Appendix G Long List Assessment

ID	Name	Better Travel Time Reliability	Improve Travel Mode Choice	Improved Liveability	Improved Safety (All modes)	Assessment of key risks	Recommendation
1	Western Bypass	5	1	3	2	• The intervention would go against the *travel choice* investment objective as it would encourage an even greater use of the car. Even if the new bypass were accompanied by a shared path, use would likely be limited (as low-density land use would surround it). • Minor safety improvements on basis that traffic through the town reduces (and the problem does not shift elsewhere on the network). • The bypass will contribute to some reduction in traffic volumes through Ashburton and Tinwald which could enhance liveability. • 2014 assessment (Option K) identified serious or fatal flaws with the option against: – Access and mobility – Land acquisition – Local and national strategies – Economics – Wider outcomes	Do not progress to short-list
2A	Eastern Bypass (Outer)	5	2	3	3	• The inner bypass alignment is too far from the town centre to provide an effective mode choice for residents. • The bypass will contribute to some reduction in traffic volumes through Ashburton and Tinwald which could enhance liveability. • 2014 assessment (Option A) identified serious flaws with the option against: – Access and mobility – Land acquisition – Local and national strategies	Do not progress to short-list
2B	Eastern Bypass (Inner)	5	1	3	2	• The 2014 Assessment discounted this option as fatally flawed because: • Little traffic would use the new route and so does not address issues with congestion. • Option does not improve travel mode choice for residents. • Does not improve safety for all modes. • Land acquisition • Project construction costs • Effects on residential amenity	Do not progress to short-list

ID	Name	Better Travel Time Reliability	Improve Travel Mode Choice	Improved Liveability	Improved Safety (All modes)	Assessment of key risks	Recommendation
3	Oak Grove Bridge (All Modes)	3	2	4	3	• Unlikely to function as an effective urban link as too far from Tinwald West development and town centre. • Would be difficult to design at northern connection as it would affect the sports centre. Although it has potential to provide good links to the schools in Ashburton, the route is not readily accessible to residents in Tinwald East without improvements to Tinwald Corridor. • 2014 assessment (Option J) identified serious flaws with the option against: – Economics – Risks (notably 'natural hazards' and 'funding') – Local and national strategies • Generally, more risks and costs than the alternative of Tarbottons Road.	Do not progress to short-list
4	Tarbottons Road Bridge (All modes)	3	4	4	4	• Option provides benefits to West Tinwald but is unlikely to have a significant effect on traffic volumes in Tinwald as it only improves access for Tinwald West. Greater benefits possible with improvements to the Tinwald Corridor. • It could provide improved access to educational and recreational centres but does not provide direct access to the town centre. • The 2014 Assessment (Option I) rejected this option because of the need to acquire business lane, connectivity to town centre and inconsistency with road hierarchy.	Progress to short-list
5	Trevors Rd Bridge (All modes)	3	2	3	3	• Urban fringe alignment is unlikely to attract sufficient usage to benefit SH1. • does not link to main commercial or employment centres. • Does not align with road hierarchy. • 2014 assessment (Option B) discounted this option due to these serious flaws.	Do not progress to short-list
6	Leeston St Bridge (All modes)	3	3	3	3	• Southern connection is largely rural so may not attract sufficient usage to provide benefits to SH1 corridor. Northern connection is not close to key activity centres and so does not promote its use. • 2014 assessment (Option C) discounted this option due to serious flaws associated with: – Little reduction in SH1 traffic volumes likely to result from this connection. – Does not connect to town centre. – Not aligned with road hierarchy.	Do not progress to short-list

