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1 Introduction

This report documents the findings of the Stage 3 consultation undertaken for the North Nelson to Brightwater Corridor Study on behalf of Transit New Zealand (Transit), Nelson City Council (NCC) and Tasman District Council (TDC).

The objective of the consultation was to determine the community's view on the preferred package and the two alternative roading options between Stoke and the Nelson CBD. Comments were requested on the following areas:

- Preferred Package
  - Public Transport
  - Cycling
  - Traffic Management
  - Travel Demand Management
  - Roading
- Option 1 (Peak Hour High Occupancy Vehicle Clearways on SH6 and Waimea/Rutherford)
- Option 2 (Southern Corridor Local Arterial Road)

Further detail on the above projects can be found in the Consultation Document.

2 Consultation Information

The basis of the Stage 3 consultation was the Consultation Document. This was developed by the consultant and signed off by both the Technical Steering Group and the Political Steering Group\(^1\). Information within the Consultation Document was obtained from the following reports:

- Outline of Strategy Options
- Comparative Assessment of Statutory Requirements
- Funding Assessment
- Stage 1 Consultation Findings
- Stage 2 Consultation Findings

A total of 6000 copies of the Consultation Document were printed and were available from various Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council offices, service centres and libraries. The Consultation Document was also available on the Transit New Zealand website along with the documents above. Newspaper statements were initially posted in ‘The Nelson Mail’, ‘The Leader’, ‘Live Nelson’ (NCC’s community publication) and ‘Newsline’ (TDC’s community publication) informing the public of the consultation process and the venues and dates of the Open Days together with the closing date for submissions.

\(^1\) The Political Steering Group includes the Mayors, two Councillors and the Managers of Infrastructure from each of NCC and TDC, as well as Transit’s Regional Manager, Transit’s Regional Transportation Manager and the Consultant Team Leader.
Open days were held in Nelson on 17 July 2007 and in Richmond on 31 July 2007. These open days were primarily to allow members of the public to discuss elements of the study with representatives of the study partners. In addition, information was displayed on notice boards. The open days were attended by approximately 88 and 128 people respectively. The open day in Richmond attracted a protest march (including MP for Nelson Hon. Dr. Nick Smith and NCC Mayor Paul Matheson) which delivered a list of questions that were subsequently answered by Transit.

During the study, Live Nelson published a feature article on the study including a feedback form for members of the public to respond. The Nelson Mail also ran a feature article on the study, including a list of questions posed to, and answered by, Transit. The Nelson Mail also published letters to the editor on the subject of the study on an almost daily basis.

3 External Influences

A number of interested parties, who where not affiliated with any of the study partners, published or advertised material which promoted the advantages and disadvantages of certain options. Furthermore, a number of these parties published and/or circulated pro-forma responses for the public to use to respond to the consultation. These are summarised in the following paragraphs.

3.1 Save Nelson’s Waterfront and Rocks Road Association

The Save Nelson’s Waterfront and Rocks Road Association produced a leaflet with a pro-forma consultation response form in support of Option 2 which was distributed to all households on or around the same day as the Live Nelson publication.

The leaflet discussed the disadvantages of Option 1 without discussing the Preferred Package or Option 2. However the leaflet did advise where further information on the study could be found.

A copy of the leaflet is attached in Appendix A.

The association also set up stalls at the open days, and were involved in the protest march.

3.2 Tahunanui Business Association

The Tahunanui Business Association also distributed a leaflet with a pro-forma consultation response form in support of Option 2. This leaflet was also available at a number of Tahunanui Businesses.

The leaflet again discussed the disadvantages of Option 1 without discussing the Preferred Package or Option 2. However the leaflet did advise where further information on the study could be found.

One respondent to the study complained that she found that at least one Tahunanui Business was asking customers to fill in the response form without advising them about Option 2. It is therefore unknown whether some of the respondents using this form favour Option 2 over Option 1 or whether they just oppose Option 1.
A copy of the leaflet is attached in Appendix B.

3.3 Unknown Organisation

Two similar feedback forms are attached in Appendix C and D. These are a very similar format to the Tahunanui Business Association leaflet, but relate primarily to the Waimea Road and Rutherford Street areas. It is unknown where these forms originated.

No additional information was received along with any of these pro-formas, so it is unknown whether respondents were advised about the consultation material.

3.4 Tahunanui School

The Tahunanui School produced their own feedback form in support of Option 2 which was distributed amongst the school community.

This form discussed the negative impacts of Option 1 without discussing what Option 1 involved or any information on the preferred package or Option 2. It also did not advise where further information could be found. This information could have been provided along with the feedback form, but no copies of this were forwarded to the consultation address.

A copy of the feedback form is attached in Appendix E.

3.5 Sustainability Ltd

Sustainability Ltd published an advertisement in the Nelson Mail urging Nelsonians to not support either option. The arguments for this included the fact that there is currently only a problem in the peak periods and that the study did not consider climate change or peak oil. The advertisement included a proforma feedback form.

