amenities (e.g. medical centre and the LSCZ) are considered.

**Alpine Estate – 379**

**Trustees of the Gordon Family Trust - 1193**

**Stuart Ian & Michael Kiri Agnes Pinfold & Satomi Enterprises Ltd – 622**

- 8.22** Alpine Estate has requested that Lot 2 DP 302568 be rezoned from notified LDR zone to a mix of Higher Density Village and MDR zone through a structure plan, the ODP and Design Guidelines Process.

- 8.23** The Trustees of the Gordon Family Trust oppose this rezoning request.

- 8.24** The site is 15.9997 ha of land. The rezone to MDR would yield an additional 193 units (LDR 242 units versus MDR 435 units).
- 8.25** The PDP zoning along Cardrona Valley Road will intensify traffic movements turning into and out of Cardrona Valley Road, particularly with the LSCZ. Rezoning the parcel of land in this submission would generate an estimated additional 154 trips during the peak hour to the road network, assuming all access the network via Cardrona Valley Road. The 2016 average daily traffic along Cardrona Valley Road was 5500vpd<sup>3</sup> and with an estimated peak hour traffic flow of 660 vehicles. Considering only the additional trips generated by rezoning from LDR to MDR would account for nearly a quarter of the trips on Cardrona Valley Road. For this reason, I oppose the rezone request because, combined with the cumulative trips from the proposed developments in the vicinity, the intersections along Cardrona Valley Road will be under capacity and efficiency pressures.
- 8.26** Stuart Ian & Michael Kiri Agnes Pinfold & Satomi Enterprises Ltd has requested that the same site be rezoned to Rural General (as it was under the ODP), I oppose this request as the area is located within the UGB. From a transport point of view, LDR is more appropriate than (ODP) Rural General to make use of the new infrastructure and neighbouring amenities such as the existing medical centre, hospital and the proposed LSCZ.

#### **Stuart Ian & Michael Kiri Agnes Pinfold & Satomi Enterprises Ltd – 622**

- 8.27** Submitter - 622 has requested that Lots 1 to 6 DP301095 be rezoned from notified LDR to Rural General.
- 8.28** In my view, (ODP) Rural General is inappropriate given the site's location within the UGB. I consider that if a less intensified zone were to be implemented then LLR would be more suitable, given the site's current use. In addition, this would be in keeping with the LLR zoning on the opposite side of Cardrona Valley Road.

---

<sup>3</sup> Peter Gordon Development, Access Assessment, Cardrona Valley Road, Wanaka, Jason Bartlett Consulting Ltd, 2015. Traffic volume calculation based on 4% annual increase, with peak hour calculated by 12% of the ADT.

- 8.29** In addition, Lots 1 and 2 border the notified LSCZ, I consider this to be appropriate zoning for any future residential developments to encourage less dependence on vehicles and improve connectivity between residential units and local amenities.
- 8.30** I therefore oppose the submission to rezone the site to (ODP) Rural General.

**Jim Ledgerwood – 562**

- 8.31** Jim Ledgerwood requests that a combined parcel of land with a total area of 2.3398 ha be rezoned from notified LDR to provide for commercial activities. I have based my assessment on a rezoning to LSCZ.
- 8.32** The area is located on the north east corner of the staggered intersection of Cardrona Valley Road and Orchard Road with Studholme Road.
- 8.33** I understand that a wedding and events centre and a licensed café operates in Lot 14, and the owner wishes to expand his operation to the adjoining sites to provide accommodation and additional complementary commercial activities.
- 8.34** In my view, rezoning to LSCZ is not appropriate for the location and at the corner of the intersection in a 70km/h speed environment. In addition, it is not appropriate as a LSCZ enables intense building coverage of up to 75% and using NZTA trip rate for commercial activities this would generate 439 trips per peak hour. In addition, LCSZ is not suitable as it could potentially reduce the level of service at the Cardrona Valley Road / Orchard Road / Studholme Road intersection.
- 8.35** From a transport perspective I oppose this rezoning request. I also raise safety concerns with the existing staggered intersection to accommodate high turning movements for the site.

