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1 Executive Summary

The fact that Rocks Road is an important asset to the community has been reinforced through the engagement process. There is a keen interest in any development or changes proposed along this route, which was confirmed by the high attendance levels at the two open days and stakeholder meetings, and the participation rate of two questionnaires. The questionnaire issued by Nelson City Council and the New Zealand Transport Agency attracted 726 responses, and a short survey carried out by the New Zealand Automobile Association obtained 658 responses.

The community sees Rocks Road as a major resource to Nelson, and they wish to enhance this area, however there are varying views from individuals and organisations on how to achieve this. The questionnaire results reflected the differing views of the community, with an almost even split (of those who stated a preferred concept) between Concept 1 and Concept 2.

The two concepts put forward for public engagement were purposefully different. Concept 1 improved the existing on-road cycle paths, and widened the footpath (keeping cyclists and pedestrians separate). Concept 2 removed the on-road cycle paths to create a 4m wide shared path (with cyclists and pedestrians sharing the space).

Analysis of the questionnaire comments indicated that the main reason respondents chose Concept 1 was because of their concerns over conflict between user groups on a shared path, predominantly between faster / commuter cyclists and small children and walkers. Other common reasons for choosing Concept 1 included the lower cost, the retention of most of the parking, and the fact that it was good for commuter cyclists.

The main reasons for choosing Concept 2 were the increase in safety (mainly in relation to cyclists), and the fact that the cyclists were separated from the vehicular traffic. Other common reasons included the increased number of people who would use an off-road shared path, and feedback that it would improve the existing layout and make the area more attractive (visually and also more attractive to recreational users and tourists).

29% of respondents did not choose a preferred concept, with over half of these people stating that they would prefer an alternative state highway route (most referring to the Southern Link), or wanting to wait until the Southern Link was built before any changes were made to Rocks Road. Many comments reflected the view that traffic volumes would be greatly reduced if the Southern Link was built, and the removal of the trucks to an alternative route would make Rocks Road a more pleasant route to cycle and walk. A third of those who did not choose a preferred concept referred to a concern over loss of parking, and a fifth had concerns regarding the cost of the concepts.

Similar themes were shown through analysis of the general comments made by recipients in regards to Concept 1, Concept 2 and Concept 3. The most prevalent remarks about Concept 1 and Concept 2 were related to the Southern Link, the need to separate cyclists from the traffic, concerns around conflict within Concept 3 was released for public disclosure purposes only. The high cost of this concept meant it was not deemed viable.
shared paths, and concerns regarding the loss of parking. Concept 3 comments also included the high cost of each concept.

When the stakeholder feedback was collated, comparable issues were raised. Feedback found that many stakeholders and many of those who attended the open days, viewed the volume of traffic (in particular heavy vehicles) to be a big problem which would be ‘solved’ by the construction of an alternative state highway route. Many people also thought that the money proposed to be spent on the walking and cycling project should be redirected to the Southern Link project.

The loss of parking was highlighted by The Waterfront Association, and adjoining residents and businesses due to the associated reduction of amenity and decreased safety for those entering, exiting or visiting the properties at the northern (Wakefield Quay) end of the route. Loss of parking was also a concern to recreational users at the southern (Tahunanui) end of the route, but to a lesser extent.

In terms of the statutory organisations engaged with as part of this project, the Department of Conservation’s concerns predominantly relate to potential impacts on coastal and marine habitats, and Heritage New Zealand would like to see the preservation of the chain and stanchion fence and the seawall where practicable. Local iwi were very supportive of this project, and would like to see this coastal area enhanced provided that their sacred sites were protected and an opportunity was offered to tell their story to balance the existing colonial history portrayed along this route.

Generally (and separated from the Southern Link project), the feedback collated over the engagement period shows that the community would be supportive of a walking and cycling facility that meets the project aims of increasing the number of users, increasing safety, and making the area more attractive, provided that the main issues (predominantly the perceived conflict between faster cyclists and other users on a shared path, and the loss of parking), were addressed.
2 Introduction

Nelson City Council (Council) and the New Zealand Transport Agency (the Agency) have undertaken a joint investigation study to improve the current cycling and pedestrian facilities along the road between Tahunanui Beach and Wakefield Quay. A preliminary report was produced, and using the initial findings and narrowing down the ‘long list’ of options from the study, Council and the Agency sought to obtain the community’s views before the project progresses any further. Two concepts were put forward for public feedback, with a third concept detailed for public disclosure only:

- Concept 1 proposed wider on-road cycle lanes, and a wider 2.4m footpath for pedestrians with an estimated cost between $9 and $13m.
- Concept 2 proposed a 4m wide off-road shared cycling / walking path with a cost estimate of between $11 and $15m.
- Concept 3 proposed a 3m wide two-way cycle lane with a separate 2.4m wide footpath, both on the seaward side of Rocks Road. This concept was presented for public disclosure purposes only, as it was decided that the far higher cost ($34-47m) was not viable.

Council and the Agency compiled an Engagement Plan (Appendix G) to outline the proposed methods of communicating with, and gathering feedback from statutory organisations, iwi, stakeholders and the community. This document (Engagement Summary) outlines how the methodology in the Engagement Plan was carried out throughout the public engagement period.

3 Engagement Objectives

Engagement Objectives from the Engagement Plan were:

- To communicate details of proposed concepts to the community
- To gain information that will help with the development and refinement of the project
- To receive public feedback on the concepts
- To engage with iwi on the project
- To engage with key stakeholders and potentially affected parties
- To seek early identification of potential mitigation measures that may alleviate stakeholder concerns
- To comply with Local Government Act requirements (Section 82) for consultation
- To maintain good relations with stakeholders and directly affected parties
- To achieve a high level of public engagement
- At the end of the investigation and reporting phase, to advise those consulted of the Council and the Transport Agency’s response, and any future investment decisions.
4 Methods of Communication

4.1 General

The four week engagement period commenced on Thursday 24 July, with comments closing Monday 25 August 2014.

The engagement related to the investigation phase of this project. This phase was not about if the project should proceed or not, but about the community’s preferences for the concepts being considered. The decision about the project proceeding or not is determined through the process of the Regional Land Transport Plan and the Long Term Plan by the Council and the Agency at the end of the investigation phase. If a preferred option is to be proceeded with it would then be considered further.

The Scope of Service brief talked about special attention being paid to owners and occupiers where the level of service for existing accesses may reduce and where on-street parking may reduce or disappear. All adjacent residents and businesses received a letter with information about the project, and details of the concepts put forward for public engagement. Representatives from the Waterfront Association were invited to attend a meeting during the first week of public engagement. Another meeting was held for the residents. At these meetings, and at the two open days, representatives from Council, the Agency and Opus were available to answer any individual questions.

