

If calling, please ask for Democratic Services

Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 Mid-term Review Hearing Subcommittee

Tuesday 9 July 2024, 9.30am

Taumata Kōrero - Council Chamber, Greater Wellington Regional Council,
100 Cuba St, Te Aro, Wellington

Quorum: Three members

Members

Adrienne Staples, Councillor (Chair)	Greater Wellington Regional Council
Wayne Guppy, Mayor	Upper Hutt City Council
Ross Leggett, Councillor	Porirua City Council
Ioana Pannett, Councillor	Wellington City Council
Alastair Plimmer, Councillor	South Wairarapa District Council
Emma Speight	New Zealand Transport Agency – Waka Kotahi

**Recommendations in reports are not to be construed as Council policy until adopted
by Council**

Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 Mid-term Review Hearing Subcommittee

(A subcommittee of the Regional Transport Committee)

1 Purpose

To hear and consider submissions made on the Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 Mid-term Review and recommend to the Regional Transport Committee any amendments.

2 Powers

The Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 Mid-term Review Hearing Subcommittee has the power to:

- Consider both the written and oral submissions, presentations received in support of submissions, and any other consultation material on the Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 mid-term review
- Seek clarification from Council officers on any technical matters
- Develop recommendations on amendments to the Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 mid-term review for consideration by the Regional Transport Committee.

3 Responsibilities

The Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 Mid-term Review Hearing Subcommittee shall ensure that:

- The hearing and consideration process is carried out in a way that is effective and timely
- Submitters are provided with the best possible opportunity to be heard in support of their submission
- Hearing Subcommittee members receive submissions with an open mind and give due consideration to each submission
- The decision making process is robust and transparent.

4 Members

The Regional Transport Committee shall appoint the following as the members of the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 Mid-term Review Hearing Subcommittee:

- a One person to represent Greater Wellington Regional Council, being the Chair of the Regional Transport Committee
- b One person to represent Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency
- c One person to represent the Hutt Valley, being an elected member of the Hutt City Council or Upper Hutt City Council

- d One person to represent the Wairarapa, being an elected member from either Carterton District Council, Masterton District Council or South Wairarapa District Council
- e One person to represent Wellington City, being an elected member of the Wellington City Council
- f One person to represent the West Coast being an elected member of Kāpiti Coast District Council or Porirua City Council.

5 Chair

The Chair is the appointed Greater Wellington Regional Council member.

6 Alternate members

There are no alternate members.

7 Quorum

Three Subcommittee members.

8 Meeting procedures

- All members have equal speaking rights and a deliberative vote.
- The Chair has a deliberative vote; and, in the case of an equality of votes, does not have a casting vote (and therefore the act or question is defeated, and the status quo is preserved).
- Members must be present for the substantial part of the hearing and deliberations in order to participate in the decision-making of the Hearing Subcommittee.
- Submitters may speak to their submission by remote participation.
- Members may not participate remotely.

9 Remuneration and expenses

Each member's remuneration and expenses are met by the council or body they represent.

10 Duration of Subcommittee

The Subcommittee is deemed to be dissolved at the end of the decision-making process on the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 mid-term review.

Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 Mid-term Review Hearing Subcommittee

Thursday 9 July 2024, 9.30am

Taumata Kōrero, Council Chamber, Greater Wellington Regional Council, 100 Cuba St, Te Aro, Wellington

Public Business

No.	Item	Report	Page
1.	Apologies		
2.	Conflict of interest declarations		
3.	Process for Considering Submissions and Feedback on the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 Mid-term Review	24.323	5
4.	Analysis of Submissions to the Draft Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 Mid-term Review	24.350	10

For Decision

PROCESS FOR CONSIDERING SUBMISSIONS AND FEEDBACK ON THE REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT PLAN 2021: 2024 MID-TERM REVIEW

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose

1. To advise the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 Mid-Term Review Hearing Subcommittee (the Subcommittee) of the process for considering submissions and feedback on the Mid-term review of the 2021 Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).

He tūtohu

Recommendations

That the Subcommittee:

- 1 **Agrees** to the hearing process as set out in this report.
- 2 **Accepts** the late submissions received on the Mid-term review of the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021.

Te tāhū kōrero

Background

2. The Regional Transport Committee established the Subcommittee to hear and deliberate on submissions and feedback made on the mid-term review of the RLTP (Establishment of the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 Mid-Term Review Hearing Subcommittee – Report 24.13). The Terms of Reference for the Subcommittee are included in the order paper for this meeting.
3. The Regional Transport Committee approved the draft 2024 Mid-term Review document for consultation at its meeting on 16 May 2024.

Public Consultation

4. This hearing completes the public consultation on the Mid-term Review of the RLTP. The consultation period was open from 24 May to 24 June 2024.

Principles of consultation

5. There are six principles set out the Local Government Act 2002. One of these principles is that views presented to a local authority should be accepted with an

open mind and should be given due consideration by the local authority in making a decision.

6. The Subcommittee should also take into account that persons who wish to have their views on the decision or matter considered by the local authority should be provided with a reasonable opportunity to present those views to the local authority.
7. It is consistent with best practice that members should be present for the substantive duration of the hearing in order to participate in the decision-making of the Subcommittee.
8. The Regional Council's Standing Orders apply and do not provide for members to participate remotely when a meeting is convened to hear, consider, and deliberate on submissions when received as part of a consultation process.
9. Members should be aware of any conflicts of interests that may arise. Any conflicts will need to be declared.

Te tātaritanga Analysis

Submissions and feedback received

10. Feedback from the community was obtained through the Have Your Say website, together with a number of written submissions received via direct mail and at events across the Region. Analysis of the feedback is detailed in Analysis of Submissions to the draft Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 Mid-term Review – Report 24.350.
11. The written submissions have been distributed to members of the Subcommittee separately. It is suggested that written submissions are taken as read by the Subcommittee and that members only discuss those submissions on which they want to make a particular comment.
12. Greater Wellington received 580 submissions from 580 unique submitters. 561 were received through Have Your Say and 19 were received via email and hardcopy.
13. Greater Wellington received four late submissions. It is proposed that the Subcommittee accept these for consideration.

Oral presentation process

14. The purpose of the hearing is to hear oral presentations in support of written submissions. The hearing is scheduled for Tuesday 9 July and Wednesday 10 July 2024. Deliberations will commence once the hearing of submitters has concluded. A hearing schedule will be provided to Subcommittee members, with a final version available on each day of the hearing.
15. Submitters have been allocated a total time of 10 minutes, which is divided into two equal segments – five minutes for the submitter to speak and five minutes for the Subcommittee to ask the submitter questions. There is no difference in the allocation of time for individuals and those speaking on behalf of groups or organisations.

Consideration of issues raised in submissions and feedback

16. The Subcommittee must consider all written submissions regardless of whether the submitter spoke to it. The Subcommittee must also consider all feedback that was received on the consultation document.

Ngā hua ahumoni

Financial implications

17. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Ngā Take e hāngai ana te iwi Māori

Implications for Māori

18. There are no direct implications for Māori arising from this report; however, staff engaged with each of the Regional Council's mana whenua partners during the consultation process. No mana whenua partners submitted.

Ngā tikanga whakatau

Decision-making process

19. Officers considered the matters requiring decision in accordance with the decision-making requirements of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Te hiranga

Significance

20. Officers considered the significance (as defined by Part 5 of the Local Government Act 2002) of these matters, taking into account the Regional Council's Significance and Engagement Policy and Greater Wellington's Decision-making Guidelines. Officers recommend that these matters are of low significance due to their administrative nature.

Te whakatūtakitaki

Engagement

21. Due to the low significance of the decision sought from this report, community engagement for the preparation of this report was not considered necessary.

Ngā tūāoma e whai ake nei

Next steps

22. The Subcommittee Chair will prepare a report to the Regional Transport Committee meeting scheduled for 23 July 2024 to confirm the Subcommittee's recommendations on any changes to the mid-term review of the RLTP.
23. The Regional Transport Committee will then consider the final updated RLTP and recommend that the Regional Council adopt the updated RLTP.

24. The Regional Council will then provide the updated RLTP to the NZ Transport Agency – Waka Kotahi.
25. Each person who made a submission or provided feedback, and who provided a contact address, will, subsequent to the Regional Council adopting the updated RLTP, receive a response outlining the decision, and any key changes.
26. A press release will be published, outlining the Regional Council’s decision and any key changes, and be made available on Greater Wellington’s website.

Ngā kaiwaitohu

Signatories

Writer	Lucas Stevenson – Kaitohutohu Ratonga Manapori Democratic Services Advisor
Approvers	Elizabeth Woolcott – Kaiwhakahaere Matua Ratonga Manapori Manager, Democratic Services Francis Ryan – Kaiwhakahaere Mana Urangi, Manapori Head of Governance and Democracy Luke Troy – Kaiwhakahaere Matua Rautaki Group Manager Strategy

**He whakarāpopoto i ngā huritaonga
Summary of considerations**

Fit with Council's roles or with Committee's terms of reference

The Regional Transport Committee established the Subcommittee to consider submissions and feedback made on the mid-term review of the RLTP 2021. This report supports that process.

Contribution to Annual Plan / Long Term Plan / Other key strategies and policies

The report provides the process for the hearing and consideration of submissions and feedback made on the mid-term review of the RLTP 2021.

Internal consultation

Staff in the Regional Transport function were consulted.

Risks and impacts - legal / health and safety etc.

There are no known risks or impacts arising from this report.

For Decision

ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT WELLINGTON REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT PLAN 2021: 2024 MID-TERM REVIEW

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose

1. To provide the Regional Land Transport Plan Mid-term Review Hearing Subcommittee (the Subcommittee) with an overview of the written submissions received on the draft Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 mid-term review, together with initial officer advice on key topics raised in the submissions.

He tūtohu

Recommendations

That the Subcommittee:

- 1 **Considers** the submissions on the draft Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 mid-term review (Attachment 1 and 2), together with the submission analysis and officer comments (Attachments 3 and 4) in determining its findings and recommendations to the Regional Transport Committee.
- 2 **Recommends** to the Regional Transport Committee, following consideration of the submissions on the draft Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 mid-term review and officer advice, any changes to the draft Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 mid-term review as agreed by this Subcommittee.

Te tāhū kōrero

Background

2. The Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) is a statutory document that must be prepared every six years as required by the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA). The current Wellington RLTP was approved in June 2021.
3. The Committee is responsible under the LTMA for the preparation of the Regional Land Transport Plan every six years and a review of that plan during the six-month period immediately before the expiry of the third year of the plan.
4. The New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA) requires the interim review of the RLTP 2021 to be finalised by 1 August 2024, to feed into the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) 2024-27.

5. On 16 May 2024, the Committee approved the draft Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 mid-term review for consultation (Report 24.214). A subcommittee was appointed to hear submissions on the Wellington RLTP 2021: 2024 mid-term review - Establishment of the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 mid-term review Hearing subcommittee (Report 24.174).
6. The public consultation period ran from 24 May – 24 June 2024. The consultation was promoted to the public through a predominantly online campaign supported by direct promotion to identified stakeholder groups, flyer handouts and hard copies sent to libraries. Information sessions also provided support to complete a submission.

Scope of the Committee’s discretion

7. Section 16 of the LTMA sets out the form and content of RLTPs, including objectives, policies and measures for at least 10 financial years. The LTMA also includes requirements for a regional programme of land transport activities, priorities and financial forecasts.
8. RLTPs must contribute to the purpose of the LTMA, “an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system”, and be consistent with the Government Policy Statement on land transport.
9. Under section 16(3)(a) of the LTMA, specified activities are automatically included in the regional programme. These are local road maintenance, renewals and minor capital works, and existing public transport services. Committed activities are also automatically included.
10. All other activities must be put forward for inclusion by an Approved Organisation. The Committee cannot add activities, although they may request an Approved Organisation to consider putting an activity forward. The Committee can choose not to include an activity that has been put forward but would have to document and provide the reasons for doing so.
11. Therefore, in respect of the activities in the draft Wellington RLTP 2021: 2024 Mid-term Review, for those not covered by section 16(3)(a) of the LTMA, the Committee has discretion over:
 - whether to continue to include the activity in the regional programme of activities; or
 - whether to give a significant activity a higher or lower regional priority than proposed in the draft.
12. The Committee cannot change the scope, scale or timing of activities, this may only be done by the relevant Approved Organisation.
13. Inclusion of an activity in an RLTP does not guarantee that it will be funded and implemented; it is one step in the funding process. The Wellington RLTP 2021: 2024 mid-term review is a statement of regional priorities and indicates to NZTA the activities the Wellington Region would like to see included in the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) 2024-27. For councils, the local funding share component of transport activities is also subject to consultation and decisions through parallel long-term plan processes.

Te tātaritanga Analysis

Submissions received

14. A total of 580 submissions were received, including 19 email submissions. These were submitted either by individuals or on behalf of a group or organisation. Of these, 35 indicated they would like to be heard in support of their submission.
15. Ninety-five per cent of submissions were made by individuals, and the remainder on behalf of groups. Of submitters who chose to identify in the region they live, 56 per cent live in Wellington City. A full copy of all submissions has been provided to members of the subcommittee and will be available for viewing at the hearings.

Submission analysis

16. Submissions covered a wide range of issues, including the weightings of transport investment priorities, priority order of significant activities, and other broader feedback on both strategic and operational issues relating to transport planning, funding, governance and networks.
17. Summary and analysis of the feedback from submissions was completed by specialist consultancy Global Research Ltd and is provided in **Attachment 1**. This includes key findings against the specific engagement questions and other key themes from the submissions.
18. Initial officer advice in response to key feedback themes is provided in **Attachment 2**, to assist the Subcommittee with its deliberations.

Key themes raised in the submissions

19. A high-level summary of the feedback and broad themes is set out below. These are not intended to be exhaustive, but to provide a flavour of the levels of support for projects and common themes raised by submitters.

10-year investment priorities

20. The online submission survey asked for people's perceptions of the weightings of the 10-year transport investment priorities. Any views identified in email submissions have been included in this analysis.
21. Over half of respondents thought 'Public Transport Capacity' should have a higher weighting, while about half of respondents thought that 'Resilience', 'Safety' and 'Strategic Access' was about right:

Responses from online survey (n= 561)

	Higher priority	It's about right	Lower priority	I don't know
Transport Investment Priority				
Public Transport Capacity (weighting 30%)	56%	34%	8%	<1%
Travel Choice (proposed weighting 20%)	40%	36%	22%	1%
Strategic Access (proposed weighting 15%)	38%	47%	13%	1%
Safety (proposed weighting 15%)	24%	59%	15%	1%
Resilience (proposed weighting 20%)	35%	49%	11%	2%

22. Overall, most respondents thought the weightings for all the Transport Investment Priorities should either be higher or were about right. There was not a strong mandate to reduce the weighting of any of the Priorities.

Order of priority of significant activities

23. The online submission survey asked about people's perceptions of the priority ranking of the significant activities list. Where submissions received via email also identified comments on significant activities these have also been included in this analysis.
24. 'Significant activities' refer to new activities seeking funding from the National Land Transport Fund, excluding:
- Maintenance, operations and renewal activities,
 - Public transport continuous programme (existing services),
 - low-cost, low-risk activities,
 - Road safety promotion activities,
 - Investment management activities, including transport planning and modelling,
 - Programme business cases.
25. The top five projects that submitters thought 'should be a higher priority' were:
- #16: Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand – 61%
 - #3: Metro Rail - Developing and Enabling Future Capacity – 50%
 - #1: Rail Network Resilience – 48%
 - #2: Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity – 46%
 - #12: Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme – 39%
26. The top five projects that submitters thought 'should be a lower priority' were:

- #5: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) – SH1 Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Reserve Upgrades – 28%
 - #8: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) – Petone to Grenada and the Cross Valley Link – 27%
 - #26: Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension – 24%
 - #21: SH59 Mackays to Linden – 22%
 - #7: Regional Cycle Network – 21%
27. The top five projects that submitters thought were ‘about right’ were:
- #11: Wellington Region Resilience Programme – 54%
 - #9: Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport Assets – 54%
 - #13: Bus Hubs and Layovers – 52%
 - #10: Riverlink - Te Awa Kairangi Improvements – 49%
 - #15: State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvements Programme – 45%
28. Overall, there was a strong mandate of support for public transport projects and programmes from respondents across the region.
29. The rail programmes of activities (currently ranked first, second and third in the list) were very strongly supported. (Where respondents had said “should be a higher priority” to projects already in the list. Officers have considered this to be a signal of support for such programmes).
30. Other public transport projects with strong support include ‘Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand’ (#16) and the ‘Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme (#12). Respondents from Wairarapa and Kāpiti were more likely than those from Wellington City to think these programmes should be higher priority.
31. The feedback on the two Roads of National Significance (currently at #5 and #8 in the draft RLTP document) was very divided.
- #5: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) – SH1 Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Reserve Upgrades
32. Respondents were split almost 50/50, with almost half selecting either ‘this should be a lower priority’ or not included in the significant activities at all, and almost half either supporting it where it was in the list or being a higher priority. Key themes raised in verbatim comments included concern for projected expenditure and stronger prioritisation of public and active transport infrastructure.
- #8: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) – Petone to Grenada and the Cross Valley Link
33. This activity had the second most comments on it. As with the Mt Victoria Tunnel/Basin Reserve Upgrades, the feedback was split, with almost half of respondents either wanting it to be higher in the list as wanting it to be lower or removed entirely.

34. The Regional Cycle Network (#8) also drew a divided response, with more people thinking the programme was either about right or should be higher in the list, as those who thought it should be given a lower priority in the list or removed completely.

Objectives and policies

35. Questions were not specifically asked during consultation about the objectives and policies due to the mid-term 'review' nature of this process which focuses on changes to the programme of activities for funding over the next 3 years. However, a general theme of support for the high-level targets emerged through the open-ended question ('is there anything else you want to tell us about transport in the Wellington Region?'). This included concern about the lower likelihood of meeting the emissions target if big roading projects were prioritised.