## **9. WANAKA TOWN CENTRE**

### **Varina Property Limited – 591**

- 9.1** Varina Property Limited has requested for a rezone for a parcel of 9 sites from notified LDR to MDR with a Visitor Accommodation Sub zone.
- 9.2** The parcel of sites is bounded by McDougall Street, Brownston Street and Upton Street and is located to the west of McDougall Street. There are 9 sites all currently zoned LDR with a VA sub zone on 181 Upton Street. The PDP has notified the entire site area as LDR.
- 9.3** The net lot yield based on the notified zone is 13, the lot yield based on the zone sought would be 24, therefore the potential estimated yield above the notified PDP zoning would be 11 residential lots.
- 9.4** From a transport perspective, the MDR zoning sought should not create significant impacts on the transport road network, providing that 2 car parking spaces per unit are provided within the sites as per the ODP Transport Chapter 14 Rules, 14.2.4.1.
- 9.5** However, the Visitor Accommodation sub zone will enable more permitted activities within the site and may create traffic and safety issues due to the increase in demand. It will also likely create parking problems. Therefore, I oppose the rezone request.

**Sneaky Curlew Pty Ltd – 737 (opposed by JWA & DV Smith Trust FS1276)  
Varina Property Ltd - 591 (opposed by JWA & DV Smith Trust FS1276;  
supported by Sneaky Curlew Pty Ltd FS1179)**

- 9.6** Sneaky Curlew and Varina Property seek for the notified Town Centre Transition Overlay (**TCTO**) (which is embedded within the MDR) to be removed and replaced with the Wanaka Town Centre Zone (**WTCZ**).
- 9.7** The rezone request applies to the TCTO as shown on PDP Planning Map 21, whereby the TCTO is applied to sites fronting both sides of

Russell Street and the southern side of Brownston Street between Chamlers Street and Dungarvon Street.

- 9.8** In addition Sneaky Curlew seeks that the TCTO is applied "for half a block depth on the north side of Upton Street, between Helwick and Dungarvon Streets".<sup>4</sup>
- 9.9** TCTO has a maximum permitted site coverage of 45%, whereas the WTCZ has no maximum site coverage for development (unless the development is on a land area greater than 1400m<sup>2</sup>, in which case the maximum permitted coverage would be 75% (rule 13.5.13 and clause 13.3.2.3)). Of the 15 subject sites, 14 of them are less than 1,400m<sup>2</sup>.
- 9.10** The maximum building heights for WTCZ is 8m to the eave line and 10m to the ridge line, for MDR (TCTO), the maximum height is 7m.
- 9.11** I oppose the rezone request because the WTCZ would enable significantly more commercial activities than the notified MDR zoning. The increase in traffic in the WTCZ is not desirable as it decreases the efficiency and also compromises pedestrian safety. Wanaka's population and traffic has grown in recent years and is expected to continue to grow. It has been modelled<sup>3</sup> that during PM winter peak in the future (2041), Ardmore Street/Brownston Street intersection would experience a Level of Service that represents unstable flow and operating at capacity. There are also high incidences with road crashes in the town centre with 9 crashes<sup>5</sup> recorded at the Brownston Street/Dungarvon Street intersection from 2010 to 2014.
- 9.12** In addition, the WTCZ is exempt from providing parking on site. However, parking demands are already high in the Wanaka town centre, and with no local buses available, this will create traffic issues with drivers circling the town centre seeking for parking spaces. It will also see an increase in the residential streets being used for parking.
- 9.13** Furthermore, the rezone to WTCZ will change the nature of Upton Street with the increase in vehicular traffic movements due to the

---

<sup>4</sup> Wanaka Programme Business Case, QLDC January 2015 [SB83], at page 17.

<sup>5</sup> Wanaka Programme Business Case [SB83], page 19.

change in land use from residential to commercial. From site observations, on-street parking on Upton Street is heavily used and appears to be used for relatively long periods. I therefore consider that the rezone request will exacerbate the current parking demands in the area.

- 9.14** I refer to the QLDC Infrastructure Strategy 2015-2045 [**SB81**], where in Table 1, page 27, it predicts that an additional 270 car parks may be required by 2026. Proposed responses include reconfiguring existing car parking areas and investigating the provision of new car park facilities, reviewing the District Plan car parking rules, managing car parking demand through alternative modes and improving public transport. The likely implications of not undertaking the proposed actions would be further town centre congestion and overflow of parking onto the residential streets. In my view, QLDC is required to further advance the planning work for the town centre car parking before any further intensification of land use is enabled.
- 9.15** Based on my assessment above, I oppose the rezoning sought for MDR (TCTO) to WTCZ, and the MDR to MDR (TCTO).

