

**Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council**

Me Heke Ki Pōneke

Ordinary Meeting of Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council

Ngā Meneti | Minutes

9.30am Rāapa Wednesday, 14 Pīpiri June 2023

Ngake (16.09), Level 16, Tahiwī,

113 The Terrace

Pōneke | Wellington



PRESENT

Mayor Whanau (Chair)
Deputy Mayor Foon (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Abdurahman
Councillor Apanowicz
Councillor Brown
Councillor Calvert
Councillor Chung
Councillor Free
Councillor Matthews
Councillor McNulty
Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Pannett
Councillor Paul
Councillor Randle
Councillor Wi Neera
Councillor Young

IN ATTENDANCE

Hohaia Holden

TABLE OF CONTENTS

14 JUNE 2023

Business	Page No.
1. Meeting Conduct	5
1.1 Karakia	7
1.2 Apologies	7
1.3 Announcements by the Mayor	7
1.4 Conflict of Interest Declarations	7
1.5 Confirmation of Minutes	7
1.6 Items not on the Agenda	8
1.7 Public Participation	8
2. General Business	8
2.1 Let's Get Wellington Moving Golden Mile Traffic Resolutions Oral Hearing	13

1 Meeting Conduct

1.1 Karakia

The Democracy Advisor opened the meeting (hui) at 9.30am with the following karakia.

Whakataka te hau ki te uru,	Cease oh winds of the west
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga.	and of the south
Kia mākinakina ki uta,	Let the bracing breezes flow,
Kia mātaratara ki tai.	over the land and the sea.
E hī ake ana te atākura.	Let the red-tipped dawn come
He tio, he huka, he hauhū.	with a sharpened edge, a touch of frost,
Tihei Mauri Ora!	a promise of a glorious day

Nomination of Acting Chairperson

Secretarial note: The chair being vacant, the democracy advisor called for nominations for a member of Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council to act as chairperson until the Mayor joins the meeting.

Councillor Calvert nominated Councillor Free as chair.

Standing Order 7.1: Provisions for election of deputy mayor, chairpersons and deputy chairpersons of committees, and representatives of the local authority

When electing a deputy mayor, a committee chairperson, a deputy chairperson or **acting chairperson**, the local authority or a committee must resolve to use one of the following two voting systems:

System A: The candidate will be elected or appointed if he or she receives the votes of a majority of the members of the local authority or committee who are present and voting. This system has the following characteristics:

- (a) “there is a first round of voting for all candidates; and
- (b) if no candidate is successful in that round there is a second round of voting from which the candidate with the fewest votes in the first round is excluded; and
- (c) if no candidate is successful in the second round there is a third, and if necessary subsequent round of voting from which, each time, the candidate with the fewest votes in the previous round is excluded; and
- (d) in any round of voting, if 2 or more candidates tie for the lowest number of votes, the person excluded from the next round is resolved by lot.”

System B: The candidate will be elected or appointed if he or she receives more votes than any other candidate. This system has the following characteristics:

- (a) “there is only one round of voting; and
- (b) if two or more candidates tie for the most votes, the tie is resolved by lot.” [LGA 2002, sch 7 cl 25

Election of Acting Chairperson

Moved Councillor Young, seconded Councillor Chung

Resolved

That Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council

1. Agree to use System A ~~or System B~~
2. Appoint **Councillor Free** as Chair

Carried

The motion was voted on part by part, the division of which was as follows:

Clause 1

For:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon (Deputy Chair), Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

Against:

Absent:

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Brown, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 13:0

Carried

Clause 2

For:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon (Deputy Chair), Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

Against:

Absent:

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Brown, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 13:0

Carried

Following the appointment of the chair, the Democracy Advisor called for Councillor Free to preside.

1. 2 Apologies

Moved Councillor Free, seconded Councillor McNulty

Resolved

That Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council:

1. Accept the apologies received from Mayor Whanau for lateness.

Carried

A division was required under Standing Order 27.6(d), voting on which was as follows:

For:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon (Deputy Chair), Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

Against:

Absent:

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Brown, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 13:0

Carried

1. 3 Announcements by the Mayor

There were no announcements by the Mayor.

1. 4 Conflict of Interest Declarations

No conflicts of interest were declared.

1. 5 Confirmation of Minutes

Moved Councillor Free, seconded Councillor O'Neill

Resolved

That Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council:

1. Approves the minutes of the Ordinary Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council Meeting held on 1 June 2023, having been circulated, that they be taken as read and confirmed as an accurate record of that meeting.

