

**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 13 –
Queenstown
Annotations and
Rezoning Requests

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

TRANSPORT – QUEENSTOWN URBAN GROUPS 1A, 1B, 1C AND 1D

25 May 2017

 **Simpson Grierson**
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott / H L Baillie
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874
SOLICITORS
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1

2. SCOPE..... 3

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 4

4. BACKGROUND..... 6

5. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS – QUEENSTOWN URBAN – BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL (1A)..... 8

6. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS – QUEENSTOWN URBAN – FRANKTON AND SOUTH (1B) 40

7. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS – QUEENSTOWN URBAN – JACKS POINT ZONE EXTENSION (1D)..... 54

8. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS – QUEENSTOWN URBAN – CENTRAL, WEST AND ARTHURS POINT (1C)..... 59

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 New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Hong Kong and Fiji.
- 1.3 I have been providing Queensland Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) with my expertise in relation to transport assessment in land development for the network wide area, since 2013.
- 1.4 I am familiar with the Queenstown area and have undertaken site visits for the rezoning submissions requiring more attention. I am generally familiar with the Queenstown 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 with the Council I have been involved in a consenting project including the review of the Traffic Impact Assessment for Wanaka Ponds.
- 1.5 In relation to the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**), I have previously provided evidence in chief and rebuttal evidence in relation to transport matters for the Upper Clutha rezonings, and appeared at the hearing.
- 1.6 I have now been asked by QLDC to provide evidence in relation to the impacts of potential rezonings in the Queenstown rezoning hearing.
- 1.7 Although this is 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.

1.8 I refer to documents included in the Council's Bundle (**CB**), Supplementary Bundle (**SB**) and Second Supplementary Bundle of Documents (**SSB**). 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) the 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) QLDC, Otago Regional Council (**ORC**) and NZ Transport Agency (**NZTA**) Wakatipu Transport Plans;
- (f) QLDC, NZTA Frankton Flats Traffic Improvement Work 2015-2021;
- (g) QLDC, Queenstown Town Centre Transport Strategy. January 2015;
- (h) QLDC, Queenstown Town Centre Transport Strategy, The Next Steps, June 2016;
- (i) public transport and key walking and cycling routes (if available);
- (j) QLDC RAMM, Asset Management Software;
- (k) QLDC Land Transportation Asset Management Plan 2016-2013, February 2016;
- (l) QLDC 2015-2045 Infrastructure Strategy, March 2015 [**SB81**];
- (m) Draft Queenstown Lakes District On Foot, By Cycle Strategy, 2008;
- (n) NZ Transport Agency Research Report 453, Trips and parking related to land use, November 2011;
- (o) Queenstown Transport Model, Abley Consultants; and
- (p) QLDC Operative District Plan (**ODP**).

1.9 All references to PDP provision numbers, are to the Council's Reply version of those provisions (unless otherwise stated).

2. SCOPE

2.1 My evidence addresses the transport-related effects of Stage 1 rezoning submissions located within the Queenstown area. My focus is on the impacts of potential rezonings on the roading network including the effects on the capacity of the network.

2.2 The individual submissions have been broadly categorised into the following groups:

- (a) **1A** Queenstown Urban – Business and Industrial;
- (b) **1B** Queenstown Urban – Frankton and South (includes Kelvin Heights, Lake Johnson, Jacks Point);
- (c) **1C** Queenstown Urban – Central, West and Arthurs Point (includes Queenstown Hill, Fernhill/Sunshine Bay, Gorge Road, Arthurs Point);
- (d) **1D** Queenstown Urban – Jacks Point Zone Extension; and
- (e) **2** Rural.

2.3 My evidence addresses the Queenstown Urban submissions within **Groups 1A, 1B, 1C and 1D**. I understand that Mr Denis Mander is providing transport evidence in relation to the submissions categorised as Group 2 - Rural.

2.4 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.

2.5 I have read Ms Kim Banks' first statement of strategic evidence for this hearing, and in particular the part where she explains each of the zones in issue. I refer to and rely on that evidence, in terms of the type and densities of zones that the Council has recommended through its right of replies in the substantive hearings, and that are being pursued. I have used the Council's position on all zones, when considering their appropriateness.

- 2.6** There was limited information provided in the submissions relating to traffic generation, so I have had to assess the rezoning requests based on assumptions made with reference to the NZTA Research Report 453 **[SB80]**. All trip generation rates have been based on this document, unless otherwise stated.
- 2.7** I have also used traffic modelling outputs from the Queenstown Network Model that was developed by Abley Transportation Consultants. The data provided was for the Ladies Mile area, between Hansen Road and Hardware Lane along State Highway 6 (**SH6**), as the model was recently updated to include the proposed full extent of Hawthorne Drive that is currently under construction.
- 2.8** I referred to Abley's 2016 models to understand the current situation along the State Highway and the roundabouts (Grant Road and Hawthorne Drive) in terms of traffic volumes and delays. Future models were also provided by Abley for 2025 and 2045, however, they did not model the Ladies Mile area. In my view, the growth in traffic seemed quite low taking into account future growth and enabled developments to the south of the SH6 – Five Mile area. I have not used the future growth, rather I used the 2016 models and assessed the generated traffic from the rezoning against the current situation.
- 2.9** This evidence is based on desktop analysis and site visits where necessary in assessing each submission.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1** I have considered the submissions grouped in 1A, 1B and 1C. I have not opposed the ones that will not have an adverse impact on the transport network for the following key reasons:
- (a) the size of the relief sought is small and the traffic generated from potential developments is considered to be minimal and will not have any effect on the road network;

- (b) I consider that the existing transport infrastructure will support the rezoning in terms of capacity and provisions for alternative transport such as buses, walking and cycling; and
- (c) any safety concerns related to access locations, design and provisions can be addressed at subdivision stage.

3.2 Of the submissions that I oppose, my key reasons for doing so are:

- (a) the scale of the relief sought, is considered to be too large and in my opinion the development(s) enabled would generate far greater traffic that I am not certain that the existing road capacity could accommodate the additional loading;
- (b) particularly in the case of Business Mixed Use Zone (**BMUZ**) requests, I have estimated trips related to ground floor activities only, and this level of generated traffic raises concerns. However, up to a 12m height is permitted and a maximum height of 20m is restricted discretionary, therefore, the vehicle generation will be higher than what I estimated;
- (c) generally I have not opposed the change to BMUZ based on its location for connectivity with other land use activities and accessibility for transport, rather I have opposed the zone change based on the size and associated trips that would be generated by it; and
- (d) the existing road infrastructure is considered to be at capacity and any further developments enabled will exacerbate the existing delays and queues experienced in areas such as McBride Street in Frankton.

3.3 In some cases I oppose higher residential intensification because the transport infrastructure does not support it. That is, alternative modes of transport are not available or are not attractive enough to reduce reliance on private vehicle use. In addition, the location of the site is in some instances not positioned close enough to land-use activities that a higher residential density could benefit from such as the town centre or shopping centre/business/commercial zones that would encourage walking and cycling trips.

3.4 I am concerned with the safety of increase in land intensification that would result in higher turning movements, particularly right turn movements. These rezonings were mostly along the State Highways, where right turn movements into the minor roads are generally accommodated by right turn bays. However, for vehicles turning into the State Highway, such as Frankton Road, it is challenging given the constant high traffic volumes throughout the day. Queues develop, and drivers can become frustrated and take shorter gaps in the traffic, and in my view is a safety concern. I oppose the submissions based on the additional traffic that would be generated from the rezoning and the increase in pressure at intersections.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 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. 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 Queenstown area.

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 (in light of the Council's reply position on the text). 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 Ms Kim Banks 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. The approach to yield calculations is detailed in the strategic s42A report of Ms Kim Banks **[SSB 96]** and I refer to and rely on this evidence.

- 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 were calculated using NZTA 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. I have referred to strategies that have identified areas of improvement that potentially assisted with deriving a conclusion for each submission.
- 4.8** 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.
- 4.9** A number of rezoning submissions concern land with access to the state highways, including:

Frankton – Ladies Mile Area

- (a) Peter and Margaret Arnott - 399;
- (b) The Jandel Trust – 717;

- (c) Hansen Family Partnership – 751;
- (d) FII Holdings Ltd – 847;
- (e) Sean & Jane McLeod - 391;
- (f) W & M Grant – 455;
- (g) Spence Farms - 698;

Jacks Point

- (h) Jardine Family Trust & Remarkables Station Ltd – 715;

Frankton Marina

- (i) DS EE Properties Ltd – 16; and
- (j) Kenneth Muir – 125.

4.10 In relation to land accessing state highways, the NZTA (as the road controlling authority) will need to be consulted 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 the Queenstown area are limited access roads (**LAR**).

5. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS – QUEENSTOWN URBAN – BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL (1A)

5.1 I note that the Group 1A section 42A evidence, includes maps showing each specific submission point addressed below where relevant.

HANSEN ROAD/FRANKTON-LADIES MILE – GENERAL ASSESSMENT

5.2 There has been a number of rezoning submissions made for the area known locally as ‘Ladies Mile’ that is located along the north side of State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and the Quail Rise Special Zone as shown in the notified planning map 31a. The area is zoned Rural (**R**) and Medium Density Residential Zone (**MDRZ**) under the notified planning map and lies within the Urban Growth Boundary (**UGB**).

5.3 The rezoning requests for the area includes a mix of business and residential zones for different locations and size within the area,

therefore I have grouped these submissions together to discuss the potential outcomes.

- 5.4** Under the ODP, the area is zoned Rural General and is mostly undeveloped. There are existing businesses of industrial nature and residential lots with accesses off the State Highway within the subject site. Frankton Flats is situated on the opposite side of the State Highway and includes the recently developed Five Mile retail centre and large format retail stores. The area is still undergoing development, with residential activity and further retail land use proposed. The Queenstown Events Centre is located on the same side, with its access directly opposite Hansen Road.
- 5.5** Hansen Road extends to Lake Johnson and is not a through road; the road is not sealed beyond the existing City Impact Church site located on the other side of Hansen Road that I am considering under this section. Opposite to the church is a retail business (gift shop) that is located within the subject site.
- 5.6** Right turn movements out of Hansen Road into SH6 is a major safety concern due to the high volume of through traffic on the State Highway. Furthermore, the access road to the Queenstown Events Centre, Joe O'Connell Drive is positioned directly opposite, which also experiences difficult right turn movements. There is a flush median with right turn bays on the State Highway to accommodate right turn movements into Hansen Road and Joe O'Connell Drive.
- 5.7** I refer to the Queenstown Lakes District Council 2015-2045 Infrastructure Strategy, Table 1, Significant Infrastructure Issues for Queenstown Lakes District. The options presented at page 26 of the Table to accommodate future growth in the Frankton road network include State Highway improvements and secondary access to the Queenstown Events Centre. These options, should they go ahead, would improve the existing situation, particularly if this includes the Hansen Road intersection. In my view, the Hansen Road/SH6 intersection requires upgrading or reconfiguration prior to any further intensification of land that requires use of this access. At a minimum, a left in and left out only option should be provided, given that there

are roundabouts on either side of the intersection to allow U-turn movements.

- 5.8** Approximately 300m east of Hansen Road is the SH6 (Frankton Road)/SH6A roundabout. The roundabout is locally known as the 'BP roundabout' and serves as a key connection for the eastbound route Frankton Road to Queenstown, westbound to Frankton Flats and beyond such as Lake Hayes Estate and to the south (SH6A) towards the airport, and the Kawarau Bridge over to Kelvin Heights and Jacks Point and beyond.
- 5.9** The current operation levels of the BP roundabout are considered to be unsatisfactory for all three legs with long queues often experienced at peak periods. Upgrade of the roundabout is currently underway to increase capacity at the roundabout, which will help alleviate the traffic congestion. The completion of the Hawthorne Drive extension from Remarkables Park to the roundabout on SH6 at the Frankton - Ladies Mile will help reduce traffic volumes at the BP roundabout by providing an alternative option. Furthermore, the widening of the State Highway from the BP roundabout to the Grant Road roundabout (Five Mile) to dual lanes in each direction is proposed by NZTA. At this stage, the implementation timeframe has yet to be planned.
- 5.10** Approximately 580m east of Hansen Road is the recently developed SH6/Grant Road roundabout. The roundabout has three legs that intersect with the SH6 in the west/east direction and Grant Road leads to the Five Mile development to the south. The roundabout consists of two approach and two exit lanes on each leg, with two circulating lanes. I have assumed that the roundabout will not have provisions for an additional leg given that the existing power station is located immediately off the roundabout that could otherwise provide access to developments to the Ladies Mile area.
- 5.11** There is another new roundabout on the State Highway that connects with Hawthorne Drive (also known as the Eastern Access Road, Eastern Arterial Road or Glenda Drive) providing access to the large format retail developments, Pak'N Save and Mitre 10 and also the proposed airport park and ride facility scheduled to open mid-2017.

By the end of 2017 the full extent of Hawthorne Drive will be completed and this will provide an important link between the Ladies Mile area and the airport/Remarkables Town Centre area. The roundabout has three legs, with two approaches and two exit lanes on each leg, with two circulating lanes on the roundabout. The Hawthorne Drive roundabout has been designed to allow for an additional north leg to allow future vehicle loadings in the Ladies Mile area.

- 5.12** To the east of Hawthorne Drive is Hardware Lane that connects to Glenda Drive providing access to the notified Industrial A zone. Access is limited to left in and left out only from the State Highway. Given its current arrangement I have assumed that there will not be any upgrades of this intersection to enable access to the Ladies Mile area.
- 5.13** New footpaths were installed in the widening of the State Highway between the Grant Road and Hawthorne Drive roundabouts. Pedestrian crossing points are provided at the splitter islands at the new roundabouts, Grant Road and Hawthorne Drive. There are no footpath provisions between the BP roundabout and the Grant Road roundabout.
- 5.14** Pedestrian usage is low because there is little development on the north side of the State Highway at present. I have concerns with pedestrian safety once the north side is developed as they have to negotiate four lanes of traffic and the posted speed limit is 80km/h. In my opinion, a safe option will need to be provided for pedestrians given the land use activities on either side of the State Highway – residential, business and retail. It is imperative that the safety of pedestrians will not be compromised and walking trips should be encouraged.
- 5.15** Provisions for cyclists have been catered for with the shared footpath and crossing points as described in paragraph 5.13.
- 5.16** There are two new bus bays, located between the access to the Garden Centre and Hardware Lane on both sides of SH6. The

existing developments and proposed developments on the Ladies Mile area provides excellent opportunity to provide public transport facilities within the developments

- 5.17** The State Highway along the Ladies Mile area is one lane in each direction from BP roundabout and widens to two approach and exiting lanes at the Grant Road roundabout. The dual lanes extend to the Hawthorne Drive Roundabout. The posted speed limit along SH6 is 50km/h from Queenstown to the west of the Joe O'Connell Drive/Hansen Road intersection. This increases to 80km/h that includes the Grant Road and Hawthorne Drive roundabouts to the east of Hardware Lane, where the speed limit is 100km/h. There are current proposals seeking to extend the 80km/h limit to include the Ferryhill Drive intersection.
- 5.18** Based on the current high level review and understanding of any future zoning options available under the rezoning submissions, I have assessed the area for the zones sought and the location and size as well. However, the area as a whole must be considered, in order to comment on the cumulative effects of the relief sought. I have assessed the submissions individually and then collectively based on Ms Kim Banks planning recommendations to determine the effects of the rezonings.
- 5.19** I have made the following assumptions that access to the Ladies Mile area will be made via a new leg on the Hawthorne Drive roundabout. I have considered access off Hansen Road, however, as discussed in paragraph 5.7 I do not recommend any further developments using this intersection until it has been upgraded or reconfigured.
- 5.20** I obtained modelling data for the area that included the new north leg on the Hawthorne Drive roundabout from Abley Transportation Consultants Ltd. This was recently modelled to include 1,150 residential dwellings for the Quail Rise South development. It is my understanding that it was modelled to undertake economic analysis for the Housing Infrastructure Fund.

