

**Before Independent Hearing Commissioners
In Queenstown**

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act)

In the matter of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (Proposed Plan)

and Hearing Stream 14: Chapter 24: Wakatipu Basin and transferred Stage 1 submissions related to Arrowtown and Lake Hayes

and The New Zealand Transport Agency
Submitter 2538

Rebuttal Evidence of Anthony (Tony) Stuart MacColl for the New Zealand Transport Agency

Dated 27 June 2018

KensingtonSwan 

89 The Terrace
PO Box 10246
Wellington 6143

P +64 4 472 7877
F +64 4 472 2291
DX SP26517

Solicitor: N McIndoe/Adam T K G Tapsell
E Nicky.Mcindoe@kensingtonswan.com/Adam.Tapsell@kensingtonswan.com

1 Qualifications and Experience

- 1.1 My full name is Anthony Stuart MacColl. I am a Principal Planning Advisor with the Dunedin Regional Office of the New Zealand Transport Agency ('**Transport Agency**'). I have been employed by the Transport Agency, and its predecessor Transit New Zealand, since 2007.
- 1.2 My qualifications and experience are set out in my Statement of Evidence ('**Primary Evidence**') in support of the Transport Agency, dated 13 June 2018.
- 1.3 I repeat the confirmation provided in my Primary Evidence that I have read, and (where my evidence is as a planning expert) agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses 2014. I also confirm that, where this evidence gives the position or view of the Transport Agency, I have the authority to do so.

2 Scope of Evidence

- 2.1 In this evidence I address points that have been made by witnesses in this hearings stream, which specifically relate to:
- a the Transport Agency's submission and further submission for Stage 2 of the Proposed Plan; and
 - b the opinions expressed in my Primary Evidence.
- 2.2 I have read the Statements of Evidence of:
- a Daniel Thorne (for submitter #838)¹; and
 - b Karl Geddes (for submitters #2489 and #229)².
- 2.3 I wish to respond to the following issues which have been raised by these witnesses:
- a whether re-zoning land in the vicinity of Ladies Mile will assist with planning and funding future transport infrastructure upgrades; and
 - b whether the Commissioners should assume that investment to address transport capacity issues will occur in the short to medium term. Related to

¹ Planning Evidence of Daniel Ian Thorne on behalf of David Boyd (Submitter #838), dated 13 June 2018

² Statement of Evidence of Nicholas Karl Geddes on behalf of Ladies Mile Consortium (#2489) and Felzar Properties Limited (#229), dated 13 June 2018.

this is whether the Housing Infrastructure Fund ('HIF') will provide a source of funding for transport upgrades.

3 Re-zoning land for future transport upgrades

- 3.1 Mr Geddes has asserted that, if submission #2489 is granted and the relevant land is re-zoned, this would provide certainty to any business case that is being prepared to ensure transport upgrades to the Shotover River Bridge.³ This statement seems to be based on the premise that if the re-zoning and development of land east of the Shotover Bridge is allowed, the process of planning for transport infrastructure is clearer.
- 3.2 Rezoning land on the Ladies Mile will not add certainty to any business case analysis regarding upgrades to the Shotover River Bridge. The business case approach is a robust, principles based approach for developing business cases for investment through the National Land Transport Programme ('NLTP'). It ensures the progressive development of a robust evidence-based investment case. The primary objective being to enable smart investment decisions for public value.
- 3.3 In my view, it is inappropriate to re-zone land on the assumption that infrastructure upgrades will occur on the basis of increased demand. This approach does not recognise that the transport network is a physical resource to be sustainably managed under the Act. If the transport network is constantly required to react to developments as a result of ad hoc re-zoning and development, then it is difficult to see how any authority can plan for its sustainable management, and its efficient and safe operation.
- 3.4 If the land is re-zoned ahead of comprehensive planning for the area, this will restrict the Council's ability to facilitate transport solutions for multiple land parcels. Even the insertion of a policy which directs the consideration of transport effects at the time of subdivision consent will not prevent an ad hoc approach, and will not enable integrated planning. Furthermore, re-zoning the land to allow for subdivision to smaller land parcels will potentially lead to an increase in the number of accesses which would affect the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Whilst the Transport Agency can control the location and standard of access to the State highway under the Government Roading Powers Act 1989 ('GRPA'), it cannot refuse an access to the State highway if there is no reasonably practicable legal alternative access (s91 GRPA).

