
Minutes of a meeting of the Regional Transport Committee
Held in Ruma Marama, Civic House, Trafalgar Street, Nelson
On Wednesday 17 September 2014, commencing at 9.07am

Present: Councillor E Davy (Chairperson), Her Worship the Mayor (R Reese), Councillors R Copeland, and B McGurk

In Attendance: Councillor I Barker, Group Manager Infrastructure (A Louverdis), Senior Asset Engineer Transport and Roading (R Palmer), Engineering Adviser (S McAuley), Administration Adviser (E-J Ruthven), L Hammond and M Owens (NZTA), and Tasman District Councillor Officer (S Downs)

1. Apologies

The Chairperson advised that Tasman Regional Transport Committee Chairperson, Councillor Norris, who usually attended Regional Transport Committee meetings as an observer, was unable to attend the meeting.

2. Confirmation of Order of Business

The Chairperson advised that a late item, the draft Regional Land Transport Programme, was to be considered at the meeting, and a procedural resolution to do so was required.

Some concern was noted that late items presented difficulties for members with regards to preparing for meetings. The Chairperson noted this concern, but advised that in this case, the delay was unavoidable.

Resolved

THAT the item regarding Draft Regional Land Transport Plan (A1244851) be considered at this meeting as a major item not on the agenda, pursuant to Section 46A(7)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to enable the Regional Transport Committee to consider the Draft Regional Land Transport Plan.

Davy/McGurk

Carried

The Chairperson advised that item 7, NZTA Regional Report, would be considered prior to item 6, Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2021.

3. Interests

There were no updates to the Interests Register, and no conflicts of interest with agenda items were declared.

4. Public Forum

There was no public forum.

5. Confirmation of Minutes – 1 August 2014

Document number A1228495, agenda pages 3-8 refer.

Resolved

THAT the minutes of a meeting of the Regional Transport Committee, held on 1 August 2014, be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Davy/Copeland

Carried

6. Chairperson's Report

The Chairperson noted the tight timeframes to be met in relation to the development of the draft Regional Land Transport Programme.

7. NZTA Regional Report

Document number A1245869, agenda pages 13-34 refer.

NZTA Representative, Lyndon Hammond, presented the report.

With regards to investment signals, he explained that a high level fact sheet was currently being drafted, which would be circulated to committee members to identify how the investment assessment process would work.

He added that, until the draft Government Policy Statement (GPS) was finalised, the investment signals would also remain draft, but that both should be finalised in the near future.

Mr Hammond noted the announcement of the Government \$212m Future Investment Fund package and \$100m Urban Cycling package, and explained that a panel was being developed to consider criteria for funding.

He also noted the development of the draft State Highway Asset Management Plan (SHAMP), and explained that a journey-approach was being taken in the development of this document.

NZTA Representative, Mark Owen, gave a Power Point presentation regarding the draft SHAMP (A1251155) and the timelines involved in relation to the development of the National Land Transport Plan (NLTP). He explained that revenue available for investing in and maintaining state highways was tight for the next three years, and consequently the draft SHAMP focused on national priorities, key journey corridors and optimising the existing transport network.

In response to a question, Mr Hammond said that the draft GPS provided for an 'R2' fund. He explained that the R2 fund would be a nationally contestable fund with a regional focus on national priorities, targeted at largely rural and provincial areas that did not have Roads of National Significance (RONS) within their transport programme.

There was a discussion regarding maintenance of the state highway network. In response to a question, Mr Owen explained that the constrained funding environment meant that lower classification roads would likely be maintained to a lower level, for example with more patching rather than full resealing, but without compromising on safety outcomes. He added that, in terms of investment, funding in the initial years of the draft SHAMP would likely be more focused on planning and design, with construction more likely from 2018 onwards.

There was a further discussion regarding the \$100 million Urban Cycling package. In response to a question, Mr Hammond said that the package would likely build on existing programmes and opportunities. He said that Nelson had a number of strengths with regards to walking and cycling projects, such as a communities model, good network plans and a high level of participation, and as a result Nelson walking and cycling projects would have a good chance of being incorporated in the NLTP. Mr Hammond stressed that if Nelson was to make an application to the Urban Cycling Fund, that the project seeking funds should be clearly visible in both the Asset Management Plan and the RLTP.

Mr Owen outlined the draft SHAMP projects for the top of the South Island, and noted that the SH6/Cable Bay Road intersection was programmed for the 2018-2021 period. In response to a question, Mr Owen explained that to bring the Cable Bay Road intersection back into the 2015-2018 programme would likely require R2 funding. He noted the importance of clearly explaining why improvements were required, such as emphasising both the HPMV nature of the route due to the quarry, and the safety indications for this intersection.

Resolved

THAT the NZTA Regional Report (A1245869) be received.

Davy/McGurk

Carried

8. Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2021

Document number A1245849, agenda pages 9-12, and late item refer.

