

Vicki Jones for QLDC – Hearing Stream 15 – Transport

My evidence assesses and makes recommendations in relation to the submissions on Chapter 29 and related variations to chapters 2 (definitions), 37 (designations), 21 (Rural), 12 (Queenstown Town Centre), and 9 (High Density Residential) (**HDR**). I consider the rebuttal Chapter 29 provisions and varied chapters are the most appropriate way of managing the transport related effects of landuse and subdivision.

Chapter 29 seeks to achieve an integrated, safe, and efficient transport network that provides for all transport modes, reduces dependency on private motor vehicles, and promotes the use of shared, public, and active transport.

In response to both submissions and evidence I have recommended certain amendments to Chapter 29, including:

1. exempting High Traffic Generating Activities (**HTGAs**) from the Minimum Parking Requirements (**MPRs**), which will remove the need for HTGAs to obtain consent for breaching the MPRs and clarify that meeting the MPRs will not necessarily result in the most appropriate outcome in relation to larger developments;
2. exempting activities from the HTGA rule where an Integrated Transport Assessment (**ITA**) exists and mitigation measures are already committed too, which I consider will improve certainty and administrative efficiency;
3. lowering the MPRs in some additional zones and for some specific activities, which will enable more efficient landuse and a reduction in car dominance;
4. narrowing the extent to which the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice 2015 (**CoP**) is incorporated into the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**);
5. reducing the requirements for end of trip facilities, cycle parking, and e-bicycle charging facilities, enabling more efficient development while still requiring some provision; and
6. providing specifically for coach parking in some zones, enabling such facilities to be established more readily, thereby encouraging coach travel and providing an alternative to visitor accommodation providing such parks on-site.

The key outstanding matters of disagreement between myself and submitters who have filed evidence are that:

1. the HTGA rule should remain (as amended in the rebuttal evidence) and in particular, should continue to apply in the Jacks Point Zone and Airport Zone, noting that it is not simply duplicating assessments that were undertaken at the zoning stage;
2. the threshold for residential units should remain at 50 units and not be raised to 100 units;
3. rental vehicle activity rules should continue to apply to the Airport Zone; and
4. the MPRs for guest room type visitor accommodation should be not reduced other than in the HDR, Medium Density Residential (between Suburb and Park streets, Queenstown), and Business Mixed Use zones.

Further to the above, I also wish to point out a minor correction to paragraph 12.4 of my rebuttal evidence, in that the largest area of Local Shopping Centre zoned land is approximately 2.9 ha; not 2 ha as initially stated.