

Request One: Complete table of SA2s on page 15 of evidence

There are 17 SA2s coloured in the figure on page 15 of my evidence (excluding the shading of the city centre itself). Below are two tables, the original from the evidence (reproduced for completeness) and the other nine SA2s as requested by the panel.

Original table in evidence

SA2	Approximate walking distance from the edge of the City Centre	% who work in the City Centre that walk to there	% who work in the city centre that use active or public transport to get there
Mount Cook West	0-800m	73%	87%
Mount Cook East	0-800m	60%	88%
Aro Valley	0-2500m	65%	85%
Brooklyn East	150-2400m	30%	68%
Wadestown	0-2500m	29%	62%
Newtown West	800-1900m	20%	77%
Oriental Bay	0-1200m	56%	70%
Roseneath	1200-2900m	24%	61%

Other SA2s

SA2	Approximate walking distance from the edge of the City Centre	% who work in the City Centre that walk to there	% who work in the city centre that use active or public transport to get there
Wellington Botanic Gardens	0-600m ¹	81%	81%
Thorndon	0-750m	76%	88%
Wellington University	0-1400m	73%	76%
Mount Victoria	0-550m ²	67%	86%
Kelburn	900-2200m	58%	75%
Northland (Wellington City)	1000-2700m	32%	68%

¹ Technically the furthest point is likely to be at the western most point of the gardens fronting onto Glenmore Street yet there are no residential properties here. North Terrace also falls within this SA2 but is an anomaly and has been ignored in this table with the furthest measurement being taken in relation to the rest of the residential properties.

² The eastern portion of this SA2 consists of Mt Victoria, the furthest measurement has therefore been taken from the furthest residential property rather than on the far side of Mt Victoria itself.

Brooklyn North	750-2900m	29%	58%
Brooklyn South	1200-3400m	21%	54%
Newtown North	1200-2200m ³	20%	77%

As noted in evidence: These walking distances have been estimated from google maps. They are included to provide a general scale of the proximity and size of the SA2s and should not be taken as definitive.

Request Two: The wording of the 2018 census question relating to the method of travel to work

Question 44 of the individual form asked⁴:

“What is the one main way you usually travel to work – that is, the one you use for the greatest distance? [If you don’t have a usual method select the one you used most recently]”

³ The northern half of this SA2 consists of Government House and Wellington Regional Hospital, the closest measurement (1200m) has therefore been taken from the southern edge of the hospital/the closest residential property.

⁴ <https://statsnz.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p20045coll2/id/713/>

Alastair Cribbens evidence summary inc correction and clarification 24.02.23

Kia ora koutou. As Mike has said, my name is Alastair Cribbens and I am a Principal Planning Advisor at Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency.

Before I start I wish to make a couple of corrections or clarifications about my evidence.

Firstly, in paragraph 5.3 the reference to the RLTP (or Regional Land Transport Plan) should also have referred to the Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). While this plan is not specifically mentioned in the NPS-UD I believe that along with the RLTP it provides important context to understand the future plans for the public transport network.

Secondly, I wish to clarify the figures used in paragraphs 6.43-6.45 and the accompanying table and diagram. Mr Wharton noted in his rebuttal that these differed from the figures in figure 42 of the section 42a report but was unsure why. The figures in the section 42a report appear to be those for travel to all locations. The figures in my evidence are based only on people travelling from these SA2's into the city centre, that is they exclude all trips to other SA2's. This is to try and focus on the people who are making this trip and whether they choose to walk or not.

My evidence outlines my expert opinion on the importance of integrating land use and transport planning by locating higher density development within the walkable catchment of rapid transit stops, the city centre and metropolitan centres.

The main focus of my evidence is on establishing a starting point for determining the size of walkable catchments.

As explained in my evidence, my main disagreement with the approach adopted by the council is the use of a time metric, combined with a slower than usually used walking speed, when establishing the starting point for the size of walkable catchments. While time is often referred to in the literature and guidance as being associated with walkable catchments sizes, it is rarely used as the metric to measure or determine catchments.

In my view distance is the widely accepted, and appropriate metric and I could find no justification from the council as to the reason for this departure, at least in establishing a starting point.

While that is my position for the starting point, I do not disagree with the attempts of the council to account for the effect of topography on the scale of catchments. I believe these two positions can be combined by using distance to establish the baseline size for flat catchments and applying a time metric along the lines of that proposed by the council.

My recommended distances for this baseline, or starting point, are set out in my evidence. The propensity for people to walk is a spectrum and there is no clear magic number. Nevertheless, in line with academic evidence and international best practice, my recommendation is that 800m would be the most appropriate starting point for rapid transit and metropolitan centre catchments and 1500m for the city centre.

My evidence also summarises my support for the identification of the Johnsonville Line as rapid transit. While I don't believe the existing inter-peak (during the day) frequencies are sufficient to categorise it being called rapid transit, based on documents such as the RLTP and RPTP I believe it can be considered 'planned'.