SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF ANTHONY STUART MACCOLL FOR THE NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY

- This statement provides a summary of my evidence in chief¹ and my rebuttal evidence.²
- The Transport Agency generally supports the Proposed Plan, and its management of effects on the functionality, efficiency and safety of the transport network. The Transport Agency's primary concern for this hearing is in relation to those submissions seeking more intensive development of land near Ladies Mile (SH6).
- As noted in my evidence in chief, there is only one provision where I have a different view to that of the Council planning officer.³ I consider that potential cumulative traffic generation effects should be considered at the time of subdivision, including where that subdivision is a restricted discretionary activity.
- The Transport Agency opposes the submissions seeking re-zoning changes because of the potentially adverse effects on the safety, efficiency and functionality of the adjacent State Highway and the surrounding transport network and in particular the Lower Shotover Bridge. More intensive development of these properties could mean that the infrastructure available is insufficient to meet the needs of the new population for this area. The Transport Agency's position is consistent with key planning documents, including the Regional Land Transport Plan, QLDC Growth Management Strategy (2007), and the Panel's findings in Hearing Streams 12 and 13, that there is no pressing need to extend the area of residential zoned land in Queenstown.
- In my rebuttal evidence⁴ I respond to issues raised by two witnesses, Daniel Thorne⁵ and Karl Geddes⁶. 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 my evidence, to address transport capacity issues will occur in the short to medium term. It is unlikely that the Housing Infrastructure Fund 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

10 July 2018

¹ Statement of Evidence of Anthony (Tony) Stuart MacColl for the New Zealand Transport Agency, dated 13 June 2018.

² Rebuttal Evidence of Anthony (Tony) Stuart MacColl for the New Zealand Transport Agency, dated 27 June 2018.

³ Statement of Evidence of Anthony (Tony) Stuart MacColl for the New Zealand Transport Agency, dated 13 June 2018, paragraphs 3.3 and 5.12-5.13. The Transport Agency seeks the addition of a new rule to Rule 27.7.6.2 as drafted in its submission.

⁴ Rebuttal Evidence of Anthony (Tony) Stuart MacColl for the New Zealand Transport Agency, dated 27 June 2018, sections 3 and 4.

⁵ Planning Evidence of Daniel Ian Thome on behalf of David Boyd (Submitter #838), dated 13 June 2018

⁶ Statement of Evidence of Nicholas Karl Geddes on behalf of Ladies Mile Consortium (#2489) and Felzar Properties Limited (#229), dated 13 June 2018.