The Chairperson noted that Council had resolved that Nelson City Council, Tasman District Council (TDC) and Marlborough District Council (MDC) would have a joint 'front end' to each Council's draft RLTP. He said that TDC would be considering its draft RLTP at Council in the coming days, and consequently, it was important that the Committee noted any front-end changes required at this meeting.

He also welcomed Tasman District Council officer, Sarah Downs, to join the meeting for the purposes of discussing the front end of the document.

The Committee considered the draft RLTP page by page.

8.1 Foreword (page 5)

With regards to paragraph 2, it was suggested that the first sentence be re-worded to state 'Nelson City does not have a rail network as a complementary transport system...' It was emphasised that Nelson was dependent on a secure, resilient and safe road transport system.

With regards to paragraph 4, it was suggested that the wording be clarified to emphasise that the RLTP began from year 1.

There was a discussion about the wording in paragraph 5. It was suggested that the wording used emphasised the choices available to Nelson residents in terms of different transport modes to meet their needs. It was suggested that the Chairperson and Mr Palmer discuss the wording used on this point.

A further suggestion was made that the foreword addressed the importance of freight movements and the Port, given that Nelson was an exporting region.

8.2 Page 9

It was suggested that the first paragraph acknowledge that transport was a function that integrated across local government boundaries, and that it was for this reason that the three Top of the South Councils had chosen to align the front end of each Council's RLTP.

8.3 Page 12

It was agreed that the first sentence of paragraph 2 required clarification.

8.4 Page 13

There was a discussion regarding horticulture and viticulture freight movements, and it was clarified that there was a peak in freight movements in autumn each year.

8.5 Page 14

Under the heading 'Seafood' it was agreed that the first sentence of the second paragraph should be reworded to read 'Salmon farming is becoming increasingly significant for Marlborough as farms are predominantly located in the Marlborough Sounds'.

Under the heading 'Tourism', it was agreed that reference should be included for the need to provide a safe roading network for self-driving foreign tourists. It was further agreed that an additional sentence regarding the importance of environmental amenity to the tourist driving experience be included.

8.6 Page 15

It was noted that an updated map, illustrating the boundaries between each of the territorial authorities, would be used.

Under the heading 'Nelson', there was a discussion regarding the importance of the port and airport to Nelson, especially with regards to roading links between Nelson and Richmond. It was noted that aside from growing freight movements, Nelson Airport was also extremely important to the Nelson economy as a major employer in the region, and as a commuting hub.

It was agreed that a separate section on 'Aviation' should be inserted under the 'Tourism' heading, as this was also linked to the start of the cycle trail. It was further noted that this section could include information regarding Marlborough Airport.

8.7 Page 16

It was agreed to include a statement that Nelson had a climate that supported active transport.

8.8 Pages 17-18

There was a discussion regarding key journey routes, during which it was noted that the figures used in the first paragraph in relation to freight movements required clarification.

It was further noted that the key journey of SH6 Richmond to Murchison should be clarified as being Richmond to Christchurch/West Coast via Murchison, to contextualise why this route was important.

There was a discussion regarding resilience of key routes, during which it was emphasised that Waimea Road was not a viable alternative

route for freight through to the Port, and at best could be called a 'back up' route. It was emphasised that, when events forced the closure of Rocks Road, it needed to be re-opened again as soon as possible. It was agreed that the second sentence of paragraph 2 on page 18 should be re-worded to state 'The road remained closed for almost a week.'

It was further noted that Rocks Road – Takaka Hill and Rocks Road – Whangamoas needed to be identified as key routes requiring resilience in weather events.

8.9 Page 19

There was a discussion regarding reliability, particularly with regards to freight movements to and from the port. In response to a question, Mr Palmer explained that forecast growth was currently 2% year on year, and that at the moment freight drivers avoided peak times to enter or exit the port due to the start/stop nature of traffic movements. It was noted that there was the capacity for further growth in freight movements if the Waimea Dam was developed.

With regards to paragraph 5, it was agreed that reference be made to self-driving foreign tourists.

8.10 Page 20

It was noted that the first sentences in paragraphs 4 and 6 were duplicated. It was further noted that there was a need to focus on alternative transport methods, such as the NBus.

8.11 Pages 21-22

It was suggested that the graph include a trend line, and that the 2014 data either be removed, or noted as incomplete.

8.12 Page 23

It was agreed that the final sentence of paragraph 1 should be reworded to say 'The three projects in Table 2 are not included with the other Top of the South significant activities as they do not need to be prioritised for NLTP funding'.

8.13 Page 24

There was a discussion regarding the measures of success as noted in the table. It was suggested that a different measure of success was required for freight movements, rather than 'increase in freight km travelled'. It was suggested that more appropriate measures might become apparent through the moderation or consultation process.

