



Ngauranga to Wellington Airport Draft Corridor Plan

Summary of consultation and submissions

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Greater Wellington
Regional Council
Wellington
PO Box 11646

T 04 384 5708
F 04 385 6960
W www.gw.govt.nz

TP/03/16/05

August 2008

Contents

1.	Consultation process	5
1.1	Draft corridor plan	5
1.2	Previous consultation	5
2.	Response to stage 3 consultation	5
3.	Main themes in submissions	6
3.1	Overall support for the plan	6
3.2	Questions of staging and timing	6
3.3	Inclusion of light rail	7
3.4	Key issues	7
Appendix 1	Key Issues	4
Appendix 2	Concerns of Organisations	7
Appendix 3	Key points of form submission	14

1. Consultation process

1.1 Draft corridor plan

The third stage of public consultation on the Ngauranga to Wellington Airport Corridor Study began in June 2008 and has involved the publication and mass circulation of a draft corridor plan, seven public information days at community centres and malls around the region, press releases, public surveys, and the receipt of written submissions until 28 July. The consultation concludes with public hearings of oral submissions from 25 August 2008.

1.2 Previous consultation

Earlier stages involved consultation on Issues (early 2007) and Options (Dec 2007-Feb 2008). The second stage 'options' consultation was notable for attracting in excess of 4500 submissions. The response included some 4200 form submissions via two postcard campaigns. The larger (3750) was initiated by a number of like minded groups¹. The smaller (482) was initiated by the Wellington Region Regional Chamber of Commerce. Much of the public debate during the options stage was the inclusion and timing of light rail options in public transport planning for Wellington City. There were 300 non-postcard submissions in the second stage, including 58 organisation responses.

These earlier consultation processes informed the draft corridor plan adopted for consultation by the Regional Land Transport Committee on 4 June 2008.

2. Response to stage 3 consultation

In total 558 written submissions were received to this phase of consultation. 344 (62%) of the submissions were in the form of a prepared written submission from Sustainable Wellington Transport, a coalition of groups committed to a sustainable transport system for Wellington. This is the same group who dominated the stage 2 consultation, although without the support of the Green Party. 91 of the remaining 198 submissions used the feedback form supplied in the draft corridor plan booklet, 84 were composed letters, and 23 were straight emails.

Geographic origin of responses is dominated by Wellington City addresses – 451 (81% of the total). The Hutt Valley contributes 9% of total responses, the western side of the region 4%, outside the region 2%, and unidentifiable addresses 4%.

A slightly higher proportion of form submission responses (83%) are identifiably from Wellington City. There is a noticeable skew in their geographic origin - 55% come from the central city or Lambton ward, with Te Aro and Kelburn particularly prominent, 10% from southern, 8% from eastern and 2% from northern suburbs, although all these areas have similar-sized populations.

There is minor scattered evidence of doubling-up. About 20 submissions come from 6 people with the same names and addresses sent on different days.

Submissions from organisations total 39 (2%), the rest from individuals and households.

¹ Cycle Aware Wellington, Living Streets Aotearoa, Green Party, Sustainable Energy Forum, Option 3, Transport 2000+, Appropriate Technology for Living Association.

The 39 include 9 small enterprises signing the form submission. Some organisations are also represented on the form submission. Several organisations are residents' associations or professional-interest groups, and some are registering a property interest in particular projects. 12 organisations are represented on the Regional Land Transport Committee or are identified in the Land Transport Act 1998 as organisation that must be consulted. The submissions of this latter group are summarised in Appendix 2.

3. Main themes in submissions

The following key themes came through from submissions:

- overall support for the plan
- questions of staging (order of projects) and timing (how fast or when projects happen)
- inclusion of light rail.

These are discussed below. A more detailed analysis of the submission feedback is provided in Appendix 1.

3.1 Overall support for the plan

While the form submitters do not support the approach taken, there is generally strong support from the other submitters. Many submitters support the approach but ask it go further. There is a high level of support by the organisation's who submitted.

The submitters using the form submission set out a philosophically-rooted opposition to the plan's approach and process, asserting instead that transport plans should follow a particular philosophy rather than a methodical process.

