

Before the Queenstown Lakes District
Council

In the matter of The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

And The Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan Stage 3
Stream 17 (General Industrial Zone)

Summary statement of evidence of Andy Carr for Upper Clutha Transport Limited #3256

7 August 2020

Introduction

- 1 My full name is Andrew ("Andy") David Carr. My experience and qualifications remain as set out in my primary statement of evidence.
- 2 This Summary Statement of Evidence sets out the key issues addressed within my primary statement, and also sets out the outcomes of discussions held with the Council's consultant traffic engineer, Mr Rossiter.

Summary of Primary Statement of Evidence

- 3 Mr Mike Smith, who was then the consultant traffic engineer to the Council, made four points within his evidence of 18 March 2020, and in my primary evidence I respond to each of these.
- 4 With regard to the road safety effects arising from the construction of a new access onto Church Road, I calculate that this would give rise to 0.09 new injury crashes per year (that is, 1 new injury crash every 10.5 years). I do not consider this figure to be particularly high, and in practice it is likely to be lower as the access will be designed to meet current standards.
- 5 My assessment of the State Highway 6 / State Highway 8A intersection shows that the increase in traffic arising from development of the site will lead to higher levels of delay. However the resultant Level of Service D on the worst-case movement is not unreasonable for an intersection in the peak hour, and queues remain low at just 2 vehicles. I also evaluated the likely road safety implications of the increased traffic flows at this intersection and found that the rate would change from 1 injury crash every 8.8 years, to 1 injury crash every 8.7 years. I do not consider that this change in crash rate is significant.
- 6 In respect of the formation of Church Road, I identified that the only difference between the formation that Church Road should already have and the formation that is required with the rezoning of the submission site, is a wider shoulder (changing from a 1.0m shoulder of which 0.5m is sealed, to a 1.5m shoulder of which 1.0m is sealed).

Discussions with Mr Rossiter

- 7 I discussed transportation matters relating to the Submitter's site with Mr Rossiter on 7 August 2020.
- 8 Mr Rossiter advised that provided the extent of development within the site was no more than 25,000sqm GFA, then he was comfortable that the traffic generated through the rezoning could be satisfactorily accommodated on the road network in respect of roading efficiency and road safety. However he was concerned to ensure

that the means by which the scale of permitted development was limited to 25,000sqm GFA was robust.

- 9 I concur with Mr Rossiter that there needs to be a robust limit to the extent of permitted development, and for clarity, my assessments to date do not address scenarios where the amount of development is greater than 25,000sqm GFA.
- 10 Mr Rossiter highlighted that in his view there were a number of ways in which the amount of development could be limited, but overall, we both considered that this was a matter for resolution between the Council and Submitter's planning experts.

Summary

- 11 On the basis of my assessment, and subject to the limit of 25,000sqm GFA on permitted development, I remain of the view that there are no traffic and transportation reasons why the submission could not be approved, and the site rezoned.

Andy Carr

Dated this 7th day of August 2020