Again the advertisement did not discuss what the preferred package or the options were, or advise where information on these could be found.

A copy of the advertisement is attached in Appendix F.

3.6 Nelsust

Nelsust supported Option 1 but did not produce a pro-forma response form, instead they photocopied the feedback form or produced Microsoft Word versions for distribution. Accordingly, it is unknown exactly how many responses were influenced by this group.

Nelsust did, however, have a stall at Victory which encouraged people to fill in feedback forms in support of Option 1. They also had a stall at the Richmond open day.
4 Responses

A total of 5,628 responses were received. A breakdown of the type of responses received is shown in the figure below.
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**Figure 4-1: Response Type**

Figure 4-1 above shows that only 548 responses (10%) were on the original consultation document feedback form. A further 2018 responses (36%) were on the Live Nelson form, a photocopied form or a MS Word version of the form. Three percent of responses were on letters, reports or emails. The remaining 52% of responses where on the pro-forma response forms discussed above.

5 Preferred Package Comments

The feedback form requested respondents to comment on the following areas:
- Public Transport
- Cycling
- Traffic Management
- Travel Demand Management
- Roading
The overall response to the preferred package measures is shown in Figure 5-1 below. This figure shows the total number of respondents who commented on the elements of the preferred package and the number who supported the projects and measures. In a number of situations, the comments made did not make it clear whether the respondent supported the preferred package or not; these were mostly due to the respondent commenting on a particular element, i.e. “need park and ride”, but without commenting on the package as a whole. Comments made by these respondents are shown in light blue in the figure.
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**Figure 5-1: Response Type**

Figure 5-1 above shows that the comments made on the preferred package were quite low in comparison to the total number of submissions received. This is mostly due to the majority of feedback form and photocopied form respondents not commenting on the measures within the preferred package. However, any comments they did make have been taken into account.

The figure above also shows that respondents who commented on the package were generally supportive of the measures. The major points made by respondents under each of the items above are discussed in the paragraphs below.
5.1 Public Transport

A total of 876 submitters commented on public transport. Of these, 544 supported the measures in the preferred package and 87 did not.

The most common comments were:

- Provide more than preferred package: 227 responses
- Provide higher frequency services: 136 responses
- Provide subsidised/affordable services: 115 responses
- Provide more services: 67 responses
- Build park and ride: 65 responses
- Commission light rail: 61 responses

Some respondent's comments will be reflected in two or more of the categories above. Also, some comments were written on pro-forma feedback forms so it is unknown whether the respondent knew what public transport measures were within the preferred package.

5.2 Cycling

A total of 796 submitters commented on cycling. Of these, 435 supported the measures in the preferred package and 68 did not.

The most common comments were:

- Improve safety for cyclists: 125 responses
- Provide more than preferred package: 110 responses
- Retain (and seal) railway reserve for cyclists: 73 responses
- Separate cyclists and vehicles: 64 responses
- Separate cyclists and pedestrians: 46 responses
- Provide more cycleways: 44 responses

Some respondent's comments will be reflected in two or more of the categories above. As with the public transport comments, a number were written on pro-forma feedback forms so it is unknown whether the respondent knew what cycling measures were within the preferred package.

5.3 Traffic Management

A total of 505 submitters commented on traffic management. Of these, 200 supported the measures in the preferred package and 36 did not.

From reviewing the comments under this section, it seems as though a number of respondents were unsure what traffic management involved. The preferred package includes traffic monitoring, bus priority schemes and clearways, but a large number of respondents commented on a wide range of other measures from other parts of the preferred package (especially pedestrian grade separation and travel demand management measures). These comments are considered in other sections.

The most common comments were:
Support clearways 22 responses
Against clearways 21 responses
Provide more than preferred package 21 responses
Install signal co-ordination 21 responses
Support bus priority 18 responses

Some respondent’s comments will be reflected in two or more of the categories above. As with the other measures, a number of comments were written on pro-forma feedback forms so it is unknown whether the respondent knew what traffic management measures were within the preferred package.

5.4 Travel Demand Management

A total of 492 submitters commented on travel demand management. Of these, 227 supported the measures in the preferred package and 53 did not.

The most common comments were:
- Implement tolls / congestion pricing 32 responses
- Support school travel plans 27 responses
- Don’t increase parking fees 25 responses
- Increase parking fees 23 responses
- Provide more than preferred package 23 responses
- Provide more car parking 19 responses
- Support workplace travel plans 14 responses

Some respondent’s comments will be reflected in two or more of the categories above. As with the other measures, a number of comments were written on pro-forma feedback forms so it is unknown whether the respondent knew what travel demand management measures were within the preferred package.

5.5 Roading Improvements

A total of 492 submitters commented on roading improvements. Of these, 156 supported the measures in the preferred package and 36 did not.