5.21 The model only included the 1,150 dwellings and on the new northern access road at the roundabout it was modelled to have 692 exiting onto the roundabout and 146 entering the new access road in the AM peak hour. At the PM peak hour, 313 exited onto the roundabout from the new access road and 729 exited from the roundabout to the new access road. The difference in the intersection performance for the roundabout with the new trips was minimal, from an overall 14 seconds delay to 16.3 seconds in the AM, and 18.5 seconds to 18.8 seconds in the PM peak hour.

5.22 The following submissions relate to *commercial and industrial* rezoning requests:

- (a) Peter and Margaret Arnott – 399;
- (b) The Jandel Trust -717;
- (c) Hansen Family Partnership – 751;
- (d) FII Holdings Limited – 847;
- (e) Stephen Spence – 8;

5.23 The *residential* rezoning requests include:

- (a) Villa dellLago - 380 (Submission on MDRZ provisions);
- (b) NZ Transport Agency – 719 (submissions on MDRZ provisions);
- (c) The Jandel Trust – 717;
- (d) FII Holdings Limited - 847 (residential zoning proposals);
- (e) Peter & Margaret Arnott (MDR Provisions) – 399;
- (f) Universal Development Limited (mapping and MDR Provisions) – 43;
- (g) Stephen Spence – 8;
- (h) Sean & Jane McLeod – 391;
- (i) W & M Grant – 455;
- (j) Hansen Family Partnership – 751 (residential proposals);
and
- (k) Otago Foundation Trust Board – 408.

Overall Summary of Rezoning Sought between Hansen Road and Quail Rise

- 5.24** In general, I have opposed the submissions that request for a BMUZ based on the size of the relief sought (18.8669ha and upwards). I consider that it would generate far too many vehicular trips and I am uncertain that the existing and potential proposed upgrades to the SH6 would be able to accommodate these additional trips without affecting performance levels and capacity. There are currently no traffic models that include the full developments that could be enabled in the Ladies Mile area.
- 5.25** A BMUZ would enable a range of activities including residential, commercial and retail. Furthermore, a building height of up to 12m is permitted, and 12m to 20m building height has a restricted discretionary activity status (this I understand would enable three to four floors). I have initially calculated vehicle trips based on ground floor activities only and these alone are estimated to be more than what is currently using the Hawthorne Drive roundabout. It is my view that doubling the current traffic on the roundabout (through a one floor BMUZ scenario) could result in delays occurring. As such allowing three to four floors of development would result in significantly higher trip generation from the development that the roundabout could not cater for. Therefore, as I oppose the ground floor level of development in itself, I have not needed to consider the effects of additional development up to the permitted height.
- 5.26** I have opposed the submissions that request a BMUZ based on the size of the relief sought, as I considered that it could generate far too many vehicular trips and I am uncertain that the existing and potential proposed upgrades to the SH6 would be able to accommodate these additional trips without affecting performance levels and capacity. Through movements along the SH6 will be affected in terms of journey times due to the increase in turning movements at the roundabout.
- 5.27** I support the notified PDP with a mix of R and MDRZ from a transport perspective because the roading network will accommodate the

MDRZ. Based on its location, connectivity and accessibility to active transport, I do not oppose rezoning part of the land to provide for commercial/business activities.

5.28 For a BMUZ in the area, I recommend that no more than 10 ha of land is rezoned in total. I have derived this maximum area based on an estimation of 1,700 trips generated under commercial activities. Again, this is based on ground floor activities only. However, with the existing transport infrastructure and potential proposed improvements I am of the view that 10ha of BMUZ would be accommodated without having adverse effects on the transport network. This is combined with residential zonings in other parts.

5.29 I now turn to each of the rezoning submissions, which I consider on a site by site basis.

Peter and Margaret Arnott – 399

5.30 Peter and Margaret Arnott seek that 13,533m² of land located at Frankton Road – Ladies Mile (Lot 1 DP 19932 and Section 129 Black I Shotover Survey District), be rezoned from notified R zone, to LSCZ and / or BMUZ. Replacing R with either LSCZ or BMUZ could potentially yield 80 lots.

5.31 Potential trips generated during peak hour from the site under LSCZ is calculated at 2.5/100m² for commercial premises **[SB80]**. Therefore the potential trips generated is 230 trips per peak hour (**vph**) (based on net area of 9,202m² after a 32% reduction for non-developable). My assessment of trips is based on ground floor commercial activities.

5.32 Under the LSCZ, residential and visitor accommodation is permitted on the first floor. Based on a net area of 9,202m², I have assumed provisions for accommodation on the first floor for all 80 lots. This would generate 64 vph based on a medium density residential flat trip rate of 0.8.

- 5.33** The combined total of estimated trips generated for both commercial and accommodation activities is 294 vph for a rezone to LSCZ.
- 5.34** The site is located opposite the Five Mile development and immediately to the east of the Grant Road roundabout on State Highway 6 (**SH6**) or also known as Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway. As set out earlier I have assumed that the roundabout will not have provisions for an additional leg given that the existing power station is located immediately off the roundabout that could otherwise provide access to development to the north of the roundabout.
- 5.35** I recommend that access to the site needs to be made via the SH6/Hawthorne Drive roundabout. A new leg on the north approach of the roundabout would need to be constructed to service the subject site.
- 5.36** When the Hansen Road intersection with SH6 is upgraded as part of the proposed four laning of SH6¹ or prior, then this will provide an additional access to the area.
- 5.37** Traffic modelling data supplied by Abley Consultants indicate that there are currently 1,480 two way vehicle trips made along SH6 at the site location in the AM peak hour and 1,878 in the PM peak hour (based on year 2016). The addition of 294 trips (estimated in paragraph 5.33 above) will have minimal effect on the Hawthorne Drive roundabout because a total of 2,235 vehicles was modelled in the 2016 PM peak model. The additional loading on the roundabout accounts for 13% of the current total and is unlikely to trigger delays.
- 5.38** Taking into account future growth (when Hawthorne Drive fully opens at the end of 2017) and consented developments in the area, I have no concerns with the zoning sought as I am confident that the existing road infrastructure can support the developments enabled. In particular, the Hawthorne Drive roundabout has been designed to allow for future vehicle loadings, therefore I do not oppose the rezoning sought. Furthermore, when Hansen Road/SH6 intersection

1 Queenstown Lakes District Council 2015-2045 Infrastructure Strategy, Table 1 Significant Infrastructure Issues for Queenstown Lakes District.

is upgraded this could potentially provide another access to the area if there was a connector road linking Hansen Road to the new north leg at the Hawthorne Drive roundabout.

The Jandel Trust – 717

- 5.39** The Jandel Trust seeks that 25.6858 ha of land located along the north side of Frankton Road - Ladies Mile (SH6) between the Grant Road roundabout and Ferry Hill Drive, be rezoned from notified **R / MDRZ** to **BMUZ**.
- 5.40** The Chapter 16 **BMUZ [CB13]** framework provides for commercial, business, retail and residential developments. It is estimated that 17.4663 ha of the site is developable after allowing 32% reduction for infrastructure.
- 5.41** Under Rule 16.5.4, the maximum building coverage is 75%, which equates to a building area of 13.0997 ha for the site. Using a 2.5/100m² trip rate for commercial premises/offices **[SB80]**, the potential trips generated during the peak hour from the rezoning is 3,275 vehicles per peak hour. In my view, the forecasted traffic generation is considered to be significant for a peak hour, given that the traffic flow on the existing state highway is around 2,000 trips for the peak hour (refer to paragraph 5.37). This will inevitably affect the capacity of the road network. In my paragraph 5.37, the modelling results showed that the addition of around 1,000 trips during the peak hour had minimal impact, however, the addition of these trips will could be over 4,000 trips and I would expect that the roundabout performance will be affected.
- 5.42** To compare with the notified zoning, I completed the same estimations under a **MDRZ**. My following calculations and estimations were based on Chapter 8 **[CB8]**. Rule 8.5.5 states that the maximum site density is one residential unit per 250m² net site area. This would yield 699 residential dwellings and an estimated 559 vehicle trips (using 0.8 trip rate factor for medium density residential flat) during the peak hour for one unit per site.

- 5.43** Comparing the notified MDRZ with the BMUZ sought, under a BMUZ it is estimated that there would be an additional 2,579 vehicle trips per peak hour.
- 5.44** The difference in vehicle trips is due to the different vehicle generation trip rates used for commercial activities and medium density dwellings, 2.5/100m² and 0.8/dwelling respectively. For the BMUZ sought, my trip generation was based on ground floor activities only, however, three storeys can be built in accordance to Chapter 16 BMUZ (Rule 16.5.8.1) states that a maximum height of 12m is permitted. I oppose the level of traffic generation based on just one floor of BMUZ activity, and therefore if all three storeys were developed, the extent of traffic generation would be much more.
- 5.45** In terms of the trip rate (vph) that I used, 2.5/100m² GFA for commercial/office premises is appropriate given that for warehousing it is 1/100m² vph which in my opinion is not entirely reflective of mixed use business activities, and the lowest trip rate related to retail is for large format retail stores/home improvement at 5.6/10m².
- 5.46** Although my traffic assessment is based on the site being fully developed which may take many years to progress, the traffic model predicts that the number of vehicles using the roundabout in year 2045 will increase to 2,815 vehicles during the peak hour. I noted that the future models that have been provided have not taken into account proposed developments in the Ladies Mile area, therefore it is difficult to assess the difference in BMUZ as sought from the notified MDR.
- 5.47** Overall, I have concerns with the substantially high traffic volume that could be generated if the majority of the Ladies Mile area was rezoned to BMUZ, considering that my estimation is based on ground floor activities only. The development trips alone are more than that what is modelled on the Hawthorne Drive roundabout for all three existing legs.
- 5.48** Potentially, this could slow the SH6 through movements at the roundabout. As I mentioned it is difficult to assess the effects of

potential trips without future models including the proposed developments. I have based my assessment on the comparison of the trips that could be generated compared to what is on the Hawthorne Drive Road roundabout during the peak hour.

5.49 I acknowledge that access to the site could be shared with the Hansen Road intersection and therefore less pressure at the Hawthorne Drive roundabout. I note in this assessment I have assumed a left in and left out only option and therefore the Grant Road and BP roundabouts will have increase of U-turn movements. The Grant Road roundabout encompasses two circulating lanes that will accommodate this. Once the State Highway is widened, I will assume that the BP roundabout will be included as part of the works to increase the capacity (perhaps to two circulating lanes).

5.50 I refer to the Arnott submission 399 (addressed above), I have not opposed the zoning to BMUZ, however, the area sought was 1.35ha. By comparison, the 25.6858ha sought for this submission is substantially greater and its associated impacts are reflected as per my vehicle trip estimations (230 versus 3,275). Consequently, I oppose the rezoning sought, and I am not comfortable with the rezoning sought from a transport perspective because of the uncertainty of the significant traffic volumes that would have on the road network that would be generated under a BMUZ.

Hansen Family Partnership – 751

5.51 Hansen Family Partnership seeks that 18.8669 ha of land located along Frankton Road – Ladies Mile be rezoned from notified R / MDRZ to Industrial or to any mix of Low, Medium or High Density, Industrial, BMUZ or LSCZ. The net area of land developable is 12.82949 ha after a 32% reduction.

5.52 For a BMUZ, it is estimated that 1,115 lots could be enabled. The BMUZ allows for a mix of business, commercial, retail and residential uses and up to 12 m building height permitted (therefore three storeys are enabled).

- 5.53** The estimation of vehicle trips follows the same method as outlined in paragraph 5.37 is calculated to be 2,405 vph. The calculation is based on the maximum ground floor activities enabled, and I have not included two more floors of activities, because the traffic generated for one floor is high enough for the purpose of this assessment.
- 5.54** In my view, similar to the Jandal Trust submission (717) a rezoning of the entire area sought to BMUZ will generate a substantial amount of vehicle trips when compared to the total trips on the State Highway currently. The potential trips generated is more than the total vehicles on the Hawthorne Road roundabout, 2,405 versus around 2,000 during the peak hour. I have concerns with the capacity of the road network and also need to consider future growth and other planned developments in the area. I oppose the rezoning sought based on the size of the relief sought.
- 5.55** I do consider that the area is suitable for BMUZ because of its location and connections to existing and proposed land use activities in the area. This is relevant, if pedestrian facilities are improved or implemented where there are no footpaths at the western side of the site (between BP and Grant Road roundabouts). I recommend a mix of land use activities being commercial and residential for the area sought. This would reduce the vehicle trip generation as trip rates are generally lower for residential than business/commercial activities. Furthermore, the mix of residential and employment opportunities in the area will reduce reliance on private vehicle use.
- 5.56** For a LSCZ in the area sought, I have derived the same recommendation as the BMUZ, in that I am supportive of the zoning but to a smaller scale so that there will be less vehicles generated.
- 5.57** I note that the LSCZ has a lower building height maximum of 10m compared to 12m for BMUZ, thus less floor area development potential. The purpose of the LSCZ is to reduce the necessity for people to travel longer distances to town centres to purchase convenience goods and access services. Therefore, if the area was partly zoned LSCZ, the remaining portion should be residential so

that the area will form a well-connected community and also reduce dependence on private vehicle use.

- 5.58** For a rezone to LDR it is estimated to yield 285 residential lots based on 450m² per residential unit (rule 7.4.9, **[CB7]**). This would generate 371 vehicles per peak hour based on a trip rate of 1.3 per dwelling.
- 5.59** Comparing to the PDP notified R/MDR, the area based on MDR could generate 412 vehicles per peak hour based on 250m² per unit and a trip rate of 0.8 for MDR.
- 5.60** The difference in vehicles per peak hour generated by the reduction in intensity is not significant with an estimated 127 less vehicle movements per peak hour generated.
- 5.61** However, given its location within the UGB and the nearby employment and community facilities (Five Mile opposite), the area could be more suitable for MDR than LDR because of active transport connections. The existing footpaths and crossing points allow for safer access across SH6 (I note that once development intensifies, alternative safer crossing options will need to be identified and implemented), and cycle provisions and public transport facilities encourages alternative modes of transport other than private vehicle use. Reducing the residential intensity from MDR to LDR would potentially reduce the vehicle trips in the surrounding network but would not be significant, therefore I do not oppose the rezoning sought.
- 5.62** I oppose a High Density Residential (**HDRZ**) across the entire site. In my view, rezoning the entire subject site to HDR would mean that the only nearby amenities for residents would be to cross the State Highway at the Five Mile development.
- 5.63** I would consider a mix of HDR or MDR and BMU or LSC zoning as this would in my view encourage trips within the area for employment, services and purchasing without traversing the State Highway. This would also encourage alternative transport modes such as walking

and cycling and reduce the reliance on private vehicle use, with local buses servicing trips to Queenstown.