Carried

A division was required under Standing Order 27.6(d), voting on which was as follows:

For:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon (Deputy Chair), Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

Against:

Absent:

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Brown, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 13:0

Carried

1.6 Items not on the Agenda

There were no items not on the agenda.

1.7 Public Participation

There were no requests for public participation in addition to the oral submitters for the hearing.

Meeting duration and Adjournment

Moved Councillor Free, seconded Councillor Chung

Resolved

That Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council:

1. Extend the meeting beyond six hours, in accordance with standing order 11.7.
2. Adjourn the meeting until 9:30am, Thursday 15 June 2023.

Carried

A division was required under Standing Order 27.6(d), voting on which was as follows:

For:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon (Deputy Chair), Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

Against:

Absent:

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Brown, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 13:0

Carried

2. General Business

Secretarial note: The following members of the public addressed the Council regarding their written submissions:

Oral submitter	Organisation/group:	Agenda Page Number
Michelle Rush		256 (#48)
Richard Burrell		28 (#4)
Alex Dyer	Cycle Wellington	298 (#56)
Alex Marinkovich-Josey		38 (#6)

(Mayor Whanau joined the hui at 10.03am)

Secretarial note: Councillor Free vacated the chair for Mayor Whanau to resume as Chairperson at 10.09am.

Oral submitter	Organisation/group:	Agenda Page Number
Andrew Williams		129 (#24)
Neil Deans		321 (#60)
Joy		489 (#24)
Jamie Collier		293 (#55)
Malcolm		33 (#5)

Secretarial note: The hui adjourned at 10.36am and resumed at 10.46am with the following members present: Mayor Whanau, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Randle and Councillor Young.

Oral submitter	Organisation/group:	Agenda Page Number
Lance Pratley		326 (#61)
Peter Northcote		434 (#13)
Rex Nicholls		118 (#22)
Dennis McKinlay		278 (#52)
Martin Jenkins	Friends of Khandallah	549 (#36)
Ian Hutchings		539 (#34)

(Councillor McNulty left the hui at 11.12am and returned at 11.21am)

(Councillor Brown left the hui at 11.19am and returned at 11.21am)

Secretarial note: The hui adjourned at 11.24am and resumed at 11.45am with the following members present: Mayor Whanau, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett and Councillor Young.

(Councillor Paul joined the hui at 11.47am)

(Councillor Randle joined the hui at 11.48am)

(Councillor Paul left the hui at 11.48am and returned at 11.50am)

Oral submitter	Organisation/group:	Agenda Page Number
James Sullivan		88 (#16)
Mike Mellor		18 (#2)
Pat S Szetey		246 (#46)
Neale Pitches		563

Julia Burgess	Driving Miss Daisy Wellington City/Wellington East	494 (#25)
Chris Vanderkolk		524 (#31)
Graeme Waters and Manjit Singh		343 (#64)
Rich H		474 (#21)

(Councillor Chung left the hui at 12.03pm and returned at 12.04pm)

Secretarial note: The hui adjourned at 12.35pm and reconvened at 12.45pm with the following members present: Mayor Whanau, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Randle and Councillor Young.

(Councillor Free joined the hui at 12.46pm)

(Councillor Abdurahman joined the hui at 12.48pm)

(Councillor Apanowicz joined the hui at 12.48pm)

Oral submitter	Organisation/group:	Agenda Page Number
Aimee Hines	Retail NZ	578
Katherine Blow	Victoria University of Wellington Student's Association	175 (#33)
Manjit Singh	Hospitality New Zealand	595
Nicola Cranfield	Cranfields	144 (#27)
Rutger Keijser		149 (#28)

(Councillor Chung left the hui at 12.56pm and returned at 12.57pm)

(Councillor Randle left the hui at 12.56pm and returned at 12.59pm)

Secretarial note: The hui adjourned at 1.27pm and reconvened at 9.30am on Thursday 15 June with the following members present: Mayor Whanau, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Randle, Councillor Wi Neera and Councillor Young.

Secretarial note: The following members of the public addressed the Council regarding their written submissions:

Oral submitter	Organisation/group:	Agenda Page Number
Richard Goodyear		195 (#37)
Richard Young		429 (#12)
Ellen Blake	Living Streets Aotearoa	304 (#57)
Liz Parsons		251 (#47)
Ian Douglas		159 (#30)

David Brian		262 (#49)
Ian Cassells	The Wellington Company	569
Paul Bailey		215 (#41)
Robert Fisher		384 (#3)
Tony Vial		444 (#15)

(Councillor O'Neill left the hui at 9.46am and returned at 10.15am)

(Councillor Brown left the hui at 10.02am and returned at 10.4am)

(Councillor Randle left the hui at 10.15am)

(Councillor Wi Neera left the hui at 10.20am)

Secretarial note: The hui adjourned at 10.31am and reconvened at 10.40am with the following members present: Mayor Whanau, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Wi Neera and Councillor Young.