**David Barton – 269**

**The Full & Bye Trust - 273**

**Philip Thoreau - 362**

**Noel Williams – 795**

- 9.16** Noel Williams has sought to remove all notified MDR zoning in central Wanaka. These submissions have requested that the MDR be rezoned to LDR.
- 9.17** I oppose the removal of the notified MDR zoning from a transport point of view because the MDR is relevant for the town centre to discourage residential urban sprawl and encourage use of alternative transport modes with less reliance on vehicles. The notified MDR zoning is appropriate and meets Objective 8.2.1– '*Medium density development will be realised close to town centres...*'.

**9.18** I note that no other information has been provided with these submissions that addresses the consequence of the change in zonings from a transport perspective.

## **10. OTHER**

### **Sean & Jane McLeod – 391**

**10.1** Sean and Jane McLeod have requested all notified LLR be rezoned LDR.

**10.2** The additional vehicular trips generated by the change in all LLR zones to LDR would be 9 times more than if they remained as LLR. (LLR 4,000m<sup>2</sup> per lot compared to LDR 400m<sup>2</sup>). The cumulative effect of the trips would be significant and the existing infrastructure would be significantly affected in terms of efficiency and capacity.

**10.3** Consequently, I oppose this rezone submission.

### **Patrica Swale – 792**

**10.4** Patricia Swale opposes the notified MDR zone in the Wanaka town centre and seeks that it be rezoned to LDR (as it was under the ODP).

**10.5** From a transport perspective, I oppose the rezone request because the notified MDR zoning in the town centre is appropriate due to close proximity to amenities and therefore less reliance on driving, and for the reasons listed in paragraph 9.17 above.

## **11. HAWEA TOWN**

### **Jude Batton – 460**

### **Joel Van Riel – 462**

**11.1** Submitter 460 has sought to rezone Lichen Lane and Sam John Place from Rural Residential (**RR**) to LDR, and is estimated to yield an additional 536 lots. Submitter 462 has sought to rezone Sam John

Place to allow minimum half acre lots, I am assuming this would rezone the land from RR to LL with 2,000m<sup>2</sup> lots, this would yield an additional 20 lots, and would be 40 lots in total with the zoning sought.

- 11.2 I oppose the rezone request from Jude Batton because there is a substantial volume of traffic that could be generated from the residential units that could be developed.
- 11.3 Sam John Place is a cul-de-sac off Cemetery Road that has a speed limit of 100km/h, given the significant increase in development, the intersection of Sam John place / Cemetery Road will require an upgrade to include prioritisation and widening at Sam John Place and investigation into the need for a right turn bay on Cemetery Road.
- 11.4 Joel Van Riel's request would increase an additional 20 lots. Based on that an additional 26 trips per hour would be added to the existing cul-de-sac off Cemetery Road. Based on a small number of additional trips, I do not oppose the rezoning sought, however, an assessment will be required to warrant the need to upgrade the intersection.

#### **Willowridge Developments Ltd – 249**

- 11.5 The submitter seeks to rezone the area bounded by Domain Road, Cemetery Road and Capell Avenue from RR to LDR. This could potentially yield an additional 572 lots.
- 11.6 There is no further information provided in this submission in regards to access to these lots. In addition, the posted speed limit on Domain Road and Cemetery Road is 100km/h and additional multiple accesses off these roads would not be recommended.
- 11.7 I oppose the rezoning as there is no supporting evidence provided by the submitter to demonstrate that the impacts on the neighbouring transport network would not be impacted given the scale of the development that would enable 572 lots under the requested rezone.

### **Streat Developments Ltd – 697**

- 11.8** Streat Developments Ltd has sought to rezone Lot 45 DP304937 from notified RR to Township Zone (which is an ODP zone). An additional 75 units could be enabled, with a total of 93 residential units based on the rezoning sought.
- 11.9** The submission included the consented subdivision RM050083 and shows the connection of the development via Grandview Road, a new access road and Capell Avenue (unformed road) off Cemetery Road.
- 11.10** From a transport perspective, the development could potentially yield an additional 121 vehicle trips per peak hour distributed over three accesses, and in my view the local transport network would be able to accommodate these trips. Consequently, I do not oppose the submission. However, I note that the area will likely experience a cumulative effect of trips generated by the proposed development in the area, which could potentially affect the transport network. In my opinion this should not prohibit this rezoning being made.

