

I hereby give notice that an ordinary meeting of the Golden Bay Community Board will be held on:

**Date:** Monday 8 April 2024  
**Time:** 1.00pm  
**Meeting Room:** Golden Bay Service Centre  
**Venue:** 78 Commercial Street, Tākaka

---

## **Golden Bay Community Board**

### **Hapori Whānui ō Mohua**

## **MINUTES ATTACHMENTS**

---

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
RGBCB24-04-3 Chris Bennett - GB Cycle and Walkways Society	
Attachment 1 GB Cycle and Walkways Society tabled document.....	2
0.0 Cynthia McConville - Golden Bay Forest and Bird	
Attachment 2 GB Forest & Bird tabled documents.....	11
RGBCB24-04-4 Water Conservation Order activity update	
Attachment 3 Water Conservation Order update powerpoint presentation.....	13

## Golden Bay Cycle and Walkways Society Inc.

### Submission: Port Tarakohe Structure Plan

27 February 2024

## Summary

- The road between Pohara and Port Tarakohe is narrow, with no shoulders and has a high risk to people walking and cycling.



- The Golden Bay Cycle and Walkways Society Inc. (GBCWS) is of the view that the proposed development at Port Tarakohe will significantly increase the risk to vulnerable road users (people walking and cycling) between Pohara and Port Tarakohe unless there are specific activities undertaken to protect them.
- TDC has a statutory responsibility and commitments to ensure that safety is not compromised through the Tasman Resource Management Plan, the Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual, and the Walking and Cycling Strategy 2022-2051
- However, the GBCWS has been advised that TDC has not done any planning, or allocated funding, for protecting vulnerable users.
- The GBCWS will prepare a concept design for a separated shared pathway for TDC's consideration with expectation that TDC will fulfill their responsibilities.

## Who Are We?

The Golden Bay Cycle and Walkways Society Inc. (GBCWS) is a volunteer organization with the goal of promoting cycling and walking in Golden Bay. We have undertaken advocacy, prepared a 20 year strategy for the development of the Golden Bay cycling network, and also built cycle paths and trails.

## Our Position on the Proposed Development

We support the development of Port Taranaki as this will bring many benefits to Golden Bay.

It is **critical** that the development be done in a holistic manner which properly considers the impact on the vulnerable users we represent: people walking and cycling.

- Abel Tasman Drive to Port Taranaki is a key element of the proposed Golden Bay Cycle Route 1 from the Heaphy Track to Taranaki.
- In May 2019 when the Port Taranaki Development was first proposed, one of our Committee members—Dr. Christopher Bennett—presented to TDC and the Golden Bay Community Board a road safety assessment of Abel Tasman Drive from Pohara to Port Taranaki (Annex 1 to this submission).
- We endorse his main conclusion that: “Due to the very narrow 1 km route from Port Taranaki to the existing Pohara shared path it is essential that any upgrade of Port Taranaki protect vulnerable road users by extending the shared path from Pohara to Port Taranaki.”



## We Object to the Current Approach Which Endangers Vulnerable Users

Tasman District Council's Port Tarohe Structure Plan under 'Access and Transport'<sup>1</sup> states: **"Cycle and walkways between Pohara and Totaranui are currently in the planning stage."**

We were encouraged to read this public commitment. However, discussions with TDC have advised that this statement is misleading:

- The planning referred to is that done by ourselves<sup>2</sup>; there is no planning being done by TDC; and,
- "We also fully understand the safety and amenity issues for people walking and cycling on this section of road. Unfortunately, given the extensive civil works likely to be required, and the constrained funding environment that Council is currently operating under, **funding is unlikely to be allocated in the draft LTP to extend walking and cycling facilities beyond Pohara Valley Road.**"<sup>3</sup>

So contrary to the above statement by TDC which clearly implies a commitment to addressing the safety of people walking and cycling:

- there is no planning being done; and,
- there is no funding available for protecting vulnerable users.

