

Questions and Answers

Pūroro Āmua | Planning and Environment Committee

25 August 2021

Item 2.1 Petition: We need routes from Newtown to the CBD safer for cycling and better for people on buses

What is an example of “interim infrastructure” referred to in paragraph 9 of the paper?

The Brooklyn Hill cycleway is an example of “interim infrastructure.” Using lighter touch, adaptable, and less costly materials allows for faster implementation of street improvements. Interim designs, like Brooklyn Hill cycleway, are made in advance of permanent upgrades that include larger scale physical works, like re-doing kerb and channel, and can support richer community engagement and help inform final designs.

What does the “transitional programme” mean?

The transitional programme is what we are calling the accelerated tactical approach to rolling out the cycleway network more quickly. As permanent upgrades are planned for future years, interim infrastructure (like the Brooklyn Hill cycleway) can help the city transition to a net zero-carbon transport system earlier, instead of waiting for the permanent upgrades, which take more time and much larger investment.

What is rapid rollout? Was this the language used in the Long-term Plan (LTP) decision?

The LTP decision referred to an accelerated programme. The rapid roll-out and accelerated delivery described in the LTP decision was:

10A. Agree to adopt option 4 rather than option 3 for the delivery of future cycling infrastructure, including:

(ii) Deliver a Rapid Rollout programme delivering low-cost cycleways across the Cycleways masterplan in years 1-3 of the LTP starting with the Southern connection. (\$40M)

10. Agree to amend the proposed cycleway investment programme by adding \$52 million in years 1 – 3 and

(iii) Instruct officers to report back on options for accelerated delivery.

The offer to meet with the petitioner is welcome, is this the new standard approach of the Council to petitioners?

No, this is not a standard approach, but we would like to offer this to the petitioner as we are currently working on a project to address their submission. However, this information will not be publicly available before the Committee papers are published for the Pūroro Āmua Committee on 23 September.

Late questions:

Is the petitioner asking for a combined bus/cycle peak priority line? What are the officers' views on the proposal for peak bus priority lines? This is the basis of the petition, yet officers do not appear to address this specifically.

The petitioner is asking for a combined bus/bike lane. Council officers believe it is possible to have separated bus and bike lanes. We are currently working on a project to address their submission, but this information will not be publicly available before the Committee papers are published for the 23 September Pūroro Āmua meeting.

What are the main demographics of the people who have signed the petition? ie location, gender etc

The organiser did not provide this information as part of the petition.

Item 2.2 Petition: Berhampore Village Upgrade

What does “co-design” mean in the officer's response?

Co-design means a process where council officers develop the design with a community group. This means there is ongoing interaction and engagement as the design principles are developed, and then as the actual design is created, to ensure community and council outcomes are aligned.

In what way was the engagement in 2019 with the community “successful” given that nothing has occurred since?

We agreed the principles and lists of issues and opportunities that created the framework for developing a design to the next stages. A number of safety improvements have been implemented through the transport and infrastructure team which were identified through the initial consultation

How were the members of the community working group determined?

The group was established by our engagement team in order to get a varied viewpoint from different members of the community, including people from the community association, and local residents, schools, and businesses.

Why can't the Council simply action some of outcomes/discussion points of the last upgrade?

The points that were raised (and mapped) were initial ideas and thoughts from the community's perspective. These need to be considered together with all the other issues surrounding Berhampore village, including future Council visions and outcomes.

When was the last official communication from the Council to this working group?

There was an update in August last year in relation to the road safety improvements

What is the full budget for this work?

As stated, the Council has allocated \$2.5M of CAPEX funding for both Berhampore and Island Bay town centre upgrades. The budget split has not been allocated at this stage, but that will be part of the design process.

How much of it is allocated to actual physical works as opposed to operational costs, costs of co-design and other engagement?

The budgets allocated are all CAPEX for delivering the project. Co-design and engagement will come out of that budget, as well as part of the design process and costs for any external consultants that may be required.

Would officers please advise if they will seek community feedback on potential signage to announce you are coming into Berhampore?

Yes, that will be one of the issues to be explored in the design process.

Late Questions:

What are the main demographics of the 118 people who have signed the petition ie location, gender etc

The organiser did not provide this information as part of the petition.

Item 3.1 Brooklyn Road bike lane trial

What is the equivalent figure for men under paragraph 34?

65% of men rated their experience as positive.

68% of men think the trial layout is safer for all.

Was the Fire Station or other emergency services asked to participate in the feedback? I note the engagement says they were involved throughout the process.

Can I have more detail on how this operated for Brooklyn Fire Brigade?

Yes, emergency services were notified via email. For the Brooklyn Fire Service, the Project Manager spent a morning with the crew and drove around the streets of Brooklyn in a truck discussing a number of things, including the Brooklyn Road trial. A member of the project team also discussed the project with members of the Fire Service at the station. The Fire Service had a link to the survey and have the team's contact details for any further discussions or questions they have.

Was there any direct discussion with our city housing tenants regarding carparking through the trial or during the assessment? If so, what was the nature of it?

Yes, we had discussions at the tenant social meetings for a couple of weeks, as well as at the "Have a go day". The tenancy advisor was also aware of the project and acted as a link between the project and tenants. There is a general desire to keep as much parking as possible at the bottom of the hill from the tenants. They are also frustrated that people not associated with the housing seem to park in the off-street parking provided.

Is the preferred option in the paper consistent with what the Council told the community could occur as a result of the trial or is extension a step further?

The recommended option is consistent with discussions that have taken place, however there have been no conversations with residents or businesses who may be directly affected by the extended option yet. These would take place through the consultation process.

As part of this process will officers review if an extension to the reduction of speed to 30k further north of the Brooklyn village would be appropriate?

There is a desire from the community to review the speed limit. However, the advice received says that taking a network approach to speed limits (when/if the new setting of speed limits rule is in place) is the preferred approach. A decision on this is expected by the end of the year.

Late Questions:

Please advise who conducted the research and analysis of users and if this was subject to expert peer review.

The survey was developed with internal Council engagement and research expertise. The results of the survey have not been externally peer reviewed.

Item 3.2 Let's Get Wellington Moving: City Streets – Indicative Business Case

Why are the programme tranches being done in a way that those with greatest benefits are first?

This is to ensure that communities can receive the highest levels of benefits as soon as possible.

Can we have more information about the Gehl public life public space work? What is an example of a new insight we can expect to see from that work?

This work will be released to Councillors soon and will be considered in the more detailed business case work for the City Streets Programme. This will further support the City Streets priorities.

What is the thinking behind potentially financially supporting Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) with their review of the bus network? What is allocated to this?

The operational review of buses is important in the context of the City Streets programme. For example, as the programme addresses current operational problems, routes will become more reliable, making services more attractive, and help improve schedules and operational efficiencies. In turn, this will affect the number of buses needed/driver requirements/ scheduling and so on.

Up to \$500k has been allocated for this, which is subject to further Board Approval and only to be spent on external resource to support GWRC over and above their business as usual.

How are the tranches taking into account the potential Mass Rapid Transit routes?

As per figure 29 of the Indicative Business Case, only projects in tranche 1 that are not affected by potential Mass Rapid Transit routes are listed for immediate start (green routes). Routes that are potential Mass Rapid Transit routes (purple routes) will be reassessed once the Mass Rapid Transit route and form has been confirmed.

What are the top three reasons/obstacles to this not being able to happen faster?

- The need to follow the required business case process for such a large investment
- Complex reviews and approvals from three partners.
- Available resources.

What consideration was given to Wellington City Council resolutions surrounding procurement in the development of 14.2.2?

The development of 14.2.2. focussed on how best to approach the market, not how suppliers would be selected. Supplier selection and evaluation criteria would be outlined in the City Streets procurement plan.

I would like to see social/environmental/responsible procurement being a central procurement consideration, what is the best way to ensure this happens?

Broader social outcomes are targeted strategic objectives of the Programme's Procurement Strategy for the Three-year Programme. Procurement processes will be required to include broader social outcome questions for consideration as part of the evaluation criteria.

Can officers confirm that there will be temporary improvements for cycling while we wait for three years for the southern connections link?

Officers are currently working on a transitional programme solution for a section of the southern connection from the City to Newtown to be delivered as soon as possible. This is dependant on the decision by the Council on the 23 September.

Paragraph 28: Why are the key corridors Johnsonville, Ngaio, Island Bay, Berhampore an exception?

There is an expectation that the interim improvements for both buses and bikes be provided by either Wellington City Council's transitional programme or LGWM Targeted Improvements within three years.

Paragraph 34: How/where are the accessibility improvements measured?

Accessibility hasn't been measured specifically as it is assumed all outcomes will provide for universal access.

Paragraph 37: Amenity and place framework - can we get to see this/how will grey areas of responsibilities/opportunities be managed?

This will be determined during the next phase of investigation.

Paragraph 38: Ghel Public space public life study, can we see more on the scope/outcomes of how the programme will work with this?

This will be determined during the next phase of investigation.

44: How many tonnes of the transport emissions are produced by transport for Wellington City. How does the LGWM plan to do its bit to mitigate the rest?

Road transport in the Wellington City boundary produced an estimated ~355,000 tCO₂e in FY20, as reported in our [City inventory on the Council's website](#). This emissions source is responsible for 33.8% of Wellington City's total gross emissions.