FII Holdings Limited – 847

- 5.64** FII Holdings Limited seeks that 25.6858 ha of land located at 145 Frankton Road, be rezoned from notified MDRZ to BMUZ. Council's estimation of developable land is 17.4663 ha with a potential to yield 820 additional lots.
- 5.65** The site is located at 145 Frankton – Ladies Mile Highway (SH6) between Hawthorne Drive and Hardware Lane (renamed from Glenda Drive). The configuration of Hardware Lane and SH6 only enables left turn movements into Hardware Lane from SH6, therefore, the addition of a north leg at the intersection is not viable.
- 5.66** Access to the site would be made via the Hawthorne Drive/SH6 roundabout with a new leg on the northern approach. I have described the road environment in paragraph 5.10.
- 5.67** The area caters for pedestrians and cyclists with footpaths, cycle lanes and crossing facilities across SH6, along with the provision of bus bays. However, I do have serious concerns for the safety of vulnerable users such as children and older people negotiating four lanes of heavy traffic.

5.68 This submission is similar to submission 717 Jandel Trust and relates to a site of the same size. Therefore, I refer to my paragraphs 5.39 to 5.43 for my assessment of traffic generation and impact on the existing road network.

5.54 The potential trips generated based on a rezoning to BMUZ would be 3,275 vph, this is based on the maximum amount of activity enabled at the ground floor (rather than three floors), as described earlier in paragraph 5.25. I have concerns that the scale of land enabled under a BMUZ could have adverse impacts on the road network from the volume of vehicles that could potentially be generated. Therefore, I oppose the rezoning sought.

Sean & Jane McLeod - 391

5.69 Sean & Jane McLeod seek that 25.7950 ha of land located opposite Glenda Drive be rezoned from notified MDRZ, to LDRZ. Under the MDR zoning, the site could yield 702 lots, compared to a yield of 390 lots under the LDR zone. The rezoning sought would result in 312 less residential lots.

5.70 From a transport perspective I do not oppose the rezoning based on the potential reduction in traffic volume and no adverse effects from the change. However, a higher residential intensification is more desirable given its location to local amenities and services, employment opportunities and accessibility with alternative transport modes available such as public transport, footpath and cycle provisions.

W & M Grant - 455

5.71 W & M Grant seek that 2.246 ha of land located at Hansen Road / Frankton – Ladies Mile Highway, be rezoned from notified R zone, to MDR with visitor accommodation (**VA**) zone or a zone to allow for commercial activities (LSCZ, AMU or BMU). The MDR with VA zone could yield 61 additional lots and 132 additional lots could be yielded under a BMU zone.

- 5.72** The site is bounded by Frankton – Ladies Mile Highway (SH6) and Hansen Road forming a triangular area of land. I have assumed access to the site will be via the existing intersection of SH6/Hansen Road/Joe O’Connell Drive. It is recognised that current right turn movements into and out of SH6 are challenging due to the high traffic volumes on the State Highway, which is a safety issue as drivers will risk undertaking turning movements in shorter gaps in the State Highway traffic.
- 5.73** In my opinion, any development proposed off Hansen Road will require an upgrade or reconfiguration of the intersection at SH6. As a minimum, reconfiguration to allow left in and left out turning movements only from SH6 to Hansen Road this is a viable option given the roundabouts at either side of the intersection to allow for U-turn movements.
- 5.74** There are two issues that in my view need to be addressed before any MDR development with VA should occur in that site.
- 5.75** First of all, I am concerned with pedestrian safety, given the close proximity to the Terrace Junction amenities (at the BP roundabout) and the Events Centre and Frankton Village there are currently no safe provisions for pedestrians (or cyclists), in terms of footpath and crossing facilities.
- 5.76** Secondly, the reconfiguration of the Hansen Road/SH6 intersection is required.
- 5.77** My views on the two issues described above are the same for the site under a BMUZ that the submitter also seeks. Although commercial activities will generate far greater vehicle trips, once the Hansen Road intersection and with a potential connector road linking to the Hawthorne Drive roundabout, I would be more confident that a commercial zoning could be accommodated in the road network.

Stephen Spence - 8

- 5.78** Stephen Spence seeks that 22.7617 ha of land located between Frankton Ladies Miles Highway and the Quail Rise Zone, be rezoned from notified MDR zone, to R zone as zoned in the ODP.
- 5.79** An R zoning will not create any impacts to the transport network. The notified MDR zone will generate substantial amount of vehicular trips and will trigger the addition of a new leg on the Hawthorne Drive roundabout. However, the MDR is considered to be suitably located based on connectivity to existing and future amenities via roads and alternative modes such as walking and cycling. Based on the transport effects from an R zone I am neutral on the submission, because the existing transport infrastructure will accommodate the notified MDRZ, and a down zoning to Rural, will reduce traffic generation.

PROVISIONS IN THE PDP RELATING TO THE LADIES MILE AREA

NZ Transport Agency (MDRZ Provisions) - 719

- 5.80** NZTA requests that the correct road name connections are accurately described in 8.5.3.1a and 8.5.3.2c. Both rules refer to *Eastern Access* and NZTA request that Road is added to read *Eastern Access Road*.

I agree with using the correct road names, it is my understanding that Eastern Access Road will be called Hawthorne Drive. Therefore, it should be changed to represent the correct road name.

- 5.81** NZTA request that the following is added to the traffic impact assessment matter in rule 8.5.3.2:

Integration with pedestrians and cycling networks, particularly the cross SH6 connections.

The amendment will require a more detailed assessment of the safety impacts for these users at the time of consenting, and therefore I agree with NZTA.

The Jandel Trust (MDR Provisions) – 717

FII Holdings Ltd (MDR Provisions) – 847

Peter & Margaret Arnott (MDR Provisions) - 399

- 5.82** Submissions 717 and 847 seek that the following amendment be made to the PDP – Chapter 8 (MDR):

8.5.3.1a - *Ensures connections to the State Highway network are only via Hansen Road, The Eastern Access Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive, or existing access locations.*

- 5.83** The Jandel Trust and FII Holdings Ltd request that the existing accesses onto SH6 are recognised in this rule. I acknowledge that there are existing accesses for individual lots along the SH6. However, from a transport perspective I do not agree with including existing access locations for new developments. There are numerous single accesses along the State Highway, and these are designed for low traffic volumes, and many are located close to each other. Additional turning movements into and out of these accesses will create conflict points. These accesses in its current form will not support any developments proposed.

- 5.84** Submission 399 seek to delete rules 8.5.3.1 (a) and (b) for the same reasons as above, the PDP ruling is appropriate, therefore should not be removed.

- 5.85** The submitters request that rule 8.5.3.2 relating to the provision of a Traffic Impact Assessment is deleted. A Traffic Impact Assessment in this area would identify any potential impacts and addresses issues such as safety, road capacity and considers road connectivity and public transport matters. Without undertaking a Traffic Impact Assessment the best outcomes for the transportation effects may not identified. Therefore the Council's recommended deletion of rule 8.5.3.2 in an earlier hearing could, for this area, potentially have detrimental effects on the transport network.

Otago Foundation Trust Board (mapping and policy change) – 408

- 5.86** The Otago Foundation Trust Board propose to build a new church and residential dwellings at the northwest corner of the Hawthorne Drive roundabout. They seek to rezone the R area of land to MDRZ. From a transport perspective I do not oppose it because it could yield an additional 39 units and the transport impacts is likely to minimal as vehicle trips will not be substantial.

1 HANSEN ROAD

Queenstown Airport Corporation (LSC Zone provisions only) – 433

Villa delLago (MDR Provisions) – 380

- 5.87** The provisions sought for submissions 433 and 380 did not have any transport effects, and I have not considered these further.

NZTA (LSC Zone Provision Only) –719

- 5.88** NZTA seeks that rules 15.4.3.2a and 15.5.1 be amended.
- 5.89** For the development of 1 Hansen Road, NZTA seek to add to rule 15.4.3.2a by adding the following requirement: (vi) No direct access to the State Highway.
- 5.90** I do not oppose the addition to the rule, because I do not support a direct access off the State Highway for the LSCZ and the access road will connect to Hansen Road.

5.91 NZTA also seek an amendment to rule 15.5.1 to read as follows: The traffic effects of additional building coverage on the State Highway, particularly with regard to the intersection between Hansen Road and State Highway 6.

5.92 I do not oppose the request to consider the effects of the State Highway 6.

Spence Farms - 698

5.93 Spence Farms seek that the following amendments be made to LSC zone building height at 1 Hansen Road:

- (a) that the maximum height shall be 10m except for building or parts of building 55m further from the State Highway boundary, in which case the maximum height shall be 15m. For all other area in the LSC zone the maximum height shall be 10m.

5.94 I oppose the request for increase of maximum building height at the LSC zone at 1 Hansen Road, as it would enable further development in the area and from site observations I do not agree that there should be any further loading on the transport network compared to what has been notified in the PDP. It is evident that there are issues with parking provisions in the area, with vehicles parked along SH6 by individuals observed to be going to work at Terrace Junction (off BP roundabout). I consider this to be a safety issue particularly for pedestrians, and enabling additional lease/retail area would in my opinion require more parking than the standard requirements to meet the demands and prevent cars parked on the State Highway. Furthermore, there are no footpaths on either side of the road or crossing points.

MCBRIDE ST

5.95 Diagrams of the land subject to each of these submissions, is included in the planning evidence.

Barbara Williams - 141

- 5.96** Barbara Williams seeks that 1.5673 ha of land located between 58-106 McBride Street, bounded by Kawarau Road (SH6A), McBride Street and Ross Street be rezoned from notified LDR zone, to either LSC, BMU or Airport Mixed Use (**AMU**) zone.
- 5.97** From a transport perspective, any intensification in Frankton would place more pressure on the existing transport network. Current operation levels, based on my observations, are at an unsatisfactory level with long delays on SH6 Kawarau Road at the SH6A roundabout, locally known as the BP roundabout. These delays have resulted in an increase of traffic on the residential streets in Frankton to avoid the BP roundabout, also known as 'rat running'. Upgrade of the roundabout is currently underway, to help alleviate the current delays.
- 5.98** Parking is an issue in Frankton, and from previous site work related to parking matters in the area, vehicles are known to park on the residential streets for long term duration particularly to use the airport. There are plans to remove the availability of parking on the SH6A verges that are used currently for airport users, and this is likely to increase the use of parking in the Frankton residential streets. This is particularly an issue on McBride Street where vehicles often cannot pass each other simultaneously due to parked vehicles.
- 5.99** The developable area of land for the Williams' has been calculated to be 1.0658 ha, and with a maximum building coverage of 75% under Rules 15.5.1 and 16.5.4, 7993m² of building area is enabled under BMUZ and LSCZ. This could trigger 200 trips during the peak hour based on a 2.5/100m² for commercial and office premises. For the reasons set out earlier, this is based on ground floor activities only. However, LSCZ enables two storeys (up to 10m in height) and BMUZ up to three storeys (up to 12m in height) under the maximum building heights in Chapters 15 and 16 [**CB 12** and **CB13**]. So, assuming that the first floor consisted of residential activities, then I estimate there to be 74 trips per peak hour based on a yield of 93 lots and using a 0.8

trip rate for medium density dwelling. This brings a total traffic generation for two floors of land use activities to be around 300 vph for the site.

- 5.100** Current vehicle trips during peak hour using the same estimation process is 31 vph, with a trip rate of 1.3 per dwelling and based on 24 residential lots.
- 5.101** The change in residential to commercial activities would result in more vehicles entering and exiting the properties along McBride Street. This creates a safety issue with the existing conditions described in paragraph 5.36. Parking demands will also increase from residential zoning, as businesses, retail and commercial premises will require visitor and employee car parks. I have already highlighted that the existing parking supply is inadequate given the use of on-street parking for long term purposes. Taking into consideration the existing traffic and parking issues, the rezoning sought to allow commercial activities will likely have a negative effect on the road network. My view is that the current LDR zone is appropriate, and I oppose the rezoning request.

Brett Giddens - 828

- 5.102** Brett Giddens seeks that 1.7793 ha of land bounded by McBride Street, Birse Street, Grey Street and State Highway 6, be rezoned from notified LDR, to LSC or to a more appropriate higher density zone such as HDR or MDR. The rezoning to LSC could yield 105 lots for the area, of which 78 would be additional to the lots enabled by the notified PDP zoning.
- 5.103** Brett Giddens' submission is similar to that of submission 141 above. The site is located to the north of submission 141 on the other side of Ross Street. The issues relating to traffic and parking are the same as described in paragraphs 5.98 and 5.99. Intensification would place significant pressure on the existing transport network, as current operation levels are at an unsatisfactory level with long delays on SH6 Kawarau Road at the SH6A roundabout.

- 5.104** McBride Street is categorised as an arterial road in the ODP, Appendix 6 Road Hierarchy, and accesses to the site will be off McBride Street. There are speed humps and demarcated parking spaces along McBride Street that reduce the travelling speeds of vehicles which would be appropriate for a LSCZ. However, in my opinion, rezoning to LSC in this area will create further capacity issues due to the associated increase in trips to the area and the increased number of turning movements in and out of the accesses.
- 5.105** The bus interchange is located on SH6A on the other side of the site to McBride Street near the Gray Street intersection. This, along with walking and cycling facilities in the area could support an intensification of the residential zoning to promote alternative transport to private car use. Furthermore, the area is located in close proximity to retail parks, schools and medical services.
- 5.106** Although there are alternative transport options available in the area, there is still a reliance on private vehicles. I have concerns with parking along McBride Street, as the on street parking is often at full capacity. Car parking spaces are restricted with demarcation lines. Increasing the intensification of development through rezoning to LSC will increase the demand for car parks and traffic, and in my opinion, the pressure on McBride Street will be intensified further and will affect through movements and the intersections along here such as Ross Street, Birse Street and Gray Street and its role as an arterial road. Therefore, I oppose the rezone to LSC.
- 5.107** I do not oppose the rezone to MDR in principle based on the location being near existing amenities and public transport facilities. However, I do have concerns with car parking in the area as described in paragraph 5.101. Given the existing conditions, and enabling more dwellings within the site will increase parking demand. Therefore I oppose a higher residential intensification in the subject area and I consider that LDR is appropriate from a transport perspective.

