

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

AND

IN THE MATTER of **Private Plan Change 28** to the Nelson Resource Management Plan

JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT (JWS) IN RELATION TO:

TRANSPORT (1)

4 May 2022

Expert Conferencing Held on: 4 May 2022

Venue: In person in Nelson (Trafalgar Pavilion) and online

Independent Facilitator: Marlene Oliver

Admin Support: Jessica Marchbanks

1 Attendance:

1.1 The list of participants is included in the schedule at the end of this Statement.

2 Basis of Attendance and Environment Court Practice Note 2014

2.1 All participants agree to the following:

- (a) The Environment Court Practice Note 2014 provides relevant guidance and protocols for the expert conferencing session;
- (b) They will comply with the relevant provisions of the Environment Court Practice Note 2014;
- (c) They will make themselves available to appear before the Hearing Panel;
- (d) This statement is to be filed with the Hearing Panel and posted on the Council's website.

3 Matters considered at Conferencing – Agenda and Outcomes

3.1 Services Overlay

Plan Change request (p21) shows the current small holding zone in the valley floor which is currently covered by the Services Overlay. That Services Overlay remains, the PPC 28 proposes to extend the Services Overlay to the balance if the Plan Change site (refer attachment Map B3). This clarifies that the whole of the PPC 28 area is to be covered by the Services Overlay. Mark Lile has confirmed that the assessment of the plan change is made on the basis of the Services Overlay covering the whole of the PPC 28 area. Mark Georgeson accepts this clarification.

3.2 **Indicative Road link to the ridgeline from Ralphine Way**

PPC 28 Structure Plan as notified shows an indicative road link. In response to some submissions questioning the feasibility of such a route, Greg McKeever (Surveyor for the Applicant) has further assessed the geometry and practicability of a route focusing on the more challenging hillside section. He has confirmed that there is a logical route at subcollector standards (at Table 4-7) of a maximum grade of 1 in 8 (at Table 4-8). The route generally follows an existing track. It is a slightly different route than shown of the Structure Plan diagram as notified. Mark Lile confirmed that an updated location for an indicative road will be shown on an amended Structure Plan diagram. The NTLDM identifies a grade on 1 in 15 (at Table 4-8) for public bus routes, the indicative road will not achieve that grade for its entire length. In the valley floor the road will satisfy the 1 in 15 gradient standard. The steeper gradients will logically be where the road rises up the hillside. It was noted that grades on the existing roads including parts of Bay View Road at 1 in 8 and parts of Walters Bluff at 1 in 7. Detailed design of any particular road will occur at subsequent resource consent stage for subdivision and or development.

The road reserve corridor will meet the Hillside Environments standard of the NTLDM (Table 4-7 footnote 2) which provides for the berm and footpath to be excluded from the uphill side of the road. The Structure Plan shows an indicative walkway / cycle link which will need to be provided for at detailed design stage. The width of the path should be 2.5m which is line with the NTLDM standard for a shared path. Greg McKeever has not completed detailed investigations at this stage but based on the information and work done to date he considers that it should be feasible to provide for a shared path link at the detailed design stage.

All experts to this JWS agree that there is a feasible route for a road and walking / cycling facilities that will meet the NTLDM standards for subcollector roads from Ralphine Way to the ridgeline as described above and this is an acceptable position at this plan change stage.

All experts to this JWS agree that the provisions of the PPC 28 (including the Structure Plan as it is to be amended), the NRMP and the NTLDM are appropriate and adequate to deliver these anticipated outcomes relating to the roading and walkway / cycle facilities.

Andrew James notes that the NTLDM at Table 4-8 requires gradients on bus routes not to be steeper than 1 in 15 and he considers that an alignment to provide a gradient nearer to 1 in 15 is possible.

All of the other experts note the text in the NTLDM section 4.7.5.3 Hillside Construction states that “a balance should be achieved between complying with design standards and minimising the adverse effects that excessive earthworks can create, such as visual pollution and high construction and maintenance costs”.

3.3 **State Highway 6 / Bay View Road Intersection**

Note: Andrew James did not participate in discussions around Waka Kotahi’s submission and the state highway network.

Scope of Waka Kotahi interest in PPC28:

Lea O’Sullivan and Andy High for Waka Kotahi confirmed that since the Waka Kotahi submission was lodged in December 2021, the relief sought by Waka Kotahi from the

PPC28 applicants has reduced in scale to exclude any upgrade of the Bay View Rd / State Highway 6 (SH6) intersection.

