

Annexure 2: Council Traffic report

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Private Plan Change 21 - Waikawa
Bay Mooring Management Areas and
Marina Zone Extension.

**SECTION 42A SUPPLEMENTARY TRAFFIC REPORT ON BEHALF OF
MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL**

1. INTRODUCTION

Qualifications

- 1.1 My full name is Rhys Chesterman. My qualifications include a Bachelor of Resource Studies (BRS) from Lincoln University, a Master of Resource Planning from Massey University (MRP) and a Master of Engineering in Transportation (MET) from the University of Canterbury. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and a member of the Institute of Professional Engineers of New Zealand (IPENZ) – Transport Group.

Experience

- 1.2 I am employed by ViaStrada and provide consultancy services as a Transport Planner and Engineer. ViaStrada is a specialist traffic engineering and planning consultancy that provides resource management related advice to local authorities and private clients. My experience includes eleven years employment in the field of traffic planning and resource management. This has included resource management related traffic planning for the Christchurch City Council and as a consultant to other local authorities and private land developers. For the four years prior to May 2004 I was the Traffic Planner for the Environmental Services Unit within the Christchurch City Council. Since this time I have continued to process resource

consent applications in relation to traffic issues. This has included direct involvement in over 2,000 resource consent applications.

Code of Conduct

- 1.3 Although not necessary in respect of council reporting and hearings, I can confirm that I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court's Consolidated Practice Note 2006. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this brief of evidence and I agree to comply with it. Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, this written evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

2. SCOPE AND STRUCTURE OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 I have been requested to undertake a desk top peer review of the applicant's traffic assessment which has been prepared by Traffic Design Group (TDG).
- 2.2 I have structured my evidence and comments broadly in the same order as that presented in the TDG report. This includes:
- (a) Description of the Proposal
 - (b) The Existing Traffic Environment
 - (c) Assessment of Effects
 - (i) Swing-moorings
 - (ii) Wet-birth Expansion
 - (iii) Future Traffic Patterns
 - (iv) Future Intersection Performance
 - (d) Parking Space Requirements
 - (e) Conclusions

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal has already been described in detail in the Application documents. The TDG report summarises the proposal succinctly, stating that Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited proposes to extend the Waikawa Bay Marina Zone further to the north-west, ultimately providing capacity for approximately 250 additional vessels. This is outlined on the proposed Planning Map 62 attached to the application as Appendix A. Furthermore, a total of (approximately) 200 swing-mooring sites will be rationalised and located into three specific Mooring Management Areas. This latter point broadly aligns with the indicative layout plan attached to the application as Appendix L¹.

4. THE EXISTING TRAFFIC ENVIRONMENT

- 4.1 A full description of the traffic environment has already been documented in the TDG report in Section 2, which I generally agree with. In summary I can confirm the following key points:
- (a) Waikawa is located approximately 4.0km north-west of Picton with the key transport link in and out being Waikawa Road. This is classified as a collector route, which has a dual function of traffic distribution and property access. The TDG report does not provide exact traffic count numbers, however they have collected traffic count data and provided a helpful graphic on page 8 of their report which implies a typical daily volume of around 5,000 vehicles per day during the high peak, summer period. Information obtained from the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) Crash Analysis System (CAS) however suggests it carries around 4,000 vehicles near the Beach Road intersection. The NZTA rate is slightly lower, probably owing to volumes being averaged out over an

¹ The TDG report refers to a figure of 186 swing mooring sites being relocated and consolidated within specific Mooring Management Areas.

entire year, and for example, encompassing the lower peak periods during winter months.

