

BEFORE THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER

Plan Change 19 to the Operative
Central Otago District Plan

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JASON ALEXANDER BARTLETT ON
BEHALF OF**

**PISA VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT LIMITED & PISA MOORINGS
VINEYARD LIMITED (#146)**

TRANSPORT

16 May 2023

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2. INTRODUCTION	2
3. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE	3
4. PROPOSAL	4
5. TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT	4
6. SECTION 42A REPORT	5
7. SUBMISSIONS	6
8. CONCLUSION	6

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY¹

- 1.1** The site (828 Luggate-Cromwell Road) is located between the existing Pisa Moorings residential suburban township and the Luggate-Cromwell Road (SH6). The Submitter, Pisa Village Development Ltd & Pisa Moorings Vineyards Ltd (#146), request that the site is rezoned as a combination of Low Density Residential zoning (LRZ) and Medium Density Residential zoning (MRZ) which will include a local retail/convenience commercial zoning, referred to as Commercial Precinct.
- 1.2** It is understood that the requested zoning site may facilitate approximately 292 residential lots (dwellings) and associated local retail/convenience and community facilities to service the new residential area and the wider Pisa Moorings.
- 1.3** It is preferred that the proposed residential zoning is accessed from the local road network within the Pisa Moorings. I consider that the existing intersection of SH6 with Pisa Moorings Road currently operates well below its traffic capacity. Additionally, I consider that this existing intersection can also accommodate the additional traffic generated by the requested rezoning.
- 1.4** Waka Kotahi provided some high level preliminary feedback through their further submission. In this further submission they oppose the requested zoning stating that it hasn't been accounted for in infrastructure planning. This submission appears to be based on general support for the notified zoning rather than specifically addressing any traffic or transport elements of the requested rezoning.
- 1.5** It is my opinion that the existing state highway and local road network is adequate and is able to accommodate the traffic which may be generated by the requested rezoning.

¹ My executive summary can be also taken as the optional summary statement which may accompany briefs of evidence as directed in Minutes 1 and 3 by the Hearings Panel.

2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1** My full name is Jason Alexander Bartlett. I am a transport engineer and work for my own transport engineering consultancy Bartlett Consulting.
- 2.2** I hold a Bachelor of Engineering from the University of Canterbury awarded in 1996 and obtained the New Zealand Certificate in Engineering, Civil Option in 1993. I have been a Member of Engineering New Zealand since 1995 (MEngNZ).
- 2.3** I have over twenty-five years' experience in road design, network management, traffic and transportation engineering including nine years in the UK. During my time in the UK I became a Chartered Engineer (CEng) and a Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers (MICE).
- 2.4** Since April 2008 I have been working as a traffic and transportation engineer in Queenstown. The first four of those years were for GHD Limited. I now operate my own traffic and transport engineering consultancy, Bartlett Consulting, which I established in July 2012.
- 2.5** As a practicing traffic and transport consultant, I have been involved in a wide range of developments and resource consent applications within the Queenstown Lakes Region and other parts of New Zealand. This includes the preparation of expert evidence before Council hearings and the Environment Court.
- 2.6** I am familiar with the subject site, Section 7 SO485598, I have visited the site on several occasions during 2022 and 2023 whilst preparing my transport assessment and leading up to this hearing.
- 2.7** In preparing my evidence I refer to and rely on the following evidence:
- (a) Mr Craig Barr, planning;
 - (b) Ms Bridget Gilbert, landscape; and
 - (c) Mr Campbell Hills, subdivision and infrastructure.

Code of conduct

- 2.8** Whilst this is not an Environment Court hearing, I confirm I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on material

produced by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

Summary of relief sought relevant to this evidence

2.9 The site (828 Luggate-Cromwell Road) is located between the existing Pisa Moorings residential suburban township to the east and Luggate-Cromwell Road (SH6). It is proposed to rezone the site as a combination Low Density Residential zoning (**LRZ**) and Medium Density Residential zoning (**MRZ**) which will include a local retail/convenience commercial zoning, referred to as Commercial Precinct. The planning evidence of Mr Barr provides greater detail of site and the relief sought with updated structure and zone plans provided in the evidence of Mr Hills.

2.10 Based on the proposed zoning it is understood that the site may facilitate approximately 292 residential lots (dwellings) and associated local retail/convenience and community facilities to service this and the wider Pisa Moorings residential area.

3. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

3.1 I have prepared this evidence to address the following matters:

- (a) The transportation elements of the proposed rezoning;
- (b) Transport assessment;
- (c) Response to the CODC Section 42A Report and associated documents with respect to transport;
- (d) Response to further submissions with respect to transport; and
- (e) Conclusions.

3.2 In preparing this evidence, I have read and considered the following documents:

- (a) The Council's Section 42A Report Stage 2 on the PC 19 prepared by Ms White (S42A Stage 2 report)²; and
- (b) The submissions and further submissions of Waka Kotahi with respect to transport.

² Refer Section 42A Report – Report on Submissions and Further Submissions PART 2 (Zoning Requests), Paragraphs 239 to 258

4. PROPOSAL

- 4.1** The site is currently used for horticulture with a fruit packing facility established in the northern part of the site. These onsite activities are currently accessed from Luggate-Cromwell Road (SH6). It is possible to access the site via the Pisa Moorings local road network, via Stratford Drive and Pony Court.
- 4.2** It is proposed to extend the residential area of Pisa Mooring to include the site. The requested zoning includes both LRZ and MRZ portions with the inclusion of a commercial precinct. It is expected that the proposed zoning will enable the development of a further 292 residential dwellings at Pisa Moorings.
- 4.3** The proposed rezoning will be accessed via the existing local road network with access from SH6 via the Pisa Moorings Road intersection and utilising Stratford Drive and Pony Court. The existing accesses from SH6 would be closed.

5. TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

- 5.1** My transport assessment has been provided as part of the rezoning request (Submission #146, Document 4)³. I stand by my previous assessment. For the purpose of this evidence, the following is a summary of the important elements from the assessment.
- 5.2** All Traffic for Pisa Mooring will utilise the intersection of Luggate-Cromwell Road (SH6) with Pisa Mooring Road. SH6 is a state highway managed by Waka Kotahi (NZTA) and Pisa Moorings Road is a local road managed by CODC.
- 5.3** At the site SH6 has a traffic flow in the region of 3,480vpd⁴ which noticeably increases to the south of the intersection with Pisa Moorings Road, towards Cromwell. For my traffic assessment I have adopted a traffic growth rate of 4% per annum to assess a future, 2032, traffic flow for SH6 and to test the efficiency of the SH6 intersection with Pisa Moorings Road.

³ Refer Bartlett Consulting, Pisa Moorings, Luggate-Cromwell Road (SH6), Proposed Zone Change, Access Assessment dated 30 August 2022.

⁴ From Mobile Road (mobileroad.org) – 3480vpd with 8.459% heavy vehicles dated 24/12/2020.

- 5.4** Currently Pisa Mooring Road serves approximately 384 built homes at Pisa Moorings. Under the current residential zoning it is anticipated that this may increase to approximately 495 residential dwellings.
- 5.5** The intersection of SH6 with Pisa Moorings Road is formed as a cross intersection with Clark Road opposite. Within the existing intersection SH6 includes both a right turn bay and a left turn lane to Pisa Moorings Road.
- 5.6** Traffic surveys undertaken at this intersection (2021) suggests that the peak traffic flow is during the pm peak period. During this period the intersection operated at an overall intersection efficiency of 17% (17% of total capacity). It is possible that the existing zoning could result in a future (2032) intersection efficiency of 26%. Over this period there will be noticeable decline in the level of service (delay) on the side roads, Pisa Moorings Road and Clark Road opposite.
- 5.7** The proposed development will result in a further 292 residential dwellings using the intersection of SH6 with Pisa Moorings Road. This increased traffic will have a noticeable change in the future (2032) intersection efficiency, increasing to 43% during the pm peak period. Overall, the traffic demand from the requested rezoning can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing cross intersection.
- 5.8** The sensitivity test undertaken shows that the requested rezoning will have a similar effect on the operation of the SH6 intersection as a higher SH6 traffic growth rate, say 8.5% per annum.
- 5.9** Overall, I consider that the requested rezoning will have a noticeable effect on the current Pisa Moorings access intersection. There will be a noticeable increase in traffic flow and during the future (2032) pm peak period the intersection will operate at 43% of its capacity. I consider that the requested rezoning can be accommodated within the existing state highway infrastructure without the need for improvements.

6. SECTION 42A REPORT

- 6.1** The Section 42A Report does not raise any issues with respect to the transport related effects of the proposed rezoning. The report

acknowledges the findings of my assessment and does not consider that traffic effects are sufficient to reject the requested rezoning⁵.

- 6.2** The Section 42A Report notes that Waka Kotahi opposes the requested rezoning sought as it has not been accounted for in infrastructure planning. The recommendation being that that a future growth overlay be applied to the requested residential rezoning.

7. SUBMISSIONS

- 7.1** The further submission of Waka Kotahi (NZTA) (#178) opposes the requested rezoning. Their further submission states that the requested rezoning is unanticipated by the plan change and the effects that a multi-lot and mixed land use development that could have should the Council accept the submission have not been accounted for in infrastructure planning.
- 7.2** This submission appears to be based on the Council's infrastructure being able to service the proposed rezoning rather than specifically addressing traffic and transport elements of the requested rezoning.
- 7.3** In this respect it is my opinion that the current state highway and local road network is adequate and is able to accommodate the traffic which may be generated by the requested rezoning.
- 7.4** In this respect, I concur with the Section 42A Report⁶ that this is a matter which can be considered at the time of subdivision where conditions may imposed through consultation with Waka Kotahi.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1** Pisa Village Development Ltd & Pisa Moorings Vineyards Ltd proposed to rezone the site to low and medium density residential with allowance for local convenience commercial/retail activities.
- 8.2** The site is currently directly accessed from SH6 at two locations. Although it is feasible to form a new intersection from the northernmost crossing point it is preferred that the proposed residential zoning is accessed from the local road network within the Pisa Moorings. I consider that the existing intersection of SH6 with Pisa Moorings Road currently operates

⁵ Refer Section 42A Report – Report on Submissions and Further Submissions PART 2 (Zoning Requests), Paragraphs 246.

⁶ Refer Section 42A Report – Report on Submissions and Further Submissions PART 2 (Zoning Requests), Paragraphs 246.

well below its traffic capacity. Additionally, I consider that this existing intersection can also accommodate the additional traffic generated by the requested rezoning.

8.3 A sensitivity test undertaken shows that the requested rezoning will have similar effects on the intersection, as a state highway growth rate of 8.5% per annum. This is the observed averaged annual state highway traffic growth rate between 2014 and 2019.

8.4 It is my opinion that the existing state highway and local road network is adequate and is able to accommodate the traffic which may be generated by the requested rezoning.



Jason Bartlett
16 May 2023