As recommended in the Engagement Plan, where practicable, all face to face interactions involved at least one Council representative and a representative from the Transport Agency. At least one representative from Opus attended all meetings and Open Days. Exceptions were the second Road Safety Groups / Port Nelson meeting where Council and Opus representatives attended, and the meeting with the Boat Shed Café proprietors where only an Agency representative attended. A list of meetings held and notes from these meetings are in Appendix D.

Engagement was focussed around Concepts 1 and 2, with Concept 3 being presented only for public disclosure purposes i.e. to show the public that more concepts were considered, but not carried forward for engagement because of the prohibitive cost.

In all documentation, meetings and open days, it was made clear that we are at the very beginning of this project, and the engagement was on ‘concepts’ i.e. retaining on-road cycle lanes with a widened footpath versus a shared path concept. Should the project progress to the detailed design phase, any issues raised during the engagement period would be mitigated as far as practicable.

4.2 ‘Live Nelson’

‘Live Nelson’ was available for articles on the project. There was an initial article on 8th February explaining that an investigation study was underway and to let the public know that a public feedback period was expected to commence in the next few months. A four page lift out feature was included in the Live Nelson publication issued on 24th July detailing the concepts with a questionnaire attached and details of how to seek further information.
4.3 **Media releases**

A media release was issued on the 12th June following discussions at the Works and Infrastructure Committee meeting about the two concepts proposed to put out to the public to hear what the community thinks works best to improve Rocks Road.

Another media release was issued on 18th July after Council approved the Engagement Plan for community feedback. A summary of the two concepts was included. Nick Smith, MP for Nelson, released his own media statement in relation to this project on 18th August. Copies of these media releases can be found in Appendix C.

4.4 **Brochure**

A copy of the Live Nelson document was produced as a four paged A4 brochure (inclusive of the questionnaire) and was available at the Council display/reception area, and the three library display areas (Elma Turner, Nellie Nightingale and Stoke Library). Copies were also distributed to all adjacent businesses and residences (with a cover letter), and were available at the open days and stakeholder meetings. This document can be found in Appendix C.

4.5 **Information for Stakeholders**

All stakeholders were written to via email or letter on 24th July. The correspondence contained:

- An overview of the project (with reference to the investigation report)
- A link to the Rocks Road Walking and Cycling Project website (see details under 4.10 to follow)
- Encouragement to place feedback
- Explanation of what happens next in the process, including decision making
- Direction to where they can get further information / ask any questions
- Dates and times of open days
- For the key stakeholder groups, an invitation to meet.

Recipients of correspondence are listed under the Engagement Register (Appendix A). Specific stakeholder feedback is documented in Section 5 below, and recorded in the minutes of meetings in Appendix D. More general public feedback (e.g. from Twitter and Facebook pages, individual letters and emails) has been collated and included in the Engagement Register and /or input into the online survey monkey questionnaire.

4.6 **Meetings**

An initial hui with iwi was held in December 2013 in order to gather information regarding features of significance of interest to iwi. A second hui was held on Wednesday 30th July.

An on-site meeting with **Heritage New Zealand** was held in March 2014. Alison Dangerfield from Heritage NZ clarified the statutory requirements that would apply and the values associated with the stanchions and chains and with parts of the seawall.
There were a number of meetings held with key stakeholders. For some meetings, the project team grouped similar interest groups together as follows:

**Bicycle / Walking / Disability Groups** meeting was held on Monday 28th July at 4pm. Representatives from Accessibility for All, Bicycle Nelson Bays, Nelson Cycle Trails Trust, Nelsust, Positive Aging Forum and Get Moving were invited to attend.

**Road Safety Groups** meeting was held on Wednesday 30th July at 2pm. Representatives from ACC, AA, Road Safe Nelson Bays, Road Transport Associated (RTA), SBL Group, Bus and Coach Association, NZ Fire, NZ Police and St John Ambulance were invited. A representative from ACC declined the meeting invitation and preferred not to provide feedback on the concepts as any effects on their organisation were difficult to assess at this conceptual stage. Only Alan Kneale (AA) was present, so due to the limited attendance, another meeting was held on Monday 11th August at 1pm. Representatives from Port Nelson also attended as well as the Police and the RTA.

**Waterfront Association / Tahunanui Business Association / Nelson Motel Association** meeting was held on Wednesday 30th July at 5pm.

**The Boathouse Society** meeting was held on Wednesday 6th August at 1pm.

**Rocks Road / Wakefield Quay residents** meeting was held on Wednesday 13th August. The Waterfront Association sent out 143 invitations to residents to attend this meeting.

Daniel and Bronwyn Monopoli (who run the Boat Shed Café) attended the Open Day on Sunday 3rd August and were able to talk to the Project Team about each of the concepts. Andrew James (NZ Transport Agency) met with the Monopolis on Thursday 21st August to discuss potential implications on the business, and to obtain their feedback. The owner of the building, who lives abroad, was written to, however no response has been received to date.

Minutes from all of the above meeting are attached as Appendix D.

Contact was made with the **Nelson Yacht Club** via telephone and email.

### 4.7 Displays, Public Information Sites

Information was displayed in the Council window as well as the Elma Turner Library (Nelson), Nellie Nightingale Library (Tahunanui) and Stoke Library. These public display sites also had hard copies of the ‘Live Nelson’ brochure available to take away.

The Waterfront Association attached a mock-up of the proposed raised fence plinth, stanchions and chains to the existing fence outside the Boathouse building along Wakefield Quay.

It was originally proposed to install information boards with the concepts along Rocks Road. This was not proceeded with due to the cost and because levels of knowledge and engagement around the proposals were already high.
4.8 Open Days

Two Open Days were held. These were held at the Boathouse, Wakefield Quay on Sunday 3rd August from 1-4.30pm, and on Wednesday 6th August from 6-8pm. A slideshow (see Appendix E) was presented by Rhys Palmer from Council at regular intervals, and Council, NZ Transport Agency and Opus staff were available to answer questions and explain the concepts further.

4.9 Responses to Specific Individuals and Enquiries

Questions were directed to the generic ‘Rocks Road’ email address for a response as appropriate. All communication via this email address is logged in the ‘Engagement Register’ under Appendix A.

4.10 Web Page

The web page within the Nelson City Council website went ‘live’ on Thursday 24th July. The web page provided links to the following information:

- Introduction: Defining the project
- Executive Summary: Taken from the Preliminary Investigation Report
- The Preliminary Investigation Report
- The Concepts: Outlining the details of Concepts 1 and 2, and a summary of Concept 3
- Give us your views: With a link to an online (survey monkey) version of the same questionnaire that featured in the Live Nelson document.