C & S Hansen - 840

- 5.108** C & S Hansen seeks that a combined total of 2,410m² of land on 16, 18 and 20 McBride Street be rezoned from notified LDR to LSC. The subject site is bounded by Gray Street, McBride Street and SH6. It is adjacent to the notified LSC area of land on Gray Street and is in close proximity to the 'Frankton Village' at the SH6/ SH6A junction.
- 5.109** The LSC would enable a maximum building height of 10m (Rule 15.5.7, **[CB12]**) and a maximum 75% building coverage (Rule 15.5.1). This equates to 1,270m² of potential area developable. Based on the database for commercial activities **[SB80]** the trip rate is 2.5/100m² GFA, and 32 trips would be generated during peak hour. LSCZ enables accommodation on the first floor. I have assumed two dwellings per lot, which would yield 8 trips per peak hour based on 1.3 per dwelling. The total trips generated would be 40 during peak hour.
- 5.110** 2016 traffic counts on McBride Street between Gray Street and Birse Street were extracted from the RAMM database² and the average daily traffic (**ADT**) is 3255 and the peak hour traffic is 343. The trips generated from the rezoning could potentially generate 40 trips per peak hour which would account for 12% of the total trips along McBride Street.
- 5.111** Based on site observations and local knowledge, the intersection of McBride Street and Gray Street is congested in weekday afternoons with vehicles on Gray Street queuing back onto McBride Street waiting to exit onto SH6A.
- 5.112** I refer to Appendix 6 in the ODP where McBride Street is categorised as an arterial road, and provides an important connector route in Frankton. As a result of this classification, local access function should be minimised as per Chapter 14 of the ODP 14.1.3 Objectives and Policies. I acknowledge that the transport chapter will be reviewed at a later stage of the district plan review. However, in my

view, it is likely McBride Street would have a similar position in the roading hierarchy given its current traffic volumes.

- 5.113** Although the potential trips generated from a rezoning is not considered to be significant I oppose the LSC sought based on the existing traffic and parking conditions in the area, particularly on McBride Street. I understand that the business activities currently operate onsite. However, LSC would enable more activities on site that in my opinion would attract more parking demands and traffic that that will exacerbate the current situation.

FRANKTON MARINA

DS EE Properties LTD - 16

Kenneth Muir - 125

- 5.114** DS EE Properties LTD (16) and Kenneth Muir (125) seek that 35,225m² of land located along Sugar Lane be rezoned from notified LDR to commercial activity. The current yield based on the notified LDR zone is 53 lots.

- 5.115** The subject area is accessed via Sugar Lane off SH6A and forms a cross intersection with Marina Drive. The intersection includes right turn bays and auxiliary left lanes on SH6A to assist traffic movements into Sugar Lane and Marina Drive. Right turn movements out of Sugar Lane are expected to endure delays and queues during peak periods based on high traffic volumes on SH6A. The annual average daily traffic (**AADT**) on SH6A was recorded to be 25,818 for the December 2016 count obtained from NZTA.³

- 5.116** Based on the notified LDR zoning, it is estimated that the site will generate around 69 trips per peak hour (1.3/dwelling rate). If the site was to be rezoned to commercial, the trip rate is higher at a rate of 2.5/100m² GFA and could potentially generate 449 trips for one floor of commercial activities during the peak hour. For a LSCZ, I assume a total of 615 trips to include residential activities on the first floor.

3 State highway traffic volumes monthly reports 2008-16.

- 5.117** I agree with the commercial rezoning sought based on its location and access to several modes of transport facilities such as walking, cycling and bus bay provisions. However, I am concerned about the impact it will have on right turn movements out of Sugar Lane to SH6. Long delays and queues will be created as a result of the increased traffic movements from intensifying the site. This becomes a safety issue with drivers risking shorter gaps in the State Highway traffic to negotiate their turning movements. In addition, these right turn movements out of Sugar Lane also need to prioritise with right turn movements out of Marina Drive.
- 5.118** The increase in trips generated will also increase movements into Sugar Lane. Currently the right turn bay from SH6 to Sugar Lane allows up to three car storage lengths due to the solid pedestrian crossing median. If the number of vehicles waiting to turn right into Sugar Lane exceeds three, then this will block the through movement on the State Highway and would not be acceptable.
- 5.119** Therefore I oppose the rezoning sought for commercial activities, unless it can be demonstrated that the right turn movements out of Sugar Lane can be managed safely either through a reduction in the zoning area sought or by upgrading the intersection to signals or a roundabout. I suggest a reduction in size for the zone sought, it is difficult to quantify the appropriate reduction based on the existing information. Traffic modelling is required to determine the additional vehicle trips that the intersection can accommodate.

Z Energy Limited – 312

- 5.120** Z Energy Limited has requested that a 2,465m² site at 846 Frankton Road be rezoned from LDR to LSC or a higher intensity residential zoning such as MDR or HDR. The net yield based on the notified zoning is 5 lots, the MDR zone could yield an additional 4 lots, and the HDR an additional 13 lots. LSZ could potentially yield 20 lots based on 120m² per lot and with potential for further development on the first floor.

- 5.121** The site sits on the corner of Marina Drive and Frankton Road. Marina Drive is currently the only access road into the neighbouring suburbs, with on-street parking limited due to the rather narrow roads and vehicle volumes. Slip lanes and turning bays make access into Marina Drive simple and prevent any disturbance along Frankton Road.
- 5.122** The Z service station currently occupies the site with two entry and exit accesses. The AADT on SH6A was recorded to be 25,818 for the December 2016 count obtained from NZTA (refer to paragraph 5.115). From a transport perspective, any further development on the site utilising the existing accesses will compromise the safety of road users from the increase in turning movements due to the high traffic volumes on SH6A. I would oppose any additional access points given the close proximity of the existing accesses in the vicinity. The existing operation as a service station already generates high traffic volumes. For comparison, it is suggested that the trip rate for service station is 40.7/100m² GFA vph compared to commercial activities at 2.5/100m² GFA vph.
- 5.123** The site is in close proximity to the Sugar Lane / Marina Drive intersection and turning movements into and out of these side roads are currently challenging due to the high traffic volumes along the state highway.
- 5.124** I oppose any rezoning that would allow more development on the site, and I understand that all of LSZ, MDR and HDR would do that.

GLEND A DRIVE

Schist Holdings Limited and Bnzl Properties Limited - 488

- 5.125** Schist Holdings Limited and Bnzl Properties Limited seek that Rule 16.5.7.1 is amended by adding a new standard for building height for Glenda Drive. The request is for the inclusion of maximum building height in Glenda Drive for up to 8m for permitted activities and up to 10m for restricted discretionary activities.

5.126 As this change would reduce building height, I do not oppose the request from a transport perspective as the development potential would be reduced and traffic effects may be reduced.

Fletcher Distribution LTD and Mico New Zealand - 344

5.127 Fletcher Distribution LTD and Mico New Zealand seeks that 2,441m² of land adjacent to the existing Frankton Placemakers site accessed off Hardware lane be rezoned from the notified R zoning to an Industrial A zoning.

5.128 The land sought for Industrial A wraps around the north and west boundary of the Placemakers site. The road infrastructure in the area has been upgraded and in my view, the rezoning sought could be accommodated with the new road layout on Hardware Lane, therefore I do not oppose the submission.

Reavers NZ Limited - 720

5.129 Reavers NZ Limited seeks that 6,053m² of land on the corner of Hardware Lane and Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway adjacent to Frankton Placemakers site is rezoned from notified R to Industrial A. The area is similar to submission 344 in terms of location with the additional strip of land along SH6A (Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway).

5.130 I do not oppose the rezoning sought as per the reasons given in paragraph 5.128.

Aviemore Corporation – 418

5.131 Aviemore Corporation seeks to extend the Industrial A south to include Lot 1 DP 472825. I am concerned about access to the site given it is located on the corner of Hawthorne Drive and Glenda Drive intersection. However as I understand this will be addressed in the subdivision stage, I do not oppose the rezoning extension sought.

QUEENSTOWN TOWN CENTRE – ENTERTAINMENT PRECINCT

Searle Lane

Taco Medic - 291

- 5.132** Taco Medic seeks to extend the Southern Boundary of the Entertainment Precinct to the Southern side of Searle Lane to include Searle Lane in its entirety. The southern boundary line currently falls short of the site boundary lane. Searle Lane is identified as a pedestrian link for the Town Centre Zone as per the PDP - Chapter 12.
- 5.133** I do not oppose Taco Medic's request to adjust the Town Centre Entertainment Precinct (**TCEP**) boundary line. In my view, the boundary adjustment sought will not result in changes to the transport network.

Village Green/Courthouse Area

1876 Bar & Restaurant - 250

- 5.134** 1876 Bar & Restaurant seeks to have land located on Ballarat Street (from Camp Street to Stanley Street) rezoned from notified Town Centre (**TC**) / Historical Heritage Precinct (**HHP**), to TCEP.
- 5.135** Inclusion in the TCEP would allow businesses the same conditions as per the proposed TCEP identified in the PDP. The proposed area on Ballarat Street is identified in the PDP-Chapter 12 as a pedestrian link into the TC as well as being mentioned in the Queenstown Town Centre Transport Strategy 2015 to undergo intersection upgrades at the Stanley Street intersection and Camp Street intersection. These intersection upgrades will better service vehicles, in particular bus services and improve safety to drivers and pedestrians.
- 5.136** I do not oppose the inclusion in the TCEP from a transport perspective as I understand that the rezoning request would not have an associated transport impact.

STEAMER WHARF

Finz Queenstown Limited - 832

5.137 Finz Queenstown Limited seeks that land located on Steamer Wharf, be rezoned from notified TC, to TCEP. Steamer Wharf is a key tourist destination as it offers a wide range of scenery including Lake Wakitipu as well as offering a range of hospitality choices and shops.

5.138 Accessibility to Steamer Wharf is provided through public bus services with bus stops directly off the Wharf.

5.139 I do not oppose the inclusion in the EP from a transport perspective as transport to and from Steamer Wharf will not be affected by the zone sought.

QUEENSTOWN TOWN

Barry Ellis - 357

5.140 Barry Ellis seeks that land located between Stanley Street, Shotover Street down to Steamer Wharf including Church Street be rezoned from notified TC, to TCEP.

5.141 I understand the rezone will result in a threshold of noise permitted, and therefore I do not oppose the change requested as it will not have any impacts on the transport network.

QUEENSTOWN TOWN CENTRE – OTHER

Queenstown Gold Ltd - 724

5.142 Queenstown Gold Ltd seeks to confirm that Lot 1 DP 306661 and Lot 2 DP27703 on the eastern side of upper Brecon Street as being within the Queenstown Town Centre Zone. As no change is sought, there are no impacts from a transport perspective.

Skyline Enterprises Limited - 574

5.143 Skyline Enterprises Limited seeks that a new Commercial Tourism and Recreation Sub-zone and associated provisions outlined in the submission are adopted on the Skyline Gondola, Restaurant and associated commercial recreation facilities on Bob's Peak.

5.144 I have concerns that the new sub zone could enable far greater development than the current notified zoning. Under the proposed new zone, there is only one reference relating to traffic generation, which is under Forestry Activities. I am concerned that there are not any matters of control or discretion for traffic generation for the commercial activities. In particular, for the area, parking requirements or alternative transport provisions will need to be satisfied and approved by QLDC given the existing pressures that Queenstown Town Centre is experiencing with parking supply and traffic congestion.

5.145 I oppose the new sub zone based on a lack of information relating to any potential traffic effects and additional traffic generation. I also consider that the rules need to include provision for matters relating to traffic, in relation to commercial activities.

WATER FRONT SUB-ZONE

Queenstown Wharves GP Limited – 766

5.146 Submission 766 has requested clarification of boundary mapping. I do not oppose the submission as the request will not have any impact on transport issues.

Remarkables Park Limited – 807

5.147 Remarkables Park Limited has requested that the High Density Residential (**HDR**) is retained on the area of land north of Man Street. I do not oppose the request as there is no change in zoning sought.

QUEENSTOWN – GORGE ROAD

Coronet Property Investments Limited – 321

5.148 Coronet Property Investments Limited supports the BMU zoning at 53 and 58 Gorge Road, and seeks that this zone be confirmed.

5.149 The submitter has not requested any changes to the zoning and there will be no impact on traffic and transport matters. Therefore I do not oppose the request in the submission.

Skylines Enterprises Limited (general support) – 556

5.150 Skylines Enterprises Limited seeks to confirm that 765m² of land located at 16 Hylton Place (Lot 8 DP 19259), be BMUZ with amended provisions. The site is situated between Warren Park to the north, the Fresh Choice Supermarket to the east and mainly residential properties to the west, with land off Hylton Place predominantly commercial activities.

5.151 No further comment is required because the submitter is seeking confirmation of the PDP and there will be no transportation effects.

6. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS – QUEENSTOWN URBAN – FRANKTON AND SOUTH (1B)

6.1 I note that the Group 1B section 42A evidence, includes maps showing each specific submission point addressed below where relevant.

LAKE JOHNSON

Woodlot Properties Ltd - 501

6.2 Woodlot Properties Ltd seeks to have 163.8862 ha of land generally located adjacent to Hansen Road and east of Quail Rise, rezoned from notified R zone, to Rural Lifestyle (RL) / Rural Residential (RR)

zone. The RR zone could yield 410 lots based on PDP Chapter 22 referring to one residence every 4,000m². The amount of trips generated as per the NZTA Transport 453, Table 8.10 is approximately 532 vehicle trips per peak hour from the development enabled by the proposed RR.

- 6.3** I have transport concerns about access for the potential trips generated by the 410 lots, as Hansen Road and Tucker Beach Road provide the only existing viable access options. Turning movements out of Hansen Road are difficult due to the high traffic volumes along the State Highway. In my view any further development utilising Hansen Road will require the intersection to be upgraded or reconfigured to a left in/left out option.
- 6.4** It is expected that left turn movements into Hansen Road for the site would be more prominent for drivers coming from the Queenstown and airport direction. There could be potential capacity issues on the “BP Roundabout”, although the section of the State Highway between the BP and Grant Road roundabouts are currently proposed to be widened at some stage and this would provide greater capacity. I assume that this would include upgrade of the BP roundabout and Hansen Road intersection. However, the implementation time is not yet known. I note that Hansen Road is not sealed beyond the City Impact Church.
- 6.5** Tucker Beach Road provides an alternative access. However, it would be considered to be an economically inefficient route as it traverses over the Tucker Beach area before the subject site.
- 6.6** I oppose the RR rezone due to the large scale of the rezoning. I consider that the access provisions via Hansen Road and Tucker Beach Road need to be investigated further to ensure that effects of the trips generated will not have an adverse impact on the existing intersections namely, SH6/Hansen Road and the BP roundabout.

