

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 (2)

10 May 2022

Expert Conferencing Held on: 10 May 2022

Venue: 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

All experts (except Andrew James and Kelly McCabe) agree that it would be appropriate to supplement the existing NRMP Services Overlay provisions with further provisions relating to PPC 28 being included in Schedule X.

The matters to be included in Schedule X are to identify the specific infrastructure constraints that must be addressed at the time of subdivision or development. In relation

to transportation, the following constraints have been identified as matters that need to be addressed before any residential activities are occupied in the PPC 28 area:

For development from Ralphine Way:

1. The existing intersection of Nile Street and Maitai Road;
2. The active mode connections from the PPC 28 plan change area to the city centre (Collingwood Street). There may be separate routes to provide for recreational users and commuters (includes work and education);
3. Gibbs Bridge walk / cycle provision;
4. The intersection of Ralphine Way and Maitai Valley Road.

For development from Bay View Road:

5. Bay View Road requires the management of the road for vehicles, parking and active modes. This does not include the intersection of Bay View Road and State Highway 6.

Gary Clark and Mark Lile have agreed to review the level of specificity around the scope of works in the above listed items.

Andrew James and Kelly McCabe consider that all of the transportation deficiencies are significant and require a considered assessment now as part of the plan change process to fully understand the remedies to ensure satisfactory outcomes. They do not consider that sufficient transportation information has been provided with the plan change request.

Andrew James also identifies the points below which he considers require consideration as PPC 28 develops:

1. Gibbs Bridge vehicle capacity and delays;
2. Maitai Valley Road between Ralphine Way and Gibbs Bridge;
3. Shortfall of parking along Maitai Valley Road associated with events at the cricket ground and Branford Park.

All other experts do not consider that this list of 3 items would necessarily be an exhaustive list of future upgrades that may be required in response to development of the PPC 28 area.

Mark Georgeson, Gary Clark and Mark Lile are satisfied that the existing and proposed NRMP provisions including the Services Overlay provide the necessary mechanisms to address transportation effects and solutions, at the time of resource consent.

Gina Sweetman, Kelly McCabe, Lea O'Sullivan and Andy High would like to review the adequacy of the existing NRMP provisions in terms of requiring appropriate information with resource consents and the adequacy of the matters of discretion in REr. 108.

Note: this topic will be referred to the planning expert conferencing.

3.2 Is the TIR assessment of active transport – trips and connections adequate and appropriate for PPC28? If not, what further information is required?

Andrew James notes that the application documents use active mode trip rates of 20% cycle and 12% walk for the Maitai catchment. Andrew James considers that those rates are optimistic given the location of the PPC 28 area to the city centre.

3.3 How is Nile Street affected and would the trees need to be removed to adequately accommodate future PPC28 multi-modal demands on this part of the network?

Mark Georgeson notes that provision is made within the current council LTP for cycle lane improvements on Nile Street. These are \$30,000 in 2024/2025, \$100,000 in 2025/2026 and \$1,300,000 in 2026/2027 and include the investigative work that is yet to be done. These improvements are irrespective of PPC 28.

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 online on 10 May 2022:

EXPERT’S NAME	PARTY	EXPERT’S CONFIRMATION REFER PARA 4.1
Gary Clark (T)	Applicant	Yes
Mark Georgeson (T)	S42A NCC	Yes
Andy High (T)	Waka Kotahi	Yes
Andrew James (T)	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