³ Statement of Evidence of Nicholas Karl Geddes, paragraph 5.15.

4 The Transport Agency's plans for the transport network in the Wakatipu Basin

- 4.1 Mr Thorne has said that some form of investment from the Transport Agency will be necessary to resolve the capacity constraints that have been identified for the Shotover Bridge.⁴ His view is that this investment is likely to occur in the short to medium term, and may be supported by funding as part of a detailed business case to the Housing Infrastructure Fund ('HIF').⁵
- 4.2 As highlighted in my Primary Evidence⁶, the Regional Land Transport Plan ('RLTP') does not plan for an additional crossing over the Shotover River. If it was in the RLTP the project would still need to go through a business case. If, after going through the business case, it was considered feasible, economically practical and aligned with the government's priorities for funding, it would still be many years before it could be built.
- 4.3 The principles of a business case approach are to ensure investments contribute to strategic outcomes, represent value for money, and deliver benefits for customers, i.e. projects need to be supported by a concise investment story. There is no certainty that a detailed business case would result in a new bridge or additional capacity being provided for. A detailed business case would look at the effects on the whole transport system. It is possible that providing additional capacity at the Shotover River would simply move the network constraints to the Frankton Flats. If this is the case then it would also be likely that such large expensive infrastructure would not be built because there would be too few benefits. The key point is that the costs and benefits of providing additional capacity will not be known until there is a detailed business case.
- 4.4 The Transport Agency does not have definite proposals for transport improvements for the Ladies Mile. However, the Transport Agency does have two placeholder activities in the Transport Agency's Investment Proposal for the Ladies Mile and wider area which are also in the RLTP. These are: 'SH6 Ladies Mile corridor improvements'; and 'SH6 Park and Ride facilities' which is outlined in Mr Gatenby's Primary Evidence (para 5.6). These activities are not in the NLTP. These activities are merely placeholders for funding to develop detailed business cases to investigate the form, function and viability of these activities.
- 4.5 Mr Thorne suggests that investment is likely to occur as part of the detailed business case to the HIF. The HIF is a government fund to assist high growth

⁴ Planning Evidence of Daniel Ian Thorne, paragraph 6.7.

⁵ Planning Evidence of Daniel Ian Thorne, paragraph 7.2(j) and (k).

⁶ Planning Evidence of Anthony MacColl, paragraph 7.1

councils to advance infrastructure projects important to increasing housing supply. A detailed business case is currently being developed. It is my understanding that the business case is looking at road networks and connections to SH6, but does not include providing additional capacity to the Shotover River Bridge. It is therefore incorrect to assume investment will occur via the HIF or any other source to resolve the capacity constraints in the immediate future.

5 Conclusion

- 5.1 It is incorrect to assume re-zoning land in the vicinity of the Ladies Mile will assist with planning and funding future transport infrastructure upgrades. It is also incorrect to assume that investment, outside that which is signalled in this evidence, to address transport capacity issues will occur in the short to medium term.
- 5.2 It is unlikely that the HIF will provide a source of funding to address the capacity issues of the Shotover River bridge. Even if funding were committed to this purpose, the planning and implementation of any project to adequately address capacity constraints would require many years and significant expense. Re-zoning land with infrastructure constraints does not contribute to the sustainable management of physical resources and I do not consider that it will contribute to a functional, efficient and safe transport network.

Anthony Stuart MacColl

27 June 2018