

Before Queenstown Lakes District Council

In the matter of The Resource Management Act 1991

And The Queenstown Lakes District proposed District Plan –
Hearing Topic 13 – Queenstown Annotations and Rezoning
Requests (Rural Group 2)

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ANDY CARR FOR

Gibbston Valley Station Limited (#827)

Dated 28 August 2017

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Andrew (Andy) David Carr. My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence in Chief.
- 2 This Summary of Evidence sets out the key points within my Evidence in Chief. I have also read the rebuttal evidence of Mr Denis Mander on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council, and I have responded to his comments.
- 3 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. This summary of evidence has been prepared in accordance with it and I agree to comply with it. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

EXISTING / POTENTIAL FUTURE TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS AND VOLUMES

- 4 In my Evidence in Chief I set out that at present, Gibbston Valley Highway (State Highway 6) has traffic patterns that are commensurate with a highway which carries both 'commuter' type traffic as well as serving recreational and tourist-type activities. The highest traffic flow in any peak hour is 510 vehicles (two-way), and allowing for the prevailing 4.1% per annum ambient traffic growth, the highway will provide Level of Service D in ten years' time.
- 5 Over the past five years there have been nine crashes on the highway. The crash rate over the majority of the highway is commensurate with the national average for highways of this nature, but there have been three injury crashes at the entrance to the winery (one in 2014, one in 2015 and one in 2016), which is higher than I would expect, with the NZTA crash prediction equation suggesting that just one crash could be expected over five years. I anticipate that improved signage would assist in addressing this, potentially with some minor geometric improvements, since it appears that a contributing factor has been that drivers have failed to notice the access. In the event that the submitter's proposal is accepted, I expect that this will occur.

EXISTING AND CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT, AND PROPOSED REZONING

- 6 At present there is a variety of development at the Gibbston Valley Winery, which is already consented but not presently constructed. I discussed this in my Evidence in Chief (paragraphs 30 and 31), but the important aspect to note is that the receiving environment is not what is presently seen on-site but rather, is a more developed environment and thus a higher prevailing traffic generation.
- 7 In my Evidence in Chief, I assessed a scenario provided to me which allowed for a nominal number of residential units, visitor accommodation units, staff

accommodation, and other activities, including the already-consented vintners market.

- 8 Since that time, I understand that the development scenario has been confirmed within the District Plan provisions sought as a result of clarifying issues raised by the Council. In particular, the provisions now provide for a maximum of 120 residential units, 150 visitor accommodation units and 90 worker accommodation units as permitted activities. At greater levels of development, the activity status is at least Restricted Discretionary and requires an assessment of the traffic effects at that time.
- 9 Taking account of the confirmed amount of permitted development, I have recalculated the traffic generation and my assessment shows that the amount of traffic generated is 20% lower than in my earlier analyses in the morning peak hour and 13% lower in the evening peak hour (that is, 49 vehicle movements (two-way) in each peak hour).
- 10 Although this will have a consequential beneficial effect on the queue lengths and delays that I previously identified, in practice these changes will be small. This is because the reduction in traffic is in the order of one vehicle movement every 1.2 minutes. In my experience, changes of this magnitude do not significantly alter the performance of intersections unless the intersection is heavily congested, which is not the case here.
- 11 Importantly, in this location, State Highway 6 is a Limited Access Road which means that any vehicle crossing has to be licensed by the New Zealand Transport Agency ("NZTA") in respect of both the location of the crossing(s) and also the volume of traffic permitted to use them. This provides an assurance under wholly different legislation to the Resource Management Act that if the Agency considers that adverse traffic-related effects will arise from any development within the site, they are able to refuse a license to the proposed crossing point.

RESPONSE TO MR MANDER REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

- 12 Mr Mander highlights that my assessment is based on only one of a number of development scenarios. I agree, but as I noted above, my scenario includes a greater amount of development that can occur as a permitted activity under the proposed rule package. I therefore consider it is robust.
- 13 With regard to access points to the site, Mr Mander highlights that the Structure Plan shows only one whereas I referred to four within my Evidence in Chief. Having reviewed the Structure Plan, I confirm that four points of access onto the highway are shown, and I understand that these are all approved by NZTA.

- 14 Finally, Mr Mander highlights concerns that the development could make use of Resta Road (a Local Road) as a way of avoiding triggering the requirements of the Limited Access Road provisions. He notes that his concerns would be allayed if any consent application affecting the site was required to be notified to NZTA.
- 15 As I noted above, any change to the location or volume of traffic using State Highway 6 will require NZTA to be notified due to the Limited Access Road status, but the zone provisions also set out that NZTA is to be notified if amendments are made to any access points shown on the Structure Plan. Given that NZTA has not submitted on the Gibbston Valley Station submission, I anticipate that these provisions are acceptable to the Transport Agency.
- 16 Accordingly, I remain able to support the rezoning of the site.