This approach of **ignoring the needs of vulnerable users** is contrary to TDC's:

- Tasman Resource Management Plan which requires under 16.2.20 (18) that Resource Consents for developments consider **"The potential effect of the activity on the safety and efficiency of the road network"**<sup>4</sup>.
- Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual which aims to ensure **"a safe, efficient and high amenity environment for all users of the transport system"** and **"a transportation network that is safe for all users"**.
- Walking and Cycling Strategy 2022-2051 which promises:
  - P5. **"What about the rural cycleways? Key hazardous locations, or pinch points, on rural cycle routes will be looked at as part of the short to medium term actions."**
  - P6. **"On high speed roads (over 50 km/h), cycle facilities will be fully separated from the vehicle traffic."**
  - P18. **"Specific hazardous locations on cycling routes that are a safety risk to cyclists will be improved."**

<sup>1</sup> <https://shape.tasman.govt.nz/port-tarokohe-structure-plan/access-and-transport>

<sup>2</sup> Email 19/2/24 from Dwayne Fletcher Strategic Policy Manager

<sup>3</sup> Email 21/2/24 from Bill Rice, Senior Infrastructure Planning Advisor Transportation

<sup>4</sup> The GBCWS requested from TDC a copy of the Resource Consent to assess what the transport development requirements associated with the development as part of the consent were. Unfortunately, this was not a straight forward question to answer as there have been many consents issued so we paused our request.

## Next Steps

It is our view that **TDC has a legal responsibility to enforce the requirements of the TRMP** and ensure that **the traffic generated from the proposed development does not reduce the existing unsafe situation further by increasing the risks to vulnerable road users.**

The only way that this can be achieved is through a **separated shared path** so that vulnerable users do not interact with the traffic arising from the Port Development.

In support of this, we have obtained TDC's LiDAR data for the area and are developing a concept design for the provision of a safe shared path between Pohara and Port Tarakohe to present to TDC.

We request that:

- TDC acknowledges their responsibility to ensure the safety of vulnerable users; and,
- Allocates funding to construct the proposed path, either from those benefitting from the Port Development, and/or as part of TDC's Long Term Plan.

Separately, we would appreciate a copy of the Resource Consent for the development to see what conditions of consent were applied to ensure that the development complies with the TRMP and NTLDM requirements of road safety.

# Technical Note

Topic: **Protecting Vulnerable Road Users With Port Tarakohe Upgrade**

Prepared For: Coastal and Catchment Public Consultations Team

Version: Draft 1, 19 May 2019

Author: Christopher R. Bennett<sup>1</sup>

## OVERVIEW

This technical note has been prepared in response to call for community feedback on the draft design ideas for the Port Tarakohe upgrade. This upgrade will see a potential ten-fold increase in the commercial activity at the port, as well as increased recreational use. The port improvements are an excellent opportunity for Golden Bay and will yield major economic and social benefits. **This note addresses an important omission: the need to protect vulnerable road users (cyclists and pedestrians) by creating a 1 km long shared use path from the end of the current shared path in Pohara to Port Tarakohe.** Failure to create such a shared use path will result in excessive road safety risks to vulnerable users during construction and operation of the improved Port. Unless this provision is made, the community should not support the Port improvement.

### It is recommended that:

- a) We need to avoid repeating the mistake in the Pohara water connection project where road safety was not considered from the onset, resulting in two major road safety hazards being introduced to the corridor which will now require expensive retrofitting try and correct.
- b) Due to the very narrow 1 km route from Port Tarakohe to the existing Pohara shared path it is essential that any upgrade of Port Tarakohe protect vulnerable road users by extending the shared path from Pohara to Port Tarakohe. The likely cost of such a path would be on the order of 2% of the estimated port improvement costs.
- c) The shared path should have a minimum nominal width of 2 m, with reductions as necessary at several locations where it would not be viable to achieve that width.
- d) The shared path should have an asphaltic concrete surface like at Pohara to ensure that cyclists use it and not the road. It should also have barriers to prevent parking on—for example by climbers.
- e) There are several locations where the road itself will need strengthening and climate proofing—particularly given the expected increase in truck traffic—and so the provision of a shared path should be done in conjunction with a broader corridor assessment.

## CURRENT SITUATION

The existing Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on Abel Tasman Drive towards Port Tarakohe is estimated (2017) at 632 veh/day, with 8% heavy traffic (<http://mobileroad.org>). The traffic in Golden Bay is very seasonal—particularly on this section of road which connects with the Totaranui campground. SH60 at Waitapu Bridge sees the peak flows over 100% higher than the ADT during summer periods. It is likely that the design traffic flows for this section during the peak period are on the order of 1200-1500 veh/day.

