

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

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
IN THE MATTER of the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation in accordance
with section 80B and 80C, and Part 5 of Schedule 1 of the
Resource Management Act 1991.

**REPLY TO QUESTIONS ASKED OF COLIN ROBERT SHIELDS
24 November 2023**

PO Box 323 QUEENSTOWN 9348
Tel +64 3 379 7622
Fax +64 3 379 2467

WYNN WILLIAMS

Solicitors: L F de Latour | K H Woods
(lucy.delatour@wynnwilliams.co.nz |
kate.woods@wynnwilliams.co.nz)

Introduction

- 1 My full name is Colin Robert Shields. I am a Senior Principal Transport Planner at Tonkin + Taylor Limited (**T+T**). Prior to joining T+T, I was a Senior Engineer with Candor 3 Limited (**C3**).
- 2 I prepared a statement of evidence on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC** or **Council**) dated 29 September 2023 on the submissions and further submissions to the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation (**TPLM Variation**). I also provided rebuttal evidence dated 10 November 2023.

Response to Questions

- 3 My response to the questions filed by Glenpanel Developments and the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust are set out in **Attachment A** below.

Colin Robert Shields

24 November 2023

Attachment A: Response to Joint Questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
	Broad Topic: Traffic and Transportation	
13	<p>Please confirm your opinion, from a transport perspective:</p> <p>(a) what the density and total population within the TPLM area is that is "needed" to support the overall transport outcomes (including public transport alignment with the Queenstown Business Case PT network through and destined for the TPLM area); and</p> <p>(b) whether, if that density and/ or total population were exceeded, whether that would further support the overall transport outcomes, rather than undermine them.</p>	<p>a) As detailed in paragraph 55 of my Evidence In Rebuttal (EIR) I consider that at least 40-60 dwellings/Ha is required for effective mode shift. I do not address in my evidence what the 'needed' population is and I have not calculated this. However, as detailed in Section 6 of the TPLM Transport Strategy, from a transport perspective, 2,400 dwellings was one of the scenarios assessed within the Queenstown Strategic Transport Model. It should be noted that that the 2,400 units modelled was based on the TPLM Variation Streamlined Planning Process (SPP) application definition of medium density of 40-48 dwellings/Ha and of high density of 60-72 dwellings/Ha. As such, a higher public transport mode share was assumed in the assessment compared to a scenario if the 2,400 units comprised of a lower level of density and hence lower public transport mode share. Based on the findings from the strategic transport model, the option of 2,400 dwellings (at the assumed SPP application medium and high density</p>

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
		<p>definitions) was considered to be the maximum number which could be accommodated within the transport network.</p> <p>b) Should the density exceed the TPLM Variation densities this could support the transport outcomes by potentially increasing further the non-car mode share, but for any scenarios above 2,400 dwellings (as previously modelled and allowed for in the TPLM variations) this would need to be reassessed within the strategic transport model to assess the impact on the capacity of both the public transport and road networks.</p>
14	<p>When you said that “at least 40-60 d/ha is required for effective mode shift”, were you referring to gross or net, and, if net, what assumptions you were using in terms of land excluded?</p> <p>(This is for clarification as Mr Brown suggests at EIR [137] that you were using a gross figure.)</p>	<p>This is Gross as per the TPLM Variation definition included in residential density standard.</p>
15	<p>Mr Shields records that the 2,400 unit figure was used for modelling, as it was “an upper level of units which, at that time in the development of the TPLM Masterplan, was considered to be deliverable”. Bruce Harland</p>	<p>a) As detailed in Section 6 of the TPLM Transport Strategy, from a transport perspective, the 2,400 dwellings was one of the scenarios assessed within the Queenstown Strategic Transport Model (noting the comment in response to Q13a</p>

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
	<p>Harland now says there is “an overall agreed dwelling cap of 2,400 that can be supported by the transport modelling”.</p> <p>Please confirm your opinion as to:</p> <p>(a) whether you consider the 2,400 unit figure to be a “cap”;</p> <p>(b) what the consequences would be, from a traffic perspective, if the 2,400 unit figure if development:</p> <p>(i) falls well short of that figure (eg because the density sought to be required is not realised); and/</p> <p>(ii) exceeds that figure, particularly in light of the anticipated modal shift, signalised intersections, and reduced 60km/hour speed limit.</p>	<p>above regarding the density assumptions). Based on the findings from the transport model, this option of 2,400 dwellings was considered to be the maximum number (at the assumed density mix) which could be accommodated within the transport network. Should the density mix alter (either increased or decreased) then the 2,400 figure could change (subject to findings from any further modelling carried out) and, as such, I would consider the 2,400 is a “cap” only in so far as the assumptions made on the number of units and density within the strategic transport modelling.</p> <p>b) i) Should TPLM Variation densities not realise then, based on my evidence and that of other submitters evidence (eg Mr Parlane), I would consider that car use is likely to increase with a lower density of development since there would not be the critical mass of population required to support public transport. As a result, traffic congestion could increase. As discussed in response to 15a above this scenario would need to be reassessed in the strategic transport model.</p> <p>b) ii) Should densities in the Medium Density and High Density Precincts exceed those assumed in the strategic transport model (as detailed in response to Q 13a above) then I</p>

