

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARING PANEL APPOINTED BY THE
QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**")

AND

IN THE MATTER of the **TE PUTAHI LADIES MILE PROPOSED
VARIATION** to the **QUEENSTOWN LAKES
DISTRICT PLAN**

AND

IN THE MATTER of a submission by **WINTER MILES AIRSTREAM
LIMITED** pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the
Act

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF LEO HILLS ON BEHALF OF
WINTER MILES AIRSTREAM LIMITED**

TRAFFIC

20 OCTOBER 2023

1. INTRODUCTION

Background and experience

- 1.1 My full name is Leo Donald Hills. I am a Director at Commute Transportation Consultants.
- 1.2 I hold the degrees of Master of Civil Engineering (2000) and a Bachelor of Engineering with Honours (1996), both from the University of Auckland.
- 1.3 I have over 25 years' experience as a specialist traffic and transportation engineer. During this time, I have been engaged by both local authorities and private clients to advise on traffic and development issues covering safety, management and planning matters of many kinds.

Expert Witness Code of Conduct

- 1.4 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 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.

Scope of evidence

- 1.5 I have been asked by Winter Miles Airstream Limited ("WMAL") to consider the potential transportation implications of the Queenstown Lakes District Council ("QLDC") Variation 1, which would introduce a new Special Purposes Zone, Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone, to the Proposed District Plan in order to implement the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan adopted by Council on 30 June 2022 – the Ladies Mile Variation ("LMV"). Specifically, I have been asked to review the transport infrastructure triggers provided in Rule 49.5.33 of the LMV.
- 1.6 My evidence addresses the transport infrastructure triggers in Rule 49.5.33 of the LMV, specifically:
- (a) The extent of their application to the LMV area;
 - (b) Issues with the interpretation of these provisions and the reasons why the transport infrastructure triggers for the LMV should only apply to the relevant sub-areas with the LMV area; and

- (c) The appropriateness of the transport infrastructure triggers for LMV Sub-Area E (in which the WMAL property is located).

2. TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE TRIGGERS

2.1 The LMV contains provisions that provide for triggers that need to be met before development can occur / implementing the LMV zoning. The trigger points relating to transportation infrastructure that must be first implemented before the zoning can be implemented are set out in Rule 49.5.33 – staging development to integrate with transport infrastructure.

2.2 Rule 49.5.33 outlines that private development within the LMV sub-areas (i.e., excluding utilities and other physical infrastructure) shown on the Structure Plan cannot occur prior to all the corresponding transport infrastructure works listed in the rule being completed. Rule 49.5.33 states (emphasis added) that:

“Development (except for utilities and other physical infrastructure) within the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Sub-Areas shown on the Structure Plan shall not occur prior to all the corresponding transport infrastructural works listed below being completed.”

2.3 On a common sense reading of this rule, it can probably be assumed that the transport infrastructural works listed in the table under Rule 49.5.33 are required to be completed for the development of the corresponding sub-area only and that sub-area can be developed without the completion of other transport works listed under other sub-areas.

2.4 However, WMAL is concerned that the use of the term “all” in this rule can be interpreted as requiring the completion of all of the works listed for Sub- Areas A - G is required before any development in those sub areas can commence. WMAL’s site is in Sub-Area E.

2.5 I consider that the transport infrastructure measures, except for the ones for Sub-Area E listed in Rule 49.5.33, are unrelated to WMAL’s site, such that delaying development of WMAL’s site pending works identified in other sub-areas is completely unjustified for the following reasons:

- (a) The intersection upgrades listed provide safe and efficient links / access from SH6 to the various sub-areas. They are not wider network upgrades;

- (b) The upgrades include bus stop upgrades at various locations along SH6. These individually would only serve the local sub-areas (i.e., users of the bus stops at Sub-Area E are unlikely to use the other bus stop upgrades listed as it would be too far to walk to these other bus stops); and
- (c) The upgrades include various pedestrian crossings across SH6. Again, these provide local links from the sub-areas across SH6 and individually only serve the local sub-areas.