The direct question in the feedback form asking "do you support the draft plan?" generated 156 comments. Of these, 42 supported the direction in the plan, and 90 supported parts of it, 80 of these supported public transport aspects but opposed roading aspects, and 25 supported roading aspects but opposed public transport aspects. Many submitters didn't answer the question directly, but went on to assess elements in the plan.

3.2 Questions of staging and timing

Many submitters question the pace of the proposed plan. Comments such as "timid, unambitious, not convincing, do it quicker" feature many times. Submitters suggest plan proposals could not deliver the network required in the time required.

The staged approach attracted few specific comments and those few were positive.

A few submitters regretted the excision of Wallace St widening, and argued for its reinstatement as necessary to make the proposed Adelaide Boulevard work. A handful of submitters questioned the absence of Aotea Quay / Waterloo Quay issues.

A significant number of submissions addressed matters outside the scope of this corridor plan such as issues outside the boundaries of the study (Petone cycleway, Transmission Gully) or local roading issues in Karori, Berhampore, Kilbirnie or Miramar.

3.3 Inclusion of light rail

Excluding the form submission for the moment, submitters question or oppose inclusion of light rail or extension of rail. Amongst them a sizeable group assert bus-based solutions will always be more appropriate for Wellington. Support is expressed for electric power as opposed to diesel fuel power (hence trolley or hybrid-bus alternatives).

Form submitters very strongly support the inclusion of light rail, particularly investigation and early delivery, and rail extension, in the final plan.

3.4 Key issues

Analysis assigned every submitter comment on a topic to one of 6 positions (usually explicit in their comments) – support, question, oppose, propose (do more or different), accelerate or delay. Appendix 1 reports response breakdown for the top 20 topics. The other 40 topics attracted less than 15 comments each. Overall submitters commented more on detailed projects than on general principles.

APPENDIX 1 – Key Issues

Issue	Element	Comments	Positions of comments	
Support the plan	General attitude to	162	42 support, 90 question – subdivided 65 pt parts, 25 roading parts; 15 oppose	9 propose, 6 accelerate
Pace of plan	Proposed timing	47	47 oppose as slow	
Substance of plan	Plan 'fluffy', lacks substance	17	6 query, 9 oppose present plan (want more substance)	2 accelerate
Global pressures, p1	Reference inadequate, issues are critical/urgent	26	4 support, 11 note the reference, but query the urgency	11 want more urgency
Modelling, p 2	Queries on extrapolation, base used, horizons used, links to other	41	2 support, 34 query, 4 oppose	1 proposes alternative
Light rail inclusion, p2	Protect LR options	127	65 support, 23 query, 5 oppose	4 propose, 30 accelerate,
Rail extension (waterfront), p3	Possible extension	72	40 support, 7 question, 0 oppose	5 propose, 20 accelerate
Urban Form, p5 and 7	Densification supported or questioned	18	6 support, 6 query, 2 oppose	4 propose
Current PT initiatives, p7	Responses to Kaiwharawhara Throat, new trolleys, ticketing, bus lanes etc.	49	42 support, 3 query, 2 oppose	3 propose, 2 accelerate
Flyer improvement, p7	Stop, route, frequency	29	20 support, 1 opposes	7 propose , 1 accelerate
TDM initiatives, p7	Current TDM plan, parking tariff example	25	6 support, 4 question, 2 oppose	10 propose more/new, 3 accelerate
Funding, p9	Importance, prioritisation, alternatives	18	1 support, 8 question, 3 oppose (cost)	6 propose new sources

PT network/spine, p9	Concept of PT spine/network	22	15 support plan, 1 opposes	4 propose , 2 accelerate
----------------------	-----------------------------	----	----------------------------	--------------------------