- (b) Waikawa Road has a trafficable width of 7.0 metres which enables two-way flow. A footpath is provided along the northern side.
- (c) Waikawa Road (and surrounds) has a posted speed limit of 50 km/hour.
- (d) Beach Road forms a T-junction along Waikawa Road which provides access to the marina area. This is controlled by a give-way sign and priority is afforded to traffic on Waikawa Road.
- (e) Beach Road is classified as a local road and therefore has a primary function of providing property access. It carries around 2,500 vehicles per day at the southern end, reducing to less than 1,000 at the northern (Marina Drive) end. This is also confirmed by NZTA in their CAS database.
- (f) Beach Road has a trafficable width of approximately 10.0 metres, reducing to around 8.5 metres at the northern end. A footpath is also provided along the northern side of the road.
- (g) Marina Drive connects with Beach Road providing further access to the existing marina area. This is also classified as a local road. It has a carriageway width of approximately 6.0 metres, and a footpath along the eastern (water front) side.
- (h) TDG have undertaken a variety of intersection counts which I accept. These occurred during the peak season periods including Thursday 27 December 2007, Saturday 29 December 2007 and Tuesday 1 January 2008. I agree that these most likely represent the marina season when it is at its busiest and therefore ensures that a robust

assessment can be undertaken. I also accept that traffic counts in the subsequent years have changed little and therefore can still be accepted as a valid representation for today's purposes. Turning counts are provided on page 9, 10 & 11 of the TDG report and this confirms that the summer peak periods tend to occur in the morning between 9:00am and 11:00am and in the afternoon between 4:00pm and 6:30pm. This is not unexpected.

- (i) Sight visibility and stopping sight distance at all surveyed intersections is acceptable, and accord with industry wide guidelines.
- (j) The layout of the site is clearly identified on page 4 of the TDG report. This highlights the marina area (wet-births) and adjoining car parking areas. For simplicity, TDG have divided this into four areas – which I will refer to throughout this report. In order to further simplify the existing characteristics of this area, I have highlighted the key components in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Existing Marina Components

Existing Site - Waikawa Marina			
MARINA WET AREAS	Area A (NW)	146 wet-births	92 car parks
	Area B (SW)	208 wet-births	123 car parks
	Area D (SE)	251 wet-births (incl. 7 births for boat sales and 6 births for charter companies)	115 car parks
DRY AREA (PARKING)	Area C (SE)	n/a	30 car parks (pay & display) 49 car & trailer car parks (pay & display)
	(SW)	n/a	22 car parks 54 car & trailer car parks
		<u>605 wet-births</u>	<u>485 parking spaces</u>

- (k) The total car parking areas directly associated with the existing marina area (i.e. Area's A, B & D) amount to 330 spaces, resulting in a parking supply rate of 0.55 spaces

per wet-birth². It is understood that these spaces are solely allocated to marine wet-birth holders only. Although no raw data is provided, TDG parking surveys undertaken in the Christmas/New Year holiday period 2007/08 have concluded that parking provision of 0.45 spaces per wet-birth is appropriate. This is slightly less than the current 0.5 spaces per birth as currently specified in the Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan³. [It is not proposed to change this rate as part of Plan Change 21].

- (l) Further car parks are provided around the marina area for other uses. This includes 155 spaces in Area C (which includes 103 larger spaces to cater for trailers as well). These spaces are used for overflow purposes and for general visitor use on a pay and display basis. These spaces are also presumably used by some people in conjunction with some of the existing swing-mooring sites.

- (m) The collation of the TDG traffic counts have enabled an estimation of the traffic generated by the marina wet-births. Traffic using the western marina areas (identified as Area A & B) can largely be assumed to be related to those marina areas (i.e. 354 wet-births). TDG have suggested that this equates to a peak hour rate of 0.25 vehicle movements per marina birth on weekends and 0.34 vehicle movements per marina birth on weekdays in the summer holiday season. TDG have not provided exact traffic figures from their tube counts (although, as already discussed, have provided a realistic graphic on page 8 for daily volumes). Reversing their figures by taking into account suggested traffic generation rates suggests that peak hour traffic volumes for traffic accessing Area A & B is around 89vph on the weekends and 120vph on weekdays⁴. This appears fair and reasonable. I agree with TDG that this represents

² 330 parking spaces/605 wet-births = current parking supply rate of 0.55 spaces per marina wet-birth.

