



Notice of the Ordinary meeting of

Nelson City Council

Te Kaunihera o Whakatū

Date:	Thursday 11 April 2024
Time:	1.00p.m.
Location:	Council Chamber Floor 2A, Civic House 110 Trafalgar Street, Nelson

Agenda

Rārangi take

Chairperson

Deputy Mayor

Members

His Worship the Mayor Nick Smith

Cr Rohan O'Neill-Stevens

Cr Matty Anderson

Cr Matthew Benge

Cr Trudie Brand

Cr Mel Courtney

Cr James Hodgson

Cr Kahu Paki Paki

Cr Pete Rainey

Cr Campbell Rollo

Cr Rachel Sanson

Cr Tim Skinner

Cr Aaron Stallard

Quorum 7

**Nigel Philpott
Chief Executive**

Nelson City Council Disclaimer

Please note that the contents of these Council and Committee agendas have yet to be considered by Council and officer recommendations may be altered or changed by the Council in the process of making the formal Council decision. For enquiries call (03) 5460436.

Karakia and Mihi Timatanga

1. Apologies

An apology has been received from Councillor K Paki Paki

2. Confirmation of Order of Business

3. Interests

3.1 Updates to the Interests Register

3.2 Identify any conflicts of interest in the agenda

4. Public Forum

5. Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

4 - 26

Document number R28455

Recommendation

That the Council

1. ***Receives the report Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval (R28455) and its attachments 336940202-11213 and 336940202-11214; and***
2. ***Approves a one-way street/two- way street (delete one) layout on Bridge Street from Rutherford Street to Collingwood Street, that will allow the Bridge to Better project developed design to proceed and then, subject to the outcome Deliberations of the Long Term Plan, detailed design; and***
3. ***Notes that the results of community feedback sought during late April and early May 2024 will be reported to Council as part of the Long Term Plan Deliberations Report on funding decisions for the Bridge to Better project; and***

4. ***Notes that the additional cost of parking, to offset any parking lost through the Bridge to Better project will be reported to Council through the Long Term Plan 2024-34 Deliberations report; and***
5. ***Notes that future progress and budget reporting on the Bridge to Better Project will be brought to Council via the Infrastructure 6 monthly report.***

CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

6. Exclusion of the Public

Recommendation

That the Council

1. ***Excludes the public from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.***
2. ***The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:***

Karakia Whakamutanga

Report Title: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval
Report Author: Lisa Gibellini - Strategic Housing Adviser
Report Authoriser: Alec Louverdis - Deputy Chief Executive / Group Manager Infrastructure
Report Number: R28455

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To receive and consider the results of business, property owner, iwi and stakeholder engagement on the Bridge to Better Project.
- 1.2 To approve a street layout option for the Bridge to Better Project which will proceed onto developed and then, subject to the outcome of the LTP detailed design.

2. Summary

- 2.1 The Bridge to Better Project is an ambitious project that has benefitted from Central Government's Infrastructure Acceleration Fund, the details of which have been canvassed on many occasions with elected members and not replicated here.
- 2.2 This report outlines the significant engagement and communications work undertaken to date and highlights the ongoing opportunities for that to continue through the design and construction phases as well as the next steps in the programme and opportunities for governance oversight.
- 2.3 This report seeks a Council decision on which street layout option (Attachment 1 336940202-11213) for Bridge to Better to proceed with into developed and then, subject to the outcome of the LTP, detailed design.
- 2.4 This decision will allow work to progress to a stage that will allow officers to meet the first payment milestone of IAF due by September 2024.

3. Recommendation

That the Council

- 1. Receives the report Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval (R28455) and its attachments 336940202-11213 and 336940202-11214; and***
- 2. Approves a one-way street/two- way street (delete one) layout on Bridge Street from Rutherford Street to Collingwood Street, that will allow the Bridge to Better project developed design to proceed and then, subject to the outcome Deliberations of the Long Term Plan, detailed design; and***
- 3. Notes that the results of community feedback sought during late April and early May 2024 will be reported to Council as part of the Long Term Plan Deliberations Report on funding decisions for the Bridge to Better project; and***
- 4. Notes that the additional cost of parking, to offset any parking lost through the Bridge to Better project will be reported to Council through the Long Term Plan 2024-34 Deliberations report; and***
- 5. Notes that future progress and budget reporting on the Bridge to Better Project will be brought to Council via the Infrastructure 6 monthly report.***