Other themes raised during consultation

36. There were a range of themes raised through the consultation, from all feedback submitted (both online and via email). Some common themes identified were:
- A desire for public transport infrastructure to be prioritised and enhanced, including being prioritised ahead of cars and/or roading.
 - A desire for public transport to be made more affordable, reliable and accessible to everyone.
 - Strong sentiment about cycling infrastructure, both in favour of (i.e. comments regarding improved safety for cyclists, or ability to ride more therefore reducing emissions), and against (i.e. being installed at expense of road space for other modes, or too much money being spent)
 - Recognition that improvements to non-car modes are important for reducing congestion as well as benefits for the environment, health, safety, equity and inclusion.
 - Need to improve access (including by improving network resilience) to strategic destinations, for freight, and for people. For people, this included getting people to locations such as Wellington Regional Hospital, and for people living in Kāpiti, north to Levin and Palmerston North. People living in Kāpiti and Wairarapa were more likely to rate the need to improve transport network resilience higher than the overall average.
 - The importance of transport safety. Many noted improved safety as a benefit of mode shifting away from cars.
 - Many submitters provided feedback on matters of an operational nature, outside the scope of the RLTP. This feedback will be forwarded to the relevant organisation for their consideration.

Detailed submissions

37. Emailed submissions were predominantly received from organisations representing transport users, transport operators, and local and regional councils.

They cover a diverse range of views and recommendations of interest to the members of each organisation.

38. Feedback from groups/organisations is specifically highlighted as part of the submission analysis in **Attachment 1** to this report, including a summary of each group submission. Group submissions were received from:

- Bus and Coach Association New Zealand
- Cycle Action Network
- Disabled Persons Assembly NZ
- Doctors for Active, Safe Transport
- Entrada Travel Group (InterCity)
- Golden Bay Cement (Fletcher Concrete and Infrastructure)
- Health New Zealand | Te Whatu Ora National Public Health Service (Health NZ)
- Horizons Regional Council
- Horowhenua District Council
- Hutt Cycle Network
- Iā Ara Aotearoa - Transporting New Zealand
- Inner-City Wellington
- Kāpiti Coast District Council
- Kinetic NZ
- NZ Automotive Association, Wairarapa
- Ōtaki Community Board
- Save the Basin Campaign
- Wellington branch of Blind Citizens NZ
- Wellington District Council of the New Zealand Automobile Association (AA Wellington)

Changes advised by Approved Organisations

39. Some of the Approved Organisations have advised changes to the activities in the draft regional programme. This has come about as a result of ongoing discussions as part of their long-term plan or other processes. Most of the changes are minor adjustments to the annual financial forecasts. Some changes are more substantial and are noted below.

40. Wellington City Council has advised a change to two former Let's Get Wellington Moving activities. The impacted activities are Golden Mile Upgrades and Thorndon Quay and Hutt Road Upgrade, both with changes to cashflow after review of the projects and adoption of Wellington City Council's Long Term Plan.

Ngā hua ahumoni

Financial implications

41. There are no financial implications arising from this report. Funding to implement the review of Wellington RLTP 2021 will be considered by each of the plan's partners and in the development of the NLTP 2024-27.

Ngā Take e hāngai ana te iwi Māori

Implications for Māori

42. Sections 18G and 18H of the LTMA outline requirements for approved organisations to consult with Māori and seek Māori contribution to decision making. Councils and Approved Organisations have their own relationships with mana whenua groups, and where possible this is incorporated into consultation on transport planning via local council LTP and other related processes.
43. Officers have been working with Greater Wellington's Te Hunga Whiriwhiri to understand how mana whenua groups may wish to partner in the development of the 2027 Regional Land Transport Plan and how those views should be represented.

Te huritao ki te huringa o te āhuarangi

Consideration of climate change

44. The draft RLTP programme for consultation has been developed in the context of a draft Government Policy Statement (March 2024). The draft GPS includes new strategic priorities that no longer include climate change, and this is reflected through a shift in the funding that will be available for activities from the NLTF. The RLTP programme must be consistent with the GPS, and the projects and activities put forward by approved organisations are for the purpose of seeking funding from the NLTF.
45. However, the region and transport sector have various emission reduction targets and commitments it must also contribute to. This is a current tension and creates a potential risk that available transport funding may not support emission reduction pathways previously identified for transport.
46. The Subcommittee and the Regional Transport Committee will need to consider these regional commitments alongside central government direction in the final GPS when it makes recommendations and decisions on regional priorities in the final RLTP.

Ngā tikanga whakataurua

Decision-making process

47. The matters requiring decision in this report were considered by officers against the decision-making requirements of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002.
48. The process for deciding this matter is prescribed explicitly by sections 13, 18, and 18B of the LTMA. These sections provide that every six years, Greater Wellington

Regional Council must ensure that the Committee prepares, on the Council's behalf, a RLTP. The Committee must consult in accordance with the consultation principles in section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).

Te hiranga Significance

49. Officers considered the significance (as defined by Part 6 of the LGA) of this matter, taking into account Greater Wellington Regional Council's Significance and Engagement Policy and Greater Wellington's Decision-making Guidelines. The consideration of submissions is part of a decision-making process that will lead to making a decision of high significance, as inclusion of activities in the Wellington RLTP 2021: 2024 mid-term review is a statutory requirement for transport activities to be considered for inclusion in the NLTP 2024-27 and receive funding from the NLTF.

Te whakatūtakitaki Engagement

50. Greater Wellington led a successful digital-forward campaign with specific attention to demographic representation across our region. This was supported by face-to-face engagements with community groups.
51. Promotion centred on engagement with the RLTP have-your-say consultation page which directed the public to two story-maps, the consultation document and the survey itself.
52. The campaign utilised a range of different mediums and channels including radio ads, social media, google ads, flyers and physical consultation documents and submission forms sent to libraries. These channels were chosen to engage with a broad cross section of people from across the whole of the Wellington Region.
53. The overall campaign was a success, reaching over 5,000 people resulting in over 500 individual submissions – a high engagement rate for a Greater Wellington consultation.
54. The majority of submission came from individuals clicking through from social media or direct links – including links in emails, and browser searches.
55. We saw good representation across a broad range of ages and genders. There was a higher number of participants from Wellington City (55%). The remainder of submissions were distributed across the Region. Throughout the campaign we consistently adjusted our approach to focus on groups that were underrepresented in the submissions.
56. Two key areas could be improved for next time - representation across different ethnicities and accessibility. Most submissions came from individuals identifying as New Zealand European which is typical of our consultations. This is an area the Greater Wellington's customer engagement function is looking to improve.
57. Greater Wellington adheres to government accessibility standards however this does not mean we meet all the needs of our communities. Some documents such

as PDF are not accessible for some members of our community, which was communicated by members of the disabled community during this process. There are many opportunities in this space and lessons learnt from this consultation will be captured for any future consultations.

Ngā tūāoma e whai ake nei

Next steps

58. Feedback from this consultation will be built into a database for consideration while developing the RLTP 2027.
59. The Hearings Subcommittee will report on the submissions and recommended changes to the RLTP 2021: 2024 mid-term review to the Committee meeting on 23 July 2024.
60. The Committee will then recommend the final RLTP 2021: 2024 mid-term review to Greater Wellington Regional Council for consideration at its meeting on 30 July 2024.
61. The final Wellington RLTP 2021 must be submitted to Waka Kotahi on 1 August 2024.

Ngā āpitihanga

Attachments

Number	Title
1	Summary and analysis of submissions on Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021: 2024 mid-term review – Global Research
2	Deliberations Table with initial officer advice

Ngā kaiwaitohu

Signatories

Writer	Shan Lu – Principal Strategic Advisor Emma Hope – Senior Strategic Advisor Amelia Wilkins – Strategic Advisor Ella Makan – Senior Marketing and Communications Advisor
Approvers	Adrew Ford – Head of Regional Transport (Acting) Luke Troy – Kaiwhakahaere Matua Rautaki Group Manager Strategy

**He whakarāpopoto i ngā huritaonga
Summary of considerations**

Fit with Council's roles or with Committee's terms of reference

Preparation of a RLTP is a function of the Regional Transport Committee under section 106 of the LTMA. The Subcommittee was established by the Regional Transport Committee to hear and deliberate on submissions and feedback received on the mid-term review of the 2021 RLTP.

Contribution to Annual Plan / Long Term Plan / Other key strategies and policies

This report is part of a longer process to develop the Wellington RLTP 2021 mid-term review, which is a key regional strategy.

Internal consultation

Engagement occurred with the members of the Committee's Technical Advisory Group.

In preparing this report, consultation was undertaken with Greater Wellington's Communications function and Climate Change team.

Risks and impacts - legal / health and safety etc.

There are no identified risks relating to the content or recommendations of this Report.



GWRC Regional Land Transport Plan: 2024 Mid- Term Review

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT: summary and
analysis

June 2024

Prepared by Global Research Ltd

For



Contents

Executive summary	2
Key findings	2
Project overview	5
Introduction	5
Mid-term Review updates	6
Engagement objectives	6
Engagement description	6
Engagement results	8
Analysis and reporting overview of multi-choice opinions and written commentary	8
Investment Priorities	10
Priority Significant Activities List	32
Any other comments	53
Group submissions	61
Who respondents were	67
Addendum	72
1. Project list.....	72
2. Priority Significant Activities Rankings.....	73

Executive summary

The Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 (RLTP) is the blueprint for a transport network that enables a connected region, with safe, accessible, and liveable places. It describes the long-term vision and objectives, identifies regional priorities, and sets out intended transport investment across the six years from 2021.

In May 2024, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) produced a draft Mid-term Review of the RLTP as required under the Land Transport Management Act 2003. The Mid-term Review will sit alongside the existing RLTP 2021, rather than replacing it.

This draft Mid-term Review is based on public feedback sought by GWRC in February 2023 to ensure that both the strategic framework of the RLTP remains valid and fit for purpose, and that the accompanying regional programme of activities is updated for the second half of its six-year duration.

A further public engagement was conducted in June 2024 to ensure that the subsequent mid-term review document accurately reflected public sentiment on the RLTP.

A total of 561 survey responses and 18 own-format submissions were received from both individuals and different organisations from across the Greater Wellington region.

Below are the key findings from the June 2024 engagement.

Key findings

Investment Priorities

The RLTP outlines five investment priorities to guide the regional programme of activities: 1. Public Transport; 2. Travel Choice; 3. Strategic Access; 4. Safety; 5. Resilience. Public engagement on the draft Mid-term Review asked respondents to consider the priority weighting of each of these and whether it needed changing.

- > The investment priority that was most frequently selected as needing to be a higher priority by respondents was *Public Transport Capacity*. The option 'this should be a higher priority' was selected by 56% of respondents.
- > The investment priority that was most frequently selected as needing to be a lower priority by respondents was *Travel Choice*. The 'this should be a lower priority' option was selected by 22% of respondents for this priority. Note that 41% percentage of respondents selected that Travel Choice should be a higher priority.
- > The most spoken about priority in comments was *Travel Choice* with around 170 respondents, followed by *Public Transport Capacity* with around 140 respondents.

- > Respondents often articulated support for a more reliable, resilient, extensive, accessible, and cost-effective public transport system that would enable people to reduce reliance on cars. Commentary also reflected widespread desire for increased investment in active transport (such as walking and cycling) through the development of more paths and cycle lanes. Generally, respondents asserted that increased uptake of public and active transport would improve sustainability, lower congestion, and enhance the safety of transport in the region. A smaller contingent of submitters opposed cycling investment and felt that cars should be retained as the most viable form of transport.

Significant Activities List

The Significant Activities list sets out the 30 land transport activities proposed to be funded over the three years from July 2024 to June 2027, listed in priority order. Public engagement on the draft Mid-term Review asked respondents to consider the current priority weighting of each of these activities and whether it needed changing.

- > The Significant Activity that was most frequently selected by respondents as needing to be a higher priority was Priority #16 *Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand*. This was selected by 61% of respondents.
- > Following this was Priority #3 *Metro Rail – Developing and Enabling Future Capacity* (selected by 50% of respondents) and Priority #1 *Rail Network Resilience* - (selected by 48% of respondents).
- > Significant Activity Priority #5 *Wellington Region Road of National Significance* was the most frequently selected by respondents as needing to be a lower priority (selected by 28% of respondents). This was followed by #8 *Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2)*, selected by 27% of respondents.
- > The most frequently discussed Significant Activity to emerge from commentary was Priority #5 *Wellington Roads of National Significance*, referenced by around 35 respondents. About half of the comments within this topic indicated support for the activity and half reflected opposition. Support was justified by assertions that the project would ease congestion, improve connectivity, and enable greater provision of public and active transport infrastructure. Respondents who opposed the activity expressed concerns about cost effectiveness and noted their preference for investment into public and active transport modes.
- > #8 *Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2)* was the second-most discussed topic, mentioned by around 20 respondents. These respondents predominantly opposed the activity. Key issues cited included cost-effectiveness and scepticism surrounding the project's ability to deliver on its stated aims.

Other comments

- > A series of other themes emerged from respondents' open comments that did not relate directly to the five Investment Priorities or the Significant Activities List.
- > Environmental concerns regarding transport and emissions targets were articulated by around 30 respondents. Submitters proposed the council invest in improvements to public transport and encourage people to mode-shift away from motor vehicles to meet emissions targets and reduce environmental impacts.
- > Comments reflecting Support for cars, roads, traffic flow, and parking were made by around 30 respondents. Various roading improvements and parking solutions were proposed to reduce congestion and improve road user experience.
- > General commentary on the review document was articulated by around 20 respondents, including general issues with the RLTP (namely, a lack of long-term focus and measurable outcomes); varied comments about the consultation process; and expressions of general support for the RLTP.

Project overview

Introduction


Transport is vital to everyday life, from travelling to where we work and play, to accessing the goods and services we need. The transport network shapes the places we live and how we live. The Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 (RLTP) sets the direction for the region’s transport network for the 10-30 years following 2021. The plan’s aim is to establish a transport network that enables the region to grow in ways that make it easy and safe for people to get around, while reducing congestion and emissions and creating more liveable places.

The RLTP includes five strategic objectives, 10-year transport investment priorities, a series of priority significant activities, and three 10-year headline targets. These targets help to monitor whether the Wellington region is moving in the right direction.

Since the RLTP was passed in 2021, external factors including weather events, the COVID-19 pandemic, economic and workforce pressures, and shifting Government policies have affected the state of transport in the region.

Specifically, the RLTP is informed by the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS). Set every three years, the GPS outlines the Government’s strategic priorities that it seeks to deliver across the next 10 years and details funding allocations under the National Land Transport Fund. The latest draft GPS was released in March 2024.

All these factors helped to inform the Draft Mid-Term Review, alongside solicited public feedback to ensure the Review accurately considers these external factors and the changing needs of the region. Data was collected through the GWRC’s ‘Have Your Say’ website as well as through individual email and postal submissions.



Mid-term Review updates

There are two key updates proposed in the Mid-term Review document.

Firstly, the weightings of the Transport Investment Priorities have altered slightly to respond to changing priorities in the region. These are weighted as follows:

- Public transport capacity – decreased from 40% to 30%
- Travel choice – unchanged at 20%
- Strategic access – unchanged at 15%
- Safety – unchanged at 15%
- Resilience – increased from 10% to 20%

Secondly, the list of 30 proposed transport activities has been refreshed for the next three years.

Engagement objectives

The objectives of the review engagement were to:

- > Inspire residents & ratepayers of the Greater Wellington region to have their say on the RLTP Mid-term Review
- > Ensure feedback gathered from the February 2024 public engagement is accurately expressed in the Draft Mid-Term Review.
- > Raise awareness of the strategic direction, transport priorities and regional programme of the RLTP
- > Build awareness of the RLTP and the considered, collaborative way the plan has been developed
- > Increase the public's understanding of the regional transport story.

Engagement description

The engagement was primarily conducted through GWRC's 'Have Your Say' page, where members of the public could access the Draft RLTP Review document and register for an information session on the review. Through this platform, respondents could also access the online survey form. Individual respondents and groups could submit longer, own-format submissions via email.

The survey included the following:

- > A series of demographic questions
- > A series of Likert scale questions on the priority ranking of the five Investment Priorities
- > A series of Likert scaled quantitative questions on the priority ranking of the 30 Significant Activities
- > A single open-ended question for any further feedback regarding transport in the Wellington Region.

Overall, throughout this engagement GWRC received:

561

Survey responses

18

Own-format submissions

Engagement results

Analysis and reporting overview of multi-choice opinions and written commentary

Analysis approach

The following discussion presents results from analysis of both multi-choice opinions (quantitative) and free-text feedback (qualitative) provided by respondents who completed the Have Your Say survey or submitted written feedback in their own formats.

How analysis was completed

Feedback from multi-choice questions

Frequency analysis was conducted on answers to multi-choice questions, which denoted the percentage of respondents who selected each option for each of the multi-choice questions in the survey.

This data has been presented in charts and interpreted by data analysts. The results are presented in relevant sections throughout the report.

Feedback from written commentary

To complete analysis, Global Research analysts read each comment received from individuals and organisations within the Greater Wellington community and organised (coded) them into themes and topics based on their salient points. The themes and topics were predominantly structured around the five Investment Priorities and 30 Significant Activities.

Some comments contained multiple points, relevant to multiple topics, resulting in these comments being coded to multiple places. The analysis was assisted by NVivo qualitative analysis software.

Analysts then synthesised the coded comments and used the results to inform this report. The discussion below is written in the order of most-to-least commonly mentioned topics for each of the free-text written questions. Comments from organisations have been coded and discussed within relevant topics and a summary of each group's submission in its entirety has also been included for context under the heading 'Group submissions'.

Within the overall 'Key findings' and 'Key Points' summary of written responses for each topic, the number of respondents that provided comment (rounded to the nearest five or ten) has been included, rather than the number of comments. This reveals the most frequently discussed aspects. Note that respondents may have made multiple comments within each topic, so respondent numbers may diverge from comment numbers.

Throughout the discussion of written comments, the number of points pertaining to particular topics have been consistently represented through the scale printed below:

- > A very large number= 150 + comments
- > A large number= 100-149 comments
- > A sizeable number= 75 – 99 comments
- > A substantial number = 50 – 74 comments
- > A considerable number = 25 – 49 comments
- > A moderate number = 15 – 24 comments
- > Several comments = 8 – 14 comments
- > A small number = 4 – 7 comments
- > A few = 3 comments
- > A couple = 2 comments

To illustrate the calibre and fabric of the feedback, quotes from respondents have been included throughout the report. Note that grammar and spelling mistakes have been amended in some cases where this does not change the meaning of the comment.

Engagement and reporting limitations

This report details respondents' views, concerns and ideas expressed during the community engagement period. The following limitations were identified when conducting and reporting on the engagement activities:

- > In some instances, respondents did not answer all questions. This means that some questions received fewer answers than others.
- > There was a significant amount of thematic crossover between certain topics, especially *Priority 1: Public Transport Capacity* and *Priority 2: Travel Choice*. To account for this, respondents' comments on these topics were coded to and analysed across multiple topics. This precipitated some repetition between some topics, though nuanced distinctions are outlined in the write up.

Investment Priorities

Key findings

Multi-choice opinions

- > Respondents agreed with the present ranking of the following Investment Priorities:
 - Safety (59%)
 - Resilience (50%)
 - Strategic Access (47%).
- > Respondents thought that the following Investment Priorities should be higher in the priority ranking:
 - Public Transport Capacity (56%)
 - Travel Choice (41%)
 - Strategic Access (38%).
- > Respondents thought that the following Investment Priorities should be lower in the priority ranking:
 - Travel Choice (22%)
 - Safety (15%)
 - Strategic Access (14%).

Written commentary

- > The most discussed Priority was *Travel Choice*, with around 170 respondents making comments on this topic. These respondents typically advocated for the prioritisation of diverse forms of active and public transport (such as cycling, walking, busses, and trains) through investment and infrastructure development. Some comments collated under this topic reflected opposition to cyclists and cycleways, due to the relative scarcity of those travelling via bike and their perceived exacerbation of congestion.
- > This was followed by *Public Transport Capacity* with around 140 respondents. Commentary pertaining to this topic reflected general support for the enhancement of public transport in the region and advocacy for greater investment in reliable, frequent, and expansive public transport connections. Many respondents discussed specific routes or proposed additional routes. Some wrote specifically about transport in the Wairarapa, commented upon Cook Strait ferries, or advocated for light rail.
- > *Safety* was discussed by around 40 respondents. Concerns were raised about the safety of pedestrians, car users, and cyclists. Many posited that mode shifting away from cars would improve safety, and some advocated for the physical separation of cyclists through bike lanes. A portion of those who discussed speeds and speed limits felt that current limits were too restrictive, while others felt that they should be stricter.

- > *Strategic Access* was mentioned by close to 20 respondents. Commentary generally reflected support for a greater focus on inter-regional travel and intra-regional access to important facilities, such as hospitals, ports, airports, railway stations, and stadiums.
- > *Resilience* was discussed by around 10 respondents (note that all public transport related resilience comments were placed in the Public Transport Capacity Priority topic).

Rating RLTP Investment Priorities


Respondents were asked to rate five *investment priorities*, classified as: public transport capacity; travel choice; strategic access, safety; and resilience.

Respondents were asked to rate each priority in response to this question: *Please tell us what you think about these priorities.* Options were: *This should be a higher priority; It's about right; This should be a lower priority; and I don't know.*

The charts below present the full results for each question.

Public Transport Capacity


Investment priority 1: *Public Transport Capacity (weighting 30%): building capacity and reliability into the Wellington Region's rail network and into the Wellington City public transport network to accommodate future demand.*



- > Over half of respondents (56%) thought that public transport capacity should be higher in the priority ranking.
- > 35% of respondents selected 'It's about right' regarding the prioritisation of public transport capacity.
- > Meanwhile, only 8% of respondents thought that public transport capacity should be a lower priority.
- > 'I don't know' was selected by 0% of respondents.

Travel Choice


Investment priority 2: *Travel Choice (proposed weighting 20%): make walking, cycling and public transport a safe, sustainable and attractive option for more trips throughout the region.*



- > 41% of respondents selected that travel choice should be higher in the priority ranking.
- > Slightly fewer respondents (36%) selected 'It's about right' regarding the prioritisation of travel choice.
- > 'This should be a lower priority' was only selected by 22% of respondents.
- > Meanwhile, 1% of respondents selected 'I don't know'.

Strategic Access


Investment priority 3: Strategic Access (proposed weighting 15%): improve access to key regional destinations, such as ports, airports and hospitals for people and freight.



- > Nearly half (47%) of respondents agreed with the current prioritisation of strategic access.
- > 38% of respondents thought that the priority ranking of strategic access should be elevated.
- > Only 14% of respondents felt that strategic access should be a lower priority.
- > 1% of respondents selected 'I don't know' regarding the prioritisation of strategic access.

Safety


Investment priority 4: *Safety (proposed weighting 15%): improve safety, particularly at high-risk intersections and on high-risk rural and urban roads.*



- > Over half of respondents (59%) selected 'It's about right' regarding the current prioritisation of safety.
- > A quarter of respondents (25%) selected 'This should be a higher priority' regarding the current prioritisation of safety.
- > Only 15% of respondents thought that the priority ranking of safety should decrease.
- > 'I don't know' was selected by 1% of respondents.

Resilience

Investment priority 5: Resilience (proposed weighting 20%). build resilience into the region's transport network by strengthening priority transport lifelines and improving the redundancy in the system.



- > Exactly half of respondents (50%) selected 'it's about right' regarding the current prioritisation of resilience.
- > 35% of respondents believed that the priority ranking of resilience should increase.
- > Only 12% of respondents selected 'This should be a lower priority' regarding the current prioritisation of resilience.
- > 3% of respondents selected 'I don't know' concerning the present prioritisation of resilience.

Investment priorities commentary

Respondents were also asked: *Is there anything else you would like to share with us about transport in the Wellington Region?*

This section analyses every response to the above question that were relevant to one or more of the five Investment Priorities. Sub themes emerged for each of the five Investment Priorities and are discussed in the commentary.

The respective discussions for each topic commence with a synthesis of the points made by the general public, followed by analysis of comments from organisations. The organisational comments have been identified and headed.

Public Transport Capacity

General support for public transport enhancement

78 comments

A considerable number of comments reflected a desire to improve public transport. Key themes across this commentary included the need for more reliable, resilient, frequent, and fast public transport services, as well as the impact such enhancements could have on traffic congestion. Around two thirds of these respondents penned comments in support of general enhancements to public transport infrastructure. Below is a sample of these comments:

A better bus service serving more locations would be a start.

More emphasis on public transport required - but within existing budgets.

Priority should be given to public transport, to make it easier, cheaper and more reliable. This includes buses and métro trains. Not slowing down freight links and movements with senseless roading programmes.

More focus on a resilient, reliable and affordable train network.

The region is only going to grow. We need better public transport options rather than more cars and congestion.

The rest of the comments were longer and more descriptive in nature. Some respondents proposed specific interventions to improve the public transport system in the region.

*I think an increase in capacity and frequency is necessary given the growth trends in ridership and the fact that for several recent large events, capacity has not met demand. People will avoid public transport options if they are frequently delayed or known to sometimes be outright cancelled. Our buses and trains need to, above all, be **reliable**.*

Priority should be ensuring current public transport such as trains and buses are far more reliable and brought up to standards that you'd find in cities overseas. As transport fares go up users need to see a dramatic improvement in reliability. Additionally the ticketing system used by Metlink should be improved to create a more streamlined experience like in Auckland. There should be a turnstile type gate at each train platform where you should scan your snapper or ticket to gain access to the platform. This reduces the need for the staff on the train to scan everybody's cards or issue cash tickets.

NB: This category has significant overlap with the Travel Choice sub theme of *Support for prioritising and enhancing the appeal of diverse transport options*. They differ in that:

- *Public Transport Capacity - Support for public transport enhancement* includes supportive commentary on public transport reliability, capacity and general infrastructure.
- *Travel Choice - Support for prioritising and enhancing the appeal of diverse transport options* includes supportive commentary on all non-car modes of transport and all commentary on affordability and the capability of enhancements to increase appeal.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

A submission from the **Bus and Coach Association NZ** supported the establishment (and topical subsidisation) of “an efficient and attractive inter-regional public transport network.” However, the association maintained that council intervention in private transport purveyors’ assets or facilities (such as council management of depots) would be inefficient and economically harmful and proposed that councils should just employ existing companies for expanded public transport services.

The **Disabled Persons Assembly** supported investment into building public transport capacity, particularly that of Metro Rail, and recommended that “investment continue to be made into every aspect” of the regional rail and Wellington Rapid Transit Bus networks. The assembly urged that the GWRC prioritise furnishing all transit stations, stops, buses and train carriages to be fully accessible to people with disabilities.

While **Entrada Travel Group (InterCity)** supported “improving transport choices and accessibility along the Wellington-Palmerston North corridor”, they expressed reservations about government interventions that could hinder competition, such as subsidised train travel.

Expressing support for collaborative inter-regional public transport planning, **Horizons Regional Council** stated that current services and planning are insufficient to address current public transport needs and future population growth of residents along the Northern Corridor. The council advocated for the GWRC to consider and plan for these residents’ needs.

Horowhenua District Council expressed support for enhanced regional and inter-regional public transport capabilities, asserting that the expansion of public transport would lessen the road toll, contribute to climate-related targets and improve equitable access to

essential services. However, the council asserted that the current needs and future growth of the Northern Corridor are not being adequately addressed in public transport planning.

While **Kāpiti Coast District Council** welcomed the enactment of the Lower North Island Rail Integrated Mobility programme and rail network investments from 2027/2028 to improve cross-regional connections, they stressed the importance of first ensuring that local transit services meet the needs of the Ōtaki community.

Kinetic NZ expressed opposition to council control of bus depots and assets on the basis that it would inhibit bus companies' efficiency, innovation and competition. The group recommended that investments to enhance bus capacity should instead contract additional services from the bus services provider market. The organisation also noted a lack of initiatives in the plan to address difficulties in bus driver recruitment and recommended that the GWRC consider steps to encourage bus driving as a career, including improving work conditions, timetabling, safety, and rest facilities.

Specific route improvements

45 comments

Requests for improvements to or the addition of specific routes were made by a considerable number of respondents. Requests included:

- > Enhanced public transport connections to Karori, Camborne, Wainuiomata, Melling, Eastern suburbs, Ōtaki, Masterton, Napier, Palmerston North, Belmont, Kelson, Island Bay, Churton Park, the airport, and Maupuia Park.
- > Enhanced public transport connections between Wellington, Lower Hutt and Porirua; Johnsonville and Porirua; between Waikanae and Peka Peka Beach; between Waikanae and Te Horo beach; between the western and eastern growth corridor; between Karori, Wilton and Johnsonville; between Porirua and Upper Hutt; between Johnsonville and Petone; between Te Awa Kairangi and Porirua; between Pukerua Bay and Paekākāriki; and inter-regionally to Auckland and the South Island.
- > Linking the Kāpiti and Wellington rail lines at Johnsonville.
- > Enhanced capacity on the Johnsonville line.
- > Stabilising the Kāpiti Line or a bus depot near Plimmerton.
- > Greater access to trains stations including Wingate.
- > Using buses all the way from Wellington Station to Waikanae when a train needs replacing, rather than having to exit the bus at Porirua.
- > Extend the Hutt Valley line electrification to Maymorn.
- > Converting cycle lanes on Adelaide Road and Kent Terrace to bus lanes.
- > Including Ōtaki in any metro rail extension.
- > A priority bus lane to Newlands.
- > New hybrid trains for the Manawatū and Wairarapa lines.
- > Exploring new train stations including at Clouston Park.

One respondent voiced gratitude for the addition of the Number 4 bus route, stating that it has created options for Northland residents. An extensive submission from a resident of Ōtaki detailed the public transport links they felt were necessary for the growing town's regional connectivity.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The **Horizons Regional Council** advocated for the enhancement of several specific transport connections. These included increased public transport services to Horowhenua, Whanganui, Rangitikei, Tararua, Waikanae, and a longer-term focus on connecting the Tararua district to Masterton. The Council also endorsed the replacement of the current Capital Connection passenger rail service with a new modern fleet and enhanced services.

Enhanced Wairarapa public transport connections

14 comments

Several respondents specifically requested the expansion and enhancement of public transport connections to Wairarapa. Respondents noted that the Wairarapa acts as a satellite for Wellington and therefore requires greater access.

Wairarapa public transport is abysmal. As one of the most rapidly growing areas in the country, you'd think we'd get more priority but we have to compete with a major city and much more populated areas due to our link to Wellington Region.

It's already underway, but Wairarapa has so much potential to support Wellington and making sure the link back to Wellington is strong - Trains etc. The biggest issue I see is if the Rimutaka hill [sic] is closed due to an accident, or road upgrades, it halts the whole region!

Requests included a general upgrade of trains, improved timetabling, warmer carriages, electrification of the lines, and the pertinence of expanded local transport connections to ensure that residents and visitors can easily traverse the Wairarapa.

Public transport resourcing and project management

12 comments

Several respondents expressed concerns about the region's current public transport resourcing or planning. Some questioned the patronage of existing public transport links.

Buses are rarely full. Could smaller buses or shuttles be considered which would cost less to run?

Need to relook at what public transport services are actually used and match capacity to this. Lots of services where there are now limited people catching them. Monday and Friday's now have less people going to CBD but services are still the same as prior to this happening. Reallocating funds to be an effective way to use existing funding more effectively.

Others were generally critical of the management of public transport projects. The following two comments are examples of this.

I've lived in the Hutt for 10 years and Kiwirail have always been upgrading with disruptions. Its erratic and not fit for purpose.

If public transport is the be all and end all of the transports issues in Wellington then the WCC & GWRC need to actually invest and create it, not just modify and tinker with the broken system we have.

Among the remaining comments, one respondent articulated that the public transport system was not efficient enough for people to go without cars and one expressed that the Hutt trains travelling to Wellington were inefficient for cyclists due to their unreliability and lack of bike-carrying capacity on bus replacements. Lastly, a former bus driver discussed issues in the workplace culture at their former place of employment.

Ferries

9 comments

Six respondents expressed the view that the Cook Strait ferries needed replacement or upgrading, with two specifically highlighting the importance of this transport link.

I would like to see the Interislander ferries replaced and upgraded. They are an essential service connecting the North and South Islands. Freight needs to cross the Cook Strait as do passengers.

Two respondents expressed concern that replacement ferries that lacked rail capability would jeopardise the movement of freight and increase road congestion and maintenance issues.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington raised concern about the capacity of ferries, not merely ferry terminals. The organisation opined that three smaller ferries were a preferred model over two larger ferries, citing more peak-season timetable opportunities and greater service capability when one ferry is decommissioned for maintenance.

Horizons Regional Council supported upgrades for CentrePort and the ferry terminal and beseeched council to improve access and resilience. The council stressed that reliable connections to CentrePort were essential for freight movement between regions of the Lower North Island.

Light rail

8 comments

Eight respondents urged council to consider light rail in the Wellington region, with specific suggestions made for light rail links between Wellington Airport, Wellington Station, and Wellington Hospital.

One respondent suggested that even if light rail implementation is not imminent, it should be considered in any transport plan as it is likely to be built in the future. Another advocated for light rail and trams as a preferred public transport option to buses, noting that they are more comfortable for users and nearby pedestrians.

A couple of respondents characterised light rail as the most efficient, highest capacity, and fastest public transport solution.

Light rail in Wellington/Poneke was a great idea! This should be still considered as an option to improve public transport.

Travel Choice

Support for prioritising and enhancing the appeal of diverse transport options 139 comments

A significant number of respondents expressed support for improving the appeal of and access to diverse transport options. Respondents advocated for further investment in infrastructure and asserted that the prioritisation of diverse transport modes including micromobility, walking, cycling, and public transport would increase their use. Some of these comments were relatively general, as evidenced by the following examples:

I think prioritization of walkability, cyclability, and public transit is paramount to Wellington. Making more areas car-free and walkable, such as Cuba Street, will make a world of difference to the city.

In general I'd like to see more of a focus of funds to public and active transport. Modes that greatly complement each other and the constrained spaces within which we operate. Rail and bus priority networks have a much longer and useful lifespan than an additional road, widened lane or additional car parking.

People need to have transport choices. Not everyone can cycle or walk long distances. However, everyone can catch a bus or train.

The disabled (myself) cannot drive and so expanding variety of public transport options should be the number one priority.

Some respondents forwarded specific suggestions for making diverse transport options more appealing and accessible. These comments typically pertained to public transport. Proposals included subsidising travel fares, making public transport free, or diversifying payment methods, such as offering credit-card payment and day passes.

Key to everything is making Public Transport accessible to everyone. If you make fares too expensive you drive away people from using it.

A single 'card' for all transport types would be useful. But cash must still be able to be used, it is legal currency after all.

Make all public transport free.

Other suggestions included more pedestrian amenities such as seating and sheltered areas, and greater integration of complimentary transport modes to facilitate more efficient and flexible journeys.

Walking and pedestrian improvements [...] are essential if you want to increase patronage and should be include in the list. Bus passengers in particular don't just magically appear on a bus they need to walk there, improvements can significantly improve patronage.

Better integration of public transport e.g. buses that link with trains and stick to timetables. The bus should not run earlier than scheduled so that it results in leaving stations / stops before the train arrives in.