ID	Name	Better Travel Time Reliability	Improve Travel Mode Choice	Improved Liveability	Improved Safety (All modes)	Assessment of key risks	Recommendation
7	Tarbottons Rd Bridge (Active Modes Only)	3	4	4	4	• This option provides a good connection between Tinwald West and educational facilities, sports centre and some employment centres in Ashburton and could form part of a wider active movement network. • Does improve route choice for active modes but is unlikely to have a significant effect on SH1 traffic volumes.	Progress to short-list
8	Chalmers Ave Bridge (all modes / NoR Option)	4	4	4	5	Option has been analysed in some detail for the NoR approval process (Option D). Provides good benefits, depending on the level of local traffic that can be attracted to the route.	Progress to short-list
9	Chalmers Ave Bridge (Active Modes only)	3	4	3	5	• Provides a safe and attractive, active mode connection between Tinwald and Ashburton. • Unlikely to result in a significant reduction in traffic volumes on SH1 corridor. • All modes bridge option is preferred in this location	Do not progress to short-list
10	Chalmers Ave to Grove St	4	4	3	4	• Makes good use of the existing road network but the increased traffic volumes on Grove Street would have greater adverse effects than NoR alignment. • This option was rejected in the 2014 Assessment (Option D-E) following feedback from the public and effects on amenity. • Impractical to implement now because of the retirement village north of Grove Street that was constructed following release of the NoR	Do not progress to short-list
11	William St to Grove St (All modes)	4	4	4	3	• Provides connection across river avoiding SH1 which will improve access to the town centre from Tinwald East. Route is not aligned with road hierarchy which will generate adverse effects on residential amenity. • The 2014 Assessment (Option E) discounted this option due to potential serious flaws associated with: – Severance – Road safety – Inconsistency with road hierarchy • Impractical to implement now because of the retirement village north of Grove Street that was constructed following release of the NoR	Do not progress to short-list

ID	Name	Better Travel Time Reliability	Improve Travel Mode Choice	Improved Liveability	Improved Safety (All modes)	Assessment of key risks	Recommendation
12	William St to Carters Tce (Active Mode Bridge)	3	4	3	4	• Provides safe active mode connection over the river but unlikely to have a significant effect on SH1 traffic volumes - does not resolve severance effects in Tinwald. • Could be one part of a wider solution but is not a solution in its own right	Progress to short-list
13	Cass St to Thompson St	3	4	4	3	• Provides a new vehicle crossing but not clear that it would attract enough traffic to provide benefits to existing bridge. Does not link well to wider network. • Does not link naturally with the existing road hierarchy which could adversely affect road safety but does use existing road alignments. Hence Chalmers Avenue options preferred over Cass-Thompson. • Is dependent upon Tinwald Corridor works The 2014 Assessment (Option F) discounted this option due to potential serious flaws associated with: • Proximity to SH1 would result in low transfer of vehicle trips. • Unlikely to resolve issues with congestion. • Inconsistent with strategic plans	Do not progress to short-list
14	Cass St to Carters Tce (Active Mode Bridge)	3	4	4	4	• Provides a safe active mode connection that will contribute to some reduction in traffic volumes in the bridge. Unlikely to be sufficient to address the capacity issues at the bridge. • Could form part of a wider area active network improvement plan	Progress to short-list
15	Active Mode Network	3	4	4	4	• Improves resilience with additional crossing options but these are not viable for motor vehicles. • Could form part of an active mode's improvements package for the wider urban area	Composite - effectively options 7+14
16	Public Transport (Bus)	2	4	3	2	• This option may provide some benefits as an interim measure but could take a long time to achieve desired benefits from mode shift. • Will require significant operating costs to subsidise the service, provide sufficient coverage and operating frequency to be attractive alternative to car.	Progress to short-list
17	Public Transport (Rail)	1	2	1	1	• This option would require introduction of a localised rail shuttle between two stations. • Operating this with sufficient frequency to make it attractive to users is unlikely to be cost effective	Do not progress to short-list

