

# **NGAURANGA TO WELLINGTON AIRPORT**

## **Stage 3 Consultation:**

### **SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT CORRIDOR PLAN**

#### **Final report on submission analysis**

**Report prepared for Greater Wellington Regional Council  
By Pathways Consultancy August 2008**

## Table of Contents

| Section    |  | Page |
|------------|--|------|
| 1          | Executive Summary.....                                 | 3    |
| 2          | Context .....  | 4    |
|            | 2.1 Previous consultation.....                         | 4    |
|            | 2.2 Draft plan consultation.....                       | 4    |
| 3          | Response.....  | 4    |
|            | 3.1 Form and type.....                                 | 4    |
|            | 3.2 Geographic origin.....                             | 5    |
| 4          | Methodology.....                                       | 6    |
|            | 4.1 Analysis.....                                      | 6    |
|            | 4.2 Reporting.....                                     | 6    |
| 5          | Main Themes of General Submitters.....                 | 6    |
|            | 5.1 Concerns of general submitters.....                | 6    |
|            | 5.2 Overall support of the draft plan.....             | 7    |
|            | 5.3 Staging and timing of draft plan.....              | 8    |
|            | 5.4 Inclusion of rail options.....                     | 8    |
|            | 5.5 Main issues of interest to general submitters..... | 9    |
| 6          | Concerns of Key Submitters.....                        | 9    |
| 7          | Issues of Interest.....                                | 10   |
|            | 7.1 Introductory principles.....                       | 10   |
|            | 7.2 Strategic principles.....                          | 10   |
|            | 7.3 Flexibility factors and plan principles.....       | 10   |
|            | 7.4 Current initiatives.....                           | 11   |
|            | 7.5 TDM and urban form initiatives.....                | 12   |
|            | 7.6 Public transport projects.....                     | 12   |
|            | 7.7 Walking and cycling strategies.....                | 12   |
|            | 7.8 Short-term roading proposals.....                  | 13   |
|            | 7.9 Longer-term roading assessments.....               | 14   |
| 8          | Additional Comments .....                              | 15   |
| Appendix 1 | Concerns of Key Submitters .....                       | 16   |
| Appendix 2 | Key Points of Form Submitters.....                     | 22   |

### List of Tables

|          |  |    |
|----------|--|----|
| Table 1  | Form and type of all submitters.....                                   | 5  |
| Figure 1 | Origins of form and general submitters.....                            | 5  |
| Table 2  | Concerns of general submitters.....                                    | 7  |
| Table 3  | General submitter response to overall draft plan.....                  | 7  |
| Table 4  | General submitter response to elements of draft plan.....              | 8  |
| Figure 2 | Proportions of general submitter response to elements of draft plan    | 8  |
| Table 5  | General submitter response to rail issues.....                         | 9  |
| Table 6  | Main issues of interest to general submitters.....                     | 9  |
| Table 7  | General submitter response to Introductory Principles.....             | 10 |
| Table 8  | General submitter response to Big Picture.....                         | 10 |
| Table 9  | General submitter response to Flexibility Factors and Principles ..... | 11 |
| Table 10 | General submitter response to Current Initiatives.....                 | 11 |
| Table 11 | General submitter response to Public Transport Projects.....           | 12 |
| Table 12 | General submitter response to Walking and Cycling.....                 | 13 |

|          |   |    |
|----------|---|----|
| Table 13 | General submitter response to Short-term Rooding Projects.....  | 13 |
| Table 14 | General submitter response to Longer-term Rooding Projects..... | 14 |
| Table 15 | Main themes in additional comments of general submitters.....   | 15 |

## **1 Executive Summary**

Written submissions on the draft corridor plan stage of consultation on the Ngauranga to Airport Corridor Study total 558, with 344 (62%) being a prepared form submission. 39 submissions are from organisations, the rest from individuals. This response compares with over 4600 on the second stage, 4200 of those being postcard submissions.

80% of submissions originate from Wellington City, but there is a difference between form and other (general) submitters in that 45% of form submitters originate from Wellington central, compared with 27% of general submitters.

Key themes in submitters' comments are overall support of the plan, the inclusion of light rail, the pace of implementation, and the detail of projects proposed.

Overall submitter support for the draft plan is divided between a quarter who support its integrated nature and a half who support "parts of" the plan – public transport and active mode supporters being the largest group. 40% of comments on the text are supportive but 20% of submitters find the proposed pace of implementation disappointing. Stated opposition centres on roading projects. Market research undertaken by Research New Zealand and reported separately identified overall support for the plan.

Inclusion of light rail is highlighted as an issue in the text of the draft plan booklet and half of all submitters comment on it. Most support inclusion and acceleration of light rail investigation. Walking and cycling strategies attract high levels of interest with many wanting more specific detail. Public transport initiatives also attract interest and support, and frequent urging of improved levels of service. Urban form and related themes attract active but scattered interest and support.

Opinion is divided between 25% support, 40% opposition and 35% questioning on larger roading proposals at Basin Reserve, Mt Victoria and Terrace Tunnels. Smaller works at Cobham Drive and Hutt Rd/Thorndon Overbridge attract more support and fewer comments. The Basin Reserve area is recognised as sensitive and requiring early action, but the draft plan's flyover design generates many questions.

## **1 CONTEXT**

### **1.1 Previous consultation**

Earlier stages of the Ngauranga to Airport Corridor Study involved consultation on Issues (2007), and Options (Dec 2007-Feb 2008). The Options stage was notable for attracting more than 4670 submissions, but this included 4230 form submissions from two postcard campaigns, the larger (3750) initiated by a coalition of sustainable transport groups, the smaller (480) by the Chamber of Commerce. There were 440 general submissions to the second stage, including 58 from organisations.

Options stage consultation was accompanied by active discussion of issues in community newspapers and web blogs. Debate centred on the nature of rail options in future public transport planning for Wellington city – specifically, whether suburban or light rail had a role south of the Railway Station.

### **1.2 Draft plan consultation**

The draft corridor plan is contained in a 16-page booklet that outlines proposed principles and actions and includes a feedback form for submissions. The draft plan proposes staging and timing for projects and, responding to earlier consultation, includes light rail in the programme for later assessment.

Draft plan consultation was launched in June 2008 and included:

- mailout of draft plan to interested organisations (180) and submitters (1000) identified from previous consultation;
- copies of draft plan sent to territorial authorities, Transit NZ, public libraries and similar locations;
- media releases and advertising by public notice in local newspapers;
- an article in *Our Region*, distributed to all households;
- posters on trains and buses;
- a dedicated webpage;
- a series of public open days at various locations, listed in appendix 3;
- presentations as requested.