Comments on specific projects in the plan				
Bus priority on spine	P 11	47	34 support, 5 question, 3 oppose	4 propose more, 1 accelerate
Bus lane Hutt Rd	P 11	24	16 support, 6 question,	1 proposes redesign, 1 accelerate
Cobham roundabout	P 13	33	10 support, 6 question (w/c), 3 oppose	10 propose (w/c), 3 accelerate, 1 delay
Basin Flyover	P 11 and 13	77	13 support, 19 question (design, impacts), 28 oppose	14 propose (tunnel instead), 3 accelerate
Walking strategy	P 13	71	14 support, 5 question, 1 opposes	25 specific proposals, 26 accelerate
Cycling strategy	P 13	86	13 support, 11 question, 2 oppose	38 propose, 22 accelerate
Wellington Rd/Ruahine St	P 15	51	15 support, 4 question, 12 oppose	13 propose (w/c), 5 acc, 2 delay
Mt Victoria Tunnel	P 15	85	20 support, 9 question, 33 oppose	15 propose (w/c), 5 acc, 3 delay
Waterfront/Terrace Tunnel	P 15	70	19 support, 17 question, 19 oppose	12 propose 2 accelerate, 1 delay

In addition, the following themes generated 10 or more submitter comments:

APPENDIX 2 – Concerns of organisations

Sub. No.	Submitter	Key Concerns
64	Land Transport NZ (NZTA)	<p>Notes support for growth spine plans but transport funding conditional on actual growth;</p> <p>Notes final study should provide clear objectives and targets for corridor;</p> <p>Questions robustness of growth assumptions;</p> <p>Questions downstream effects of Ngauranga to Aotea Quay extra lane, urges multi-modal approach here;</p> <p>Supports walking & cycling (CBD) and urges fully-costed programme developed quickly;</p> <p>Notes relaxing of analysis rules for carriageway allocation bus v car if alt routes;</p> <p>Spells out preferred stepped approach to pt (lane to busway to consider alt technologies);</p> <p>Requests acceleration of later steps into plan stage 1;</p> <p>Concerns re mitigation costs (urban design, neighbourhood effects) of Basin Flyover, urges PT and walking & cycling connection benefits be included;</p> <p>Accepts Cobham Dr investigation warranted.</p>
117	Upper Hutt City Council	<p>Local concerns appear to dominate regional;</p> <p>Critical corridor with regionally significant destinations, part of regional network, regional linkages neglected in draft</p> <p>Fears locally-oriented improvements eg PT and walking & cycling will impact adversely on arterial vehicle congestion</p> <p>If reduced long term parking in city then need more such parking beyond, but this has adverse comfort and time impacts on commuters</p> <p>Questions whether outcomes contribute to RLTS outcomes</p> <p>Short-term PT and walking & cycling projects are Wellington City costs;</p> <p>Support bus/traffic improvements at Basin;</p> <p>Support extra capacity at Cobham Dr but note given justification is local not regional;</p> <p>Supports Ngauranga to Aotea peak lanes but questions Hutt Rd bus lanes and downstream effects (Terrace Tunnel);</p> <p>Supports staging;</p> <p>Support Wellington Rd/Ruahine St;</p> <p>Support assessment of Mt Victoria Tunnel;</p> <p>Support assess of PT improvements but query carriageway loss;</p> <p>Questions waterfront lane reduction and discusses Terrace Tunnel pressures;</p> <p>Notes traffic growth projections.</p>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Key Concerns
122	Automobile Assn	<p>Notes traffic growth projections;</p> <p>Park and ride needed south of city;</p> <p>Terrace Tunnel tidal flow alternative proposed;</p> <p>Endorse draft's rejection of LR, because new conflicts and adverse effects on carriageway space, suggest articulated buses instead on waterfront route;</p> <p>PT enhancements don't address poor waiting facilities and security/shelter issues;</p> <p>Basin project urgent;</p> <p>Support Basin flyover;</p> <p>Funding sources unclear – ratepayer impacts?</p> <p>Plan sketchy re budget, timelines, consenting, and funding.</p>
142	OnTrack	<p>Note Regional Rail Plan</p> <p>Registers interest in consequences of widening Thorndon Overbridge;</p> <p>Note Kaiwharawhara throat, extra turnout (platform capacity) projects impacted, and siding road;</p> <p>Rotem units require extra track storage and maintenance facilities near the widening;</p> <p>Need to maintain rail (freight) connections to port and ferry;</p> <p>Rail needs may impact Aotea works.</p>