The most common comments were:
- Install more pedestrian grade separated crossings 131 responses
- Install Hampden Street pedestrian overbridge 61 responses
- Fix bottlenecks 32 responses
- Provide more than preferred package 31 responses
- Do nothing 18 responses

Some respondent’s comments will be reflected in two or more of the categories above. As with the other measures, a number of comments were written on pro-forma feedback forms so it is unknown whether the respondent knew what travel demand management measures were within the preferred package.
6 Nelson to Stoke – 2 Options

6.1 Preferred Option

In addition to the preferred package, respondents were asked to comment on their preferred option for increasing capacity between Nelson to Stoke. The two options were:

- Option 1 (Peak Hour High Occupancy Vehicle Clearways on SH6 and Waimea Road/Rutherford Street)
- Option 2 (Southern Corridor Local Arterial Road)

As discussed earlier, these two options were the main focus of the community during the consultation period and were the subject of all external influences on the consultation.

The feedback form requested respondents to indicate their preferred option. The responses are summarised in Figure 6-1 below.
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**Figure 6-1 : Preferred Option**

Approximately two thirds of respondents favoured the Southern Corridor Local Arterial Route as the preferred option to provide for additional capacity between Nelson and Stoke. Just fewer than 30% favoured Peak Hour Clearways on SH6 and Waimea Road/Rutherford Street, 5% supported neither option and 0.2% requested that both options be progressed. The preferred option by response type is shown in the figure below.
Figure 6-2: Preferred Option by Response Type

Figure 6-2 shows that the overall preferred option is also reflected by those who did not respond on pro-forma feedback forms. However, of the non-pro-forma responses, a significantly higher percentage supported neither option. This could reflect the fact that the pro-forma responses focussed on the negative impacts of Option 1 rather than championing Option 2.

The predominant comments are discussed further in the paragraphs below. It should be noted that this report only discusses the issues as commented, and does not discuss whether or not the comments are justified or suggest any alternative measures.
6.2 Option 1: HOV Clearways

The comments made on the feedback forms in relation to Option 1 have been summarised and collated. The predominant issues are reported below.

6.2.1 Reasons for Option 1

Although 1650 respondents indicated that the peak hour clearways was their preferred option, there were relatively few substantive comments made in support of this option. These are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourages cycling/PT/TDM</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheaper</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better for Environment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above comments, a large number of respondents commented on issues such as Climate Change and Peak Oil, with many of these respondents choosing Option 1. These issues are discussed later in this report.

6.2.2 Reasons against Option 1

Most of the comments in relation to Option 1 were in opposition, and these are shown in Table 6-2. The responses column depicts the number of people who made written comments on their submission. In addition, if this comment was also printed on the pro-forma responses, it is shown on the subsequent columns. (i.e 907 submissions and pro-formas included an individual comment indicating that the respondent did not want changes on Rocks Road; in addition, the Save Nelsons Waterfront pro-forma and the Tahunanui Business Community pro-forma also had this comment printed on their pro-forma feedback forms).
Table 6-2: Reasons against Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Save Rocks Road</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/driveway issues</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trucks on Rocks Road</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases traffic</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/cyclist safety</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only short-term solution</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects businesses</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damages environment</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to develop waterfront</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community severance</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High tide/weather can close Rocks Road</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects tourism</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access strategy Issues</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects parking</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wont work</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects schools</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage issues</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearway confusing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock falls</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearway lanes too narrow</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearway may become permanent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreases property values</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top five issues are discussed in further detail below.

**Save Rocks Road.** This was the most commented on aspect of the Option 1 proposal, with over 900 people commenting that they did not want changes along Rocks Road. This could be due to a number of reasons, including increased traffic, environmental reasons or recreational reasons, but many respondents did not give a reason for their views.

**Access/Driveway Issues.** Almost 170 respondents commented that Option 1 would impact on the properties fronting both SH6 and Waimea Road and Rutherford Street, by making it more difficult to enter and or exit their properties. A number of respondents said that they currently have to reverse out of their properties, and if the existing shoulder/parking lane is reduced, then this would become an unsafe manoeuvre. A number of businesses also commented on this possibly having a negative effect on customer levels.

**No trucks on Rocks Road.** Almost 150 respondents commented that they would like to see all heavy vehicles banned on Rocks Road with these vehicles being detoured along other routes. A large number of these respondents suggested that the alternative route be the SCLAR. A few respondents recognised that the current state highway is the main route to the port but suggested that larger vehicles be banned during peak hours.
**Increases Traffic.** Increased traffic on the clearway routes was given as a reason against Option 1 for over 120 respondents. This was seen as having a number of impacts, such as increased pollution, reduced amenity or reduced pedestrian and cyclist safety.

**Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety.** A total of 120 respondents commented that Option 1 would increase the safety risk for pedestrians and cyclists. The main reasons given for this included; making pedestrians cross three lanes of traffic, removing the cycle lanes or the shared walkway/cycleway along the waterfront.

### 6.3 Option 2: SCLR

The comments made on the feedback forms in relation to Option 2 have been summarised and collated. The predominant issues are reported below.