Media commentary on this stage was light, but included an article in the *Dominion Post* favouring light rail options. A public opinion survey was conducted during the submission period. Written submissions arrived slowly, 75% of the final tally being received and accepted in the period 28-31 July.

The stage concludes with public hearings of oral submissions in August 2008. Hearing Committee deliberations will be reported to the Regional Land Transport Committee before adoption of a final plan.

## **2 RESPONSE**

### **3.1 Form and type**

558 written submissions were received, 344 (62%) in the form of a prepared form submission from Sustainable Wellington Transport, a coalition of groups similar to the

sponsors of the larger postcard campaign in the options stage. The lower level of organised response in this stage contributes significantly to the lower level of total response. In this report the 344 form submitters are reported separately and the remaining 214 submitters reported as general submitters.

**Table 1 – Form and Respondent Type**

| <i>FORM</i>     |            | <i>RESPONDENT</i>      |            |
|-----------------|------------|------------------------|------------|
| Prepared form   | 344        | Individuals/Households | 519        |
| Feedback form   | 91         | Key submitters         | 14         |
| University form | 16         | Other organisations    | 25         |
| Letters         | 84         |                        |            |
| Emails          | 23         |                        |            |
| <b>TOTALS</b>   | <b>558</b> |                        | <b>558</b> |


39 (1.6% of) submissions are from organisations, the rest from individuals and households. The 39 include 9 who are signatories to the prepared form, and 30 general submitters. Several are Residents’ Associations or professional interest groups, some are registering a property interest. Concerns of Key Submitters, ie organisations represented on the RLTC or identified in the Land Transport Management Act, are set out in Appendix 1.

### 3.2 Geographic origin

Geographic origin of responses is dominated by Wellington City – 80.8% of submissions originate in the city. The Hutt corridor contributes 8.5%, the Western corridor 3.8%, Wairarapa 0.8%, outside the region 2%, and unidentifiable (not given) 4.1%.

There are noticeable differences between origins of form and general submissions:

**Figure 1 – Origins of form and general submissions**



82.5% of form submissions (78.5% of general submissions) originate in Wellington city (areas 1-5 above). Within this, 45% of form submitters but 27.5% of general submitters are from the central area (area 1, Lambton ward, but including Mt Cook). Areas 2-Wellington East and 5-Wellington North residents are under-represented in form submitters. Submitter origin is not representative of population distribution.

## **4 METHODOLGY**

### **4.1 Analysis**

Submissions were received in batches. Each submission was tabulated by origin (form, type, address), then read and its content divided into separate comments, each coded by text topic addressed and direction of opinion expressed. Key words and phrases used by submitters for each comment were recorded – especially support, question, oppose, propose. Codes were tallied in batches, and batch tallies recorded and summed. A checking read and tally was undertaken to ensure consistency of coding.

The template for coding is the draft corridor plan booklet. Coding was organised first into sections following the booklet structure, then into 75 possible subtopics (“issues”) addressed in the text. Comments were coded as expressing one of 6 directions of opinion on the text:

- support (stated);
- question (questioning a detail but not stating either support or opposition);
- oppose (stated);
- propose (suggesting more detail on the issue, more or alternative action);
- accelerate (wanting action quicker than the plan suggests);
- delay (wanting action delayed or postponed).

### **4.2 Reporting**

Most individual submitters generate 2-6 comments, and key submitters and active individuals generate up to 40 – even active submitters comment on only half the possible issues. The total number of comments tallied is 2034, an average of 8 from each general submitter. If comments were distributed randomly around the 113 possible issues (this includes 48 additional themes noted), each issue would receive 18 comments. This sets the reporting threshold, as issues attracting 20+ comments are attracting more than average interest.

A decision was needed on treatment of the quantitatively dominant prepared form, a single set of messages repeated 344 times, swamping the comments of submitters who composed their own comments. The set of comments in the form is entered in the tallies once and recorded separately in Appendix 3, ie treated like a Key Submitter. A small group (<10% of) form signatories compose their own amending comments – these comments are included in reported tallies. The maximum number of general submitters on any issue becomes 245.

There are opportunities for imprecision in noting, coding, and tallying each message. However, the methodology is sufficient to record and report reliably on the relative level and direction of interest in each issue amongst general submitters. In narrative reporting, percentages (of those commenting) are used, or relevant groups described as “a handful” (less than 10), “noticeable” (11-20), “considerable” (21-40), or “significant” (above 40).

## **5 MAIN THEMES OF GENERAL SUBMITTERS**

### **5.1 Concerns of general submitters**

Table 2 indicates that general submitters are more interested in some aspects of the plan than others, with overall support, light rail and projects prominent, but principle and explanatory

sections attracting less interest. Additional comments (addressing topics not in the original text) are also present, but scattered:

**Table 2 - Concerns of general submitters**

| <i>SECTION OF TEXT</i>                     | <i>NO. ISSUES</i> | <i>NO. COMMENTS</i> | <i>AVGE PER ISSUE</i> |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Overall support of plan                    | 3                 | 313                 | 104                   |
| Principles (1 <sup>st</sup> half of text)  | 55                | 378                 | 7                     |
| Light Rail/Rail extension                  | 2                 | 199                 | 100                   |
| Action Plan (2 <sup>nd</sup> half of text) | 15                | 626                 | 42                    |
| Additional comments                        | 48                | 518                 | 11                    |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                               | <b>113</b>        | <b>2034</b>         | <b>18</b>             |

## 5.2 Overall support of draft plan

The first half of the draft plan introduces a range of issues in Foreword and Introduction (pp1-2), sets out the vision, goals and desired outcomes (p 4 and 16), discusses change factors (pp 5-6) and current initiatives (pp 7-8). The second half sets out proposed initiatives in 5 and 10 year timeframes. Overall, the draft plan presents an integrated multi-modal approach – proposing action in parallel in each of four dimensions: public transport, high street, arterial roading, and local connections including walking and cycling. The plan has been developed using traditional scientific methods of analysis and modelling, taking into account issues and principles set out in pp 1-8 of the draft plan, and it stresses flexibility and review process.

The form submission begins by asserting a different philosophy based on the value of environmental sustainability prevailing. It rejects traditional methods, asks for early action on public transport and local connections and rejects proposals leading to extra roading capacity.