### **Allenby Farms – 02**

- 11.11** Allenby Farms requests to rezone 19.6 ha of notified Rural land to LLR in the Mt Iron area. It is estimated that an additional 49 lots could be yielded.
- 11.12** There is no further supporting evidence on how these sites would be accessed, therefore I oppose the rezone sought.

## **RURAL / URBAN FRINGE**

### **12. CORNER OF SH 6 AND SH 84**

#### **Bernie Sugrue – 588**

- 12.1** Bernie Sugrue has sought to rezone 5.8ha of triangle shaped notified Rural land on the corner of Wanaka Luggate Highway (SH84) and Albert Town – Lake Hawea Road (SH6) to RR.

- 12.2** The estimated yield for the request is an additional 9 lots on the site. The additional traffic that would be generated by the zone change would have minimal impact on the surrounding road network therefore I do not oppose the rezoning sought. I refer to Appendix C of the submission where correspondence from NZTA has been provided that states '*Given there is alternative access available via CP10A to the whole site, we would not be in a position to approve a new crossing place on SH6*' and agree that one access point should be provided for the development.

### **13. STUDHOLME ROAD**

**Deborah Brent – 369**

**Hawthenden Limited – 776**

- 13.1** Deborah Brent has sought for a zone boundary realignment to extend the zone boundary to enable more LLR in the Studholme Road area.
- 13.2** The RG area in this submission lies outside the border of the UGB that runs along Studholme Road. Currently, the full extent of Studholme Road has not been completed and there is no indication as at the date of filing this evidence when the road is programmed for completion.
- 13.3** The estimated yield from the PDP zoning is 55 (for submission 369), with the LLR boundary realignment, this will yield an estimate of 111 lots. Using 1.3 vehicle trips per dwelling (NZTA Research Report 453), this would generate 144 trips per peak hour.
- 13.4** Hawthenden Limited's submission refers to three areas to the south of Studholme Road as shown in the district plan maps 18, 22 and 23, where the submitter has sought for ONL adjustment and rezone to RL and RR from RG. The area combined would yield an additional 59 residential lots, and predicted 77 trips per peak hour as per my assumptions based on NZTA research report 453. Given the lack of infrastructure to these sites and without supporting information in the submission, I oppose the rezone sought.

- 13.5** This is because I consider the cumulative effect of rezoning the land south of Studholme Road (outside the UGB) would generate considerable vehicle trips during the peak hour (over 200) that could potentially create safety and capacity issues, particularly given that Studholme Road has not been fully formed. Although I note that it has been identified as a new secondary road in the Wanaka Transportation and Parking Strategy **[SB85]**.
- 13.6** I note that from an overall planning perspective, Mr Barr could support the Area C component of the Hawthenden (776) submission and the Scurr et. al submissions to rezone land can be supported. The estimated combined yield of these areas is 27 properties, the majority of these would have their accesses via the formed part of Studholme Road. Based on potentially an additional 35 peak hour trips generated I do not oppose the request because in my view the surrounding road network would be able to accommodate these trips.
- 14. CARDRONA VALLEY ROAD AND STUDHOLME ROAD RURAL LIFESTYLE ZONE**
- Calvin Grant & Joelene Marie Scurr – 160**  
**Glenys & Barry Morgan - 161**  
**Don & Nicola Sarginson - 227**  
**Nicola Todd - 254**  
**Joanne Young - 796**  
**Murray Stewart Blennerhassett – 322**  
**Robert and Rachel Todd - 783**  
**Glenys and Barry Morgan - 815**
- 14.1** Submissions 160, 161, 227, 254, 796, 322, 783 and 815 seek for the notified RG zone bordering south of Studholme Road be rezoned to Rural Lifestyle.
- 14.2** Rezoning to Rural Lifestyle would yield an additional 27 properties in the 58ha of land bounded by Cardrona Valley Road and Studholme Road.

**14.3** It is estimated that 35 trips per peak hour would be generated for the 27 properties. From a transport perspective, these trips will not have an impact in terms of the operating level of service of the road network. For that reason, I do not oppose the zoning sought.