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
		consider public transport use could increase further. However, as discussed in response to 15a above this scenario would need to be reassessed in the strategic transport model .
17	<p>Waka Kotahi's expert (Dave Smith) is recommending signals be established at Lower Shotover/Stalker and Howards and the highway be subject to a reduced 60km/h speed limit. This will enhance the safety and convenience for cross-highway movement, and potentially reduce vehicle generation of movement between the northern and southern side of the Variation/TPLM area.</p> <p>Please confirm your opinion, on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) whether increased pedestrian (and cycle) movements between north and south sides of the TPLM is likely to occur; (b) if so, whether this is likely to beneficially affect (ie reduce) the external vehicle generation across the highway, and potentially also across the Shotover Bridge; and (c) if so, how could these crossing points be best optimised to increase the safety, convenience and perceived amenity for pedestrians (and cyclists). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) As detailed in paragraphs 15, 17, 19 of my EIR I confirm this. (b) As detailed in the TPLM Transport Strategy and my evidence, this will reduce external vehicle trip generation on SH6. (c) I consider that the pedestrian and cycle crossing points (as indicated in the TPLM Variation) are optimised in terms of providing direct and safe crossing locations to the proposed bus stops on SH6 and for providing links to/from the Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate communities.

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
18	<p>Please confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That no network or corridor modelling has been undertaken to quantify the change (improvement) in network capacity arising from the proposed signalisation and reduced 60km/h speed limit; b) Whether any such further assessment would be helpful, and if it can be undertaken; and c) With such an assessment, if undertaken, or without, your opinion on the extent to which the proposed signalisation and reduced 60km/h speed limit will increase capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Correct. b) I would suggest that the views are sought from Waka Kotahi and QLDC on the helpfulness of further network modelling and whether this modelling can be undertaken. My view is that since the existing transport model is a strategic model and cannot assess in detail the impact of specific interventions (such as providing a traffic signal intersection instead of roundabout), then use of the strategic transport model is unlikely to be helpful. I consider that this is the reason why Waka Kotahi requested that I carry out Sidra modelling of the traffic signal intersections. Likewise I am of the view that the Strategic transport model would not be able to accurately predict any changes in traffic flows with the speed limit reduced to 60 km/h. c) The improvement in capacity arising with the signalisation (compared to the with roundabout scenario) is demonstrated in paragraphs 11 to 21 of my EIR. By inference, since a speed limit of less than 80 km/h is required by Waka Kotahi for the introduction of traffic signals, then it can be assumed that the Sidra assessments for the traffic signal intersections includes for the effects of a speed limit reduction to 60 km/h.

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
19	<p>The planning experts agreed that it will be a RTS under NPS-UD. Do you agree that this therefore means that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) greater intensification is anticipated around Rapid Transit Stops (and that building setbacks would also need to be reduced); and (b) people can be anticipated to walk to such for up to at least 10 minutes (800m) and, potentially, 15 minutes (1,200m); (c) it is inappropriate to provide a slip lane in the 'Amenity Access Area', for local vehicle access (and associated private accessways / car parking) in the SH6 cross section; (d) in each case, if not, why not; and (e) even if <i>you</i> do not agree, that NZTA might have this expectation to enable the best use of the RTS and its Rapid Transit Stops on its State Highway? 	<p>Should SH6 be classified as a RTS, then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) I accept that this is a possibility. b) Should this be considered to be a RTS, it is still a bus based form of transport unlike a rail or light rail RTS in other cities such as Auckland and Wellington. As such, I consider that a walkable distance of 400 to 500m to a bus stop is still appropriate as defined in the TPLM Transport Strategy. However, 800m is accepted within MfE guidance documents on the implementation of the NPS UD¹ as the maximum typical 'walkable catchment area. I also note that QLDC² use 600-800m as a walkable catchment to bus stops, shops and services. Therefore, subject to the walkable catchment being over a relatively flat terrain, I agree that a walkable catchment of up to 800m could potentially be adopted should SH6 be defined as a RTS. I would not accept 1200m walk distance to a bus stop as a walkable catchment since this clearly exceeds NPS UD and QLDC guidance on walkable attachments.