179	Kapiti Coast District Council	<p>Draft plan lacks urgency and purpose – refer drivers of current mode shift;</p> <p>Support staged approach but urge acceleration;</p> <p>35% Kapiti commuters to CBD currently take train – could be more;</p> <p>Hospital journey of primary importance for Kapiti residents – should be by uninterrupted train so support Light Rail, 5-year wait for a study is too long, wants LR sooner not later;</p> <p>Advocates mode shift (from road to PT and walking & cycling);</p> <p>Supports active modes eg 30 kph zones, walking & cycling network planning;</p> <p>Supports local mitigations, applauds Adelaide Boulevard (provided arterial route to hospital);</p> <p>Questions Basin Flyover on impact grounds;</p> <p>Fears re funding, especially PT.</p>
184	Regional Public Health	<p>Prioritise PT and walking & cycling and TDM above all roading;</p> <p>Accelerate assessment of LR/busways, if done first then roading works unnecessary;</p> <p>Supports bus priority measures (CBD) to be instigated concurrently with assessments;</p> <p>Opposes Basin Flyover, Ruahine widening, Ngauranga to Aotea Quay peak</p>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Key Concerns
187	Wellington Region Chamber of Commerce	<p>lanes, tunnel duplications, reiterates roading works redundant in face of fuel price/mode shift;</p> <p>Proposes equity for 'people at margins' as a consideration (re: fares, mobility);</p> <p>Supports prioritising pedestrians in CBD; proposes "shared space";</p> <p>Suggests quality of PT fleet as a priority;</p> <p>Suggests 2 PT routes, waterfront (rail arterial) and Golden Mile (bus local) ;</p> <p>Supports Adelaide Boulevard;</p> <p>Wants 4th lanes on Ngauranga to Aotea Quay reserved for emergency vehicles (and buses);</p> <p>Supports bus lanes on Hutt Rd;</p> <p>Supports bus priority city to airport but via taking current carriageway not by creating new carriageway;</p> <p>Supports Airport Flyer improvements, note adjustments unhelpful to Hutt Hospital;</p> <p>Supports bus priority on key suburban routes;</p> <p>Supports walking & cycling strategies inc route hierarchy;</p> <p>Urges resource allocation to walking & cycling;</p> <p>Urges more bike storage on trains;</p> <p>Questions whether waterfront lane reduction requires Terrace Tunnel, supports lane reduction and increased pt use on waterfront;</p> <p>Supports mode shift philosophy;</p> <p>Proposes frail rely on pt more than cars;</p> <p>Considering trans-disadvantaged (hence PT needs) will meet all needs;</p> <p>Notes incremental nature of roading improvements – one leads to another;</p> <p>Proposes densification strongly linked to PT use and provision;</p> <p>Feels local walking & cycling in east neglected;</p> <p>Feels Aotea/Gateways area (Stadium, Aotea, Ferry PT and pedestrian connections) neglected;</p> <p>Feels LR should precede not follow increased pt use (quality attracts).</p> <p>Ngauranga to Airport a critical regional (and national) corridor;</p> <p>Supports mixed (balanced) investment;</p> <p>Supports 4 ingredient approach;</p> <p>Supports most projects but reserved on dedicated bus lanes;</p> <p>Urges acceleration of roading scheme assessments and believe these projects needed within 10 years so planning process needs to start earlier;</p> <p>Urges caution regarding forecasts from transitory fuel pricing – private vehicles</p>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Key Concerns
		<p>still have a future, and technology fixes possible, meaning roading will be needed;</p> <p>Urges Terrace Tunnel duplication a stand-alone project needed for SH1 demand reasons, not tied to waterfront lane reduction, doubts waterfront lane reduction by itself will resolve pedestrian access to waterfront;</p> <p>Supports plan in deferring assessment of LR;</p> <p>Wants quality bus fleet in short-term;</p> <p>Notes current bus service needs improvement, supports current initiatives but urges more/quicker/investment in bus service;</p> <p>Support peak period bus lanes but questions 24hr bus lanes;</p> <p>Opposes car-free CBD – refer business survey;</p> <p>Off peak carriageway dedication to buses not sensible if bus demands low and goods/car demands high;</p> <p>Support Ngauranga to Aotea Quay peak lanes and Basin improvements in short-term;</p> <p>Note supporting business survey on Basin works;</p> <p>Support walking & cycling works, caution against over-promoting cycling in Wellington conditions;</p> <p>Funding sources should be wider- include private sector and debt-financing;</p> <p>Pricing/tolling options possible in this corridor.</p>