³ See Condition for Permitted Activities 34.1.1.2.3 for 'marina activities' which requires one parking space for every two births (10% of which should be assigned to trailer parking).

⁴ 89vph/354 births = trip rate of 0.25 trips per birth; AND 120vph/354 births = trip rate of 0.34 trips per birth.

traffic flows during the peak holiday season and that flows for most of the remaining year (especially winter months) will be considerably lighter.

- (n) I agree with TDG that the higher weekday rate of 0.34 vehicle movements per marina birth will ensure a robust assessment for marina purposes. This means that if a further 250 wet-births are constructed in Waikawa there could be a reasonable expectation that it might add a further 85 vehicle movements during the peak hour periods⁵. A further 250 wet-births (if developed) would add a further 85 vehicle movements resulting in a total additional traffic increase of 170 vehicles during the peak hour period. The traffic generation from general visitors and/or swing-mooring sites is unknown because it is difficult to distinguish between those users and the Area D marina wet-birth users who might share the access and parking resources located in Area C and Area D. In the absence of any data on Swing Mooring rates I would estimate that the traffic generation (and parking) rate would be similar to the rates generated by Marina activities. It is understood that many existing swing mooring users access their boats by parking their vehicles alongside Waikawa Road and Port Underwood Road further north – thereby bypassing the existing Marina zone.
- (o) I agree with the crash history analysis provided by TDG which highlights the five recorded crashes near the Beach Road/Waikawa Road intersection in the five year period 2005-2009. I agree that these were not directly related to the geometric design of the intersection, nor do I believe they highlight a particular safety concern.

⁵ 250 additional births x 0.34 trips per birth = 85 trips during the peak hour period.

5. ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS

- 5.1 The TDG report discusses swing-moorings, wet-birth expansion, future traffic patterns, future intersection performance and parking space requirements. These will be addressed in turn.

Swing-moorings

- 5.2 As discussed above in paragraph 4.1(l), it is unclear exactly how many existing swing-moorings there are in Waikawa Bay. I am however advised that it is around 180 and I am therefore guided by that figure. I am also advised that the proposed Mooring Management Areas could accommodate around 200 sites (as per Appendix L in the Plan Change application), therefore resulting in an additional 20 swing-mooring sites.
- 5.3 The TDG report has indicated that the consolidation of any existing swing-moorings *is not expected to have any effect on parking or traffic generation, since the mooring management areas will restrict the number of swing-moorings in the bay.* Given the new Mooring Management Areas will potentially be able to cater for an additional 20 swing-mooring sites, there will potentially be a slight increase in traffic volumes. Although TDG have not specifically referred to the potential increase of 20 additional swing-mooring sites, the surrounding road network could easily cater for this level of increase. [See also further discussion and assessment below under the heading Future Intersection Patterns].
- 5.4 In theory I agree with TDG that the Mooring Management Areas will be able to restrict moorings to a manageable level, however the location of them relative to car parking areas will need some consideration. Given that the existing car parking alongside the western marina areas are generally provided (or allocated) to marina wet-birth users only, there might be a need to allocate some parking (somewhere) for swing-mooring users – especially for those using the new Mooring Management Area at the northern end of the bay. If no parking is provided at the northern end for swing-mooring users this might result in a 1km walk back to the parking area in Area C. This might result in some frustration for some swing-mooring users. [See

also further discussion and assessment below under the heading Parking Space Requirements].

- 5.5 I also agree with TDG that any mooring outside of the Mooring Management Area would require resource consent assessment as a non-complying activity, therefore requiring applicant's (and enabling Council) to undertake a full assessment of traffic related effects. This would also extend to include *inter alia* traffic generation and parking provision.