The safety issues associated with this intersection cannot be solely attributed to traffic effects from PPC28 because:

- Safety issues regarding the interaction between the Atawhai Shared Path and vehicles using Bay View Rd already exist and have been acknowledged by both Waka Kotahi and Nelson City Council. This is being addressed by Nelson City Council in consultation with Waka Kotahi.
- For the intersection as a whole - the main issue with this intersection is the form i.e. 'T-junction' and the speed of vehicles using SH6, as outlined in the Safe System Assessment. Increased traffic using Bay View Rd will exacerbate this issue, however it is estimated that the operational efficiency of this intersection will reduce further prior to any additional traffic generated as a result of PPC28. State highway corridor improvements will continue to be assessed by Waka Kotahi on a regional level.
- Additional traffic at this intersection associated with PPC28 will be difficult to estimate given the unknown timing of staging, the roading connections proposed (not all associated with PPC28), and the associated distribution of traffic i.e. link to Frenchay Drive which will occur in the short to medium term as a result of the Bayview residential subdivision (RM205239), a potential link via Walters Bluff, and in the longer term the link from Bay View Rd to Maitai Valley Road through the PPC28 area. There is also a number of other relevant variables such as changes in driver behaviour, transport mode shift, fuel costs, etc.

The key outcome Waka Kotahi are seeking through the PPC 28 process is surety of the provision of safe, efficient, convenient and timely multi-modal transport options within the plan change area and linking to existing transport infrastructure and urban amenities.

3.4 Is area wide traffic modelling required now as part of PPC28 or later, through subsequent subdivision and land use consents? Do the rules in the NRMP and PPC28 provide for this to occur or are any amendments required to PPC28?

Gary Clark considers that area wide traffic modelling is not required at this time as part of PPC 28 as there are a large number of variables to consider over an extended timeframe. Such assessment is more appropriately done at subsequent stages such as the resource consents for subdivision and/or development. The provisions in the existing NRMP and those proposed in PPC 28 adequately provide for this assessment.

Mark Lile to identify relevant planning provisions so that these can be reviewed at a subsequent expert conferencing session (Tuesday 10 May 2022).

The Nelson Future Access Study includes a regional traffic model that takes account of the FDS 2019 which anticipated intensification of the CBD taking effect in the period 2018 – 2028 and PPC 28 greenfield development taking effect in the period 2028 – 2038. The FDS 2019 indicated that PPC 28 greenfield development (as referred to as "Kaka Valley") would occur over "Decade 2" being 2029 – 2038 with an estimated yield of 614 homes. In the FDS 2019 scenario it is assumed that the only road link would be via the Maitai Valley Road. This modelling assumed an increase 2228 in dwellings in the central area as a result of intensification during the same parallel timeframe (Decade 2) and a further 154 in Decade 3.

Mark Lile's best estimate of development timeframes for PPC 28 are that the first 50 dwellings might be occupied by 2027.

All experts agree that no further area wide modelling is required to inform the current PPC 28 application.

3.5 **What are the relevant trip generation rates to use to assess PPC28?**

All experts agree that the analysis provided with the plan change (which uses a rate of 7 vehicle trips per dwelling, per day) is appropriate and adequate for the purposes of deciding on the plan change request. It is noted that subsequent resource consents may include a request for further sensitivity testing of the trip rate.

3.6 **Trip distribution**

Gary Clark has assumed that the trip distribution when the link road is completed as a 70 / 30 split between the Maitai Valley Road and Bay View Roads respectively. This does not include the existence of a potential Walters Bluff connection.

Mark Georgeson and Andy High accept Gary Clark's 70/30 split for the purposes of assessing PPC 28 at this time. As with the trip generation rates, this matter can be reconsidered at subsequent resource consent stages when specific development scale can be assessed.

Andrew James considers that there is the potential for all of the traffic from the completed development of the PPC 28 area to use Maitai Valley Road only.

All experts agree that if a Walters Bluff connection is completed this will reduce the loadings onto both Maitai Valley Road and Bay View Road.

3.7 **Completion of the indicative road link between Maitai and Bay View**

It is anticipated that early development will occur separately from Bay View Road and the Maitai Valley Road ends, and eventually the road will be required to link.

Andrew James notes that the NTLDM at 4.13.2.1 and 4.6.8.1 requires that transport networks be designed for a convenient access of public transport. Other provisions in the NTLDM limit the length of permit cul-de-sacs. Andrew James' concern is that if the road link is not completed then this will make the provision of public transport less viable. Andrew James considers that the assessment should be done at this time in the plan change process.