Middleton Family Trust (rezone and landscape line) - 338

- 6.7** Middleton Family Trust seeks that the notified R zoning of land located between Queenstown Hill to the west, Lake Johnson to the south and Shotover River to the north be rezoned to LDR and RR.
- 6.8** The Trust propose that 76.5ha of land be rezoned to LDR and 18ha to RR zoning. This equates to 52.02ha and 12.2ha of developable LDR and RR land respectively and would yield 1,156 LDR lots and 30 RR lots.
- 6.9** Paragraph 3.5 of the Trust's submission states that access off the Hawthorne Drive/SH6 roundabout has sufficient capacity to service the proposed residential development sought by the submitter. The submitter has not provided any information or technical analysis to support this, not even an assessment at a high level.
- 6.10** It is estimated that based on the LDR and RR area sought, 1,542 vehicle trips could be generated during the peak hour based on a 1.3 trip rate per dwelling.
- 6.11** Referring to the Queenstown Transportation Model, Abley Transportation Consultants, a total of 2,235 vehicles were modelled using the Hawthorne Drive Roundabout in the 2016 PM peak hour. The vehicle trips generated by the rezoning alone accounts for 69% of the total existing trips on the roundabout.
- 6.12** In my opinion the size of the area sought for residential zoning is too large and the existing transport infrastructure may not support the traffic demands in terms of capacity and efficiency. I also take into account other developments in the area that are in the notified plans. Consequently, I oppose the rezoning sought.

James Canning Muspratt - 396

- 6.13** James Muspratt seeks that 1.2063 ha of land legally described as Lot 1 and 2 DP 486552, be rezoned from notified R zone to RR zone due to the northwest section of the land being part outside the ONL

boundary. The RR zone could yield 2 additional lots. The property is located near the northern end of Hansen Road, with the northwestern corner portion outside the ONL boundary.

- 6.14** I do not oppose the rezoning request based on the estimated yield of 2 residential lots, as I consider that there would be minimal impacts on the transport network based on the traffic generated.

Keith Hindle & Dayle Wright - 476

- 6.15** Keith Hindle & Dayle Wright seek that 3.0326 ha of land located at 130 and 133 Tucker Beach Road be rezoned from notified R zone to RR zone. The RR zone could yield five lots. The site is located north of the Quail Rise Zone and lies parallel to the Shotover River.

- 6.16** I do not oppose rezoning the land from R to RR based on the number of lots that could be enabled and from a transport perspective the effects will be minimal.

FRANKTON – NOTIFIED MEDIUM DENSITY ZONING

NZIA Southern & Architecture + Women Southern - 238

- 6.17** NZIA Southern & Architecture + Women Southern seek that 30.9812 ha of land along Frankton Road, located between Sugar Lane and the notified LSC at the edge of 'Frankton Village', be rezoned from notified LDR to MDR. Under notified LDR, 468 lots could be enabled. Based on an MDR zoning, 843 lots could be enabled. The estimated development potential over and above the PDP zoning is therefore 375 residential lots.

- 6.18** Current road network operation levels in the Frankton area are perceived to be at unsatisfactory levels with long delays on SH6 Kawarau Road at the SH6A roundabout, locally known as the BP roundabout. These delays have resulted in an increase of traffic on the residential streets in Frankton to avoid the BP roundabout, also known as 'rat running'. Upgrade of the roundabout is currently underway to help alleviate some congestion.

- 6.19** On-street parking is an issue in the Frankton area, particularly at the northern end of the subject site. Parked vehicles along the residential streets have been observed to disrupt through vehicle movements by not enabling vehicles to pass each other simultaneously. It also highlights the parking demands in the area.
- 6.20** Based on NZ trip database⁴ with a peak hour trip rate of 0.8 for a medium dwelling, the additional trips created would be 300 for the peak hour. This substantial increase in traffic generated in the Frankton area is not desirable, as any intensification should be considered as part of planned traffic improvement measures. I do not support rezoning the entire 30.9812 ha of land sought as the transport effects are considered to be detrimental to the existing road network. In the following paragraphs, I have assessed the area of land in sections.
- 6.21** I do not support MDR zoning from Lake Avenue eastwards on the subject site based on the existing issues described in paragraphs 5.49 and 5.50. Furthermore, I do not support an MDR zoning on the lots along Frankton Road because the accesses are off Frankton Road. Intensification will increase traffic trips and it is not desirable to increase turning movements in and out of Frankton Road.
- 6.22** To the west of Lake Avenue, some of the residential properties are accessed directly off Frankton Road, or via Yewlett Crescent and Stewart Street. There are also properties that are accessed via Frankton Beach Access and then to Shoreline Road that front onto Frankton Road. From a transport perspective I do not oppose rezoning properties that do not have direct access off Frankton Road
- 6.23** The rezoning extends to Sugar Lane, and it appears that only 875 Frankton Road is currently occupied by rental apartments, and is accessed via Sugar Lane. I do not oppose a MDR zoning for 875 Frankton Road given that the change in land use will be minimal.

4 NZTA Trips and Parking Related to Land Use November 2011 [SB80].

6.24 The remaining residential lots have accesses off Frankton Road, and for the reasons I set out in paragraphs 5.117 and 5.118 regarding the intersection of Sugar Lane and Frankton Road, I oppose the MDR zoning sought. Overall, I oppose the MDR rezoning for the area sought, however, I am not against rezoning the existing lots that are not accessed off Frankton Road, these include Shoreline Road and Stewart Street.

Russell Marsh – 128

6.25 Russell Marsh seeks that 6.0715 ha of land located in Frankton, bound by Yewlett Crescent, Lake Avenue, Birse Street and McBride Street, be rezoned from notified LDR to MDR. The MDR zone could enable a total of 165 residential lots, 73 above the proposed LDR zone. In summary, Russell Marsh has requested the following amendments:

- (a) amend the plan to reinstate the original Frankton proposed MDR zoning as per the MACTODD report;
- (b) amend the plan to include Stewart Street, Lake Avenue, Birse Street and McBride Street into MDR zoning as opposed to LDR; and
- (c) amend the plan to include Frankton district streets in the MDR zoning that are currently outside the air noise boundary.

6.26 The submission seeks to retain the LDRZ. In the initial consultation prior to notification of the PDP their property was originally proposed to be MDR. However it was notified as LDRZ. Essentially they are asking for this zone to remain.

6.27 From a transport perspective, intensification of all of the streets in Frankton to MDR could place significant pressure on the existing transport network. Current operation levels are at an unsatisfactory level with long delays on SH6 Kawarau Road at the SH6A roundabout, locally known as the BP roundabout, refer to paragraph 6.18 for details.

- 6.28** Parking is an issue in Frankton, with the perception of long term vehicles parked on the residential streets, particularly on McBride Street, vehicles often cannot pass each other simultaneously due to parked vehicles. The subject area includes non-residential activities such as a school, tavern and motor camp and parking is often spilled out onto on street parking.
- 6.29** Based on NZ trip database⁵ with a peak hour trip rate of 0.8 for a medium dwelling, the additional trips created would be 58 for the peak hour. Although the number of trips generated is not high, currently, any additional traffic generated in the Frankton area is not desirable, as any intensification should be considered as part of planned traffic improvement measures. Based on this, I do not support the rezoning to MDR in Frankton.

Ian & Dorothy Williamson – 140

- 6.30** Ian & Dorothy Williamson oppose that 22.7617 ha of land located at Frankton Road be rezoned from notified MDR zone to (the operative) LDR zone. Retaining the operative LDR zoning as opposed to the notified MDR zoning could potentially result in a reduction of 361 residential lots.
- 6.31** Due to the nature of submission, I do not perceive any transport related issues with retaining LDR zone, as the traffic issues will not be intensified.

STEWART ST

JD Familton & Sons Trust – 586

- 6.32** JD Familton & Sons Trust seeks that 807 m² of land located at 17 Stewart St, Frankton be rezoned from notified LDR zone to MDR zone. The MDR zone could yield one additional lot.

- 6.33** Due to the minimal impacts imposed from the one potential additional lot, I do not oppose the rezoning sought from a transport perspective.

BOYES CRES

Queenstown Lakes District Council - 790

- 6.34** QLDC seeks that 855 m² of land located at Boyes Crescent, Frankton, be rezoned from notified R zone to LDR zone. The LDR zone could yield one additional lot.

- 6.35** There will be minimal impacts to the transport network, therefore I do not oppose the zoning sought.

QUEENSTOWN HILL ABOVE MARINA

Bruce Grant - 318

Bruce Grant (UGB) - 434

- 6.36** Bruce Grant seeks that 5516 m² of land located off Marina Drive (Lots 6, 7 and 10 DP 345807) be included in the UGB by extending the boundary to cover all of these lots. Mr Grant also requests a zone change from the notified R zone to LDR zone. The LDR zone could yield eight additional lots. The site has frontage onto Frankton road and is bounded by the ONL and the UGB.

- 6.37** I have assumed access to the area would be made via an existing right of way off Marina Drive, which currently provides access for residential units in the upper part of the site. The access off Marina Drive is narrow with insufficient width for on-street parking and potentially creates safety issues with illegal parking.

- 6.38** I do not oppose the LDR zone from a transport perspective, because given that only a maximum of eight lots could be yielded, the traffic impacts will not be significant. I have raised concerns regarding the right turn movements at the Marina Drive/SH6/Sugar Lane intersection as described in paragraph 5.117, however, it is estimated that 10 vehicle trips would be generated over a peak hour, therefore I

do not think that would exacerbate the existing situation. However, my recommendation is based on a condition that access shall be via Marina Drive and not off Frankton Road.

KELVIN HEIGHT

Winton Partners Funds Management No.2 Ltd – 533

Land Information New Zealand - 661

6.39 Winton Partners Funds Management No.2 Ltd seeks that 6.6155 ha of land located at 35 Peninsula Road between Kingston Road SH6 and Peninsula Road, be rezoned from notified R zone, to HDR, MDR, LDR, or BMU zone. The possible yields and calculated number of trips during peak hour (under **[SB80]**) for each zone sought, is as follows:

| Zone | Yield (lots) | Trips (vph) |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| HDR | 391 | 313 |
| MDR | 180 | 144 |
| LDR | 100 | 80 |
| BMU | 391 | 1125 |

6.40 The posted speed limit along Peninsula Road is 70km/h. Access to Peninsula Road is made via the SH6 Kawarau Falls Bridge.

6.41 Kawarau Falls Bridge is currently under construction to aid in servicing access into the Wakatipu Basin and reduce traffic congestion in the short to medium term.

- 6.42** HDR zones also require close proximity to Town Centres as well as providing access to Town Centres through public transport, walk and cycle ways. The Connectabus route (route 6) services those between Frankton and Kelvin Heights, operating approximately between 7am-6pm with a high frequency during the peak AM and PM periods of 45-60 minutes, whereas frequency drops outside the peak times to 2 - 4 hours.
- 6.43** I have assumed that NZTA would not permit access off SH6 for proposed developments because it is a LAR, access would be made via Peninsula Road. From a transport perspective, the rezoning sought would need to demonstrate that there would be minimal traffic impacts on the Peninsula Road/SH6 intersection, particularly for right turn movements into and out of Peninsula Road. It is difficult to assess the effects of the trips generated with no base information to refer to, but I believe that a transport assessment should be undertaken to identify any safety issues and better determine a more appropriate zoning.
- 6.44** I oppose the rezoning sought for BMU as the potential trips generated is assumed to be too high for the Peninsula Road/SH6 intersection and would create adverse effects. I do not oppose the residential zonings sought from a transport perspective based on the potential vehicle trips that either zone could generate providing that the Peninsula Road/SH6 intersection can accommodate the additional trips without creating longer delays/queues. I note that the vehicle trips for HDR could potentially be less than my estimation, given that there are alternative transport options such as bus, walking, cycling and ferries.

Kerr Ritchie Architects - 48

- 6.45** Kerr Ritchie Architects seeks that 1.0524 ha of land located at 48 and 50 Peninsula Road in Kelvin Heights, be rezoned from notified R zone to LDR zone. The LDR zone in the area sought could yield 16 residential lots, however, the land is constrained by geotechnical hazards and it is understood that there is only potential for one or two

lots at the site. The site has frontage onto Peninsula Road which has a speed limit of 70km/h.

- 6.46** There are no pedestrian footpaths along Peninsula Road, nor dedicated cycleways, which causes concern surrounding safety for those using active transport.

- 6.47** The site enables 16 residential lots and the potential traffic generated should all lots be developed will not affect the surrounding transport network. I do not oppose the LDR zoning sought for Kerr Ritchie Architects, however, I have concerns with sight lines and access location that I understand could be addressed in the subdivision stage.

Bonisch Consultants - 425

- 6.48** There are three sites under the Bonisch Consultants submission. I have categorised them into three sites.

Site 1

- 6.49** Bonisch Consultants seek rezoning of 3.04 ha of notified LDR land in the Kelvin Heights area. The site fronts onto the south side of Peninsula Road from Balmoral Drive to approximately 347 Peninsula Road. The submitter requests that 0.8 ha of land on the western side of the subject area be rezoned LSC and the remaining 2.2 ha of land be rezoned MDR.
- 6.50** The LSC sought could potentially trigger around 130 more trips during the peak hour than the notified LDR. This is based on using a commercial/office premises trip rate of 2.5, rather than a higher rate for retail land uses, and I have assumed that the first floor of each building would be used for accommodation. I consider that it is appropriate as LSCZ enables small scale commercial and business activities to meet needs of the local community and provide work opportunities in the residential areas, therefore encourages less dependence on private vehicle use.
- 6.51** I refer to the Mees – Kelvin Heights – Peninsula Road – Proposed Medium Density Zone Structure Plan, Baxter Design Group included in the Bonisch Consultant submission. It shows the primary access through the middle of the subject site, running parallel to Peninsula Road, with three access points to Peninsula Road.
- 6.52** The proposed mid site access is located where there is an existing bus stop, and is at the intersection of Mincher Road and Peninsula Road. The bus stop will need to be relocated to allow for the mid site access. I am concerned that sight lines for the new access could be compromised with the relocated bus stop. This will need to be addressed as it is a safety risk. I also note that there is a bus stop with shelter located immediately to the west of Mincher Road on Peninsula Road, a safe cross point for pedestrians should be provided. In general, the site is well placed for public transport facilities.

- 6.53** The access to the west of the site, where the proposed LCSZ is, utilises the existing Deer Park Heights access road which is located adjacent to Balmoral Drive. Deer Park Heights road provides access to a small number of residential properties.
- 6.54** I have safety concerns given the close proximity of the proposed access and Balmoral Drive. I recommend that the Deer Park Height access to the proposed LSC is removed or a safe option is presented to take into consideration the Balmoral Drive intersection.
- 6.55** Furthermore, LSC activities will require a right turn bay from Peninsula Road, because the developments will attract the residents to the west of the site since there is no closer existing or proposed similar land use activities in the area. However, it appears that there is insufficient width along Peninsula Road to allow a right turn bay into the proposed access.
- 6.56** The third access is located at the eastern boundary of the site and provides access to the MDR. I do not perceive any issues that could not be addressed at subdivision stage.
- 6.57** I do not oppose the rezoning request to LSC and MDR for the area of land sought. However, I recommend that the access point to the LSCZ as shown in the Structure Plan is not used, unless a safe access design can be demonstrated by the submitter at this proposed location. Possible options to address this could include relocating the access to the LSCZ, or increasing the portion of MDR within the site compared to LSC, as there will be less trips generated under a MDR.