**15. MAP 22**

**Murray Stewart Blennerhassett – 322**

**15.1** Murray Blennerhassett has requested for Lot 1 DP367753 located on the corner of Mount Aspiring Road and Ruby Island Road be rezoned from notified RG to Rural Lifestyle or Rural Residential.

**15.2** It is estimated that RL would yield an additional 1 lot, and RR 15 more lots within the site. I consider that the traffic impact will be minimum, therefore I do not oppose the rezoning request.

**16. STICKY FOREST (MAP 18)**

**M Beresford – 149**

**16.1** M Beresford has sought for the 50.6742 ha known as Sticky Forest to be rezoned from notified RG to LDR. The rezone sought would yield an additional 765 lots from zero lots (unless consented).

**16.2** I oppose this rezone request due to a lack of information about the infrastructure required for the potential developments to be enabled. Access would likely be via the existing and proposed subdivisions surrounding the site, Northlake to the west, Kirrimoko Crescent to the south and the existing LDR subdivision to the east of the site.

**17. ALBERT TOWN**

**Scott Mazey Family Trust -- 518**

**17.1** I do not oppose the Scott Mazey Family Trust's request to rezone approximately 1ha of land on their property at 965 Aubrey Road, from notified RG to LLR, as traffic effects will be minimal.

**Christine Pawson - 432**

**Trevor and Mary-Anne Sievers - 440**

- 17.2** Christine Pawson and Treven and Mary-Anne Sievers have sought for two sites to be rezoned from RL to RR to the west of Templeton Street in Albert Town.
- 17.3** I do not oppose this rezone request as the size of the land does not enable further residential lots and therefore the traffic effects will be minimal, if not nil.

**18. ORCHARD ROAD AND RIVERBANK ROAD**

**Orchard Road Holdings Ltd - 91**

**Jackie Redai and Others - 152**

- 18.1** Both sites are notified Rural and are located on the north side of Orchard Road.
- 18.2** Orchard Road Holdings has sought a rezoning from RG to LDR and this would enable 632 allotments. Based on a 1.3 trip rate per hour this would generate 822 trips in the peak hour. I consider the potential trips generated from a LDR zone would be detrimental to the surrounding network, in particular at the staggered Cardrona Valley Road / Orchard Road / Studholme Road intersection. In my view, the LDR zoning is not appropriate for the scale and location of the area. I oppose the rezone sought.
- 18.3** Jackie Redai has requested for the notified Rural zone to be changed to RR zone for the combined 41ha (approximate) of land along Riverbank Road from Orchard Road to Ballantyne Road. The rezone could allow 69 residential lots based on 4,000m<sup>2</sup> per lot.
- 18.4** I oppose the rezone sought because the additional trips generated per peak hour, is estimated to be 90 and while the surrounding road network would accommodate the extra trips, there is concern with the additional accesses that would be created and their locations. I am

also concerned with the impact this would have on the intersection of Ballantyne Road and Riverbank Road. Taking into account the proposed development in the area such as Three Parks, an assessment would be required to determine whether a roundabout is installed to accommodate the increase in trips along Riverbank Road and improve road safety.

#### **Willowridge Developments Limited - 249**

- 18.5** Willowridge Developments Limited has sought for Lot 3 DP 17123 with a total area of 12.296ha to be rezoned from notified RG to Industrial B.
- 18.6** It is estimated that 8.3ha will be developed for industrial land use. I have assessed this figure against the NZTA trip rate for industrial activities and the trips generated were excessive. I consider that it is not appropriate for Wanaka.
- 18.7** Industrial zoning will generate more heavy vehicle movements. However, the site is located on the corner of Ballantyne Road and Riverbank Road, which I consider to be suitable given that heavy vehicles can avoid travelling through built up areas such as residential, shopping centres and schools. Ballantyne Road is recognised as an industrial area, with the existing industrial activities on the west side of the road (opposite to the industrial zone sought).
- 18.8** The approved outline development plan RM140354 of the Three Parks development shows an indicative road link to the subject site. Depending on the land use activities within the site, the link to Three Parks could be undesirable as heavy vehicle will travel through the Low Density Residential area.
- 18.9** In my opinion, an Integrated Transport Assessment is required to support the change in land use to Industrial B from mainly Rural to identify the potential implications on the surrounding road network, particularly Ballantyne Road / Riverbank Road intersection. Until such an assessment is undertaken, I oppose this rezoning request.