Wet-Birth Expansion

- 5.6 It is understood that the north-western expansion of the marina zone could provide an additional 250 marina wet-births. That said, it is noted that the Council has discretion over parking related issues for new marina developments anyway (see existing Rule 34.1.1.2 and 34.3.1) – which specifically deal with any adverse effects associated with on-site vehicle manoeuvring and car parking areas (see also Matters for Consideration 34.3.3(g)). This in my opinion is an appropriate trigger to deal with car parking within the Marina Zone. [See also further discussion and assessment below under the heading Parking Space Requirements].
- 5.7 Inevitably there will be construction related effects associated with the development of a new marina area. TDG refers to such development as potentially resulting in some temporary inconvenience. I agree. Although quantifying the actual traffic related effects are unknown until a proposal is put forward, such effects can include additional heavy truck movements and potential delays associated with construction. With this I mind I agree with TDG that the appropriate mechanism to mitigate and manage these effects is through the resource consent process. For example, a temporary traffic management plan could easily be introduced (or imposed) as a condition of consent. This is standard practice for construction related effects which tend to be temporary in nature.

Future Traffic Patterns

- 5.8 TDG have suggested that, once developed, the extension of the Marina Zone will generate similar levels of traffic per birth as the existing births. As discussed in paragraph 4.1(m) above, the existing peak hour holiday traffic generation rate ranges between 0.25 and 0.34 vehicle movements per marina birth on weekends and weekdays respectively. To ensure a robust assessment is carried out TDG have used the higher rate of '0.34vph per birth' for their assessment. I agree with this methodology.
- 5.9 Assuming an additional 500 wet-births are ultimately constructed (250 new wet-births in the rezoned north-western area of the bay + a further 250 wet-births in the existing north-eastern Marina Zoned area of the bay), the additional traffic loading onto the existing network could amount to 170 vehicles⁶. TDG have then loaded this level of traffic onto the existing road network and made the observation that this would represent a 20-25% increase to the traffic at the Waikawa/Beach Road intersection. Indicative traffic volumes are then provided in Figure 9 (page 16) of the TDG report. These volumes are accepted.
- 5.10 The proposal to create Mooring Management Areas could also result in around 20 additional swing-mooring sites which might add some additional traffic. Using the same rate for wet-births this might add a further 7 trips during the peak our period⁷. This would make little difference to the overall quantification of traffic and would not detrimentally affect the subsequent modelling carried out by TDG.

Future Intersection Patterns

- 5.11 TDG then apply the above traffic generation rates to the existing network using SIDRA INTERSECTION (also known as aaSIDRA). This is a well-known, advanced micro-analytical/simulation software package used worldwide for intersection capacity, level of service and performance analysis by traffic and transportation engineers, operations and planning professionals. It employs lane-by-lane and

⁶ 500 wet-births x 0.34 = 170 vehicles over the peak hour period. [Note that using the lower rate of 0.25 would equate to 125 vehicles over the peak hour period].

⁷ 20 additional swing-mooring sites x wet-birth rate of 0.34vph ≈ 7 additional vehicles.

vehicle drive-cycle models coupled with an iterative approximation method to provide estimates of capacity and performance statistics (delay, queue length, etc.). Although I have not reviewed all of the SIDRA input criteria such as lane widths, headways and critical gaps etc., I am confident of methodology used by TDG and accept the modelled outcomes given the simplicity of the intersections in the area. I also agree that the key intersection for analysis is the Waikawa/Beach Road T-junction.

5.12 TDG provide a summary table on page 17 of their report which identifies the existing and forecasted traffic volumes. More importantly, it highlights the overall level of service (LOS). For information purposes, Level of Service results are based on the concept described in the US Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) and various other publications. It is used as a performance standard and is a qualitative assessment of the quantitative effect of factors such as speed, volume of traffic, geometric features, traffic interruptions, delays and freedom to manoeuvre. There are six levels of service which includes LOS A through F. For information purposes these can be described as follows:

- LOS A: Vehicles unimpeded in manoeuvring in the traffic stream and delay at intersections is minimal. [i.e. delay \leq 10 seconds]
- LOS B: Manoeuvring in the traffic stream is only slightly restricted and delays are low. [i.e. delay 10-15 seconds]
- LOS C: Stable operating conditions, but with manoeuvring becoming more restricted with motorists experiencing appreciable tension in driving and longer queues. [i.e. delay 15-25 seconds]
- LOS D: conditions border on a range in which small increases in flow can significantly increase intersection delay. [i.e. delay 25-35 seconds]
- LOS E: Conditions are characterised by significant intersection delays. [i.e. delay 35-50 seconds]

- LOS F: Severe congestion, extensive queuing and delay. [i.e. delay >50 seconds].