The feedback form begins with the question of support for the draft plan. Responses from general submitters are set out in Table 3. This issue attracts the greatest interest, with 66% of general submitters commenting, many offering several comments. A quarter support the proposed “integrated” plan, but the majority support “parts of” the plan and question other parts – these are recorded in the first line as questioning comments. In this case questioners are broken down into 2 additional lines, a significant group supporting public transport and active mode parts of the plan and a noticeable group supporting roading projects. Relevant other comments are included in the tallies:

**Table 3 – General submitter response to overall draft plan**

|                        | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | <b>TOTALS</b> |
|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Support draft plan     | 42             | 90*             | 15            | 9              | 6            | 0            | <b>162</b>    |
| *Support pt/w-c parts  | 65             | 13              | 3             | 9              | 6            | 0            | <b>96</b>     |
| *Support roading parts | 20             | 6               | 28            | 0              | 0            | 1            | <b>55</b>     |
| <b>TOTALS</b>          | <b>127</b>     | <b>109</b>      | <b>46</b>     | <b>18</b>      | <b>12</b>    | <b>1</b>     | <b>313</b>    |


When comments on the text of the plan are analysed and presented as in Table 4 a more detailed picture emerges, with 47% supporting the principles in the first half, but 30% supporting action proposals in the second half. Proportions in Table 4 are illustrated in Figure 2, indicating the differences between directions of comments on principles and projects:



**Table 4 – General submitter response to elements of draft plan**

|   | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | <b>TOTALS</b> |
|---|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Principles – 60 issues, inc overall plan and rail options | 418            | 226             | 77            | 81             | 87           | 1            | <b>890</b>    |
| Projects/actions – 15 issues                              | 185            | 99              | 113           | 146            | 76           | 7            | <b>626</b>    |
| <b>TOTAL COMMENTS</b>                                     | <b>603</b>     | <b>325</b>      | <b>190</b>    | <b>227</b>     | <b>163</b>   | <b>8</b>     | <b>1516</b>   |

**Figure 2 – Proportions of general submitter response to elements of plan**



### 5.3 Staging and timing of plan

The draft plan notes staging as an organising principle, includes a proposed staging of actions, and seeks feedback. The principle attracts a handful of supportive comments.

More noticeable is the significant proportion of submitters (20%) who make additional comment on the related issue of pace of implementation, invariably regarding proposed pace as disappointing. “Timid, unambitious, not committed and not convincing” comments feature, and come from supporters of balance, of public transport, walking/cycling and roading. Disappointing pace is the theme prompting the largest number of additional comments. Reinforcing this observation, comments asking for “acceleration” are 10% while those asking for “delay” are 0.5% of all comments on the text.

### 5.4 Inclusion of rail options

Earlier process and distinct boxes on pp 2-3 of the draft plan highlighted the issues of whether light rail should be included as an option for assessment going forward, and whether suburban rail routes might be extended into the city beyond the Lambton Railway Station. The plan proposes to protect a potential route for light rail based on the busway network, to assess the light rail option in 5-10 years, and exclude the suburban rail extension option. These issues attract the highest level of interest for any particular topic, with half of general submitters commenting, many on both topics. Half of these support light rail’s inclusion in the plan and another quarter urge acceleration. Light rail is seen by its supporters as a way forward fitting the vibrancy and densification aspirations of the city, a proven model with environmental advantages that could mend “the broken spine” of Wellington public transport. A central point in the form submission is advocacy for light rail investigation to be accelerated, and key submitters also urge the assessment be brought forward:

**Table 5 – General submitter response to rail issues**

|                          | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | TOTALS     |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Light rail investigation | 65             | 23              | 5             | 4              | 30           | 0            | <b>127</b> |
| Rail extension           | 40             | 7               | 0             | 5              | 20           | 0            | <b>72</b>  |
| <b>TOTALS</b>            | <b>105</b>     | <b>30</b>       | <b>5</b>      | <b>9</b>       | <b>50</b>    | <b>0</b>     | <b>199</b> |

Amongst additional comments a noticeable group support “more affordable” bus-based solutions that “fit Wellington’s scale of use and narrow streets”.

### **5.5 Main issues of interest to general submitters**

Level of interest in individual issues varies from nil to nearly half of all general submitters. Table 6 lists issues by level of interest, down to those attracting 25 or more comments (ie, a significant 10% or more choose to comment). In general Table 6 underlines the observation that general submitters are more interested in particular projects than general principles:

**Table 6 – Issues of most interest to general submitters**

| Section             | Issue                          | Level of interest<br>- number of comments |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Feedback form       | Support of plan                | 162                                       |
| Introduction        | Light rail inclusion           | 127                                       |
| Action plan         | Cycling strategy               | 86  |
| Action plan         | Mt Vic Tunnel                  | 85  |
| Action plan         | Basin Flyover                  | 77  |
| Introduction        | Suburban rail extension        | 72  |
| Action plan         | Walking strategy               | 71  |
| Action plan         | Waterfront/Terrace             | 70  |
| Action plan         | Wellington/Ruahine             | 51  |
| Current Initiatives | PT components                  | 49  |
| Additional comment  | Disappointing pace of plan     | 47  |
| Action plan         | Bus priority/CBD spine         | 47  |
| Introduction        | Modelling                      | 41  |
| Action plan         | Cobham roundabout              | 33  |
| Additional comment  | More bus initiatives           | 32  |
| Current Initiatives | Flyer improvements             | 29  |
| Foreword            | Global environmental pressures | 26  |
| Current Initiatives | TDM initiatives                | 25  |

## **6 CONCERNS OF KEY SUBMITTERS**

Particular concerns of each Key Submitter are reported in Appendix 1. Key Submitters generate more comments than average (15 compared with 8), more comments on plan principles, and account for most comments on funding and prioritisation. Key Submitters represent all philosophical views on plan content and balance but of those who comment, half support the plan’s integrated approach. Prominent themes amongst additional comments of

Key Submitters are concerns with a perceived neglect of regional (arterial) routes, and similar concerns on port and freight needs in the study area. Trip time issues are a frequent topic amongst Key Submitters - in contrast individual submitters focus on trip mode.