**19. RIVERBANK ROAD**

**John Young - 733**  
**Marianne Roulston - 741**  
**Gerald Telford - 742**  
**K and M R Thomlinson - 743**  
**Danni and Simon Stewart - 745**  
**M and E Hamer - 747**  
**Craig and Maree Jolly and Shaw - 749**  
**Peter J E and Gilliam O Watson - 750**  
**Graham P and Mary H Dowdall - 753**  
**E B Skeggs - 756**  
**Elizabeth Purdie - 17**

- 19.1** The above submissions address land located along the east side of Riverbank Road between Orchard Road and State Highway 6 and have sought for a rezone from notified RL to RR. Collectively the area is approximately 30ha with the potential to yield an additional 68 lots.
- 19.2** I have considered that Riverbank Road has a posted speed limit of 80km/h and is in a rural environment. The proposed Three Parks mixed use development opposite the rezone sought is proposed to have two accesses off Riverbank Road.
- 19.3** I have assumed that the additional lots would have direct access off Riverbank Road. From a transport perspective, I oppose the submission based on the added traffic on Riverbank Road and the potential impacts it may have on the three intersections along Riverbank Road. In particular the Ballantyne Road intersection given that Ballanytne Road is the priority road. This high level assessment is based on the potential safety implications and turning conflicts on Riverbank Road with the Three Parks development.

**Ian Percy & Fiona Aitken Family Trust - 725**

- 19.4** Submission 725 has sought for a special character zone like Gibbstion for 246 Riverbank Road.

- 19.5** I do not oppose this submission from a transport perspective for the reason that there will be no changes in infrastructure and traffic.

**Robert & Lynette Duncan - 721**

- 19.6** Robert and Lynette Duncan have sought to rezone approximately 100ha of notified LLR zoned land on Aubrey Road to MDR.
- 19.7** My view is that the rezone request is inappropriate for the land as the existing infrastructure could potentially not support the significant trips that would be generated with a MDR zone. It is estimated that 714 additional lots could be yielded compared to a 47 yield based on PDP zoning (assuming 2,000m<sup>2</sup> per lot).
- 19.8** Average daily traffic on Aubrey Road is around 3,000 (based on QLDC Ramm data for 2016), the MDR rezone could potentially generate over 900 trips for the site alone. Therefore, I oppose the rezoning request.

**20. RURAL**

**Glen Dene Ltd - 384**

**Sarah Burdon - 282**

- 20.1** Submissions 384 and 282 seek rezoning from Rural to RL around the Glen Dene Homestead area, which has an estimated yield of an additional 3 residential units. I do not oppose the zoning sought because the effects of 3 residential units on the transport network will be minor.
- 20.2** In addition, Submitter Glen Dene 384 has also requested that the Hawea Campground be rezoned Rural Visitor Zone, which is proposed to be a Stage 2 PDP zone. However, there is a lack of supporting material for the rezoning sought to assess the potential impacts on the transport network.

- 20.3** The rezoning would enable significant development potential for the 21.692ha of land. There will be an increase in larger vehicles such as buses, coaches, campervan and caravans in the transport network, and these vehicles will need to be accommodated within the site.
- 20.4** Access to the subject site will be via SH6 Makaroa-Lake Hawea Road and will be dependent on NZTA's approval for the intensification on the State Highway and access considerations.
- 20.5** Based on the little information submitted for the assessment and potential development the rezoning sought would enable, I oppose the zoning sought.

**Heather Pennycook - 585**

- 20.6** The submitter seeks for land to be rezoned from RL to Rural General, which is an ODP zone. I do not oppose this rezoning because adverse transport impacts are not anticipated.

**Lake McKay Station Ltd - 483**

- 20.7** Lake McKay Station Ltd request that 17ha of land on Lake McKay Station, west of Luggage Township is rezoned to RR from notified Rural zoning.
- 20.8** The rezoning sought would yield an additional approximately 29 lots. I have reviewed the submission document, Lake McKay Station Plan Change, Atkins Road Rural Residential Zone, and the Section 32 Evaluation Report by Opus.
- 20.9** The site would be accessed off Atkins Road via SH6, and is sealed at the intersection. I recommend that Atkins Road is widened to allow for two lanes of traffic.
- 20.10** I do not oppose the submission, as the road controlling authority, the NZTA will be required to provide comment on the access onto SH6 as an upgrade may be required to accommodate the increase in trips.