5.13 The key intersection of Waikawa Road and Beach Road will operate with an overall level of service LOS A. This means that delays for side road traffic will remain low (even during peak holiday seasons). The TDG modelling implies that the worse movement (i.e. largest delay) will be traffic turning from Beach Road. This is because priority is afforded to traffic on Waikawa Road. That said this turning movement equates to LOS B and the overall delays remain extremely low. This all suggests that the intersection will continue to operate efficiently. I also agree with TDG that other local intersections closer to the marina will carry lower volumes and therefore will also continue to operate to a high level of service.

Parking Space Requirements

- 5.14 Parking is the key traffic issue because this is the main trigger for traffic assessment for activities in the Marina Zone (see Rule 34.1.1.2.3, which will remain unchanged as a result of the Plan Change).
- 5.15 Although car parking areas are proposed to be added to the list of permitted activities in the Marina Zone (see proposed addition 34.1), marinas themselves have been included as a Discretionary Activity (see proposed addition 34.4). Marina activities are however specifically listed in Rule 34.1.1.2.3 which have a dedicated parking rate. As already discussed above in paragraph 5.6, this rule specifically deals with any adverse effects associated with on-site vehicle manoeuvring and car parking areas in the Marina Zone and in my opinion is an appropriate trigger to deal with car parking within the Marina Zone.
- 5.16 I have also emphasised in paragraph 5.5 above that any mooring outside of the Mooring Management Areas would require resource consent assessment as a non-complying activity, therefore requiring applicant's (and enabling Council) to undertake a full assessment of traffic related effects. This would also extend to include *inter alia* traffic generation and parking provision.

- 5.17 Swing-mooring sites however do not have a dedicated parking requirement. In the Marina Zone this would be a moot point because the existing wording would still enable appropriate consideration. For information purposes, the wording of Parking Rule 34.1.1.2.3 has been replicated below. This states:

If an activity is not represented in the list below, the activity closest in nature to the new activity should be used, or whether there are two or more similar activities the activity with the higher rate shall apply. Alternatively, application may be made to find a new rate.

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Parking Spaces Required</i>
<i>Ship brokering and other retail activities.</i>	<i>One for every 50m² of GFA</i>
<i>Boat hire, chartering</i>	<i>One for every two staff members the operation is designed to cater for.</i>
<i>Marina</i>	<i>One for every two births 10% of which should be assigned to trailer parking.</i>

[My emphasis added].

- 5.18 In my opinion the swing-mooring sites (had they been located within a Marina Zone) could be assessed under the 'marina' activity rate as this represents the next *activity closest in the nature*. This method replicates a similar approach taken by other District Plans around New Zealand (e.g. Christchurch). Using the existing 'Marina' parking rate would require 388 parking spaces for the existing births and moorings in the area (including the 605 existing wet-births and 170 swing-mooring sites)⁸. It follows that the existing activities would have a complying number of car parking spaces using this methodology.
- 5.19 The potential problem however is that the swing-mooring sites which are located within the proposed Mooring Management Areas are not located within the Marina Zone. Instead they are located within Coastal Marine Zone One – for which there are no parking requirements. This technically means that the swing-mooring sites have a nil parking requirement.
- 5.20 I accept that this is an historical issue and that as part of the current plan change proposal the existing swing-moorings will largely be relocated. With the exception of a few (20) additional moorings,

⁸ 775 boat spaces (wet-births and swing-mooring sites) x 0.5 (one space for every two births) ≈ 388 (including 10% for trailers = 38).