(Councillor Apanowicz joined the meeting at 10.41am)

Oral submitter	Organisation/group:	Agenda Page Number
River Wicks		134 (#25)
Malcolm Gore		190 (#36)
Khoi Phan		394 (#5)

(Councillor Paul left the hui at 10.43am)

(Councillor Brown left the hui at 10.50am)

Secretarial note: The hui adjourned at 10.55am and reconvened at 11.00am with the following members present: Mayor Whanau, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul and Councillor Young.

(Councillor McNulty joined the hui at 11.02am)

(Councillor Wi Neera joined the hui at 11.03am)

(Councillor McNulty left the hui at 11.03am and returned at 11.19am)

Oral submitter	Organisation/group:	Agenda Page Number
James Barber		83 (#15)
Bruce Johnston		139 (#26)
Barrie Saunders		113 (#21)
Bianca Moller		98 (#18)

Secretarial note: The hui adjourned at 11.21am and reconvened at 11.50am with the following members present: Mayor Whanau, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul and Councillor Young.

(Councillor Brown joined the hui at 11.52am)

Oral submitter	Organisation/group:	Agenda Page Number
Danny Arulandu	Istana Malaysia Restaurant	504 (#27)
Steve Maran		529 (#32)
Steve James		529 (#32)
Isabella		565 (#39)
Regan Sayer		48 (#8)
Gerard Earl and Sandamali Ambepitiya	Property Council	599
Barry Wilson and Eyal Aharoni	SOS Courtenay Place	570
Robert Armstrong		509 (#28)
Greig Wilson	Greig Wilson (company)	419 (#10)
Ed Gibbs	Wellington Chamber of Commerce	588
Chris Dudfield		364 (#68)
Alex Gray	NZAA District Council	604

(Councillor Young left the hui at 12.11pm and returned at 12.16pm)

(Councillor Randle joined the hui at 12.27pm)

(Councillor Paul left the hui at 1.13pm and returned at 1.15pm)

(Councillor Matthews left the hui at 1.17pm and returned at 1.19pm)

(Councillor Chung left the hui at 1.17pm)

(Councillor Free left the hui at 1.20pm and returned at 1.25pm)

2.1 Let's Get Wellington Moving Golden Mile Traffic Resolutions Oral Hearing

Moved Mayor Whanau, seconded Councillor Matthews

Resolved

That Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council:

1. Receive the information.
2. Hear the oral submitters and thank them for their submissions.

Carried

A division was required under Standing Order 27.6(d), voting on which was as follows:

For:

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Deputy Mayor Foon (Deputy Chair), Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Paul, Councillor Randle, Councillor Wi Neera, Councillor Young

Against:

Absent:

Councillor Chung

Majority Vote: 15:0

Carried

Attachments

- 1 Presentation - Neil Deans
- 2 PowerPoint presentation - Peter Northcote
- 3 PowerPoint presentation - James Sullivan
- 4 Presentation - Driving Miss Daisy
- 5 PowerPoint presentation - The Wellington Company
- 6 Presentation - Robert Fisher
- 7 Presentation - Rex Nicholls
- 8 Submission - Neale Pitches
- 9 Submission - Ian Cassels
- 10 Submission - SOS Courtenay Place
- 11 Submission - Retail NZ
- 12 Submission - Wellington Chamber of Commerce
- 13 Submission - Hospitality New Zealand
- 14 Submission - Property Council
- 15 Submission - NZAA District Council

The meeting concluded at 1.27 pm with the reading of the following karakia:

Unuhia, unuhia, unuhia ki te uru tapu nui	Draw on, draw on
Kia wātea, kia māmā, te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua	Draw on the supreme sacredness To clear, to free the heart, the body and the spirit of mankind
I te ara takatū	
Koia rā e Rongo, whakairia ake ki runga	Oh Rongo, above (symbol of peace)
Kia wātea, kia wātea	Let this all be done in unity
Āe rā, kua wātea!	

Authenticated: _____
Chair

Ordinary Meeting of Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council

Minute item attachments

9.30am Wednesday, 14 June 2023
Ngake (16.09), Level 16, Tahiwī,
113 The Terrace, Wellington

Business

Page No.

