

SH8 Beaumont Bridge Replacement – Consultation Summary

1 Summary

Consultation comprised of a letter to landowners and the wider Beaumont community, stakeholders, meetings and a community Open Day. Overall there is support for a new 2-lane bridge.

A mail drop on the 7th November 2016 invited Beaumont residents to the Open Day to discuss the proposal with the project team on 15 December 2016. The Open Day was well received with 20 residents dropping in and providing feedback.

General consensus in the local community and surrounding area is that a replacement bridge is necessary and the preferred option is 'Option A', noting some opposition to it.

Stakeholders and both Councils consulted have raised no concerns about a new 2-lane bridge, but have raised some general environmental and infrastructure matters that will need to be addressed as the project proceeds.

Additionally the Beaumont Hotel collected feedback from customers which was provided to the project team. The feedback provided indicated approximate 345 people were in favour of Option A, with just 3 registering a preference for Option B.

All parties consulted with indicated a desire for consultation to continue during the process.

Ongoing discussions are essential to the successful outcome of the project.

2 Introduction

As part of the Detailed Business Case consultation has been undertaken to engage the wider community, directly affected parties and other stakeholders that have an interest in the project. The overall aim of community engagement is to provide the community with opportunities for active engagement prior to decisions being made, with the intention of informed decision making.

A Consultation Plan was prepared at the outset of the project which identified the parties to be consulted with, and the methods / means by which consultation would be undertaken.

This report outlines the community consultation that has been undertaken.

3 Consultation Activities

Two corridor options were used for consultation purposes:

- Option A, just downstream of the existing bridge, with a short ne highway alignment; and
- Option B, further downstream of option A, with a considerably longer new highway alignment.

The two options were first sent to property owners who would potentially be affected by the works, in addition to an information letter and feedback form.

An open day was held on 15 December 2016. This provided the project team with an opportunity to discuss the potential options with the Beaumont community.

Feedback from the potentially affected property owners and the community was collated and reviewed by the team before progressing the business case.

The parties consulted were:

- Otago Regional Council and Clutha District Council (including Lawrence Tuapeka Community Board)
- KTKO, TAMI, Te Runga o Ngai Tahu
- Fish and Game, Department of Conservation, Heritage NZ
- Chorus, Powernet, Transpower
- Police, Fire Service, St Johns
- Road Transport Association, Heavy Haulage Association, NZ Automobile Association
- Clutha Gold Trail Trust

4 Consultation Responses

4.1 Meetings

The following meetings were held:

PARTY	SUMMARY
Beaumont Hotel	In initial meeting was held with the owners of the Hotel on 14 October 2016. Present were Simon Underwood (NZTA project Manager) Shane Roberts (Opus) Ali Mills and Gunnar Egilsson. Ali and Gunnar were generally supportive of the project, though apprehensive about the potential impact on their business – particularly Option B.

4.2 Directly Affected Landowners

The following responses were received from the following landowners with land 'underneath' Option A or Option B:

PARTY	SUMMARY
Crawford (29 Rongohere Rd)	Prefer option B but will affect them considerably. Concerned at impact on sale of property (currently for sale)
Van den Hoven	Happy to see something happening. Willing to sell land if needed.
Beaumont Hotel	<p>Prefer option A – less disruption, cheaper.</p> <p>Hotel has historic frontage to SH8.</p> <p>Progressing a resource consent for an expansion of the Holiday Park – this would be reliant upon passing traffic.</p> <p>The holiday park expansion is necessary to make the business viable.</p> <p>Clutha gold Trail cyclists rely on the Hotel for refreshments and accommodation.</p>
Lawrence	Option B would get rid of the existing curve on SH8. Have had a staff member drive off SH8 at this curve.
Healey	<p>Agree that the bridge needs to become two lanes.</p> <p>Interested to know the time frame.</p> <p>For those whose property is partially affected would Transit take the complete property or just the proportion?</p> <p>Corridor A - is not ok for us as it goes through our garden. In this area there are three 150+ year old Oak trees and also a tree planted on our Maori Grandsons afterbirth. Our property has been our home for just on 40 years, we have put a lot into the garden and the house. We love living in this wee historic town of</p>