## 7 ISSUES OF INTEREST

### 7.1 Introductory Principles

This section follows the sequence of the draft plan booklet, presenting summaries of the level of interest, direction of comment, and themes in noted comments for each section or issue. Tables present the breakdown of comments for main issues and the summary for others. For example the following table presents total comments on Foreword and Introduction, pp 1-3 of the booklet (excluding the rail issues), reporting that over half of all comments came in 2 of 16 possible issues. At less than 10 comments per issue, this section attracts low levels of interest. A considerable group specify their support of the inclusion of global environmental issues amongst principal factors, and want more urgency attached. An active group question aspects of modelling. Common queries are base figures (population figures used, the valuation of time for a public transport user), time horizons (wanting longer horizons), and traffic volume projections versus fuel pricing scenarios:

**Table 7 – General submitter response to introductory principles**

|                       | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | TOTALS     |
|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Global envt issues    | 4              | 11              | 0             | 0              | 11           | 0            | <b>26</b>  |
| Modelling             | 2              | 34              | 4             | 1              | 0            | 0            | <b>41</b>  |
| 14 other issues       | 29             | 7               | 9             | 5              | 5            | 0            | <b>55</b>  |
| TOTAL, 16 issues p1-3 | <b>35</b>      | <b>62</b>       | <b>13</b>     | <b>6</b>       | <b>16</b>    | <b>0</b>     | <b>132</b> |

### 7.2 Strategic principles

Page 4 of the draft plan sets out “the big picture”, ie strategic vision, RLTS outcomes, and city goals. P 16 is also relevant. This section attracts the lowest level of submitter interest, <2 per issue, with no issue nearing 20 comments. The few comments support public transport lines in the text. Queries are the omission of the national (NZTS) perspective, and proposals include inserting VKT outcomes:

**Table 8 – General submitter response to the big picture**

|                         | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | TOTALS    |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| Total 13 issues, p 4/16 | 14             | 5               | 1             | 2              | 0            | 0            | <b>22</b> |

### 7.3 Flexibility factors and plan themes

For convenience, two sections of the booklet are considered together: pp 5-6 of the plan setting out factors shaping adaptive flexibility and review, and p 9 introducing the action plan. With an average of 6 comments per issue these sections are among the lowest in levels of general submitter interest, with 3 issues accounting for most comments and 45% of all comments supporting the text. There is interest in flexibility factors amongst a handful, with the factor of highest interest, urban form, attracting comments debating densification (eg in Newtown) and the effects of land-use decisions on transport networks

(supermarket and sports centre locations). Submitters support the flexible approach but ask for more specification of review triggers.

While submitters support the plan in respect of a proposed public transport spine, a handful question the network effects (lower levels of service for suburban routes). Comments on funding seek more detail on where the money is coming from, or suggest a variety of alternative sources – debt funding, Crown or private, adjusted Financial Ratios, land taxes. A handful expresses concern that the ratepayer will be asked to pay more:

**Table 9 – General submitter response to flexibility factors and plan themes**

|                            | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | TOTALS    |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| Urban form                 | 6              | 6               | 2             | 4              | 0            | 0            | <b>18</b> |
| PT spine/network           | 15             | 0               | 1             | 4              | 2            | 0            | <b>22</b> |
| Funding concerns           | 1              | 8               | 3             | 6              | 0            | 0            | <b>18</b> |
| 12 other issues            | 23             | 6               | 3             | 8              | 1            | 0            | <b>41</b> |
| <b>TOTAL for 15 issues</b> | <b>45</b>      | <b>20</b>       | <b>9</b>      | <b>22</b>      | <b>3</b>     | <b>0</b>     | <b>99</b> |

#### 7.4 Current Initiatives

This section attracted fairly high levels of interest. Over 60% of comments are supportive, and nearly 30% want more action or urgency. Current public transport initiatives set out on p 7 of the booklet attract particular attention, and 85% support. Many submitters propose more initiatives on public transport topics outside the text of this plan - these were recorded as additional comments and divided into bus-related (32 – a noticeably high level) or rail-related (13).

Additional comments address elements such as waiting shelters or station facilities, timetabling especially off-peak, fleet capacity, further infrastructure works required (especially for rail at and around Kaiwharawhara and Railyards), Snapper ticketing, driver behaviour. A further group comment on fares – noticeably tertiary students. In general current public transport services were of high interest to submitters, who supported current improvements and wanted more of them, more quickly.

Flyer improvements were also supported, and suggestions included Western Flyers and Frequent Flyers. TDM comments divide into those suggesting further soft measures now (flexible working hours, carpooling) and those discussing harder (pricing) measures later:

**Table 10 – General submitter response to current initiatives**

|                          | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | TOTALS     |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| 6 current pt initiatives | 42             | 2               | 0             | 3              | 2            | 0            | <b>49</b>  |
| Flyer improvements       | 20             | 0               | 1             | 7              | 1            | 0            | <b>29</b>  |
| TDM detail               | 6              | 4               | 2             | 10             | 3            | 0            | <b>25</b>  |
| Other 3 issues           | 9              | 2               | 2             | 8              | 1            | 0            | <b>22</b>  |
| <b>TOTAL (11)</b>        | <b>77</b>      | <b>8</b>        | <b>5</b>      | <b>28</b>      | <b>7</b>     | <b>0</b>     | <b>125</b> |

## 7.5 TDM and urban form proposals

Proposals for “activity streets” and parking tariff adjustments on p 12 and the related reference on p 13 of the booklet attract under the reporting threshold in level of submitter interest. Comments are divided – a handful supports the proposals, another handful questions or opposes, especially proposed parking tariff adjustments. However a considerable group follows the urban design theme, reappearing in responses to walking and cycling needs. The car-free CBD debate is one of a cluster of related themes in additional comments. Others want earlier consideration of congestion charging, or prioritisation of local or cross movement over arterial or through movement, and a few discuss decentralisation of shopping and employment. As individual issues none reach the reporting threshold, but the theme is noticeable.

## 7.6 Public transport projects

Outside light rail or busway assessment and the current initiatives already reported, public transport proposals are set out on pp 11 and 15 of the booklet and include further bus dedication interventions in the CBD implementing the spine theme, bus lane proposals for Hutt Rd (associated with Ngauranga to Aotea extra laning) and on main suburban routes, and bus separation at the Basin leading in the longer term to a transitway to Newtown.

A frequent comment in respect of Hutt Rd bus lanes and the Basin separation is that they are partly public transport and partly extra roading capacity. For this reason some submitters qualify their support and are recorded as questioners. Comments on suburban route bus priority and the proposed transitway do not reach the reporting threshold. A handful questions the impact of bus lanes on onstreet parking for suburban routes.