common sense would imply that the overall (parking) effects will largely remain unchanged. People driving vehicles and accessing the two eastern most Mooring Management Areas will probably continue to access their boats by parking their vehicles alongside Waikawa Road and Port Underwood Road further north – thereby bypassing the existing Marina Zone (unless they choose to park in the pay & display areas within the Marina Zone). If no parking is provided at the northern end of the Marina for swing-mooring users this might result in a 1km walk back to the parking area in Area C (if available), or alternatively they might be forced to park on the eastern side of the Bay and dinghy across. This might result in some frustration for some swing-mooring users.

- 5.21 As I understand the existing provisions in the Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan list swing-moorings as a discretionary activity which enables some consideration of potential and/or associated effects (see Rule 35.4.2.8). Under the proposed Plan Change, the use of swing-moorings is listed as a permitted activity and therefore any associated parking effects in the future would not technically be required to be considered (see proposed bullet point insertion to Rule 35.1).
- 5.22 Given that the existing car parking alongside the western marina areas are generally provided (or allocated) to marina wet-birth users only, there might be a need to allocate some parking (somewhere) for swing-mooring users – especially for those using the new Mooring Management Area at the northern end of the bay.
- 5.23 The questions then become whether or not parking should be provided specifically for swing-mooring sites, and if so what should the appropriate parking rate be, and where should those spaces be located. In my opinion, and in the absence of any detail on the parking rate of swing-mooring sites, the appropriate trigger for this (if necessary) should be highlighted in the rules associated with Coastal Marine Zone One as this is where the Mooring Management Zones are located. An appropriate parking rate for swing-mooring sites might mirror that for Marina births (i.e. one space for every two births [swing-moorings]). This has been proven to be sufficient through the

TDG surveys, and as I understand aligns with guidance provided in the Australia Standard AS3962-2001 *Guidelines for Design of Marinas*. Appendix L of the Plan Change application suggests that the northern most Mooring Management Area could accommodate 27 sites. Based on the same parking rate for marina births, this might require 14 car parking spaces and include at least one trailer parking space.

- 5.24 As I understand there is existing public pedestrian and vehicle access available to the small beach at the end of the existing north-west marina. I also understand that there is an obligation on the Marina's part to provide pedestrian access, although no legal requirement to provide road access. Nevertheless, my advice from TDG is that such public access for pedestrians and vehicles would continue to be provided as and when any future expansion of the marina occurred, by way of a road and associated footpath facilities to be extended along the landward margin of any new marina extension.
- 5.25 TDG have also informed me that it is further intended that the existing beach facility, from which dinghy's are launched to access the swing moorings, would be replicated at the end of the north-western extension in conjunction with a small amount of public parking and a vehicle set-down and turn-around facility. In conjunction with that, I understand that undertakings have also been made as part of individual agreements with north-western mooring owners to provide parking and secure dinghy storage adjacent to the north-western extremity of any new Marina extension.
- 5.26 While parking could be provided in the Marina Zone (where most of the parking is already located and to which there is a plentiful supply), this could place an onerous requirement on a third party that only has the ability to control activities located within that zone (i.e. marina activities). Although it would appear that access and parking will continue to be provided to some swing-mooring sites via the Marina, my initial concern was that access could be restricted at any time. For example, could future vehicle access to the marina be controlled by electronic swipe cards and gates (as is the case overseas), which in turn might exclude vehicle access to others wanting to use the

parking for other non-marina purposes (i.e. swing-mooring sites)? If public access to parking in the Marina Zone is not guaranteed and there is a possibility that general public parking and/or vehicle access could be closed, there might be a need for Council to consider the parking needs for swing-mooring sites, especially those swing-mooring sites that will be relocated further north and on the north-western side of the bay. It would appear that this might be unnecessary, however there is uncertainty as to whether this is guaranteed or is simply a gentleman's agreement.

