

**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 15

**REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL ANDREW SMITH
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

TRANSPORT

22 August 2018

 **Simpson Grierson**
Barristers & Solicitors

M G Wakefield / C J McCallum
Telephone: +64-3-968 4009
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023
Email: mike.wakefield@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874
SOLICITORS
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. SCOPE.....	1
3. MR CARR (ON BEHALF OF NGĀI TAHU PROPERTY LIMITED AND NGĀI TAHU JUSTICE HOLDINGS LIMITED) (2335).....	2
4. MR CARR (ON BEHALF OF NGĀI TAHU PROPERTY LIMITED AND NGĀI TAHU JUSTICE HOLDINGS LIMITED) (2336).....	3
5. MR CARR (ON BEHALF OF NGĀI TAHU PROPERTY LIMITED AND NGĀI TAHU JUSTICE HOLDINGS LIMITED) (2739).....	4
6. MR WILLIAMS FOR REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED AND QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED (#2462).....	6

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Michael Andrew Smith. I am a Principal Transport Engineer and National Specialist – Road Safety, and have been employed by Stantec NZ (formally MWH NZ Limited) since 1996.
- 1.2 My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence in chief dated 23 July 2018 (**EiC**).
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 Throughout my evidence I refer to the following versions of the PDP text, as follows:
- (a) **Decision:** to refer to the PDP Stage 1 Decisions version 5 May 2018; and
 - (b) **S42A Provision 29.X.X:** to refer to the recommended version of a Stage 2 provision, as included in Appendix 1 to Vicki Jones' s42A Report (i.e. S42A Rule 29.5.1)

2. SCOPE

- 2.1 My rebuttal evidence is provided in response to the following evidence filed on behalf of various submitters:
- (a) Mr Andy Carr on behalf of Ngāi Tahu Property Limited and Ngāi Tahu Justice Holdings Limited (#2335, #2336 AND #2739); and
 - (b) Mr Williams on behalf of Remarkables Park Limited and Queenstown Park Limited (#2462).

3. **MR CARR (ON BEHALF OF NGĀI TAHU PROPERTY LIMITED AND NGĀI TAHU JUSTICE HOLDINGS LIMITED) (2335)**

3.1 Mr Carr has filed evidence in relation to Rule 29.5.22 - Minimum distances of Vehicle Crossings from Intersections, seeking that consideration be given to the operating speed of a road when determining the minimum distance requirements and thus permit smaller distances than permitted in the PDP. Mr Carr suggests, at paragraph 4.14, that the matter of discretion be amended to read as follows:

"Effects on the efficiency of landuse and the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including the pedestrian and cycling environment, taking into account the operating speed of the road"

3.2 The term *operating speed* refers to the speed at which drivers are observed operating their vehicles. The 85th percentile of a sample of observed speeds is the most frequently used descriptive statistic for the operating speed associated with a particular location or geometric feature. The term *Posted Speed* refers to the legally posted speed of a road.

3.3 I support in principal the amendment proposed by Mr Carr in that it permits consideration of reduced distances between vehicle crossings and intersections as a matter of discretion where an applicant can demonstrate a lower frontage road operating speed.

3.4 I am cognisant that an access to a road frontage is dependent on the nature, scale and impact of the proposed development. That is, a residential property would have a lower safety and network impact close to an intersection than that of a hotel. The latter would have a higher level of turn movement, and hence potentially require a greater off-set.

3.5 In reaching the position, I consider that it is also helpful to consider whether the rule is easy to understand from a lay person's perspective. The alteration requested by Mr Carr introduces a test of determining the operating speed of a road that would not be determinable by a lay person. That is, vehicle operating speeds (85th percentile speeds) need

to be measured at the proposed access site in accordance with recognised procedures including number of vehicles measured, time of day, weather conditions, observance of person measuring etc. This measurement is unable to be done by the general layperson.

3.6 It is likely applicants will seek to use this matter of discretion for new subdivisions where a lower posted speed limit is proposed. I consider this appropriate, and note the adoption of a 10km/h above the posted speed limit as being commonly accepted as described by Mr Carr.¹ I note in some developments the lower speed limit is not posted, but relies on engineering design to encourage lower vehicle speeds. In this scenario, where a speed cannot be measured, the speed adopted would be the estimated 85th percentile design speed (as estimated in accordance with the Code of Practice) plus 10km/h.

3.7 This allows for the inevitable variation between estimated speeds and measured real world speeds.

4. MR CARR (ON BEHALF OF NGĀI TAHU PROPERTY LIMITED AND NGĀI TAHU JUSTICE HOLDINGS LIMITED) (2336)

4.1 Mr Carr has filed evidence in relation to Table 29.8 Car Parking Sizes and Layout, specifically with respect to the Minimum Aisle Dimensions for Car Parking. Mr Carr is seeking that the PDP minimum Aisle Width be reduced to that presented in the AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 'Parking Facilities Part 1: Off-Street Car Parking'. Mr Carr states at paragraph 5.1 that:

"..in practice, it is typically necessary to specify minimum widths for car parking aisles so that a non-technical reader of the District Plan is able to easily understand what dimensions are expected to ensure that the parking spaces are appropriately accessible."

4.2 Mr Carr further states at paragraph 5.2 that:

"The submitters highlight that the widths proposed for the District Plan in Table 29.8 are inconsistent with those included within Standard AS/NZS2890.1:2004 'Parking Facilities Part 1: Off-Street Car Parking'. I concur."

