

# MINUTES

**TITLE:** Tasman Regional Transport Committee  
**DATE:** Friday 26 March 2010  
**TIME:** 9.30 am  
**VENUE:** Council Chamber, 189 Queen Street, Richmond.

**PRESENT:** Unitary Authority representatives: Crs Trevor Norriss (Chair), Barry Dowler, Judene Edgar  
NZ Transport Agency representative: Dr Deborah Hume  
Economic Development appointee: Bill Findlater  
Safety and Person Security appointee: Inspector Brian McGurk

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Engineering Services Manager (P W Thomson),  
Transportation Manager (G Clark), R Firth, P Peet (MWH NZ), J Skinner (NZTA), Executive Assistant (V M Gribble)

## APOLOGIES

Moved Cr Edgar/D Hume  
RTS10-03-01

**THAT apologies from Crs T B King and S G Bryant, and P Heywood, C Musgrave, F te Miha, and P Burton for absence be received.**  
**CARRIED**

## 1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

### 1.1 Tasman Regional Transport Committee – 23 October 2009

Moved Crs Norriss/Dowler  
RTS10-03-02

**THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Tasman Regional Transport Committee held on 23 October 2009, containing resolutions numbered RTC09/10/01 to RTC09/10/05 be confirmed as a true and complete record.**  
**CARRIED**

## 2 NATIONAL CYCLE TRAIL

Engineering Manager, Peter Thomson, arrived at the meeting at 9.43 pm.

Transportation Manager, G Clark advised that Tasman District Council has been successful in progressing to the feasibility business case stage with the Ministry of Tourism for National Cycle Trail funding. The business case is now being prepared in conjunction with Nelson City Council and Nelson Cycle Trails Trust. Issues to be resolved are Richmond to Mapua and across the Waimea River and around to Mapua without getting on the state highway.

Ms Hume advised that Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council have made the short list for the NZ Transport Agency cycling money.

### **3 DRAFT REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY – SUBMISSIONS**

The agenda contained copies of the 22 submissions received to the Draft Regional Land Transport Strategy.

#### **Sub 4 & 5 Paul Searancke and also on behalf of Motorcycling NZ**

Mr Searancke was in attendance and was disappointed there was no mention of motorcyclists in the strategy and sought an increased level of support for this travel mode. He said this would be an excellent opportunity to form a strategy to move forward for motor cyclists. He noted that a lot of the motor cycle accidents occurring in the Tasman District involve motor cyclists from outside the district which suggests road markings or other things are different to other areas in New Zealand. He would like the strategy to recognise the issues and also that motor cycling organisations have input into the roading system.

Mr Findlater said there has been discussion and consideration of motor cyclists. He said a significant number of motor cyclists come from other regions to ride in Nelson, but believes there are other mitigating circumstances affecting the accident rates.

Motorcycling NZ noted that motorcycling activities are severely under-represented in the draft.

Mr Searancke said there should be recognition in the document that there is an issue relating to accidents.

Cr Edgar suggested adding a paragraph highlighting that motor cyclists are included under the heading “motor vehicle”.

Mr Searancke suggested motor cycle parks also be provided for motor cyclists. He would like to see this region being a leader rather than a follower. He would like to see greater information sharing and having the opportunity to contribute. He acknowledged the rider training that Tasman District Council is undertaking.

Mr McGurk said police analysis of crash data shows there are a lot of injuries and deaths in Tasman District area. Common factors seems to be cyclists touring. How do we reach those people?

Mr Searancke said it is an education process, involving organisations, ie Ulysses Motor Cycle Club. He said Ulysses do educate their people and said training should be a natural part of riding. It comes down to education and changing the culture so you can improve everybody. It's not a quick fix. He said the Victorian strategy works reasonably well.

Mr Clark noted that Tasman is a leader in motor cycling training.

Cr Edgar (page 19 of agenda) asked whether it is correct that 70% of cycling crashed occurred on urban roads and 30% of cycling crashes occur on rural roads.

Target 5.1.3b – is it possible to provide a base year to compare and/or to measure improvement by. Mr Clark said it is difficult to get because the information is commercially sensitive.

#### **Sub 14 Walk Nelson Tasman**

Richard Butler and Judy Cox were in attendance to present the submission on behalf of Walk Nelson Tasman. They are supportive of the strategy. They encouraged consideration of a protocol for use of shared pathways and say the cambers and crossovers are an issue for people with limited mobility. There needs to be a more comprehensive public transport system, especially with the ageing population in Tasman District. They would like to see public transport to Wakefield and Motueka which would enable people with mobility issues to use that system instead of taxis which are very expensive, even with the Total Mobility subsidy. They said footpaths are just as important as open spaces.