The web page also covered all the information for Local Government Act requirements.

All documentation (e.g. brochure, public displays) encouraged the use of the website to submit comments. However, there were still a large number of ‘paper’ questionnaires returned (253) that were manually recorded in Survey Monkey so that all the feedback could be analysed as a whole.

There was also scope for the public to submit comments on the Council’s Facebook and Twitter pages. This information was recorded in the Communication Register in Appendix A, and where applicable, recorded in Survey Monkey.

4.11 Further Communication

At the end of the investigation and reporting phase, those consulted and those who provided feedback will be advised of the Council and the Transport Agency’s decision if, how and why the project will proceed. The general public will also be informed, and should the project progress to the detailed design phase, a further opportunity to provide feedback will be available through the Regional Land Transport Plan and Long Term Plan processes.
5  Engagement Feedback

5.1  General Public

Feedback from the general public via the open days and the questionnaire / comments was varied. However, in general, people were supportive of improving the walking and cycling facilities along this route, as long as all users were considered (including residents and businesses). Recurring comments included:

- Strong concern regarding loss of parking on landward side between Poynters Crescent and Richardson St, and the impact this may have on safety, and the amenity value of the adjacent businesses and residences
- Concern over the perceived conflict between users on shared paths, in particular between faster / commuter cyclists and walkers / children
- The Southern Link was often referred to as the answer to improving Rocks Road, and is viewed by some of the public as being closely associated with any changes planned for Rocks Road
- Removing the trucks and reducing the speed would make Rocks Road quieter, more pleasant and would improve safety. This was often, but not always, commented on alongside remarks about the Southern Link.

A summary of all of the issues raised from stakeholders and the general public is included as Appendix C.

5.2  Statutory Organisations / Iwi

5.2.1  Department of Conservation (DoC)

DoC’s primary interest is in relation to the potential impacts on coastal and marine habitats, particularly rock formations around Magazine Point (identified as a site of regional significance in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory). Impacts should be avoided, if possible, and any reclamation should be minimised as far as practicable with consideration given to coastal hazard risks, climate change and sea level rise over at least a 100 year timeframe.

5.2.2  Iwi

Iwi were the most enthusiastic of the stakeholders, and representatives at the hui thought that their whanau would favour the shared path concept as a way of getting more people enjoying the waterfront and making it more attractive in general. Particular consideration should be given to access to the water, and promoting marine health (e.g. any sea bed structures should have the potential to support mussels, small fish etc.). Iwi would appreciate the opportunity to ‘tell their story’ along this route. Iwi’s greatest concern was regarding the possible installation of a toilet at Basin Reserve (as part of a separate Council project). The Basin Reserve was an earlier occupied site and is considered waahi tapu (sacred).
5.2.3 Heritage NZ

Alison Dangerfield met with the project team on site in March 2014. At this meeting possible options were discussed where the heritage fence could be retained while meeting Building Act requirements for safety. The Building Act provides for allowances for heritage items. A possible solution was to raise the fence on a plinth to improve safety. Feedback was sought on the two concepts put forward for public engagement, but it was recommended by Heritage NZ staff to follow up with Alison Dangerfield when she returned from leave at the end of August. Further liaison is necessary throughout the project process.

5.3 Feedback from Stakeholders, Organisations and Potentially Affected Parties

Below is a summary of the feedback received from stakeholders, organisations and potentially affected parties (listed in alphabetical order). It is repeated below in a summary style to avoid being too lengthy. In order to get an overall picture of feedback, a table has been included in Appendix F summarising each submission in terms of preferred concept (if any), and what issues were of most concern.

5.3.1 Accessibility for All

Both concepts would see an improvement for the mobility impaired, so they support any widening of the existing path. Would like to see mobility parks along this route.

5.3.2 Barrier Free NZ

Received feedback letter from JM Cox representing this charitable trust (advocates of accessibility for all people). Sees the opportunity for a great recreational facility for tourists and locals, with associated health benefits, but people must feel safe. Prefers a separate commuter cycling facility, and pedestrians having right of way on a shared path. Legislation and enforcement is required to reduce shared path conflict, and ensure that pedestrians have the right of way. Accessibility for older / mobility impaired is important (NZ Standard 4121:2001), but a 2m shared path width should be sufficient (refers to the NZTA ‘Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide').

5.3.3 Bicycle Nelson Bays (BNB)

Very supportive of improving the Rocks Road facilities for walkers, cyclists and recreational users, making the ‘under-utilised’ waterfront more attractive for everyone (including investors). BNB believes we should use this opportunity to redefine a key part of our urban environment, and create an environment unique to Nelson.

See the provision of some form of off-road cycle facility as being very important, as it would greatly increase the number of cyclists by unleashing the latent or supressed demand. BNB see many benefits in providing an off-road facility (linking through Tahunanui), including reducing congestion, increasing patronage at the waterfront businesses.

The feedback throughout the engagement period showed scepticism around the predicted number of users, and the BNB believe that the numbers are grossly under-estimated for Concept 2, which could affect the benefit / cost ratios, and in turn, the viability of the project.
In regards to funding, BNB agrees that the regional ‘R’ funding should be spent on this project, and the proposed $100m ‘urban cycle ways fund’ could potentially be used to complete the off-road cycling link at either end of this project (i.e. through Tahunanui to the south, and linking up with the Maitai River to the north).

5.3.4 Boat Shed Café

Bronwyn Monopoli (joint proprietor) was passionate about the aesthetic damage a cantilever structure may do to the original curved wall when viewed along its length. Did not like the shared path idea, and was strongly opposed to removal of parking on the hill side as the café needs access to 351 Rocks Road for deliveries, rubbish, taxis etc. If the Boat Shed building is to be relocated, they would want a say over when this would happen, and would like to see it done quickly to reduce the disruption to the business (both customers and staff).

5.3.5 The Boathouse Society Management Committee

Although the Committee support the improvement of the waterfront environment, they would not support either option in its current form due to the lack of detail presented and the high degree of uncertainty surrounding the effects the proposed changes would have on users of the Boathouse.

Due to the heritage aspect of the Boat Shed building, the Committee would oppose its relocation further into the haven. They would also oppose the addition of a 530mm plinth to raise the fence (although raising of 150mm would be acceptable). They do support the proposed ‘solid debris catch fence’ at the base of the cliffs around Magazine Point.

Loss of parking is a major issue, as it is already highly utilised in this area. Any reduction in parking would negatively affect the Boathouse, and concern was raised around how the construction of the refuge would affect parking in the vicinity.

It was stated that the costs around the work on the seawall that would be required under both concepts has been greatly under-estimated, and strengthening of the existing wall is recommended. Concerns were also raised around the conflict between an expected increase in vehicle number and heavy freight, as well as increased numbers of walkers, cyclists and recreational users.