	<p>Beaumont and are very passionate about Beaumont and the history. We do not intend selling in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Corridor B - Is not a good option as it affects more residential property. It would straighten the section of road but the road will still have many bends in it.</p> <p>Corridor C - Is another option of going from Lowburn Creek along the base of the hill and existing road line and bridge built either side of the existing bridge or extensions made to the width of current bridge. Only grazing land would be affected. Best option.</p> <p>No residential land should be affected.</p> <p>Keep Beaumont as a go ahead Community.</p> <p>We are not willing sellers of our property.</p>
<p>Henderson</p>	<p>Prefer Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It utilises most of the existing highway. Historically this is significant - It does not by pass the hotel. The hotel is a valued asset of our community and it's long term viability is of concern to all of us. - Minimal disturbance to residential property. <p>However, I believe No disturbance to residential property is acceptable. It is unacceptable and I believe unnecessary to cut through the Healy property as shown in your plan and if this option becomes preferred then the corridor should not include this property but go through the paddock to the north.</p> <p>Corridor B</p> <p>I view this as totally unacceptable for the following reasons.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Maximum disruption to residential properties. This includes having a highway close to properties where there has not been one before.- Isolates the hotel. The hotel is a valued asset to our community and it's long term viability is of concern to all of us.- Cuts through the township and destroys the character of the town and community.- Removes one residential property from the community (12 Weardale St). We enjoy our holiday home and as a holiday home on the Book a Bach website it provides accommodation for those using the Clutha Gold Trail and economic value to the area. We value our community and all the properties in it. <p>There is not and will not be a willing seller of 12 Weardale St to Opus. I bought this property in 1995 so that it would not fall into the hands of ECNZ and to help protect the town of Beaumont and the wider area from destruction by way of hydro drowning. I am, as are many of our residents, very passionate about our town and it's environs. While we accept that there will ultimately need to be a new bridge across the river at Beaumont we are adamant that it should stay as close to the original as possible with least disruption to the township and it's residents. This also includes the closing of roads which we consider are an important part of our community.</p>
Hewitt	<p>We would be totally opposed to plan B. This plan would take away the magnificent river views we have and bring the bridge closer to our home (in fact right over our home) and creating more stress due to increased traffic noise, pollution etc. We</p>

	<p>also have a concern that it may cause a devaluation of our property.</p> <p>Plan B would also encroach on more people in the community. Plan A although not perfect would be a better option, even though this would also bring the bridge closer to our home with its attendant problems. Why can't we have Plan C with the bridge built on the north side of the existing bridge which would connect with State Highway 8 by the picnic area? This would affect less people and not put pressure on the housing.</p>
Hutchinson Trust	Option A preferred as it will have less impact than Option B – particularly due to the impact on the hotel and visitor numbers and residents if Option B was considered.
Mitchell	Suggest a variation on A and B with a new alignment between the Healey and Henderson property as it would have less disruption. Concerned about the speed of vehicles through Beaumont with both options as they stand.
Van Rossom	Prefer option A as it is less disruptive to residents and properties. Has some concerns about the realignment of Rongahere Rd.

4.3 Community Open Day

A community Open Day was held at the Beaumont Hall on 15 December 2016.

The open day was held between the hours of 3pm and 7pm. The Transport Agency was represented by Simon Underwood (Project Manager). Opus International Consultants was represented by Natalie Veale (Opus Project Manager), Shane Roberts (Planner) and Megan Crossen (Civil Engineering Technician).

A total 20 people came through the Open Day.

Everyone who attended the open meeting fully supported the need for a new 2-lane bridge. There was not unanimous support for either option, however Option A was

generally the preferred option. Matters such as property impacts, increased noise, intersection upgrades, and the interaction with the Clutha Gold Trail were raised.

The following written feedback was received after the Open Day.

FEEDBACK	
Alison Joyce	Option A keeping the road nearest the hill. Access for the cycle trail paramount also.
Anna Mickell and Tim Dowson	<p>Beaumont Bridge is a defining landmark – it serves as a entry point to the Millenium track, slows traffic to view the Clutha River and means traffic slows to pass the pub. Would be best if new bridge did not detract from these features.</p> <p>We would support he Healey’s garden being undisturbed. It is beautiful and of immense value to our small community.</p>
Bill Dacker	<p>Thanks for the opportunities you gave recently for viewing and questioning your team about the new bridge at Beaumont options. Talking to you and other residents and interested parties present enabled me to think more clearly about them.</p> <p>My own position is for option A now as long as it can be modified to remain well clear of the Healey’s and their garden and trees. This option would I think have the support of most at Beaumont so long as the Healey's concerns can be addressed. Perhaps the most important point raised in informing my change of made from option B was by Lee M about the effects on the community should a major new highway divide the community.</p> <p>This small community has suffered a lot over many years through ECNZ and then Contact Energy plans to build more dams in the district and the buying up of properties by the first for that end. Then Contact sold off many in the district without a great deal of consultation and Opus directed demolition of many houses that could have been saved and would have meant selling to more varied purchasers if they had been available when the selling took place after Contact cancelled its dam plans. This small community has just started to recover from the effects of these years, beginning in 1992, started to rebuild. Another major construction like option B,</p>

	affecting many of those remaining and some starting again, would be very unfair.
Jeff Butler	<p>Prefers option A, however it should not affect historic trees. Would be least disruptive to the community.</p> <p>Option B not suitable, goes close to and through houses, cuts off the front of the pub and will have a huge impact on a small community.</p>
Stacey Robertson	Prefer option A as traffic will still be going past the hotel. Also doesn't go between houses as B does. A new bridge would be fantastic.

