

**IN THE MATTER**

of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**

of a submissions and  
further submissions  
lodged by **WINTER  
MILES AIRSTREAM  
LIMITED** (Submitter  
94) in relation to the **TE  
PUTAHI LADIES MILE  
PROPOSED  
VARIATION** to the  
**QUEENSTOWN LAKES  
DISTRICT PLAN**

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF LEO DONALD HILLS ON BEHALF OF  
WINTER MILES AIRSTREAM LIMITED**

1. My full name is Leo Donald Hills. I am a Director at Commute Transportation Consultants.
  2. I prepared a statement of evidence dated 20 October 2023 in which I agreed to comply with the Expert Witness Code of Conduct. The purpose of this document is to provide a brief summary as directed by the Panel.
  3. I have listened to the hearing recordings in relation to evidence presented by Mr Shields (Council's Traffic Engineer), including the Commissioners' questions and Mr Shield's answers.
  4. My evidence was very confined to a review of the transport infrastructure triggers of the proposal, in particular:
    - (a) To express my opinion that transport infrastructure needs only to be supplied on a sub-area basis; and
    - (b) Whether a pedestrian underpass is required in Sub-Area E.
- 1.2 In this regard, I supported the LMV provisions to stage development to integrate with transport infrastructure, provided that Rule 49.5.33 was clarified, and the wording / terminology amended.
  - 1.3 In particular, my evidence was that the wording of Rule 49.5.33

should be clarified to make clear 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.

- 1.4 I generally consider that 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).
- 1.5 Both changes (minor wording addition to 49.5.33 "*for the Sub-Area*" and removal of objective 49.2.6.4b) have now been fully incorporated into the Appendix A provisions attached to Mr Jeff Brown's rebuttal evidence and the Hearings Version of the provisions. Thus, I am now satisfied that if the Panel accepts the wording of these provisions per that evidence, the LMV provisions are appropriate as far as Winter Miles Airstream is concerned.

**Leo Hills**

6<sup>th</sup> December 2023