

Before an Independent Commissioner of Wellington City Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a resource consent application for the Future Accommodation Strategy to develop the western portion of the site at 1 Molesworth Street, Wellington

**EVIDENCE OF ANDREW CARNELL ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT IN SUPPORT OF
APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT**

TRANSPORT PLANNING

15 May 2023

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Andrew Carnell. I am a Lead Consultant within the Integrated Transport and Mobility team at Aurecon Limited.

1.2 I am authorised by the Applicant, Parliamentary Service, on behalf of His Majesty the King, to give this statement of evidence on its behalf.

2. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

2.1 I am a Transport Planner with 15 years' experience working in both the United Kingdom and New Zealand.

2.2 I hold a Masters Degree in Transport Economics and I am a Chartered Member of the Institute of Logistics and Transport.

2.3 I have experience in assessing and preparing evidence on the transport impacts of development proposals. In the UK my experience included leading on the transport planning inputs to a number of significant urban redevelopment sites in the City of Birmingham and elsewhere in the West Midlands. More recently in my role at Waikato Regional Council I have prepared transport evidence for a number of plan change proposals and provided transport inputs into resource consent applications. Most recently at Aurecon I have acted on behalf of Waipa District Council in preparing evidence for the Plan Change 12, Airport Northern Precinct proposal.

2.4 I am familiar with the application site and the surrounding locality. I have reviewed and been briefed on the relevant application documents including the Integrated Transport Assessment ("ITA") for Parliament Precinct Future Accommodation Strategy ("FAS"), submissions on the application that raise concern relating to my area of expertise, and the Council's Section 42A Report. The ITA produced for the proposal provides a comprehensive assessment of the transport impacts of the development, follows an

industry standard methodology for the assessment of transport impacts, and I adopt its conclusions.

3. CODE OF CONDUCT

3.1 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses outlined in the Environment Court's Practice Note (2023) (**Code**) and have complied with it in preparing this evidence. I also agree to follow the Code when presenting evidence to the Independent Hearing Commissioner. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I state that I rely upon the evidence of other expert witnesses. I also confirm that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my opinions.

4. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

4.1 The Parliamentary Service commissioned Aurecon Ltd to prepare an Integrated Transport Assessment (**ITA**) Report to support the resource consent Application. This ITA document provides the evidence base on which I base my opinion.

4.2 The ITA was prepared in accordance with the guidance specified in the Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines published by the New Zealand Transport Agency.

4.3 The ITA covers the following points:

- (a) Introduction;
- (b) The surrounding Environment;
- (c) New and future network changes;
- (d) Existing site transport provisions;
- (e) Proposed development;
- (f) Proposed trip generation and network effects;
- (g) District plan assessment; and
- (h) Recommendations and conclusions.

4.4 My evidence will address the following matters:

- (a) The overall transportation impacts of the proposal;
- (b) Vehicular trip generation for the development;
- (c) Traffic impacts on Ballantrae Place;
- (d) Consideration of local pedestrian access improvements;
- (e) Comments on the Council's Report; and
- (f) Conclusions.

5. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Transport impacts of Proposal

5.1 The main transport impacts of the proposal (which are predominantly positive) are summarised below:

- (a) The removal of day-to-day service, staff and visitor vehicle entry and egress movements from the Museum Street site access is expected to improve safety and the environment for pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity of the Bowen Street/Museum Street/The Terrace intersection.
- (b) The proposal includes a reduction of on-site staff parking by 42% which will significantly reduce the volume of private vehicle traffic to the site. The reduction in on-site parking provision aligns strongly with the Wellington District Plan Policies (12.2.15.6, 12.2.15.7 and 12.2.15.8), and objectives which aim to reduce reliance on private vehicle use.
- (c) Because of the excellent levels of accessibility to the site via public transport, walking and cycling staff have good opportunities to switch to other modes of travel besides private vehicle. The

development proposal includes significant increases in on-site cycle parking by 89 spaces to support this transition.