2.6 Given the unrelated nature of these works, the consequences of a literal interpretation of Rule 49.5.33, i.e., all triggers met before any development can occur would, in my opinion, significantly delay development for no appropriate reason.

2.7 I have briefly discussed this matter with Mr Shields¹, and he has confirmed that my assumption, that the transport infrastructural works listed in the table under Rule 49.5.33 are required to be completed for the development of the corresponding sub-area only, is correct.

2.8 Based on the above:

- (d) I recommend that Rule 49.5.33 is clarified and amended to avoid potential uncertainty; and
- (e) I have undertaken my assessment of the appropriateness of transport infrastructure triggers in the LMV on the basis that it only applies to Sub-Area E, where WMAL's land is located.

3. APPROPRIATENESS OF THE TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE TRIGGERS FOR LMV SUB-AREA E

3.1 As noted, I have reviewed the appropriateness of the transport triggers assuming only the ones listed under Sub-Area E apply to the site. In this regard there are three upgrades listed as follows:

- (a) Intersection on State Highway 6 at Howards Drive;
- (b) Bus stops on State Highway 6, west of Howards Drive intersection (one on each side of the State Highway 6); and

¹ Senior Principal Transport Planner at Tonkin + Taylor Limited (T+T). Mr Shields has provided evidence for the QLDC on the Transport Strategy for the LMV and the transport related provisions proposed in the LMV.

- (c) Pedestrian/ cycle crossing of State Highway 6 east of Howards Drive intersection at the location shown on the Structure Plan as Key Crossing (+/- 40m).

3.2 I have considered each of these upgrades below.

SH6 / Howards Drive upgrade

3.3 The SH6 / Howards Drive upgrade is an appropriate trigger as it would provide a safe and efficient link from Sub-Area E to SH6. Waka Kotahi are already planning this upgrade (roundabout) as part of the NZ Upgrade (NZUP) Queenstown Package (SH6 Ladies Mile corridor improvements).

SH6 bus stops

3.4 The Bus stops on SH6 are also required, in my opinion, to serve Sub-Area E and, in particular, to encourage mode change early in the development of the area. I note the actual bus stops are the only requirement in the precinct (rather than bus services) which I consider appropriate as any bus services cannot be controlled by any developer. I note that while the actual bus stops are not specifically included in the NZUP programme², bus lanes are included.

Pedestrian / cycle crossing

3.5 The third trigger is a pedestrian / cycle crossing of SH6 east of Howards Drive. I generally agree that some form of pedestrian crossing is required in this location to link Sub-Area E to the existing area to the south and to future Sub-Area J.

3.6 I note that the actual trigger table is not specific in regard to the form of the pedestrian crossing, however, Objective 49.2.6.4b states:

“49.2.6.4 Encourage the use of pedestrian and cycling modes by:

...

b. Preferring the provision of an underpass for the Key Crossing indicated on the Structure Plan”.

3.7 In this regard:

- (a) In my opinion, underpasses can create issues regarding safety (CPTED) of users, especially at night.

² <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/nz-upgrade-programme-queenstown-package/>

(b) I consider signalised at-grade crossings to be the optimal form of pedestrian crossing in these situations as these are more direct in terms of accessibility as well as providing better security for all users. I do however acknowledge that this needs to be balanced with the effect on traffic flow.

3.8 I therefore agree with the trigger table in that no specific pedestrian treatment is referenced. I do however consider that Objective 49.2.6.4b relating to the preference for an underpass should be removed.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 I support the LMV and the associated provisions to stage development to integrate with transport infrastructure, provided that Rule 49.5.33 is clarified and the wording / terminology is amended as per my evidence above.

4.2 In particular, the wording of Rule 49.5.33 should be clarified that the works listed are required to be completed for the development of the corresponding sub-area only and that sub-areas can be developed without the completion of other transport works listed under other sub-areas.

4.3 I generally consider the triggers in Sub Area E are appropriate, however, in my opinion Objective 49.2.6.4b relating to the preference for a pedestrian underpass should be removed (no changes to the trigger table).

Leo Hills

20 October 2023