Mr Butler said they are wanting some more measurable targets. He said public transport needs to be a network to be strong. A good service between Nelson and Richmond is important and it needs to be thought of in terms of long term investment. The present service could be improved by encouraging the use of Bateup Road, Hill Street and Champion Road, especially for those people with limited mobility.

#### **Sub 7 NZ Federated Farmers**

Edwin Newport was in attendance to present the submission on behalf of NZ Federated Farmers which requested ongoing maintenance of roads for heavy vehicles, continued investment into slow vehicle bays, improved and more frequent stock effluent disposal sites and priorities for rural road network. Motueka Bridge needs replacing to accommodate the traffic.

Cr Edgar asked are there areas within the local road network where stock effluent sites should be?

Mr Newport said most sites, to be strategically placed, would need to be on the state highways. He suggested one in Hope would be beneficial.

#### **Sub 11 BLIP (Biking Lanes in Paradise)**

Victoria Davis represented BLIP and expressed concern for vulnerable road users and considered too much was spent on the Ruby Bay Bypass. They would like some funding in Golden Bay to do some education, eg test drivers to see if they know where their car is in relation to a cyclist, ie the 1.5 metre safety bubble. She asked if a feasibility study had been undertaken to barge fishing produce out of the Bay instead of using heavy vehicles. She said it should be mandatory for every roading project to be looked at to ensure what is being undertaken is not making it harder for cyclists, pedestrians etc.

Cr Dowler spoke about educating cyclists, especially those going two abreast on a narrow roadway.

Ms Davis said a lot of cyclists say they ride two abreast because they feel safer, it's not to be a nuisance or arrogant.

Cr Edgar said education is needed across the board, making everything safe, enjoyable and efficient.

In response to a remark made by Ms Davis, Cr Norriss noted that this committee works very closely with Nelson City Council.

Mr Clark said he is part of the Arterial Traffic Study being undertaken with Nelson City Council along with many other projects. It is important to realise Nelson City Council's issues are different to Tasman's.

#### **Sub 10 Mapua Districts Cycle and Walkways Group**

David Mitchell and Gillian Pollock were in attendance to present the submission on behalf of the Mapua Districts Cycle and Walkways Group. The group want more spending on dedicated cycle ways, footpaths and walking routes; "regional developments" – Nelson and Tasman; greater focus on problem intersections; changes to TRMP – review Rural 3 zoning; want better public consultation over major projects like the Ruby Bay Bypass. They note the governance structure should reflect Nelson-Tasman connection, the disproportionate budget between vehicle users and walkers/cyclists, request greater focus on problem intersections and are against high use of cars for short trips. Mr Mitchell acknowledged NZTA's willingness to engage in consultation with the group.

Mr Clark said part of the process of doing the strategy will be implementation plans, eg for cycling, which will go out to communities for their feedback. Widening will be done on Seaton Valley Road and Old Coach Road will have a separate off road cycleway. We have to target where we see the demand. A significant portion of the transportation budget is put towards cycling and walking as noted in the Ten Plan.

#### **Sub 15 A4A (Accessibility for All)**

Dave Tippet, Senior Advisor for community programmes at Sports Trust and Simon Lawrence, Richmond resident with particular interest in alternative mobility were in attendance to present the submission on behalf of A4A. A4A is a new forum with focus on accessibility for all. The aim of the forum is to work at a more strategic level. A4A requested a strategy for co-operation of shared pathways for walkers, cyclists and mobility scooters, improved footpath design as the current footpath cambers provide a barrier for people with limited mobility, also pedestrians and prams. They consider accessibility is a big issue. They requested public consultation on major new transport infrastructure and they consider the design of drive-through facilities needs to be given more consideration. They would like to see park and ride facilities in Richmond. They would appreciate input in new facilities or upgrading of existing facilities at an early design stage. A4A reaches far and wide in terms of groups of people that will be using shared paths and bus services.

Cr Edgar noted that wheelchair accessible buses are mentioned on page 96 of the strategy.

Mr Lawrence said it could be more specific in how you'd go about that. There's nothing in the actual targets. Many places of similar size in New Zealand have already managed to fit themselves with these buses.

Mr Clark said Council can encourage them, but the public transport in Richmond/Nelson is a private service. We have been working with Nelson City Council to try and have funds available to improve that service, but unfortunately funding doesn't exist at the moment from NZTA.

Mr Tippett asked if there is a tender process that can be written into a contract with the commercial providers to encourage them to use those buses.

Mr Clark said the operator of the service was keen to explore those options as part of the ten year process but because of loss of funding through NZ Transport Agency we don't have a contract with the commercial providers.

