

Lay evidence of Lake Hayes and Shotover Country Community Association (prepared by Rob Burnell) in support of the submission by Lake Hayes and Shotover Country Community Association (Submitter 79)

Dated 27 October 2023

Questions and Queries Regarding Te Putahi Ladies Mile (TPLM) Masterplan Section 42A report

- Rob Burnell representing LHSCCA as a lay person.
- Apologies in advance if the questions are not appropriate for this part of the hearing.
- Where I refer to WE in my questions, this references LHSCCA

The questions are focused on:

- Transport and Modal Shift
- Housing Supply
- Schools

Transport and Modal Shift

[I'm not certain this is the right forum to bring these next few points forward, but I've noted them down as it helps me set the context in my own mind]

- We contend that this is still probably the most critical part of the plan.
- It has continually been the weakest part of the plan and continues to be.
- The submissions given on this matter and the illustrate that fact
- The presentation on transport solutions given at Shotover School in 2021 was woeful.
- There is an on-going concern as to traffic modelling and the impact on people's daily lives.

- For such a critical part of the of the plan, LHSCCA is very disappointed that it has only been considered a subtheme in Mr Brown's report and are surprised that whereas in other areas of his report his provides greater detail as to the issues presented, in the main, he simply defers to the evidence provided by My Pickard and Mr Shields.

Considering My Pickard's and Mr Shields Evidence

Q.

Both Mr Pickard and Mr Shield are heavily invested in the Masterplan. One is a council employee, the other has 'been involved since the beginning'.

For such a critical part of the plan:

1. Why was this request for evidence not outsourced as per many of the other witness statements, and,
2. Would there not have been value in getting an independent expert to provide evidence on the plan and enable some analysis that is not offered from a biased perspective?
3. Would council consider getting their traffic management plan peer reviewed?

• Q.

Can it be considered a true statement, based on the evidence presented by Mr Shields and Mr Pickard, that the basic tenor of the transport strategy is (and forgive my simplification but we must be able to understand the strategy in the clearest of terms)

1. Very limited or no car-parks allowed in the masterplan (as referenced in the Comprehensive Parking Management Plan) means no cars,
2. means no increased congestion,
3. means the modal shift will work.

Is this the expectation. YES or NO?

• We are querying Mr Pickard's evidence. I reference some of the statements made which cause concern for what is termed a Masterplan:

(Page 3 point 13)

"I would stress that the [transport] strategy's success is dependent on the wider programme being implemented".

(page 5, point 19)

Sylvan Street link is considered a critical part of the masterplan > "business case has not been provided for in this instance". (why not, what does this mean, when will it be?)

(page 5, point 21)

“The TPLM variation should provide a high level of transportation mode choice”.

(page 5, point 23)

“The potential positive effects of developing correctly”.

(page 6, point 25)

“It is acknowledged that ideally all transport infrastructure and services should be in place at the earliest opportunity but with the current affordability issues amongst transport partners this may not be possible” ! What does this mean?

Q.

While we accept the 42A report’s author supports Mr Pickard’s evidence, is council not concerned that the evidence and language provided by Mr Pickard regarding TPLM casts doubt on the success of the plan and can any of these points raised be reviewed and more certainty be offered?

Do we not need more certainty and confidence around all these points raised when transport is such a critical part of the jigsaw! This has been the weak link all the way through and creates concern.

- page 3, 13(b)

“Remedying...the traffic effects from the developed south side of the highway, by providing...social and community infrastructure, negating the need for external trips”

Q.

A large part of this is dependent on the school and it is acknowledged that causes a large part of the peak-hour traffic congestion. That said, the detail of the local infrastructure is yet to be proven aside from a larger supermarket, and we contend that there will still very much be a need for external trips for work and pleasure. This is based on current life-style patterns and society behaviour and so we contend (based on our experience of living in the region) that a large portion of residents in TPLM will seek to buy or already have cars already.

Will the plan consider a contingency for this and if not, based on our thinking that personal car use will persist, should the residents of LHSCCA be concerned that Lake Hayes and Shotover Country become a car-park for masterplan residents?

Housing Supply

- (page 69 referencing Ms Fairgray's report

"Dwelling demand could be met without the Variation and that exceeds long-term demand."

"No ability under the RMA for Council to make a landowner develop their land."

also;

- (page 98, 11.169))

Regarding the sub-theme Affordable Housing (which LHSCCA are supportive of) and the restrictions to building which are intended to be actioned within the TPLM

"The suite of provisions in the Variation that address affordability" i.e. restrictions (my word)

Q.

We contend that these points combined make the desired development less attractive to developers and therefore;

What exactly are the councils' considered implications if the land is banked for the next 20 years as per other sites in and around Queenstown and what flow-on impact does this have to the success of the Masterplan, the likelihood of new schools and transport initiatives therein which are reliant on urban intensification?

I'm keen on understanding risk as Mr Pickard evidence, as already delivered states that transport is dependent on the wider programme being implemented.

Schools

(page 95, 11.156)

"I do not know, at the time of preparing the 42A report if any further progress has been made between parties in the acquisition of land for future schools"

“I agree that the schools, particularly the secondary school, are one of the key facilities that underpin the Transport Strategy and the modal shift and that at least until there is confirmation that MoE has acquired land...there are no guarantees that the new schools will eventuate”

Q.

This remains a MAJOR concern for LHSCCA. A ‘strong indication is not definitive’

From a lay perspective, would best planning practice determine that until there is an absolute commitment from MoE as a secondary school is referenced as such as critical part of the jigsaw, the plan cannot be considered viable and therefore should only proceed once the MoE is committed?

AND/OR

Does council expect to hear more from MoE prior to the December hearing dates?

Other Points to Make

- General perspective:

Why is it that when hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent on the masterplan, that it is this late in the process that only as the Section 42A report is issued that clarity and answers to major concerns are forthcoming?

- Page 68, point 11.6.

“There is what could be called a social justice issue arising from existing residents... ‘seeking to close the door’ on new entrants to live in the District for lifestyle of other reasons.”

The LHSCCA finds this remark really unfortunate and would like to make it clear and placed on the record that this approach to our submission and feedback offered as part of this process is in no way connected to this idea.