Mark Georgeson identifies that NTLDM 4.6.8.1 provides for "the planning and incorporation of bus routes into a new subdivision should be included as part of the subdivision application...". Gary Clark notes that there are sufficient mechanisms within the NTLDM to control and assess the need for bus routes within the plan change area. Mark Lile has also made reference to the operative NRMP information requirements for subdivision within the services overlay (REr 108) which refers to Appendix 14.2 and the requirement to describe movement networks including for public transport (Ap 14.2.2.ii(e)iii.) and there are also matters in proposed PPC 28 Schedule X. (e.g. X.2 and X.3).

Mark Georgeson, Gary Clark, Mark Lile, Gina Sweetman, Lea O'Sullivan and Andy High do not consider that the link road needs to be completed in the first stage of development and consider it appropriate for the link road to be constructed in stages as a part of subsequent subdivision applications. The resilience and connectivity benefits will be realised when the link road is completed.

3.8 **Is the TIR conclusion over safety deficiencies accurate? If not, what has not been addressed and what needs to be addressed?**

What are the current deficiencies in the transport network (excluding State Highway 6) and are these able to be resolved? Should they be resolved as part of PPC 28 or can they be resolved subsequently? If so, at what stage should this occur and what is the mechanism for this to occur?

Gary Clark has identified the key deficiencies as:

1. The existing intersection of Nile Street and Maitai Valley Road;
2. The active mode connection from the PPC 28 plan change area to the city centre (Collingwood Street);
3. Gibbs Bridge walk / cycle provision.

Gary Clark considers that these deficiencies are able to be addressed as part of the detailed design and subsequent resource consent applications.

Mark Lile agrees with Gary Clark's position and identifies the Services Overlay and associated provisions which provide the mechanism to address offsite infrastructure constraints using the resource consent process. Mark Lile accepts that if there is a deficiency or uncertainty as to scope of the provisions then he accepts those matters can be addressed by amending the PPC 28 Schedule X.

Other experts reserve their position on the adequacy of the operative NRMP provisions together with the proposed PPC 28 provisions to address the identified deficiencies in the transport network outside of the PPC 28 area. Earlier in this JWS Mark Lile undertook to provide reference to relevant planning provisions. It is agreed that this matter may be addressed further on the transportation expert conference on 10 May 2022 and will be referred to the expert conferencing for the Planners scheduled for 19/20 May 2022.

Mark Georgeson also identifies the safety of Bay View Road as a relevant deficiency in terms of the function and management of the road for vehicles, parking and active modes.

Andrew James also identifies:

1. Gibbs Bridge vehicle capacity and delays;
2. The intersection of Ralphine Way and Maitai Valley Road; and
3. Maitai Valley Road between Ralphine Way and Gibbs Bridge;
4. The assessment of the active mode connection from the PPC 28 plan change area to the city centre (Collingwood Street) needs to consider linkages to the schools;
5. Shortfall of parking along Maitai Valley Road associated with events at the cricket ground and Branford Park.

3.9 **What is the relevance of the potential Walters Bluff connection? Is this linkage fundamental to the development and if so, should it be shown on the Structure Plan?**

All experts agree that a future indicative road and walk / cycle connection to the existing Walters Bluff road is desirable and the Structure Plan diagram should be amended to include these within the PPC 28 area, noting that there is a private property outside of the PPC 28 area separating the site from the existing road.

3.10 **Note: this expert conferencing session did not address all matters on the agenda and a further session on transportation is scheduled for 10 May 2022.**

4 PARTICIPANTS TO JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT

4.1 The participants to this Joint Witness Statement, as listed below, confirm that:

- (a) They agree that the outcome(s) of the expert conferencing are as recorded in this statement; and
- (b) They have read Appendix 3 of the Environment Court’s Practice Note 2014 and agree to comply with it; and
- (c) The matters addressed in this statement are within their area of expertise; and
- (d) As this session was held in person and online, in the interests of efficiency, it was agreed that each expert would verbally confirm their position to the Facilitator and this is recorded in the schedule below.

Confirmed in person and online on 4 May 2022:

EXPERT’S NAME	PARTY	EXPERT’S CONFIRMATION REFER PARA 4.1
Gary Clark	Applicant	Yes
Greg McKeever (Surveyor)	Applicant	Yes for item 3.2 only
Mark Georgeson	S42A NCC	Yes
Andy High	Waka Kotahi	Yes
Andrew James	Save the Maitai	Yes
Mark Lile (P)	Applicant	Yes
Gina Sweetman (P)	S42A NCC	Yes
Kelly McCabe (P)	Save the Maitai	Yes
Lea O’Sullivan (P)	Waka Kotahi	Yes