Most comments (68%) support plan proposals, and there is discussion amongst key submitters around permanent or peak dedication of carriageway, taxi and/or cyclist and/or goods vehicle use of bus lanes. Comments on Hutt Rd proposals are supportive but some key submitters question downstream effects.

**Table 11 – General submitter response to public transport proposals**

|         | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | <b>TOTALS</b> |
|---------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| CBD bus | 34             | 5               | 3             | 4              | 1            | 0            | <b>47</b>     |
| Hutt Rd | 16             | 6               | 0             | 1              | 1            | 0            | <b>24</b>     |

## 7.7 Walking and cycling strategies

These two areas attract very high levels of interest amongst general submitters, amongst the highest recorded. The dominant theme is that the text in the plan lacks detail (“commitment”) and these two areas generate a quarter of all acceleration comments. Considerable groups amounting to 35% of walking and 44% of cycling comments propose a range of specific projects to include in strategies, and consequently the proportion of support for the presented plan is low at 15%. Advocates stress the active, healthy, convenient and low-impact advantages of these modes, while questioners cite Wellington’s topography and weather as limiting factors.

**Table 12 – General submitter response to walking and cycling**

|         | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | <b>TOTALS</b> |
|---------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Walking | 14             | 5               | 1             | 25             | 26           | 0            | <b>71</b>     |
| Cycling | 13             | 11              | 2             | 38             | 22           | 0            | <b>86</b>     |

Proposals frequently advocated for inclusion in strategies include increased funding and resources and:

- for walking, hierarchies of routes (including better pedestrian connection between port and station, friendlier light phasing in the city), more overhead bridges especially to the waterfront, better shelter around rail stations bus interchanges and shelters, safe routes to school, and implementation of accessibility standards;
- for cycling, completion of a Harbour cycleway, attention to safety issues notably angle parking on Thorndon Quay, public bike hire and bike park facilities, and consideration in design of road works – notably Mt Victoria Tunnel and Wellington Rd/ Ruahine St.

A noticeable group refer to a “shared streets” concept incorporating walking/cycling and urban design themes, where the needs of the slower modes dictate the street environment (hence traffic calming, speed limits, lighting phases, allocation of carriageway space and amenity), and urge its application in the CBD.

## **7.8 Short-term roading proposals**

Roading projects in the plan are divided into short-term proposals and long-term assessments. Short-term proposals specified on pp 12-13 are Ngauranga to Aotea extra laning, Cobham roundabout works, and separation at the Basin Reserve via a flyover. Of these, Ngauranga to Aotea comments do not reach the reporting threshold, even when combined with the associated Hutt Rd bus lane comments, interest in Cobham roundabout is moderate, but Basin Flyover generates very high interest, much of it centred on the artist’s impression included in the booklet:

**Table 13 – General submitter response to short-term roading proposals**

|                   | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Cobham roundabout | 10             | 6               | 3             | 10             | 3            | 1            | <b>33</b>    |
| Basin flyover     | 13             | 19              | 28            | 14             | 3            | 1            | <b>77</b>    |

Ngauranga to Aotea comments are dominated by queries, such as those of Centreport and ONTRACK questioning operational impacts of widening Thorndon Overbridge. Cobham roundabout has the highest level of support/accelerate comments amongst roading projects (39%), and the lowest level of oppose/delay comments (12%). Other comments focus on including local walking/cycling needs in design and arguments that this project is responding more to a local landuse.

The Basin Flyover proposal prompts comments from over 30% of all general submitters. 21% of these comments are support or accelerate, 38% oppose or delay. A theme in

comment is priority – several submitters see the Basin work as the “next, key, early, most urgent” work, and it is often specifically nominated as a priority. A prominent theme in comment is criticism of the design as “ugly, noisy, dominating” and the Basin Reserve and Historic Places Trusts register trustee interests. A noticeable group propose other solutions – at grade, 2-way, and tunnelling. An element in the proposed work is to separate the public transport flow and pilot a transitway through to Hospital/ Newtown, and those with this in mind favour “more expensive but more effective” tunnelling.

## 7.9 Longer term roading assessments

On p 15 of the booklet, three roading projects are proposed as longer-term with their assessments scheduled after 2013, after review of this plan. As a group they prompt very high interest, with up to 33% of all submitters commenting, and the direction of comments being divided. This group generates 75% of all delay comments:

**Table 14 – General submitter response to long-term roading proposals**

|                    | <i>Support</i> | <i>Question</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Propose</i> | <i>Accel</i> | <i>Delay</i> | <b>TOTALS</b> |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Wellington/Ruahine | 15             | 4               | 12            | 13             | 5            | 2            | <b>51</b>     |
| Mt Vic Tunnel      | 20             | 9               | 33            | 15             | 5            | 3            | <b>85</b>     |
| Waterfront/Terrace | 19             | 17              | 19            | 12             | 2            | 1            | <b>74</b>     |

WellingtonRd /Ruahine St proposals sit in the middle of submitter interest in roading proposals. 40% of the comments are support or accelerate, 28% oppose or delay, and walking/ cycling needs are a common theme in proposals. The case for action is presented by key submitters who observe “gross queueing now”, travel time creep and variability, and increasing weekend congestion. The degree to which this proposal is linked with others (especially Mt Victoria Tunnel) is noted by some as evidence of creeping incrementalism, by others as a need to see the corridor as a whole route. Linkage is a factor in another main theme, the links between this proposal and related local needs – Goa St for Hataitai Park and the Constable St/Newtown connections.

The proposed assessment of a second Mt Victoria Tunnel prompts a very high level of interest, one-third of all submitters commenting. While this proposal attracts the greatest proportion of oppose or delay comments (42%) there is also a considerable group, 30% of comments, supporting or urging acceleration. Opposition is commonly expressed as encouraging car use; support commonly expressed as access reliability requiring 4-lane service to regional destinations. Supporters tend to see the project as a priority and want assessment earlier than 2013, stressing links with adjacent projects. As an indicator of opposing views, one submitter accuses the draft plan of being “tunnel- visioned” for including this in assessment, another observes that the best-performing option in the technical modelling required this project, so the “tunnel-less” draft plan is deficient. Many urge attention to parallel routes, some wondering why the Pirie St (Bus) Tunnel is not acknowledged. The current tunnel is seen as “toxic” for walkers and cyclists; assessment should include walking/ cycling needs.

The final proposal, Waterfront /Terrace Tunnel, combines proposals to assess duplicating the Terrace Tunnel with proposals to assess reducing the “waterfront route” (Bunny St south) from 6 lanes to 4. The level of submitter interest is high, but direction is divided – 30% support or urge acceleration, 30% oppose or urge delay. 40% question the scheme or

propose alternatives. A common theme is questioning whether the two traffic flows are indeed linked, and many observe a need to act in the right order – Terrace Tunnel relief before lane reduction. Some believe that lane reduction will not achieve the pedestrian/urban design objectives, actual overhead bridges are needed. A frequently-supported alternative is tidal flow at Terrace Tunnel, and supporters see this as an early priority.

## 8 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Submitters also comment on topics not specified in the text, and these unprompted comments were recorded and coded to observe any repeated themes. Excluding topics that drew only 1 or 2 comments, there are 48 such themes generating 518 comments, most of which are captured in Table 15. The highest of these is the 47 (ie, nearly 20% of all general submitters) commenting on the perceived slow pace of implementation of the plan, noted earlier. Other themes have also been incorporated in the text. Themes attracting more than 12 unprompted comments (5% of general submitters) are:

**Table 15 – Main themes in additional comments of general submitters**

| TOPIC                            | THEME                                  | No. Comments |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Pace of plan                     | Disappointing, slow, timid             | 47           |
| Current bus services             | Need other improvements                | 32           |
| Out of scope                     | Local issues and works                 | 29           |
| Separation (of modes, by grade)  | Apply separation principles            | 24           |
| Funding public transport         | Divert money from roads                | 22           |
| Bypass (Karo Dr) design          | Lights/At-grade design are problems    | 20           |
| Kaiwharawhara station/ferry/rail | Important neglected issue              | 17           |
| Substance of plan                | Too “fluffy”, not detailed enough      | 17           |
| Car-free CBD                     | Opinions for and against               | 15           |
| Peripheral parking               | Interchanges north and south of city   | 14           |
| Public transport fare issues     | Propose time-based, student fares, etc | 13           |
| Current rail services            | Need further improvement               | 13           |

Notable amongst these is the theme of applying separation principles either at-grade by carriageway allocation or by grade-separating modes. This theme repeats in comments on specific projects. Submitters acknowledge there will be extra financial cost but point out the continuing social costs where the principle has not been applied – Karo Drive being frequently mentioned. The cluster of freight and people movement issues around Kaiwharawhara and the port entrance is often cited by key and general submitters as the most important neglected issue, and separation principles suggested there too.



## Appendix 1 Concerns of Key Submitters

| Submission No | Submitter                | Key Concerns   |
|---------------|--------------------------|--|
| 64            | Land Transport NZ (NZTA) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Notes support for growth/spine plans but transport funding conditional on actual growth;</li> <li>- Notes final study should provide clear objectives and targets for corridor;</li> <li>- Questions robustness of growth assumptions;</li> <li>- Questions downstream effects of N2Aotea extra lane, urges multi-modal approach here;</li> <li>- Supports w/c (CBD) and urges fully-costed programme developed quickly;</li> <li>- Notes relaxing of analysis rules for carriageway allocation bus v car if alt routes;</li> <li>- Spells out preferred stepped approach to pt (lane to busway to consider alt technologies);</li> <li>- Requests acceleration of later steps into plan stage 1;</li> <li>- Concerns re mitigation costs (urban design, neighbourhood effects) of Basin Flyover, urges pt and w/c connection benefits be included;</li> <li>- Accepts Cobham investigation warranted;</li> </ul>   |
| 117           | Upper Hutt City Council  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local concerns appear to dominate regional;</li> <li>- Critical corridor with reg-sig destinations, part of regional network: regional linkages neglected in draft</li> <li>- Fears locally-oriented improvements eg pt and w/c will impact adversely on arterial vehicle congestion</li> <li>- If reduced longterm parking in city then need more such parking beyond, but this has adverse comfort and time impacts on commuters</li> <li>- Questions whether outcomes contribute to RLTS outcomes</li> <li>- Short-term pt/wc projects are Wgtn city costs;</li> <li>- Support bus/traffic improvements at Basin;</li> <li>- Support extra capacity at Cobham but note given justification is local not regional;</li> <li>- Supports N2Aotea peak lanes but questions Hutt Rd bus lanes and downstream effects (Terrace Tunnel);</li> <li>- Supports staging;</li> <li>- Support Wgtn/Ruahine;</li> <li>- Support assess of 2MVT;</li> <li>- Support assess of BRT or LR but query carriageway loss;</li> <li>- Questions waterfront lane reduction and discusses Terrace Tunnel pressures;</li> <li>- Notes traffic growth projections;</li> </ul> |
| 122           | Automobile Assn          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Notes traffic growth projections;</li> <li>- PnR needed south of city;</li> <li>- Terrace Tunnel tidal flow alternative proposed;</li> <li>- Endorse draft's rejection of LR, because new conflicts and adverse effects on carriageway space, suggest articulated buses instead on waterfront route;</li> </ul>   |

|     |                               |  |
|-----|-------------------------------|--|
|     |                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PT enhancements don't address poor waiting facilities and security/shelter issues;</li> <li>- Basin project urgent;</li> <li>- Support e-w Basin flyover; use the underspace</li> <li>- Funding sources unclear – ratepayer impacts?</li> <li>- Plan sketchy re budget, timelines, consentability, and funding</li> </ul>   |
| 142 | OnTrack                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Note WRRP</li> <li>- Registers interest in op consequences of widening Thorndon Overbridge;</li> <li>- Note K throat, extra turnout (platform capacity) projects impacted, and siding road;</li> <li>- Rotem units require extra track storage and maintenance facilities near the widening;</li> <li>- Need to maintain rail (freight) connections to port and ferry;</li> <li>- Rail needs may impact Aotea works</li> </ul>  |
| 179 | Kapiti Coast District Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft plan lacks urgency and purpose – refer drivers of current mode shift;</li> <li>- Support staged approach but urge acceleration;</li> <li>- 35% Kapiti commuters to CBD currently take train – could be more;</li> <li>- Hospital journey of primary importance for Kapiti residents – shd be by uninterrupted train so support LR, feels 5-year wait for a study is too long, wants LR sooner not later;</li> <li>- Advocates mode shift (from road to pt/wc);</li> <li>- Supports active modes eg 30 k zones, wc network planning;</li> <li>- Supports local mitigations, applauds Adelaide Boulevard (provided arterial route to hospital);</li> <li>- Questions Basin Flyover on impact grounds;</li> <li>- Fears re funding, esp pt, urges higher FAR</li> </ul>  |
| 184 | Regional Public Health        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Structured with general rex 1<sup>st</sup>, and elaboration</li> <li>- Prioritise pt/wc and TDM over all roading;</li> <li>- Accelerate assessment of LR/busways, if done first then roading works unnecessary;</li> <li>- Supports bus priority measures (CBD) to be instigated concurrently with assessments;</li> <li>- Opposes Basin Flyover, Ruahine widening, N2Aotea peak lanes, tunnel duplications, reiterates roading works redundant in face of fuel price/mode shift;</li> <li>- Proposes equity for 'people at margins' as a consideration (re: fares, mobility);</li> <li>- Supports prioritising peds in CBD; proposes "shared space" (ped priority, slow vehicles);</li> <li>- Suggests quality of pt fleet as a priority;</li> <li>- Suggests 2 pt routes, waterfront (rail arterial) and Golden Mile (bus local) ;</li> <li>- Supports Adelaide Boulevard;</li> <li>- Wants 4<sup>th</sup> lanes on N2Aotea reserved for emergency</li> </ul> |