ID	Name	Better Travel Time Reliability	Improve Travel Mode Choice	Improved Liveability	Improved Safety (All modes)	Assessment of key risks	Recommendation
18	Four lane existing bridge	5	5	3	5	• Widening of the bridge is impractical and is likely to require complete bridge replacement and there is no practical alternative route during construction. • An increase in capacity is likely to increase bridge usage and require further improvements to the SH1 corridor. • The 2014 Assessment (Option G) discounted this option as seriously flawed because of increased severance effects without improvements to intersection along the corridor and no improvement to route resilience.	Do not progress to short-list
19	Improve clip-ons	3	4	4	4	• Option is reliant on improvements elsewhere in the network which are not guaranteed. Improvements to active mode connection could increase mode share but is unlikely to significantly affect traffic volumes	Progress to short-list
20	Duplicate Bridge	5	4	4	4	• Duplication of the road bridge including active modes within the existing transport corridor represents efficient use of land resources. • Does not resolve potential severance issues with high traffic volumes on SH1. Dependent on Tinwald SSBC. • Previously opposed by KiwiRail	Progress to short-list
21	West St / Carters Tce	5	4	4	4	• Concept uses existing transport corridor and increases capacity for motor vehicles while improving connections for active modes. Grade separation of SH1 rail crossing will reduce congestion and contribute to increased safety. • The increased capacity could transfer congestion effects to other locations on the network. Improvements to the Tinwald corridor are still required. • Previously opposed by KiwiRail	Progress to short-list
22	West St / Melcombe St	5	4	4	4	• The option uses the existing transport corridor. Making Melcombe St the northbound SH1 carriageway will increase traffic volumes which will affect local property access and adversely affect residential amenity. • The option will be reliant on improvements to the Tinwald corridor to create safe access. • The 2014 Assessment (Option H) discounted this option as seriously flawed because of increased severance effects without improvements to intersections along the corridor, effects on amenity, railway, and road safety.	Do not progress to short-list

ID	Name	Better Travel Time Reliability	Improve Travel Mode Choice	Improved Liveability	Improved Safety (All modes)	Assessment of key risks	Recommendation
23	Four lane SH1 (Walnut Ave to Maronan Rd)	5	5	3	3	• Four laning would provide more capacity to the north and south of the bridge but the bridge would still create a bottleneck because it is constrained to two lanes unless a new bridge was constructed. • The 2014 Assessment (Option G) discounted this option as seriously flawed because of increased severance effects without improvements to intersection along the corridor and because it provides no improvement to route resilience.	Do not progress to short-list
24	Improve Southbound merge at SH1 / South St	4	1	1	3	• This option may provide short term benefits by reducing the congestion associated with the southbound merge but does not improve mode choice and road safety at the merge. • Ideally, this option should be linked with improvements to clip-ons.	Progress to short-list
25	Railway Bridge clip-ons	3	4	4	4	• Ensuring safety of pedestrians and cyclists near railway is high risk and may not get Kiwirail APA. • This option does not provide route choice for motorists or increase resilience of the road network	Do not progress to short-list
26	Land-use Controls	1	1	1	1	• Existing land zoning would need to be changed to prevent residential development by right. Likely to be strong opposition to this. Provides no direct benefits to the transport network. • Could form part of an integrated development plan for the District.	Do not progress to short-list
27	Tinwald Community Facilities	1	2	4	1	• Establishing new community facilities in Tinwald would remove the need for some travel by motor vehicle because the shorter distances would enable active modes to be used. • This would provide some reduction in traffic volumes using the bridge and would not contribute to route choice or mode choice for travel between Ashburton and Tinwald. • Could form part of integrated development plan for the District.	Do not progress to short-list
28	Congestion Charging	3	3	1	1	• Unlikely to be practical to implement. Does not increase route choice or mode choice	Do not progress to short-list
29	HOV / freight Restrictions	3	2	1	1	• The location of Ashburton within the strategic network makes restricting freight movements at peak times impractical without creating large freight parking areas which then affects freight transport costs	Do not progress to short-list

ID	Name	Better Travel Time Reliability	Improve Travel Mode Choice	Improved Liveability	Improved Safety (All modes)	Assessment of key risks	Recommendation
30	Freight Rail Hub	1	1	1	1	• This option would not necessarily reduce freight volumes on bridge as goods would need to be transported to the hub for the next stage of travel. • Requires multiple handling points for goods which is not practical for many goods.	Do not progress to short-list
31	E-scooters	2	3	2	1	• This option may promote a change of travel mode but would not affect the travel demands. • Travel across the bridge via an alternative motorised mode, e.g. e-bike or scooter would involve sharing the traffic lanes and is not considered safe with the high volumes of traffic on the bridge	Do not progress to short-list