5.3.6 Dolejs Builders Ltd.

This business supported planning for the next 100-150 years rather than the next 10-20 years. They felt that property owners must be consulted, that parking should be retained and the trucks should be removed from Rocks Road. The idea of housing a maritime museum along the waterfront was supported, and they stated that the owners of 301 Wakefield Quay would not back the road being brought closer to their property.

5.3.7 Emergency Services

A representative from the NZ Police was not so concerned about ‘getting through’ in an emergency as their vehicles are small and manoeuvrable, so could negotiate any new layout of the road. There was some concern that the signalised crossing under Concept 2 would result in an increase in nose to tail accidents.
St Johns Ambulance stated that they would rely on the roading authorities and designers to come up with a safe configuration and they would adapt to the new layout, whatever it was. They saw the loss of parking as a concern to some (e.g. residents), but the Ambulances could always use the footpath to park on (with lights flashing) if they had to service a home without parking.

Fire NZ were most concerned about any reduction in agreed response time of seven minutes (from call to arrival at incident), so an adequate clearway needs to be provided within any new layout. Congestion is already an issue, especially in summer at peak times, so a reduction in road width or restrictions associated with refuges has to be considered. They provided details of their vehicle widths etc.

5.3.8 Gibbons Holdings Limited

Suggested that an option to retain the status quo should have been included in the public engagement documentation in order to compare the cost / benefit ratios of the two concepts with what we already have. They have a number of questions regarding information and data within the preliminary investigation report.

Does not believe any improvement of the walking and cycling facilities is warranted, as Rocks Road is currently adequate for walkers, and if cyclists do not want to cycle on the road, they can use the Bishopdale Railway Reserve. Opposes the loss of parking on the landward side, as it would be detrimental to the waterfront businesses and a large number of residents. Opposes the installation of a shared path, as cyclists should either cycle on the road or use the alternative shared path (Railway Reserve).

5.3.9 Harbourlight Bistro

Feedback letter states both concepts are inadequate for businesses and residents in the area, mainly due to loss of parking (for customers and service vehicles). Would like to see the trucks removed and the speed reduced.

5.3.10 National Council of Women of New Zealand (Inc.)

Supports the opportunity to increase safety for walkers, cyclists and recreational users, in particular, agreeing with the cliff protection measures proposed. The group sees relocating the Boat Shed building as reasonable in order to achieve the required width. Questions were raised around how the widening would affect the seawall (in terms of wave impact and erosion), and climate change implications on the proposed design.

The majority concluded that Concept 1 (with some changes) would best meet the current needs, with a small number of people preferring to ‘do nothing’ until the Southern Link is built. They do not support the mixing of faster commuter cyclists with walkers/children/recreational cyclists, and if the shared path concept is progressed, they recommend separation of walkers and cyclists to decrease conflict. They see loss of parking on the landward side an issue for the residents, and the loss of parking on the seaward side an issue for the mobility impaired and recreational users.

5.3.11 Nelson Heritage Advisory Group (NHAG)

Received feedback via email, plus a composite image of the seawall, a Heritage Inventory Report and an assessment of impacts on Heritage Values as part of the Nelson Arterial Traffic Study.
NHAG would like to see an Archaeology and Heritage and Landscape assessment of the whole of the Rocks Road area as well as a detailed assessment of what is proposed for the seawall, chain and stanchions and Magazine Point rock formation. The report should consider potential impacts and proposed remedial actions.

Artefacts that may be uncovered could include remnants of the old swimming baths and boat haul out area near the swimming baths. There may also be evidence of pre-European occupation and use e.g. the known archaeological site near the junction of Richardson St and Rocks Road.

NHAG would support widening of the seawall by a sensitively designed reinforced concrete cantilever or simply supported / separate timber or concrete structure, but would not support a new seawall being built in front of the existing seawall. Detailed design is critical. A Heritage Conservation Plan is urgently required for this wall.

NHAG see the existing location and function of the chain and stanchion fence to be vital to their landscape and heritage value. Retention of the existing chain droop, link size and diamond shaped inserts of the fence is very important, as is the preservation and repair of the stanchions. NHAG state that a plinth higher than 150mm would seriously detract from the appearance of the area.

NHAG support the involvement of iwi in reflecting their culture and history in association with the waterfront, however they do not support the relocation of the Boat Shed Café, or the installation of toilets at Basin Reserve, and are concerned about how access to the water will be incorporated into the widened seawall design.

5.3.12 Nelson Residents’ Association Incorporated

Feedback received stated that all seafront buildings (with the exception of the Yacht Club) up to and including the old Power House building need to be removed or demolished in order to get the most of the views from the waterfront, and to create a ‘marine boulevard’ environment. Supports the inclusion of an aquarium in a new structure. They see the existing parking facilities inadequate for business operations.

5.3.13 Nelson Tasman Cycle Trails Trust (NTCTT)

Opposes Concept 1, supports Concept 2 and would like to see links at both ends. Recommends installation of a ‘wander barrier’\(^2\) to ensure safety for shared path users. The Trust believes that only Concept 2 would achieve the three stated aims of the project.

5.3.14 Nelson Yacht Club

Very supportive of improving walking and cycling facilities. Concerned about any loss of space in the building (should the small area within the road reserve have to be removed) and the cost implications of any changes required to the building. The Yacht Club membership is increasing in number, so they are keen to retain as much space as possible.

\(^2\) A structure of some form that deters users from travelling outside the shared path zone. This could be a rumble strip, or a small fence etc.
5.3.15  Nelsust

Nelsust believes that Concept 1 is ‘fatally flawed’ due to the lack of separation between cyclists and traffic (which makes it unsafe); the wider road (inclusive of full cycle lanes) may encourage drivers to speed; and the 2.4m wide footpath may become a default shared path for those who aren’t confident using the on-road facilities.

Nelsust states that Concept 2 would work if the shared path width was reduced (but amenity area ‘platforms’ were incorporated, similar to the existing fishing platform); the landward parking is retained; additional seaward parking is provided (with potential for planting / seating areas / vendors within the space); and a ‘drift/wander barrier’ provided where there is no other buffer between users and the traffic. Feedback also included cyclists being safer on a shared path (with kerb separation) rather than an on-road cycle lane (with only a line of paint serving as separation from traffic), fast cyclists would remain on the road, the perception of conflict on shared paths, and the benefits of not demarcating separate areas for cyclists and walkers.

Specific feedback was given regarding the crossing points. Nelsust support the refuges, particularly near the Boathouse, and suggests additional refuges are installed at the Bisley Steps, and between the Boathouse and the Boat Shed Café. A shared path link to the north is supported, which would make the signalised crossing an interim measure.