In terms of the contribution from Let's Get Wellington Moving, the programme has identified carbon reduction as a core objective. Each component of the programme options has been considered for how it might reduce carbon emissions, and this analysis will continue as we refine options and move towards implementation. Mass Rapid Transit, Walking/Cycling, and Travel Demand Management investments are expected to do the bulk of the heavy lifting from the programme's perspective; however, it is important to note the programme is not expected to create zero-carbon transport on its own.

What processes are being put in place between organisations to reduce disruption to users and businesses? How will we build relationships and communications with stakeholders? How will this be reported?

This will form part of the Detailed Business Case when there is more certainty around the types of solutions, where they are located and what impact they might have. There will be communications and engagement with stakeholders and the public during the next phase of investigation.

Page 150: With much of the growth happening in the north are we confident we have the desired uplift in public transport and active modes to support this?

The programme is seeking to achieve a transformational change in urban development within close proximity to the CBD which will form part of the engagement on the wider Programme. The City Streets Programme is proposing investment in the PT linkage to Johnsonville, linking through to a significant investment in PT and active modes on the Thorndon Quay Hutt Road project.

Page 194: Procurement - do the partners have a Strategic Procurement framework? If not will we look to adopt the Wellington City Council strategic procurement framework?

The Programme has an overarching Procurement Strategy that responds to Partners' procurement policies and processes. A separate Procurement Strategy has been developed for the Three-year Programme (which includes City Streets).

Page 194: Sustainable Management for the environment - how do we have assurance this will be managed, minimised, and reported to?

The Programme uses a robust Multi-criteria Framework which considered environmental impacts and opportunities. This will be applied when options are considered, assessment and developed in subsequent phases of investigation.

Page 247: Please explain how the big jump comes about for separated cycleways at mid-point costings?

Costs for both mid-point and high for a separated cycle lane assume that there is a need to add a secondary drainage system, these costs are consistent with costs used in the construction of Wellington City's cycleway network

Page 304: Is there a copy of the Environmental sustainability guidelines referred to on this page?

To mitigate this risk, it has been suggested that the "Programme to establish/provide environmental sustainability guidelines to support the CS package" These guidelines will need to be established once the IBC is approved.

Page 304: There is big concern is around social license to operate and maintain public confidence. How can the Council be part of the solution, as opposed to the problem, going forward? How can we best communicate challenges we are hearing from the community and get good resolve going forward?

Refer to above.

The programme of work/activity proposed in Wellington City Council's Transitional programme and LGWM Targeted improvements using the innovating streets methodology of trialling, testing and improving will go a long way towards gaining public confidence.

Late questions:

What does P50 mean (mentioned on pages 91 and 93 in our papers)? I see it referenced as mid-point in the Indicative Business case attachment.

P50 is our expected forecast cost that includes some contingency. However at this stage, given the scope has not been finalised, this could still change as the investigation and public engagement progresses.

Do the Ngauranga Gorge improvements include walking and cycling on the gorge itself or just bus priority, or is it all three?

This will be investigated for all modes.

Paragraph 72 - Would you please clarify in terms of the funding (split between partners, timing of funding, where WCC has budget allocated etc). The sentence of approximately 67 words is hard to understand and comments in the supporting Information on P. 96 are not detailed enough.

The enduring funding splits are yet to be agreed, however until that agreement is made, we have an interim arrangement within the Relationship and Funding Agreement. The Council has fully budgeted for the City Streets Programme within the current LTP for the first six years.

Paragraph 14 - You refer to central government funding. Is this in fact crown agency (NZTA) funding?

Correct, as per the Let's Get Wellington Moving Relationship and Funding Agreement, central government funding is provided by Waka Kotahi through the National Land Transport Fund.

Paragraph 38: The public space public life study is still under development yet surprisingly this is a keystone to support the business case. Please advise the terms of reference/scope for this study and when you expect to receive it

The Gehl study is not a keystone to the IBC, it will however support the individual business cases in the CBD at the next phase

Paragraph 48 – Tranches - please provide details of milestones over the proposed 10-year period.

The indicative programme for the city streets programme is provided on pages 67 and 68 of the IBC

Paragraph 53: Why was this business case not held over until the completion of the MRT/SH1 business cases? The diagram highlights a number of disjointed projects with the business case itself. In addition, half the projects are entirely dependent on mass rapid transit and strategic highway decisions yet to be made (note comments provided under the LGWM programme).

There is an opportunity to progress the Tranche 1 immediate start projects prior to the completion of the MRT/SHI business case to deliver benefits to communities as soon as possible. Once the MRT/SHI business case has been completed the remaining tranche 1 projects will be reassessed.

