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1. Introduction

This report documents the findings of Stage 1 consultation undertaken for the North Nelson to Brightwater Corridor Study for Transit New Zealand (Transit), Nelson City Council (NCC) and Tasman District Council (TDC).

The overarching objectives for consultation were:

1. Inform the key stakeholders and the wider community of the Corridor Study, the development of a combined Nelson Tasman Regional Land Transport Strategies and access options and alternatives to Port Nelson.
2. Provide opportunities for the key stakeholders and the wider community to participate in the process.
3. Obtain meaningful information in an efficient and timely manner, while meeting all legislative requirements.
4. Use the information to assist the Project Team to develop practical options and alternatives for further detailed analysis.
5. Provide effective feedback to key stakeholders and the wider community to show how inputs were considered.

The ‘start–up’ phase of Stage 1 consultation involved the development of a key list of stakeholders. Key stakeholders were identified in the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (section 15) with additional key stakeholders identified by Transit New Zealand. Individuals and organisations who submitted on transport and roading subjects under the Nelson and Tasman Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) process were also added to the mailing database.

Initial notification of the project along with the preparation and distribution of the North Nelson to Brightwater Corridor Study Preliminary Discussion Document to key stakeholders occurred in November 2004. The opportunity for wider community involvement was generated through a media release and public notices in local and regional newspapers informing the wider community of the Corridor Study and seeking their input.

Fifty-four Preliminary Discussion Documents were posted out to key stakeholders on 24 November 2004 with a closing date for written feedback by 17 December 2004. This was extended to 21 January 2005 to engage wider community consultation. The document was available from the main offices of the Nelson and Tasman Councils and the Transit website.

Sixty-three people and organisations sent in feedback on returned feedback forms, by telephone or email. Thirty-one key stakeholder meetings were held.
2. Issues

2.1 Broad Philosophical Issues

Ten significant issues were noted from the analysis of the feedback from 63 people and organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Main Issues</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integrated design</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Growth and congestion</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lane upgrades</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Southern link</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=</td>
<td>Land use planning</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strategic vision</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Access to Port</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Attitude and behaviour</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the feedback found that 33 submitters considered public transport was the main issue, followed by 26 contributions considering integrated design of roads and the corridor as an issue. Growth and the associated congestion with increased population and traffic was the third ranked issue.

Lane upgrades, in particular the widening of carriageways and creating more passing lanes and bays, was noted by 23 of the 63 people and organisations. It was mentioned that alternative forms of transport such as cycling and walking need to be considered early on when designing new or retrofitting any road network.

Two issues were ranked fifth equal. One was the southern link corridor, where there are two diverging schools of thoughts on this issue. Twenty people and organisations considered the southern link should be constructed as a road, thus their position was to see this existing corridor developed into an integrated road link (with cars, heavy vehicles, cyclist, walkers all catered for) to reduce traffic congestion along Waimea and Rocks Road. Conversely other people and organisations stated their position on using the southern link corridor as a public transport route. This is reflected in the public transport issue being ranked first by 33 people and organisations.

Fifth equal with the southern link was land use planning. Twenty people and organisations considered this a main issue. Land use planning impacted on the corridor study area in relation to growth and congestion. The pressure of current and future land use applications in North Nelson (Lud Valley), Wakefield Quay apartments (Nelson), south Richmond development and tourism growth along the frontage of SH60 (Appleby Highway) all contribute to this issue.

During stage 1 consultation there was no doubting that the corridor study area required some level of strategic transportation management. This is reflected by 18 of the 63 people and organisations commenting on the lack of a strategic vision for transportation and the fragmentation of transport documents and implementation of transportation solutions in the region.
Ranked as number eight, 16 people and organisations considered that access to Port Nelson is crucial to the local economy. There is a co-relation between that number and those that support the southern link as a main issue. The need to have an efficient access to the Port would be strengthened by the construction of the road along the southern link.

Attitude and behaviour is ranked ninth. The attitude of the general population to not use public transport is also related to the first ranked issue - public transport. The lack of frequency, journey times and transport information adds to a poor public transport service that is not well supported. Commuters travelling individually from Wakefield, Brightwater, Mapua and Tasman also contribute to the influx of congested corridor traffic during peak times.

As a specific land use planning mechanism, designation is ranked tenth. Six of the 63 people and organisations considered that the designation along the Hope bypass should be considered as a viable state highway bypass and progressed further. The southern link designation was considered an important strategic corridor for users. As noted earlier though whether it caters for cars and heavy vehicles or becomes an alternative link for cyclists and pedestrians is an area that will be further explored as part of the corridor study.

2.2 Site specific

Feedback is grouped onto six geographic areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Geographic Areas within the Corridor</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corridor Study Area</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waimea and Rocks Road, Port Nelson, Tahunanui, Airport</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nelson City</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stoke and Richmond</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>North Nelson/Atawhai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brightwater/ Hope/ Appleby/ Pea Viner corner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback from the 63 people and organisations may be clustered into six geographic locations.