In addition to the above, Nelsust believes that the preliminary investigation report greatly underestimated the predicted user numbers under Concept 2, and believes that the seawall widening costs are inaccurate. This would affect the total costs associated with each concept, as well as the Benefit Cost Ratios. The perception survey (results of which were included in the preliminary investigation report) was also stated as being ‘flawed’ as it only questioned people who currently use the walking and cycling facilities along Rocks Rd. A number of cost saving and funding ideas, calculations of how more parking can be retained, and suggested improvements to Concept 2 were also included in the submission. Nelsust provided notes and cross sections of ‘Rocks Road Esplanade - 2007’ from Grahame Anderson Architect.

5.3.16  New Zealand Automobile Association (AA)

At the stakeholder meeting, the AA representative supported improving the walking and cycling facilities, but had some concerns regarding reduced efficiencies as a result of the additional refuges and signalised crossing. The AA sent out a survey (to all their members with an email address), encouraging them to take part in the engagement process, and asking them to complete the AA’s own five question survey in order for the AA to gauge their member’s views on the concepts.

A total of 658 members responded to the survey. Of the members who responded to the question ‘which of the two options do you prefer?’ 1% didn’t know, 23% favoured Concept 1, 36% favoured Concept 2 and 40% preferred neither concept. When asked ‘why do you not like either concept? All but 9 of the 251 members responded with their reasons. Approximately 49% of the comments made reference (in various words) that the Southern Link or an alternative route needed to be built to enable the removal of heavy vehicles from Rocks Road.
5.3.17  New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects (NZILA) - Nelson / Marlborough Branch

Supports the enhancement of this area, but believes that because of the significant landscape and amenity values of the waterfront, a full landscape assessment is required. Views from the water need to be assessed in the design of any new structures to extend the path. They consider that the relevant authorities need to address the substantive issues affecting the landscape values (including the existing traffic activity), and unique environment to develop the waterfront as the region’s foremost urban coastline and natural / economic asset for the region. Specific feedback on the concepts include:

- Relocate Basin Reserve crossing (if sightlines are adequate) to better link the landward walkway and the fishing platform
- Include generous steps to the foreshore where site analysis indicate these should be located
- Identify how the pedestrian crossing points will be regulated
- Identify how the proposed seawall extension will affect the much enjoyed swimming steps adjacent to Days Track
- Recognise that although the road is a strongly lineal element, the pedestrian areas should include nodal concepts for pause and coastal access
- Consider rumble strips to further define the cycle ways
- The quality of the detailed design and design solutions decided on for each challenge along the route will be vital in the success of the project overall
- Do not support shared path with commuters and road cyclists as speeds are not compatible or safe in combination with walkers, pausing and crossing.

5.3.18  Port Nelson

Port Nelson representatives stated that they had no major concerns regarding the relocation of the Boat Shed Café (which is on land owned by Port Nelson), however they are yet to confirm whether it would interfere with the mooring circles. They affirmed that speed and efficiency of freight movements was a high priority for their business, and they would rely on the Road Transport Associations views on whether Concept 1 or 2, or neither, were acceptable.

5.3.19  Residents who submitted Individual Feedback

Adrian Olney from Russell McVeagh Lawyers (representing a group of residents). Letters (via email) were sent 1st Aug and 11th Aug.

- Safety: Had strong concerns regarding Concept 2, and engaged another consultant (BECA) to assess the proposal. Concerns over safety of shared paths in general, lack of on-road facilities for commuter cyclists, and lack of compliance with NZTA legal obligations or stated safety objectives of the project.
- BECA Report: Took into account Corridor Width and Operations, Road Safety (increased conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, and commuter cyclists and traffic, and decreased safety of those entering and exiting to properties), Parking. Summarise that further design should be undertaken for Concept 1, Concept 2 should be disregarded as it fails to meet the safety objective of the project; and Concept 3 is investigated further as providing segregated walking and cycling facilities will provide the safest environment for all users.
• Adversely affected residents: Particular concern regarding loss of parking from opposite the Boat Shed Cafe to Richardson St under Concept 2. Parking loss could mean some houses without alternative parking could not be inhabited by the mobility impaired (potential human rights issue), safety concerns around entering and exiting properties without sufficient manoeuvre space, no visitor parking, traffic lane closer to homes (with potential noise impact), and potential for the above to decrease property values by up to 30%.

• Process: States that due to the safety issues around Concept 2 (no safety audit has been done), this concept should not even be considered an option, the consultation process further compromised by the impression that NZTA funding would be lost unless a project was committed in the current funding round (Adrian believed this was incorrect).

• Summary: Concept 2 is non-viable because of the safety concerns and the opposition from residents (particularly the Waterfront Association who stated they would fight this to the greatest extent possible), and Concept 3 should be further investigated given that the National Party announced (during the engagement period) additional funding of $100m for urban cycleway development.

Tom Sturgess (383 Wakefield Quay): Supported an improvement of Nelson’ waterfront, but any changes must ensure a safe environment for all users and take a long-term view of the area. Believed the public engagement process was flawed as the concepts put forward were not ‘doable’ (from a cost/benefit point of view), did not comply with NZTA and NCC legal obligations and did not achieve the stated objectives of the project. He believes that the alternative arterial road should have been up for discussion, and believes the public were misinformed regarding the end date of funding from the NZTA, as other funding may be available (e.g. the proposed $100m urban cycle ways package).

Opposes Concept 2, and believes Concept 1 is viable if the parking was reinstated outside Wakefield Quay B&B and the footpaths were a minimum of 1.5m wide.

Kim Chapman-Taylor and Helen Austin (369 Wakefield Quay): Owners of this historic cottage have strong views on removal of parking as there is no other alternative for them and their elderly mother who lives with them. Concept 2 (with the loss of parking and relocation of traffic lanes closer to the houses) has negative effects on the heritage, aesthetic and monetary value of their cottage.

Haven Court Body Corp (5/331 Wakefield Quay): Does not believe either concept would be an improvement. Build Southern Link first so that trucks can be removed and speed limit decreased.

Tony Gowans: Supports the improvement of facilities, with safety as a priority, and believes that Concept 2 would attract more people to use the area. Also supports the Southern Link proposal going ahead in the longer term.