4.4 Correspondence

The following summarises the correspondence received in addition to that:

PARTY	FEEDBACK
Te Ao Marama Inc	<p>In regards to information received 16 November 2016. We have reviewed the information supplied to date, which at this stage of the project is limited. Our preliminary comments are as follows:</p> <p>For Ngā Rūnanga the issues would most likely focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Management and mitigation measures to be taken on sediment run-off during any earthworks. · Management and mitigation measures to be taken on effects to any waterway ie. water quality. · Management of excess excavated material. <p>Ngā Rūnanga would request that the following be a condition of the resource consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · That the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Archaeological Discovery Protocol (attached) should be adhered to. <p>Ngā Rūnanga support the proposal of a new State Highway 8 Beaumont Bridge and have no issues with either of the options proposed at this stage, but do have a preference to Option A, as this looks like would have the least impact on the environment with existing roading to be used.</p>

	<p>Ngā Rūnanga would like it noted that there is a recorded Māori archaeological site (G44/4 – findspot – adze) in the vicinity of the above proposal and there is the potential to disturb unrecorded sites during any earthworks. Therefore, any earthworks undertaken should be carried out in a way that allows contractors to monitor for artefacts or archaeological material.</p> <p>Please note that this reply is made without prejudice. The Rūnanga reserves the right to reconsider its position in light of additional information and/or research.</p> <p>Thank you for seeking our feedback at this early stage and encourage consultation throughout the development of the above proposal.</p>
KTKO	<p>In regards to information received 16 November 2016. We have reviewed the information supplied to date, which at this stage of the project is limited. Our preliminary comments are as follows:</p> <p>For Ngā Rūnanga the issues would most likely focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Management and mitigation measures to be taken on sediment run-off during any earthworks.· Management and mitigation measures to be taken on effects to any waterway ie. water quality.· Management of excess excavated material. <p>Ngā Rūnanga would request that the following be a condition of the resource consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· That the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Archaeological Discovery Protocol (attached) should be adhered to. <p>Ngā Rūnanga support the proposal of a new State Highway 8 Beaumont Bridge and have no issues with either of the options proposed at this stage, but do have a preference to Option A, as this looks like would have the least impact on the environment with existing roading to be used.</p>

	<p>Ngā Rūnanga would like it noted that there is a recorded Māori archaeological site (G44/4 – findspot – adze) in the vicinity of the above proposal and there is the potential to disturb unrecorded sites during any earthworks. Therefore, any earthworks undertaken should be carried out in a way that allows contractors to monitor for artefacts or archaeological material.</p> <p>Please note that this reply is made without prejudice. The Rūnanga reserves the right to reconsider its position in light of additional information and/or research.</p> <p>Thank you for seeking our feedback at this early stage and encourage consultation throughout the development of the above proposal.</p>
Heritage New Zealand	<p>Matt Schmidt, Regional Archaeologist advises as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Archaeological assessment required for areas proposed · Recommends test trenches · Assessment should include old bridge as well · In terms of archaeological matters Matt has no objection in principle to either option · There are no New Zealand Heritage List entries within either of the proposed alignments. · I note the existing bridge is scheduled in the Clutha District Plan however this is not directly relevant to the current consultation.
Otago Regional Council	<p>"Regarding the two proposed alignments, Council would encourage the selection of the alignment that will cause the least environmental effects both during and after the bridge's construction.</p> <p>Council would also expect best engineering practices to be used during the design and construction of the bridge.</p> <p>A full assessment of the proposal will be made by Council staff upon receipt of a complete resource consent application.</p>

<p>Chorus</p>	<p>"I am the network planner for Otago/Southland and your proposed bridge upgrade at Beaumont has dropped onto my desk.</p> <p>Across the existing bridge we have a 100mm duct and a couple of copper cables.</p> <p>We'll be installing a fibre cable some time in the future.</p> <p>If the new bridge goes ahead, we'll definitely need to replicate what we currently have, plus we'll have to rebuild the approaches to the bridge to join up with the rest of the network.</p> <p>I won't be able to attend the community meeting on the 15th, but we would definitely like to be kept in the loop regarding progress, and our Service Company designers will need to redesign what we've got in the area.</p>
<p>Powernet</p>	<p>Prefer option B as there would be less reconfiguration of the network – costs of which would not be met by Otagonet Ltd.</p>
<p>Transpower</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter asking for feedback on the SH8 Beaumont Bridge replacement design envelopes.</p> <p>We've reviewed the location of the envelopes against our high voltage transmission assets, and have determined that there is no direct conflict.</p> <p>We support any solution that makes access to our assets (transmission towers and overhead lines) easier for maintenance activities. We don't require to be involved in any further consultation.</p>
	<p>Otago Fish and Game Council has no strong feelings for the replacement bridge options and has no objection to either of them. Our interest increases when you get to the design stage. Fish and Game would like to see minimum disturbance to the river bed through bridge pile placement, and no contamination during the construction phase by isolating pile construction from river water.</p> <p>Salmon have been observed spawning immediately upstream of the bridge and trout almost certainly spawn in the mainstem as well.</p>

The Clutha sustains a popular trout and salmon fishery in the reach upstream and downstream of the bridge and it also provides habitat for waterfowl.

Please keep us in the loop as the project proceeds