¹ [Understanding and implementing intensification provisions for the NPS on urban development \(environment.govt.nz\)](https://environment.govt.nz/understanding-and-implementing-intensification-provisions-for-the-nps-on-urban-development/)

² [Joint Housing Action Plan | Let's Talk Queenstown Lakes District Council \(qldc.govt.nz\)](https://qldc.govt.nz/joint-housing-action-plan-lets-talk-queenstown-lakes-district-council/)

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
		<p>c) A 'slip lane' is not necessarily proposed within the TPLM cross sections, but in any event there are ongoing discussion amongst the Urban Design and Transport experts about cross sections and I would revert to the outcomes of these discussions.</p> <p>d) See above response to b and c.</p> <p>e) The views of Waka Kotahi should be sought on this, I cannot comment on behalf of Waka Kotahi.</p>
22	<p><u>If</u> the Panel were minded to include the extension area, what changes to the western end of the TPLM Variation would you recommend to best integrate the extension area from a traffic and transportation perspective.</p> <p>In particular, do you agree that the realignment of the collector road as tabled by AHFT would:</p> <p>(a) support the development of the town centre area? (b) help mitigate impacts on the SH; and (c) reinforce modal shift outcomes at the western end?</p>	<p>Recommendations could include:</p> <p>(i) TPLM Variation compliant medium to high density residential development within 800m of the proposed bus stops on SH6.</p> <p>(ii) No low density residential development (since this does not support public transport use).</p> <p>(iii) Implementation of Travel Behaviour Change and Travel Demand Management measures as proposed for the rest of TPLM.</p>

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
		<p>(iv) Provision of key community facilities within walkable catchment of the medium to high residential development.</p> <p>(v) Safe and direct active mode links from the extension area to the key community facilities within TPLM.</p> <p>(vi) Enhancement of safe and direct active mode links from the old Shotover River bridge to the Extension area and the rest of TPLM</p> <p>I have reviewed references to the realignment of the Collector Road in paragraph 47 and Appendix A of the evidence of Mr Bartlett and Mr McKenzie. This indicates that TPLM Collector Road A would be relocated to create a signalised intersection with Lower Shotover Road. As requested I comment as follows:</p> <p>(a) As detailed in paragraph 46 of my EIR, the extension area would be a long walk and cycle distance to the TPLM proposed 'town centre area' and the proposed realignment of the Collector Road does little to improve this issue.</p> <p>(b) There is no evidence provided in the evidence of Mr Bartlett and Mr McKenzie on how realignment of the internal Collector Road A will mitigate impacts on SH6 and therefore I do not agree with this comment.</p>

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
		(c) There is insufficient evidence provided to demonstrate that all residential developments will be within 800m of the proposed bus stops on SH6 and also, as identified in point a above, much of the extension area exceeds the walkable catchment of 800m. For these reasons I do not agree with this statement.
Glenpanel Traffic/ Transportation matters		
46	Do you consider, in light of the agreed changes to the SH corridor (signalised intersections, reduced 60km/hour speed limit, and it being a Rapid Transport System, with Rapid Transit Stops), that it may be appropriate to reconsider what is most appropriate in respect of the nature of the collector road including its cross sections, and function?	I do not consider that any change is required to the 'nature' and function of the Collector Road since it was designed within the masterplan based on the assumption that SH6 would be the bus corridor, that there would a 60 km/h speed limit in place on SH6 and that the SH6 Stalker Road and Howards Drive roundabouts would be signalised.
47	Did you take instructions in rejecting at [44] Mr Bartlett's evidence that 180 units could be developed and occupied, without additional transportation infrastructure being in place? In any event, do you agree that: (a) the Flints Park Fast Track proposal was declined for policy reasons, principally that the site remained rural lifestyle and outside the UGB, given that the TPLM Variation had not been notified;	I am not sure who I would have been receiving instructions from given my evidence is based on my own professional opinion. In any event, no instructions were considered required since it is apparent, based on the information provided, that there is no resource consent in place confirming that 180 residential units could be developed without additional transportation infrastructure.

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
	<p>(b) the evidence from Waka Kotahi NZTA was that 180 units could be developed and occupied; and</p> <p>(c) that you have no evidential basis to disregard what Waka Kotahi NZTA said at the time.</p>	<p>a) I cannot comment on the reasons for refusal, but it is quite clear there is no public transport arrangement agreed with ORC.</p> <p>b) Again I cannot comment on behalf of Waka Kotahi but Waka Kotahi indicated they had a number of concerns regarding the potential impact of the development and only indicated additional or revised conditions (including relating to provision of a SH6 underpass and use of the Homestead approved site access) "<i>should the Expert Consulting panel were of a mind to grant consent</i>".</p> <p>c) As detailed above Waka Kotahi indicated that they had a number of concerns regarding the potential impact of the development and only indicated additional or revised conditions (including relating to provision of a SH6 underpass and use of the Homestead approved site access) "<i>should the Expert Consulting panel were of a mind to grant consent</i>".</p>