#### 6.3.1 Reasons for Option 2

A total of 3672 respondents indicated that the Southern Corridor Local Arterial Road was their preferred option. However, only 937 respondents included comments about this option. The comments in support are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides better traffic flow</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term solution</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a third route</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes road network</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer than Option 1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides better access for emergency services</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there were a significant number of respondents who preferred Option 2, almost 100 of these indicated that the SCLR was not an ideal solution. Reasons for this were varied, but mostly revolved around the issues below.

#### 6.3.2 Reasons against Option 2.

Although Option 2 was preferred by the majority of respondents, a significant number of the 937 respondents who commented on the option discussed the negative aspects of the proposal. These are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain Railway Reserve</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Severance</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases Traffic</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These issues are discussed in further detail below.

**Retain Railway Reserve.** Over 70 respondents indicated that they would like to see the railway reserve retained for pedestrians and cyclists. A significant proportion of these also suggested this route be upgraded by being sealed and/or lit.

**Community Severance.** Almost 60 respondents indicated that they had concerns in regards to the impact the SCLAR would have on the Victory community.

**Pollution.** Over 30 respondents discussed pollution as a significant issue with the Southern Corridor Local Arterial Road. However, it should be noted that an additional 51 respondents indicated that they believed that air quality in the corridor was being addressed by current NCC policies.

**Increases Traffic.** A total of 20 respondents discussed the negative impacts associated with the SCLAR introducing more traffic into Nelson City Centre.

**Too expensive.** Seventeen respondents indicated that they viewed the SCLAR as being too expensive to fix Nelson’s traffic problems.

### 6.4 Other Comments

A number of other comments were made in regards to the issue of providing additional capacity between Nelson and Stoke. These are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build tunnel</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other projects first</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement tolls</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a different option</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide four lanes along SCLAR</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider peak oil</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve capacity along Waimea Road only</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bus lanes on SCLAR</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a one way pair with SCLAR and Waimea Road</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These comments discussed in greater detail below.

**Build tunnel.** Almost 90 respondents discussed the possibility of installing a tunnel either along part of the SCLAR or on a different alignment.

**Do other projects first.** Almost 70 respondents suggested that other projects be undertaken before constructing either Option 1 or 2. Most comments related to undertaking the public transport measures, travel demand measures and fixing the bottlenecks. A number of submissions referenced a Nelson Mail article on this subject. (The 67 respondents referenced here includes those who commented on this subject under ‘Roading’)

Implement tolls. Over 30 respondents indicated that they thought that tolls or congestion pricing should be introduced. Various respondents indicated that this should be on the SCLAR, other new routes or on existing roads. (The 32 respondents referenced here includes those who commented on this subject under 'Travel Demand Management')

Provide a different option. Almost 30 respondents indicated that they consider that capacity improvements are required but did not support either Option 1 or Option 2.

Provide four lanes along SCLAR. Almost 30 respondents indicated that they would like to see the original Southern Link constructed, or a four lane version of the SCLAR.

Consider peak oil. Over 20 respondents discussed the issue of Peak Oil and the effect this will have on the private car. The majority of these respondents wanted no further roads to be built as they believed that petrol will become much more expensive resulting in a declining demand for private car travel.

Improve capacity on Waimea Road only. A total of 23 respondents presented the idea of an altered Option 1 involving upgrading Waimea Road and Rutherford Street without touching the SH6 route. These comments included, 3 laning, 4 laning, clearways in both direction or a tidal flow lane.

Provide bus lanes on SCLAR. Almost 20 respondents indicated that the SCLAR should include some form of bus priority, be it clearways or bus only lanes. Some indicated that the SCLAR should be available for public transport only.

Create a one way pair with SCLAR and Waimea Road. A total of 15 respondents presented the idea of providing additional capacity by creating a one way pair with the SCLAR providing the northbound lanes and Waimea Road providing the southbound lanes.

7 Summary and Conclusions

Stage 3 consultation on the North Nelson to Brightwater Corridor Study attracted a great deal of community interest and a total of 5628 responses.

The majority of submissions did not comment on any elements of the preferred package. Of those that did:
- 544 supported and 87 opposed the public transport measures within the preferred package;
- 435 supported and 68 opposed the cycling measures within the preferred package;
- 200 supported and 36 opposed the traffic management measures within the preferred package;
- 227 supported and 53 opposed the travel demand management measures within the preferred package; and
- 156 supported and 36 opposed the roading projects within the preferred package.

The vast majority of responses focussed on the issue of providing for additional capacity between Nelson and Stoke. Of these:
- 29% supported Option 1: HOV clearways
- 66% supported Option 2: SCLAR
- 5% supported neither option
- 0.2% supported both options

The high response rate and large number of comments received relating to the two options indicates that there are a number of issues that need to be further discussed with the community before a preferred option is
chosen. To aid this process, Nelson City Council is convening a forum of representatives from a number of community groups to discuss the major issues around the two options. This forum will report to the Regional Land Transport Committee, who will then subsequently determine the next steps for the study.
Appendix A  Save Nelson’s Waterfront and Rocks Rd Association Proforma

Save Nelson’s Waterfront, Waimea Road & Rutherford Street

The Nelson to Brightwater Consultation Document published by Transit New Zealand and the Regional Land Transport Committee in July 2007 sets out 2 Options as solutions for Nelson’s traffic problems. Option 1 is being promoted as the preferred package.