Other Residents: Many of the residents (at the Open Days, residents meeting, or via individual submission) shared the following opinions regarding Concept 2:

• Loss of parking a big issue for residents between Victoria Rd and Richardson St. Concerned that there would be nowhere for visitors or service vehicles to park, and also a reduction in manoeuvre space when exiting their properties (some have to reverse out onto the highway).
• Loss in amenity (loss of parking and in some cases, garages may not be able to be used safely, noise effects of traffic lanes moving closer to houses) may mean valuation decreases – would there be financial compensation?
• Increase in noise and vibration a concern should the vehicle lane move closer to the houses (also as a result of signalised crossing under Concept 2).
• Safety issues around nearness of vehicles to the shared path. A shoulder or buffer/barrier was suggested.
• Concern about loss of amenity at the swimming wall opposite Days Track. There was a desire to retain/improve access to water, retain the ‘sitting steps’, and keep the parking.
• One resident raised a question regarding his garage which is within road reserve.

5.3.20 Road Transport Association (RTA)

A representative of the RTA does not support anything that would decrease the efficiencies of movement of freight. Particular concern was around the signalised crossing (under Concept 2) as it would have negative impact in terms of money, time, and increased emissions. He said it takes a lot for a large truck to stop and start again. Promotes the construction of the Southern Link first.

5.3.21 Tahunanui Business Association

Supports an integrated cycle network, however no concept put forward is workable or safe while heavy traffic continues to use Rocks Road. The shared path is thought to exacerbate problems with pedestrians and cyclists crossing Tahunanui Drive. An integrated solution is required, inclusive of a link through to Tahunanui/Annesbrook/the beach/airport areas plus the construction of the Southern Link.

5.3.22 Tasman’s Great Taste Trail

Feedback suggested that any solution would be a compromise, due to the limited width of this route, but a shared path is essential to get more people walking and cycling this route. A physical barrier is recommended (wall/fence around 600-800mm high), separating the shared path from vehicles in order for less confident users to feel safe. Education, painted lanes and/or speed limits should be investigated along with appropriate pavement marking to encourage as much separation as possible between walkers and cyclists. The facility would need to meet the Grade 1 or 2 specifications under the NZCT Design Code in order to become part of the Great Taste Trail.

5.3.23 The Waterfront Association (TWA)

From the commencement of the public engagement process, TWA has been very interested in the concepts put forward, and has made their views known regarding their opposition to Concept 2, mainly in regards to safety and loss of parking between the Boathouse and Richardson St on the landward side.

Representatives from TWA attended a stakeholder meeting, both open days and organised a residents meeting with the Rocks Road Project Team. TWA also printed their own assessment of the concepts on two separate flyers that were distributed around Nelson.

Formal feedback was received outlining the terms of reference (how the project has altered since July 2013), the process and design issues (outlining the lack of accuracy in the concept cross sections and aerial...
views/overlays, and the preliminary investigation report), the concepts (pros and cons), the chain and stanchion fence, the costings and the TWA’s proposed solution.

TWA had concerns that the information given to the public was not accurately portrayed (e.g. drawings and costings), and as such, would not allow valuable feedback. They raised a number of issues regarding both concepts (included in Appendix C), and presented a proposal that would mitigate many of the larger issues. The proposal involved retaining all parking between the Harbourlight Bistro and Richardson St, provided a reduced width shared path (with markings to separate walkers and cyclists), a 1m shoulder between the shared path and the traffic lane, an on-road cycle lane on landward side, the removal of one link in the chain fence to lessen the chain ‘droop’, and a reduction in the height of the fence plinth to 320mm.

5.4 Questionnaire

Information on the Rocks Road Walking and Cycling project (with the questionnaire attached) were distributed to Nelson residents as part of ‘Live Nelson’ insert into the local newspaper – see Appendix B. Paper copies of the brochure (with questionnaire attached) were also available at the open days, and public displays in the Council reception area and the Nelson, Tahunanui and Stoke libraries. The internet based, Survey Monkey questionnaire was also linked to the Council’s Rocks Road webpage.

There was a high level of public interest in this project, and as a result, 726 questionnaires were completed (253 returned in a paper format and 473 completed via the online questionnaire). All paper questionnaires, as well a public feedback/comments via email, Twitter, Facebook and letters were manually entered into the survey monkey system in order to capture all the data.

The questionnaire sought to obtain public opinion regarding each concept in general, with four opportunities to insert comments (in relation to Concept 1, Concept 2, Concept 3 and why the respondent chose their preferred concept). A summary of comments is provided in Appendix F. Specific feedback was also sought in relation to the three aims of this project:

- Increase number of pedestrians and cyclists
- Improve safety
- Improve the attractiveness of the area.

The questionnaire included 20 questions (inclusive of the four open ended questions with comments fields detailed above), with the respondent choosing one of five answers which acted as a ‘sliding scale’ from one end of the spectrum to the other. Allowing for a five point sliding scale gives the respondent more scope, and leads to more ‘spread’ in the results (see example below).

Figure 1: Excerpt from Questionnaire Showing Sliding Scale from 1-5, with Three Options Labelled
Through the engagement process it has become clear that there are a number of passionate advocates of both Concept 1 and Concept 2. Feedback from a couple of stakeholders identified that the questionnaire was ‘open to abuse’ as there was no requirement to record the name of the submitter, therefore one person could place multiple responses. This is true in relation to the paper questionnaires, where we have relied on the honesty of the community. However, the internet based survey (via the Survey Monkey system) records the IP address of the computer that the online survey was completed on, therefore it would be quite clear if numerous responses were submitted from one person. All individual responses were checked for duplication, and (apart from the ‘incomplete’ surveys described below) only one ‘multiple entry’ case was found where six responses from the same computer, saying a similar thing, were submitted at a similar time. The multiple entries were not deleted as it was not on a large scale, was not believed to sway the results, and was possibly entered by different members of the same family using the same computer.

A number of respondents were found to have submitted ‘incomplete’ surveys online, often accidently submitting their responses at the end of the first of the three online pages, then going on to start again and fill in the entire questionnaire. In these situations (easily identifiable as shown ‘incomplete’ followed by another questionnaire from the same IP address, immediately after the first incomplete survey), the first ‘incomplete’ questionnaire was deleted so that the repeated responses did not taint the data. A total of 17 ‘incomplete’ responses were deleted from the survey results.

5.4.1 Preferred Concept

The majority of the respondents (71%) chose a preferred concept. The results shown in the graph below indicate an almost even split between the 255 respondents who preferred Concept 1 (49.42%) and the 261 respondents who preferred Concept 2 (50.58%).

Figure 2: Preferred Concept
It should be noted that 29% of respondents skipped this question, so did not provide a preferred concept. The next question asked why the respondent chose their preferred concept.