|     |                                 |  |
|-----|---------------------------------|--|
|     |                                 | <p>vehicles (and buses);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports bus lanes on Hutt Rd;</li> <li>- Supports bus priority city to airport but via taking current carriageway not by creating new carriageway;</li> <li>- Supports Flyer improvements, note adjustments unhelpful to Hutt hospital;</li> <li>- Supports bus priority on key suburban routes;</li> <li>- Supports wc strategies inc route hierarchy;</li> <li>- Urges resource allocation to wc;</li> <li>- Urges more bike storage on trains;</li> <li>- Questions whether waterfront lane reduction requires Terrace Tunnel, supports lane reduction and increased pt use on waterfront;</li> <li>- Sub includes health fx and research;</li> <li>- Supports mode shift philosophy;</li> <li>- Proposes frail rely on pt more than cars;</li> <li>- Considering trans-disadvantaged (hence pt needs) will meet all needs;</li> <li>- Notes incremental nature of roading improvements – one leads to another;</li> <li>- Proposes densification strongly linked to pt use and provision;</li> <li>- Feels local w/c in east neglected;</li> <li>- Feels Aotea/Gateways area (Stadium, Aotea, Ferry pt and ped connections ) neglected;</li> <li>- Feels LR should precede not follow increased pt use (quality attracts);</li> </ul>                         |
| 187 | Wgtn Region Chamber of Commerce | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N2A a critical regional (and national) corridor;</li> <li>- Supports mixed (balanced) investment;</li> <li>- Supports 4 ingredient approach;</li> <li>- Supports most projects but reserved on dedicated bus lanes;</li> <li>- Urges acceleration of roading scheme assessments ( MVT, TT, Ruahine);believe these projects needed within 10 years so planning process needs to start earlier;</li> <li>- Urges caution re forecasts from transitory fuel pricing – private vehicles still have a future, and tech-fixes possible = roading will be needed;</li> <li>- Urges Terrace Tunnel duplication a stand-alone project needed for SH1 demand reasons, not tied to waterfront lane reduction, doubts waterfront lane reduction by itself will resolve ped access to waterfront;</li> <li>- Supports plan in deferring assessment of LR;</li> <li>- Wants quality bus fleet in short-term;</li> <li>- Notes current bus service needs improvement, supports current initiatives but urges more/quicker/investment in bus service;</li> <li>- Support peak period bus lanes but questions 24hr bus lanes;</li> <li>- Opposes car-free CBD – refer business survey;</li> <li>- Offpeak carriageway dedication to buses not sensible if bus demands low and goods/car demands high;</li> </ul> |

|     |                                |  |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|
|     |                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support N2Aotea peak lanes and Basin improvements in short-term;</li> <li>- Note supporting business survey on Basin works;</li> <li>- Support w/c works, caution agst over-promoting cycling in Wgtn conditions;</li> <li>- Funding sources shd be wider- include private sector and debt-financing;</li> <li>- Pricing/tolling options possible in this corridor</li> </ul>   |
| 308 | Hutt City Council              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A critical corridor, regional destinations</li> <li>- Supports both roading and pt proposals in draft</li> <li>- Prioritisation another story, requires regional approach</li> </ul>  |
| 352 | Wgtn International Airport Ltd | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support planning for critical corridor;</li> <li>- Applauds links with wider WCC planning (Kilbirnie growth), note though that investment in infrastructure, especially transport, must precede growth;</li> <li>- Supports 4 ingredient approach;</li> <li>- Supports positive initiatives in 4 ingredients;</li> <li>- But disappointed that short-term plans will not address the congestion/reliability/time-critical issues to/from airport and city;</li> <li>- Airport's locational advantage (close/quick to city) is being eroded, with 30-40minute journeys now common instead of the previous 10-15 minute journeys;</li> <li>- Draft plan's actual programme on these issues is to delay the assessments (except Basin, which is mainly about separating n-s and e-w traffic); instead urge to accelerate assessment (and implementation) of MVT and Ruahine work;</li> <li>- See these two works as linked not separate;</li> <li>- Basin design needs to be careful;</li> <li>- Flyer improvements noted and welcomed;</li> <li>- Support bus priority works Hutt Rd and Golden Mile;</li> <li>- Note bus improvements require roading improvements;</li> <li>- Support plan's position on LR;</li> <li>- Question Terrace Tunnel priority, effectiveness, and link to waterfront, noting N2Aotea will shift more traffic to waterfront;</li> <li>- Urge regional priority to N2A corridor</li> </ul> |
| 357 | NZ Bus                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compliments plan;</li> <li>- Believes all traffic (private and public) will grow so all modes require investment;</li> <li>- Provides figures on Wgtn's bus patronage (internationally high), recent growth (4%) and investment (fleet capacity, snapper, trolleys);</li> <li>- Supports multi-modal 4 ingredient approach and action plan;</li> <li>- Supports roading improvements;</li> <li>- Supports planning for LR in future;</li> <li>- Supports Big Picture elements;</li> <li>- Supports flexibility/review procedures;</li> </ul>  |