- 5.27 Access (and parking) at the north-western end of the bay could be secured through an easement (or other agreement) which is separate to this Plan Change. This would in turn provide those swing-mooring holders some practical and readily accessible parking facilities. This in my opinion would be simplest solution and would not require any changes to the rules in the Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan.
- 5.28 If however Council were to take a view that dedicated parking is required for swing-mooring sites then this could (for example) be included as an additional 'specific condition' to Rule 35.1.2. This could specify a parking rate which is similar to marina activities. Alternatively, swing-moorings (as identified in Coastal Marine Zone One) could instead be listed as a limited discretionary activity in Rule 35.3 with Council discretion being limited to parking matters.

6. CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 Ultimately I agree with TDG's conclusion that the proposed Plan Change to extend the Marina Zone can accommodate an additional 250 wet-births, together with associated parking and vehicle access. The parking rates for Marina activities in the Marina Zone have a dedicated parking rate that favourably aligns with the current supply and also aligns with parking surveys undertaken by TDG during the peak holiday season. There is also ample capacity on the road network to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the possible future development of a further 250 wet-births within the

existing Marina Zone, together with a potential increase of 20 swing-mooring sites within the proposed Mooring Management Areas.

- 6.2 The swing-mooring sites in the Bay will essentially be rationalised and relocated into three specific Mooring Management Areas. With the exception of a few (20) additional swing-mooring sites likely to eventuate, the proposal will effectively be parking neutral. People driving vehicles and accessing the two eastern most Mooring Management Areas will probably continue to access their boats by parking their vehicles alongside Waikawa Road and Port Underwood Road further north – thereby bypassing the existing Marina Zone (unless they choose to park in the pay & display areas within the Marina Zone). If no parking is provided at the northern end of the Marina for swing-mooring users this might result in a 1km walk back to the parking area in Area C (if available), or alternatively they might be forced to park on the eastern side of the Bay and dinghy across. This might result in some frustration for some swing-mooring users.
- 6.3 The number of swing-mooring sites on the north-western side of the Bay will remain similar. They will however simply be pushed further north, extending the distance between them and the nearest practical parking area. So long as parking and access is made available to these swing-mooring users, there will little (if any) potential adverse effects. It is understood that parking and access will be provided as part of any new Marina development and that the existing beach facility, from which dinghy's are launched to access the swing moorings, would be replicated at the end of the north-western extension in conjunction with some public parking and a vehicle set-down and turn-around facility. At the date of writing this report, it is unclear whether this has been guaranteed or whether this is simply a gentleman's agreement.
- 6.4 Inevitably there will be construction related effects associated with the development of a new marina area which could result in some temporary inconvenience for local users. Given that new marina construction requires a resource consent application (as a discretionary activity), the appropriate mechanism to mitigate and manage these effects is through the resource consent process. For

example, a temporary traffic management plan could be introduced (or imposed) as a condition of consent. This is standard practice for constriction related effects which tend to be temporary in nature.

- 6.5 For the reasons discussed above I can generally support the proposed Plan Change from a traffic perspective and agree with the findings presented by TDG. This support is however subject to a guaranteed parking solution associated with the north-western most Mooring Management Area.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 I generally agree with the findings of TDG. Although there is some uncertainty as to whether parking and access will be made available for swing-mooring users on the north-western side of the Bay, this could be secured through an easement (or other agreement) which is separate to this Plan Change. This would in turn provide those swing-mooring holders some practical and readily accessible parking facilities. This in my opinion would be simplest solution and would not require any changes to the rules in the Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan.
- 7.2 If however Council were to take a view that dedicated parking is required for swing-mooring sites then this could (for example) be included as an additional 'specific condition' to Rule 35.1.2. This could specify a parking rate which is similar to Marina activities (as defined in Rule 34.1.1.2.3). Alternatively, swing-moorings (as identified in Coastal Marine Zone One) could instead be listed as a limited discretionary activity in Rule 35.3 with Council discretion being limited to parking matters.

Rhys Chesterman
5 October 2010