NB: This category has cross over with the Investment Priorities sub theme of *Support for public transport enhancement*. They differ in that:

- *Support for public transport enhancement* includes commentary on public transport reliability, capacity and general infrastructure.
- *Support for prioritising and enhancing the appeal of diverse transport options* includes commentary on all non-car modes of transport and all commentary on affordability and on how enhancements could increase appeal.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ stated that it “strongly supports the high prioritisation given to significant activities related to the development, maintenance and improvement of public transport infrastructure and ... services” and recommended that activities focused on the improvement of walking and cycling infrastructure are highly prioritised. The agency noted that providing a greater range of travel choice enables people to make more efficient journeys while promoting good health and economic prosperity.

Kāpiti Coast District Council noted the importance of travel choice for community wellbeing and the delivery of positive social and economic outcomes. The council stressed that having public transport options available is critical to vulnerable groups and isolated communities’ access to core services and opportunities.

Prioritising other modes of transport over cars

52 comments

A considerable number of respondents asked council to prioritise non-car modes of transport ahead of cars and car-related infrastructure. Most of these comments were general in nature.

Submitters noted that investment in alternative modes of transport such as public transport, micromobility, cycling and walking had greater longevity and net benefit and was more environmentally friendly than car-centric projects. Some respondents also stated that focussing on non-car transport could ease traffic congestion. Here is a sample of the comments made:

Activities focused on increasing the frequency and reliability of public transport options should be the priority, to the exclusion of new roads.

Please improve public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure before building new roads.

Wellington needs fewer cars in the city centre and more micromobility.

At this point in time we don't need more roads supporting more cars. We need to enable reliable public transport and give people real transport choices such that they don't need to take private transport if they don't want to.

Please continue with the great work to introduce more bike lanes despite the vocal minority that are against it! The public transport network is good too. Centering non-car transportation is vital for the city's growth and for the environment.

More transport choice please beyond cars - we need better efficiency, less transport-related violence, and more inclusive transport system that caters for everyone, not predominantly people who chose to drive.

A few respondents addressed the need to adapt infrastructure to support a shift towards alternative transport modes, expressing their support for street narrowing, reallocation of road space away from cars, and physically separated lanes for active transport users.

Support for cycleways

51 comments

A considerable number of respondents expressed specific support for cycle infrastructure. Sentiment identified cycle infrastructure as a crucial priority for the region.

Cycle lanes, particularly those which are physically segregated from vehicular traffic, are top priority.

Stronger focus on public transport and cycleways in recent years has been a big improvement, but more needs to be done.

A few respondents voiced gratitude or praise for existing cycleway upgrades. Some expressed that they have seen an increase in the number of people cycling in the city.

Thanks to the changes made there are already a lot more people on bikes. More cycling and public transport!

Very keen on the low cost bike lanes - I'm seeing a significant increase in bike traffic around town.

A few respondents requested specific upgrades to cycling infrastructure, including enhanced bike storage and more accessibility for bikes on trains. Respondents sought more cycleways and two respondents endorsed the proposed upgrades to the Johnsonville to Tawa bike path link. A sample request is printed below.

Additionally, paved cycleway from upper hutt through to wellington should be a priority, along with a pedestrian/cycleway through stokes valley, over the river to Manor Park station. this would bring some much needed access to a community that is growing.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Expressing support for cycling as an environmentally friendly and health-promoting activity, the **Disabled Persons Assembly** stressed a need to balance space for cyclists with that for pedestrians. The organisation advocated for separation of cycleways from pedestrian footpaths to ensure the safety of both groups, and recommended that more representatives from the disabled community be “involved in the design of all proposed cycle ways at a cross-regional level”.

Doctors for Active, Safe Transport noted the substantial health benefits, reduced CO² emissions and congestion reductions of cycling and rendered this mode of travel as the best substitute for short car trips. While expressing support for all cycling projects included in the Plan, DAST urged that more focus on constructing integrated cycle networks within major population centres was needed. Additionally, the group recommended that all arterial cycle lanes be physically separated from traffic to achieve optimal uptake of cycling.

Health NZ recommended that significant activities comprising cycle infrastructure improvements be granted high prioritisation due to significant health, economic and sustainability benefits. The agency stressed that cycle lanes should be physically separated from motor traffic to improve users’ sense of safety and encourage uptake.

Hutt Cycle Network wrote in support of cycling infrastructure investment, citing cost-effectiveness and health, environmental, and congestion benefits. The group advised that council should encourage people to substitute short car trips within communities with cycle rides.

Opposition to cycleways

40 comments

Opposition to cycleways was articulated by a considerable number of respondents. Many of these comments were expressive and included detailed descriptions of cycle lanes’ ills. Common rationale was that cycleways obstructed traffic flow and only benefited a small portion of the population.

I cycle and drive and my observation is that motor traffic has been forgotten about in the zeal to improve cycleways. Having cycled in Wellington for over 50 years I do not understand why there is a need for cyclists to take over exclusive areas of road built for cars.

Invested too much in cycleways that are not being used at the expense of making getting across the city quickly a priority.

A few respondents suggested that public transport needs to be prioritised over cycle infrastructure. Here are two comments expressing this sentiment:

If you're serious about making buses a priority for public transport, then you will need to make choices between that and cycle lanes, especially in Wellington city. And recognise that, for many people and many journeys, private cars will be the best or only realistic option.

Public transport of all kinds must be the priority over scooters and bike lanes

Stop building new cycleways for now, improve bus services/ public transport reliability/ on time/ frequency/ routes to make it more attractive than just using personal vehicles to go around by default.

A few of the respondents who raised the issue of cycleways' obstructing access to cars highlighted the challenge of deterring residents from car use. Two respondents in this subset suggested that expanded cycle infrastructure caused accessibility issues for those who need to use cars.

A smaller subset of comments were brief, general statements, such as the following:

Forget prioritising cycle lanes.

Safety over cycle ways.

Stop wasting money on cycle ways and nice to haves. Return focus to core deliverables.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The **Blind Citizens Assembly** raised the concern that some cycle lanes limited on-street parking, impacting the ability of blind persons and other people with disabilities to access taxis or other cars. Additionally, the group stated that many in the disability community felt unsafe when crossing cycle lanes, partly due to the design but also due to the behaviour of cyclists who neglect to slow down or stop.

Active and public transport accessibility and design concern 27 comments

A moderate number of respondents expressed concerns and suggestions about the accessibility and design of active and public transport options in the region. These included:

- > Access issues for KiwiRail links in the Hutt Valley and at Wingate Station
- > Bus shelters being ineffective in sheltering from the weather
- > The current public transport network not being sufficient to support a full move away from car use
- > The current parking system in Wellington City discouraging people from staying longer in town, during which time they could be using active or public transport
- > Older people not being considered amidst the prioritisation of cycling and walking
- > Clarification for bike access on trains
- > Extending the hours that Gold Cards can be used
- > The barrier created by dogs not being allowed on public transport
- > The need for private car access for some members of the public
- > The likelihood of EVs making public transport redundant
- > The infrequency of bus stops making bus networks harder to access
- > Concerns about the impacts of e-scooters

- > The lack of direct public transport services between Wellington Hospital and the Hutt Valley
- > Recognition for the segway as an option for those unable to easily walk or cycle.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The **Blind Citizens Assembly** highlighted several distinct barriers prohibiting blind persons and other people with disabilities from accessing public and active transport. The assembly noted inadequacies in the design of many public transport stops and stations such as platform narrowness, a lack of shelter, a lack of real-time information signs and alerts, and a lack of parking and bus transfers at some rail stations. The organisation urged that accessibility enhancements be a mandatory requirement for all new infrastructure and renewal projects and recommended that Total Mobility be included in the RLTP.

The **Disabled Persons Assembly** recommended that investment continue into “every aspect of the regional rail network including in making carriages, train stations and stops fully accessible to disabled people” as well as into “every aspect of the Wellington Rapid Transit Bus network including in making all depots and buses fully accessible”.

Health NZ recommended that “higher prioritisation be given to significant activities that achieve equitable access to active and public transport” to align with the Government Position Statement 27 (GPS) of providing people with better transport options to access social and economic opportunities.

Motorcycles

4 comments

Four comments contained reference to motorcycles. Respondents believed that transport plans should include greater consideration of motorcyclists, with some respondents noting the benefit motorcycles provide in reducing traffic congestion. Requests included cheaper parking options and greater access to bus lanes for motorcyclists. One respondent noted that sewer access covers can pose safety hazards to motorcyclists.

Strategic Access

25 comments

A moderate number of respondents discussed how strategic transport planning could provide access to important assets and regions. A few large submissions provided by community groups or other councils pertained to this topic. Common requests included improved access to Wellington Hospital, Wellington Railway Station, Wellington Airport, Palmerston North Hospital, Levin health services, stadiums, ports, and other regions. Within these contexts, individual respondents typically advocated for rail or light rail. Examples of these individual comments are printed below.

Also extend rail to Wellington Hospital and airport should be priority.

Moving more freight by rail should be a significant priority all over the country.

Infrastructure, roads and water should be the main priority for GWRC. Better roading access to Hutt Valley and Porirua and to hospitals, Wellington airport and ports should be the focus to ensure Wellington is future focussed and

economically viable. Cycle lanes, public transport improvements are a luxury and should be pushed down the list.

One respondent raised concerns about Remutaka Hill's susceptibility to closure and the consequences of this for the region's accessibility.

A submission from an Ōtaki resident asserted that the town was in a high growth area and required improved transport connections to the rest of the region for the sake of education, trade, and access to health and social services.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Ia Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand expressed concern that the proposed re-weightings of investment priorities in the RLTP failed to reflect the priorities of the GPS. The organisation advocated for the relative weighting of Strategic Access to be increased from 15% to 25%, with weightings of Public Transport Capacity and Travel Choice decreased.

In its statement on Strategic Access, the **Disabled Persons Assembly** criticised the prioritisation of building Roads of National Significance to fix issues of traffic congestion and blockages, urging that the GWRC continue to invest in public and active transport infrastructure to reduce car traffic volumes.

A submission by **Golden Bay Concrete**, a division of Fletcher Concrete and Infrastructure, expressed that resilience strengthening of Aotea Quay overbridge could impact access to and the operation of its Aotea Quay site, complicating the supply chain of the company's products to the residential building industry.

Horizon Regional Council noted the importance of the Horizons region for road and rail freight movements between key ports across the North Island and expressed support for activities improving access within and across the region, namely upgrades to State Highway 1 from Ōtaki to north of Levin, the Lower North Island Rail Integrated Mobility (LNIRIM) service, CentrePort, and State Highway 2 from Masterton to Featherston.

Horowhenua District Council supported broader regional and interregional corridors and public transport services, asserting that these would improve people's access to important locations such as hospitals and airports. The council also voiced encouragement for upgrades to CentrePort to improve access for inter-regional freight movements.

A submission from the **NZ Automobile Association, Wairarapa** included a request to replace the Waihenga Bridge on State Highway 53, suggesting the bridge is not fit for purpose and needs attention, especially considering its placement on a State Highway.

Safety

Transport safety

25 comments

Several respondents discussed transport safety, with the majority raising concerns about pedestrian and driver safety or stressing the need for transport safety to be a high priority. Many noted improved safety as a benefit of mode shifting away from cars. Some comments were general in nature, like the following samples:

It is important to understand the transport system as a whole when investing. Eg investing in walking and cycling and public transport also means increased safety as well as lower emissions.

Additionally the safety of pedestrians walking around the city was not addressed in this and need more focus (as it expands beyond pedestrians and public transport users) for easier and safer commutes in and around the city no matter the time or day

A few comments were more descriptive in nature.

Three comments were critical of purportedly ineffective or unnecessary safety adjustments to regional roading networks, including Remutaka Hill Road.

The rest of the comments were one-off, and included:

- > A request for orange LED streetlights
- > A request for ventilation on all public transport to reduce the spread of illness
- > A suggestion that bus drivers should not have to work night shifts as these are too dangerous
- > A suggestion that sewer access covers pose a danger to motorcyclists
- > A suggestion to use billboards to promote safety
- > A suggestion to increase train services to reduce the time passengers had to spend at night waiting, and therefore improve their safety
- > A suggestion that the use of speed bumps before pedestrian crossings increased the risk of pedestrians being hit by cars
- > A concern that the use of skateboards on roads and footpaths carries safety risks for riders and pedestrians.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

While stating their support of the RLTP's commitment to reduce road deaths and serious injuries (DSIs), **AA Wellington** expressed concern that the measures required to achieve DSI reduction targets could prove counterproductive and reduce public support for the GWRC's aims. The organisation cited the failure of the Road to Zero strategy to reduce DSIs to illustrate the difficulty of making gains in this area.

The **Disabled Persons Assembly** stressed the need for safety improvements along footpaths, cycleways and rural roads, recommending that these amenities receive an equal amount of investment as safety improvements on motorways and highways.

Ia Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand suggested that re-weighting the RLTP's significant activities to better align with the GPS and placing greater priority on roading improvements and maintenance would garner safety benefits for freight operators and private road users. The association endorsed the present weighting of Safety as an investment priority (15%).

The submission by **Health NZ** emphasised a focus on improving safety in order to reduce the number of DSIs resulting from traffic. An additional point made was of safety perceptions being a major barrier for people to regularly use active transport modes – and

that therefore investing in active transport infrastructure, particularly that which physically separates users from traffic, will encourage uptake. The health body underscored that investing in safety-enhancing infrastructure would bring significant health, social and economic co-benefits associated with a greater uptake of active transport modes.

Hutt Cycle Network reported that there were 186 DSIs on roads in the Wellington Region in 2019 and targeted no more than 122 road DSIs by 2030 in alignment with the Road to Zero national strategy.

Speed and speed limits

14 comments

Several comments contained reference to speed and speed limits on roads. Sentiment varied, with some respondents calling for higher speed limits and some for lower.

Two respondents requested the slowing of car speeds to support cyclists. One noted that reduced speed limits would lower carbon emissions, and another requested existing 30km per hour speed limits be retained.

Reducing the speed limits in built up urban areas to 30 kph would work a whole lot better for cyclists (+ buses and motorists).

One respondent cited physical separation of active transport modes by speed as “the gold standard for both efficiency and safety”, recommending a three-lane system that would separate pedestrians from faster modes such as bikes and scooters.

Four respondents were critical of the road speed limit between Featherston and Masterton. Three advocated for increasing this speed limit to 100km per hour and one expressed additional general criticism of the State Highway's upgrades. One respondent claimed that speed bumps at crossings and intersections are ‘complete oversized overkill’. Two expressed that low speed limits had negative effects on congestion and productivity.

Need to increase [sic] speed limits to reduce congestion.

Cycle related safety

12 comments

Several respondents wrote about the safety of cyclists. Most of these submitters supported enhancements to cycle safety through investment in bike lanes and paths. Here is a sample of these comments:

Investments in public transport and safe cycle paths are more important than private cars.

Safety is a big concern for cyclists so continuing development of cycle lanes is necessary to get less confident cyclists out cycling safely and children cycling to school.

Three respondents raised concerns about cycle safety in specific locations, including the incomplete cycle lanes around the Basin Reserve and Berhampore Hill, the lack of a cycle lane along the Seatoun Bays to the Airport Subway Cycleway, and the Tawa to Johnsonville cycle route.

Two respondents suggested cycleways were impeding on car safety by reducing vehicles' road space, including the following comment:

The cycle lanes are out of control and create dangerous situations where cars have to veer into oncoming traffic especially the ones that have barriers.

Resilience

14 comments

NB: comments that related specifically to public transport resilience were analysed under the Public Transport Capacity Priority topic.

A small number of respondents discussed matters related to the resilience of the region's transport system. Comments covered a variety of topics and reflected unique perspectives.

One respondent requested that funding be based on the resilience of a mode of transport, and that planning of transport infrastructure be contingent upon its viability in an emergency. Another argued that prioritizing resilience should not be used as "an excuse for building more roads". Others simply stated that transport resilience needs to be invested in or prioritised.

A few comments included reference to specific locations, with one respondent suggesting that more resilience should be built into the Remutaka Hill Road and Wairarapa Region, while another proposed building a link to the Hutt Valley under a seawall on the foreshore to adapt to rising sea levels. One respondent expressed reservations about the proposed Petone to Grenada road in the RLTP, citing a lack of information about its resilience as a route in the event of an earthquake.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington stated that they supported increasing the Investment Priority weighting of Resilience from 10% to 20%, asserting that a resilient transport network is essential for withstanding extreme weather events.

Ia Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand expressed approval of the Plan's recognition of major weather events and advocated for the weighting of Resilience as an investment priority to be increased from 20% to 30%.

Priority Significant Activities List

Respondents were asked to identify whether each of the 30 Priority Significant Activities' priority ranking was appropriate or whether it needed to be adjusted.

This section also presents the commentary made by respondents in response to the survey's open-ended question that relates to specific Significant Activities.

A summary of the appraisal of all activities is presented in the last section of the report (Page 73).

Key findings

Summary of multi-choice questions

- > The five projects with the highest percentage of *about right* rankings were:
 - #11: Wellington Region Resilience Programme – **54%**
 - #9: Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport Assets – **54%**
 - #13: Bus Hubs and Layovers – **52%**
 - #10: Riverlink - Te Awa Kairangi Improvements – **49%**
 - #15: State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvements Programme – **45%**
- > The five projects with the highest percentage of *should be a higher priority* rankings were:
 - #16: Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand – **61%**
 - #3: Metro Rail - Developing and Enabling Future Capacity – **50%**
 - #1: Rail Network Resilience – **48%**
 - #2: Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity – **46%**
 - #12: Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme – **39%**
- > The five projects with the highest percentage of *should be a lower priority* rankings were:
 - #5: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) – SH1 Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Reserve Upgrades – **28%**
 - #8: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) – Petone to Grenada and the Cross Valley Link – **27%**
 - #26: Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension – **24%**
 - #21: SH59 Mackays to Linden – **22%**
 - #7: Regional Cycle Network – **21%**

Key findings – cont.

Summary of comments

- > 22 of the 30 Significant Activities were referenced by respondents.
- > The most discussed Significant Activity was #5 – *Wellington Roads of National Significance (1)* which was commented on by 35 respondents. Sentiment was mixed, with equal numbers of comments expressing support and opposition to the activity. Opposition primarily concerned cost effectiveness and preference for investment into public and active transport options. Some respondents who expressed support cited the need to ease congestion and improve connectivity, whilst others framed it as an opportunity to include public and active transport connections and infrastructure development as part of the project.
- > The next most frequently discussed Significant Activity was #8 *Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2)* which was commented on by around 20 respondents. These respondents typically expressed opposition to this proposal, questioning the effectiveness of the investment and the capability of the project to deliver its stated aims.
- > Significant Activity #4 *Wellington Rapid Transit Bus Corridors*, with close to 10 respondents articulating various concerns and suggestions. Concerns tended to pertain to project specifics such as the project’s location, connections, and accessibility.
- > All other activities received commentary from no more than 3 respondents each.


Priority Significant Activities List rankings

Respondents were asked to rate 30 *significant activities* by responding to this question: *We want to know what you think about this list. There are 30 programmes of activities in total*

Response Options included: This should be a higher priority; It's about right; This should be a lower priority; This shouldn't be included in the significant activities list; I don't know.


The full results for each question are presented in the charts below, from the first activity to the thirtieth activity.

1 RAIL NETWORK RESILIENCE




- > Higher priority–48%; It's about right–44%; Lower priority–5%; Shouldn't be included–2%; I don't know–1%

2 COMPLETING METRO RAIL RESILIENCE AND CAPACITY




- > Higher priority–46%; It's about right–43%; Lower priority–5%; Shouldn't be included–2%; I don't know–3%

3 METRO RAIL - DEVELOPING AND ENABLING FUTURE CAPACITY




- > Higher priority–50%; It's about right–40%; Lower priority–6%; Shouldn't be included–2%; I don't know–2%

4 WELLINGTON RAPID TRANSIT BUS CORRIDORS PROGRAMME




- > Higher priority–38%; It's about right–41%; Lower priority–13%; Shouldn't be included–5%; I don't know–3%

5 WELLINGTON REGION ROAD OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE (1) – SH1 MT VICTORIA TUNNEL AND BASIN RESERVE UPGRADES




- > Higher priority–30%; It's about right–18%; Lower priority–28%; Shouldn't be included–22%; I don't know–3%

6 NATIONAL TICKETING SOLUTION (NTS)




- > Higher priority–28%; It's about right–34%; Lower priority–20%; Shouldn't be included–9%; I don't know–10%

7 REGIONAL CYCLE NETWORK




- > Higher priority–31%; It's about right–25%; Lower priority–21%; Shouldn't be included–23%; I don't know–1%

8 WELLINGTON REGION ROAD OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE (2) – PETONE TO GRENADA AND THE CROSS VALLEY LINK




- > Higher priority–27%; It's about right–23%; Lower priority–27%; Shouldn't be included–24%

9 ASSET CONTROL – DEPOTS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT ASSETS




- > Higher priority–20%; It's about right–54%; Lower priority–11%; Shouldn't be included–5%; I don't know–11%

10 RIVERLINK - TE AWA KAIRANGI IMPROVEMENTS




- > Higher priority–20%; It's about right–49%; Lower priority–12%; Shouldn't be included–6%; I don't know–13%

11 WELLINGTON REGION RESILIENCE PROGRAMME




- > Higher priority–28%; It's about right–54%; Lower priority–7%; Shouldn't be included–1%; I don't know–9%

12 PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY ACTION PLAN PROGRAMME




- > Higher priority–39%; It's about right–45%; Lower priority–8%; Shouldn't be included–3%; I don't know–6%

13 BUS HUBS AND LAYOVERS




- > Higher priority–23%; It's about right–52%; Lower priority–13%; Shouldn't be included–5%; I don't know–7%

14 ACCESS KENEPURU (NEW PHASES)




- > Higher priority–10%; It's about right–41%; Lower priority–17%; Shouldn't be included–6%; I don't know–26%

15 STATE HIGHWAY VALUE FOR MONEY SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME




- > Higher priority–15%; It's about right–45%; Lower priority–20%; Shouldn't be included–10%; I don't know–10%

16 BUS NETWORK GROWTH TO MEET PUBLIC TRANSPORT DEMAND




- > Higher priority–61%; It's about right–31%; Lower priority–5%; Shouldn't be included–2%; I don't know–2%

17 WELLINGTON REGIONAL HOSPITAL TRAVEL ACTION PLAN INITIATIVE




- > Higher priority–38%; It's about right–44%; Lower priority–5%; Shouldn't be included–2%; I don't know–12%

18 KĀINGA ORA EAST PORIRUA REGENERATION PROGRAMME




- > Higher priority–16%; It's about right–40%; Lower priority–12%; Shouldn't be included–8%; I don't know–23%

19 FERGUSSON DRIVE ARTERIAL LINK IMPROVEMENTS




- > Higher priority–11%; It's about right–32%; Lower priority–21%; Shouldn't be included–7%; I don't know–29%

20 PARAPARAUMU METROPOLITAN CENTRE CONNECTIONS




- > Higher priority–12%; It's about right–41%; Lower priority–15%; Shouldn't be included–5%; I don't know–28%

21 SH59 MACKAYS TO LINDEN




- > Higher priority–7%; It's about right–36%; Lower priority–22%; Shouldn't be included–9%; I don't know–25%

22 SH2 MASTERTON SOUTH COMMERCIAL VEHICLE REGIONAL SAFETY CENTRE




- > Higher priority–7%; It's about right–32%; Lower priority–19%; Shouldn't be included–11%; I don't know–31%

23 WATERLOO STATION TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD)




- > Higher priority–27%; It's about right–35%; Lower priority–8%; Shouldn't be included–4%; I don't know–25%

24 MASTERTON NORTH: CONNECTING COMMUNITIES




- > Higher priority–14%; It's about right–34%; Lower priority–11%; Shouldn't be included–6%; I don't know–34%

25 HUTT CITY COUNCIL LED STREETLIGHTS UPGRADE




- > Higher priority–11%; It's about right–39%; Lower priority–17%; Shouldn't be included–14%; I don't know–18%

26 WELLINGTON TRANSPORT OPERATIONS CENTRE BUILDING EXTENSION




- > Higher priority–8%; It's about right–35%; Lower priority–24%; Shouldn't be included–9%; I don't know–24%

27 SMARTER NETWORK TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION PROGRAMME




- > Higher priority–23%; It's about right–43%; Lower priority–10%; Shouldn't be included–6%; I don't know–18%

28 HUTT CITY TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS - LOCAL ROAD PARKING DENSITY




- > Higher priority–11%; It's about right–31%; Lower priority–19%; Shouldn't be included–14%; I don't know–25%

29 WHITFORD BROWN/PAPAKOWHAI ROAD INTERSECTION UPGRADES



- > Higher priority–9%; It's about right–31%; Lower priority–15%; Shouldn't be included–9%; I don't know–37%

30 LINCOLNSHIRE FARM NEW ROAD



- > Higher priority–4%; It's about right–22%; Lower priority–17%; Shouldn't be included–14%; I don't know–43%

Significant Activities commentary

Respondents were also asked: *Is there anything else you would like to share with us about transport in the Wellington Region?*

This section analyses responses to the above question which referred to specific Significant Activities. A full addendum of the 30 Significant Activities is also included on Page 72.

Note on commentary from Health NZ:

Health NZ provided a table which visually displayed the anticipated impacts of each programme on six key areas: Death and Serious Injury (DSIs), Physical Activity, Air Pollution, Noise Pollution, Climate Change, and Equity and Accessibility. Brief comments on the activities were also provided in the table. Health NZ comments in this section are derived from this table and are therefore not included in total comment numbers.

1 Rail Network Resilience

2 comments

One individual respondent specifically commented on the Wellington Rail Network improvements, which relates to Significant Activity Priority #1. Here is the comment:

Wellington Rail Network needs a lot of improvements, cleaning up of stations and rail corridors as well as cleaning or upgrading Wellington station even though it is a heritage building it could use some work.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington identified this activity as a priority.

Health NZ identified this activity as having likely neutral or no impact on all key areas (DSIs, Physical activity, Air pollution, Noise Pollution, Climate Change, and Equity and Accessibility).

2 Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity

2 comments

One individual respondent specifically commented on the Significant Activity Priority #2, critiquing the lack of action on Rail Scenario 1 and suggesting that the project would have been completed at a lower cost had it been actioned earlier.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington identified this activity as a priority.

Health NZ identified likely positive impacts on Physical activity and Equity and Accessibility and a negative impact on Noise Pollution.

3 Metro Rail – Developing and Enabling Future Capacity

3 comments

A few respondents discussed Significant Activity Priority #3. Support for this activity was propagated by submissions from organisations (see below), though one criticised the prioritisation of local metro services over national freight.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington identified this activity as a priority.

Bus and Coach Association NZ supported this activity as part of their support for investment in metro rail.

Health NZ identified likely positive outcomes on Physical activity, Air pollution, Noise Pollution, Climate Change, and Equity and Accessibility. Equitable access depended on the affordability and availability of extended services.

4 Wellington Rapid Transit Bus Corridors Programme

12 comments

Several respondents made comments related to components of Significant Activity Priority #4. Some of these comments were critical of this plan, including:

- > A suggestion that the East-West bus corridor has no clear West elements
- > Questioning of the Miramar to Airport focus, compared to the CBD to Seatoun link
- > Criticism that the Golden Mile project is not a good use of funds and that an additional bus spine is unnecessary.
- > Criticism that the Golden Mile and Thorndon Quay developments are destructive and impede vehicle movement.
- > A suggestion that the Airport link should be given lower priority.

A couple of respondents proposed public transport connections between Lower Hutt and Hutt Valley to Wellington Hospital and Wellington Airport.

One respondent expressed general support for the investment into public transport.

The cancelling of light rail is very unfortunate, but it has also shown us that we cannot rely on Labour to achieve PT outcomes. Therefore, if National are going to come to the party on implementing rapid bus corridors we simply must take the money and run with it as hard as we can. Real life improvements will be more useful than better ideas sat untouched in a filing cabinet, and Wellington already has a healthy bus culture that will embrace reliable bus transport in dedicated corridors.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington stated that the Harbour Quays Bus Corridor is unnecessary. Instead, they suggested that the Golden Mile route could be made more efficient through the refusal of cash payments and boarding of passengers from both bus doors.

The **Blind Citizens Assembly** (Wellington Branch) also criticised the Harbour Quay route, stating that the hubs would not be accessible, particularly in the winter.

Bus and Coach Association NZ showed general support for the investment in rapid transit bus corridors.

Health NZ identified likely positive impacts on Physical activity and Equity and Accessibility. Positive outcomes for Air pollution, Noise Pollution, Climate Change were anticipated with electrification of the bus fleet. A negative impact on Death and Serious Injury (DSIS) was also anticipated due to an increase in buses, cyclists and pedestrians.

5 Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) 39 comments

A moderate number of comments related to components of Significant Activity Priority #5. Around half of the respondents who commented upon this topic opposed aspects of the proposal. These submitters expressed concerns about the projected cost of the project and advocated for the alternative prioritisation of public and active transport options. Improving public and active transport infrastructure was asserted to be a more effective investment to reduce congestion.

Good, affordable public transport is the best way to reduce traffic especially at peak hours. Spending huge sums on a new Mt Victoria tunnel is like using a hammer to crack a nut as traffic congestion both ways is limited to less than an hour each way. And, by say Auckland standards, it isn't really congestion at all as it keeps moving. That \$2.2bn (it will be actually a lot more than that - Transmission Gully ended up costing 100% over its original cost of \$750m) could make a big difference if used to fund more bus lanes, electric buses and more cycle lanes etc.

The other half of respondents expressed general and conditional support for the activity. Submitters stated that this change would improve access and solve current traffic flow issues. Often, respondents specifically noted the need for improved connections to the airport.

Construction of the 2nd Mt Vic Tunnel and Basin Reserve improvements is overdue by at least 20 years.

Other submitters framed the development as an opportunity to prioritise public or active transport routes. Respondents' conditional support was often contingent upon the provision of alternative transport options and other roading changes to ease congestion.

Just an aside on the Mt Vic bus tunnel situation. If we're adding a tunnel (total 3), then the current bus tunnel should become walking/biking and the new tunnel should be a two-way bus/light rail tunnel. (grr the current national govt).

We need another Mt Vic tunnel with good pedestrian and cycling access through it. As far as motorways go rather than building mega tunnel should look at finishing motorway with second terrace tunnel and 4 lanes all the way.

Second Mt Vic tunnel will not fix congestion south bound without also finishing motorway that was never built to capacity. Single southbound lane through terrace tunnel is major bottleneck only for it to go back into multiple lanes after tunnel.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington characterised this project as nationally significant, providing an effective connection from Wellington Airport and the Eastern suburbs to the rest of the region.

la Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand praised this activity as improving the efficiency, safety and resilience of the regional transport network through strategic access.

The **Hutt Cycle Network** opposed this activity, characterising it as a continuation of “dramatic investment” into roading.

Health NZ identified likely negative impacts on Death and Serious Injury, Physical activity, Air pollution, Noise Pollution, and Climate Change due to a projected increase in road vehicle use from the project.

6 National Ticketing Solution (NTS) 3 comments

A couple of comments were made in support of National Ticketing Solution Priority #6. Respondents asserted that this would improve transport accessibility, particularly in the context of inter-regional travel.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington identified this project as one of national significance.

Health NZ identified this activity as having likely neutral or no impact on all key areas. Impact on equity was contingent upon the affordability of fare options.

7 Regional Cycle Network 3 comment

One respondent spoke to the Hutt Valley specifics of Significant Activity Priority #7. They requested plans be enhanced to connect Melling to Upper Hutt, and suggested the rail corridor could be used to supply a cycling path between Silverstream and Upper Hutt.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington identified this activity as a priority.

Whilst stating support for cycling as an active transport mode, the **Disabled Persons Assembly**, expressed concern about the placement of cycleways becoming a safety risk for the local disabled community and recommended that disabled people should be consulted during their design.

Health NZ identified this activity as having likely positive impacts on all key areas through improved cyclist safety, encouraging a mode-shift to cycling, and improving environmental and health outcomes.

8 Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) 23 comments

All but two comments pertaining to Activity #8 reflected opposition or concerns regarding the project. Respondents predominantly questioned the effectiveness of investment into this activity and whether it would achieve the outcomes cited such as increasing transport network resilience and easing congestion. Opposition typically included lengthy and specific critiques of the activity and suggestions for preferred developments. Respondents generally agreed that this project should not be a high priority.

Other projects which specifically should be de-prioritized include the cross-valley link, it is argued this will open up new housing and reduce congestion. These are antithetical outcomes, if additional housing is constructed (and much of the area serviced by this road is already urbanized) the additional travel demand will undermine any improvement in congestion within the time this housing is built out. A much better option would be removing parking and the grass median from the Petone esplanade if additional capacity must be attained.

The Petone to Grenada road and cross valley link seem to run counter to what the plan proposed as developing a multi-modal integrated regional plan. From my perspective it would just encourage urban sprawl and associated costs/traffic and there may be other better value for money propositions to ease congestion East-West in the Hutt before building this major new road.

This activity was also included in blanket statements opposing both Wellington Region Roads of National Significance (see Significant Activity #5 – Wellington Region Road of National Significance).

The two Roads of National Significance should be removed from the list. They need to be turned into multi-agency investigation with a focus on accessibility not mobility. There is a leap into a preferred infrastructure solution that isn't good practice or resilient. What are the problems these two RONS are trying to address? We should be considering reducing not increasing high maintenance hilly roads with low density car dependent Greenfields. We need to consider are the RONS the best place to have these roads?

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington identified this project as one of national significance.

Ia Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand praised this activity, noting that it would improve the efficiency, safety and resilience of the regional transport network through strategic access.

The **Hutt Cycle Network** expressed opposition to this development, arguing that this project reflects an over-prioritisation of motor vehicles and does not consider future sea level rises which are projected to submerge the proposed connection.

Health NZ identified likely negative impacts on DSIs, Physical activity, Air pollution, Noise Pollution, and Climate Change due to a projected increase in road vehicle use from the project.

9 Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport

Assets

1 comment

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The **Bus and Coach Association NZ** penned a highly detailed submission opposing the control of depots and bus assets by local authorities, arguing that the private sector is sufficiently equipped to provide public transport services and asserting that other services, namely charter, tour and transport services for the Ministry of Education, would be compromised.

Health NZ identified this activity as having likely neutral or no impact on all key areas.

10 Riverlink – Te Awa Kairangi Improvements

6 comments

A small number of comments expressed criticism and made suggestions regarding Significant Activity Priority #10. Concerns included the following:

- > Potential impact on the development of a Melling-Manor Park rail link should be included in the review of this project.
- > The Riverlink should extend the Meling Line further north
- > Funding should be properly secured for the Riverlink walking and cycling tracks.
- > Traffic in Kelson will be affected.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington identified this activity as a priority.

The **Disabled Persons Assembly** supported for the project for enhancing accessibility and reducing flood risk from the Hutt River. Continual prioritisation of the project was encouraged.

The **Hutt Cycle Network** expressed concerns about the project, arguing that it signifies a regression in cycling infrastructure and actively improves motor vehicle user experience whilst dedicating only minor improvements for users of other modes of transport.

Health NZ identified this activity as having likely positive impacts on all key areas through local roading improvements enhancing access and safety, as improvements to active transport infrastructure would decrease DSIs. Decreasing congestion and improving access to active transport was also noted to have generally positive impacts on health.

11 Wellington Region Resilience Programme

3 comments

A couple of respondents discussed Significant Activity Priority #11, articulating the following points:

- > Excluding Chaytor Street resilience strengthening, there are no planned improvements for the Western suburbs of Wellington.
- > A business case of the Ngauranga Interchange should be completed before developing a Greenfield transport route that diverts traffic from the interchange.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

AA Wellington identified this activity as a priority.

Health NZ characterised this activity as beneficial to Accessibility, Equity, and Climate change mitigation. Increasing resilience to natural disasters was associated with climate resilience and the improvement of access to essential services.