- (d) The proposal significantly reduces vehicle access to the Parliamentary Precinct via Museum Street, relocates servicing of the site to the proposed Ballantrae Place building (accessed via Ballantrae Place), and increases on-site cycle and mobility parking. Internal vehicle movements within the site would be simplified and primarily restricted to the basement linkages to increase the safety of pedestrians and cyclists within the site.

5.2 In my opinion the reconfiguration of the site, with the primary access point becoming Ballantrae Place instead of Museum Street, will result in an overall improvement to safety and amenity compared to the existing access point from Museum Street. This, combined with the overall reduction in car parking and improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure, will promote sustainable travel to the development.

5.3 It is my opinion that walking and cycling connectivity to the site is very good. Pedestrian and cycling improvements at the Bowen Street / The Terrace / Museum Street intersection have recently been undertaken as part of the Let's Get Wellington Moving (**LGWM**) project. These improvements include safety improvements, widening crossing points, adding a new signalized crossing over Bowen Street from Lambton Quay, and traffic signal upgrades. The upgrades at the Bowen Street / The Terrace / Museum Street intersection are expected to improve the safety and amenity for pedestrians and cyclists and will further improve access to the Parliament Precinct.

Vehicular Trip Generation

5.4 One of the key elements of the proposal is to construct two new buildings, located on the existing car park area, within the Parliamentary Precinct. The gross floor area within the site area would be increased by 10,150m². It is

expected that existing staff within the site will be relocated to the new proposed buildings, so the development is not expected to generate significant additional movement to and from the site.

5.5 Vehicular traffic to the site will be constrained by the available parking provision which is being reduced by 42% when compared to the existing parking. A summary of the existing and proposed on-site parking provision is provided in Table 1 below.

Table 11: Proposed Parking Provision

CAR PARK	STAFF	STAFF EV	VIP DROP OFF	MOBILITY	PROPOSED TOTAL	EXISTING TOTAL
Bowen House						68*
West Carpark					0	114
Upper Carpark	34				34	63
EW Basement	40	8	2	7	57	57
Forecourt Basement	63				63	63
PH/PL Link Basement	45				45	45
Museum Street Building (MUS)				1	1	0
Total	182	8	2	8	200	410

*Not part of the application site

5.6 The use of remaining on-site parking spaces will be managed by specific allocation; only staff with parking permits will be allowed to park in the designated parking. As per current arrangements, there will continue to be no visitor parking on-site.

6. BALLANTRAE PLACE CAPACITY AND TRAFFIC VOLUMES

6.1 Ballantrae Place provides vehicle access to several activities including the Parliamentary Precinct, The Ministry for Primary Industries, Defence House,

a childcare service 'Playhouse Inc', a Wilson parking area, and frontage for eight residential properties.

- 6.2** The ITA considers the traffic impacts of the proposal on Ballantrae Place. Under the proposal, servicing of the Parliamentary Precinct will occur via Ballantrae Place instead of Museum Street. Servicing vehicles would typically include cars, courier vans, 8 metre medium sized trucks and 11.5metre large rigid trucks. Servicing movements to and from site are not expected to increase overall because of the proposed works, however they will transfer from the current access point on Museum Street to Ballantrae Place.
- 6.3** I consider the transfer of traffic from Museum Street to Ballantrae Place to be an improvement over the existing access arrangements for the site, as it will significantly reduce the conflict between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists on the uncontrolled Museum Street access.
- 6.4** The existing Annual Daily Traffic (**ADT**) of Ballantrae Place is estimated at 1,670 vehicles per day. Assuming that all entry and egress movements (day to day parliamentary staff access and service vehicle entry/egress) to the Parliamentary Precinct, currently occurring via Museum Street will be rerouted to Ballantrae Place, and also allowing for a 42% reduction in vehicle movements due to the reduction in car parking, the ITA estimates that this would result in a total approximate ADT of 1,872 along Ballantrae Place. Under the proposal, the ADT will remain within typical traffic flow volumes for secondary collector roads. The ITA demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity in the right turn bay at the intersection with Bowen Street and Ballantrae Place to accommodate the anticipated increased traffic volumes and potential for increased queuing.
- 6.5** The increase in average daily vehicle movements is estimated to be approximately 12%, which in my opinion would not have a significantly detrimental impact to the amenity and functioning of the properties along Ballantrae Place. To put this into context, when spread over a 12 hour day

this would be roughly equivalent to an increase in the number of vehicles passing Ballantrae Place from every 43 seconds to every 38 seconds. This increase in traffic is unlikely to be perceptible, particularly in the context of the existing noise and vibration from the nearby motorway overpass. I concur with the opinion of the Section 42A authors report in respect of Ballantrae place which states “that traffic movements from commuter and servicing vehicles are generally to be expected in the Central Area particularly considering the commercial and office activities occurring nearby” and concludes that these effects are acceptable. During the construction phase there will be a temporary increase in construction traffic to and from the site.

6.6 It is my opinion that the effects of this can be managed as part of a Construction Traffic Plan (CTP) as specified in the recommended conditions, set out in the Transport Advisor Assessment by Patricia Wood, dated 13 July 2022. The proposed condition for the CTP as set out in the Section 42A report includes for example agreement with the Council as to the method, timing and mitigation measures to manage construction traffic. The consent holder must carry out the work in accordance with the certified CTP. I refer to the evidence of Mr Russell Allen which addresses the methods for management of the construction phase of the proposal.

7. COMMENTS ON THE COUNCIL REPORT

7.1 The council transport advisor Ms Patricia Wood has responded to the application stating that “*The proposal is acceptable in terms of transport aspects subject to compliance with the suggested conditions*”. I agree with her conclusion and with the conditions she refers to.

7.2 In relation to transportation matters, the section 42A report proposes the following conditions:

- (a) The submission of and compliance with a ‘Construction Traffic Plan’ document (which I have referred to earlier in my evidence),

which would control the means and extent of construction traffic to the site (refer suggested conditions 28-31).

- (b) A requirement to provide plans providing detailed construction details of the proposed internal roads, and levels between proposed elements of the development, where they tie into existing street levels (refer suggested condition 32).

7.3 I have reviewed the text of the proposed Council conditions and I believe they are appropriate and typical given the scale and nature of the development.

8. COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

8.1 The submission by Ewen Robertson expresses concern about the increased traffic volumes on Ballantrae Place and disruption to residential activities because of the construction program.

8.2 In response to Mr Robertson's concerns, it is my opinion that the proposed development would not have a significant detrimental impact on the properties on Ballantrae Place, for the reasons set out in section 6 of my evidence.

9. CONCLUSIONS

9.1 In conclusion, based on the information presented in my evidence and the supporting ITA report, it is my opinion that the transport effects of the proposed development are acceptable, and the proposal aligns with Council policy relating to car parking and reduction in private vehicle usage. The proposal provides betterment in terms of moving traffic from the uncontrolled Museum Street access to Ballantrae Place, where there is less potential conflict with cyclists and pedestrians.

- 9.2** In my opinion, increased construction traffic on Ballantrae Place can be appropriately addressed with a CTP as recommended by Council. Any ongoing increases in traffic volumes on Ballantrae Place will be minor and can be accommodated in the existing roadway.
- 9.3** The ITA undertook an assessment of the proposal against the Wellington Operative District Plan, which demonstrates alignment with the transport element requirements of the District Plan, and established that the proposal is well aligned in all matters.
- 9.4** The development is in line with the Operative District Plan because:
- (a) The development site is in a highly sustainable location with excellent access by bus, walking and cycling.
 - (b) The proposal moves to reduce the amount of car parking spaces within the site and improve the amount of cycle facilities and storage on site thus encouraging travel by sustainable modes.
 - (c) The access strategy helps to rationalise vehicle movement in and around the site.
- 9.5** I am of the opinion that the proposed development can be appropriately supported by the existing road network and maintain appropriate levels of safety and efficiency on the adjoining network.
- 9.6** I therefore believe that there are no outstanding traffic or transport reasons why the proposed development should not be approved.

Andrew Carnell

15 May 2023