The City Street's IBC is clear how it fits with the wider LGWM programme and has been developed to provide the maximum benefits while providing flexibility to allow different priorities to be delivered once decisions have been made in relation to the combined MRT / SHI / TDM project (plus the cycleway programme).

Paragraph 75: It is noted 'there is limited ability to make changes to the current business case' yet throughout the paper there are requirements to factor in future decisions such as the Mass rapid transit route. Paragraph 77 clarifies that the BCR for City Streets will likely change after the SH1/MRT packages are considered. Please explain.

Once the Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) route and form has been agreed the projects dependent on the MRT decision will be reassessed. As these projects will be reassessed the interventions and associated benefits will change, which will result in a change to the BCR which may be positive or negative.

Paragraph 61: How will you ensure that the professional services (in scarce supply already) required will not impact other city projects. These are already in limited supply, so any reprioritisation towards LGWM will affect other projects. How will the Council prioritise the need for such scarce resource in this Covid world?

Let's Get Wellington Moving will procure and manage professional services to develop the single stage business cases. It will be up to the professional service providers to honour their current commitments.

Paragraph 62: We are being asked to approve spending \$350million, without any explicit rationale for the business case.

This paper is not for the approval of \$350m of spending, it is to approve the IBC to allow further investigation to occur.

Paragraph 70: The first three years of the proposed 10-year \$350 million spend is only \$42.8 million with little tangible difference on the streets. How confident are you in the spend for the remaining seven years?

The forecast spend for the first three years is \$81.71m as per table 23 on page 60 of the indicative business case. The first three years are focused on developing single stage business cases for all tranche 1 projects and pre-implementation/detailed design and commencing implementation/construction of the tranche 1 immediate start projects. Given that a significant amount of business cases and design will be completed in the first three years we are confident that the full \$350m can be delivered within 10 years.

What independent peer review/assurance review has been undertaken on the indicative business case- by whom, when and scope of the review

As per Waka Kotahi requirements the business case was independently reviewed by Alchimie in June 2021. Waka Kotahi's requirements for peer reviews can be found at

<https://www.nzta.govt.nz/planning-and-investment/planning-and-investment-knowledge-base/201821-nltp/2018-21-nltp-investment-assessment-framework-iaf/peer-review-of-proposals/>

Waka Kotahi has completed an Investment Quality Assurance (IQA) of the business case.

Item 3.3 Traffic Resolution - TR94-21 Courtenay Place

Is this referring to 9 car parks only?

This Traffic Resolution is referring to 11 car parks (nine regular parking spaces and two loading zone spaces) that are located at the end of the slip lane on the south side of Courtenay Place as indicated on the map. No other parks are impacted by this Traffic Resolution.

The 11 parks are split into two groups:

- One group of four parks (located directly at the end of the slip lane). These parks were originally P120 metered parks, but it was agreed at through TR83-21 at RPC on 8 June 2021, that these parks would be converted to P30 parking at all times. Unfortunately, while this decision was verbally agreed by the RPC committee – it was not formally captured as part of the official record of proceedings, which is why we are asking to formally agree this as part of Traffic Resolution TR94-21.
- The second group of 7 parks are located further west along Courtenay Place. In this group, two carparks are currently designated as loading zones and the remaining five are currently P120 paid parking between the hours of 8am to 8pm seven days per week. The intention of Traffic Resolution TR94-21 is to convert the existing P120 paid parks to P30 time restricted at all times.
- For the two parks that are currently designated a Loading Zone – these would remain a Loading Zone between the hours of 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday and would revert to be P30 after hours, 10pm Fri – 8am Sat and 8pm – 8am Sun.

This Traffic Resolution is not looking to convert all existing available P120 on-street parking in the vicinity to P30. This Traffic Resolution is only looking to convert some existing on-street parking as outlined above. We understand that there is some concern that has been raised by the intent of this Traffic Resolution is to remove all P120 metered parking at this time. That is not the intention.

Late Questions:

What would be the process and impact of making the P30 parks – free of charge?

The intent of Traffic Resolution TR94-21 is to make the P30 parks referred to above, free of charge at all times, except for the two parks that are dedicated loading zones between the hours of 8am and 6pm, Monday to Saturday.

For the information of elected members - at the Regulatory Processes chairs meeting on 3 August 2021 the decision was made that this paper should be considered by the Planning and Environment Committee given the potential revenue impacts. Officers were also asked to consider a scenario where only the original four parks closest to the slip lane become P30 at all times and the remainder 5 stay P120 during metered hours and P30 after hours from (10pm Fri – 8am Sat), (10pm Sat – 8am Sun) and (8pm Sun – 8am Mon).

The Traffic Resolution TR94-21 currently recommends that all the identified parks be converted to P30 at all times, but officers will be able to speak to this alternative.