Addendum to Transportation Hearing Report

To:	Gina Sweetman Consultant Planner to Nelson City Council	From:	Mark Georgeson Consultant Transport Expert to Nelson City Council
Project/File:	310204627	Date:	28 June 2022

Reference: Private Plan Change 28 Maitahi Bayview – Addendum to Transportation Hearing Report

Introduction

1. I have prepared this report as an addendum to my Section 42A 'Transportation Hearing Report' (dated 20 May 2022), in response to the Applicant's expert evidence and their proposed amendments to the Private Plan Change 28 (**PPC28**) provisions of the Nelson Resource Management Plan (**NRMP**).

2. In response to the Council Officer's Section 42A Report and the expert witness conferencing, the Applicant has proposed several changes and additions to the NRMP provisions that formed part of the notified PPC28 application. These changes include a requirement to mitigate existing identified off-site transport network deficiencies, amendments to the Structure Plan's internal roading network as well as external connection points, and the requirement for an 'Integrated Transportation Assessment' (**ITA**) at all subsequent subdivision applications.

3. This report summarises my review of the transport-related evidence provided by the Applicant and assesses the proposed changes to the PPC28 specific NRMP provisions. I then provide recommendations on how, in my view, the PPC28 provisions may be strengthened to better achieve a safe and effective transport outcome for development at the site.

4. Section 329 of the Local Government Act has also been brought to my attention. It states as follows and has informed the need to bring forward some more specific transport standards to the NRMP provisions that compensate for S329:

> *"No road shall be laid out or constructed by the council, and no road or proposed road on any scheme plan shall be approved by the council, with a grade in any part of its length steeper than*
>
> *(a) That fixed by any operative [[district plan]] for the district; or*
>
> *(b) Where there is no such district scheme or no such grade is specified in any such district scheme, that fixed by any bylaw or [[resolution of]] the council; or*
>
> *(c) One metre in 8 metres, in any case where that grade is not fixed by any such [[district plan]] or by any bylaw or [[resolution of the council]]."*

5. In preparing this addendum report I have reviewed the following documents and evidence prepared by the Applicant's experts.

    a. traffic evidence prepared by Mr Clark (dated 13 June 2022);

b. urban design evidence and appended 'urban design figures' which show the revised PPC28 Structure Plan, prepared by Mr Nicholson (dated 15 June 2022);

c. planning evidence prepared by Mr Lile (dated 15 June 2022); and

d. updated 'Schedule X' (V2 dated 15 June 2022) appended to Mr Lile's evidence.

6. I have discussed the Applicant's evidence and proposed changes to the PPC28 provisions with the Section 42A planning expert, and have also reviewed the Urban Design and Landscape S42A experts responses insofar as they relate to transport matters, specifically the amended Structure Plan's internal transport network layout and external road connections.

Changes to 'Schedule X'

7. The Applicant has made the following changes and additions to Schedule X:

   a. added a new '**Table X.11 'Service Overlay – Transport Constraints and Required Upgrades**', which identifies off-site network deficiencies which need to be addressed to accommodate PPC28 transport demands;

   b. added a new provision '**X.14 Integrated Transportation Assessment**' which requires an Integrated Transportation Assessment to be prepared and submitted with any new resource consent application with the PPC28 site.

8. I discuss each of these changes in turn below.

New 'Table X.11'

9. The key changes put forward by Messrs Clark and Lile to the PPC28 provisions include the addition of a new **Table X.11 'Services Overlay – Transport Constraints and Required Upgrades**', which sets out five off-site network constraints identified during the traffic conferencing[1] as requiring attention prior to any development within the PPC28 site. For ease of reference, I have reproduced this table below.

Table X.11 'Services Overlay – Transport Constraints and Required Upgrades'

Transport Upgrade	Construction or improvement	Development Threshold
The existing intersection of Nile Street and Maitai Road;	Upgrade intersection to address safety deficiency. These improvement works are likely to be Traffic Signals, but other options can be considered.	Prior to the first new dwelling/lot with access onto Ralphine Way

[1] Joint Witness Statement (2) – 10 May 2022; Para 3.1

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);	Construct a separated shared path from PPC 28 to Nile Street and/or Hardy Street. The shared path will be at least 2500mm wide. There are a number of design options that will be considered as part of Stage 1 of the subdivision.	Prior to the first new dwelling/lot with access onto Raphine Way.
Gibbs Bridge walk / cycle provision;	Construct a shared cycle/walk bridge across Maitai River. Note that this upgrade may be replaced with alternative shared path access from PPCR 28 that removes the need for this project.	Prior to the first new dwelling/lot with access onto Raphine Way.
The intersection of Ralphine Way and Maitai Valley Road.	Improve sight lines, install intersection control and provide right turn bay for Ralphine Way.	Prior to the first new dwelling/lot with access onto Raphine Way
Bay View Road requires the management of the road for vehicles, parking and active modes.	Implement parking restrictions and improve forward sight lines through vegetation removal. This does not include the intersection of Bay View Road and State Highway 6	Prior to the first new dwelling/lot with access onto Bay View Road from PPCR 28 area.