308	Hutt City Council	<p>A critical corridor, regional destinations</p> <p>Supports both roading and pt proposals in draft</p> <p>Prioritisation another story, requires regional approach.</p>
352	Wellington Airport Ltd	<p>Support planning for critical corridor;</p> <p>Applauds links with wider WCC planning (Kilbirnie growth), note though that investment in infrastructure, especially transport, must precede growth;</p> <p>Supports 4 ingredient approach;</p> <p>Supports positive initiatives in 4 ingredients;</p> <p>But disappointed that short-term plans will not address the congestion/reliability/time-critical issues to/from airport and city;</p> <p>Airport's location advantage (close/quick to city) is being eroded, with 30-40minute journeys now common instead of the previous 10-15 minute journeys;</p> <p>Draft plan's actual programme on these issues is to delay the assessments (except Basin); instead urges to accelerate assessment (and implementation) of Mt Victoria Tunnel and Ruahine St/Wellington Rd works;</p> <p>See these works as linked not separate;</p> <p>Basin design needs to be careful;</p>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Key Concerns
357	NZ Bus	<p>Flyer improvements noted and welcomed;</p> <p>Support bus priority works Hutt Rd and Golden Mile;</p> <p>Note bus improvements require roading improvements;</p> <p>Support plan's position on LR;</p> <p>Question Terrace Tunnel priority, effectiveness, and link to waterfront, noting Ngauranga to Aotea Quay will shift more traffic to waterfront;</p> <p>Urge regional priority to this corridor.</p> <p>Compliments plan;</p> <p>Believes all traffic (private and public) will grow so all modes require investment;</p> <p>Provides figures on Wellington's bus patronage (internationally high), recent growth (4%) and investment (fleet capacity, snapper, trolleys);</p> <p>Supports multi-modal 4 ingredient approach and action plan;</p> <p>Supports roading improvements;</p> <p>Supports planning for LR in future;</p> <p>Supports Big Picture elements;</p> <p>Supports flexibility/review procedures;</p> <p>Supports bus lanes and bus priority measures along current routes, feels bus priority is greatest single improvement that can be made ;</p> <p>Supports walking & cycling plans;</p> <p>Supports pedestrian improvements linked to bus routes, includes shelters;</p> <p>Supports cyclist use of bus lanes;</p> <p>Questions taxi use of bus lanes;</p> <p>Intend to facilitate bike hire;</p> <p>Urge traffic engineering attention to bus journey (signalling, messaging, cameras) – highly related to bus time variability in CBD;</p> <p>But also need attention to roading capacity and allocation as well, hence bus priority/bus lanes;</p> <p>Very high bus use of Golden Mile in peaks (120-180 per hour, =2-3 a minute) = lane need;</p> <p>Bus stop capacity also an issue, though 'Snapper' ticket will help dwell times;</p> <p>Urge attention to funding sources, central government and debt-funding;</p> <p>Support bus lanes Hutt Rd, suggest designs;</p> <p>Support roading improvements at Basin, especially to separate traffic and buses currently caught in the conflicts;</p> <p>Support Cobham Dr improvements;</p>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Key Concerns
		Support bus priority on key suburban routes; Support Bus Rapid Transit in short term, do not preclude LR in longer term; Prefer tidal flow for Terrace Tunnel not 2 nd tunnel; Note bypass has improved some flows but grade-separation should be considered for resolving conflicts.
358	NZ Historic Places Trust	Notes Basin Flyover affects the listed Pavilion and Basin Reserve Historic Area.