This would be undertaken at the time of subdivision, if the rezoning is accepted.

### **Lake McKay Station Ltd - 483**

- 20.11** Lake McKay Station Ltd 483 has sought for three areas to be rezoned from notified Rural zone to RL zone. I have reviewed Appendix 2, Engineering Report included in the submission. The report highlights the current accesses to the sites that are all existing farm tracks and explores access options for each site. Area 2 in the report refers to submission 483. My views are presented in the following paragraphs.
- 20.12** Area 1 proposes 20 lifestyle blocks and has presented three access options to the site as there are currently no formed roads to the site. I have reviewed the options, and conclude that access to the site is constrained by the existing landscape and the options presented have high costs as bridge crossings will be required. Also, should the newly formed roads be vested QLDC, it would be an ongoing liability for the Council due to the maintenance costs.
- 20.13** Area 3 is 6ha of land and the RL rezoning sought would enable two to three units with access via a track off Kingan Road in Luggate. As described in the engineering report the track is restricted to single lane only due to land constraints. From a transport safety perspective the RL zoning is not considered appropriate given that widening the track to allow for two lanes of traffic would incur substantial costs and even then, there is a risk of erosion. I therefore oppose the rezoning sought.
- 20.14** Area 4 is 42ha of land and 14 units would be enabled with the Rural Lifestyle zone and is accessed off SH6. As identified in the engineering report, the sight distances at the SH6 intersection is substandard. The proposed submission will require NZTA approval for the intensification of the access and present mitigation measures for the substandard sight distance. I therefore oppose the rezoning sought based on the intensification of the land will present safety issues in the transport network.

### **Lesley and Jerry Burdon 581**

- 20.15** Submitter 581 requests to rezone 38ha of land located on the western side of Lake Hawea from Rural to RL with the inclusion of a Building Restriction Area.
- 20.16** The request would yield an additional 4 lots. The sites will be accessed off SH6. In my view I do not oppose the submission, however I note that the site would be required to meet NZTA's criteria for access to the state highway.

### **Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society - 706**

- 20.17** Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society has sought for a rezone from the notified Makarora Rural Lifestyle Zone to Rural. I do not oppose this submission because the impacts on the transport network would be reduced with the removal of the development enabled under Rural Lifestyle Zone.

### **Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd 583**

- 20.18** The Submission seeks to rezone notified PDP Rural Zone to a bespoke zone, the 'Glendhu Station Special Zone' for the Glendhu Bay area. Consent has been granted for an 18 hole golf course, clubhouse, jetty, 12 visitor accommodation units, 42 residencies/visitor accommodation units (lot sizes range from 3,525m<sup>2</sup> to 8,719m<sup>2</sup> per unit).
- 20.19** The Glendhu Station Special Zone will enable a variety of activities including additional visitor and residential accommodation, wedding venue and services, extension of camp ground farm tours and eco themed visitor accommodation.
- 20.20** The information supporting the submission is at a high level and contains no information on traffic. It is difficult to determine the impacts on the transport network as potentially the zoning sought could be significant in terms of traffic generation. Glendhu Bay can only be accessed via Wanaka Mount Aspiring Road. The road is

known to have safety issues particularly with the narrow road widths. In addition, the area within Glendu Bay has been recognised as a black spot for vehicle crashes.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, I do not support the zoning sought from a transport perspective.

### **Crosshill Farms Ltd 531**

- 20.21** Crosshill Farms Ltd has requested to rezone the areas identified within the proposed Rural Landscape Classification (**RLC**) covering the Crosshill Farm as Rural Lifestyle. The total land area covers 300ha. This land has a PDP notified zoning of Rural.
- 20.22** The rezone could potentially yield 102 lots. I have assumed that access to these lots would be off Dublin Bay Road via SH6 (Lake Hawea – Albert Town Road). As the road controlling authority, NZTA would at the subdivision stage be required to make an assessment on the impacts on SH6, particularly, the one way Albert Town Bridge over the Clutha River. The potential trips generated may warrant the need for a right turn bay into Dublin Bay Road combined with the horizontal curvature of SH6 that may fall short of sight distance requirements.
- 20.23** In my view, I do not support the zoning sought over the large parcel of land because it can potentially yield a substantial amount of lots – 102. SH6 will also most likely be affected and will likely require improvements to make it safer for turning movements into and out of Dublin Bay Road.