|     |                          |   |
|-----|--------------------------|---|
|     |                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports bus lanes and bus priority measures along current routes, feels bus priority is greatest single improvement that can be made ;</li> <li>- Supports w/c plans;</li> <li>- Supports ped improvements linked to bus routes, includes shelters;</li> <li>- Supports cyclist use of bus lanes;</li> <li>- Questions taxi use of bus lanes;</li> <li>- Intend to facilitate bike hire;</li> <li>- Urge traffic engineering attention to bus journey (signalling, messaging, cameras) – highly related to bus time variability in CBD;</li> <li>- But also need attention to roading capacity and allocation as well, hence bus priority/bus lanes;</li> <li>- Very high bus use of Golden Mile in peaks (120-180 per hour, =2-3 a minute) = lane need;</li> <li>- Bus stop capacity also an issue, though snappier ticketing will help dwell times;</li> <li>- Urge attention to funding sources, central govt and debt-funding;</li> <li>- Support bus lanes Hutt Rd, suggest designs;</li> <li>- Support roading improvements at Basin, esp to separate n-s and e-w traffic – sth and east buses currently caught in the conflicts;</li> <li>- Support Cobham improvements;</li> <li>- Support bus priority on key suburban routes;</li> <li>- Support Bus Rapid Transit in short term, do not preclude LR in longer term;</li> <li>- Prefer tidal flow for Terrace Tunnel not 2<sup>nd</sup> tunnel;</li> <li>- Note bypass has improved some flows but grade-separation shd be considered for resolving n-s and e-w conflicts;</li> </ul> |
| 358 | NZ Historic Places Trust | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Notes Basin Flyover affects the listed Pavilion and Basin Reserve Historic Area</li> </ul>   |
| 359 | Porirua City Council     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vital corridor, with reg-sig destinations;</li> <li>- Modelling shd be for 2026 or later, fits gestation periods of projects better;</li> <li>- Modelling shd link to other corridor plans</li> <li>- Support most projects proposed</li> <li>- Note waterfront reduction proposal echoes TG in separating arterial (SH1) from local (waterfront) issues; suggest tidal flow alternative be investigated;</li> <li>- Want regional approach to pt;</li> <li>- Consider freight not well covered;</li> <li>- Support 4 ingredient multi-modal approach;</li> <li>- Feels regional perspective, ie through travellers to regional destinations (esp hospital), not stressed enough, eg regional pt connections not considered; SH1 improvements don't take account of Western/Hutt Corridor proposals in same timeframe; links to Wgtn Regional Strategy given cursory attention, need for internationally competitive airport (port) ;</li> </ul>   |

|     |            |   |
|-----|------------|---|
|     |            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Feels the gestation of controversial corridor plan projects will be long – this needs to be considered in prioritisations;</li> <li>- Feels pt spine should connect to airport too;</li> <li>- Support parking proposals;</li> <li>- Support N2Aotea 4-laning but question reducing the capacity of Hutt Rd;</li> <li>- Support Cobham improvements;</li> <li>- Support w/c strategies, note this includes mobility scooters etc;</li> <li>- Support assessments of MVT, Ruahine;</li> <li>- Recognising LR not feasible inside 10 years, urge development of bus system inc bus priority/lanes in the short term;</li> <li>- Urge more consideration of Lambton interchange transfer between train/walk/bus modes, eg integrated ticketing;</li> <li>- Gateway issues are urban form not transport;</li> <li>- Port freight needs overlooked.</li> </ul>  |
| 362 | Centreport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primary activities are located in this corridor and transport network support is critical to port viability;</li> <li>- As commercial developer, interested in people movement; proximity to Lambton interchange is an attracting factor but ped linkages and direct pt linkages to Waterloo/Aotea unsatisfactory;</li> <li>- As port, interested in freight movements both road and rail;</li> <li>- Existing roading configuration (4-laned, with merges and slips) Aotea/Waterloo v important and pleased to note lane reduction schemes occur south of Bunny;</li> <li>- In short-term reliable accessible ring route vital;</li> <li>- Support N2Aotea extra capacity;</li> <li>- Thorndon Overbridge widening has impacts ( ferry terminal, silo) – construction disruption – Port needs early consultation;</li> <li>- Possible slip lane at K to ferry, has resilience value;</li> <li>- Support scheme assessments happening earlier;</li> <li>- Note projections of reduced traffic along Aotea;</li> <li>- Request review of lost SH1 status of Aotea/Waterloo;</li> <li>- Rail freight to port needs to be protected – recent and forecast high growth; impacts Waterloo Quay – rail/road grade separation ultimately required;</li> <li>- Stake interest in excavation material for reclamation purposes;</li> <li>- Urge efforts to secure Crown funding for corridor projects;</li> <li>- Support softer TDM initiatives but concerned if cordon/congestion charging and freight not exempted.</li> </ul> |

## **Appendix 2      Key Points of Form Submitters**

- Query business as usual model, propose new philosophy (pt-w/c first, no extra roading);
- Heed majority of 2<sup>nd</sup> stage submitters;
- Give greater attention to global envt issues, climate change, peak oil, GG emissions;
- Prioritise cross-corridor (local) movements;
- Introduce bus lanes quickly;
- Assess Light Rail in 2 years, implement in 5 as rail spine;
- Delete Mt Vic and Terrace Tunnels;
- Delete Basin Flyover;
- Delete extra Wgtn/Ruahine;
- Allocate resources to w/c by trips taken;
- Priority for peds in city, 30k zones, review light phases in city;
- Safe routes to school;
- Pedestrian safety around bus/train stations;
- Support reducing lanes on waterfront route;
- Support traffic calming;
- Cyclists in bus lanes;
- Harbour walkway/cycleway;
- Public bike hire;
- Delete N2Aotea extra lanes;
- Delete Cobham improvements;
- Prioritise RTI and IT (in current PT initiatives);
- Accelerate urban densification;
- Support telecommuting/ridesharing (in current TDM initiatives);
- Support flexible working hours (in current TDM initiatives);
- Support car share preferential parking (in current TDM initiatives).

## **Appendix 3                      Public Information Days (during consultation period)**

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| 18 June | Kilbirnie Community Centre, Wellington City |
| 19 June | WCC Library, Wellington City                |
| 21 June | Queensgate Mall, Lower Hutt City            |
| 28 June | Rimu Room, Paraparaumu Library              |
| 5 July  | Trentham Mall, Upper Hutt City              |
| 12 July | North City Mall, Porirua City               |
| 19 July | Johnsonville Mall, Wellington City          |