In response to a question, Mr Palmer explained that the two GPS objectives identified were the main objectives for the region.

8.14 Pages 25-27

The projects in the table were noted. Mr Palmer explained that the investment framework required further refinement.

In response to a question, Mr Palmer noted that, regardless of the outcome of the Southern Link, there was still a need for an efficient route through to the port.

8.15 Page 28

There was a discussion regarding the Arterial Traffic Study, and it was agreed to remove the second bullet point at the bottom of the page, and incorporate the first bullet point into the preceding sentence.

8.16 Page 29

There was a discussion regarding whether the global financial crisis should be included in the list of bullet points in the first paragraph.

In response to a question, Mr Palmer noted a large increase in numbers of people working from home in the latest census data, and that arterial traffic flow would also be affected by land use and modelling. In response to further questions, he explained that population growth was at odds with flat-lining or decreasing traffic numbers, and the influences over the amount of traffic were complex and hard to identify.

8.17 Page 30

With regards to street lighting, Mr Palmer explained that LED fittings would be installed on an as-replacement basis.

8.18 Page 32

Following discussion, it was agreed that all five GPS objectives should be reflected in the table, with policies/directions and measures of success for communities identifying Nelson-based themes.

With regards to item 2 in the table, Mr Palmer explained that investing in methods to reduce fuel related vehicle operating costs referred to considering feasible and cost effective vehicle fleets and central government's Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority fuel efficiency advice. He added that roading projects took fuel-related vehicle operating costs into consideration, for example, considering different types of roading surfaces to lessen resistance and balancing the installation of traffic lights resulting in greater stop/start traffic flows against safety measures.

In response to a further question, Mr Palmer explained the difficulties in measuring success with regards to transport-related particulate matter in Nelson airsheds, and it was suggested that this measure be

replaced with an increase in the number of alternative travel modes taken up.

With regards to item 3 in the table, Mr Palmer explained that with an increasing number of cyclists, a flat or declining number of cycle crashes was an appropriate measure of success.

8.19 Page 34

With regards to the first four items on the table, Mr Owen explained that there were no known HPMV restrictions on state highways in the Top of the South region.

There was a discussion regarding the SH6/Cable Bay Road intersection. In response to a question, Mr Palmer explained the NZTA priority rating for this project. Mr Owen added that there may be an opportunity to prioritise this project through R2 funding, and explained the importance of emphasising the project benefits and profile.

In response to a question, Mr Owen explained that the Enhanced Network Resilience Nelson project was part of a national project considering resilience planning. He said that this related to investigation and reporting work rather than physical works.

Attendance: Councillor Davy left the meeting at 11.22am, and Councillor Copeland assumed the Chair.

8.20 Page 35

Mr Palmer explained that the list of programmes was ranked 1 to 9 based on timeframes in the current Asset Management Plan. He said that work had not yet started on prioritising the projects.

The Committee considered each of the proposed local road network projects.

8.20.1 Public Transport Integrated Ticketing

It was noted that this project had recently been considered by Council.

8.20.2 Rocks Rd to Maitai Path

There was a discussion regarding this project. In response to a question, Mr Palmer clarified that Council had not considered this issue to date, but it had been included in the project to avoid a disconnect between Rocks Road and the CBD, depending on the outcome of the Rocks Road walkway/cycleway project. It was noted that NZTA had undertaken high level work considering the potential for a route along the State Highway, but that the focus at this stage was to understand where connections may work. Mr Hammond suggested that NZTA be included as an organisation responsible for this project.

There was a discussion around potential funding for this project. In response to a question, Mr Hammond suggested that funding may be possible through the NLTP as it was linked to the state highway network. He said that the Urban Cycling fund could potentially be a back-up source of funding, but cautioned that the project should be placed in the optimal location, not simply put along the state highway in order to attract funding.

8.20.3 Tahunanui Cycle Network

Mr Palmer noted that a report would be presented shortly, outlining the findings of the initial investigation and seeking further direction.

8.20.4 HPMV Upgrades – 50MAX Maitai Valley Road

Mr Palmer noted that this project was for minor improvements to seismically upgrade bridges on the Maitai Valley Road, which had the effect of addressing their strength for 50MAX vehicles. He noted the efficiency gains available if stronger bridges for forestry activity existed in the area.

8.20.5 Maitai Shared Path (Saltwater Creek Bridge)

Mr Louverdis noted that this was the bridge from the Maitai Shared Pathway to Akerston Street.

8.20.6 Walk Cycle Schools Package

It was noted that these were a number of small, integrated projects to encourage active journeys to and from school.

8.20.7 Waimea Road Retaining Wall at Snows Hill

Mr Palmer explained the need to retain an existing embankment, noting that Waimea Road was a key lifelines route.