12 Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan

Programme

1 comment

One respondent suggested that a bus stop should be moved to the Johnsonville mall carpark to mitigate unsafe crossing behaviour between the rail platform and library.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified this activity as having likely positive impacts on all key areas for disabled people.

13 Bus Hubs and Layovers

1 comment

One respondent asserted that the development of bus hubs is disruptive to residents and that residents should have more say in decision-making.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified this activity as having likely positive impacts on Physical Activity, Noise pollution, and Equity and Accessibility. Accommodating growth in service user demand would benefit health. Positive outcomes to Air pollution and Climate change were anticipated depending on the provision of EV charging for electric buses.

14 Access Kenepuru (new phases)

0 comments

No comments were made that specifically related to Significant Activity Priority #14.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified this activity as having likely neutral or no impact on all key areas, the net effect on health outcomes depending on how local roading and active transport improvements are prioritised.

15 State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvement Programme **1 comment**

One comment opposed the inclusion of funding for policing activities within this project, stating that they shouldn't use a transport budget to deliver this.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified the potential for this activity's safety improvements for existing highway networks to decrease DSIs.

16 Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand **0 comments**

No comments were made that specifically referenced Significant Activity Priority #16.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified likely positive impacts on Physical activity and Equity and Accessibility. Positive outcomes for Air pollution, Noise Pollution, Climate Change were anticipated with electrification of the bus fleet.

17 Wellington Regional Hospital Travel Action Plan Initiative **2 comments**

A couple of respondents bemoaned that cycling and public transport are not given enough priority, one discussing negative experiences of using public transport to access Wellington Hospital.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified likely positive impacts on Physical activity, Air pollution, Noise Pollution, Climate Change, and Equity and Accessibility.

18 Kāinga Ora East Porirua Regeneration Programme **0 comments**

No comments were made that specifically related to Significant Activity Priority #18.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified likely positive impacts on all key areas as well as improvements to multiple determinants of health. Street reconfiguration was anticipated to potentially decrease DSIs.

19 Fergusson Drive Arterial Link Improvements **1 comment**

One respondent expressed disappointment at the lack of improvements slated for Upper Hutt aside from Activity #19, which they proposed should be replaced with various public and active transport improvements.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified likely negative impacts on DSIs, Physical activity, Air pollution, Noise Pollution, and Climate Change due to a projected increase in motor vehicle use.

20 Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Connections **1 comment**

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The Kāpiti Coast District Council called for the Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Connections project to be placed higher on the funding priority list.

Health NZ noted that overall health impacts are dependent on the balance between the negative outcomes of increasing roads and the positive effects of active transport promotion within this activity.

21 SH59 Mackays to Linden **1 comment**

One respondent questioned why activity #21 was included in the list of priorities due to the existing availability of off-ramps on the motorway.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ stated that any impacts to health are dependent on the nature of development and the provision of roads, cycleways and walkways.

22 SH2 Masterton South Commercial Vehicle Regional Safety Centre **2 comments**

One comment expressed scepticism that the number of crash and fatalities warranted a regional safety centre in Wairarapa.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The Horizons Regional Council expressed support for this activity.

Health NZ identified a likely positive impact on DSIs.

23 Waterloo Station Transit Oriented Development **1 comment**

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The **Blind Citizens Assembly** commented that station upgrades, such as the proposed Waterloo station development, provides an opportunity to make accessibility improvements and could guide future development for other stations.

Health NZ identified likely neutral impacts on all key areas.

24 Masterton North Connecting Communities

0 comments

No comments were made that specifically related to Significant Activity Priority #24.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ stated that health impacts are dependent on the nature of development and the provision of roads, cycleways and walkways.

25 Hutt City Council LED Streetlights Upgrade

3 comments

A few respondents discussed Significant Activity Priority #25, articulating the following points:

- > The number and brightness of lights needs to be considered to prevent light pollution.
- > This project would be easy to deliver and is a comparatively small investment.
- > Hutt City has already upgraded to LED lights.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified a likely positive impact on Climate change due to the use of LED lights over HPS.

26 Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension

0 comments

No comments were made that specifically related to Significant Activity Priority #26.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified likely neutral impacts on all key areas.

27 Smarter Network Technology and Innovation Programme

0 comments

No comments were made that specifically related to Significant Activity Priority #27.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified likely neutral impacts on all key areas.

28 Hutt City Transport Improvements - Local Road Parking Density **0 comments**

No comments were made that specifically related to Significant Activity Priority #28.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified likely no or neutral impacts on all key areas. They noted that there are potential safety benefits to this activity, and that improved access to residential parking could improve accessibility. However, there may be an increase in road vehicle use.

29 Whitford Brown-Papakōwhai Road Intersection Upgrades **0 comments**

No comments were made that specifically related to Significant Activity Priority #29.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ identified likely positive impacts on DSIs, Physical activity, Air Pollution, Noise pollution, and Climate Change.

30 Lincolnshire Farm New Road **1 comment**

One comment was made opposing the development, stating that only a private landowner would benefit.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ stated that health impacts are dependent on the nature of development and the provision of roads, cycleways and walkways.

Any other comments

Respondents were also asked: *Is there anything else you would like to share with us about transport in the Wellington Region?*

This section analyses all further responses to the above question that did not relate to either the five Investment Priorities or the 30 Significant Activities. A series of themes that emerged from these responses are outlined and analysed below.

Key findings

- > Environment and transport was the most frequently discussed theme, receiving commentary from close to 30 respondents. Transport emissions and Generalised environmental concerns were sub-themes of this topic. Respondents asked council to invest into public transport infrastructure and facilitate mode-shifting away from motor vehicles to meet emissions targets and reduce environmental impacts.
- > Car-centric support was an equally prominent additional theme, raised by around 30 respondents. Street widening or narrowing emerged as a sub-theme within this topic. These respondents generally specified the roading or parking infrastructure they wanted enhanced or amended.
- > General comments noting concerns, support or suggestions regarding the Mid-term Review were raised by close to 20 respondents. Several critiqued the lack of long-term focus and measurable outcomes within the RLTP. Various criticisms pertained to the consultation process itself and a few comments indicated general support for the RLTP.
- > Remaining comments reflected support for effective government investment, car taxes and subsidies, support for the maintenance of existing infrastructure, and discussion of population growth as it pertains to transport planning. All remaining commentary was either one-off in nature or unclear; these comments have been themed within the Miscellaneous category.

Environment and transport

Transport emissions

20 comments

A moderate number of respondents expressed support for a reduction of transport emissions, citing better environmental and health outcomes. Most of these comments included a recommendation to reduce car use. Proposals included improving public transport, including calls for more electric busses and bus priority lanes, and improving rail transport and access to train stations. Respondents also advocated for the improvement of active transport infrastructure.

High priority for bus, rail and cycling as well as pedestrians in our city and regions. We need to always be focused on mitigating the effects of climate

change and reduction of emissions as well as moving people safely around the region.

Most importantly, the RLTP should be designed to improve public transport and make cycling, walking safer to get people out of their cars, thus cutting emissions and reducing the necessity for more road building programmes, which will keep people in their cars and increase emissions, making it impossible for the region and NZ as a whole to meet obligations under the Paris climate accords. [...] Our region is already too full of cars. 70% of trips in Wellington City are made by car (it will be far higher in other parts of the region) and we need to get this down to European levels of 30-40%. The aim should be to make our region far less car-centric, which will have huge health benefits through reduction of air and noise pollution and an increase in active transport modes.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Ia Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand noted that the GPS no longer has emission reductions as a strategic priority.

Doctors for Active, Safe Transport supported active transport projects, and noted that they reduce transport emissions. The organisation also encouraged the long-term funding of integrated cycle and rapid transport networks, as recommended by the Climate Change Commission.

Health NZ was in favour of prioritising active and public transport infrastructure. They stated that the resulting reduction of pollutants from transport would have significant benefits for cardiovascular and respiratory health and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The **Hutt Cycle Network** raised concern that little has been done since 2021 to reach the 2021 RLTP's carbon emission goals, and that more should be done to reach these goals. They noted that cycling is significantly more environmentally friendly than other modes of transport.

Kāpiti Coast District Council also asserted that improving public transport options is essential for achieving climate emission reduction targets.

Environmental impacts and climate change 13 comments

Several respondents raised general concerns about the impacts of transport on the environment and climate change, and vice versa. These included advocacy for greater resilience planning, more reliable public transport, and less roads being built for private vehicles.

Save The Basin Campaign believes that because of the Climate Emergency we cannot afford to prioritise valuable resources on another Mt Vic road tunnel for private vehicles over mitigation and resilience. We have a unique opportunity in Wellington to build on infrastructure for Public Transport initiatives.

In the face of immediate climate change threats, resilience planning should include planning for how we operate with reduced capacity for sustained periods of time. We may need to be ready to pivot to public transport and to live with degraded roads for longer periods of time. Where such choices are needed, a focus on public transportation should be preferred over individual vehicles.

A few comments raised concerns about sea level rise, including concerns with the building of susceptible roads such as the Cross-Valley Link.

Are we considering managed retreat on roads that will eventually succumb to climate change? Building a RONS that is going to be very susceptible to climate change like the Petone to Grenda connection and Cross-Valley Link makes no sense.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Ira Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand raised concerns about major weather events and stated that resilience and strategic access should be prioritised to support the transport system and supply chain in the case of such events.

Doctors for Active, Safe Transport argued for the reduction of private motor vehicles on environmental and health grounds.

Health NZ discussed the impacts of environmental noise pollution from road traffic noise and called for greater prioritisation of public transport infrastructure. Health NZ argued that more travel choices would encourage more efficient travel and incentivise the use of public transport, thus reducing noise pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Similarly, they proposed that increased investment in active transport infrastructure would lead to better environmental outcomes.

Electrification

5 comments

A small number of respondents expressed support for the electrification of buses, ferries, and train lines.

Continue conversion to electric buses and ferry.

A few commenters also supported a general uptake of private electric vehicles in the region.

*EV pay half price congestion charge for the first five years, to also encourage uptake of EV in Wellington.
Exempt only registered service, emergency and delivery vehicles.*

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Horizons Regional Council expressed support for decarbonising the bus fleet.

Support for cars, roads, traffic, and parking

General car-centric support

22 comments

A significant number of respondents expressed general support for cars or requested enhanced car-related infrastructure such as roading and carparking. Some of these comments were generalised and statement-like in nature. Here is a sample of these comments:

Please add car parks to support small businesses.

Don't get rid of a lot of inner-city parks — our public transport is not efficient enough, so people shop elsewhere.

Quality of roading – i.e. durability of surface - potholes - tar bleed etc - very high priority.

Make it easier for people to use private transport.

A small number of respondents made the point that although other modes of transport needed support, private cars were still an important part of the transport system.

Improve cycle access, but don't hammer parking (and make parking more accessible by allowing more cash payments at meters), in fact re-localise parking buildings for local benefit instead of off-shore profit...

One respondent suggested that vehicles with a green light had to wait for pedestrians to finish crossing the road, disrupting traffic flow.

The rest of the comments in this topic included specific references to an area of roading that the respondent deemed problematic or that they wanted enhanced. The following areas were raised:

- > Better roading linking the Hutt Valley, Porirua to hospitals, Wellington Airport and ports
- > Improved access to Riverstone Terrace and State Highway 59
- > Access roads and carparks at Winstone Lakes
- > Restricting the building of housing without off-street parking to increase space on the roads
- > Replacing parking along Vivian Street with an extra traffic lane
- > Upgrading State Highway 58 to include two lanes
- > Replacing traffic lights on State Highway 2 with a fly-over to improve traffic flow.

One respondent praised the development of Transmission Gully and the expressway to Ōtaki, calling these a 'joy' to travel on.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The submission from the **NZ Automobile Association, Wairarapa** included requests for the Waihenga Bridge to be replaced and the building of two roundabouts on State Highway 2 – one at the Cashmere Oaks subdivision and one at the southern end of Greytown.

NB: Comments that included a specific request to prioritise cars ahead of cycleways, without covering any other content, were discussed in the *Travel Choice - Opposition to cyclists and cycleways* sub theme.

Street widening or narrowing

9 comments

Several respondents addressed the width of streets, articulating a variety of sentiment. Two were in support of narrow streets as a deterrent to car travel and an incentive for other modes of transport. Two proposed using wide streets to create public transport thoroughfares, with another requesting the removal of road construction that was obstructing buses. One respondent suggested narrow streets either needed to be car-free or needed to be widened to be useable and went on to suggest adding lanes to streets will increase traffic. Another respondent proposed making the Esplanade four lanes. One respondent questioned why footpaths were becoming wider than roads.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Ia Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand specified that the northern side of Remutaka Hill Road should be widened to make it safer and more efficient.

General comments about the Mid-term Review

General critiques and/or suggestions

11 comments

General critiques and suggestions were articulated by several respondents. As well as broad comments that the RLTP “could be better”, respondents specifically noted the lack of measurable outcomes, the cost of the plan for ratepayers, and the RLTP’s lack of long-term focus.

Fundamentally, governments (and councils) come and go, but a region’s truly strategic story for its development – and the transport investments therein – must be much bigger and more enduring than that. The trajectory of infrastructure investment massively determines urban form, for 50-years plus. A region needs to have a substantively sound trajectory of change for itself, and have identified the necessary investments in major infrastructure to take them along that trajectory. We need to be thanking our earlier selves (and receiving our kids’ thanks) in 30 years’ time, not suffering regrets for our short-sightedness.

A few respondents shared concerns about the breadth of the priorities, proposing that a smaller number of large key projects should be prioritised over miscellaneous smaller projects.

The regional plan needs to prioritise a smaller a number of key large projects that will really improve transport capacity. We have seen the success of transmission gully and the Kapiti expressway, and the 80kph traffic jams at the end of these roads, so the extension of this past levin is the obvious big one. The other obvious major bottleneck to improve is the basin reserve / Mot Vic tunnel. [...] Smaller projects should also be trimmed back so they are not the unaffordable, over-engineered, gold-plated projects we see around the region now.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The **Bus and Coach Association NZ** asserted that the plan should be composed with a greater long-term focus, expressing that today's plans and investments in transport should account for their outcomes throughout the next 30 years.

The **Hutt Cycle Network** shared a broad opposition for the significant activities proposed, as it would "take us significantly backwards". They also criticised the 2021 RLTP for its undelivered emissions, safety, and mode-share targets.

The consultation process

8 comments

Concerns and suggestions regarding the consultation process were raised by several respondents. These comments varied, and included the following:

- > Decisions should consider transport plans and studies in other countries.
- > There should be a way for respondents to see their previous responses to other engagements.
- > There should be a shorter consultation period, and consultation should only be held for the implementation of specific activities, and not the general plan.
- > Weighting strategic priorities against one another neglects how they relate to each other.

One respondent praised the engagement process, stating that it was easy to understand. They also specifically applauded StoryMaps as a "great resource".

General support

3 comments

A few respondents stated their general support for the RLTP. These were succinct, overarching statements of support.

Keep going, a lot of progress has been made, let's keep the momentum up.

Governance and funding

Government spending

10 comments

Several respondents expressed concerns about government spending, budget allocation and criticism of subsequent rates increases. Comments generally called for effective investment and a reduction in wasteful spending.

Spend the \$ where it will have the most impact for most people - and think of a 30yr + window to realise value

A couple of comments emphasised the importance allocating a significant budget to maintenance.

I'm really concerned about the priority placed on the two roads of national significance. The Wellington Regional Council has so many demands on its finances, particularly with regards to needs to develop resilience to changing weather, needs to do up the pipe system and the public transport system, which has been struggling and needs pretty constant repairs.

Governance issues

4 comments

A small number of comments contained general or specific criticisms, including the following points:

- > Wellington City Council are not listening to ratepayers' concerns about proposed increases
- > The Government Policy on Land Transport is too car-centric
- > Government agencies are ill equipped to deliver on 30+ projects
- > One critical comment about the Chairman of the WRC.

Maintain, upgrade and/or prioritise existing infrastructure

7 comments

A small number of respondents placed emphasis on maintaining, investing and prioritising existing infrastructure before working on new projects. A couple of these comments included specific suggestions for SH2 and Wairarapa State highways.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The **NZ Automobile Association, Wairarapa** requested that replacement of the Waihenga Bridge on SH53 and the construction of two roundabouts on SH2 – at the access point to Cashmere Oaks subdivision and at the southern end of Greytown – are included as action points in the RLTP.

Activities for Future Consideration

5 comments

One comment reflected support for the continuation of projects from the 2021 RLTP, while another respondent proposed that the funding allocated for the Kelburn Cable Car strengthening should be redirected elsewhere.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Horizons Regional Council and **Kāpiti Coast District Council** both expressed support for the Lower North Island Rail Integrated Mobility.

Golden Bay Cement, a division of Fletcher Concrete and Infrastructure, expressed that the resilience strengthening of Aotea Quay overbridge would likely impact business operations and sought early stakeholder engagement.

Population growth

4 comments

A few respondents reported that population is set to decrease in Wellington, rather than increase. Another comment proposed roading changes in Cashmere Oaks to accommodate projected population growth.

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

The **NZ Automobile Association, Wairarapa** noted that significant growth is expected in the Cashmere Oaks subdivision, with plans for a new retirement village. The association implored council to upgrade access to SH2 with a roundabout to support these additional residents.

Car tax and subsidy suggestions

4 comments

A small number of respondents made suggestions regarding car taxes and parking. A couple of respondents expressed support for peak time congestion charges. One submitter advocated for free parking for disabled people, and another suggested that suburban residents should pay for parking to discourage residents from owning more than one car per household.

Government partnerships

2 comments

COMMENTS FROM ORGANISATIONS

Health NZ stated support for partnership with mana whenua as an objective of the current RLTP and in the development of the 2027 RLTP.

Kinetic NZ advocated for collaborative public transport service procurement utilising Kinetic NZ's international experience and expertise in Zero Emission Bus procurement and depot design.

Miscellaneous

Unclear or one-off comments

11 comments

Several comments either lacked crucial context or were outside the scope of the discussion.

'No' comments

7 comments

A small number of respondents answered 'no'.

Group submissions

A small number of longer submissions were provided by groups. Any themes that emerged from these submissions were discussed under the appropriate themes in the body of this report. However, a summary of each is provided below for a consolidated snapshot of these organisations' sentiments.

Bus and Coach Association New Zealand

The association is the peak body for bus and coach drivers and personnel. Its submission outlined the following:

- > Its existing position in terms of the length of transport planning strategies, the need for inter-regional public transport network, and its criticisms of current procurement practices.
- > Broad support for the direction of the RTLP, tempered by specific concerns about investment priorities related to Public Transport Capacity.
- > Key points concerned bus driver terms and conditions and the control of depots and public transport assets.

Disabled Persons Assembly NZ

The Disabled Persons Assembly NZ is a pan-impairment organisation run by and for disabled people.

The group proposed amendments to the transport network to enhance its inclusivity, safety, and accessibility, and endorsed the continued implementation of the Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan.

DPA made eight recommendations:

1. Continued investment in making the regional rail network more accessible for disabled people.
2. Continued investment in making the Wellington Rapid Transit Bus network more accessible, including buses and depots.
3. Giving priority funding to the Riverlink project.
4. Ensuring that disabled people are involved in the design on proposed cycle ways.
5. Placing equal investment in the safety of footpaths, cycleways, and rural roads to match that invested in highway safety.
6. Making phone bookings an option for Tawa on-demand services.
7. Ensuring GWRC provides funding for two financial years for mobility vehicle fit outs to be undertaken.
8. Ensuring GWRC and Waka Kotahi increase the amount that mobility drivers get paid per customer.

Doctors for Active, Safe Transport

The advocacy group Doctors for Active, Safe Transport provided extensive background into the health benefits of active transport modes, especially cycling.

The group advocated for cycling to be given higher priority in the RLTP due to the positive health impacts of this transport mode, especially when compared to the perceived negative health impacts of cars.

Entrada Travel Group (InterCity)

Entrada Travel Group, parent company to land-based transport operator InterCity, expressed concern that the Lower North Island Rail Integrated Mobility would create an “unlevel playing field” for transport service delivery for the Wellington-Palmerston North Corridor connection.

The submission stated that InterCity connections to the rest of the North Island are dependent on revenue streams generated from this connection and that the economic viability of this service provision would be compromised with decreased patronage from this connection, limiting the overall transport options available to Wellington residents.

The group stated that RLTP objectives could be better achieved at a lower cost through collaboration and integrated planning with commercial operators such as InterCity.

Golden Bay Cement (Fletcher Concrete and Infrastructure)

Cement manufacturer Golden Bay Cement, a division of Fletcher Concrete and Infrastructure Ltd provided a submission that stated the need for prior and early engagement on the Earthquake Resilience Strengthening/Exploring Replacement Options of the Aotea Quay Overbridge within the ‘Other Activities’ section of the RLTP.

The submission identified the company as an affected party of the development due to its Wellington Service centre being adjacent to the Aotea State Overbridge. The company noted that extensive construction works may impact its operations and service delivery.

Health New Zealand | Te Whatu Ora National Public Health Service (Health NZ)

Health New Zealand | Te Whatu Ora National Public Health Service provided extensive background in its submission as to the health impacts of the transport system, including how this relates to inequitable health outcomes. Key points included:

- > An overview of the relationship between transport and road deaths or serious injuries, physical activity, air quality, noise pollution, climate change, and equity and accessibility.
- > Support for partnering with mana whenua on the RLTP.
- > A request to prioritise public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure and an outline of the health benefits of doing so, including reduced road deaths or serious injuries, improved physical activity, improved air quality, reduced noise pollution, a reduction in emissions, and improved equity and accessibility.

A table was provided which visually rated the anticipated impacts for each Significant Activity, with brief comments, on six key areas: Death and Serious Injury (DSIs), Physical Activity, Air Pollution, Noise Pollution, Climate Change, and Equity and Accessibility. These are detailed for each project within the topic Significant Activities commentary, Page 4241.

Horizons Regional Council

The Horizons Regional Council's submission focused heavily on inter-regional connections, including suggestions for enhanced connections as well as reference to the existing inter-regional activities listed in the Horizons RLTP. Key points of its submission included:

- > Stating its core focus is to provide a connected, efficient, reliable, and environmentally friendly transport system.
- > Highlighting State Highway 1 and 2, North Island Main Truck line, and the Wairarapa line as key inter-regional corridors, as they are pertinent for recreation, economics and emergency management. It noted safety here as a critical consideration.
- > Noting the key role the Horowhenua and Kāpiti Coast play across both Horizons and Greater Wellington, and the need for enhanced public transport connections here as well as along the Northern Corridor.
- > Highlighting the key role Horizons plays in the inter-regional freight scene, with reference to links to various ports.
- > Suggesting that both councils' transport plans align, considering the connection between the two.

Horowhenua District Council

The Council's submission included an introduction describing the region's significant population growth and outlining its various strategies and plans that respond to this.

The submission expressed support for the following:

- > Safe, resilient, effective Inter-regional corridors via road and rail

- > Enhanced inter-regional public transport connectivity to support commuters, reduce reliance on cars, and connect people to key services.
- > Support for the Significant Activity 6 - National Ticketing Solution.
- > Support for any upgrades to Centre Port to encourage inter-regional freight movements.

Hutt Cycle Network

The network's submission focused heavily on the need for a shift in transport modes towards cycling and expressed criticism of perceived inaction on the RTLP's emissions reductions, safety, and mode shift targets.

- > Mode shift was offered as a central mechanism for quickly, cheaply and effectively delivering on the GWRC's transport objectives.
- > The network cited RTLP's Significant Activities #10 Riverlink – Te Awa Kairangi Improvements and the Roads of National Significance plan, specifically #8 Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) - the Cross Valley Link as contexts where the RTLP falls short of achieving these targets and prioritises service improvements for motor vehicle users.

Ia Ara Aotearoa - Transporting New Zealand

Ia Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand is a national membership association representing the road freight transport industry. Their submission that made the following points:

- > Proposal to reweight the Transport Investment Priorities, requesting an increased focus on Resilience (proposed weighting of 30%) and Strategic Access (proposed weighting of 25%), as recent weather events and the COVID-19 pandemic have emphasised the pertinence of these needs.
- > They suggested that this proposed adjusted weighting would better align with the draft GPS 2024, changes in the transport scene, and the views of its membership.
- > Shifting these priorities would require an adjustment to the Significant Activities list, with greater priority being placed on roading improvements and maintenance.
- > The association also proposed widening Remutaka Hill Road to improve safety and access.

Kāpiti Coast District Council

The Kāpiti Coast District Council noted the projected population growth of the Western growth corridor. The council characterised several key transport interventions as imperative to the liveability of a densified Kāpiti. These included:

- > Enhancement of public transport services and crucial connections within the region. For the council, mode-shifting to public transport would alleviate climate emissions and enable vulnerable populations to access services, such as healthcare or employment opportunities.
- > Higher prioritization of Significant Activity #20, the Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Connections project. The council asserts that the swift actioning of this project would relieve congestion in and around Kāpiti's town centre, assist vulnerable people's strategic access to the town centre and adjacent services, and encourage development due to the release of a large swathe of land.
- > Improvement of accessibility to public transport (through more reliable and ubiquitous connections and potential rail services) would help marginalised communities to reach critical services. This is particularly relevant to the inter-regional context, as many opportunities are concentrated in the regions' urban centres.

Kinetic NZ

Kinetic NZ, Operator of Metlink buses in Wellington, included a submission that made the following points:

- > The need for a long-term and bipartisan national strategy extending at least 30 years.
- > The need for initiatives to attract and retain public transport personnel and improve working conditions.
- > Opposition to the asset control of bus depots by local authorities due to the private sector being better suited for this role.
- > a proposal for collaborative public transport service procurement utilising Kinetic NZ's international experience and expertise in Zero Emission Bus procurement and depot design.

NZ Automotive Association, Wairarapa

The association's submission requested for the following activities to be included in the RLTP:

- > A replacement of the Waihenga Bridge on SH53 prior to Martinborough.
- > The addition of a roundabout on SH2 at the access to the Cashmere Oaks subdivision.
- > The addition of a roundabout on SH2 at the southern end of Greytown at the intersection between Humphries Street and Papawai Road.

Wellington branch of Blind Citizens NZ

This organisation advocates for and supports people who are blind, deafblind, vision-impaired or have low vision. The group's submission included the following:

- > Praise for the codesign approach used by GWRC and the Metlink team to remove barriers to accessing public transport.
- > A request that any transport project, pilot or update be made accessible for all, and support for the Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan.
- > Suggestions for how rail, bus, and Rapid Transit networks could be made more accessible, including through wayfinding and alert delivery.
- > Noting that current design of cycle lanes and bus stops created barriers for those with a vision impairment.
- > A proposal to adjust the Total Mobility service to make it more user friendly.

Wellington District Council of the New Zealand Automobile Association (AA Wellington)

The association was generally supportive of the RLTP, and points raised by their submission included the following:

- > Support was expressed for the changes in investment priorities.
- > Reservations were expressed regarding the achievability of the RLPT's targets. Unsuccessful targets noted by the AA Wellington includes unchanged road safety outcomes and a lack of transport mode shift to public and active transport.
- > The proposed addition of the Harbour Quays Bus Corridor was also criticised.
- > A review of GWRC's forecasts was recommended due to recent population decline.
- > A new economic analysis and integrated transport plan with WCC regarding rapid transit bus lanes was also recommended. This review was suggested due to inflation and the withdrawal of Government funds since the previous economic analysis.
- > Rail capable ferries were also discussed, with suggestions made to have three smaller ferries instead of two larger ones to make the service more reliable and available.
- > Three projects (the RONS SH1 Second Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Improvements, the National Ticketing Solution, and the RONS Petone to Granada and Cross Valley Link) were identified as nationally significant in nature, and recommendations were made for the GWRC to support their progress.
- > Support for the following projects was also expressed:
 - Rail Network Resilience and Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity
 - Te Awa Kairangi - Riverlink Project
 - Wellington Region Resilience Programme
 - Wellington Rapid Transit Bus Corridors Programme
 - Metro Rail Developing and Enabling Future Capacity
 - Regional Cycle Network.

Who respondents were


Key findings

- > Over half of respondents identify as a man/boy (53%).
- > More than half of respondents live in Pōneke/Wellington City (55%).
- > The top 3 age groups that respondents selected were 25-44 (20%), 55-65 (19%), and 25-34 (18%).
- > The majority of respondents were New Zealand European (78%).
- > The majority of survey respondents submitted their feedback as individuals (98%).

Note that the below charts include only responses from those who answered each question in the survey. Longer, own-format submissions such as email feedback are not included in the below data.

Gender of respondents

Respondents were asked: *Gender: How do you identify?*




Key findings:

- > Over half of respondents (53%) identify as a man/boy.
- > 40% of respondents identify as a woman/girl.
- > 2% of respondents did not specify a gender.
- > 5% of respondents selected 'prefer not to say'.

Where respondents live

Respondents were asked: *Where in our region do you live?*




Key findings:

- > Pōneke/Wellington City was the most common place of residence for respondents, with over half (55%) selecting that they live there.
- > 16% of respondents live in Te Awa Kairangi ki Tai/Lower Hutt.
- > Remaining respondents were from Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta/Upper Hutt (8%), Porirua (7%), Kāpiti Coast (7%), Wairarapa (5%), and 2% selected that they don't live in the Wellington region.

Respondents' age groups

Respondents were asked: *Which age group do you belong to?*




Key findings:

- > The most common age group of respondents was 35-44 (20%).
- > The next most common age group was 55-65, with 19% of respondents selecting this.
- > 18% of respondents were aged 25-34.
- > Remaining respondents selected the age groups 45-54 (15%), 65-74 (13%), 16-24 (9%), 75 years or older (5%), and 0% of respondents were 15 years old or younger.

Ethnicity of respondents

Respondents were asked: *Which ethnicities do you identify with?*




Key findings:

- > Over three quarters of respondents (78%) were New Zealand European.
- > 16% of respondents selected other ethnic group.
- > 4% of respondents were Māori and 3% were Indian.
- > Chinese, Pacific Peoples, and Middle Eastern/Latin American/African were each selected by 1% of respondents.

Individuals and group submissions

Respondents were asked: *I am submitting as:* The options were an individual or an organisation.



Key findings:

- > Nearly all respondents submitted their feedback as individuals (98%).
- > Only 2% of respondents were submitting on behalf of an organisation.

Addendum

1. Project list

1	Rail Network Resilience	9	Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport Assets	17	Wellington Regional Hospital Travel Action Plan Initiative	25	Hutt City Council LED Streetlights Upgrade
2	Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity	10	Riverlink – Te Awa Kairangi Improvements	18	Kāinga Ora East Porirua Regeneration Programme	26	Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension
3	Metro Rail – developing and Enabling Future Capacity	11	Wellington Region Resilience Programme	19	Fergusson Drive Arterial Link Improvements	27	Smarter Network Technology and Innovation Programme
4	Wellington Rapid Transit Bus Corridors Programme	12	Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme	20	Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Connections	28	Hutt City Transport Improvements - Local Road Parking Density)
5	Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1)	13	Bus Hubs and Layovers	21	SH59 Mackays to Linden	29	Whitford Brown/Papakowhai Road Intersection Upgrades
6	National Ticketing Solution (NTS)	14	Access Kenepuru (New Phases)	22	SH2 Masterton South Commercial Vehicle Regional Safety Centre	30	Lincolnshire Farm New Road
7	Regional Cycle Network	15	State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvements Programme	23	Waterloo Station Transit Oriented Development (TOD)		
8	Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2)	16	Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand	24	Masterton North: Connecting Communities		

2. Priority Significant Activities Rankings

The rankings below are from highest to lowest percentages.

It's about right

Activity name	Percent	Count
#11: Wellington Region Resilience Programme	54%	299
#9: Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport Assets	54%	300
#13: Bus Hubs and Layovers	52%	288
#10: Riverlink - Te Awa Kairangi Improvements	49%	274
#15: State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvements Programme	45%	252
#12: Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme	45%	248
#1: Rail Network Resilience	44%	244
#17: Wellington Regional Hospital Travel Action Plan Initiative	44%	243
#2: Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity	43%	241
#27: Smarter Network Technology and Innovation Programme	43%	238
#4: Wellington Rapid Transit Bus Corridors Programme	41%	227
#20: Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Connections	41%	228
#14: Access Kenepuru (new phases)	41%	226
#18: Kāinga Ora East Porirua Regeneration Programme	40%	224
#3: Metro Rail - Developing and Enabling Future Capacity	40%	221
#25: Hutt City Council LED Streetlights Upgrade	39%	218
#21: SH59 Mackays to Linden	36%	201
#23: Waterloo Station Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	35%	194
#26: Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension	35%	191
#24: Masterton North: Connecting Communities	34%	189
#6: National Ticketing Solution (NTS)	34%	186
#19: Fergusson Drive Arterial Link Improvements	32%	178
#22: SH2 Masterton South Commercial Vehicle Regional Safety Centre	32%	176
#28: Hutt City Transport Improvements - Local Road Parking Density	31%	172
#29: Whitford Brown/Papakowhai Road Intersection Upgrades	31%	172
#16: Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand	31%	170
#7: Regional Cycle Network	25%	138
#8: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) – Petone to Grenada and the Cross Valley Link	23%	127
#30: Lincolnshire Farm New Road	22%	122
#5: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) – SH1 Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Reserve Upgrades	18%	99

This should be a higher priority

These tables are organised from highest to lowest percent

Activity name	Percent	Count
#16: Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand	61%	339
#3: Metro Rail - Developing and Enabling Future Capacity	50%	277
#1: Rail Network Resilience	48%	266
#2: Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity	46%	258
#12: Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme	39%	216
#17: Wellington Regional Hospital Travel Action Plan Initiative	38%	211
#4: Wellington Rapid Transit Bus Corridors Programme	38%	208
#7: Regional Cycle Network	31%	171
#5: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) – SH1 Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Reserve Upgrades	30%	167
#11: Wellington Region Resilience Programme	28%	155
#6: National Ticketing Solution (NTS)	28%	153
#23: Waterloo Station Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	27%	147
#8: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) – Petone to Grenada and the Cross Valley Link	27%	147
#27: Smarter Network Technology and Innovation Programme	23%	128
#13: Bus Hubs and Layovers	23%	128
#9: Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport Assets	20%	112
#10: Riverlink - Te Awa Kairangi Improvements	20%	112
#18: Kāinga Ora East Porirua Regeneration Programme	16%	88
#15: State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvements Programme	15%	81
#24: Masterton North: Connecting Communities	14%	79
#20: Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Connections	12%	64
#19: Fergusson Drive Arterial Link Improvements	11%	62
#25: Hutt City Council LED Streetlights Upgrade	11%	61
#28: Hutt City Transport Improvements - Local Road Parking Density	11%	59
#14: Access Kenepuru (new phases)	10%	56
#29: Whitford Brown/Papakowhai Road Intersection Upgrades	9%	47
#26: Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension	8%	44
#22: SH2 Masterton South Commercial Vehicle Regional Safety Centre	7%	39
#21: SH59 Mackays to Linden	7%	39
#30: Lincolnshire Farm New Road	4%	24

