

**Wendy Banks for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 21 July 2017**

**Queenstown Mapping – Hearing Stream 13**

1. My evidence for Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) relates to traffic and transportation matters regarding rezoning requests in submissions grouped as Queenstown Urban (Groups 1A, 1B, 1C and 1D) of the Queenstown Lakes District.
2. Queenstown is currently undergoing major growth in population numbers and it has been recognised<sup>1</sup> that the existing transport infrastructure is at or near capacity, notably State Highway 6, the Frankton area, and the town centre.
3. Future transportation upgrades and plans<sup>2</sup> are proposed in the short, medium and long term, and are not limited to providing additional road capacity since Queenstown is constrained by Lake Wakatipu and steep topography. They include encouraging 'active' transport to reduce dependence on private car use, such as public transport and integrated footpath and cycle routes.
4. Transport planning in Queenstown is challenging given the physical constraints, the current delays during the morning and evening peak periods and the existing land-use developments, particularly with the location of the Queenstown Airport in Frankton. The Frankton area is expected to accommodate the future population and business growth given the physical constraints in other urban areas in Queenstown.
5. Road capacity, safety and efficiency is not all that is currently being affected. The current traffic volumes and expected growth in traffic numbers will place even further pressure on parking, particularly in Queenstown town centre. Furthermore, Queenstown's ownership in vehicles per dwelling is likely to be high due to shared living and reliance on private vehicles.
6. In my view the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) complements the future planned transportation improvements such as improvements to State Highways 6 and 6A by NZ Transport Agency and measures to increase the use of alternative transport modes such as public transport, walking and cycling that QLDC are proposing. For the rezoning submissions I have considered the existing and future transport

1 2015-2045 Infrastructure Strategy, QLDC, March 2015.

2 Queenstown Town Centre Transport Strategy, The Next Steps, QLDC, June 2016.

---

network. However, there were some submissions<sup>3</sup> where I have taken into account the future upgrades in the area; but due to existing traffic and parking issues, I am not comfortable with the rezoning. Through this assessment, I have identified potential rezonings that could trigger or further promote active transport, such as rezoning from Low Density Residential (**LDR**) to Medium Density Residential (**MDR**) in the Fernhill and Frankton Road areas (Sean & Jane McLeod (391) and Reddy Group Limited (699)).

7. State Highways 6 and 6A connect Queenstown to the west (Frankton and Lake Hayes) and to the south (airport, Kelvin Heights Peninsula and Jacks Point). As these are important connector routes, I consider that adding additional accesses<sup>4</sup> on the State Highways should be avoided where possible, a view shared by the NZ Transport Agency.
8. Further, I have concerns with the existing intersections along the State Highways with some rezoning requests<sup>5</sup> and the potential impacts it could have on road safety and efficiency of the road network. These intersections along SH6A include Sugar/Marina Drive and Goldfield Heights.
9. On State Highway 6 between SH6A and Tucker Beach Road (Frankton Flats area<sup>6</sup>), I consider access should be limited to the existing accesses, with no creation of new accesses to support new developments.
10. SH6 from Frankton to Kelvin Heights/Jacks Point (Kawarau Road to Kingston Road) will see significant improvements when the Kawarau Bridge is expected to open at the end of 2017. However, in my opinion upgrades that are currently underway or planned should be viewed as improving the current capacity in order to relieve existing delays and improve the network efficiency. Care is needed to ensure that extensive new developments will not over saturate the new or upgraded roads given the physical constraints i.e. limited land to create road capacity. In my view, there is a large emphasis by submitters on the additional capacity that has been created or will be created such as the new fourth leg on the Hawthorne Drive/SH6 roundabout for the "Hansen Road - Ladies Miles" (also known locally as Quail Rise South) area and the further widening along the SH6. However, the effects that it will have on the surrounding transport network has

3 Submissions 455, 141, 828, 840, 312, 574, 238 and 127.

4 Sought by submissions 717, 847, 399, 533, 715 and 501.

5 Submissions 455, 698, 16, 125, 312, 501, 338, 238, 318, 533, 715, 389.

6 Submissions 399, 717, 751, 847, 391, 455, 698, 8 and 408.

---

somewhat been overlooked. While additional capacity could ease the traffic generated from new developments, the traffic issues downstream will still exist. In summary, there is potential to shift traffic issues from one area to another without resolving those issues.