The comments provided by **those who chose Concept 1** as their preferred concept (242 respondents) are as follows:

- 41% had concerns around conflict between users of the shared path, in particular, faster / commuter cyclists versus walkers and young children. Some had a strong dislike for shared paths, others had more minor concerns
- 15% liked this concept because it cost less than Concept 2
- 13% liked that Concept 1 retained most of the parking / or had concerns about loss of parking in general (in regards to the residents and businesses at the Wakefield Quay end, and the recreational users at the Tahuna end)
- 12% said it was good for commuter cyclists
- 7% said it was best for the majority of users
- 7% wanted the Southern Link or an alternative highway built instead, or preferred to wait for the Southern Link to be built before altering Rocks Road
- 7% said neither option was the perfect solution but Concept 1 was better than Concept 2
- 5% were against the signalised crossing point under Concept 2

The comments provided by **those who chose Concept 2** as their preferred concept (244 respondents) are as follows:

- 28% said this concept would increase safety (mainly in relation to cyclists)
- 23% liked that the cyclists were separated from the traffic
- 13% said that it would increase the number of users
- 13% thought it would improve the existing layout / make the area more attractive / would be better for recreational users and tourists
- 7% thought that it was best for the majority of users
- 7% liked the idea of a shared path / promenade / boulevard

The comments provided by **those who did not chose a preferred concept** (137 respondents) are as follows:

- 53% wanted the Southern Link or an alternative highway built instead, or preferred to wait for the Southern Link to be built before altering Rocks Road
- 31% were concerned about the loss of parking (in regards to the residents and businesses at the Wakefield Quay end, and the recreational users at the Tahuna end)
- 26% said they wanted neither of the concepts
- 22% had concerns over the cost of the concepts
- 12% wanted nothing to be done
- 10% would like the trucks to be removed from Rocks Road
5.4.2 Projected increase in walking and cycling numbers

To address the first aim of the project (to increase the number of walkers and cyclists), and to try and capture the perceived ‘latent demand’, the questionnaire asked ‘do you use Rocks Road’. Results are shown in Figure 3).

**Figure 3: Existing Use of Rocks Road**

![Figure 3: Existing Use of Rocks Road](image)

Almost all (98%) of the respondents use Rocks Road as a driver of a vehicle, with high numbers also using Rocks Road as a pedestrian, a cyclist and a recreational user (all between 62% and 74%). When asked ‘would you use the area more if Concept 1 / 2 was developed?’ people responded as in Figure 4.

**Figure 4: Projected Increase in Users**

![Figure 4: Projected Increase in Users](image)

The results above show that the majority of respondents would not change their level of use if Concept 1 was developed.
For Concept 1:

- 87% of respondents would not change their use as a **driver of a vehicle**, with a total of 9% predicted to use it less
- 61% of respondents would not change their use as a **pedestrian**, with a total of 29% predicted to increase their use (18% between no change and would use it more, and 11% would use it more)
- 60% of respondents would not change their use as a **cyclist**, with a total of 27% predicting to increase their use (14% between no change and would use it more, and 13% would use it more)
- 64% of respondents would not change their use as a **recreational user**, with a total of 22% predicted to use it more (13% between no change and would use it more, and 9% would use it more).

If Concept 2 was developed, the results in relation to projected use were similar in regards to use by drivers of a vehicle, but more positive in general regarding increased use as a pedestrian, cyclist and recreational user. For Concept 2:

- 79% of respondents would not change their use as a **driver of a vehicle**, with 14% predicted to use it less
- A total of 49% predicted to increase their use as a **pedestrian** (16% between no change and would use it more, and 23% would use it more), with 41% of respondents not changing their use
- A total of 42% predicting to increase their use as a **cyclist** (11% between no change and would use it more, and 31% would use it more), with 36% of respondents not changing their use
- 45% of respondents would not change their use as a **recreational user**, with a total of 36% predicted to use it more (12% between no change and would use it more, and 24% would use it more).
5.4.3 Attractiveness

The word ‘attractive’ has many interpretations, so two questions were asked in order to capture the perceived improvement to the visual attractiveness of the area under each concept, and how each concept would affect the area’s attractiveness to tourists and recreational users.

Figure 5: Visual Attractiveness

The graphs above show that the majority of respondents thought there would be no change (37% ‘neutral’) to the visual attractiveness under Concept 1, with a lower number of respondents thinking there would be no change (20% ‘neutral’) to the visual attractiveness under Concept 2.

The results also indicate that a much higher proportion of respondents thought that Concept 2 would increase the visual attractiveness of the area (total of 51% answering on the ‘positive’ side of neutral, as opposed to 29% for Concept 1). A high percentage of respondents thought that both concepts would NOT improve the attractiveness of the area (29% answering ‘No’ under Concept 1, 24% for Concept 2), which reflects the polarising views of the respondents.
The graphs above show that the majority of respondents thought that Concept 1 would not improve the tourism and recreational opportunities (total of 45% on the ‘negative’ side), compared with Concept 2 (total of 32% on the ‘negative’ side).

The results also indicate that a much higher proportion of respondents thought that Concept 2 would improve tourism and recreational opportunities (total of 51% answering on the ‘positive’ side of neutral, as opposed to 33% for Concept 1).

5.4.4 Increase in safety

Median pedestrian refuge islands are proposed under both concepts as a way to increase the safety of people using this route. In order to address this aim of the project, the public were asked to rate the median refuge islands proposed at four locations under both concepts.

Figure 7: Median Refuge Islands
As can be seen from the graphs above, when asked to rate the proposed installation of four refuges at different locations along the route, the majority of the respondents answered positively (‘very good’ or in between ‘very good’ and ‘neutral’).

There were a total of 20 comments made, spread across all four comments fields. A few respondents commented that the refuges would make it safer for people to cross and would enable the Basin Reserve parking area to be better utilised. There was also some concern over the amount of widening that would be required to install the refuges, and the impact on traffic flow.

5.4.5 How well each concept caters for different users

The respondents were asked how well they thought each concept catered to different users of this route. The results are provided in the graph below.

Figure 8: Concept 1 – Catering for Different Users

The results from this question indicate that the majority of respondents regarded Concept 1 as catering well for pedestrians (64% ‘positive’) and commuter cyclists (54% ‘positive’), and not as well for car parking (38% ‘neutral’ and 39% ‘negative’) or recreational cyclists (47% ‘negative’). A number of respondents commented that less confident cyclists and children were unlikely to use this facility as there was no separation from the traffic.