Option 1 = creating a third clearway lane and future traffic growth along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Road, Wakefield Quay, Haven Rd, Rutherford St and Waimea Road.

Option 2 = the construction of a one lane each way local road and separate cycle way along the Railway Reserve and above Beatsons Road from the Waimea Rd roundabout to the top of St Vincent St.

Transit have stated that the clearway lane would become a 3rd vehicle lane if there is low take-up of public transport & carpooling. Rocks Road would be firmly established as the major arterial route for the City. It also states that the Option 2 “SCLAR route will be protected and could be considered at a later date as a long-term solution”.

Save Nelson’s Waterfront believes that Option 1 is a short term, cost-cutting, band-aid solution to Nelson’s traffic problems. The waterfront with its beauty, history, views, walks, swimming, fishing, sailing & dining is one of the most best-loved icons of the region and should be preserved and enhanced for now and future generations. Increased traffic will irretrievably damage this historic precinct.

We support Tahunanui Business Association and Waimea Road & Rutherford Street Businessman’s and Resident Society in their opposition to Option 1.

Complete the official Feedback Form in the consultation document or use the one attached. The Transit Feedback Form means that you have to tick for Option 2 in order to stop Option 1.
FORMS MUST BE RETURNED BY 17TH AUGUST.

Why Nelson Should Oppose Option 1

Identity & Enjoyment. Option 1 would increase traffic making the waterfront roads an unsafe and less attractive environment for locals & tourists alike. The third clearway lane on Rocks RD would be open to buses, HOV’s & trucks for one hour in the morning would then become all-day parking, obstructing the aesthetics of one of the world’s finest foreshores.

Safety
Option 1 would mean all the traffic on Rocks Rd and Wakefield Quay would be one lane closer to the residences than at present. The landside footpath would become 1.5 m wide. The central Northbound ‘all-vehicle all-day’ lane would be reduced by ¾ m to just 3 m’s wide. The maximum width for the logging and heavy freight trucks to the port is 2.4 m wide. With the re-alignment of the road, Rocks Rd to haven Rd would become more winding which is difficult & dangerous for passing trucks. The huge number of property entrances, tricky intersections and people crossing the roads make this road simply unsuitable for high traffic.

Economic
Many businesses on Tahunanui Drive, Rutherford St & Waimea Rd would suffer with the loss of their vital street parking for customers. Rutherford St would be 4 lanes from Halifax to Nile St with reduced parking. Option 1 would have a negative impact on the tourist dollar income to the region by degrading the premier tourist area of Tahunanui and the waterfront.
Residents
Some historic residences would lose their only permanent parking and there would be unsafe access onto the new road.

Footpath and Cycleway
The footpath on the seaward side of rocks Road would be widened “with piles or cantilevered construction” to incorporate a four metre shared footpath and cycleway. Option 1 is unsafe as Southbound cyclists would have to cross Rocks/Wakefield Rds twice to get to Tahuna. This is not a pedestrian and cyclist friendly proposal.

Heritage
40+ listed historic buildings which could be adversely affected by road widening, increased traffic & traffic being one lane closer. Footpath widening would mean the 2km listed Rocks Rd Chains & Stanchions would be moved. Building code & resource consent constraints mean a new fence might have to be erected inside the chains.

Flawed Process
Along the Option 1 route from Tahunanui Drive to Waimea Road, 4 to 5 times the number of residents, schools, businesses and communities will be directly affected by unsafe roads, community disruption, noise, pollution, reduced house prices & negative economic impact than with Option 2.
Three laning of Rocks Rd and Waimea Rd (now termed Option 1) has already been rejected by Nelson in the 2006 Stage 2 findings. A short consultation period, faulty costings, a predetermined outcome and does not lead to informed public debate.

- Paper Copies of the Nelson to Brightwater Consultation Document, the Feedback Form and background documents are available from the NCC, TDC & the local libraries.
- PDF's copies can be downloaded via our web site www.saveelonswaterfront.org.nz (click on the Transit web link then click on Projects, then Nelson, then Strategy Study SH6 and SH60).
- Make a Donation to help fund the campaign. Contact us or visit the website for further details.
- Visit the Website. www.SaveNelsonsWaterfront.org.nz for further information and have your say on our blog.

Save Nelson’s Waterfront & Rocks Road Association are a coalition of concerned citizens, pedestrians and cyclists, local businesses & tourist operators who are concerned about protecting Rocks Road and the Waterfront

Contact: Save Nelson’s Waterfront & Rocks Road Association, www.saveelonswaterfront.org.nz
Email: help@saveelonswaterfront.org.nz, Phone: 021 02515077, c/o PO Box 1204, Nelson, 7040
Nelson to Brightwater Feedback Form

I strongly oppose Option 1 (Peak Hour Clearways Route on Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd, Wakefield Quay, Haven Rd, Rutherford St, Waimea Rd)

My preferred Option is Option 2 Southern Corridor Local Arterial Route (SCLR)

Comments: .................................................................