Site 2

- 6.58** The submitter also seeks the rezoning of 2.07 ha of vacant land located the end of Balmoral Drive and Oregon Drive. The site is zoned LDR in the PDP, and the submitter seeks the land be zoned MDR. The MDR zoning sought would yield an additional 25 lots over and above the notified yield of 31 lots.

6.59 I have reviewed the Structure Plan included with the submission, and understand that it is proposed that Oregon Drive and Balmoral Drive be linked within the subject site. Balmoral Drive will extend beyond the MDR site to link with the notified LDR.

6.60 I do not oppose the rezoning sought because in my opinion the difference in volume of traffic will have minimal impact on the existing road network.

Site 3

6.61 I refer to the Mees – Kelvin Heights – Extension to Low Density Residential Zone, Baxter Design Group provided in the submission. The submitter seeks to rezone two areas from R zone, to LDR. The combined area is 18.01 ha and could yield 272 residential lots.

6.62 New and upgraded transport infrastructure will be required to access these lots. The rezoning sought is an extension of land that has been notified as LDR, which is mostly undeveloped. Therefore I anticipate that the Council will extend the roads to the notified zoning, which could then extend to the rezoning area sought. This would be addressed at the subdivision stage.

6.63 The area for the zone extension is small in proportion to the notified, but undeveloped LDR. The cumulative effects may be significant, however, it is difficult to assess what they would be.

6.64 I do not oppose the request because it is a LDR extension, and I have assumed that the new road infrastructure will be able to accommodate the traffic generated.

F.S Mee Developments Co Ltd - 429

6.65 F.S Mee Developments Co Ltd seeks that 3.5 ha of land located on Peninsula Road in Kelvin Heights along Lake Wakatipu, be rezoned from notified LDR zone to HDR zone. The HDR zone could enable 207 lots, 154 more than the notified LDR zone. The site is located on the other side of Peninsula Road from the Hilton Hotel and

apartments, and the Lakes Edge that is currently under construction, both are zoned HDRZ.

6.66 HDR zoning requires close proximity and accessibility to local town centres by public transport, walking or cycling. The site is in close proximity to the Queenstown Trail on the edge of Lake Wakatipu that runs parallel to Peninsula Road. The trail provides access to the Frankton / Remarkables area, which is around 1km away. There is an existing pedestrian crossing facility near the access road to the Hilton on Peninsula Road, which links the bus stop on either side of the road.

6.67 The total lots yielded under HDR zone is 207 lots, therefore the estimate of trips generated under the proposed HDR is 166 vehicles during the peak hour. Under the notified LDR, the estimated trips per peak hour is 69 and I consider that this is quite low and will not create any adverse impacts over the peak hour. Under the proposed HDR, there could be approximately 100 more trips an hour than the LDR.

6.68 I oppose the rezoning sought, because the local amenities (restaurants and café with small convenience store) at the Hilton opposite the site is not considered to be appropriate to support HDR. The nearest shopping centre is at Remarkables Park and is not considered to be within walking distance (approximately 2km from the site).

7. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS – QUEENSTOWN URBAN – JACKS POINT ZONE EXTENSION (1D)

Jardine Family Trust & Remarkables Station Ltd - 715

7.1 Jardine Family Trust & Remarkables Station Ltd seek that the Jacks Point (**JP**) zone be extended to include approximately 163 ha of land located to the south of the existing JP zone. The area is known as Homestead Bay. The estimated yield of the rezoning sought is 784 lots and would be 541 more residential lots than the notified PDP.

- 7.2 The submitter requests that PDP Chapter 41 Jacks Point, *41.5.6.1 – Access from State Highway 6 shall be only at the intersections at Maori Jack Road and Woolshed Road, as shown on the Structure Plan* be deleted or provision made for two new access points to be created within Lot 8 DP 443832 as Controlled Activities (with control limited to design and location for State Highway traffic safety considerations).
- 7.3 Under RM160562 a new access onto the State Highway and the design of a new collector road has been approved. The access is located at the Hanley's Farm (also known as Hanley Downs) subdivision of the State Highway between Woolshed Road and Maori Jack Road. In Ms Jones' Section 42A Hearing Report for Chapter 41 Jacks Point Resort Zone, 17 January 2017 **[SSB 108]** she recommended that the approved collector road be included in the Jacks Point Structure Plan. The amended provisions for 41.5.6.1 will allow access onto State Highway from 3 intersections at Woolshed Road, Hanley's Farm and Maori Jack Road.
- 7.4 From my understanding, the submitter is requesting that a further two accesses are created south of Maori Jack Road within Lot 8 DP 443832. This will equate to five accesses for the JP Zone allowing for the zoning sought.
- 7.5 Submitter 715 states in paragraph 3.5 – *A third and fourth access point onto the State Highway may be required to service the Homestead Bay extension. This point will be located in the vicinity of the existing vehicle crossing which provides gravel access to the*
- 7.6 As the paragraph is incomplete, I have assumed that the submitter is referring to the approved access to the cleanfill site, see paragraph 6.74 below. No further details have been provided in the submission regarding these potential accesses.
- 7.7 There is an existing access road to the NZone (Skydiving operation) approximately 1.3km south of Maori Jack Road. The road only serves NZone and does not provide access to the JP zone. However, if the zone is extended to the State Highway it will, as a consequence,

include the NZone site and thereby mean that a fourth access exists into the JPZ.

7.8 Approximately 900m south of the NZone road, a new access road has been approved for a cleanfill site under RM160616 and for the upgrading of existing Crossing Place 48 into Lot 8 DP 44382. The existing farm access will be upgraded for servicing the cleanfill site. The road will be designed to a NZTA Diagram E Type standard with a 15m radius. The access is restricted to serve the purpose for the cleanfill site activities only and does not provide or enable access to the JP zone beyond. The access has not yet been formed. Similar, to the NZone access road, if the zone is extended to the State Highway, presumably this will mean that, if the access in fact formed already or at some stage, then it will essentially provide a fifth access into JP zone albeit with limited vehicle movements provided.

7.9 Both access to roads described in paragraphs 6.74 and 6.75 are within the area over which the submitter is seeking to extend the JP zone. It is uncertain whether the submitter seeks these two access roads as the additional accesses off State Highway for the Homestead Bay (**HB**) development. Or they intend to create a new one given their submission states:

This point will be located in the vicinity of the existing vehicle crossing which provides access to the

7.10 This is based on minimal details provided in the submission with regards to the location and need for additional accesses off the State Highway. Road connections to the State Highway, internal road linkages and interaction with the existing JP zone are not shown in the Structure Plan.

7.11 The issue seems to be whether the existence of these accesses should be acknowledged in Rule 41.5.6.1 as sought, (thus making it a controlled activity consent for further subdivision to utilise that access), or not (thus making it a discretionary activity consent for other development to be connected to this access).

- 7.12** Based on Mr Corbett's evidence for Transport – Jacks Point for the Council, he identified that the traffic models developed in 2012 for the Hanley's Farm Plan Change 44 transportation assessment report, has increased significantly based on the land use activities enabled in the notified chapter. He estimated a 55% increase in dwellings. I understand this is partly due to the 2012 modelling using some assumptions that did not necessarily reflect the maximum yield possible, partly due to the fact it did not assume any development in Homestead Bay, and partly due to the intensification enabled by the PDP chapter.
- 7.13** I agree with Mr Corbett that there is insufficient data currently to determine potential traffic effects on the road network and that additional traffic modelling needs to be undertaken at the resource consent stage.
- 7.14** At this stage, it is difficult to say when or if the additional two accesses off the State Highway are required without assessing the development traffic using the existing Maori Jack Road. However, I disagree that the use of the two access points should be able to be consented as controlled activities. Rather, I prefer that a restricted discretionary activity consent process is required in order to ensure the two access points offer the most appropriate traffic solution.
- 7.15** The TDG assessment of traffic effects for the Hanley Downs Plan Change 44 including the traffic modelling on the State Highway did not include Homestead Bay. Under the notified Chapter 41, the land use assumptions for Homestead Bay were 239 residential lots and 2.1 ha footprint of commercial/community/retail/residential/visitor accommodation. I have assumed that the notified Homestead Bay development will connect to Maori Jack Road to access the State Highway.
- 7.16** The extension of the JP Zone will enable a further 541 residential lots. It is estimated that the vehicle trips generated by the additional lots only during the peak hour is 703 vph. There is concern about the impact this additional traffic would have on the intersections at SH6 and to some extent the wider network, particularly through Frankton.

Based on minimal information provided, it is difficult to assess the impacts, therefore I oppose the extension sought.

Wild Grass Partnership, Wild Grass Investments No 1 Ltd & Horizons Investment Trust - 567

7.17 Wild Grass Partnership, Wild Grass Investments No 1 Ltd & Horizons Investment Trust support the continued exclusion of the Lodge Activity areas from being located within an Outstanding Natural Landscape.

7.18 There are no transport issues with the support received for the continued exclusion of the Lodge Activity areas from being located within an Outstanding Natural Landscape.

Woodlot Properties Ltd - 501

7.19 Woodlot Properties Ltd oppose the proposed UGB, and suggests as part of their submission that additional areas be added in to the UGB at Jacks Point and Frankton.

7.20 I understand the UGB is designed to enable urban development within the boundary, subject to specific controls, and to avoid any urban development beyond the boundary. Public buses do not currently service the submission area, however, they will be included in the ORC's proposed bus routes.

7.21 The area to the north of the JP Zone is currently zoned rural and State Highway 6 traverses the site with two tight bends. There is an existing access, Boyd Road, off the eastern most bend that serves the rural properties and farming activities in the area.

7.22 Based on the current transport infrastructure I oppose the UGB extension sought because of the existing alignment of the SH6, in my view no new accesses should be created for that area to the north of the JP zone. Although, there is an existing road, Boyd Road at the SH6 bend, it currently supports very low traffic volumes and it would be unsafe to cater for more traffic.

7.23 Should an extension to the UGB be considered for the area north of the JP zone, then I recommend that the PDP include rules to ensure that any development enabled is to have only access to the portion of land south of the SH6 via the existing consented accesses, Woolshed Road, Hanley's Farm Access Road and Maori Jack Road.

7.24 Access to the north of the SH6 could be considered if the SH6 was realigned to ease the curves at the bends.

7.25 The second area sought for UGB extension to the south of the JP Zone, is also known as the Homestead Bay. I refer to the Jardine Family Trust & Remarkables Station Ltd submission 715 regarding the extension of the JP Zone, and have the same evidence as to the zone extension.

8. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS – QUEENSTOWN URBAN – CENTRAL, WEST AND ARTHURS POINT (1C)

8.1 I note that the Group 1C section 42A evidence, includes maps showing each specific submission point addressed below where relevant.

QUEENSTOWN HILL ABOVE MARINA

Remarkable Heights Ltd - 347

8.2 Remarkable Heights Ltd seeks that 1.5654 ha of land located at Middleton Road (Lot 102 DP 411971), be rezoned from notified R zone to LDR zone. The LDR zone could yield an additional 24 residential lots.

- 8.3** The site is accessed through Middleton Road as this is the only current road into the site. Middleton Road connects with Frankton Road with a right turn bay access into Middleton Road. Pedestrian footpaths allow for accessibility through Middleton Road towards the proposed site as well as street lighting to provide additional safety.
- 8.4** Although integrated with active transport, the steep gradient of Middleton Road poses potential difficulties for pedestrians and cyclists. Buses service regularly along Frankton Road, although the bus stops are not in close proximity to Middleton Road.
- 8.5** The main transport issue is the right turn movements out of Middleton Road onto Frankton Road. Potentially, the 24 residential lots could add another 15 right turn movements during the peak hour, this is based on an assumption of 75% turning right towards Queenstown of a total of 19 trips generated during the peak hour. The number of trips generated by the rezoning is not significant and my concerns regarding right turn movements is an existing issue rather than directly caused by the rezoning. I therefore do not oppose the LDR sought for the area in Remarkable Heights.

Middleton Family Trust - 336

- 8.6** Middleton Family Trust seeks that the Queenstown Heights Overlay Area (**QTN Overlay**) is removed from the underlying LDR zone for 38.6111 ha of land located at Queenstown Hill. This will enable an increase in density from QTN Overlay of one unit per 1,500m² to one per 450m² for LDR. Without the Overlay, the LDR zone could yield 583 lots, 408 over and above the notified PDP.
- 8.7** My estimation of vehicle trips generated by intensification sought is 758 vehicles per peak hour, and will generate an estimated 530 trips more than the notified framework.
- 8.8** I oppose the zoning sought because the intensification will result in an estimated additional 530 vehicles during the peak hour and this will have a significant impact on the Middleton Road intersection with Frankton Road. Right turn movements are currently difficult due to the

high volumes of traffic in both directions on Frankton Road. There is an existing flushed median that assists turning movements.

- 8.9** In my view, to accommodate these additional trips the intersection will need to be upgraded to allow right turn movements out of Middleton Road. The median cannot be relied on for the traffic that would be generated. If a 50/50 split is taken for left and right turn movements out of Middleton Road in the morning peak, the potential right turn movements could be 265 vehicles. I have not considered vehicles entering Middleton Road, but it is not expected to be a high proportion of traffic during the morning. Any upgrades to the intersection to allow safe turning movements such as a roundabout will disrupt the free flow traffic conditions on both directions on Frankton Road.
- 8.10** Within the area, there are consented lots that have not yet been built, but will further increase the traffic movements. I oppose the amendments sought to enable a higher density of residential lots because it could enable a significant number of lots and I consider that the transport effects will be adverse based on safety.
- 8.11** I note that in their planning evidence for the Residential hearing, the Middleton Family Trust have requested a site density of 749 lots for the site. My assessment has been based on 583 lots and concluded that yield was too intense for the existing transport infrastructure; therefore an increase to 749 lots would not change my view on the impacts from the rezoning.

Mount Crystal Limited - 150

- 8.12** Mount Crystal Limited seeks that 2.736 ha of notified LDR land adjacent to the Holiday Inn Queenstown on Frankton Road be rezoned part MDR and HDR. It has been requested that 1.24 ha of land located on the northern part be rezoned to MDR and the remaining southern portion 1.49 ha of land be rezoned to HDR.

- 8.13** The MDR zone could yield 34 lots and would be 15 lots more than the notified LDR zone. The HDR zone could enable 88 lots and be 66 more than the LDR zone.
- 8.14** The site appears to be undeveloped, and there is an access off Frankton Road to the site. However, I consider the access to be offset by the existing access to the Alpine Village apartments on the other side of Frankton Road. Bus stops are not within walking distance, and there is no footpath on the northern side of Frankton Road (where the site is located).
- 8.15** I oppose the HDR zone from a transport perspective because it would enable an additional 66 lots over the notified LDR, and I have concerns with the traffic that could be generated for turning movements onto Frankton Road. I do not oppose the MDR zoning request because the intensification at that density is not considered to be significant.