### **Sub 17      NZ Road Transport Association**

Mr Grant Turner was in attendance to present the submission on behalf of the NZ Road Transport Association. The Association wants economic efficiencies for transport of freight, increased emphasis on freight movement, increased weights and dimensions for heavy vehicles, the inclusion of a freight strategy, no closure of key routes and they request that the Committee works in co-operation with Nelson City Council. Road closures need to be carefully looked at for economic reasons. He said the Association wants to set up a freight committee.

Cr Norriss said the issue with O'Connors culvert (on the state highway) is to do with weights and it affects the fruit season.

Mr Findlater said it is important that it is understood that road transport and freight means a lot to this committee and is part of its every day meeting. The Committee recognises the value of the transport industry to this region. He said the Economic Development Agency would be happy to work on the freight committee.

Dr Hume said she was keen for NZ Transport Agency to participate in the freight committee.

Mr Clark said he has been trying to find information on important key freight routes, state highways as well as local roads. One issue that Tasman District Council has with increase in maintenance is increased cost and we want to work with the NZ Transport Agency in assessing what that cost is in order for these costs to be measured and considered across the country.

### **Sub 20      Automobile Association**

Mr R Egan was in attendance to present the Automobile Association. The Association supports the strategy, and wants better engineered roads for safety. They encouraged creation of more passing lanes and slow vehicle bays, wider road shoulders, the straightening of unnecessary curves, removal of roadside safety hazards, removal of any roadside vegetation and obstacles to improve sight lines and the use of more "self explaining" signage.

## **Sub 2 Nelson City Council**

The submission noted the impact of Nelson corridor plans on the Tasman RLTS, requested that parking charges be included in the CBD parking strategy. The submission supports walking, cycling and passenger transport and continuation of travel demand management.

## **Sub 6 NZ Transport Agency**

NZ Transport Agency considered the strategy to be well-written and structured. They requested the addition of an appendix noting key medium- to long-term capital transport projects; more information regarding crash statistics – state highway versus local roads and noted that road safety for tourists is not mentioned. NZTA asked that there be a general stock take of targets to ensure they are fundable, measurable and achievable and a target for reducing fatalities and serious casualties. Walking and cycling should be moved from public health targets to another area and it was noted that the strategies for walking and cycling do not include maps.

## **4 CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS**

The Committee reviewed the submissions and comments made by Gary Clark and Phil Peet, as included in the agenda.

Submission 1 – Park and Ride to be included in PT Strategy PT3 Activity 3, ie Richmond Interchange/ Park and Ride.

Submission 2 – CBD parking strategy will be undertaken in the short term, rather than medium term.

Dr Hume encouraged the Transport Committees of Nelson City Council and Tasman District to work together.

Submissions 4 and 5 – explore the Victorian model VMAC. Paragraphs to be added in 3.5 and also rider statistics. Dr Hume undertook to send information that NZ Transport Agency has. Define motor vehicles in Executive Summary to include motor cycles. Also include motor cycles in 6.1.1.

Submissions 6 – differential between state highway and local road was more understanding the profile of where accidents are. General comment on focusing differently on GPS versus NZTS. Safer Journeys should be incorporated, particularly for motor cyclists. Activity area needs to focus on a freight and tourist strategy. The tourist side is the safety side and dove-tailing into GPS and NZTS funding criteria.

Submission 7 – more chance working with Marlborough for another stock effluent station. Working with Top of the South working group. Slow vehicle bays will be dealt with in Freight Working Group. Freight Working Group to be added into 3.5.

Submission 8 – two places review of engineering standards P 53, 112, under travel demand management and suggested it be moved to front of document. Add target concerning engineering standards and working with Nelson City Council (P 42). Cost is a major issue dealing with road noise.

Submission 10 – will be significant change in traffic flows and noise once Ruby Bay Bypass opens.

Submission 11 – note the process to go through when setting speed limits.

Submission 12 – an audit was done on disability car parks compliant with national regulations which will be reported to a future meeting of the Engineering Services Committee.

Submissions 14 and 15 – cambers on footpaths noted in engineering standards. Protocols on shared pathways will be dealt with as part of the implementation plans.

Submission 17 – issues of setting up joint committee to be communicated. Will be working with NZ Transport Agency and Transport Association. Comment on O'Connors Creek culvert.

Submission 18 – outside scope. Been sent to NZ Transport Agency.

Submission 20 – advise submitter that Tasman District Council does work with Nelson City Council.

Submission 21 – something for cycle plan which will include a map showing provisions for cyclists and pedestrians.

Mr Thomson said the final document needs to come back to the Tasman Regional Transport Committee for approval and then be passed to Council.

**Moved B Findlater/B McGurk  
RTS10-03-03**

**THAT the Chairman, Transportation Manager and Cr J L Edgar review the final draft of the Tasman Regional Land Transport Strategy.  
CARRIED**

The meeting concluded at 2.26 pm.

Date Confirmed:

Chair: