



Report 12.210  
Date 21 May 2012  
File TP/01/16/10

Committee Regional Land Transport Programme Hearing  
Subcommittee  
Author Natasha Hayes, Senior Transport Planner  
Adam Lawrence, Senior Analyst/Project Coordinator

## Report on submissions to the draft Regional Land Transport Programme 2012 - 2015

### 1. Purpose

To provide the Subcommittee with an overview of the submissions received on the draft Regional Land Transport Programme 2012-15, together with draft officer comments and recommendations.

### 2. Significance of the decision

The consideration of submissions to the draft RLTP is part of a decision-making process that will lead to the Committee making a decision of high significance within the meaning of the Local Government Act 2002. The decision-making process is explicitly prescribed for by section 18A of the Land Transport Management Act 2003, this process includes the use of the special consultative procedure as set out in the Local Government Act 2002.

### 3. Background

The amended Land Transport Management Act 2003<sup>1</sup> (the Act) requires the Regional Transport Committee to prepare and consult on a Regional Land Transport Programme (RLTP) every three years.

The RLTP is a three year programme that contains all the land transport activities proposed to be undertaken throughout the region for the next 3 financial years (2012 – 2015), the regional priority of those activities, indicative activities over the following 3 financial years, plus a 10 year financial forecast.

---

<sup>1</sup> As amended by the Land Transport Management Act 2008.

The proposed activities in the RLTP are submitted by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and 'Approved Organisations' (including the eight territorial authorities (TAs) and Greater Wellington). The activities in the programme relate to passenger transport, walking and cycling, road safety, travel demand management, local roads, state highways, and the movement of freight.

The Regional Transport Committee sought feedback on the draft RLTP in April 2012, in relation to the transport activities included in the draft programme and the identified priorities for funding transport activities in the region. After considering the feedback provided through submissions, the Regional Transport Committee will recommend a final RLTP for Council's adoption in late June 2012. The final adopted RLTP will support the region's bid for funding assistance from the National Land Transport Fund, through inclusion in the National Land Transport Programme.

#### **4. Scope of the Committee's discretion**

Section 16 of the Act sets out the form and content of RLTPs. Section 16(1) (a) sets out those activities that must be automatically included in the programme. These are: local road maintenance, renewals and minor capital works and existing public transport services. Committed activities are also automatically included.

In terms of all other activities the Committee cannot include activities not put forward by an approved organisation. This does not preclude the Committee from requesting an approved organisation to consider including a project. However, it can choose not to include an activity that has been put forward.

Therefore, the decision for those projects currently included in the 3-year programme that the Committee has discretion over is:

- i) whether to continue to include the project/activity in the 3-year programme
- ii) whether to give the project/activity a higher or lower regional priority.

It is important to note that this programme forms one step in the funding process.

Many activities require local funding that is approved separately through each council's Long Term Plan (LTP) and Annual Plan processes.

In most cases, activities are included in the regional programme because they require some funding from the National Land Transport Fund. While the New Zealand Transport Agency will take account of the regional programme and priorities it does not have to include any activities or projects in the National Land Transport Programme, nor is it bound to follow the regional programme when considering detailed funding applications. However an activity must be in the regional programme to obtain funding from the National Land Transport Fund.

## **5. Consultation**

The Regional Transport Committee, at its meeting on 9 March 2012, approved the draft Regional Land Transport Programme for public consultation.

Consultation ran from 26 March until 4 May 2012. Public notices were placed in the Dominion Post and local newspapers. A summary of the draft RLTP was distributed to all households in the region, along with Greater Wellington's draft Long Term Plan 2012 - 2022. The full draft programme was mailed out to around 200 stakeholders and public libraries.

Information was also available on Greater Wellington's website, including an electronic submission form.

## **6. Submissions received**

545 submissions were received on the draft programme. Of these submitters, 45 indicated a wish to be heard in support of their submission.

Around 95% of submissions were received from individual members of the public, most using either the paper feedback form contained in the summary document or the online submission form on Greater Wellington's website. The remainder were received from local councils, organisations/agencies, advocacy groups and community groups. Formal submissions were received from three territorial authorities (Kapiti Coast District Council, South Wairarapa District Council and Masterton District Council).

A number of submissions also came through to this process via Greater Wellington's LTP process. Where submissions were made on the LTP that addressed RLTP matters (i.e. matters relating to prioritisation and roading projects) these have been included in the Regional Transport Committee's submission process. This is to ensure any comment made about strategic transport issues is dealt with by the appropriate processes.

A full copy of all submissions has been provided to members of the Subcommittee.

A Subcommittee was established to hear these oral submitters and consider all submissions, by the Regional Transport Committee at its meeting on 9 March 2012. Additional members of the Subcommittee were confirmed at the Greater Wellington Council meeting on 27 March 2012.

## **7. Submission analysis**

The issues raised by submitters ranged both in terms of topic and specificity. Submitters commented on high level strategic issues through to detailed operational issues. This analysis sets out the common and more significant issues raised by submitters. Also provided is officer comment (including advice from the relevant approved organisation where appropriate) and draft recommendations.

The RTC Technical Working Group<sup>2</sup> has reviewed and provided input to the comments, advice and draft recommendations set out in this report.

## 7.1 Overview

General support was noted overall by submitters for the projects included in the draft programme even if views varied greatly about the order of priority in which projects were ranked in the draft programme.

To the question in the submission form ‘Do you support the projects in the draft Regional Land Transport Programme?’ around 238 answered ‘Yes’ and 192 answered ‘No’. A small number of submitters did not specifically respond to this question, some stating that they supported it in part only.

In terms of general funding priorities and activity areas there was clear support amongst submitters for both public transport and walking/cycling activities to receive more emphasis, higher priority and more funding generally. While a number of submitters supported road projects and felt that funding for these was justified, many submitters felt that money spent on new road projects should be transferred to public transport, walking and cycling improvements.

Another strong theme was the need to reduce spending, avoid debt and keep rate increases to a minimum. Submitters noted that in times of economic recession there was need for careful spending and that the focus should be on maintaining the existing transport network rather than spending on new expensive projects.

Of the third priority large new projects, a significant number of submitters commented on ‘Electronic Ticketing’ and the ‘Ngauranga to Petone walkway/cycleway’ (just over 100 submissions each or approx 20%). For Electronic Ticketing, half of the submissions were in support and half were opposed. For the Ngauranga to Petone walkway/cycleway, support for the project was conclusive amongst submitters, with only four submitters opposing it.

Other projects receiving a high level of comment in the third priority group were ‘SH1 Mackays to Peka Peka Expressway’ (55 submissions), ‘SH1 Basin Reserve improvements’ (58 submissions), and ‘SH1 Widening of Ruahine Street/Wellington Road’ (24 submissions). More comment in opposition than support was received for these three RoNS projects.

In the ‘Other significant activities expected to commence within the next ten years’ category in the draft programme the project that attracted the most comment through the submissions was ‘Transmission Gully Expressway’, with a mention from around 51 of all submitters (10% of total). The majority of those submitters (around 80%) supported Transmission Gully with many seeking higher priority and asking that its timing be brought forward. In this category, other projects receiving a reasonable level of comment were ‘Mt Victoria Tunnel Duplication’ and ‘Petone to Grenada Link Road’ both receiving relatively equal comment support and opposition.

---

<sup>2</sup> Made up of officers from NZTA and all local councils in the region.

Submitters identified a number of strategic projects or ideas that are not currently included in the draft RLTP three year programme or ten year outlook. The most commonly identified ‘missing project’ was some form of light rail system and a new railway station at Raumati (15 submissions each).

These matters are covered in further detail in the sections below.

## 7.2 Programme large new projects (third priority) (486 submissions)

A number of submitters disagreed with all third priority large new projects, while other submitters saw these as the most important projects to progress.

### 7.2.1 Overall ranking of projects (436 submissions)

The draft RLTP submission form asked (question 2) ‘Do you agree with the ranking given to the high cost, large, new projects (third priority projects) due to start in the next three years?’ Of those who answered this question, 65% said ‘No’ and 35% said ‘Yes’. Those who answered ‘No’ to this question usually identified one or more projects of which they would amend the priority.

The question went on to ask ‘What order of importance do you think is appropriate?’ Where submitters identified support/opposition or a different priority for one or more specific projects, the results have been included in the individual project summaries in the following sections.

However, where submitters re-ranked all or most of the 13 projects as a proposed new list, the results were analysed to highlight any patterns (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: Analysis of suggested rankings – Question 2(a)

Project Name	Ranking in draft RLTP	Up	No change	Down	New ranking based on submissions
Mt Vic Tunnel Safety	1	0%	65%	35%	1
Adelaide Road Improvements	2	10%	45%	45%	2
SH1 Ruahine Street/Wellington Road	3	10%	32%	58%	3
Aotea Quay Improvements	4	17%	35%	48%	4
Electronic Integrated Ticketing	5	23%	27%	50%	5
SH1 Inner City Bypass Optimisation	6	28%	32%	40%	6
SH1 Basin Reserve Improvements	7	43%	30%	27%	8
Johnsonville Triangle Improvements	8	27%	28%	45%	9
Ngauranga to Petone Cycleway/walkway	9	27%	28%	45%	7
SH2 Carterton to Masterton Safety	10	38%	37%	25%	10
SH1 Mackays to Peka Peka Expressway	11	37%	53%	10%	11
SH1 Ngauranga to Aotea Quay ATMS	12	38%	58%	3%	12
SH2 Ngauranga to SH58 ATMS	13	28%	72%	0%	13

*Comment* - Overall, the analysis showed that when combined, submitters rankings did not differ significantly from the ranking in the draft programme. However, it did highlight a common theme amongst these submitters that the Ngauranga to Petone walkway/cycleway should be higher up the third priority list, moving up two places in the new rankings.

**Recommended change:** *It is recommended that the Committee consider elevating the Ngauranga to Petone walkway/cycleway project higher up the list of third-priority projects as described in section 7.2.10 in this report.*

#### 7.2.2 Rank 1: Mt Victoria Tunnel Safety improvements (16 submissions)

Those submitters who listed a new rank order for projects overall often had this project at or near the top of the list, suggesting a level of comfort with this as the highest ranked third priority project. However a number of those who singled out the project specifically queried its priority and cost, and were unclear about what the project involved and how it differed from recent upgrading work that had involved the tunnel closure. Others acknowledged that safety for users of the tunnel was an important issue.

*Comment* – The safety aspects of this project have contributed to its high ranking amongst third-priority projects.

*NZTA advise that the work undertaken recently on Mt Victoria Tunnel was phase 1 of safety improvements for the tunnel. It involved the demolition of the concrete ceiling and interim upgrade works of the fire sprinkler system. Phase 2 (this project) will involve a series of improvement works including works to the Fire Life Safety systems, the pedestrian walkway and the road surface.*

**Recommended change:** *Officers recommend amending the description of this project in Table 4 of the final RLTP to reflect the above information and to be clear what this project involves.*

#### 7.2.3 Rank 2: Adelaide Road improvements (9 submissions)

A small number of submissions specifically mentioned the Adelaide Road improvements project, with an equal level opposed and supportive. One submitter noted that the project should include a 24/7 bus lane the whole way along Adelaide Road.

*Comment* – Support and opposition to the project is noted. This project to widen and improve Adelaide Road arterial route is required to meet growth in traffic from the southern and eastern suburbs of Wellington City. It links with the Basin Reserve grade separation project ensuring the maximum potential is gained from reducing the conflict between local and State Highway traffic.

*Wellington City Council advises that bus priority measures on Adelaide Road were identified in the Ngauranga to Airport Corridor Plan and are currently in place, operating during peak hours. Following completion of this project it is expected that the bus lanes will operate at all times.*

*Wellington City Council advises that this project has now been split into two stages, \$2.5m in 2012/13 and \$3.5 in 2015/16 as a result of changes through development of Wellington City Council draft Long Term Plan. It has, however, been retained as a third priority activity.*

***Recommended change: Amend the project timing in the final RLTP to reflect this advice, and update the description as set out in Table 3, Section 8 of this report.***

#### 7.2.4 Rank 3: SH1 Ruahine St/Wellington Rd widening (26 submissions)

Submissions were received both in support of (around 8) and in opposition to (around 15) this project. Those in support commented on the need for urgency in completing this section as part of the connection to the airport, and the need for improved access along Ruahine Street/Wellington Road for safety reasons. Submitters in opposition did not agree with the taking of town belt land/green space and the impact on adjacent properties. Some felt the project was unnecessary as traffic volumes were no longer growing, or that the project could be deferred given the economic climate.

*Comment – Safety issues associated with intersections along Ruahine Street/Wellington Road and both peak and off-peak/weekend congestion along this stretch have been constantly identified through previous consultation and planning processes. This project aims to address these issues prior to the Mt Victoria Tunnel duplication.*

*Concerns relating to impact on the town belt and adjacent properties are noted. These impacts will be considered in detail at the scheme assessment and detailed design stage.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.2.5 Rank 4: Aotea Quay improvements (4 submissions)

This project attracted only a few specific submissions. One of the comments received was that the objectives of this project were unclear, but that earthquake strengthening and pedestrian access to the ferry terminal should be important considerations.

*Wellington City Council advises that the construction phase for this project is no longer due to start in the next three years as a result of changes through development of Wellington City Council draft Long Term Plan. Only property costs remain in the programme.*

***Recommended change: As this project will not now commence in the next three years, it should be removed from the ‘Third-priority large new projects’ list in the programme and added to the ‘Other significant activities expected to commence in the next ten years’ list, as set out in Table 3, Section 8 of this report. Property costs (\$1M) for the project should be included in the non-prioritised activity group.***

## 7.2.6 Rank 5: Electronic Ticketing (114 submissions)

Electronic Ticketing was one of two third priority large new projects attracting a significant number of submissions. This project was specifically noted in around 110 submissions (approx 20% of submissions). Almost exactly half of the submissions were in support and half were opposed.

Comments in support noted that an electronic and integrated system was long overdue, that the current system is outdated, and the project would be more efficient, encourage more public transport use and contribute to a range of Regional Land Transport Strategy outcomes.

Submitters who opposed the project thought it was too expensive, would be unaffordable in the current economic climate, and that the benefits do not justify the high cost. Other common concerns were that it would result in fare increases/high cost to users, would lead to job losses, and that it would be a deterrent to casual users.

There were also a number of comments about the type of system that should be implemented. Some did not want to see the current Snapper system extended and others liked the Melbourne system. The need for a national system run by independent operators was identified by some.

*Comment – Electronic integrated ticketing is a concept included in the Regional Public Transport Plan. The introduction of an electronic integrated ticket for use on all Metlink public transport services in the region is a significant enhancement for the public transport system.*

*Greater Wellington’s Public Transport Group advises that key benefits include one ticket/fare (ie. pay once regardless of mode or operator), speeding up boarding of services, improving revenue collection on rail, providing more flexibility when changing fares or fare products, providing valuable data on travel patterns, and supporting a layered service approach as set out in the Regional Public Transport Plan.*

*The estimated cost of \$39M is expected to cover the system itself and the hardware that will be required to implement the system on rail. This includes electronic gates at Wellington station and ticket readers at stations. Greater Wellington intends to build on the system currently being implemented in Auckland and utilise the national ticketing central system that is being procured by NZTA to reduce costs and risks. The system would be future proofed as far as possible to allow for technology developments.*



*In accordance with Greater Wellington's Revenue and Financing Strategy, around 50% of the cost of the system would need to be covered by fare revenue, with the remainder covered by rates and NZTA subsidy. Having an electronic ticketing system will not directly mean more expensive fares for public transport users. If fare revenue from patronage growth increases at the assumed rate of 3% per annum this would cover enhancement projects including electronic ticketing, reducing the need for fare increases.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.2.7 Rank 6: SH1 Inner City Bypass optimisation (13 submissions)

A small number of submissions were received both for and against this project. A comment made by several submitters was that it is not clear from the available information what this project is and what 'optimisation' involves, therefore making it difficult to provide a view.

***Comment*** – *Submissions for and against this project are noted.*

***NZTA advises*** that the Inner City Bypass Optimisation project involves better use of the existing State highway network to take into account proposed changes on the wider network (Roads of National Significance projects). The project aims to develop a low cost short to medium term improvement with in existing corridor.

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.2.8 Rank 7: SH1 Basin Reserve improvements (59 submissions)

Around 10% of all submitters on the draft RLTP specifically mentioned this project. Some submitters supported this project, often calling for it to have a higher priority. However, the bulk of submitters who mentioned this project were either opposed or thought it should be a lower priority. The common reasons for opposition were related to disagreement with any kind of flyover or bridge. Some submitters felt it would be a visual intrusion or an eyesore. Others felt the money would be better spent on light rail or other projects, or encouraging peak time drivers to travel at other times.

The Mt Victoria Historical Society opposed the Basin Reserve improvements project due to the impact on Buckle and Tasman Streets historic streetscape, the pedestrian environment and Memorial Park, the Home of Compassion Creche, the Basin Reserve as an iconic public recreation space and historic values, and Ellice and Dufferin Streets heritage, amenity and visual streetscape values.

A small number of submitters suggested alternative ideas for improvements such as putting a road straight through the Basin Reserve instead of spending money on a flyover, constructing an underpass and tolling it, or introducing a network of tunnel links to all hub roads.

***Comment*** - *This project is identified in the Ngauranga to Wellington Airport Corridor Plan, adopted in October 2008. The work to develop the corridor plan found that more journeys are likely to be made as a result of an*

*increasing population and greater economic activity, particularly in the Wellington central business district and along the Johnsonville to Kilbirnie 'growth spine'. The plan concluded that the solution was a 'multi-modal' approach, which involves making significant improvements to our public transport, walking and cycling facilities, as well as our roads. To achieve more reliable public transport journey times for travel north-south along this key public transport spine, without negatively impacting journey times on State Highway 1 to/from the Wellington Airport, some form of separation between the two corridors is needed.*

***NZTA advises** - The Basin Reserve project is part of a multi-modal approach to developing Wellington's transport network. The project is part of a transport response that recognises that we can't rely on motorised transport alone, or on public transport, cycling or walking. The Basin Reserve project and Inner City Bypass project seek to address the road capacity element of the overall plan for transport in Wellington. Through this process a number of options were explored including an option that tested whether a significant investment in public transport would meet Wellington's future transport needs. We concluded that the solution included road capacity upgrades as well as a 'multi-modal' approach, which involves making significant improvements to public transport, walking and cycling facilities, as well as our roads.*

*The Basin Reserve project, part of the overall multi-modal approach, will:*

- *Reduce travel times for pedestrians, cyclists, road and public transport users. This will help to reduce congestion.*
- *Reduce vehicle operating costs*
- *Reduce crashes*

*The NZTA considered a number of alternative ideas for improving the transport network around the Basin Reserve for public transport users, pedestrians and cyclists as well as motorists. Various at-grade and tunnel options were investigated as part of the development of the project. Taking into account the multi-modal requirements of the transport network around the Basin Reserve, the NZTA believes that on balance a bridge provides the most cost-effective transport and urban design solution.*

*NZTA expects to lodge an application for resource consent this year and concerns about the visual appearance and heritage effects of a bridge located near the Basin Reserve and its surrounds and these will be taken on board when preparing the applications and the consent process will provide an for detailed consideration of any effects.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### **7.2.9 Rank 8: Johnsonville Triangle roading improvements (7 submissions)**

Those who mentioned this project specifically were generally supportive. Urgency around these improvements was noted in relation to significant traffic congestion in this area. The need to address pedestrian safety and access as part of the project was identified.

*Comment – This project addresses existing transport issues and provides capacity for an expanded Johnsonville Mall, allowing for further improvements when needed.*

*Wellington City Council advises that the project includes a number of improvements to enhance access including improved pedestrian safety, enhanced public transport links/movements, and improved vehicle flows.*

*Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.*

#### 7.2.10 Rank 9: Ngauranga to Petone cycleway/walkway (103 submissions)

Support for this project was conclusive amongst submitters, with only a handful of submitters opposing it, compared with over one hundred in support. This re-iterates the support through submitter rankings as set out in section 7.2.1 of this report. Submitters called for the project to be given a higher rank/priority to reflect its high benefit/cost ratio (3.1) and the strong support it received through the Hutt Corridor Plan. Key benefits identified included improved safety for existing cyclists, increase in cycling/walking and contribution to Regional Land Transport Strategy objectives, tourism benefits, resilience benefits, reduced traffic volumes on State Highway 2 and completion of a strategic gap in the regional cycle network between two major cities.

Many submissions asked that the timing of the project be brought forward to be completed within three years so that the investigation/design is carried out in 2012/13 and construction within 2013/14. Supporting this were comments that the project is a relatively low cost, long overdue and the current facility is very unsafe, poorly maintained and a major barrier to cycle trips between the Hutt Valley and Wellington City.

In terms of the design of the new walkway/cycleway comments included need to take account of sea level rise and storms and be wide enough to be a safe shared path.

The small number of submitters opposed to the project did not agree it was value for money or necessary given current economic climate. Some suggested that there was an adequate facility already in place.

*Comment – Strong support for this project through a large number of submissions is consistent with the level of support from submitters in previous consultation processes such as the Hutt Corridor Plan. The need for this project and significant benefits are acknowledged and the project is included in all the relevant regional transport plans including the Regional Cycling Plan 2008 and the Hutt Corridor Plan 2011.*

*It is recognised that the design of the walkway/cycleway will need to provide a good level of service for this strategic cycle link. Further design consideration will be part of the investigation and design phases.*

*The Committee could consider changing the rank/priority order of this project by elevating it higher up the list of third-priority large new projects. This*

would signal the region's strong support for this project to be progressed. It is noted, however, that because this project would be funded from the 'Walking and Cycling Activity Class', it will be competing for funding with large walking/cycling projects in other regions rather than other projects in the third-priority list which are funded from different activity classes.

The Committee cannot respond to calls for the timing of this project to be sooner. Timing of projects is at the discretion of the organisation responsible for implementing the project. The Committee could ask NZTA to consider whether earlier timing for construction of the walkway/cycleway is possible.

**NZTA notes** the high level of support for this project and the requests from submitters for construction of the project to be brought forward. **NZTA advises** that investigation, design and construction funding have been scheduled for the financial years 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 respectively. NZTA feels that this project is appropriately phased in order to undertake detailed investigation of all options to provide a continuous high quality cycleway adjacent to State Highway 2 between Ngauranga and Petone.

**Recommended change:** Consider elevating the priority rank given to this project within the third priority group to signal the region's strong support for this project to be progressed with urgency. The project could be elevated to 2<sup>nd</sup> in the third priority large new projects list, after the Mt Victoria Tunnel Safety Improvements which is ranked 1<sup>st</sup> on this list due to its safety focus.

#### 7.2.11 Rank 10: SH2 Carterton to Masterton Safety improvements (19 submissions)

Of the submitters who commented on this safety project, around half were supportive and half were not. Submitters supporting the project sought a higher priority, identifying a high crash risk along this section of State Highway 2 and relatively low cost of the project as key reasons. One submitter felt this project should be combined with an upgrade of Buchanan Place/Ngaumutawa Road/SH2 intersection.

Other submitters did not agree that this area has a high crash risk or felt there were other higher priorities in Wairarapa (such as Waihenga Bridge on SH53). Both Masterton District Council and South Wairarapa District Council questioned the rationale for this project and whether it should proceed at the expense of other projects such as the council maintenance programmes which they believed would have greater safety benefits. Several submitters were concerned about reduction of safe passing opportunities with a median barrier in place and high numbers of heavy vehicles in the area.

**Comment** – The mixed views about this project are noted, including opposition from both South Wairarapa and Masterton District Council. The Wairarapa Corridor Plan includes safety improvements identified in the relevant crash reduction studies on State Highway 2 between Te Marua and Mt Bruce.

**NZTA advises** that the section of road between Carterton and Masterton is a High Risk Rural Road which is determined by the High Risk Rural Road Guide.

*This is a measure of the number of high severity crashes per km per year. The section of State Highway has a medium collective risk. Actual crashes for the 5 year period between 2006 – 2010 were 7 fatal and serious crashes (not actual number of casualties) and the State Highway is a 2 star rated road. The traffic volumes are 10,000 vehicles per day; roads carrying greater than 6000 vehicles per day typically result in more head on crash fatal and serious casualties than run off road crash casualties. Installation of a wire rope barrier will improve safety for protection against head-on crashes along this stretch of road on State Highway 2.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

#### 7.2.12 Rank 11: SH1 MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway (57 submissions)

This project attracted comment in around 10% of all submissions. More submissions were received seeking a lower priority or opposing the project than those seeking higher priority or supporting the project.

Submissions in support cited addressing safety and congestion as the key reasons. Those opposed thought it was too expensive, didn't have a sufficient benefit/cost ratio, and would have an unacceptable impact on the environment and community. Some felt the existing highway should be upgraded alongside the rail corridor instead.

**Comment** – *This project replaces the previous Kapiti Western Link Road that appeared in the previous RLTP 2009-12 as the intervention to improve safety and capacity issues on State Highway 1 through this section of the Western Corridor. The preferred option of constructing the expressway along the proposed 'Sandhills' route rather than upgrade the existing State Highway 1 route was made in 2009 following consultation with the local community.*

**NZTA advises** that the Kapiti Expressway is an important component of the Wellington Northern Corridor which runs from Levin to Wellington Airport. The Wellington Northern Corridor is one of seven 'roads of national significance' that the Government has identified as essential state highways that require upgrading to reduce congestion, improve safety and support economic growth in New Zealand.

*The estimated cost of Mackays to Peka Peka section has been validated by an independent cost audit. The efficiency (benefit to cost ratio) of the preferred option compares favourably with that of the alternative routes considered and meets the project objectives.*

*NZTA has developed a detailed scheme assessment for the project and has now lodged an application for designation and resource consent with the Environmental Protection Agency. The consent process will provide an opportunity for detailed consideration of impacts and effects of the project, with public input. Full details of the proposal are available on the NZTA website at <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/mackays-to-peka-peka-application/index.html>*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

#### 7.2.13 Rank 12: SH1 Ngauranga to Aotea Quay ATMS (14 submissions)

This project attracted mostly opposition with submitters not seeing the value of an Active Traffic Management System (ATMS) or saying it was not needed. Submitters felt the cost associated with this project was expensive for a 'short stretch' of motorway.

***Comment** – While this is relatively short stretch of motorway it carries over 80,000 vehicles per day and suffers severe congestion at peak times. The use of Active Traffic Management Systems are identified and supported through policies in the Regional Land Transport Strategy and Travel Demand Management Plan as methods to improve traffic flows and make best use of the existing network, and to improve safety and information for travellers. This project involves using ATMS to enable the use of the existing shoulder on the motorway as a 'fourth lane'. It may also involve a 'clip on' bridge to the Aotea Overhead Bridge, hence the relatively high cost.*

***NZTA advises** that whilst modelling is ongoing, early indications are that this project will deliver significant benefit to the network in that it optimises the existing asset whilst also lending itself to a staged implementation programme thereby enabling the NZTA to manage its investment over a number of years. It is likely that approximately \$30M of the total allocation of approximately \$7.5M will be spent over the next three years and the remainder deferred beyond the 2015/16 financial year.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.2.14 Rank 13: SH2 Ngauranga to SH58 ATMS (8 submissions)

Several submissions supported the State Highway 2 ATMS project and sought a higher priority. Others felt that the benefits did not justify the cost and that the project was unnecessary.

***Comment** – The use of Active Traffic Management Systems are identified and supported through policies in the Regional Land Transport Strategy and Travel Demand Management Plan as methods to improve traffic flows and make best use of the existing network, and to improve safety and information for travellers.*

***NZTA advises** that this project would provide the current ATMS to be extended into the Hutt Valley resulting in crash reductions, travel time and vehicle operating cost savings for road users.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

### **7.3 Programme other projects (23 submissions)**

#### **7.3.1 Committed and Non Prioritised Projects**

A small number of submissions were received in relation to specific committed or non-prioritised projects in the draft programme. One submitter noted that a large proportion of activities fit into these categories with little discretion for change.

*Comment - Committed activities must be included in the programme in accordance with Section 16(3) (c) of the Act. The Committee has no discretion over these activities.*

General support for maintenance of existing roads and footpaths under the non-prioritised category was noted. Activities receiving specific support were the NZTA High Productivity Motor Vehicle (HPMV) route and SH1 Intersection Optimisation at Kapiti Road, and the KCDC Milne Drive/Te Roto Drive intersection project.

*Comment – Support for the above projects is noted.*

Masterton District Council submitted that road maintenance is a priority for the district. They noted that they cannot afford for this to be reduced and that the current level of subsidy must be at least maintained.

*Comment - The subsidy level for local council maintenance is a separate matter relating to the financial assistance rates determined by the NZ Transport Agency.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### **7.3.2 First and Second Priority Projects**

Overall, submitters were supportive of the categorisation of activities into the first and second priority groups.

*Comment – The definition of which activities fall within these priority groups is set out through the prioritisation policy in the Regional Land Transport Strategy as adopted by the Regional Transport Committee in 2010. Activities within the first priority group are considered to be of equal rank, having first call on available funding. Activities within the second priority group are also considered to be of equal rank, having the next call on funding.*

A number of submitters noted support for activities in these priority groups, particularly those relating to walking/cycling (such as Silverstream to Upper Hutt walking/cycling path and Wainuiomata Hill shared path) and road safety (such as Kapiti Road Safety Action Plan). Masterton District Council specifically supported the project ‘Conversion of carriages for operation on the Wairarapa line’ in the second priority category.

*Comment - The support for specific activities and the general categorisation of activities in these groups, with relatively high priority given to the low cost walking, cycling and road safety activities is noted.*

The importance and need for transport planning and studies was recognised by some submitters, whereas others felt that too much was spent on planning and there needed to be more ‘doing’ or implementation.

*Comment - Studies and investigations are vital to ensure that the right solution is selected and developed for addressing our transport issues and needs. Statutory transport planning is a requirement of the LTMA 2003. The need for, and benefits of, studies must be identified as part of the funding process for these activities.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

#### **7.4 Significant future projects (4-10 years) (78 submissions)**

*Comment - Projects in this category are provided to give a picture of activities that are outside the three year programme but expected to commence in the next ten years. These activities are not part of the three year programme and are consequently not required to be prioritised under the Act. The Committee cannot adjust the timing of activities in this process and therefore cannot bring projects forward into the three year programme. It can only ask the relevant organisation to give consideration to advancing or deferring the timing of a project.*

##### **7.4.1 Transmission Gully Expressway (52 submissions)**

In terms of other significant activities expected to commence within the next ten years, the project that attracted the most comment through the submissions was ‘Transmission Gully Expressway’, with a mention from around 52 of all submitters (10% of total). The majority of those submitters (around 80%) supported Transmission Gully with many seeking higher priority and asking that its timing be brought forward.

Supporters talked about the project being crucial and noted frustration at how long it was taking to implement. Need for the project was considered necessary from a safety, alternative route, resilience, access, economic growth, and congestion perspective. Submitters noting opposition to Transmission Gully thought it was a waste of money, wasn’t future proofed in the context of decreased fossil fuel availability, and that alternatives should be looked at such as light rail, spreading peak demand, or mode shift.

*Comment – The strong level of support for this project is noted. Transmission Gully is identified in the Regional Land Transport Strategy and the Western Corridor Plan. It has also been identified as one of the Wellington RoNS. The designations and resource consents for Transmission Gully has recently been through the Environmental Protection Agency’s Board of Inquiry process with a draft approval recently released. This is a significant milestone for the project.*



*NZTA advises that it expects construction to commence in 2015/16 with completion by around 2021. NZTA understands the frustration felt by some submitters with construction timing, however, it is important that the design of this significant project is considered carefully and that environmental effects are managed appropriately.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.4.2 Mt Vic Tunnel Duplication (17 submissions)

The project receiving the next highest level of comment was the Mt Victoria Tunnel Duplication project. Comments received were equally in support and opposition. Those in support noted bad congestion on weekends, that it was a high priority and important for the future of Wellington. Submitters who opposed the project suggested that congestion could not be considered 'severe', that congestion is caused mostly by taxis, and that light rail is a better alternative for funding.

Mt Victoria Historical Society provided detailed reasons why they considered the project should not proceed relating to the impact on a number of historically significant buildings, mostly in Paterson Street.

***Comment*** - *This project is included in the Ngauranga to Airport Corridor Plan as a longer term project. It has also been identified as part of the Wellington RoNS project. The existing tunnel is a significant pinch-point on the State Highway 1 route to the Airport and eastern suburbs, improving the long term efficiency of this route is an important objective of the corridor plan and RoNS project. Consideration of potential impacts, including on historical buildings, and mitigation measures will be part of the ongoing scheme development. While its construction timing is not scheduled to commence in the next three year programme period, it is expected to be a significant activity within the next ten years.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.4.3 Petone to Grenada Link Road (10 submissions)

Also receiving a number of specific comments through submissions was the Petone to Grenada Link Road, with a fairly balanced amount of support and opposition. Supporters asked for the project sooner, identifying the need for a link between the southern end of the Hutt Valley and State Highway 1. One submitter supported the link but emphasised that it should be connected to the Dowse interchange rather than Petone interchange at the eastern end, to connect with a future Cross Valley Link. The common comment from those who opposed the project was the impact on Korokoro Stream and aspects of Belmont Regional Park, and a preference for upgrading State Highway 58 and State Highway 2 instead.

***Comment*** – *This project is included in the Hutt Corridor Plan as a key initiative to improve east-west connections between State Highway 2 at the southern end of the Hutt Valley and State Highway 1.*

*NZTA advises that following feedback during the Hutt Corridor Plan, the scope of the next phase of investigation for the Petone to Grenada project will be expanded to include consideration of possible upgrades to State Highway 58 and State Highway 2 between Ngauranga and Petone. It will also investigate the impact of a Petone to Grenada Link Road on travel across the Hutt Valley, particularly towards Seaview, and the need for a potential Cross Valley Link.*

*The exact route of the Petone Grenada Link Road has not yet been defined and consideration will be given to the need to provide links across the Hutt Valley and how this will affect the form and function of the road. The investigation into the Petone Grenada Link Road will consider the impact of the road on the surrounding environment, including impact on the Korokoro Stream and Belmont Regional Park, with an aim of minimising adverse impacts.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.4.4 Other projects

Other projects in the ten year outlook (including Otaihanga to Waikanae Safety, Peka Peka to Otaki Expressway, Regional Rail Plan Passenger Rail Improvements, Terrace Tunnel Duplication and MacKays to Centennial Highway Safety) attracted a relatively low amount of comment, but all received some level of support.

*Comment - Support for these other projects identified as beyond the next three year programme, but expected to comment within ten years is noted.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.5 Programme 'missing' projects (69 submissions)

Submitters sought a range of projects that they felt should be included in the programme, that currently are not identified. The most commonly identified projects were light rail, a new Raumati railway station, and State Highway 2 intersection upgrades through Hutt Valley.

##### 7.5.1 Light Rail (15 submissions)

Light rail was requested by a number of submitters as a more sustainable, quiet, efficient, seamless transport option. Light rail was supported generally in the region, but also specifically between Wellington Railway Station, the Regional Hospital and the International Airport. Tram-train was also identified, eventually linking Wellington CBD with Kapiti, Hutt Valley and Wairarapa. Elevated light rail systems were also suggested.

*Comment – Support for light rail (and tram-trains) through the submissions is noted. These options are being investigated as part of the current Wellington Public Transport Spine Study the outcomes of which are due to be reported by early 2013 and will be followed by public consultation.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

## 7.5.2 Rail projects (33 submissions)

The most common ‘missing project’ identified was a new railway station at Raumati (16 submissions). These submitters generally provided detailed submissions setting out their reasons for asking that this project be included in the programme. Submitters cited access for commuters and for recreational access to Queen Elizabeth Park. They noted that the project is a long-standing priority that has been deferred, that several petitions had been presented in support over recent years, and that Raumati was the only community along the Western Corridor not served by a railway station. Kapiti Coast District Council sought consideration of how a Raumati Railway Station fits into the long term vision for the rail network.

Other new rail projects which submitters requested were extension of the commuter rail network to Otaki (and in some cases Levin/Palmerston North), a new railway station or a request only ‘halt’ platform at Mackays Crossing, and double tracking of north-south junction on the North Island Main Trunk Line.

*Comment – Greater Wellington’s Public Transport Group advises that during 2012 a detailed review and update of the Regional Rail Plan will be undertaken. The primary objective will be to refresh Rail Scenario One, whilst re-examining the Implementation Pathway beyond this point. Consideration of new stations, including Raumati will be part of this. The Regional Rail Plan sets Greater Wellington’s strategy for the overall future development of the passenger rail network, and is the appropriate place to consider upgrades and changes to the network. There will be an opportunity for community input through this review over the coming months.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

## 7.5.3 SH2 Intersection Upgrades Hutt Valley (10 submissions)

A number of submitters called for intersection upgrades along State Highway 2 through Hutt Valley, by removing at-grade traffic lights and constructing flyovers similar to Dowse interchange. Congestion and safety were key reasons noted for supporting these projects. Melling interchange was commonly identified, together with Kennedy-Good, Haywards and Petone. Several submitters who sought an interchange upgrade at Melling also suggested that the Melling line be extended as part of the project.

Submitters noted the absence of State Highway 2 intersection upgrades from the draft programme.

*Comment - The need for ongoing safety and access improvements along State Highway 2 through Hutt Valley, including grade separated interchanges at Melling, Kennedy Good and SH2/58 Haywards, was identified as part of the Hutt Corridor Plan.*

*NZTA advises it agrees that the long-term strategy for the Melling and Kennedy Good interchanges is full grade separation however these projects do not currently provide sufficient benefit in areas of national investment priority*

to attract funding. Instead the NZTA is investigating a number of interim improvements which could be implemented at lower cost and potentially more rapidly than the full grade separation while still achieving many of the benefits. NZTA is seeking funding for investigating these improvements through the NLTP.

The location of, and access to, Melling railway station was part of the considerations for the Melling interchange investigation in 2010/11. However, there are no plans for extension of the Melling line during the next three year programme period. Potential rail network enhancements such as this will be a matter covered by the Regional Rail Plan review.

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

#### 7.5.4 Other projects

A number of other projects or ideas were identified by submitters. These are set out in the table below, along with comments from officers.

**Comment** - Overall, there are a significant number of land transport projects, options and ideas that could be implemented in the region if funding was unlimited. This is not the case and the region must therefore put together a list of its top priorities for funding from the National Land Transport Fund.

In some cases the ‘missing projects’ identified by submitters have been identified through our planning but are subject to further work before a project can be identified in the programme.

Other projects they have either been ruled out as an option through previous planning, or have not been identified through the various transport planning processes, or are considered unlikely to commence within ten years.

The Committee does not have the ability to add projects to the programme. The Committee could request that the relevant agency give further consideration to the potential of or need for a particular project for inclusion in future RLTPs if it believes the project should commence within the next three years or should be identified within the ten year outlook. No such projects have been specifically identified by officers.

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

Table 2: Other missing projects identified by submitters

Project/Idea	Comment
Second local road bridge over Waikanae River	A second road bridge over the Waikanae River will be provided as part of the MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway project. No additional local bridge is proposed at this time.
Improvements to the Rimutaka Hill Road on the Featherston side	NZTA advises that improvements to the Rimutaka Hill were investigated as part of the State Highway Plan from Featherston to Upper Hutt 2008. It identified a series of improvements to be made. Unfortunately projects proposed on the Featherston side did not provide sufficient benefit in areas of national investment priority to attract future funding.

Six-lane River Road, Upper Hutt	<i>The Hutt Corridor Plan identified a future project to 4-lane River Road/SH2. The timing of this project (construction) is beyond ten years. No requirement for 6 lanes along this stretch was identified through this planning process.</i>
Peak southbound bus lane through Ngauranga Gorge	<i>NZTA advises that this project was investigated as part of the Ngauranga Triangle Study, the project was examined at a high level in the long list and medium list of projects and was discounted from further investigation due to the poor economic efficiency of the project.</i>
Underpass at Elizabeth Street/SH1 in Waikanae	<i>NZTA advises that the underpass at Elizabeth St/SH1 Waikanae was looked at as part of the original Waikanae Transport Interchange. However when the RoNS were proposed it was identified that Mackays to Peka Peka would reduce traffic at this location.</i>
Masterton Eastern Bypass	<i>The Wairarapa Corridor Plan (July 2010) identified the design and construction of a heavy vehicle bypass east of Masterton with indicative timing by 2016.</i> <i>Masterton District Council advises that it subsequently carried out an economic evaluation of four scenarios, using NZTA project approval/funding criteria, in August 2011. This evaluation concluded that for each scenario the benefits are significantly outweighed by the costs. Consequently the project has not been put forward in the next RLTP, but will be re-evaluated in three years for the 2015 – 2018 RLTP.</i>
Pukerua Bay Bypass	<i>The Transmission Gully Project is expected to commence construction in the 2015/16 financial year. Transmission Gully, once completed will alleviate the congestion problems experienced in Pukerua Bay. The bypass will not be needed in this scenario, and there will instead be opportunity to change the priority on the existing highway. Accordingly the Pukerua Bay Bypass Project has been put on hold.</i>
Shuttle train service between Masterton and Upper Hutt	<i>Greater Wellington's Public Transport Group advises that Wairarapa public transport services have been reviewed over the last 12 months. A shuttle train service between Masterton and Upper Hutt has been found to be unaffordable but other possible changes to rail services are still being considered.</i>
Tunnel under the Rimutaka Hill	<i>Tunnel options were considered as part of the NZTA Featherston to Upper Hutt study but were found to be unaffordable. The preferred option was to upgrade the existing route. The most recent upgrade completed is the Muldoons corner project.</i>
Implementation of the outcomes of the current Public Transport Spine Study (which sits in 'committed' category)	<i>A feasibility study 'Wellington PT Spine Study' is underway to look at options for the public transport corridor through the Wellington CBD between the Railway Station and the Hospital in Newtown longer term, including consideration of connections to the wider public transport network.</i> <i>The draft RLTP includes provision for a scheme assessment to be carried out in relation to the outcomes of the current feasibility study. No specific project solutions can be identified at this time.</i>
High-speed, elevated monorail to the Wellington Airport	
Underground rail through Wellington City CBD	
Harbour crossing to Wairarapa	
Gondola over the harbour from Newlands to Wellington Prison land	<i>These projects have not been identified through any planning process to date.</i>

## 7.6 Activity areas and funding priorities (210 submissions)

A large number of submitters made comments generally about the allocation of funding and emphasis on particular modes or activities.

Overall, there was a theme through many submissions that there should be more emphasis and funding allocation for public transport, walking and cycling, and that the draft programme was dominated by highway and roading projects.

***Comment** – The allocation of funding across the various activity classes is set out at the national level in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding (the GPS). The Committee cannot move funding from one activity class such as state highways to another such as public transport. If projects are excluded from the RLTP then the available funding in a particular activity class will go to other parts of New Zealand.*

*The projects in the programme are put forward by the relevant Approved Organisation in order to address needs for the networks they manage. These are often identified through the relevant multi-modal corridor plan or implementation plan process under the policy framework of the Regional Land Transport Strategy. NZTA, Greater Wellington, and local councils put forward those projects that they can afford to fund over the three year period. While state highway projects are 100% funded by central government, public transport, walking and cycling activities generally require a significant local share from ratepayers.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

### 7.6.1 Public transport (86 submissions)

A large number of submissions were received which supported and sought a higher priority for public transport improvements generally.

The comments associated with these submissions stated that public transport is more sustainable, resilient to rising fuel prices, more efficient, better value for the money spent, and addresses congestion.

***Comment** – Strong support for public transport investment and improvements through submissions is noted. Public transport activities in the programme include operation of existing and new services, maintaining existing infrastructure, minor enhancement projects and large new capital projects.*

A number of submitters felt that public transport investment should be focused on getting existing services to run reliably, and to make public transport more efficient and affordable to encourage people to use it.

***Comment** – The focus of public transport investment over the next three years is to maintain and upgrade the existing network and to improve its efficiency and reliability.*

Kapiti Coast District Council sought examination of public transport service needs in Otaki as part of upcoming Kapiti Public Transport Service Review and Regional Rail Plan review including cost/benefit analysis of bus/rail and community willingness to pay. The council identified retention of the Capital Connection and rail electrification to Otaki as a priority.

***Comment** – Greater Wellington’s Public Transport Group advises that bus services in Otaki have recently been reviewed, including input from the community. A number of changes are planned and will be implemented following conclusion of contract negotiations with the operator. In relation to possible future rail network enhancements, such as commuter rail extensions, these will be covered under the upcoming Regional Rail Plan review (refer to earlier section 7.5.2). Greater Wellington continues to work with KiwiRail and Horizons Regional Council in relation to options for retaining the Capital Connection.*

A large number of submitters provide comment on detailed public transport matters that have been referred to Greater Wellington’s Public Transport Group for consideration alongside the finalisation of Greater Wellington’s Long-Term Plan. These covered issues relating to public transport fares (eg. affordability, Gold Card, Snapper), public transport infrastructure (eg. station upgrades, park and ride facilities, bus shelters, fuel types) and public transport services (eg. routes, services, timetables).

***Comment** – These detailed matters have been referred to Greater Wellington’s Public Transport Group for consideration alongside the finalisation of Greater Wellington’s Long-Term Plan.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.6.2 Walking and cycling (91 submissions)

Support for more investment in walking and cycling improvements and for a higher priority for these active modes was a very strong theme through the submissions. Benefits from walking and cycling such as less pollution, less pressure on road space, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, health benefits, cost efficiencies and many others were identified. One submitter suggested that Greater Wellington adopt a transport user hierarchy for strategic planning with active transport at the top.

***Comment** – Strong support for walking and cycling through these submissions is noted. The Regional Land Transport Strategy includes outcomes to increase walking and cycling trips, to improve the cycling and level of service for these active modes. Any proposed mode based hierarchy for strategic planning would be a consideration for the Regional Land Transport Strategy rather than this programme.*

Submitters emphasised the need for safe and pleasant walking and cycling facilities throughout the region. A number of specific locations were identified where these were considered unsafe and inadequate and a number of new cycleway/walkway facilities were sought. These included improvements to the on-road shoulder for cyclists along State Highway 2 through Hutt Valley (particularly at Kelson), cycle provision on State Highway 2 bridges in Wairarapa, a safe cycle link through Ngauranga Gorge and into Wellington City and improved walking/cycling facilities along State Highway 1 linking local communities.

***Comment** – The Regional Cycling Plan includes a Strategic Cycle Network to be continuously improved as programmes and funding allow. Many of the locations identified as requiring new or improved facilities are part of this network. A large new project to address a significant gap in the strategic cycle network, between Petone and Ngauranga, is included in this three year programme. Other minor projects or programmes that will progress some of these identified deficiencies are also included. The comments relating to walking and cycling issues have been passed on for consideration by NZTA and local councils as part of their ongoing programmes to improve the networks that they manage.*

The need for safety improvements through Pukerua Bay was noted by several submitters, regardless of whether Transmission Gully went ahead, to ensure safety of pedestrians and the local community.

***NZTA advises** that Porirua City Council is already undertaking a number of improvements in Pukerua Bay for pedestrians and cyclists with the construction of a shared pathway adjacent to the state highway and there is an existing pedestrian overpass over State Highway 1. Any proposed pedestrian projects implemented by NZTA will need to be determined by Porirua City Council in line with a pedestrian/community based strategy.*

Submitters highlighted the need for all new road projects to include high quality cycle facilities. Cycle Aware Wellington and others asked that cyclists be consulted as part of the design of any large roading projects that go ahead, to avoid need for expensive retro-fitting of cycle facilities.

***Comment** – Comments regarding involvement of cyclists in design process for roading improvements have been forwarded to the relevant Approved Organisations for their consideration.*

Also identified was the need for better integration between cycling and public transport (buses and trains).

***Greater Wellington's Public Transport Group advises** that the installation of bike racks on buses is provided for in Greater Wellington's Long Term Plan in 2017/18 with \$1m funding included in the draft RLTP 10-year financial forecasts (not identified specifically as project <\$5m and therefore not a significant project). Over the past few years there has been significant improvement in bicycle parking at railway stations, and a new policy on the carriage of bikes on trains has been adopted.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**



### 7.6.3 Roading (42 submissions)

There were a number of general comments from submitters calling for new and improved roads generally. Addressing safety and congestion were key reasons.

However, most of the general submissions relating to roads suggested that less of overall transport funding should be allocated to roads. These submitters felt that building new roads would only lead to increased traffic and congestion. Rising oil prices and reducing traffic volumes were often referred to as a reason for opposing new road projects. Many of these submitters felt that funding should be shifted from road projects to public transport, walking and cycling.

*Comments - Submitter views supporting roading improvements, together with a large number of submitters noting opposition to roading projects are noted. The Regional Land Transport Strategy calls for a multimodal approach to development of the transport network. The programme includes projects to enhance all modes that make up the region's transport network, including roading projects.*

*As noted under section 7.6.1 above, the Committee cannot shift funding and investment from one activity class to another.*

#### (a) Local roads (4 submissions)

Comments received relating to local roads included calls for more funding for local roads improvements, including footpath upgrades, seal extensions and maintenance. There was also a call to make central city environments car free and pleasant environments for pedestrians and public transport users.

*Comment - Detailed local road comments have been forwarded to the relevant local council.*

#### (b) State highways (45 submissions)

Submissions were received in support and opposition to state highway projects. Support for state highways projects included comments supporting the need for good access on state highways as the backbone of the transport network to support growth. Submitters identified safety and congestion issues, particularly on State Highway 1 through the region. Submitters noted that public transport improvements do not suit all types of trips.

A strong common theme amongst submitters was that the Wellington Roads of National Significance (RoNS) projects dominated the programme and should be removed, deferred, or given a lower priority. Reasons such as: too expensive, impacts on health, environment, economy, social cohesion were noted.

*Comment – The submissions supporting and opposing state highway projects, including RoNS are noted. State highways play an important role in linking the region's centres and key regional destinations. Many of the RoNS projects were identified through the region's planning processes prior to being*

*identified as part of the Wellington RoNS project. The RoNS projects are put forward to the programme by NZTA and are funded 100% by central government. The RLTP is required to be consistent with the GPS which gives priority to progressing RoNS projects.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.6.4 Road safety (15 submissions)

Road safety was a topic raised in a number of submissions. Some submitters felt that the only road projects that should be progressed were road safety ones. Submitters supported the priority given to safety in the programme, and the overall safe systems approach. By contrast, one submitter felt that road safety projects should be scrapped and we should ‘accept the risk’.

Masterton District Council noted that reducing funding for the ‘Road Safety Promotion Programme’ delivered by the Wairarapa Road Safety Council would severely compromise the good safety outcomes achieved by this group.

More specific road safety comments included, for example, requests for more emphasis on safety messaging and safer design for pedestrians.

***Comment*** - *Improved road safety is one of seven key outcomes of the Regional Land Transport Strategy that the proposed RLTP seeks to address. The Regional Road Safety Plan sets out a safe systems approach, consistent with the national Safer Journeys strategy. This includes a range of initiatives including safer roads and roadsides (for all users including vulnerable modes), safer road users, and safer vehicles. Safety activities are given high priority in the programme, with most being included in the second priority category, and with particular consideration given to safety in the ranking of large new third-priority projects.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.6.5 Freight (6 submissions)

A small number of submissions were received with comments specifically in relation to freight generally. Comments received mainly covered getting trucks off roads and onto rail.

***Comment*** – *The Regional Freight Plan identifies a range of projects and measures to improve freight efficiency. Most freight journeys within the region are relatively short distances, making them unsuitable for movement by rail. However, there are opportunities for longer distance freight movements and some commodities like logs to be transported by rail. Projects to support this, like a log transfer site at Waingawa for example, are not generally funded through the NLTP.*

***Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.***

#### 7.6.6 Travel demand management (TDM) (13 submissions)

Managing the demand for travel and encouraging more sustainable transport choices was a topic identified by a number of submitters. There were calls to reduce reliance on cars, particularly for short trips, and to make alternatives to car more attractive. Some submitters thought that initiatives to reduce private car use should take precedence over all other projects. There were also suggestions around need for campaigns to promote cycling over vehicle use, for a car sharing database to be advertised on television, and for employers to stagger work hours.

*Comment – The Regional Travel Demand Management Plan includes a range of measures to encourage, promote and provide more efficient and sustainable travel. This includes, for example, walking and cycling events and campaigns, promoting the Lets Carpool website. TDM activities in the programme sit both within the non-prioritised group (in the new and improve local road activity class) and under in some cases in the second priority group where they have a road safety emphasis.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

#### 7.6.7 Local authority area (6 submissions)

Several submitters felt that not enough funding was allocated to Wairarapa and to Otaki. Another submitter felt that Lower Hutt residents should not have to pay for Wellington City upgrades.

*Comment - The programme sets out the expenditure proposed by the various agencies responsible for the activities in response to identified needs and issues in each area. The Regional Transport Committee has recommended priorities for third priority activities (major projects) based on their contribution to the region's strategic outcomes as set out in the Regional Land Transport Strategy. This process does not set priorities based on geographic spread within the region.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

#### 7.6.8 Maintain current levels of service (9 submissions)

Maintaining the existing transport network was recognised as important by a number of submitters, rather than spending on large new projects that are not needed.

*Comment - Maintenance of local roads is automatically included in the programme, and maintaining existing state highways and public transport infrastructure are included in the first priority group. These receive the first call on funding. Large new projects sit in the third priority group and must be ranked as not all are likely to receive funding.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

#### 7.6.9 Timing of projects (5 submissions)

A common theme mentioned by some submitters was a ‘too much talk, not enough action’ sentiment.

*Comment – The call for more action in implementing projects is noted. The Committee cannot change the timing of projects in the programme – timing is decided by the relevant implementing organisation based on readiness and funding availability. Planning, investigation, design and consent processes are all important pre-cursors to constructing a new transport project to ensure an effective solution is found and the effects are minimised.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

### 7.7 Funding sources and general level of funding (70 submissions)

General funding comments ranged from a suggestion that the ten year outlook looks like ‘a wish list’ through to the need to invest in future transport network regardless of cost. It was also suggested that priorities should be based on ‘value for money’.

#### 7.7.1 Alternative funding options (10 submissions)

A number of alternative funding options (eg. tolls, regional fuel tax) were proposed. Some submitters also questioned the fairness of the funding system with more ‘user pays’ suggested for both roads and public transport.

*Comment – Tolling is an alternative funding option that can be considered for new roads. There are no current proposals for toll roads in the region. Regional fuel taxes and congestion charging or other forms of direct road pricing are not possible under the current legislation. However, the Regional Land Transport Strategy does include policies to continue advocating for changes to legislation to enable road pricing measures to be considered by the region in future.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

#### 7.7.2 Government Policy Statement (5 submissions)

Comments relating to the Government Policy Statement on land transport funding (GPS) covered a wide range. Some urged Greater Wellington to make sure that the Wellington region gets its share of national funding for the projects it needs. Others disagreed with the GPS direction and urged Greater Wellington not to follow the government priorities, including RoNS.

*Comment – The GPS sets out the available funding across the various activity classes at the national level. It also identifies the government’s priorities for land transport investment, including continuing to progress the identified RoNS projects. The LTMA 2003 requires that the Regional Transport Committee must be satisfied that the RLTP is consistent with the GPS.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

### 7.7.3 Public transport fares and funding levels (10 submissions)

Specific comments relating to public transport fares were forwarded to Greater Wellington's Public Transport Group for consideration. However, at a high level the comments in submissions fell under two general and potentially conflicting views. That public transport fares should not be increased, particularly if greater use of public transport is to be encouraged, and that public transport should be more (or fully) user pays.

*Comment - The National Farebox Recovery Policy requires that fares nationally cover at least 50% of public transport operating costs nationally in the medium term. The Greater Wellington Long Term Plan includes a policy on fare recovery to reflect this. The balance comes from the National Land Transport Fund and rates. The Regional Transport Committee cannot change this policy. The nature and basis for how fares are charged is being considered by Greater Wellington as part of the current fare structure review.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

### 7.7.4 Rates (16 submissions)

Specific comments relating to rates were forwarded to Greater Wellington's Long Term Plan for consideration. Overall comments were that rates increases were not affordable to the community, particularly given the current economic climate. Comments from submitters included those such as 'no rates should be spent on state highways' and 'remove large road projects to keep rates down'.

*Comment - Rates are set independent of this RLTP process in the separate LTP/Annual Plan processes run by each local and regional council. Local council's rate funded contributions to particular projects and activities vary considerably across activity classes. State Highways projects are 100% funded by central government and therefore do not have any impact on rates.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

### 7.7.5 Reduce Expenditure Generally (38 submissions)

A strong theme amongst submitters was the need to reduce spending, avoid debt and keep rate increases to a minimum. Submitters noted that in times of economic recession there was need for careful spending and that the focus should be on maintaining the existing transport network rather than spending on new expensive projects. Examples of the comments received under this topic include 'Cut spending', 'new projects should be deferred until the economy improves', 'spend money wisely'.

*Comment – In developing the regional programme, consideration has been given to what is realistic, responding to funding constraints and the need to be mindful of affordability in the current climate. However, it is also important that we continue to make progress in addressing the region's transport needs to support our growth and competitiveness.*

A number of submitters felt that any projects with a low benefit/cost ratio (BCR) should be removed from the programme.

*Comment – Benefit/cost ratio is one of three key criteria against which large projects are assessed as part of the prioritisation process. However, a low benefit/cost ratio alone does not rule a project out as other considerations are also relevant.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

## **7.8 Policy and process issues (75 submissions)**

### **7.8.1 Regional Land Transport Strategy vision and outcomes (14 submissions)**

There was overall support noted for the Regional Land Transport Strategy vision and outcomes. However, a common theme was that the projects in the programme would not achieve these, and some believed the programme contradicted the Regional Land Transport Strategy outcomes (relating to greenhouse gas emissions and public transport modes share in particular).

*Comment – Contribution to the outcomes of the Regional Land Transport Strategy is one of three key criteria against which the priority ranking of third priority large new projects are ranked. ‘Strategic fit’ is another criteria and this gives high priority to the State Highway 1 RoNS projects. The Regional Land Transport Strategy outcomes cover a range of aspects including increased public transport and walking/cycling, reduced road congestion, improved road safety, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, improved freight efficiency, and safer, more efficient and reliable strategic links. A range of projects for all modes are proposed in the programme to address these needs.*

A small number of submitters made comments relating to resilience. The need to take account of likely future trends and consider whether projects will become obsolete with future technology developments was identified. Earthquake strengthening of transport infrastructure and ensuring emergency access can be provided after an event were sought by several submitters.

*Comment – Consideration of resilience (in terms of natural events such as earthquakes and climate change, and network incidents such as accidents on lane blockages) is part of the region’s overall network planning, with projects such as Transmission Gully and Petone to Grenada link road responding to resilience needs. Future proofing is also a consideration for individual projects like electronic integrated ticketing.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

### 7.8.2 Climate change and peak oil (19 submissions)

A number of submissions commented on the need to take account of climate change and peak oil. These submitters sought more urgency in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and suggested that the programme should do more to respond to the Regional Land Transport Strategy outcome 'reduced greenhouse gas emissions' through increased investment in electric public transport and active modes. Some submitters felt that the roading projects in the draft programme (particularly the RoNS projects) would only increase the region's dependence on fossil fuels in a time when availability of these is decreasing and fuel prices rising.

*Comment – Climate change and rising oil prices are key issues recognised in the Regional Land Transport Strategy. Continued investment in public transport, walking and cycling improvements are crucial in this context. However, vehicle fuel efficiency, alternative fuels and new technologies are other measures that are likely to respond to these challenges. A multi-modal programme of improvements is consistent with the direction in the Regional Land Transport Strategy.*

**Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.**

### 7.8.3 Process matters (39 submissions)

Some submitters noted their support for the consultation approach and the opportunity to have a say in relation to the draft programme. However others felt it was a waste of money and resources. Several submitters noted concern with the limited discretion for change as part of this process.

*Comment - The Committees discretion in relation to the RLTP and the consultation process is set by the Land Transport Management Act 2003.*

Also mentioned was a lack of detail about the projects proposed, consequently making it difficult to provide an informed view on the appropriate priorities for projects.

*Comment - In many cases, more detailed information about projects was available from the relevant lead agency on request. In other cases the projects are at the concept stage, with the detail yet to be developed and determined. Consideration was also given to the level of information that should be provided to achieve a reasonable balance between a highly technical document and a document that could be easily digested by all regional residents.*

There were a small number of comments on the prioritisation principles and methodology. One submitter suggested the highest priority should go to projects that have been delayed longest. Another submitter felt that the programme should stick to projects with direct benefits, not based on forecasts. Several submitters noted that they were unclear how the Assessment Profile of High, Medium, Low had been applied and why projects with H,H,H were not at the top of the list.

*Comment* - The prioritisation process used to develop the draft ranking of large new projects is based on an adopted Regional Land Transport Strategy policy which involves assessing the strategic fit, the effectiveness in achieving the Regional Land Transport Strategy outcomes, and the benefit/cost ratio of each project. The Assessment Profile shown in Table 4 of the draft RLTP is different, it relates to the profile given to a project by the relevant lead agency in the NZTA online system.

*Officers recommend no change from the draft RLTP.*

## 7.9 Matters referred to other agencies (146 submissions)

In many cases submitters raised issues that cannot be considered as part of this process because they are outside the scope determined by the Act, or because they relate to other decision making processes.

Where submitters raised detailed issues related to project timings or cost, or an operational matter, then that submission has been forwarded to the relevant implementing agency for their consideration. Detailed matters relating to local roads in a specific area have been forwarded to the relevant local council. Detailed or operational issues relating to the state highway network have been forwarded to the NZ Transport Agency. Matters relating to operation of the public transport network, including those about specific routes or services, have been forwarded to Greater Wellington’s Public Transport Group.

## 8. Changes advised by Approved Organisations

In addition to the feedback received summarised above Approved Organisations (i.e. local councils and NZTA (Highways and Network Operations) have advised a number of changes to the activities included in the draft RLTP.

Approved Organisations are still finalising their programmes. Officers will include subsequent changes to activity, phases and costs in the final RLTP for approval by Regional Transport Committee.

*Officers recommend the following amendments:*

Table 3: Changes to the programme advised by AOs

Change	Organisation	Priority	Project	Comment/amendment
Add	HCC	Non-prioritised	Seismic Strengthening of Pomare - Wingate Railway Overbridge	Projects omitted due to an error but costs included in totals.
Add	NZTA	Committed	SH1 RoNS Basin Reserve Improvements	<i>Recommendation: Add these activities to the final RLTP.</i>
Add	NZTA	Non-prioritised	High Productivity Motor Vehicles Route – CentrePort to Piarere (construction phase)	



Add	NZTA	Non-prioritised	SH1 Optimisation of Southbound Off-Ramp at The Terrace (design and construction phases)	
Add	NZTA	Second priority	Road Safety Promotion 12/15 – High Strategic Fit	
Update	NZTA	Third priority	SH1 (RoNS) – Basin Reserve Improvements (property and construction phases, the investigation and design phases are committed activities)	NZTA advises that this activity should be renamed ' <i>SH1 (RoNS) – Basin Reserve Improvements, Paterson Street to Tory Street bridge</i> ' in line with the naming convention of other RoNS. The suggested change has been modified to retain reference to Basin Reserve.  <b>Recommendation: Amend the name of this project in the final RLTP - as set out above</b>
Update	NZTA	Third priority	SH1 Inner City Bypass Intersection Optimisation	Construction cost reduced to \$.7.9m.  <b>Recommendation: Note change in construction cost will be included in the final RLTP.</b>
Add	UHCC	Non-prioritised	Whitemans Valley Bridge B6/1 Seismic Strengthening	Project omitted in error but costs included in totals.  <b>Recommendation: Add this activity to the final RLTP.</b>
Add/Update	UHCC	Second priority	Road Safety Promotion High/Medium/Low Strategic Fit	Changes to allocate road safety promotion costs across low, medium and high strategic fit activities.  <b>Recommendation: Amend allocation of road safety promotion costs for UHCC in the final RLTP.</b>
Remove	WCC	Non-prioritised	High-Risk Urban Intersections Improvement Project (\$1.5m)	Activities removed from programme by WCC.  <b>Recommendation: Remove these activities from the final RLTP.</b>
Remove	WCC	Non-prioritised	Medium-Risk Urban Intersections Improvement Project (\$0.5m)	
Remove	WCC	Non-prioritised	Road Risk Mitigation - Ngaio Gorge Rd (\$1.2m)	
Remove	WCC	Non-prioritised	Te Aro Rooding Improvements (construction phase - \$2m)	
Remove	WCC	Non-prioritised	Wellington City Safer Speeds Implementation Project (\$1.5m)	
Add	PCC	Non-	Whitford Brown Ave / Okowai	Additional activities submitted

		prioritised	Road intersection improvement	by PCC for inclusion in RLTP.
Add	PCC	First priority	AMP Forward Works Programme development	<b>Recommendation: Add these activities to the final RLTP.</b>
Add	PCC	First priority	Development of forward works plan for resurfacing	
Add	PCC	First priority	Remaining Life Study of Rooding Structures (1)	
Add	PCC	First priority	Seismic screening and assessment of roading structures	
Add/Update	WCC	Second priority	Road Safety Promotion - High/Medium/Low Strategic Fit	
Add/Update	KCDC	Second priority	Road Safety Promotion – High/Medium/Low Strategic Fit	Changes to allocate road safety promotion costs across low, medium and high strategic fit activities.  <b>Recommendation: Amend allocation of road safety promotion costs for KCDC in the final RLTP.</b>
Update	WCC	Third priority	Adelaide Road Improvements	WCC advises that the construction phase for this project should be split into two stages, \$2.5m in 2012/13 and \$3.5 in 2015/16 and the project description updated as follows: "This project is for the widening and improvement of Adelaide Road. This arterial route is required to meet growth in traffic from the southern and eastern suburbs of Wellington City. It links with the Basin Reserve grade separation project ensuring the maximum potential is gained from reducing the conflict between local and State Highway traffic. It is a major link to the regional hospital and a major transport spine identified in the Ngauranga to Airport study. The City has growth aspirations for the Adelaide Road precinct as part of the city's growth spine strategy."  <b>Recommendation: Amend the project timing and</b>

				<i>description in the final RLTP - as set out above</i>
Update	WCC	Third priority	Aotea Quay Improvements	<p>WCC advise that the construction phase for this project is no longer planned to commence within the next three years. It is however expected to commence within the next ten years. Property costs of \$1M will be included in the current programme as a non-prioritised activity.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: The project should be removed from the 'Third Priority' list and added to the 'Other significant activities expected to commence in the next ten years' list. Property costs for the project should be included in the non-prioritised activity group.</i></p>

## 9. Next steps

The Hearings Subcommittee will report back on submissions and recommended changes, to the full Regional Transport Committee meeting on 22 June 2012.

The Regional Transport Committee will then recommend a final programme to Greater Wellington for consideration at its meeting on 27th June 2012. The Act specifies (s18B(3)) that the Council MAY decide to approve the programme without modification OR refer the programme back to the Regional Transport Committee with a request that it reconsiders one or more aspects of the programme. If referred back, the Committee, after reconsidering matters, may forward to the Council an amended programme OR supply further information that it considers will help the Council with its decision.

Once the Council receives an amended programme or a programme with additional information the Council MUST approve the programme or amended programme and forward it to the New Zealand Transport Agency; OR forward the programme or amended programme to the Agency stating that it is not approved along with a statement of reasons.

## 10. Communication

The Chair of the Hearings Subcommittee may wish to issue a statement on the submissions at the completion of deliberations.

## 11. Recommendations

*That the Subcommittee:*

1. **Receives** the report.
2. **Notes** the content of the report.
3. **Agrees** to recommend to the Regional Transport Committee the following changes to the draft RLTP, as a result of consideration of submissions and updates from approved organisations:
  - a) **Amend** the final programme to reflect changes advised by approved organisations and listed in Table 3, Section 8.
  - b) **Elevate** the Petone to Ngauranga walkway/cycleway to second in the list of third priority large new projects to reflect its urgency and importance.
  - c) **Amend** the description of the Mt Victoria Tunnel Safety Improvements project in Table 4 of the final RLTP to reflect the officer comment provided in section 7.2.2 of this report.

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

Report approved by:

**Natasha Hayes**  
Senior Transport Planner

**Luke Troy**  
Manager, Corporate Planning



**Jane Davis**  
General Manager Strategy  
and Community Engagement