1 Evidence Mr Carr Paragraph 4.6.

4.3 In my view, the reference to AS/NZS 2890.1: 2004 should be approached with caution when considering the adoption of this standard for aisle dimensions. The document was last reviewed in 2004, and was based on an evaluation of the Australian² vehicle fleet that was registered in 2000. As the document is yet to be reviewed to consider the current vehicle fleet, it is possible that the stated dimensions may be less than required for safe and efficient use.

4.4 It is my view that AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 provides the absolute minimum dimensions that would be acceptable for an application when considering adequate parking dimensions. AS/NZS2890.1:2004 requires consideration of many factors, not just aisle width, in the determination of an appropriate car park layout.

4.5 While Mr Carr is not aware of any issues arising from use of the standard,³ there is anecdotal evidence that some drivers are selecting to not use car parking buildings due to tight dimensions and the consequential damage to their vehicles. I am not aware of this being reported formally to the respective road controlling authorities.

5. MR CARR (ON BEHALF OF NGĀI TAHU PROPERTY LIMITED AND NGĀI TAHU JUSTICE HOLDINGS LIMITED) (2739)

5.1 In relation to Table 29.9 Heavy Vehicle Parking Layout standards, Mr Carr supports the s42A amendments requiring the provision of minimum stall widths of 3.5m and, for coach parking, minimum access path widths for pedestrians of 1.5m⁴. However, Mr Carr also supports an amendment to Table 29.9 (Rule 29.13) to only specify the minimum bay dimensions, and note that unimpeded manoeuvring is required into the space provided.

5.2 Mr Carr notes that bespoke layouts are often required,⁵ and that the proposed provisions do not provide flexibility. He also notes it is

2 It is considered that the Australian fleet reasonable reflects the New Zealand fleet, however the fleet in either country in 2000 is likely to be quite different in 2018.

3 Mr Carr Evidence Paragraph 5.3

4 Mr Carr Evidence Paragraph 6.8

5 Mr Carr Evidence Paragraph 6.6.

typically necessary to specify dimensions to assist non-technical readers.⁶

5.3 I maintain the position set out in my EIC that:⁷

“While the requested amendment has merit in order to simplify Table 29.9, the provision of minimum aisle widths (presented in the PDP) achieves the same outcome as unimpeded manoeuvring but is prescriptive and therefore enables the council to determine with certainty whether the rule is complied with or consent is required”.

5.4 It is my opinion that a non-technical person (lay person) can assess the PDP heavy vehicle parking requirements, however full consideration in an application would require input from a traffic specialist as presented by Mr Carr. However, in either case, in full consideration of an application that breaches Table 29.9, an appropriate provision and outcome could be achieved through considered evidence by a traffic specialist.

5.5 If an application was non-compliant with the PDP rule, the level of assessment required to be presented to Council to permit evaluation of the proposed layout is in line with the evidence by Mr Carr. That assessment would require an analysis of vehicle tracking curves to demonstrate unimpeded manoeuvring into spaces with no more than one reverse manoeuvre permitted when entering, and no more than one reverse manoeuvre permitted upon exit.

5.6 I believe a suitable outcome can be achieved with an advice note for Rule 29.13 that reads:

“alternative heavy vehicle parking arrangements will be considered by Council with provision of design vehicle tracking curves to demonstrate unimpeded manoeuvring into spaces with no more than one reverse manoeuvre permitted when entering, and no more than one reverse manoeuvre permitted upon exit”

6 Mr Carr Evidence Paragraph 6.1.

7 At paragraph 7.26.

6. MR WILLIAMS FOR REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED AND QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED (#2462)

- 6.1** Mr Williams' evidence considers Rule 29.9.15 Minimum Parking Ratios⁸ (**MPR**) for guest room type accommodation (e.g. hotels) and supports a flat ratio of 1 car park per 5 guest rooms⁹, instead of the ODP two-step assessment rule of 1 car park per 3 guest rooms up to 60 guest rooms and 1 car park per 5 guest rooms thereafter. Mr Williams does not discuss the staff parking rate, therefore I have assumed he has no issue with the staff parking rates.
- 6.2** After considering the evidence prepared by Mr Williams, I agree a lower MPR rate for guest room type visitor accommodation in the High Density Residential Zone (**HDR**) and Medium Density Residential Zone (**MDR**) (between Park and Suburb Street, Queenstown) (Rule 29.9.10) can be considered, with retention of the PDP staff parking rate.
- 6.3** I note that, generally, hotels are likely to generate comparable (or less) traffic and parking demand than motels / unit type visitor accommodation due to having onsite ancillary facilities (ie. Restaurant, guest services, gym, etc), therefore meeting visitors needs on site. It is my experience that hotels in the Queenstown Lakes District often attract a different type of visitor (ie. guests who fly / drive, business or long-distance traveller), alongside a proportion of guests travelling by coach.
- 6.4** I am cautious about adopting the 1 car park per 5 guest rooms MPR suggested by Mr Williams for hotel style accommodation. I note in this regard that Ms Jones's rebuttal evidence recommends that the MPRs for unit type visitor accommodation in the Business Mixed Use Zone (**BMU**) is reduced in a similar manner (Rebuttal Rule 29.9.10).
- 6.5** As noted above at para [SG to include reference], I agree that a lower rate can be provided in the HDR and MDR zones, but in the absence of available published data on parking demand for hotels I am currently

8 Evidence of Mr Williams Paragraph 6.6.

9 Evidence of Mr Williams Paragraph 6.14.

unable to support, as a blanket approach, the same reduction for other zones where guests are likely to be limited in mode choice. That is not to say, that I would not support a stepped 1:4 to 1:5 approach for those zones, so long as the stepped threshold is appropriate.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M.A. Smith', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Michael Andrew Smith

22 August 2018