

Denis Mander for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 21 July 2017

Queenstown Mapping – Hearing Stream 13

1. My evidence for Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) in this hearing stream relates to traffic and transportation matters.
2. Many submissions have not provided adequate information on the traffic and transportation effects of the rezoning they propose. Given the consequent uncertainty over the potential effects I have generally opposed these submissions. These include the following:
 - (a) Gary Strange (168), Nick Clark (298);
 - (b) M&C Wilson (848);
 - (c) Kingston Lifestyle Family Trust (689);
 - (d) Tim Taylor (826);
 - (e) The Station at Waitiri (331);
 - (f) Te Anau Developments (607);
 - (g) Amrta Land Ltd (677); and
 - (h) Middleton Family Trust (393).
3. With respect to the submissions from Mount Christina Limited (764) and Amrta Land Ltd (677), I am concerned that granting of the rezoning requests will lead to demands for the upgrading of the roads serving the two areas.
4. In response to my evidence several submitters have provided additional information that lead me to change my position on the rezoning applications. The most significant of these is in respect to Queenstown Park Limited (**806**), Gibbston Valley Station (**827**) and Grant Hylton Hensman, Sharyn Hensman & Bruce Herbert Robertson, Scope Resources Ltd, Granty Hylton Hensman & Noel Thomas van Wichen, Trojan Holdings Ltd (**361**).

Gibbston Valley Station (827)

5. Mr Carr for Gibbston Valley Station has provided further traffic analysis, which has been helpful in explaining how traffic may access and egress the development. Mr Carr's evidence also indicates the existing high crash rate on the State Highway in the vicinity of the site; a factor that may impact on the design and use of available access points.

-
6. Being at a zoning stage, I appreciate that there will be some uncertainty as to the traffic generated by the eventual development and where access to the State Highway will be obtained. Although the State Highway alongside the submitter's land is a Limited Access Road, the Agency does not have control over the use of Resta Road at the eastern end of the land affected by the rezoning proposal.
 7. In this instance my concerns would be allayed by notification to the NZ Transport Agency of any consent application affecting the site, therefore giving it the opportunity to submit. In addition, I consider that the Council should have the ability to impose traffic and transportation conditions on any consents that are granted.

Queenstown Park Limited (806)

8. Mr Penny for QPL has provided considerable information on the management of traffic to/from the site.
9. My residual concerns relate to assumptions regarding use of public road for parking, and to impact of the development on Boyd Road and the connection with the State Highway.
10. With respect to parking, Mr Penny refers to parking for gondola patrons within the Frankton and Lake Hayes urban areas. The parking in Frankton urban area would, it appears, be provided on private land, while the parking at Lake Hayes Estate is to be provided in road reserve. It is not clear what arrangements are in place to permit the use of the land areas referred to for parking. I doubt that the use of road reserve for parking can be taken as a given, though that would be a decision for the Council.
11. With respect to roading, Mr Penny refers to a rule in the proposed Queenstown Park Station Zone provisions (Rule 44.5.2) that would provide that any residential or visitor accommodation within the Rural Visitor or Rural Residential areas prior to the upgrade of the Boyd Road / State Highway 6 intersection is non-complying. I support this approach, but consider that the NZ Transport Agency be empowered to submit on resource consent applications affecting the area sought to be rezoned, and that Council have the ability to impose traffic and transportation conditions on any consents that are granted.

Grant Hylton Hensman, Sharyn Hensman & Bruce Herbert Robertson, Scope Resources Ltd, Granty Hylton Hensman & Noel Thomas van Wichen, Trojan Holdings Ltd (361)

12. In respect of submission 361, I remain concerned that there is an underlying issue that the roading access to the state highway is not sufficient to meet projected traffic levels.
13. Proceeding with this rezoning could result in the District Plan creating a development potential that cannot be serviced by the State Highway. Paragraph 20a of Mr Bartlett's evidence refers to the possibility of reducing the built area within the zone as one way of addressing congestion on the development approach to the State Highway. However, his evidence does not indicate the extent of the reduction. It is implicit that there is a concern at the level of congestion on internal access to the state highway, but no analysis has been provided to quantify this.
14. Please be aware that paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 of my rebuttal evidence contradict each other, and that I confirm that I do remain opposed to this rezoning because of Mr Bartlett's outstanding concerns over congestion.