<sup>1</sup> B. Eng. (Civil), M. Eng. (Transportation), Ph.D. (Transportation). 92 Bay Visa Drive, RD1 Takaka, [chris@lpcb.org](mailto:chris@lpcb.org)



The route is frequently used by cyclists (year round). With the construction of the Pohara-Takaka cycleway it can be anticipated that recreational users will increase in number over time—especially if the ‘Heartland’ ride circuit eventuates which would see cyclists travelling Nelson-Kaiteriteri-Totoranui (boat)-Pohara-Takaka-Collingwood-Heaphy-Karamea-Old Ghost Road. There are also pedestrians from Pohara campground (mainly summer) and climbers also climbers who park next to the road.

The 1 km section from Pohara has no shoulders, and there are a number of constrictions as shown in the photos below (taken 18/5/19 by the author). This puts the vulnerable users at high risk of a traffic crash.




## RECOMMENDATION

Any upgrade to Port Taranaki will significantly increase the road safety risk for vulnerable users:

- During construction there will be a major increase in construction traffic, particularly heavy trucks;
- After completion:
  - There will be increased heavy truck traffic to and from the port;
  - There will be increased recreational traffic—particularly during the summer season;
  - The port will serve as an increased ‘magnet’ for vulnerable users (especially from Pohara) who may wish to use the facilities.

The extension of the existing shared use path from Pohara can eliminate these risks by providing a safe and effective separate facility for vulnerable users. To achieve this:

- The path should be surfaced in asphaltic concrete (as is the existing shared path) so that it is used by road cyclists who tend to avoid crushed gravel surfaces
- There should be a physical barrier (such as an unmovable kerb) between the path and the road. This will not only further protect vulnerable users, but will also stop climbers and others from parking on the shared path.
- The path should have a nominal width of 2 m (2.5 m would be better, but much more difficult to achieve) which will allow for bi-direction traffic. Where this is impracticable due to major physical constraints, it can be reduced (see photos below). This approach would allow the route to qualify as a NZ Cycle Trail (see below <https://nzcycletrail.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/NZCT-Cycle-Trail-Design-Guide-v4-Feb-2015.pdf>).



The potential cost of the shared path—including structures—should be less than \$300,000 (about 2% of the total costs proposed for the port project). Given the risks of traffic fatalities and serious injuries—and the social costs associated with these—this cost is justified given the nature of the project.


Separately, the project should budget for the cost of improvements to the road as there is coastal protection as well as pavement works that will be required.

**The construction of a shared path to protect vulnerable users should be done prior to the major civil works commencing at Port Tarakohe so that they are not endangered by the construction traffic.**

Should there not be support for the shared path, the local community should not support the proposed development as it will have too great a potential for the community suffering fatalities and serious injuries from the truck traffic associated with the construction and enhanced port operations.



## Photos



*Examples of reducing the shared path width for obstacles.*



*Examples of road constriction where < 2.5 m likely required.*







Cynthia McConville 1/2



### THE INTERTIDAL ZONE

Rototai has a large area of intertidal flats and is renowned for its population of international and indigenous migratory shorebirds. Rototai hosts more than one per cent of the total population of South Island Pied Oystercatchers and is of international importance for this species.

The principal attraction for these shorebirds is the abundance of desirable food. There are also safe high water coastal roosts that provide shorebirds with a refuge and resting place while they wait for the receding tide to uncover the molluscs, crustaceans and worms on which they rely.



Vehicles disturb feeding and resting birds and can cause birds to desert their nests all of which have population level consequences.

Driving on the intertidal flats severely impacts marine life. By compressing the surface vehicles reduce survival of the small marine creatures that inhabit the intertidal zone.

These creatures make up the food chain on which many birds and our marine life depend.