There was a relatively balanced response to how well Concept 1 catered for other recreational users (35% ‘neutral’) and truck drivers (40% ‘neutral’).
Respondents were also asked to provide **general comments regarding Concept 1**. A breakdown of the comments (from 467 respondents) is below:

- 14% wanted the Southern Link or an alternative highway built instead, or preferred to wait for the Southern Link to be built before altering Rocks Road
- 11% said that cyclists needed to be separated from the traffic, or a barrier / buffer / rumble strip needed to be provided between cyclists and the traffic
- 10% had concerns around the conflict between walkers and cyclists on shared paths
- 10% wanted the trucks removed from Rocks Road
- 9% were against loss of parking
- 5% thought this concept was good for commuter cyclists

**Figure 9: Concept 2 – Catering for Different Users**
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Concept 2 was thought to cater quite well for pedestrians overall (54% positive), with most respondents choosing answers at either end of the sliding scale (32% ’Very well’ and 26% ’Not well’) which indicates strong views at both ends of the spectrum. When the comments were analysed, it was found that there were a number of people concerned about conflict with cyclists (particularly faster / commuter cyclists) on the shared path which could explain this disparity.
Of the respondents, 38% thought that car parking was ‘Not well’ catered for (less than Concept 1). General comments regarding Concept 2 mentioned issues around resident, business and recreational amenity and decreased safety as a result of loss of parking.

Commuter cyclists were not thought to be well catered for, with the majority of respondents choosing ‘not well’ (31%, less than Concept 1). Comments in the questionnaire explained that commuter cyclists were unlikely to use a shared path (particularly southbound which would require crossing over to the seaward side), and would continue to use the road to avoid conflict on the shared path. However, without on-road facilities, safety of commuter cyclists was shown to be a concern.

Recreational cyclists were thought to be catered for best of all (59% positive, better than for Concept 1), followed by other recreational users (48%). A number of comments stated that Concept 2 would encourage less confident cyclists, and family groups to use the facility as it was separated from the traffic so perceived to be safer.

The results indicate a mainly neutral response to Concept 2 catering for both car drivers (35% neutral) and truck drivers (36% neutral). However, a number of respondents commented about traffic flow being interrupted by the signalised crossing under Concept 2. Acceptability of traffic delays as a result of the signalised crossing was captured through asking this question individually (see Figure 12).

A breakdown of the general comments regarding Concept 2 (from 498 respondents) is below:

- 17% had concerns around conflict between users of a shared path. A further 4% were supportive of the shared path concept but recommended bike bells were compulsory / educating users on safe sharing practices
- 15% were against loss of parking
- 11% wanted the Southern Link or an alternative highway built instead, or preferred to wait for the Southern Link to be built before altering Rocks Road
- 10% said that on-road cycle lanes needed to be provided
- 7% wanted trucks removed from Rocks Road
- 5% thought it cost too much
5.4.6 Road Layout

The respondents were asked to take into account all users (i.e. drivers, pedestrians, cyclists of all varieties and other recreational users), and to choose how each concept affected the layout of this stretch of road overall.

Figure 10: Road Layout

More respondents said the layout improved under Concept 1 (42% positive) rather than making it worse (33% negative). Concept 2 produced the most polarising results, with 31% respondents stating that it would improve the layout (total of 46% positive responses), and 29% stating it would make the layout worse (total of 42% negative responses). After analysing the comments regarding the concepts, these results could be explained by many respondents liking the idea of a shared path, but others having concerns regarding loss of parking and the associated safety and amenity issues.

5.4.7 Signalised Crossing Point (Concept 2 only)

In order to extract public opinion around the proposed signalised crossing point under Concept 2, two questions were asked. The first asked the respondent to rate the signalised crossing in terms of improving attractiveness of this facility.
Opinion was split, with the highest proportion (28%) responding ‘Not good’, but almost half responding positively with either ‘Very good’ - 24% or ‘Between Very good and Neutral’ - 20%.

Analysis of the comments fields found that a small number of respondents did not like the idea of having to cross the road to reach the shared path (8% of respondents who placed comments under Concept 2, and 5% of respondents who placed comments when asked why they chose their preferred concept).

**Figure 12: Potential Traffic Delays as a result of the Signalised Crossing Point**

![Pie chart showing potential traffic delays](image)
When asked how acceptable the potential traffic delays were as a result of the signalised crossing point, the results were quite similar to the previous question regarding attractiveness of the signalised crossing. The majority of respondents (45%) providing a negative reply (31% ‘not acceptable’ and 14% between ‘not acceptable’ and ‘neutral’), with 37% of providing a positive reply.

Analysis of the comments fields in the survey found that there were concerns regarding the signalised crossing point proposed under Concept 2. 8% of the comments under Concept 2 referred to a dislike of the signalised crossing due to either the negative impact on traffic flow/congestion, or the impact on the adjacent residences (increased noise and the increased difficulty entering and exiting their property).

5.4.8 General Comments on Concept 3

Of the respondents, 533 provided general comments regarding Concept 3. A breakdown of the feedback received is provided below:

- 24% thought it cost too much
- 18% wanted to see the Southern Link built instead, or at least wait until the Southern Link is built before altering Rocks Road
- 16% supported this concept, with a further 10% supporting it if it cost less / funding was available
- 17% did not support this concept
- 5% wanted to see the trucks removed from Rocks Road
- 5% were against loss of parking

5.4.9 Summary of Questionnaire

The high level of public interest in this project led to a good number of the community participating in the questionnaire. A total of 2,121 comments were made, spread over the four text boxes within the questionnaire. Through analysing each individual comment, valuable information was gathered regarding the respondent’s views on each of the three concepts, and comments on the project in general.

Analysis of the comments indicated that the main reason respondents chose Concept 1 was because of their concerns over conflict between user groups on a shared path, predominantly between faster / commuter cyclists and small children and walkers. Other common reasons for choosing Concept 1 included the lower cost, the retention of most of the parking, and the fact that it was good for commuter cyclists.

The main reasons for choosing Concept 2 were the increase in safety (mainly in relation to cyclists), and the fact that the cyclists were separated from the vehicular traffic. Other common reasons included the increased number of people who would use an off-road shared path, and feedback that it would improve the existing layout and make the area more attractive (visually and also more attractive to recreational users and tourists).

29% of respondents did not choose a preferred concept, with over half of these people stating that they would prefer an alternative state highway route (most referring to the Southern Link), or wanting to wait until the Southern Link was built before any changes were made to Rocks Road. Many comments reflected the view that traffic volumes would be greatly reduced if the Southern Link was built, and the removal of the trucks to an alternative route would make Rocks Road a more pleasant route to cycle and walk. A third
of those who did not choose a preferred concept referred to a concern over loss of parking, and a fifth had concerns regarding the cost of the concepts.

Similar themes were shown through analysis of the general comments made by recipients in regards to Concept 1, Concept 2 and Concept 3. The most prevalent remarks about Concept 1 and Concept 2 were related to the Southern Link, the need to separate cyclists from the traffic, concerns around conflict within shared paths, and concerns regarding the loss of parking. Concept 3 comments also included the high cost of each concept.

The information gathered from the questionnaire suggests that the majority of the community would support a project to improve the walking, cycling and recreational facilities along Rocks Road, provided that the issues raised were addressed appropriately.
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