Reasons Against Option 1

- Option 1 would degrade the waterfront and Rocks Rd which are one of Nelson's most loved areas.
- Option 1 would endanger the health, prosperity & safety of many more residents, schools, kindergartens, businesses and communities than Option 2.
- Option 1 would discourage tourism from the whole region & damage the tourism industry which is Nelson's 3rd largest employer and the 4th largest GDP earner in the region.
- Option 1 would turn the Tahunanui & Rutherford St shopping areas into an unsafe & noisy thoroughfare.
- Increased traffic with Option 1 would put more pollution into Waimea Rd and Tahunanui which are two of the most polluted parts of Nelson.
- Option 1 is unsafe & would discourage cycling and walking generally and especially along Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Rd, Wakefield Quay, Haven Rd, Rutherford St & Waimea Rd.
- Option 1 is inconsistent with Nelson City Council's goals of being a "child and people friendly", "safe" and having a "strong economy".

Additional Comments: .................................................................

Contact Details:
Name: ........................................................................
Address: ........................................................................
Email: ........................................................................

Return by 17th August 2007 to Nelson to Brightwater Consultation, PO Box 3455, Richmond.
Appendix B  Tahunanui Business Association Proforma

The North Nelson-Brightwater Corridor Study has resulted in a consultation document setting out two options for the Annesbrook to City section. Transit is looking for feedback on these options -

Option 1 - the clearway 3-laning of Annesbrook Drive, Tahunanui Drive, Rocks Road and Wakefield Quay, and also of Rutherford Street and Waimea Road.

Option 2 - the construction of a one lane each way local road and separate cycle way along the Railway Reserve and above Beatsons Road from the Waimea Road roundabout to the top of St Vincent Street.

Transit's preferred option is Option 1 - to make a third lane through Tahunanui, along the Waterfront and up Waimea Road - and the document appears very slanted in this direction. It is extremely short on detail and there are a lot of unanswered questions.

The Tahunanui Business Association is concerned about the severe effects of the proposed Option 1 on the Tahunanui community, that clearways and 3 lanes of heavy traffic along Tahunanui Drive will create increased separation between the east and west sides of Tahunanui with road closures and restricted access/exit points making it very difficult for the community to access schools, public amenities, health services and recreational facilities.

> Clearways north from the Annesbrook roundabout mean 3 lanes, no stopping, no parking, initially during the morning peak period (times unspecified). Any vehicles parked in the clearway would be towed away.

> The clearway would be for trucks, buses and high occupancy vehicles only.

> It appears there will be no cycle lanes on Tahunanui Drive - would children cycling to school and other cyclists have to share the roadway with the traffic?

> There will be major changes to streets off Annesbrook Drive and Tahunanui Drive -
- Muritai Street - no right turn in or out - i.e. left in, left out, only.
- Green Street - no right turn in or out - i.e. left in, left out, only.
- Rui Street - closed off from Tahunanui Drive
- Rawhiti Street - closed off from Tahunanui Drive
- Maire Street - no right turn out on to Tahunanui Drive
- Parkers Road - traffic lights
- Tosswill Road/Tahunanui Drive crossing to be replaced with an overbridge
- Will right turns be allowed into and out of residences and businesses on Tahunanui Drive?

The Association is concerned that the proposal will have an extremely negative impact on Nelson’s premier tourist and recreational areas of Tahunanui Beach and the Waterfront.

The Tahunanui Structure Plan proposed the development of a people friendly village environment at Tahunanui - "...to promote a village heart for Tahunanui that is compact, walkable, diverse, accessible" and "...to improve access to and enhance ...the area through a network of well connected links and spaces."

Hardly compatible with three lanes of heavy traffic, no cycle lanes on Tahunanui Drive, and restricted access and mobility for residents and visitors alike.

Tahunanui deserves better than to be sacrificed to the demands of heavy through traffic —

COMPLETE A FEEDBACK FORM AND HELP PRESERVE OUR COMMUNITY

Copies of the Consultation Document and Feedback Form are available from Nelson City Council, Nellie Nightingale Library, Tahunu Pharmacy, Kingsland Court Motel, and Pots n Prints.

A suggested feedback form is attached - just tick the boxes, sign, and complete contact details.

FEEDBACK FORMS MUST BE RETURNED BY 17 AUGUST 2007.

Go to www.tahunanui.co.nz for more information and links to Transit's website.

Tahunanui Business Association
Nick Harley, Chairperson, c/- Tahunu Pharmacy
Ainslie Riddoch, Secretary, c/- Pots n Prints
Nelson to Brightwater Feedback Form

I STRONGLY OPPOSE OPTION 1
(PEAK HOUR CLEARWAYS ON SH6 (TAHUNANUI DRIVE) &
WAIMEA/RUTHERFORD ROUTES).