4. Background

- 4.1 In June 2021, the New Zealand Government announced the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund (IAF) initiative as part of the Housing Acceleration Fund announced in March 2021.
- 4.2 On 22 September 2022 the Council entered into a contract with Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities, acting on behalf of the Crown Infrastructure Acceleration Fund (IAF) for the Bridge Street Linear Active Transport Corridor, now known as “Bridge to Better”.
- 4.3 The agreement is to fund the Bridge to Better project \$36.3 Million subject to special conditions, including Council committing funding through the Long Term Plan 2024/34 and enabling housing outcomes.
- 4.4 The Long Term Plan 2024/34 is currently out for consultation and includes a proposal to increase the Council funds already set aside (of \$32 million) for Bridge to Better to \$42.4 million. It also states that public feedback on a concept design is proposed to take place in May 2024.

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

- 4.5 The project includes for the upgrade of potable water, wastewater, stormwater, above ground roading and the Paru Paru wastewater pump station upgrade.

5. Discussion

- 5.1 Since Council entered into the IAF contract a design consortium contract has been awarded (following a public tender process) that has arrived at optioneering and concept designs, ready for a Council decision to proceed to the next stage.
- 5.2 Following approval of a street layout concept, officers will be progressing with an Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) model to seek benefits from early thinking around buildability, construction sequencing/staging to better inform the design. This also provides opportunities to lock in a contractor early and address any wider market/resourcing pressures. The intention is to get a contractor on board late 2024.
- 5.3 Construction is due to take place in 2026/2027 however the wider three waters infrastructure upgrades works (i.e. works that sit outside of Bridge Street) will be staged ahead to assist with capital works project sequencing to minimize overall disruption to the central city area.
- 5.4 The Paru Paru Pumpstation project also falls within the Bridge to Better programme of works and will also follow an ECI process; with construction to take place from 2026-2028.

Engagement and Communications

- 5.5 Bridge to Better has an extensive engagement history, most notably through Te Ara o Whakatū, which specifically highlighted the Bridge Street project and the Annual Plan 2023/24 which sought additional funding to begin engagement and design optioneering ahead of the availability of IAF funding which is dependent on the LTP 2024/34 decision currently out for consultation. That funding was approved.
- 5.6 Communications around this project have been in the public domain since 2021 and the successful IAF funding was formally announced in October 2022.
- 5.7 In August 2023, work began on early engagement with stakeholders to inform concept design, including meeting with Te Tauihu Iwi.
- 5.8 In September 2023, early engagement was publicly launched with a media release, letter to affected businesses, and 1:1 visits from the engagement team. The release was covered by the Nelson App (TOPS Media), Nelson Mail and RNZ.
- 5.9 The engagement has been live on Shape Nelson and featured across Council social media and publications since September 2023, alongside a publicity campaign that has included 13 updates or articles in Our Nelson, as well as Phantom posters.

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

- 5.10 Further engagement also occurred with key community groups and Te Taihū iwi, with 12 hui occurring with iwi leaders to date, as well as regular updates.
- 5.11 In December 2023, two information sessions were hosted by the Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce and the What If Whakatū Nelson initiative respectively, both of which were publicly advertised and well attended.
- 5.12 Building on the history of engagement with Te Ara o Whakatū, the Bridge to Better project team has met with over 80 businesses and spoken to over 250 individuals.
- 5.13 In March 2024, following six months of extensive early engagement activity, a letter from the Chief Executive and a proactive survey consultation was issued to businesses and property owners in the Bridge Street catchment to canvas preferences on street layout.
- 5.14 There were 52 respondents to the survey, which included questions seeking feedback on a one-way or a two-way option, as well as questions relating to key issues raised in early engagement such as carparking and construction impacts.
- 5.15 The information stated within the survey estimated on-street carparking would reduce by 60% in the one-way option and 50% in the two-way option.
- 5.16 Feedback was also received from iwi and community groups who had been involved in the early engagement, complementing their earlier involvement.
- 5.17 The survey results indicated the following high-level findings:
 - 5.17.1 Preference for a two-way street (58%) over a one-way street (42%).
 - 5.17.2 Above average sentiment: 6.3/10 for two-way vs 5.3/10 for one-way.
 - 5.17.3 Support for parking loss mitigation methods such as shifting to a higher turnover time limit (P60 or less) and creating offset parking elsewhere.
- 5.18 Survey results also indicated that most respondents (80%) felt Council is getting the level of engagement 'About Right' with just 20% indicating 'Not Enough'.
- 5.19 A range of feedback was received on suggested improvements, construction impacts and other issues which will be considered throughout the design and construction phases.