Body Corporate 22362 - 389

- 8.16** Body Corporate 22362 seeks that 10.7844 ha of land at Goldfield Heights be rezoned from notified LDR to MDR. The MDR zone could enable a total of 293 lots, and it is estimated that this would yield an additional 130 lots.
- 8.17** It is estimated from **[SB80]** that the total vehicle trips from a MDR zoning would generate 234vph during the peak hour. I estimate there to be an additional 104 trips per peak hour from the rezoning.
- 8.18** The site location is appropriate for MDR with provision of footpaths and pedestrian crossing facility across Frankton Road. Bus stops with shelters are provided in close proximity to the Goldfield Heights intersection.
- 8.19** However, I do have concerns with the additional vehicle trips as a result of intensification of land of that magnitude. Right turn movements out of Goldfield Heights will be difficult in the current situation; this is assumed based on high traffic volumes along

Frankton Road. The additional trips will load more turning movements at the intersection. I oppose the rezoning because it will potentially trigger intersection improvements to accommodate these movements to ensure safe operation of the intersection. Any upgrades to the intersection to allow safe turning movements such as a roundabout will disrupt the free flow traffic conditions on both directions on Frankton Road.

QUEENSTOWN CENTRAL

Firestone Investments Limited (General Support) - 722

- 8.20** Firestone Investments Limited seeks to confirm that Lot 5 DP 351561 is zoned as HDR.
- 8.21** No change is sought, therefore there is no impact from a transport perspective.

Remarkable Park Limited (General Support) - 807

- 8.22** Remarkable Park Limited seeks to retain HDR zoning of land to the north of Man Street.
- 8.23** No change is sought, therefore there is no impact from a transport perspective.

Grant Keeley - 1359

- 8.24** Grant Keeley seeks that 4,050 m² of land located at 37-51 Kent Street be rezoned from notified HDR to LDR zone. The LDR zone could reduce an overall 18 lots from the notified zoning. Kent Street is a cul-de-sac with multiple access points through Edgar St, York Street and Dublin Street. Dublin Street connects to Frankton Road.
- 8.25** With a reduction in residential lots, there will not be any traffic related issues created and therefore I do not oppose the rezoning. However, I do consider that the HDR zoning is appropriate based on its town

centre location and will encourage walking and cycling and less dependence on private vehicle use.

NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern - 238

8.26 NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern seek that the BMU be extended to include 14.2094 ha of land. They seek the following:

- (a) use the natural boundary with Horne Creek to separate the HDR zone from BMU zone;
- (b) have BMU front the main roads and have HDR behind; and
- (c) have permeability linkages, not just at Horne creek but also at the base of Queenstown Hill, landmark buildings, green spaces, view shafts etc.

8.27 Referring to the map attached to the submission, the request is for the BMU to be extended from Gorge Road through Queenstown Town Centre to Frankton Road and Dublin Street.

8.28 I do not oppose the rezoning sought based on the highlighted areas in the map submitted, because the Gorge Road and Queenstown Town Centre locations are appropriate for mixed residential, commercial, retail and business uses and achieve *an urban environment that is desirable to work and live in* – Policy 16.2.1.2. From a transport perspective, I agree with the mixed use activities enabled because this encourages less dependence on private vehicle use.

8.29 The areas identified for the BMU are mostly notified with HDR and I do not expect that the BMU will change the impacts of traffic and transport negatively as land use activity is restricted as per the reply chapter.

8.30 In my view, the rezoning sought will encourage more walking and cycling trips. Improvements to cycling and walking safety along Gorge Road have been identified in the QLDC-Town Centre

Transport Strategy, June 2016 programmed for July 2017 to June 2018.

- 8.31** Gorge Road has also been mentioned in the January 2015 Transport Strategy for the installation of bike racks on all Connectabus services operating in Urban zones, which will further encourage cycling.
- 8.32** Gorge Road is also mentioned as being a part of the arterial route study, which aims to develop up-measures for implementation in the short, medium and long term that will improve the people moving capacity and trip reliability.
- 8.33** Based on my assessment, I do not oppose the BMU extension sought and in my view it will encourage less dependence on private vehicle use.

P J & G H Hensman & Southern Lakes Holdings Limited - 543

- 8.34** P J & G H Hensman & Southern Lakes Holdings Limited seek that 8.1416 ha of land located on Queenstown Hill (lot 13 DP 27397), be rezoned from notified LDR zone to HDR zone. The HDR zone could yield a total of 481 lots that would be 358 over and above the notified yield. The site is situated at the end of Windsor Place and extends to properties fronting onto Hensman Road.
- 8.35** HDR zones require close proximity to Town Centres which are easily accessible by public transport, cycle and walk ways. The site is located approximately 1km from Queenstown Town Centre making it adequately accessible by active transport, however footpaths are narrow and located on only one side of the road. Access to the site from the town centre is at a steep gradient that might discourage walkers and cyclists.
- 8.36** Traffic generation will increase from the intensification, however, it is difficult to determine how significant these volumes generated would be if it was rezoned to a HDR. Walking and cycling opportunities may be discouraged given its steep gradient, and winter months are not

considered desirable. Furthermore, there are no existing public transport provisions to support non-vehicle owners.

- 8.37** In terms of HDR, I have concerns with the site's location from the town centre (approximately 1km) and steep gradient that alternative transport modes to driving such as walking and cycling would not be used as preferred and encouraged in the policies in Chapter 9. In my opinion, the existing transport infrastructure and provisions do not support the HDR rezoning of 8.14 ha of land. I have concerns with the effects it would have on the intersections on Edinburgh Drive and Hensman Road as this link is used for bypassing Frankton Road. The traffic generated from HDR if alternatives modes of transport are not used will be distributed to intersections further downstream that are considered to be operating at unsatisfactorily levels.
- 8.38** I oppose the rezoning sought based on the existing transport provisions and site constraints and that the location may not be desirable enough to discourage dependence of vehicle use. Public transport to the area and improvements to active transport facilities will be required should a HDR zone be considered.

Queenstown Lakes District Council - 790

- 8.39** QLDC seeks that 1.8737 ha of land known as Commonage Sports Reserve be rezoned from R to MDR. The MDR zone could yield 51 lots.
- 8.40** The site would be accessed via Vancouver Drive. I do not oppose the rezoning sought because it is estimated that 41 vehicle trips will be generated by a MDR zone during peak hour and I do not expect that it would have adverse effects on the existing road network.
- 8.41** QLDC is also seeking that 4,282 m² of land located on Kerry Drive be rezoned from R and LDR to entirely LDR and the consequential amendment of the UGB line and ONL Line to the western boundary of this site. This is estimated to yield six residential lots.

- 8.42** I do not oppose the rezoning sought because the yield will have minimal effect on transportation matters.

Allium Trustees Limited - 718

- 8.43** Allium Trustees Limited seeks that 8,385 m² of land generally located between Manchester Place and Vancouver Drive be rezoned from LDR to HDR.

- 8.44** In terms of HDR, I have concerns with the site's location from the town centre (approximately 1km) and the steep gradient that alternative transport modes to driving such as walking and cycling would not be used as preferred and encouraged in the policies in Chapter 9. In my opinion, the existing transport infrastructure and provisions do not support a HDR in the area.

- 8.45** I oppose the rezoning sought because from a transport perspective an HDR zone is not appropriate and would not be able to meet Chapter 9 policies to maximise non-private vehicle movements based on existing provisions and site constraints. An MDR or LDR based on the surrounding areas are more appropriate for the site.

Garth Makowski - 686

Mulwood Investments Limited – 731

Belfast Corporation Limited - 727

- 8.46** Garth Makowski, Mulwood Investments Limited and Belfast Corporation Limited all seek that 2.7979 ha of land located at Belfast Terrace, be rezoned from notified MDR to HDR. The HDR could yield 165 lots, of which 89 would be over and above the notified yield. Belfast Terrace is a single lane dual carriageway with no road markings. The site has frontage onto Belfast Terrace which provides access for sites.

- 8.47** Additional trips generated from the additional lots under HDR zoning can be estimated as per **[SB80]** as 71vph during peak hour. These additional trips generated are likely to impact roads leading toward the Town Centre.

8.48 HDR zones promote non-vehicular uses such as walking, cycling and public transport. I do not consider that the sites location from the town centre (approximately 1km) is within close proximity to encourage walking and cycling given that the site is a steep gradient from the town centre. Footpath provisions are adequate and well lit however, with no supporting public transport in the area, there will likely be reliance on private vehicles.

8.49 I oppose the rezoning sought because in my view, the location does not support the policies as set out in the HDR.

YORK STREET

Sue Knowles - 7

8.50 Sue Knowles seeks that 4,828 m² of land located at York Street be rezoned from notified HDR to LDR. The LDR zone could see a reduction in 21 lots.

8.51 I do not oppose the reduced intensification of the area sought because this will not have a negative impact on the transport network.

Body Corp 27490 – 363

8.52 Body Corp 27490 seeks that land located from 1 to 17 York Street, be rezoned from notified HDR to LDR.

8.53 I do not oppose the reduced intensification of the area as sought, because this will not have a negative impact on the transport network.

PARK STREET / GARDENS

Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Incorporated - 506

8.54 Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Incorporated seek that 4.6533 ha of land located and bound by Park Street and Hobart Street be rezoned from notified MDR, to ODP HDR zone or a zone similar to Arrowtown Historic Management (**AHM**) Zone. The ODP

HDR zone sought would yield a maximum of 70 lots, and would be 56 lots less than the yield based on the PDP zone.

- 8.55** I do not oppose the rezoning sought from a transport perspective because the reduction in lots will not have a negative impact on the transport network.

Janice Kinealy - 821

- 8.56** Janice Kinealy seeks that the notified MDR be rezoned to ODP HDR, specifically on Brisbane Street.

- 8.57** I have read the submission and understand that Janice Kinealy request that the existing recession planes are kept. In my view, the request will not have an effect on transport effects.

Peter Flemming and Others - 599

- 8.58** Peter Flemming and Others seeks to oppose any density change over the Brisbane Street area, without having provisions for transport and car parking considered.

- 8.59** Having no provisions for transport and car parking can cause significant impacts therefore I oppose the provision sought.

Millennium & Copthorne Hotels New Zealand Limited (General Support) - 182

- 8.60** Millennium & Copthorne Hotels New Zealand Limited seek that land located at 32 Frankton Road, Queenstown (Lot 1, DP 24192) retain the notified HDR zone, or some other zoning be provided for hotels at current height.

- 8.61** No change is sought, therefore from a transport perspective there are to be no transport impacts with this submission.

Aws Trustees No 31 limited - 641

8.62 Aws Trustees No 31 limited supports the notified HDR zones that apply to 6,701 m² of land located at 53, 57, 61 and 65 Frankton Road. The HDR zone could yield 40 lots. The site is bounded by Suburb Street and Dublin Street.

8.63 No change is sought, therefore from a transport perspective there are to be no transport impacts with this submission.

Millennium & Copthorne Hotels New Zealand Limited (Other – Rezonings) - 679

8.64 Millennium & Copthorne Hotels New Zealand Limited seeks that 1.87 ha of land located at 27 Frankton Road (Lots 1 & 2 DP 25442), be rezoned from notified MDR zone to HDR zone with a maximum height of 12m. The HDR zone could yield 111 lots and would be 51 over and above the notified yield.

8.65 The Copthorne Resort Hotel with its frontage on Frankton Road occupies most of the land within the site. The remaining area to the south west is occupied with residential dwellings. These are accessed via Hobart Street, Adelaide Street and Park Street.

8.66 The site is situated on the edge of the town centre zoning, and is easily accessible to the amenities via well connected footpaths.

8.67 I refer to QLDC's ODP Chapter 14 Transport Rules 14.2.4.1 Parking and Loading, which require one resident/visitor parking space per three guest rooms. PDP Objective 9.2.6.7 considers a reduction in parking requirements where a site is located within 400m of a bus stop or the edge of a town centre. The submission site meets the criteria.

8.68 Park Street forms the southern border of the subject site, and is part of the Queenstown Trail, therefore the site is in an optimum location for walking and cycling and its close proximity to the town centre.

- 8.69** For this hotel site, the parking requirements would be one park per three guest rooms⁶ up to 60 rooms, one staff parking per 20 beds, and one coach park per 50 guest rooms. Applying this to the additional 51 lots yielded through the rezoning would require 17 additional guest car spaces, one additional coach car space and approximately three additional staff spaces.
- 8.70** If parking requirements can be met, I see minimal impacts to transport as accessibility to local bus stops and active transport tracks encourage walking and cycling with proximity to the town centre reducing private car use as well as the sites current use as a hotel. Therefore I do not oppose the rezoning sought.

Dato Tan Chin Nam - 61

- 8.71** Dato Tan Chin Nam seeks that 2.0094 ha of land located and bounded by Frankton Road (SH6A), Adelaide Street, Suburb Street and Park Street be rezoned from notified MDR to HDR. The HDR zone could yield 119 lots, an additional 64 lots to that yielded by the notified zoning. This submission is similar to submission 679 above at paragraphs 7.64 to 7.70.
- 8.72** The site is situated on the edge of the Town Centre zoning, and is easily accessible to the amenities via well connected footpaths.
- 8.73** I refer to QLDC's ODP Chapter 14 Transport Rules 14.2.4.1 Parking and Loading, which require one resident/visitor parking space per three guest rooms. PDP Objective 9.2.6.7 considers a reduction in parking requirements where a site is located within 400m of a bus stop or the edge of a town centre. The submission site meets the criteria.
- 8.74** Applying this to the additional 64 lots yielded through the rezoning would require 20 additional guest car spaces, one additional coach car space, and approximately three additional staff spaces, assuming that one room contains one guest.

6 14.2.4.1 Parking and loading 1 per 3 guest rooms up to 60 guest rooms; thereafter 1 per 5 guest rooms. In addition 1 coach park per 50 guest rooms.

8.75 Park Street, which forms the southern border of the subject site, is part of the Queenstown Trail therefore the site is in an optimum location for walking and cycling and its close proximity to the town centre.

8.76 If parking requirements on site can be met, I see minimal impacts to transport as accessibility to local bus stops and active transport tracks encourage walking and cycling with proximity to the town centre reducing private car use as well as the sites current use as a hotel. Therefore I do not oppose the rezoning sought.

Neville Mahon - 628

8.77 Neville Mahon seeks that 7,525 m² of land located at 12, 18, 20 and 24 Park Street as well as 9 Brisbane Street (Lots 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 DP 9667 respectively), be rezoned from MDR to HDR. The HDR zone could yield 44 lots, and would yield 24 lots over and above the notified zones. The site is on and bounded by Park Street and Brisbane Street which has a close proximity to Queenstown Town Centre, Queenstown Gardens and Lake Wakatipu all of which are easily accessible via well connected footpaths.

8.78 The site is located within 400m of a bus stop or the edge of a town centre and reduced parking requirements may be considered as per PDP Objective 9.2.6.7.

8.79 Park Street, which forms the western border of the subject site is part of the Queenstown Trail, therefore the site is in an optimum location for walking and cycling and its close proximity to the town centre.

8.80 HDR is appropriate and I consider that there will be minimal impacts to the transport network as accessibility to local bus stops and active transport tracks encourage walking and cycling with proximity to the town centre reducing private car use. Therefore I do not oppose the rezoning sought.