This should be a lower priority

Activity name	Percent	Count
#5: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) – SH1 Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Reserve Upgrades	28%	155
#8: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) – Petone to Grenada and the Cross Valley Link	27%	149
#26: Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension	24%	133
#21: SH59 Mackays to Linden	22%	122
#7: Regional Cycle Network	21%	118
#19: Fergusson Drive Arterial Link Improvements	21%	115
#15: State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvements Programme	20%	112
#6: National Ticketing Solution (NTS)	20%	110
#28: Hutt City Transport Improvements - Local Road Parking Density	19%	104
#22: SH2 Masterton South Commercial Vehicle Regional Safety Centre	19%	104
#14: Access Kenepuru (new phases)	17%	93
#30: Lincolnshire Farm New Road	17%	92
#25: Hutt City Council LED Streetlights Upgrade	17%	92
#29: Whitford Brown/Papakowhai Road Intersection Upgrades	15%	82
#20: Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Connections	15%	81
#13: Bus Hubs and Layovers	13%	73
#4: Wellington Rapid Transit Bus Corridors Programme	13%	71
#18: Kāinga Ora East Porirua Regeneration Programme	12%	68
#10: Riverlink - Te Awa Kairangi Improvements	12%	66
#24: Masterton North: Connecting Communities	11%	63
#9: Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport Assets	11%	59
#27: Smarter Network Technology and Innovation Programme	10%	53
#23: Waterloo Station Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	8%	46
#12: Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme	8%	45
#11: Wellington Region Resilience Programme	7%	41
#3: Metro Rail - Developing and Enabling Future Capacity	6%	33
#2: Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity	5%	29
#1: Rail Network Resilience	5%	29
#16: Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand	5%	26
#17: Wellington Regional Hospital Travel Action Plan Initiative	5%	25

This shouldn't be included in the significant activities list

Activity name	Percent	Count
#8: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) – Petone to Grenada and the Cross Valley Link	24%	130
#7: Regional Cycle Network	23%	127
#5: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) – SH1 Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Reserve Upgrades	22%	120
#25: Hutt City Council LED Streetlights Upgrade	14%	80
#28: Hutt City Transport Improvements - Local Road Parking Density	14%	77
#30: Lincolnshire Farm New Road	14%	76
#22: SH2 Masterton South Commercial Vehicle Regional Safety Centre	11%	58
#15: State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvements Programme	10%	56
#26: Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension	9%	52
#21: SH59 Mackays to Linden	9%	51
#6: National Ticketing Solution (NTS)	9%	51
#29: Whitford Brown/Papakowhai Road Intersection Upgrades	9%	47
#18: Kāinga Ora East Porirua Regeneration Programme	8%	46
#19: Fergusson Drive Arterial Link Improvements	7%	37
#24: Masterton North: Connecting Communities	6%	33
#27: Smarter Network Technology and Innovation Programme	6%	33
#14: Access Kenepuru (new phases)	6%	33
#10: Riverlink - Te Awa Kairangi Improvements	6%	32
#20: Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Connections	5%	30
#9: Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport Assets	5%	28
#4: Wellington Rapid Transit Bus Corridors Programme	5%	27
#13: Bus Hubs and Layovers	5%	27
#23: Waterloo Station Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	4%	23
#12: Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme	3%	14
#3: Metro Rail - Developing and Enabling Future Capacity	2%	12
#2: Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity	2%	12
#17: Wellington Regional Hospital Travel Action Plan Initiative	2%	11
#16: Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand	2%	10
#1: Rail Network Resilience	2%	10
#11: Wellington Region Resilience Programme	1%	6

This report has been prepared by:

Global Research
150 Office Rd
Merivale
Christchurch 8014
New Zealand
+64 3 355 4562
www.globalresearch.nz

July 2024

For Deliberations – Consultation Topics and Other Matters Requiring Decision

1. Consultation options

The following matters formed the options formally consulted on as part of the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 – 2024 Mid-Term Review Consultation Document. The RTC Sub-Committee needs to recommend the preferred options to Regional Transport Committee on 23 July 2024.

RLTP Consultation Questions	Officer advice	Subcommittee recommendation
<p>Transport Investment Priorities – Review of Weightings</p> <p>The RLTP outlines five investment priorities to guide the regional programme of activities: 1. Public Transport Capacity; 2. Travel Choice; 3. Strategic Access; 4. Safety; 5. Resilience. Public engagement via the online ‘Have Your Say’ platform on the draft Mid-term Review asked respondents to consider the priority weighting of each of these and whether it needed changing. The following is based on the collated responses of 561 submissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Respondents agreed with the present ranking of the following Investment Priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Safety (59%) o Resilience (50%) o Strategic Access (47%). > Respondents thought that the following Investment Priorities should be higher in the priority ranking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Public Transport Capacity (56%) o Travel Choice (41%) o Strategic Access (38%). > Respondents thought that the following Investment Priorities should be lower in the priority ranking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Travel Choice (22%) o Safety (15%) o Strategic Access (14%). <p>Written commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Based on analysis of respondents’ free-text comments, the most discussed Priority was Travel Choice, with 246 comments overall. This was followed by Public Transport Capacity with 174 comments; Safety with 40 comments; Strategic Access with 21 comments; and Resilience with 10 comments (note that all public transport related resilience comments were placed in the Public Transport Capacity Priority topic). > The primary sentiment that emerged was the desire for a more reliable, resilient, extensive, accessible, and cost-effective public transport system that enabled people to reduce reliance on cars. In this sense, there was clear support for both Priority 1: Public Transport Capacity and Priority 2: Travel Choice. 	<p>Officers recommend no changes to the RLTP Transport Investment Priorities.</p> <p>While there is support for increasing weighting of public transport capacity and travel choice, they already have high weightings, and there is no clear mandate to reduce the weightings of any of the other investment priorities.</p>	

<p>Significant Activities list – overview</p> <p>The top five projects that submitters thought ‘should be a higher priority’ were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #16: Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand – 61% • #3: Metro Rail - Developing and Enabling Future Capacity – 50% • #1: Rail Network Resilience – 48% • #2: Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity – 46% • #12: Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme – 39% <p>The top five projects that submitters thought ‘should be a lower priority’ were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #5: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) – SH1 Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Reserve Upgrades – 28% <p>NB: Respondents were split almost 50/50, with almost half selecting either ‘this should be a lower priority’ or not included in the significant activities at all, and almost half either supporting it where it was in the list or being a higher priority. Key themes raised in verbatim comments included concern for projected expenditure and stronger prioritisation of public and active transport infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #8: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) – Petone to Grenada and the Cross Valley Link – 27% <p>This activity had the second most comments on it. As with the Mt Victoria Tunnel/Basin Reserve Upgrades the feedback was split, with almost half of respondents either wanting it to be higher in the list as wanting it to be lower or removed entirely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #26: Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension – 24% • #21: SH59 Mackays to Linden – 22% • #7: Regional Cycle Network – 21% <p>The Regional Cycle Network (#8) also drew a divided response, with marginally more people thinking the programme was either about right or should be higher in the list, as those who thought it should be given a lower priority in the list, or removed completely.</p> <p>The top five projects that submitters thought were ‘about right’ were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #11: Wellington Region Resilience Programme – 54% • #9: Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport Assets – 54% • #13: Bus Hubs and Layovers – 52% • #10: Riverlink - Te Awa Kairangi Improvements – 49% • #15: State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvements Programme – 45% <p>More details of the public feedback of the significant activity list please Appendix 1 Significant Activities list feedback.</p>	<p>Officers suggest the subcommittee consider moving #16 and #12 projects to a higher priority.</p> <p>However, it worth noting the scope and impact of these projects (as currently described) on a regional scale is limited.</p> <p>Officers recommend no changes to #5, #7 and #8.</p> <p>There is no clear public consensus.</p> <p>Officers recommend no changes to #26 and #21.</p> <p>Approximately one-quarter of respondents indicated that they were unsure about the ranking of these two projects. This high level of uncertainty makes it difficult to ascertain a clear public consensus.</p>	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

2. Changes advised by Approved Organisations during the consultation period.

The following changes have been submitted after the draft Regional Land Transport Plan was released for public consultation.

Name	Summary of request	Officer advice	Subcommittee recommendation
WCC	Change in cashflow to two committed activities Golden Mile Upgrades and Thorndon Quay and Hutt Road Upgrade. The changes to these former Let's Get Wellington Moving activities have come about after review of the projects and adoption of the Wellington City Council Long Term Plan.	Officers recommend accepting change as requested. This has no material change to the programme.	
Other	Other minor adjustments to financial forecasts.	Officers recommend accepting changes as requested. There is no material change to the programme.	

3. Other matters raised by consultation submissions

A range of matters were raised during the RLTP 2021: 2024 mid-term review public consultation process that require a non-financial response.

Sub #	Matter Raised	Officer advice	Subcommittee recommendation
Numerous	50+ requests for specific public transport improvements. These included additional services, changes to timetables and additional routes.	No change to RLTP programme required. Addition of new projects or specific network changes is outside the scope of this RLTP review decision making process. Several activities in the RLTP programme provide public transport improvements. The feedback from submissions will be provided to Metlink as the Approved Organisation for their consideration.	
E001, E010, E018	Increase priority for Cook Strait ferries and improve freight connections	No change to RLTP programme required. Decisions relating to the Cook Strait ferries is outside the scope of this RLTP decision making process. The RLTP 2021 notes 'Cook Strait ferries provide the key link for road and rail freight between the North and South Island' (RLTP2021 p137) - this will be a continued area of interest and advocacy for the RTC going forward. Several activities within the RLTP programme will contribute to better freight connections by improving the region's strategic road and rail networks. Those activities are identified against investment priorities 'Strategic Access' and 'Resilience'. Overall, submission feedback suggests the weighting of these priorities is about right. As noted in the RLTP 2024 mid-term review (p16) 'Construction of a new Aotea Quay roundabout is underway to improve freight access to the Interislander ferry terminal at Kaiwharawhara'.	

E001	<p>Prioritise double tracking and improving rail resilience in region – move rail line away from Pukerua Bay.</p> <p>Consider tolling to increase funding for roading – reduce focus on cycleway infrastructure development.</p> <p>Reduce funding available to Wellington Cable Car</p>	<p>No change to RLTP programme required. Decisions relating to these matters are outside the scope of this RLTP decision making process. Feedback to be provided to relevant Approved Organisation and for consideration during RLTP 2027 development.</p> <p>Improving the resilience of the region’s transport network rail and road is a strategic objective and priority within the RLTP. Several projects within the current programme will contribute to rail network resilience.</p> <p>Road pricing and other funding tools are a continued area of interest and advocacy for the Regional Transport Committee.</p>	
E002, E003	<p>Concern over spending on major roading projects to detriment of other transport modes. Petone to Grenada Road of National Significance given as example. Requests all project work previously undertaken on the project be closely reviewed to ensure project is needed before it commences.</p> <p>Additional concern on best value for money not being realised – not just with new roads but by prioritising spending on roads instead of prioritising other transport modes.</p>	<p>No change to RLTP programme required.</p> <p>Feedback regarding project work previously undertaken to be provided to Waka Kotahi as the lead agency for the Petone to Grenada Road of National Significance.</p> <p>Feedback regarding mode priorities is covered in the officer advice on regional investment priorities and weightings above.</p> <p>Note the RLTP 2024 programme represents a bid for funding support from the National Land Transport Programme and available funding reflects central government’s GPS 2024.</p>	
E004, E005, E008	<p>Prioritise transport modes which provide a health benefit over other transport modes – i.e. walking and cycling improve population health and reduce risk of cardiovascular disease etc. Prioritise making these modes safer and easier for more people to use</p>	<p>No change to RLTP programme required.</p> <p>‘Travel Choice - Make walking, cycling and public transport a safe, sustainable and attractive option for more trips throughout the region’ – is one of the five transport investment priorities in the RLTP. Discussion regarding the relative weighting of this priority area is provided in the officer advice on regional investment priorities and weightings above.</p> <p>Note that many of the improvement activities for active modes, particularly walking, are captured within the low cost, low risk programme and are not highlighted within the significant activities list.</p> <p>Feedback to be provided to relevant Approved Organisation.</p>	
E006, E014, E015	<p>Horizons Regional Council, Horowhenua District Council, Kāpiti Coast District Council</p> <p>Requests increased priority for inter-regional travel, particularly public transport and movement of freight. Public transport highlighted as being particularly important due to increasing move north of key services – many people in Kāpiti, particularly Ōtaki have to travel to Levin for services.</p>	<p>No change to RLTP programme required.</p> <p>The importance of inter-regional transport connections is an area of interest and advocacy for the Regional Transport Committee.</p> <p>Note – Inter-regional freight issues will be focus of an upcoming joint Lower North Island Freight Strategy and will inform the RLTP 2027 development (see Appendix 1 of RLTP 2024 mid-term review).</p>	

E007	Golden Bay (division of Fletcher Concrete & Infrastructure ltd) Request to be involved in the development of project to explore options to earthquake strengthen Aotea overbridge.	No change to RLTP programme required. Submission will be provided to Wellington City Council as the relevant Approved Organisation for consideration as they progress this project.	
E009, E012, E016	Disabled Persons Assembly, Blind Citizens New Zealand (Wellington) Highlighting need to prioritise activities which enable disabled people to easily get around the region, as well as improve process to make sure all activities are built in a way that lets them be as accessible as possible.	The importance of continually improving the accessibility of transport networks, infrastructure and services is recognised in the RLTP 2021 and is an ongoing area of interest and advocacy for the Regional Transport Committee and its member organisations. In relation to public transport, Greater Wellington has adopted an Accessibility Charter 2021 and an Accessibility Action Plan 2023 – which led to a package of activities being included in this RLTP programme – currently ranked #12 among the region’s significant activity list. Discussion on the ranking of this project is provided in officer advice above.	
E010	Ia Ara Aotearoa - Transporting New Zealand Increased emphasis on resilience and strategic access, reduced emphasis on pt capacity and travel choice. Urgent roading improvements required to Remutaka hill road	No change to RLTP programme required. Several activities within the RLTP programme will contribute to better freight connections by improving the region’s strategic road and rail networks. Those activities are identified against investment priorities ‘Strategic Access’ and ‘Resilience’. Overall, submission feedback suggests the weighting of these priorities is about right. This discussion is reflected in the office advice on investment priorities above. Feedback regarding Remutaka Hill Road will be provided to Waka Kotahi as the relevant Approved Organisation managing the maintenance of this section of state highway.	
E011, E013, E019	Highlighting need for increased focus on a 30-year strategy.	No change to RLTP programme required. Central government has signalled that, once formed, the National Infrastructure Agency (NIA) will work closely with the NZTA Waka Kotahi and KiwiRail to develop a 30-year plan for transport infrastructure in New Zealand. A longer-term Regional Network Plan will also be a key component of the next RLTP 2027.	
E011, E013	Bus and Coach Association NZ, Entrada InterCity Travel Group Concerned moving public transport assets (i.e. depots) into public ownership will reduce competitiveness for contracts. Concern that funding passenger rail improvements (LNIRM project) will create an uneven playing field impacting the commercial viability of parallel inter-city bus services.	Operational feedback regarding route and asset commercial issues will be provided to Metlink and Horizons Regional Council as the relevant public transport network managers.	
information round table discussion	From information round table discussion on July 3 some submitters highlighted their concern about the lack of prominence of walking as a universal transport mode in the RLTP document and asked that this be included in the final version.	Officers will review where this could be added into the RLTP document and will draft a paragraph to be tabled at the hearings on 10 July.	

4. Additional points raised during oral hearings for discussion/deliberation.

Sub #	Matter Raised	Officer advice	Subcommittee recommendation

Appendix 1 Significant Activities list feedback

Significant activity	This should be a higher priority	It's about right	This should be a lower priority	This shouldn't be included in the significant activities list	I don't know
#1: Rail Network Resilience	48%	43%	5%	2%	2%
#2: Completing Metro Rail Resilience and Capacity	46%	44%	5%	2%	3%
#3: Metro Rail - Developing and Enabling Future Capacity	50%	40%	6%	2%	2%
#4: Wellington Rapid Transit Bus Corridors Programme	38%	41%	13%	5%	3%
#5: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (1) – SH1 Mt Victoria Tunnel and Basin Reserve Upgrades	30%	18%	28%	22%	2%
#6: National Ticketing Solution (NTS)	28%	34%	20%	9%	9%
#7: Regional Cycle Network	31%	25%	21%	23%	0%
#8: Wellington Region Road of National Significance (2) – Petone to Grenada and the Cross Valley Link	27%	23%	27%	23%	0%
#9: Asset Control – Depots and Public Transport Assets	20%	54%	11%	5%	10%
#10: Riverlink - Te Awa Kairangi Improvements	20%	49%	12%	6%	13%
#11: Wellington Region Resilience Programme	28%	54%	8%	1%	9%
#12: Public Transport Accessibility Action Plan Programme	39%	45%	8%	2%	6%
#13: Bus Hubs and Layovers	23%	52%	13%	5%	7%
#14: Access Kenepuru (new phases)	10%	41%	17%	6%	26%
#15: State Highway Value for Money Safety Improvements Programme	15%	45%	20%	10%	10%
#16: Bus Network Growth to Meet Public Transport Demand	61%	30%	5%	2%	2%
#17: Wellington Regional Hospital Travel Action Plan Initiative	38%	44%	4%	2%	12%
#18: Kāinga Ora East Porirua Regeneration Programme	16%	40%	12%	9%	23%
#19: Fergusson Drive Arterial Link Improvements	11%	32%	21%	7%	29%
#20: Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Connections	11%	41%	15%	5%	28%
#21: SH59 Mackays to Linden	7%	36%	22%	10%	25%
#22: SH2 Masterton South Commercial Vehicle Regional Safety Centre	7%	32%	19%	11%	31%
#23: Waterloo Station Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	27%	35%	8%	4%	26%
#24: Masterton North: Connecting Communities	14%	34%	12%	6%	34%
#25: Hutt City Council LED Streetlights Upgrade	11%	40%	16%	15%	18%
#26: Wellington Transport Operations Centre Building Extension	8%	35%	24%	9%	24%
#27: Smarter Network Technology and Innovation Programme	23%	43%	10%	6%	18%
#28: Hutt City Transport Improvements - Local Road Parking Density	11%	31%	19%	14%	25%
#29: Whitford Brown/Papakowhai Road Intersection Upgrades	9%	31%	15%	8%	37%
#30: Lincolnshire Farm New Road	4%	22%	17%	14%	43%