### **Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd 782**

- 20.24** The submitter seeks to rezone 14.54ha of land to the south of Wanaka airport and SH6 from Rural to Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone (**WAMUZ**). This would be a new zone and be based on the PDP Chapter 17 Airport Zone.
- 20.25** The new zoning would enable up to 75% building site coverage and is assumed that land would be used for commercial activities.

---

6 QLDC RAMM.

- 20.26** I do not support the rezoning from notified Rural to WAMUZ based on the potential development that would be enabled. The site is located on the other side of SH6 (Wanaka-Luggate Highway) to the Wanaka airport. The WAMUZ is intended for airport and airport-related activities, the site would require crossing SH6 and this important matter has not been considered in the submission.
- 20.27** In addition, the full extent of Mount Barker Road is not sealed and increased traffic along this road could create maintenance and safety issues such as dust, nuisance and safety of drivers with loss of control on loose gravel.

**Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd - 820**

- 20.28** Submission 820 has requested to rezone land from Rural to RL with access off Smith Road via Mount Barker Road. The rezone would enable an additional 25 residential lots in the area.
- 20.29** From a transport perspective, I note that the western section of Mount Barker Road and Smith Road is not sealed. However, based on a maximum of 25 residential developments and with no further intensification in surrounding area the impacts would not be significant on the transport network. I therefore do not oppose the rezoning sought.

**Wakatipu Holdings - 314**

- 20.30** Wakatipu Holdings has requested to rezone land from Rural to Rural Lifestyle and this would enable an additional 4 lots with access off Church Road.
- 20.31** I do not oppose the rezone sought because the impacts on the transport network would be minimal based on the additional traffic generated.

**Evan Alty - 339**

- 20.32** Evan Alty seeks that the RR zone at Rekos point is rezoned to Rural. I do not oppose this submission from a traffic perspective because the rezone would result in a reduction in traffic.

**Jeff Rogers - 2**

- 20.33** Jeff Rogers has sought to rezone Lot 1 DP 303093 at Cardrona from Rural to Rural Visitor Zone, which is a Stage 2 PDP zone. The site is 3,580m<sup>2</sup> of land and is located to the eastern side of Cardrona Valley Road.
- 20.34** Through applying the ODP zoning provisions for a rural visitor zone, the rezoning would enable an estimated 980m<sup>2</sup> of development potential due to setback requirements. However, there are no further details with regards to specific activities sought in the submission.
- 20.35** Given that the site is located off Cardrona Valley Road, and currently there is a lot of activity for that area in a rural environment (i.e. restaurant, visitor and residential accommodation) and commercial activities associated with Cardrona Village located immediately to the south, I have assumed that additional pedestrian trips would be generated across the road, and parking would be required as per the ODP, based on the type of land use.
- 20.36** The most likely development scenario is visitor accommodation. The traffic generation based on 980m<sup>2</sup> of the site being developed for this use would be 68 trips per peak hour. This assumes that 20 motel units would be built on site. I consider this is acceptable.
- 20.37** The location of the site is on a 50km/h speed limit zone, I recommend that one access to the site should be provided and no reversing movements out of the site be permitted. Therefore I do not oppose the submission.

**Willowridge Developments Limited - 249**

- 20.38** Willowridge Development Limited has sought to rezone Rural land referred to as Luggate Park Stage 2A and Stage 2B to LDR and RR. A resource consent has been approved for 138 urban lot over 30ha of land. A further 22 lot subdivision has been lodged for Rural Residential zoning. The yield has not be calculated as it is not clear from the submission what areas are sought to be rezoned to LDR and RR.
- 20.39** The site fronts onto SH6 Luggate-Cromwell Road. The submission does not provide any supporting documents for access locations nor the number of accesses the site would have off SH6. There is also not enough information to undertake a yield calculation. Therefore I oppose the submission based on the uncertainty of the rezoning sought and also that the site is on a 100km/h high speed environment road.



**Wendy Banks**

**17 March 2017**