Feedback analysis found that 32 of the 63 people and organisations took a broad view of the issues associated with the corridor study area. The issues they raised and noted above generally filter through the remaining five geographic areas.

The second geographic spread of issues is concentrated around the ‘loop road’ of Nelson, namely Waimea and Rocks Road, Port Nelson, Tahunanui and branching along the arterial roads to the airport. Congested intersections, in particular the Tahunanui twin roundabouts, reduced traffic movement and delays for private car and heavy vehicles, particularly along Annesbrook/Tahunanui Drive and Rocks Road, all contribute to a road network at or near vehicle handling capacity. The conflict between differing users, for example cyclists and heavy vehicles, locals and visitors, create a multitude of social, traffic and environmental problems.

Nelson city ranked third with five people and organisations detailed specific issues within Nelson City. Many of them were attributed to inner city traffic congestion and the necessity for and against a car park building.
Ranked fourth is Stoke and Richmond with four of the 63 people and organisations outlining specific problems in this area. The need to increase the carriageway width of Whakatu Drive was expressed and it was noted that congestion is a key issue at the intersections of SH6/Lower Queen Street and at Three Brothers corner. The ‘snowball effect’ of solving any traffic congestion at one intersection to only move the congestion problem further along the corridor was also noted.

North Nelson and Atawhai are fifth on the site-specific ranking for geographic locations. The location is identified as a potential area for urban growth under the Nelson urban growth strategy. Incremental growth is an issue along with poor intersection design, speed environment along the frontage of Hira School and the future harvesting of logs coming out of Cable Bay. Cable Bay is also experiencing a surge in adventure and cultural tourism and with it the pressure to cater for traffic generated by domestic and international tourists.

Brightwater, Hope and Appleby/Pea Viner corner is ranked sixth with three of the 63 people and organisations outlining site-specific issues. Heavy vehicles using Lansdowne Road and Lower Queen both into and out of the corridor study area was also touted as a site-specific issue. As mentioned earlier the uncertainty of the Hope bypass causes some concern to affected landowners. Given the pressure for land use changes along the Appleby state highway frontage, there are issues with the existing speed environment and the move from a rural outlook to a more intensive scale of development.

3. **Options and Alternatives**

The options and alternatives may be clustered under the following headings:

- Roading infrastructure
- Traffic management
- Public transport
- Travel demand management

Feedback analysis notes that 63 people and organisations nominated a roading infrastructure, traffic management, public transport or travel demand management option and alternative.

**Roading infrastructure examples include:**
- new road links, cycle routes and possible pedestrian improvements.

**Examples of traffic management include:**
- tidal flow, traffic calming, clearways, passing lanes, intersection upgrades, one-way streets, public transport measures (bus lanes, bus streets, bus priorities).

**Public transport examples include:**
- express buses, increases in headways and number of services, airport bus, traveller information, rail and light rail evaluation, interchange provision.
Travel demand management include:

- parking supply, demand and pricing; teleworking, teleshopping, flexible hours, workplace travel plan, school buses, road pricing, cordon pricing, car pooling, awareness and promotional campaigns, public transport subsidies and cost sharing.

Some of the options and alternatives were 'packaged' together.

Examination of the feedback found that generally 24% (15 out of 63) favoured Roading Infrastructure options, 30% (19 out of 63) favoured Traffic Management options, 21% (13 out of 63) favoured Public Transport and 25% (16 out of 63) favoured Travel Demand Management.

Given the breadth of options and alternatives most of the feedback touched on some aspect of the four headings noted above. However it is fair to say that some people and organisations favoured a greater response to public transport options as opposed to roading infrastructure.

Given the nature of the business of some organisations, for example the Road Transport Association and Port Nelson, clearly one of their main objectives in terms of an option was that roading infrastructure should facilitate the efficient movement of heavy vehicles along the corridor. In contrast the cycle representatives favour a mix of roading infrastructure such as improved cycleways and traffic management such as better public transport services.

4. Conclusion

In meeting the objectives for consultation, key stakeholders and the wider community have been informed of the Corridor Study, the proposed combined Nelson Tasman Regional Land Transport Strategy and the access issues associated with Port Nelson.

There have been ample opportunities for the key stakeholders and the wider community to participate in the process through meetings, feedback on a preliminary discussion document, public notices and a media release.

Meaningful information has been available from the Nelson and Tasman Councils and the Transit web page. The discussion document was available from late November 2004 until late January 2005.

The study team is now in a position to add the helpful initial consultation responses received to the next stage, which is identification and analysis of Options and Alternatives. There will be further opportunities for detailed consultation and feedback when this further analysis has been progressed.

Information from feedback forms, letters and emails and file note recorded from key stakeholder meetings have been sent through to the Project Team to develop practical options and alternatives for further detailed analysis.

Effective feedback key stakeholders and the wider community to show how inputs were considered are shown in this report and will be further expanded on in the Stage 2 Options and Alternatives consultative procedures.