Reasons against Option 1:

☐ It has a negative effect on Economic Development in Tahunanui Area due to
Clearways, Restricted Parking and difficulty with Access to Properties.

☐ Safety Standards and Personal Security is Diminished due to increased traffic
flow.

☐ Access & Mobility to Tahunanui Streets is restricted due to Road Closures and
No Right Turns and result in an increased separation of the Tahunanui
Community.

☐ Air Quality would decrease and Noise Pollution would increase due to heavier
traffic flow on Tahunanui Drive and Surrounding Streets.

☐ Increased Traffic Flow will severely Impact on Access and Enjoyment of the
Beach, Waterfront and Recreational Areas for both Residents and Tourists.

OTHER COMMENTS: WHY OPTION 1 WOULD AFFECT YOU:

________________________________________________________________________

(Please use other side of page if required)

MY PREFERRED OPTION IS OPTION 2 (Southern Corridor Local Arterial
Road)(SCLR).

Signed: ___________________ Date: _______________

Contact Details:

Name: ____________________________

Address: __________________________

Email: ____________________________

Return By 17 August 2007

Nelson to Brightwater Consultation
PO Box 3455
Richmond
Appendix C  Unknown Pro-forma 1

Nelson to Brightwater
Feedback Form

I Strongly Oppose Option 1
(Peak Hour Clearways on SH6 (Tahunanui Drive) & Waimea/Rutherford Routes).

Reasons against Option 1:

☐ It has a negative effect on Economic Development in Rutherford & Waimea Rd.

☐ There are 2 Colleges, 2 Primary Schools and 2 Kindergartens located on or close to Waimea Rd. Their environment will severely affected

☐ No cycle lanes in Waimea Rd and Rutherford St so cyclist heading down Waimea Rd will have to cycle in heavier (i.e. weight) and greater volumes of traffic. Children riding to schools on Waimea Rd will be very exposed.

☐ Option 1 does not encourage people to walk or bike within the Waimea area.

☐ No Right Turns into some side streets & three sets of traffic lights will not improve traffic movement. Reduced access to large pockets of residential properties.

☐ Reduced Air Quality and increased Noise Pollution due to heavier traffic flow.

☐ Rutherford, Waimea Rd will have no parking on northbound side and reduced on South. Residents, customers and guests will not be able to park on road. Not a concern with Option 2 as parking is permanently available both sides.

☐ Devaluation of houses and businesses, Option 1 will reduce appeal of the area.

OTHER COMMENTS: WHY OPTION 1 WOULD AFFECT YOU:

________________________________________

________________________________________

(Please use other side of page if required)

MY PREFERRED OPTION IS OPTION 2 (Southern Corridor Local Arterial Road (SCLR)).

Contact Details:

Name: ____________________________ Signed: ____________

Address: ____________________________ Date: ____________

Email: ____________________________

Return By 17 August 2007

Nelson to Brightwater Consultation
PO Box 3455
Richmond
Appendix D  Unknown Pro-forma 2

Nelson to Brightwater
Feedback Form

I Strongly Oppose Option 1
I Strongly Support Option 2

17 AUG 2007

Reasons against Option 1:

☐ It only delays an inevitable necessity to action option 2 ensuring 3 routes, 6 lanes North/South. It also adversely impacts business in both Rutherford & St Vincent Sts.

☐ Pedestrian safety reduced, especially crossing clearways. Eliminating parking on one, or both sides of the road, will result in more pedestrians crossing the road. Especially important given the number of schools in the area.

☐ Waimea Rd & Rutherford St have 2 High Schools, 2 Primary Schools and 2 Kindergartens located on or close to Waimea Rd. Their environment will be negatively impacted.

☐ No cycle lane, cyclists going down Waimea Rd/Rutherford St or to get to a destination along Waimea Rd/Rutherford St will have to cycle in heavier, faster moving traffic and will be greatly exposed. Children riding to school very exposed.

☐ No Right Turns into some side streets & three sets of traffic lights will not improve traffic movement. Reduced access to large pockets of residential properties.

☐ Reduced Air Quality and increased Noise Pollution due to heavier traffic flow.

☐ Rutherford St & Waimea Rd will have no parking on northbound side and reduced on South. Residents, customers and guests will not be able to park on road. Not a concern with Option 2 as parking is permanently available both sides in so long as Rutherford street remains as a dual carriageway.

☐ Devaluation of houses and businesses, Option 1 will reduce appeal of the area.

OTHER COMMENTS: WHY OPTION 1 WOULD AFFECT YOU:

__________________________________________________________________________________________

(Please use other side of page if required)

MY PREFERRED OPTION IS OPTION 2

Contact Details:

Name: ______________________________ Signed: ______________________________

Address: ______________________________ Date: ______________________________

Email: ______________________________

Return By 17 August 2007

Nelson to Brightwater Consultation
PO Box MES
Appendix E  Tahunanui School Proforma

NELSON TO BRIGHTWATER FEEDBACK FORM

Option 1 is contrary to Transit's own stated objection of
- assisting safety and personal security
- improving access and mobility
- profiting and promoting public health

1. Please provide comment on the measures within the preferred package:

Public Transport
- Support improved public and school bus service
- Concern regarding safety of bus stops on clearways.