FERNHILL / SUNSHINE BAY

Sean & Jane McLeod - 391

- 8.81** Sean & Jane McLeod seek that 54.1094 ha of land be rezoned from notified LDR to MDR. This land would include most of Fernhill and Sunshine Bay on the lower slopes within 4-500m of Fernhill Road, and that it is also extended along Frankton Road to include Panorama Terrace, Larchwood Heights, Andrews Park, Goldfields, Battery Hill Marina Heights and everything in between. The MDR zone could yield 1472 lots and would be 654 over and above the notified LDR yield.
- 8.82** Using the **[SB80]**, the difference in traffic movements for the two zones is not that significant. Based on the entire area of land sought the notified LDR zone with 818 lots, the trips generated is estimated to be 1,062 during the peak hour (using 1.3/dwelling trip rate). The estimated vehicles generated during the peak hour for the MDR zone with 1,472 lots is 1,177.
- 8.83** I do not oppose the rezoning sought because the areas identified in the submission are considered to be close to the town centre and there are existing transport infrastructure to support the MDR, with footpath provisions and the sites selected are not too steep to discourage walkers and cyclists. Furthermore, there are public transport facilities that can be relied on in these areas. The only potential issue is parking on residential streets if vehicles per dwelling exceeds the District Plan's on-site requirements for parking per residential unit.

Mr Trevor William Oliver – 479 (oppose)

- 8.84** Mr Trevor William Oliver opposes the notified MDR zone of 1.0810 ha of land located between Wynyard Crescent and Fernhill Road, and requests that the area is rezoned to LDR, which is the ODP zone.
- 8.85** From a transport perspective, the MDR is appropriate with the LSC located on the corner of Fernhill Road and Richards Park Lane and the existing transport infrastructure supports the MDR. However, the

traffic effects from the request will be minimal and may reduce the number of vehicles generated therefore I do not oppose the zoning sought.

Reddy Group Limited - 699

- 8.86** Reddy Group Limited seeks that 7,447m² and 2,317m² of land located at 139 Fernhill Road and 10, 12, 14 and 16 Richards Park lane respectively, be rezoned from notified LDR to MDR. The Reddy Group also seeks that all mentioned properties be included in the VA sub-zone. MDR zone at Fernhill Road could yield 20 lots and would enable nine lots in addition to the notified zone. Richards Park could enable six lots, with three lots over and above the LDR zone. In addition to these two submissions, Reddy Group Limited also seeks to amend the zoning map to retain MDR zoning at 20 Aspen Grove.
- 8.87** Access off the sites can be made via Fernhill Road, Aspen Grove and Richards Park Lane, with Fernhill Road or Sainsbury Road providing routes east towards the Queenstown Town Centre.
- 8.88** Proximity to Queenstown Town Centre encourages active transport within the area, with adequate footpaths and cycling provisions within the roads. It is noted that investigation into the feasibility of reducing the gradient of the Town Link track to Fernhill for January 2017 to June 2017 has been identified in the QLDC CBD Transport Strategy 2016
- 8.89** Bus services operating along Fernhill Road include the Connectabus (Route - 9) which operates between 7am-11pm with a high frequency throughout the day. Bus stops are easily accessible from the site, with the closest bus stop approximately less than 200m.
- 8.90** Fernhill Road has also been identified in the January 2015 Transport Strategy for the installation of bike racks on all Connectabus services operating in Urban zones, which will further encourage cycling trips. Continuous improvements and accessibility to active transport within Queenstown should reduce the dependence on private vehicle use.

- 8.91** Additionally, Queenstown Transport Strategy 2015 identifies Fernhill Road as part of the arterial route study, which aims to develop measures for implementation in the short, medium and long term that will improve the people moving capacity and trip reliability. The strategy includes a walking and cycling audit of the roads and pathways. This project will assess safety risks and make operational improvement recommendations.
- 8.92** I do not oppose the rezoning sought based on the potential improvements to the area and that the current transport infrastructure supports the zoning request.

Hurtell Proprietary Limited, Landeena Holdings Limited, Shellmint Proprietary Limited - 97

- 8.93** Hurtell Proprietary Limited, Landeena Holdings Limited, Shellmint Proprietary Limited seeks that 1.5237 ha of land located at Lot 1 DP 21182 be rezoned from LDR zone to HDR zone. The HDR zone could yield 90 lots and would be 67 over and above notified zone. The area is located off Wynyard Crescent.
- 8.94** For HDR zoning, the site is not considered to be in close proximity of the town centre to encourage alternative transport modes so that private vehicle movements would be reduced.
- 8.95** The site is easily accessible to public bus stops along Fernhill Road, with the closest bus stop approximately less than 200m away. The current bus service that operates along Fernhill Road is the Connectabus (Route - 9), which operates between 7am-11pm with a high frequency throughout the day.
- 8.96** Trips generated through HDR zoning are estimated to be 54 vph as per **[SB80]**. Access onto the site can be made via Wynyard Crescent which currently serves as an unmarked single lane carriage way.
- 8.97** Paragraphs 7.86, 7.88 and 7.89 provide details of improvement measures for active transport in Fernhill Road. Overall, I do not oppose the rezoning sought from a transport perspective.

GORGE ROAD

Jeff Aldridge - 86

- 8.98** Jeff Aldridge supports the idea of Gorge Road being under HDR zoning and suggests it be looked at as a worker accommodation area. Gorge Road predominately consists of industrial and commercial activities, with the notified zoning encompassing R, BMU and HDR, and significant natural area overlays. There is no specific PDP or ODP Workers Accommodation sub zone, although I understand this to be a type of residential activity, with the notified zone already being high density residential.
- 8.99** High density development is encouraged within close proximity to town centres to reduce private vehicle movements and maximise public transport, cycling and walking as per Policy 9.2.6.1. This is partnered within the QLDC Infrastructure Strategy 2015-2045, which forecasts traffic growth to result in major delays, with bumper to bumper traffic travelling at an average speed of 20km/h. Therefore a high priority on public and active transport service improvements is critical.
- 8.100** Although the additional activity may cause parking concerns along Gorge Road and on site may cause transport impacts under a VA zone. The proximity to Queenstown Town Centre will reduce reliance of private vehicles and its topography is considered to be desirable for walkers and cyclists. It is one of the few stretches of road in the area that does not increase in elevation sharply.
- 8.101** Public transport services along Gorge Road include the Connectabus service which offers services to the Town Centre via bus Route – 8. The Route-8 Connectabus service operates between 7:05am - 9:35pm with the frequency of the bus service occurring seven times per day.
- 8.102** Improvements to cycling and walking safety along Gorge Road have been mentioned in the QLDC-Town Centre Transport Strategy, June 2016 with improvements expected to take place between July 2017 and June 2018. Gorge Road has also been mentioned in the January

2015 Transport Strategy for the installation of bike racks on all Connectabus services operating in Urban zones, which will further encourage cycling. Gorge Road is also mentioned as being a part of the arterial route study, which aims to develop up-measures for implementation in the short, medium and long term that will improve the people moving capacity and trip reliability.

- 8.103** The 2015 strategy also mentions a walking and cycling audit of the roads and pathways. This project will assess safety risks and make operational improvement recommendations.
- 8.104** I do not oppose the addition of worker accommodation in the notified HDR areas on Gorge Road.

Westwood Group – 70

PR Queenstown Ltd - 102

- 8.105** Westwood Group seeks that 4,593 m² of land located from Boundary Street to Robins Road, along Gorge Road be rezoned from notified HDR to BMU. The BMU zone could yield 27 lots. Gorge Road has developed into a mixed use industrial / business area along the extent of the road.
- 8.106** PR Queenstown Ltd seeks that five adjoining sites with 4,593 m² of land located at 30-46 Gorge Road, be rezoned from notified HDR to BMU. The BMU zone could yield 27 lots. The site has frontage onto Gorge Road and occupies the western side between “Gorge Road Council Carpark” and the commercial corner of Gorge and Robins Road.
- 8.107** Based on a maximum of 75% building coverage in Chapter 16.5.4, the peak hour generated trips would be 86 for commercial premises under BMU zoning as per **[SB80]**, i.e. 2.5vph/100sqm during the peak hour. In my view, the volume of traffic under a BMU zone is not of concern, furthermore, the BMU enables residential development this potentially could reduce trips.

8.108 I do not oppose the rezoning sought because it will form an extension to the existing business activities on Gorge Road.

Neki Patel - 103

Hamish Munro - 104

Barry Sarginson - 107

Clyde Macintyre - 108

8.109 The submitters seek to rezone five adjoining sites 30 – 46 Gorge from notified HDR to BMU. From a transport perspective I do not oppose the rezoning because it is reflective of the current land use activities.

ARTHURS POINT

Ngāi Tahu Tourism Ltd - 716

8.110 Ngāi Tahu Tourism Ltd seeks that 11.3325 ha of land located at Morning Star Beach Recreation Reserve, Arthurs Point, be rezoned from notified R, to Rural Visitor (**RV**) zone. The RV zone could enable 338 lots.

8.111 The site is bound by Redfern Terrace, Arthurs Point Road and the Shotover River.

8.112 It is difficult to estimate the traffic generated from the rezoning sought, however, based on the 11.3325 ha of land sought, I have concerns with the potential development that could be enabled under a RV zone. Furthermore, the RV zone enables multi-storey high density development.

8.113 The Edith Cavell Bridge over the Shotover River is identified within the QLDC Infrastructure Strategy 2015-2045 as an asset critical to service delivery, as it provides the only alternative access in Queenstown. The bridge operates as a single lane with no provision for pedestrians or cyclists. The additional trips generated along Arthurs Road will cause further strain to the bridge, increasing delays and safety concerns.

8.114 I oppose the rezoning sought based on the level of development and its associated traffic volumes that will have an adverse effect on the existing transport road network, particularly the one-way road bridge over the Shotover River.

Sam Strain - 349

8.115 Sam Strain seeks that 6047 m² of land located at Arthurs Point Road, Arthurs Point (Lots 1 & 2 DP25724), be rezoned from notified R to LDR. The LDR zone could yield nine lots. A request to extend the UGB onto the property site was also included with the submission. The site is located southwest of Redfern Terrace and has frontage onto Arthurs Point Road. The site is also situated within the Morning Star Reserve in Arthurs Point.

8.116 Trips generated from the LDR zoning will not be a concern given that the site could only enable a maximum of nine residential lots.

8.117 I do not oppose the rezoning sought providing that access to the sites will not be via Arthurs Points Road because of the site is located on the outside of a tight horizontal curve.

Michael Swan - 494

8.118 Michael Swan seeks that 2.3602 ha of land located at 111 Atley Road, Arthurs Point, be rezoned from notified R to LDR. The LDR zone could yield 36 lots.

8.119 It is estimated that 36 residential lots would generate approximately 47 vph during the peak hour under a LDR zone. The additional trips generated during the peak hour is not high but may affect the operation of the Atley Road/Mathias Terrace intersection as it is used by all vehicles in the area. The intersection with Arthurs Point Road and Atley Road may be affected, however it is assumed in the morning period that there would be more left turn movements towards Queenstown.

8.120 I do not oppose the rezoning request based on the low volume of traffic it could potentially generate.

Larchmont Developments Limited - 527

- 8.121** Larchmont Developments Limited seeks that 5.8957 ha of land located at 111 Atley Road, Arthurs Point be rezoned from notified R to LDR. The LDR zone could yield 89 residential lots. A request to extend the UGB around the submission area has also been made. The area is in the same location as submission 494 but with a significantly larger area sought.
- 8.122** Trips generated as per [SB80] approximates that 1.3vph are generated per dwelling, therefore it is estimated that approximately 116 vehicles during the peak hour would be generated under a LDR zone.
- 8.123** I oppose the rezoning sought from a transport perspective, because the knock-on effect of traffic generated from the development enabled will impact on the intersections identified in 7.118, and also because the increase traffic on the one-way bridge over the Shotover River and contribute to existing delays.

Alpine Estate Ltd - 450

- 8.124** Alpine Estate Ltd seeks that approximately 1.9ha out of 4.1759ha of land located at Arthurs Point Road, Arthurs Point (Lot 1 DP 12913), be rezoned from notified LDR to HDR. The HDR zone could yield 247 total lots and would be 184 over and above the notified yield. The site is located on the northern side of Arthurs Point Rd and is adjacent to the notified Rural Visitor zone on its east side.
- 8.125** I agree with the submission in paragraph 9c that the HDR would supplement the adjacent RV zone. In addition, paragraph 9e of the submissions states that the site is located next to the bus stop and also there are footpath provisions and connections to trails which supports the rezoning.
- 8.126** However, given the scale of the development with the rezoning area sought, I have concerns with the traffic impacts and safety on Arthurs Point Road. The site is adjacent to the existing Shotover Lodge and

entertainment activities as the Nugget Point Hotel on the opposite side of the road. The access points are in close proximity of each other, which creates conflict points.

- 8.127** I am not assured that a HDR zone of such a large scale is appropriate in Arthurs Point because I do not consider that the existing or planned local amenities in the area will support such a zone. Reply Chapter 9 9.2.1 provides:

Objective – High-density housing development will occur in urban areas close to town centres, to provide greater housing diversity and respond to strong projected growth in visitor numbers.

- 8.128** Trips generated from HDR zone can be estimated based on **[SB80]**. 239vph during the peak hour are expected to be generated. The traffic volume from the development could potentially be slightly lower, with people opting to use buses instead of driving. Queenstown is approximately 5km away, and therefore cycling is an option, however, I do not expect that it would account for a large portion of travellers.
- 8.129** I oppose the HDR zone from a transport perspective based on the scale of the development, and I do not consider that the location and alternative transport options available support a HDR zoning. Furthermore, I have concerns with high turning movements into and out of Arthurs Point Road.

Darryl Sampson & Louise Cooper - 495

- 8.130** Darryl Sampson & Louise Cooper seek that 1.5877 ha of land located at Arthurs Point Road, Arthurs Point, be rezoned from notified R to Rural Visitor (**RV**) zone to cover the total extent of their property. The RV zone could yield 47 lots. In addition to extending RV zone over the whole property (Lot 2 DP 24233), a request to extend the UGB around the proposed extended RV zone has been made.

8.131 I do not oppose the RV extension sought as the area of land is small compared to the notified RV zone. The transport effects in addition to the enabled RV zone will not be significantly different.

8.132 I do not oppose the extension of the UGB to include part of the submitter's land to become unified as RV zone as opposed to being split zoned, due to the nature of the relatively minor size of land extension.

Mandalea Properties - 642

8.133 Mandalea Properties seek that 6,445 m² of land located at Arthurs Point Road, be rezoned from notified R zone to RV zone. The RV zone could yield 19 lots. The submitter's property is split zoned R and RV with the boundary of the two zones forming the UGB. The opposing R zone of the property extends to the south and east of the proposed RV zone. The land has frontage onto Arthurs Point Road which has a speed limit of 70km/h.

8.134 I do not oppose the extension of the UGB to include part of the submitter's land to become unified as RV zone as opposed to being split zoned, due to the nature of the relatively minor size of the land extension and the minimal impacts to transport.



Wendy Banks

25 May 2017