## **Group 1A**

### ***Skyline Enterprises (574)***

11. I am concerned that the level of development permissible within Skyline Enterprise's new Commercial Tourism and Recreation Sub-Zone (**CTRSZ**) in the Bob's Peak area would enable significantly more traffic generation than the notified Rural zoning. Critically, there are no matters of control or discretion for traffic generation for the commercial activities, and the evidence provided does not provide me with comfort that the Council will have appropriate control over transportation matters, ie. ensuring the transport infrastructure is safe and efficient, for the area.

## **Geographic overlap in Groups 1A and 1B**

### ***McBride Street: C & S Hansen (840) and Brett Giddens (828)***

12. C & S Hansen and Brett Giddens request that four lots on McBride Street be rezoned from notified LDR to Local Shopping Centre (**LSC**) zone. I am opposed to this rezoning, based on the existing traffic volumes and parking demands along the residential street that often reduce to one lane of traffic as they are not able to simultaneously pass each other. I am concerned with the increased intensification of the land sought, and the evidence provided does not in my opinion give comfort that LSC is appropriate for the subject area.

### ***Ladies Mile<sup>7</sup>***

13. The northern side of the State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Tucker Beach Road is notified Rural and Medium Density Residential (**MDR**). There were numerous submissions for this area, generally for intensification of the land to enable commercial activities such as Business Mixed Use Zone (**BMUZ**). My

<sup>7</sup> Andrew Carr for Universal Developments (177), Peter and Margaret Arnott (399), Hansen Family Partnership (751), FII Holdings Limited (847) and the Jandel Trust (717)

---

concern is the size of land sought for rezoning and its associated traffic effects that would be generated from enabled developments for BMUZ. In my evidence in chief I recommended a reduced BMUZ of a maximum of 10 ha to address these concerns (or a residential zone of an equal or lesser density would also address my concerns). I have also taken into account NZ Transport Agency's evidence on the wider site, and agree that a residential zoning across the wider 'Ladies Mile' area from Hansen Road to Ferry Hill Drive, would be more appropriate in terms of the traffic movements that would be generated compared to that of a commercial area.

14. I consider that the Hansen Road intersection with SH6 is unsafe for right turn movements out of the site, particularly with the Joe O'Connell Drive at the intersection. I agree with the NZ Transport Agency's view that the land to the north of SH6 should be restricted to residential activities as it would provide for better traffic outcomes with less traffic generated. I am concerned about pedestrians crossing the State Highway at a posted speed limit of 80km/h. The developments on either side of the State Highway would generate pedestrian trips and they should not be discouraged either.

### **Group 1B**

#### ***Middleton Family Trust (338) / Oasis in the Basin Foundation (FS1289)***

15. In my evidence in chief I opposed this submission based on the significant number of lots that it could yield at 1,156 low density residential lots and 30 rural residential lots. I noted that there was no evidence or technical analysis provided with the submission to support that the new access on the Hawthorne Drive/SH6 roundabout can accommodate this as well as consideration for other developments in the area.
16. Through submitter evidence, the total relief sought has been reduced to a total of 1,150 lots. Although the revised lot numbers would generate less traffic, the difference is marginal, being 3% less than the estimated traffic in my evidence in chief. Mr Bartlett's evidence for the submitter agrees that there was minimal information related to traffic effects with regards to the proposed rezoning. Further, he recommends that a transport assessment be undertaken to determine the traffic effects of the development.

- 
17. Oasis in the Basin Foundation opposes the Middleton Family Trust submission. Mr Carr on behalf of Oasis in the Basin Foundation supports the rejection of the rezoning sought, however, suggests that the use of Tucker Beach Road access for the site instead of using a new leg on the SH6/Hawthorne Drive roundabout.
  18. According to Mr Carr the formation of a new leg on the roundabout will be met with topographical challenges and considers that there would be sufficient capacity once NZ Transport Agency upgrades the Tucker Beach Road intersection with SH6.
  19. I continue to oppose the rezoning based on the lack of evidence that has been provided for the traffic effects, In addition I do not agree with Mr Carr's suggestion of having only one access route to the site.