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

- 5.20 A summary of the key feedback from stakeholders is provided in Attachment 2. Communities of interest is made up of art and culture, accessibility for all, active transport organisations.
- 5.21 Two Council workshops have been held on the project this year. The first on 23 February where an overview of the engagement undertaken over the previous 6 months was provided along with a discussion of the street layout options to be taken back to stakeholders for feedback. At the second workshop on 22 March Council considered the stakeholder survey feedback provided on the two options also presented in this report.
- 5.22 Key stakeholders have been informed of the survey results and that this report is being tabled at this meeting.

Design Guiding Principles

- 5.23 Following any decision by Council on a road layout and following LTP deliberations, the design principles that will be incorporated into the developed and detailed design will include:
 - 5.23.1 Urban greening with trees and low plantings prioritising native plantings, integration of raingardens with endemic plant species that will enable didactic stormwater to prepare the city for higher frequency storm impacts.
 - 5.23.2 A flush surface street without kerb and channel will enable a flexible surface suitable for a variety of public activation opportunities such as festivals, markets, parades to celebrate Nelson's arts and creative events legacy.
 - 5.23.3 Cultural expression reflected through the integration of unique details working with iwi co-design will be revealed through materials, details, colours, textures, patterning, and artwork.

Street Layout Concept Options

- 5.24 A wide range of street layout options were considered during the concept design process. These options included variations in how all street users were catered for, and how the street space could be allocated. Several options were discarded early in the process, and these were: a fully pedestrian street, a street with no parking and a street with angle parking (due to critical safety concerns and the excessive space required to accommodate it).
- 5.25 The initial long list of options was assessed against key project principles that resulted in a shorter list of options that were then assessed against the following key criteria and sub criteria shown in brackets:
 - 5.25.1 Supporting city centre housing intensification (with consideration of the needs of future residents and the development sector); and

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

- 5.25.2 Urban greening (space for raingardens, play, positive effects on microclimate); and
 - 5.25.3 Community and culture (support business needs such as parking and outdoor dining, encouraging people to stay longer, Iwi considerations); and
 - 5.25.4 Moving people (supports the Active Transport route status, all users catered for safely, impact on adjacent streets, simple and clear to use, servicing needs, e.g. loading)
- 5.26 From the assessment process, two main options emerged, the key difference between them being how the traffic (motor vehicles and bicycles) moves along the street and how much space is available for other uses such as landscaping. Both options include a flush (level) street with no kerbs, this allows flexibility to hold events and creates car park spaces that are more accessible for mobility impaired people. A flush street also has more flexibility on where people cross the road.
- 5.27 Overall, both options meet - to varying extents - the range of project guiding principles and assessment criteria, such that when applying a numerical scoring (unweighted) to the assessment the result is very close. The options are described in section 6.0 of this report along with an assessment of their advantages, disadvantages and risks.

Parking

- 5.28 At the Bridge to Better workshop held on 23 February 2024 elected members discussed the question of whether offset car parking should be provided elsewhere in the city centre. Officers have considered where offset carparking could be provided without the need to purchase further land and have cost estimates for a range of car options.
- 5.29 Offset car parking can be provided off Paru Paru Road at Rutherford Park, adjoining the existing formed carparks and opposite the site of the proposed city centre playspace. Officers explored rough cost estimates for three options: Option 1 provides 37 carparks for \$525k; Option 2 provides 55 carparks for \$860k; and Option 3 provides 81 carparks for \$1.3million.
- 5.30 The provision of offset carparking and its scale, costs and implications for Council's debt cap will be addressed in the LTP deliberations report.

Hardy Street

- 5.31 At the Bridge to Better workshop held on 22 March 2024 elected members raised the question about the possibility of Hardy Street being a one-way in the opposite direction and whether that would work with and complement any decision by Council on a one-way layout for Bridge Street this report. The question extended to officers was cost and timing of this proposition.

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

- 5.32 The underground infrastructure in Hardy Street is of varying age and condition. Any works in Hardy Street, as in Bridge Street, would need to work on the principle of “dig up once”, essential to minimise cost and disruption to local businesses. If Hardy Street was to be upgraded to complement Bridge Street there would be a mixture of underground upgrades that would be prudent to undertake, while some underground infrastructure would be left in situ as it still has an expected life of between 30 to 80 years.
- 5.33 High level estimated costs for all works to bring Hardy Street up to the same level of service as a Bridge Street one way layout would be around \$40 million (excluding cost escalation that is dependent on what year the works are to be undertaken). This includes greater outdoor dining areas to complement the “eat street” businesses on Hardy, design work, consultation, consultant/construction costs and allowances for coal tar removal.
- 5.34 Ideally any work on this initiative would follow on from the work in Bridge Street with consultation commencing earlier. This would be an additional cost that is not included within the current LTP. The Council is already close to the debt cap limit of 200% being consulted on in the LTP 24/34 and any decision to include funding for Hardy Street would require reprioritising this above other projects to ensure the debt cap is not exceeded.