Cynthia McGonagle 2/2


# Te Puna Waiora o Te Waikoropupū Springs and the Wharepapa Arthur Marble Aquifer Water Conservation Order 2023

WCO clauses apply to the areas that influence the Springs:

- **Wharepapa Arthur Marble Aquifer Recharge Area (WAMARA)**  
(pink outline)
- Confined part of the Wharepapa Arthur Marble Aquifer (WAMA)  
(blue hatch)

Approximate land cover in WAMARA:

- 87% indigenous forest, native/natural cover
- 2% exotic forest
- 10% grass land / farms
  - (1% irrigated dairy, 2% dryland dairy, 5.5% dairy support & drystock)
- 1% other uses







Source: DoC Management Plan

Te Waikoropupū Springs.

Photo: The Nelson Provincial Museum, Tyree Studio Collection, 182242/3.



Te Waikoropupū Springs, 29 December 1936.  
Photo: The Nelson Provincial Museum, Allison Collection, PF6.



Te Waikoropupū Springs.  
Photo: The Nelson Provincial Museum, Kingsford Collection, 163046/6.



Te Waikoropupū Springs. Photo: Gregg Napp.



Source: McGlinchey 2019



# Council Obligations

To **protect** the springs and their associated values, and to work with Manawhenua Iwi to achieve this goal.

- **Restrict** future permitted activities or consents which impact water quality or flow
  - This includes diffuse or point source discharges to land if contaminants may enter the water
  - There is some scope for additional consents to take water within the specified limits
    - Any new consents will operate under a cease-take regime so that limits are not exceeded
- **Manage** four water quality attributes within the springs to specified limits
  - They are nitrate, dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP), dissolved oxygen, and water clarity
- **Monitor** the attributes and ensure that future permitted activities and consents won't contribute to specified limits being exceeded and a reduction in nitrate is achieved



# WCO limits & triggers

- Sets an **Allocation Limit**: 766 l/s at main spring
- Sets a **Minimum Flow**: 6895 l/s at main spring
- **Sets limits** for Nitrate, DRP, Dissolved Oxygen and Water Clarity
  - Sets a **Nitrate limit** of 0.41 mg/L in 2038
  - Defines an **action trigger** at 0.44 mg/L until 2038 and 0.41 after 2038



# WCO limits & triggers

- **Comparison with current situation:**

- Consented amount: ~518 l/s, so ~248 l/s 'available' within WCO quality limits
- All water permits will need a cease take to protect minimum flow
- Nitrate: in 2021 ~0.45mg/L median > so WCO limitations will likely apply
- WCO does not affect current permits until their expiry OR existing lawful activities
- Creates a moratorium on NEW permits for water use or nitrate discharges until the nitrate limit is met

# WCO context overview

- Council is only 1 organisation/group looking after the springs
  - Iwi, DoC, landowners, wider community
- WCO is only 1 tool in the tool-box to protect the springs
  - RM plans, management plans, bylaws, NES, NPS
- Actions to protect the spring are at different stages:
  - There are protections that have already been in place for some time
  - Some new ones are currently in progress
  - Some new ones are programmed for the near future
  - Potential ones for the future, but not yet discussed





# Current protections for Springs

- **WCO** covers council functions for water flows/levels & discharges within WAMARA
  - S217: WCO is operative - council shall not grant water, coastal or discharge permits that are contrary to it
- **DoC** provides protections within reserve under a bylaw (access, noise, etc)
  - DoC management plan 2009 in conjunction with Manawhenua ki Mohua
- **TRMP** includes provisions relating to:
  - Access to Springs (watercraft, vehicles, stock), including for control of didymo
  - Defines some values/uses of Springs and karst/aquifer to be protected
  - Springs are a listed Wahi Tapu within cultural heritage provisions > manawhenua approvals for activities
  - Discharge rules that apply across the region, but also act to protect the aquifer recharge and Springs
- **Landowner efforts:** farm setback, planting, constructed wetland trial & detailed physiographic mapping and nutrient management plans in recharge area

# Work underway to implement WCO & address Nitrate

- Partnership with iwi
- Monitoring: since 1990s, ^ June 2003
- Peer review of science
- Plan change development
- Freshwater Farm Plans
- Science investigations
  - Land use maps
  - Climatic N variability
  - Karts landscape
  - Lab differences
  - Models
- Action Plan – focused on Nitrate
- Public Communications
  - dedicated WCO webpage
  - data online