Cycling
- Support designated cycle ways and not shared with pedestrians or heavy transport.

Traffic Management

Travel Demand Management
- Support the completion of pathways on Tahuna Hills and over bridge from Toswill Road.

2. Preferred roading option

Option 1 Peak Hour clearways on SH6 & Waimea/Rutherford Routes  Preferred ☐

Option 2 Southern Corridor Local Arterial Road (SCLAR)  Preferred √
- Primarily because Option 1 is unsuitable for Tahunanui School Community
Additional Comments cont…

Reasons against Option 1:

- Any acquisition of school land will undermine size and function of our playground.
- Heavier traffic volumes will increase risks of noise pollution and poor air quality.
- Shared clearways between cyclists and heavy transport will compromise children’s safety.
- Turning restrictions and road closures will separate the community and cause substantial inconvenience to residents traveling to school and other services.
- Traffic congestion and turning restrictions on Tahunanui Drive will encourage increased traffic into Muritai Street creating safety issues at our main entrance.

3. Contact details:
Name:
Address:
Email

Please return to school or post directly to:
Nelson to Brightwater Consultation
P O Box 3455
Richmond

By 15 August 2007
NELSONIANS GIVE BOTH TRANSPORT OPTIONS THE THUMBS DOWN

- Peak hour commuter traffic is the only issue identified in the consultation document for the next twenty-five years. This accounts for only 6% of the year (or 4.5% if school term times only are considered).
- The cost of solving this problem is put at $140 million plus an additional $15 million for Option 1, or $34 million for Option 2.
- The consultation document fails to assess the regional impacts of issues such as peak oil and climate change, which will occur within twenty-five years. Live Nelson (11 August 2007) states that passenger vehicles account for 17% of our greenhouse gas emissions. This is predicted to rise in the future, and option 2 will simply add to increase emissions. Both these issues will lead to an increase in fuel prices, which will increase the price of virtually everything that we buy, not just fuel for the car. The Reserve Bank Governor, stated on 26 July 2007 that “rising oil prices accounted for nearly half of the June quarter Consumer Price Index increase”. As a low wage economy we are less able to afford oil price increases compared with other countries such as the UK (fuel prices may be double there but incomes are more than double making it more affordable than here).
- The failure to include an assessment of these impacts means that the document is fundamentally flawed. Neither the described ‘preferred package’ nor options 1 or 2 provide the necessary solutions.
- There is not a peak hour traffic problem now. Commuters generally choose where they live and work, so if journey times increase or travel costs rise in the future, they will make personal choices to minimise these negative impacts on their lives. They can choose to reduce their commuting distance, car pool, stagger their working day, or use alternatives such as buses/motorbikes/bicycles/walk.
- These ‘travel demand management’ changes need to be implemented prior to expecting Nelsonians (who do not contribute to this commuting problem) both to contribute financially as tax and rate payers, and to suffer negative social and environmental impacts. Option 2 will result in increased congestion and pollution throughout the city, parking problems, reduced safety for locals both pedestrians and road users, and increased severance of communities.
- The Nelson community has been polarised by the two options, this needs to be reversed.
- Do you want to become involved in an inclusive community participation process that involves both commuters and Nelsonians meeting together to identify the issues and to reach a consensus that has the best outcome for all?
- Do you think that solutions should be aiming to:
  - maximise the efficiency of the numbers of people travelling along a given road space;
  - move people as fuel efficiently as possible;
  - cater for all ages of population, especially as the number of retired people increase?

Then act now, don’t delay, give it the “THUMBS DOWN”:

- Complete the feedback form below and send it back immediately to Nelson to Brightwater Consultation, PO Box 3455, Richmond. It must arrive before 17 August 2007. Get your friends and family to send in a form too if they feel the same about this.
- Complete the contact detail form below to register your interest with THUMBS DOWN so that we can keep in touch with you.

Registration of interest in the THUMBS DOWN Group. Please tick the box if you consent to this information being kept on the THUMBS DOWN database.

Please complete this form and return it to:
THUMBS DOWN, PO Box 1615, Nelson, or email: katy@sustainability.org.nz

| Name: |  |
| Email: |  |
| Address: |  |

Feedback on the Nelson to Brightwater Consultation Document:

I do not support either Options 1 or 2.
I would like the Regional Land Transport Committee to initiate an inclusive community process for commuters and Nelsonians that enables us to develop long term solutions for all future transport issues giving the best outcome for everyone.

Signature: ___________________________  Signature: ___________________________
Name: ___________________________  Name: ___________________________
Email: ___________________________  Email: ___________________________
Address: ___________________________  Address: ___________________________