6. Options

- 6.1 Council has two options to consider. Each of the street layout options is described below and illustrations of the key components of spatial allocation of each are provided in Attachment 1 and should be read together. The advantages, disadvantages, and risks of each are also summarised in the table below.
- 6.2 While the results of the survey were a slight preference for a two-way street (58%) over a one-way street (42%), the over whelming message from business and property owners on Bridge Street, stakeholders and iwi was that regardless of which option the Council just needs to get on and get this project done. With so much effort from those consulted with there is considerable reputational risk if the Council doesn’t approve either of the options below.

Option 1 : One-Way Street Layout

- 6.3 Option 1 is a one-way street for traffic and cyclists sharing the east bound traffic lane, with west bound cyclists having their own space known as a ‘contraflow’ cycle lane.
- 6.4 This option of a one-way street was tested and found to have negligible traffic impacts on the wider network. This is because Bridge Street is a low volume street and is not a key traffic link, it is a street that allows access to central city destinations. The traffic peak is around lunchtime

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

compared to a commuter focused street where there are clear morning and afternoon traffic peaks.

- 6.5 This option has wider footpaths than the existing layout that allow more space for outdoor dining and seating areas.
- 6.6 It includes parking bays on the north side only, with several loading bays on the south side. The number of parking spaces will be less than there is currently and slightly less than a two-way option.
- 6.7 Between the parking bays on the north side and the loading bays on the south side, space would be provided for greenery, cycle parking and for pedestrian activation space, making the street more vibrant by compelling longer stays/visits to Bridge Street and the city centre. Overall, there is more space (an extra 1.2m) for these uses than a two-way street.
- 6.8 In this layout there would be defined places to cross the road for those who need a crossing. The distance to cross the road is less than a two-way street and easier as there is only one direction of traffic, although there will be cyclists in both directions.
- 6.9 With this one-way layout the intersection of Trafalgar Street will be less complex for people due to the reduced number of turning movements with a one-way street.
- 6.10 Under this option approximately 55 parking spaces (60% loss from 91 parks) will be lost.

Option 2: Two Way Street Layout

- 6.11 Option 2 is a two-way street where traffic and cyclists would share the same traffic lane that would be narrower than the existing lanes with cycle markings that communicate the sharing situation.
- 6.12 This option has wider footpaths than the existing layout that allow more space for outdoor dining and seating areas.
- 6.13 In this layout there would be defined places to cross the road for those who need a crossing. The distance to cross the road is a bit (1.2m) further than a one-way street.
- 6.14 With a two-way layout parking bays on each side including several loading bays are accommodated. The number of parking spaces would be less than there is currently, about half, this is so more space could be provided for greenery, cycle parking and pedestrian activation space in the street, making the street more vibrant by compelling longer stays/visits to Bridge Street and the city centre.
- 6.15 There are opportunities to improve the intersection of Trafalgar Street, but it may still remain complex for some people unless some vehicle turns or movements are banned.

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

- 6.16 Under this option approximately 38 parking spaces (50% loss from 91 parks) would be lost.
- 6.17 The advantages, disadvantages and risks associated with Council's decision to approve one of the options is summarised in the table below. Officers have not made a recommendation on either option.

Option 1: Approve the one-way street layout to go to developed design	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the recommended approach in the heavily engaged on and community supported Te Ara o Whakatū • Is a truly transformational project that can enable revitalisation of the city centre and attract greater private investment for housing and commercial development. • Satisfies the call from stakeholders and the community to invest in the city public realm and get on and deliver a project. • Satisfies the requirements of the IAF funding in that it meets all stated outcomes. • Safer for all users due to the reduction in vehicle conflict points at intersections and removal of head-on collision risk. • Easier for people to cross the street and intersections as motor traffic in one direction only and the distance is shorter. • More space (an extra 1.2m) for uses such as landscaping seating and public amenity than a two-way street. • Can achieve more effective raingardens due to greater space allocation. • Likely to promote better use of the parking squares as westbound movement into the city. • Less amenable to accommodating buses which is supported by business who want buses and the old bus hub removed from Bridge Street. • Can stand as a project alone or could be supported by a future project to one-way Hardy Street in the other direction thereby maximising revitalisation investment in the city centre. • Westbound traffic is distributed to adjacent streets in low volumes and resulting in no network efficiency concerns.

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes more parking than the two-way option. • Would require design changes at the west end of the street to accommodate the current bus exit movement from the Bus Hub if this was to remain in Bridge Street. This would be contrary to feedback from business who want both the buses and the bus hub to be removed from Bridge Street. • A one-way option was not the most supported option by the stakeholders engaged with.
Option 2: Approve the two-way street layout to go to developed design	
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a transformational project that can enable revitalisation of the city centre and attract greater private investment for housing and commercial development. • Satisfies the call from stakeholders and the community to invest in the city public realm and get on and deliver a project. • Satisfies the requirements of the IAF funding in that it meets all stated outcomes. • A two-way option was the most supported option by the stakeholders engaged with. • Allows greater network flexibility for people driving, particularly those making deliveries. • People are more used to this configuration than a one-way street. • Retains marginally more parking than the one-way option. • Would accommodate the current bus exit movement from the Bus Hub if this was to remain in Bridge Street. • Can stand as a project alone or could be supported by a future project to give Hardy Street a similar treatment thereby maximising revitalisation investment in the city centre, although noting that a two way Hardy Street ay provide less space and amenity for the outdoor dining focus of the street.
Risks and Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less space available for other uses. • Less likely to achieve the Linear Park concept supported in Te Ara ō Whakatū.

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Less safe for all users overall than the one-way option (but not at a level that makes this a fatal flaw for the option).• If selected to enable the buses to remain at the old SBL site (25 to 27 Bridge St) then this would be contrary to feedback from business who want both the buses and the bus hub to be removed from Bridge Street.• There may be some reputational risk that a two-way option is not the transformative project the community and city centre business and stakeholders are seeking.
--	---

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 This report seeks a Council decision on which street layout option to proceed with into developed and then detailed design for the Bridge to Better works.
- 7.2 Council only has funding to take one option through to developed design, and completion of that is the first payment milestone of IAF due by September 2024.

8. Next Steps

- 8.1 Following the approval by Council on a street concept layout, developed design will commence that will include:
- 8.2.1 Further communications enabling more useful information about the project to be shared.
 - 8.2.2 Early engagement results and the concept layout will be released for further public feedback via Shape Nelson which will feed into LTP deliberations.
 - 8.2.3 Engagement with key stakeholders particularly on key issues such as timeframes and mitigation impacts.
 - 8.2.4 The intention remains to work closely with stakeholders to continually provide feedback and input, ensuring communication lines remain open throughout the project.
- 8.3 The project life deliverables include:
- 8.3.1 The design development continuing through to mid-2025 in partnership with key stakeholders.
 - 8.3.2 Securing all necessary consents, early contractor involvement/tendering ahead of construction activities with construction planned to take place in 2026/27 with wider three

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

waters infrastructure upgrades works (i.e. works that sit outside of Bridge Street) staged ahead to assist with wider capital works project sequencing and minimize overall disruption to the central city area.

- 8.3.3 The project will work to align with the IAF Funding Agreement Milestones and seek IAF income/payments as the projects progress.
- 8.3.4 Future updates will be provided through the Infrastructure 6-monthly Report

Attachments

Attachment 1: Illustration of Street Layout Options Bridge to Better 336940202-11213 [↓](#)

Attachment 2: Summary of Key Feedback from Stakeholders 336940202-11214 [↓](#)

Important considerations for decision making
Fit with Purpose of Local Government <p>The recommendations in this report support the cultural, economic and social wellbeing of the community by confirming which street layout option to proceed into developed and detail design in order to revitalise and provide infrastructure capacity to enable development in the city centre</p>
Consistency with Community Outcomes and Council Policy <p>The recommendations in this report align with the following community outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our urban and rural environments are people friendly, well planned and sustainably managed• Our infrastructure is efficient, cost effective and meets current and future needs• Our communities are healthy, safe, and resilient• Our Council provides leadership and fosters partnerships, a regional perspective, and community engagement
Risk <p>There is a risk that some members of the Bridge Street stakeholders and iwi may not support the option selected by Council. This risk is however mitigated by either option being able to achieve the project objectives, that Council has considered the view of those potentially affected in making this decision, and that there is general consensus in the feedback that there is a need to get on and get this project implemented whatever the option in order to show commitment to the need to revitalise the city centre through civic investment. There is a risk that if Council does not make a decision on which option to proceed with, this will undermine the community support for the project and mean that IAF delivery and funding milestones are not met.</p>
Financial impact <p>Funding for the completion of developed design was approved via the Annual Plan 2023/24 and therefore this decision does not have any financial impact. The longer term funding of the project is currently being consulted on via the Long Term Plan 2024/34 and decisions in relation to that will be made as part of the deliberations on the LTP.</p>
Degree of significance and level of engagement <p>This matter is of low significance because the decision on which option to proceed to developed and detailed design does relate to a strategic</p>

Item 5: Bridge to Better Project Concept Approval

asset; it will not result in any changes to levels of service and there will be no impact on the level of financial debt. Notwithstanding this significant communication and engagement with key stakeholders and iwi has been undertaken, the results of which have been provided in this report so that the Council in making this decision is taking in the views of those potentially affected by the project. In addition, a public feedback process is proposed following this decision so that the Council can consider in its deliberations on the LTP, in regard to future funding of this project, the further views of the wider community

Climate Impact

Climate impact will be considered throughout the design, material selection, and construction methodology and period of this project.

Inclusion of Māori in the decision making process

Engagement with iwi has been undertaken throughout the project to date and this is summarised in section 5.2.2 of this report.

Legal context

- Council has power to make this decision under its power of general competence (Local Government Act 2002 s12(2)).
- The general decision-making requirements of sections 76 to 82 of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002 apply to this decision of Council. The report demonstrates that these general requirements have been met by:
 - assessing significance and necessary consultation (refer Degree of significance and level of engagement above); and
 - identifying the reasonably practicable options and assessing their advantages and disadvantages (refer options table in the body of the report).

Delegations

This is a matter for Council

Option 1

One Way Street Layout



NDOCS 336940202-11213

Street Sections

1-way option – South side loading bay – 19.7m width (Schematic looking towards Collingwood Street)



NDOCS 336940202-11213

Street Sections

1-way



NDOCS 336940202-11213

Street Sections

1-way option



NDOCS 336940202-11213

Option 2

Two Way Street Layout



NDOCS 336940202-11213

Street Sections

2-way option – South side loading bay – 19.7m width (Schematic looking towards Collingwood Street)



NDOCS 336940202-11213

Street Sections

2-way



NDOCS 336940202-11213

Street Sections 2-way option



NDOCS 336940202-11213

Attachment 2 Summary of Key Feedback from Stakeholders
<p>Te Taihū Iwi</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the expression of cultural narratives through all design decisions to let the shared identity, values, history and stories of the area inform the design. 2. Seek restoration through design to better balance the natural and built environment, returning cultural and environmental vitality eroded overtime. 3. Encourage the use of greening, water, native plantings and restorative design to bring nature back into the streetscape and recognise the origin of the space. 4. Support opportunities to strengthen visibility and recognition of Toi Māori in a way that builds capacity and capability for future capital works across the city. 5. Seek a design for the future, a whole of system approach to infrastructure, and the integration of cultural, social, environmental and economic outcomes.
<p>Communities of Interest</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seek accessibility for all ages, cultures and abilities to ensure the upgrades achieve a more inclusive and welcoming city centre design blueprint. 2. Encourage more responsive design such as flat non-linear layouts to create more negotiated shared spaces, promoting a destination over a thoroughfare. 3. Promote vibrancy with more arts, culture, events, seating, open spaces, lighting, and greening. Encourage play, creativity, social connection and movement. 4. Call for safety and inclusivity by making the street people-focused, creating greater vibrancy and encouraging utilisation of the street for more of the day. 5. Support environmental restoration and greening opportunities, reconnecting the street with its natural and cultural foundations for a stronger sense of place.
<p>Businesses and Property Owners</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Express concerns about the decline of the CBD with many businesses struggling in a challenging climate. They are seeking action to stimulate the city centre. 2. Support revitalisation and modernisation, with cautious optimism about the potential of the improvements. They seek a focus on enhanced business vitality. 3. Encourage a destination and character focus to stimulate businesses, attract and retain more spend in the city, and ensure Nelson remains relevant. 4. Offer a range of views on parking from opposing any reduction to calls for more radical changes to the street to create a more people-focused destination. 5. Seek clarity on the construction approach and timing, as many businesses are feeling uncertain and anxious about this period and the impacts on trade.

NDOCS-336940202-11214