359	Porirua City Council	Vital corridor, with regionally significant destinations; Modelling should be for 2026 or later, fits gestation periods of projects better; Modelling should link to other corridor plans; Support most projects proposed; Note waterfront reduction proposal echoes Transmission Gully in separating arterial (SH1) from local (waterfront) issues; suggest tidal flow alternative be investigated; Want regional approach to PT; Consider freight not well covered; Support 4 ingredient multi-modal approach; Feels regional perspective, ie through travellers to regional destinations (especially hospital), not stressed enough, eg regional PTT connections not considered; SH1 improvements don't take account of Western/Hutt Corridor proposals in same timeframe; links to Wellington Regional Strategy given cursory attention, need for internationally competitive airport (port); Feels the gestation of controversial corridor plan projects will be long – this needs to be considered in prioritisations; Feels pt spine should connect to airport too; Support parking proposals; Support Ngauranga to Aotea Quay 4-laning but question reducing the capacity of Hutt Rd; Support Cobham Dr improvements; Support walking & cycling strategies, note this includes mobility scooters etc; Support assessments of Mt Victoria Tunnel, Ruahine St/Wellington Rd; Recognising LR not feasible inside 10 years, urge development of bus system inc bus priority/lanes in the short term; Urge more consideration of Lambton interchange transfer between train/walk/bus modes, eg integrated ticketing; Gateway issues are urban form not transport; Port freight needs overlooked.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Key Concerns
362	Centreport	<p>Primary activities are located in this corridor and transport network support is critical to port viability;</p> <p>As commercial developer, interested in people movement; proximity to Lambton interchange is an attracting factor but pedestrian linkages and direct PT linkages to Waterloo/Aotea unsatisfactory;</p> <p>As port, interested in freight movements both road and rail;</p> <p>Existing roading configuration (4-laned, with merges and slips) Aotea/Waterloo v important and pleased to note lane reduction schemes occur south of Bunny St;</p> <p>In short-term reliable accessible ring route vital;</p> <p>Support Ngauranga to Aotea Quay extra capacity;</p> <p>Thorndon Overbridge widening has impacts (ferry terminal, silo) – construction disruption – Port needs early consultation;</p> <p>Possible slip lane at Kaiwharawhara to ferry, has resilience value;</p> <p>Support scheme assessments happening earlier;</p> <p>Note projections of reduced traffic along Aotea Quay;</p> <p>Request review of lost SH1 status of Aotea/Waterloo Quays;</p> <p>Rail freight to port needs to be protected – recent and forecast high growth; impacts Waterloo Quay – rail/road grade separation ultimately required;</p> <p>Possible interest in excavation material for reclamation purposes;</p> <p>Urge efforts to secure Crown funding for corridor projects;</p> <p>Support softer TDM initiatives but concerned if cordon/congestion charging and freight not exempted.</p>

APPENDIX 3 - Key points of form submission

Key Points

Query business as usual model, propose new philosophy (PT and walking & cycling first, no extra roading)

Heed majority of 2nd stage submitters

Pay greater concern to global environmental issues, climate change, peak oil and greenhouse gas emissions

Prioritise cross (local) movements

Introduce bus lanes quickly

Assess LR in 2 years, implement in 5 as rail spine

Delete Mt Victoria and Terrace tunnel assessments

Delete Basin flyover

Delete Wellington Rd/Ruahine St widening

Allocate resources to walking & cycling by trips taken

Prioritise pedestrians in city, 30kph zones, review light phases

Safe routes to school

Pedestrian safety needs around bus/train stations

Support reducing lanes on waterfront

Support traffic calming

Cyclists use bus lanes

Harbour walkway/cycleway

Public bike hire

Delete Ngauranga to Aotea Quay extra lanes

Delete Cobham Dr improvements

Prioritise Real Time Information and Integrated Ticketing (In current initiatives)

Accelerate urban densification

Support telecommuting/ ridesharing (under TDM)

Support flexible hours (under TDM)

Support car share pilot (under TDM)