### **Group 1C**

#### ***Body Corporate 22362 (389)***

20. Sean and Jane McLeod (391) seek that 54.1094 ha of land be rezoned from LDR to MDR. The areas of the land sought include Fernhill and Sunshine Bay, which I do not oppose. The submission extends along Frankton Road and includes Panorama Terrace, Larchwood Heights, Andrews Park, Goldfields, Battery Hill Marina Heights and everything in between. I do not oppose the Frankton Road areas in my evidence in chief. My opinion was based on both areas being relatively close to Queenstown town centre with excellent opportunities for walking and cycling as well as existing public transport facilities available.
21. In my evidence in chief I opposed Body Corporate 22362 submission because of the concerns on the impacts on the Goldfield Heights intersection with the State Highway. I realised that I gave contradicting evidence with submissions 389 and 391 as they are in the same area. In my error I thought that submission 389 referred to the Goldfield Heights area on the upper slopes, therefore I based it on a reliance on private vehicle use rather than using alternative transport. Consequently I now no longer oppose the submission.

---

***P J and G H Hensman and Southern Lakes Holdings Limited (543)***

22. P J and G H Hensman and Southern Lakes Holdings Limited has sought a rezoning in the Queenstown area from LDR to High Density Residential (**HDR**).
23. I oppose the submission because in my view the location is not appropriate for a HDR zone because the site is over 1km away from the Queenstown Town Centre, and I am concerned about the heavy reliance on private vehicles that the maximum enabled 481 HDR lots would have on the transport network. I am not certain that the steep topography and distance from the town centre would encourage walking instead of driving.
24. In my rebuttal evidence I reconsidered whether MDR would be appropriate. I do not oppose a rezoning to MDR from a transport perspective because the neighbouring sites are zoned MDR and the lower intensification, when compared to HDR, will place a lesser demand on parking.

***Ngāi Tahu Tourism Limited (716)***

25. In the original submission Ngai Tahu Tourism Limited sought for 11.3225 ha of land located at Arthurs Point be rezoned from Rural to Rural Visitor zone. In my evidence in chief I oppose the rezoning based on the scale of the development and its associated traffic effects on the existing transport infrastructure.
26. In Mr Farrell's planning evidence on behalf of Ngāi Tahu Tourism, he requested that I consider the proposal with no residential development on site as it is not intended to develop residential units in the future. In the Rural Visitor Zone residential development is a permitted activity, so unless the submitter offers up specific rules to prevent that type of development, additional development would be possible.

***Larchmont Developments Limited (527)***

27. Larchmont Developments requested that 5.8957 ha of land be rezoned from Rural to LDR in the Arthurs Point area via Atley Road. I opposed the submission based on the traffic effects from the a potential yield of 89 residential lots enabled in the rezoning.
28. In addition, I have concerns with Atley Road providing access to the site, which would require an upgrade including widening and extending of the road to serve

---

the subject site. However, there would be a short extent of road that would not meet the minimum road width requirements of 15m, rather it could be widened to 9.5m. I have raised concerns in my rebuttal evidence with this pinch point with regards to safety due to limited sight visibility and the reduced pedestrian/cyclist provisions.

29. I have considered Dr Marion Read's evidence, where she has calculated a reduction in the rezoning to either 8 lots at 800m<sup>2</sup> per lot or 22 lots at 300m<sup>2</sup> per lot. In my view the reduced size of the rezoning would reduce the risks and the consequence would be the same. However, I would not oppose the submission with the upgrade of Atley Road if the number of LDR lots were reduced to 22.<sup>8</sup>

### **Group 1D**

#### **Jardine Family Trust and Remarkables Station Limited (715)**

30. Submission 715 seeks increased development within the Homestead Bay area of the Jacks Point Zone. There is insufficient supporting evidence to determine the suitability of providing new additional accesses. In addition, there was uncertainty with the existing traffic modelling relied on, such that the traffic effects from the proposed rezoning were uncertain. In my view, robust evidence is required to ensure that the traffic effects internally (within the zone) and externally (on SH6 and further) will not be adverse. I am not comfortable with the rezoning sought because there is not enough information about the traffic effects.

<sup>8</sup> I note that in my rebuttal evidence I state 20 lots. This is a typographical error and it should read 22. I've used the correct figure in this summary.