8.20.8 Quarantine/Nayland Intersection Upgrades

Mr Palmer said that NZTA modelling indicated that this intersection would create tailback by the 2021-2024 period. It was queried whether work on this intersection could be considered earlier, as part of the Quarantine Road/Whakatu Drive intersection, and Mr Owen noted that NZTA may be prepared to assist with this project given the potential impacts for the State Highway.

8.20.9 Stoke Bus Interchange

There was a discussion regarding this project, and councillors noted potential developments in central Stoke that may impact on this project. In response to a question, Mr Palmer explained that the proposed budget was for a simple exchange with regards to transport solutions, but if Council wanted to take into account urban design outcomes, local funding may be required.

It was suggested that the timing of this project may need to be moved forward.

8.20.10 Waimea Rd/Van Diemen Junction Improvements

Mr Palmer explained that this intersection created issues for the functioning of Waimea Road as the extension of the ring route out of the CBD. He said that traffic signals could potentially manage this intersection more efficiently, while improve pedestrian crossing.

8.20.11 Additional Projects

There was a discussion regarding whether any projects were missing from the list.

It was suggested that the stormwater network under the state highway at Orphanage Creek be considered, as the consequence of insufficient stormwater drainage had implications for the state highway capacity.

In response to a question, Mr Owen noted that stormwater work could be funded where there was a benefit to a state highway, however it would depend on whether there was inadequate stormwater management when the state highway was created, or whether intensified local development had created the issue.

There was a discussion regarding the proposed southern link road, and how this linked to the local roading network. It was emphasised that investigative work needed to be carried out at the same time that investigative work was being undertaken by NZTA with regards to the southern link, in order to completely understand how the southern link would fit with the existing network.

It was agreed that a local project regarding the CBD ring route investigation be included for 2015-2018, in order to undertake this work.

8.21 Pages 36 - 38

Mr Palmer explained that the operations and maintenance forecast would be presented to NZTA for moderation.

8.22 Page 40

Mr Palmer explained that a Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) was required, and that it was proposed to bring a draft plan to a Regional Transport Committee meeting for discussion as soon as it was prepared. He said that it was preferable that the RPTP was consulted on at the same time as the RLTP.

Attendance: Councillor Davy returned to the meeting at 12.06pm and resumed the Chair.

There was a discussion regarding farebox recovery, during which it was suggested that Nelson's farebox recovery was too high as compared to other urban centres. It was suggested that the price of public transport in Nelson was currently a barrier to greater uptake of the service.

In response to a question, Mr Hammond explained the importance of building a business case for additional public transport services and greater subsidies through the RPTP, emphasising the investment that Council had put into this area to date. He noted the importance of understanding the matrix between user-pays, reducing the cost of the service and increasing patronage.

Attendance: Councillor Copeland left the meeting at 12.11pm.

8.23 Appendices

Mr Palmer explained that several sections had been omitted from the appendices, and tabled a document outlining proposed Appendices 6, 7 and 8 (A1254225).

There was a discussion regarding the indicators for monitoring performance measures, as set out in Appendix 3. Following discussion, it was agreed that the travel time variability measures between Picton and the Marlborough Kaikoura border should be removed from the Nelson section.

With regards to the targets for walking, cycling and bus growth, the importance of providing viable choices was noted, to ensure that the performance targets were realistic rather than aspirational.

It was suggested that the target for energy efficient development was inappropriate as these were already requirements for subdivisions, and that the target for greenhouse gas emissions was unrealistic.

With regards to multiple occupancy vehicles, Mr Palmer explained how monitoring took place. It was digested that numbers may be skewed by parents driving children to school.

8.24 Next Steps

There was a discussion regarding how to consult the Police with regards to the development of the RLTP. It was suggested that officers and the Committee Chair meet with Police representatives in the near future to incorporate any Police input prior to the next Regional Transport Committee meeting.

It was agreed that the draft RLTP return to the Regional Transport Committee on 3 October, prior to being recommended for Council approval at the Council meeting on 9 October.

Resolved

THAT the report Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2021 (A1245894) and its attachment (A1244851) be received;

AND THAT officers amend the draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2021 to incorporate the editorial changes requested by the Committee;

AND THAT the amended version be reported back to the RTC for final review on 3 October 2014;

AND THAT the Committee delegate authority to Council to approve the submission of the draft Regional Land Transport Plan to New Zealand Transport Agency by 17 October 2014 for their national moderation process;

AND THAT the Committee delegate approval to Council to amend the draft Regional Land Transport Plan following New Zealand Transport Agency moderation as the version to commence the Special Consultation Procedure with respect to the draft;

AND THAT the Committee approve the draft timetable for consultation of the draft Regional Land Transport Plan.

Davy/McGurk

Carried

There being no further business the meeting ended at 12.30pm.

Confirmed as a correct record of proceedings:

_____ Chairperson _____ Date

Regional Transport Committee
17 September 2014