10. I propose some amendments below which in my view will provide further certainty around the form and timing of required mitigation.

    Row 2 – Active Mode Connection from PPC28

11. I note that an active mode connection via Hardy Street has been previously reviewed by Council and discounted such that the Nile Street option is more suitable. I therefore suggest removing reference to "and/or Hardy Street" from the 'construction / improvement' column.

12. In addition, and to ensure new active mode links between the site and the CBD that serve a transport function achieve a suitable gradient that is attractive and supportive of encouraging cycling, I recommended adding a requirement that such links are sealed and, as far as practicable, provided at a gradient no steeper than 1:15.

    Access onto Ralphine Way

13. I propose a minor change to the Table X.11 wording in rows 1-4 under the 'Development Threshold' column, to ensure the timing of these works is undertaken "prior to any new PPC28 lot **that could access via** Ralphine Way".

Row 5 – Bay View Road

14. At paragraph 21 of his evidence Mr Clark states "*there were no capacity constraints on the wider network including the Walters Bluff and Bay View Road as agreed in expert conferencing".* I do not fully agree with this statement and note that during the expert traffic conferencing[2] , Bay View Road was discussed as having current issues associated with kerbside parking practices reducing the carriageway width to one lane and triggering safety concerns. In my opinion, these current issues give rise to capacity constraints too.

15. In view of this, I consider the proposed wording of measures currently described in row 5 of Table X.11 should be expanded to include achievement of forward sightlines and sightlines at accessways and intersections to meet required minimum standards as set out in the Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual (**NTLDM**), and widening and/or introduction of parking restrictions sufficient to enable a car to pass a bus (to be given effect to by the time a bus route is established), and to provide improvements to support safe cycling.

16. I also recommend a minor adjustment to wording in the 'Development Threshold' column (equivalent to Ralphine Way), to read "Prior to the first new dwelling/lot **that could access via** Bay View Road".

New 'X.14 Integrated Transportation Assessment'

17. The second key change to Schedule X is the proposed new provision '**X.14 Integrated Transportation Assessment**', which requires an ITA to be prepared and submitted as part of any new application for subdivision or development. I note this provision is intended to supplement the current requirement within section 4.3.1.2 of the NLTDM for a Transportation Assessment Report, which relates more to extending the transport network rather than assessing impacts of new land use activity.

18. Whilst I agree with the intent of the new provision X.14, it would in my view be appropriate to include a definition of ITA, and to provide guidance on the scope of ITA required. I therefore recommend a definition referencing the Waka Kotahi industry standard 'Research Report 422 Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines' November 2010 (**RR422**), which usefully provides guidance on ITA scope (RR422 Table 6.1 Scope of ITA) in the form of 'Simple', 'Moderate', 'Broad' and 'Extensive', relative to the quantum of traffic generated and significance of transportation effects arising from any new activity.

19. In this instance, such a provision would best apply to requiring any subdivision application involving less than 100 dwellings, as a minimum, an ITA with a 'moderate' scope, with any activity involving >100 dwellings requiring as a minimum a 'broad' scope ITA. In this manner, the RR422 Table 6.3 includes comprehensive guidance on the respective items that should be addressed in associated 'moderate' and 'broad' ITAs, including on-site and off-site mitigation, consideration of cumulative transport effects associated with adjacent land zoned for future development (such as that within the PPC28 site), and assessment of public transport, walking, and cycling needs and how these modes will be encouraged.

[2] Joint Witness Statement (2) – 10 May 2022; Para 3.1

Changes to the 'PPC28 Structure Plan'

20. The Applicant has included an amended PPC28 Structure Plan[3] which includes an indicative secondary road connection to the west in approximately the location of Walters Bluff, and a new indicative secondary road into Kaka Valley.

    Site Connection to the West (at Walters Bluff)

21. I agree with the addition of the new site external connection, noting it provides a fundamental link to the site from the west to supplement the Bay View Road and Ralphine Way connections to the north and south. This link will deliver associated benefits of improved route choice (to reduce trip length) and enhanced permeability within the site itself. I note that there does remain some uncertainty around the timing of such a link, and I discuss this further at paragraphs 24 and 25 below.

    New Secondary Road to the Kaka Valley

22. I support the intent of including the proposed new sub collector road access to the Kaka Valley, and agree with the S42A Urban Design expert, Mr McIndoe, that this new route would more logically connect to the main site spine road immediately adjacent to the proposed commercial centre, to improve accessibility and to deliver a more integrated transport outcome.

Other Matters

Gradient of Internal Spine Road and Timing of Construction

23. The indicative alignment of the through site collector 'spine road' has been developed to strike a balance between delivering a suitable geometric design and managing hillside visual amenity and impacts. Notwithstanding this, the final gradient of the road will need to be designed and constructed to ensure that where there is no practicable impediment, the road achieves as shallow a grade as possible within the southern hillside environment, being no steeper than 1:8 and with sections of no steeper than 1:15 where bus stops are to be provided, to ensure a practicable future public transport service. I therefore recommend this requirement be included as part of the proposed provisions.

24. Given the importance of completing both this through site link and the external site connection to the west (adjacent Walters Bluff) in delivering efficient access and permeability to development within the PPC28 site, it is in my view appropriate to a include a trigger for their introduction in the context of the subsequent staged resource consent applications.

25. I therefore recommend that once development within the northern portion of the site reaches the indicative western site connection, then completion of the spine road or formation of the western site link be operational.

PPC28 Site Active Modes Infrastructure

26. The topography of the site is such that footpath and cycle route gradients will need to be designed and audited to ensure an appropriate outcome is achieved that is attractive and supportive to encouraging active modes, including for transportation purposes. Accordingly, I

[3] Included in 'Urban Design Figures' appended to the Urban Design evidence of Mr Nicholson

recommend including a provision that requires off-road paths to be sealed and at a grade no steeper than 1:20 except within the southern hillside environment, where grades no steeper than 1:15 shall be achieved where the paths divert away from the road carriageway, and that these paths shall be at least 2500mm wide. Where constraints are proven to prevent 1:15 grades, then sections no steeper than 1:12 will be required to be constructed to a minimum 3000mm width, to compensate for potential greater speed differentials of users.

Conclusion and Recommendations

27. Following my assessment of the Applicant's proposed amendments to the PPC28 NRMP provisions, I make the following recommendations:

    - update wording in Table X.11 row 2 to remove reference to "and / or Hardy Street".
    - adjust wording in rows 1-4 of Table X.11 under the 'development threshold' column to read "Prior to any new PPC28 lot **that could access via** Ralphine Way".
    - amend wording in Table X.11 at row 5 under 'construction or improvement' to read "measures required to achieve sightlines in line with the NLTDM, and road width sufficient for a car to pass a bus", and adjust wording under the 'development threshold' column to read "Prior to the first new dwelling/lot **that could access via** Bay View Road".
    - Add definition to proposed provision X.14 to reference the 'Research Report 422 Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines', and add wording to require "any development of <100 and >100 dwellings to provide as a minimum, a 'moderate' and 'broad' ITA, respectively.
    - I support the S42A Urban Design expert (Mr McIndoe) suggested amendment to the new indicative road access into the Kaka Valley, in that this should be realigned to connect with the main site spine road immediately adjacent to the proposed new commercial zone.
    - add a new provision that requires the final gradient of the north-south spine road to be designed to ensure that where there is no practicable impediment, the road achieves as shallow a grade as possible within the southern hillside environment, being no steeper than 1:8 and with sections no steeper than 1:15 where bus stops are to be provided.
    - add a new provision requiring that once development within the northern part of the site extends as far as the external site connection road to the west (adjacent Walters Bluff), then either 'the main north-south spine road is to be connected in full' or 'the new external site connection to the west (adjacent Walters Bluff) is to be constructed and operational'.
    - add a new provision requiring off-road paths that serve a transport function to be constructed to a minimum 2500mm width and with grades no steeper than 1:20, and no steeper than 1:15 through the hillside environment. Where constraints are proven to prevent 1:15 grades being achieved, then sections no steeper than 1:12 will be required to be constructed to a minimum 3000mm width.

28. These proposed changes provide further certainty for the Applicant and the Council around mitigation, assessment, and timing and form of the internal transport links.