2.1 Let's Get Wellington Moving Golden Mile Traffic Resolutions Oral Hearing

1.	Presentation - Neil Deans	2
2.	PowerPoint presentation - Peter Northcote	3
3.	PowerPoint presentation - James Sullivan	5
4.	Presentation - Driving Miss Daisy	13
5.	PowerPoint presentation - The Wellington Company	16
6.	Presentation - Robert Fisher	27
7.	Presentation - Rex Nicholls	28
8.	Submission - Neale Pitches	30
9.	Submission - Ian Cassels	36
10.	Submission - SOS Courtenay Place	37
11.	Submission - Retail NZ	45
12.	Submission - Wellington Chamber of Commerce	55
13.	Submission - Hospitality New Zealand	62
14.	Submission - Property Council	66
15.	Submission - NZAA District Council	71

Oral Submission to Golden Mile Hearings from Neil Deans: Submitter #60

Summary

- Thank you for the opportunity to speak and for the work to improve the Golden Mile for public transport, cyclists and pedestrians
- Note I have also made a **separate submission on various other cycle/vehicle routes through the CBD**, which appear to be joined up, but not entirely clear
- I have lived and worked in many parts of New Zealand and travelled extensively around the world, so have seen where public and other transport can work effectively and safely.
- I acknowledge Wellington has some significant geographical constraints but **appreciate the range of transport options available**, especially new e-options.
- I **use various modes of transport to and through the CBD**, commuting daily by bicycle from Khandallah to Manners St, sometimes using bus or trains and often cycle or walk around and through the CBD; occasionally visiting or crossing the CBD/Golden Mile by private car mostly in weekends. **Thanks for new cycleways along Hutt Rd.**
- I **support most of the proposals to improve the area, especially for cycles**, but have some observations and suggestions.
- **All traffic users need to recognise and respect other transport uses, and understand how to operate safely and consistently.**
- **Enabling traffic to be spread throughout the day** reduces peak traffic issues.
- **Clarifying expectations of behaviour** for different traffic modes would be helpful; requires a change of mind set.




Specific points


- **Appreciate the linkages** and joining up of different transport options; which need to link up; starting and stopping lanes is hazardous
- Note **some options are not mutually compatible**, eg cyclists, pedestrians and buses so should be separated
- **Signs and use of paint needs to be specific and consistent** (eg don't use green paint for both bus and cycle lanes; 45 and 90 degree carparks are highly hazardous for cyclists)

Peter Northcote, LGWM oral submission, 14 June 2023



Change private exemption test from 'impossible' or abandon Willis St northbound prohibition


Current		Proposed
0.76		1.73
	km	
6		10
3-7		7-18
	mins	






Defer the Willis Street traffic resolution

- Passing it when just starting consultation on Victoria Street is **very poor policy and process** which would **limit Victoria Street options**.
- **City Streets' intention** is for **cycle lanes in Victoria Street**, with its **many carpark entrances, removing street parking** for pick up / delivery, share cars, visiting prof rooms / public services, etc, while many **vulnerable pedestrians attempt to access the library and Civic Square**.
- **Proper consideration should be given to bi-directional micro/cycle lane on Willis Street**, with southbound busses using multi-lane Victoria Street (and private traffic allowed on both as now):
 - **Greater net benefit for all road and pavement users**
 - **Increased vibrancy and connection** for and between Golden Mile, Civic Square and waterfront.





The vast majority of submitters chose the biggest change even knowing the cost

Public backs most radical plan to remove cars from Wellington's Golden Mile

Joel MacManus · 19:30, Oct 28 2020



The majority of public feedback has supported the most progressive plan to remove cars from Wellington's Golden Mile.

Wellingtonians have overwhelmingly backed a radical plan to remove cars from the city's Golden Mile, to significantly widen footpaths and to turn several side streets in Wellington's inner city into pedestrian-only zones.

Almost 2000 people gave feedback on three options for proposed changes to Wellington's Golden Mile, which runs 1.5 miles from the Beehive to the end of Courtenay Place.

The vast majority supported the "transform" option, the most radical of the three options to reform Wellington's main shopping and entertainment area. The plan would cost **up to \$80 million** and remove up to 200 car parks between Wellington Railway Station and Kent/Cambridge Terrace.

Do not let perfect be the enemy of better!

- ▶ Is this design perfect?
 - ▶ No
- ▶ Is it better than the status quo?
 - ▶ YES!!!
- ▶ Delaying for perfect will result in no changes and millions more spent to get to the same point.
 - ▶ Which is odd when many here complain things take too long and cost too much.

Lack of out front parking kills businesses?



Another business sure that parking removal will destroy business

[REDACTED] pay to occupy, are an essential part of being able to do business on Hutt Road as they provide car parking for [REDACTED]. Removing these car parks will have a significant impact on the site.

May 2016

Current state of the site



Still open and trading in 2023

Change for the right reasons is still good, even when uncomfortable.

- ▶ The changes will result in people having to adjust.
 - ▶ Just as they do for rush hour traffic or when they can't find parking exactly where they want to
- ▶ The Golden Mile has the highest rents in the city.
 - ▶ Odd how landowners never not expected to ever adjust pricing down.
- ▶ Almost every single example from similar sized locations show these changes increase business incomes.
 - ▶ The Retail Impact Assessment provides solid examples
- ▶ Wellingtonians submitted overwhelmingly for the biggest change.
 - ▶ Even when LGWM was pushing for less change.



**Driving Miss Daisy Wellington City/Wellington East
- submission on Golden Mile traffic resolutions**

This submission relates to the Lambton Quay consultation, but applies equally to all areas of the Golden Mile.

Driving Miss Daisy is a companion driving service providing transport and assistance for older people, people with physical and intellectual disabilities, and people recovering from injury. We are an essential service and provide support for vulnerable individuals.

Many health-related providers are located in Lambton Quay, including physios, dentists, medical practices, optometrists, and ultrasound, imaging and x-ray services. We assist people to appointments at these providers on a regular basis.

Our service differs from a taxi in that we provide door-to-door assistance, helping our clients out of our vehicles to and from the reception area for the appointment they are attending. This may entail assisting users of wheelchairs, walkers, or crutches, people with vision and hearing impairments, and people living with chronic illness, mental ill health, dementia.

We acknowledge the efforts of LGWM in managing traffic flow and improving the efficiency of our public transport system. We understand the necessity to prioritise public transport and enhance the overall accessibility of the area. We are concerned, though, that in prioritising pedestrians, cyclists, and bus users, we do not further disadvantage those who already live with mobility and accessibility limitations.

While we acknowledge the efforts being made to provide increased mobility parking in side streets, we firmly believe that this still poses a disadvantage for our clients. The proposed changes will require our clients to navigate extended footpaths, cycleways, and bus lanes, potentially being exposed to weather conditions and adding stress and fatigue to their journey. This is likely to have a negative impact on their overall wellbeing, health, and/or recovery.

As an approved Total Mobility provider, we play a crucial role in ensuring people with impairments can meet their daily needs. The Total Mobility Scheme is intended to complement public transport services and ensure people with impairments can continue to access their services and community in a safe and dignified manner, and is open to people with a disability that prevents them from travelling on buses. Our clients, who are unable to use the bus services prioritised for Lambton Quay, rely on our assistance to attend their appointments. It is essential that we have access to Lambton Quay and are able to stop our vehicles and assist our clients directly into their appointments.

We understand that a special authority process is proposed for vehicle access to Lambton Quay, but this process appears incompatible with the nature of our service. The individual trip basis and the requirement to apply days in advance do not align with the regular and on-demand care and assistance we provide to our clients.

In addition to the above issues, it is important to consider the financial implications of these access restrictions. Our clients, who are already disadvantaged by disability or special needs, will face increased costs due to the additional time and assistance required if we are unable to access Lambton Quay on their behalf. It is crucial to minimise financial burdens on these individuals who are already facing numerous challenges.



Driving
Miss Daisy®

We're There For You

We're family when
family can't be there



Our safe, friendly and
reliable companion
driving service offers
independence and
peace of mind.



Total Mobility cards accepted,
offering discounts in most regions
across New Zealand.

Call Driving Miss Daisy and ride with a friend

Our nationwide companion driving service offers much more than just transportation. We'll drive you to and from your destination and provide further assistance as needed.

Our drivers are all safety checked, licensed and first aid accredited for your peace of mind.

Driving Miss Daisy can help with any appointment or outing.

- Proud to be trusted by national organisations
- Total Mobility cards accepted
- ACC registered vendor
- Bookings essential



Wheelchair accessible vehicles available in most regions.

0800 948 432



Driving
Miss Daisy®

We're There For You

www.drivingmissdaisy.co.nz



Lets Get Wellington Moving or Lets Get Wellington Walking





Harbour Quays

What we learnt:

Big idea led to an
unfortunate result





The “problem”

projected 50–80,000 people in the next 30 years – how to move them?




The background

- No money
- Poor infrastructure
- Unhappy Wellington



Wellington is a relatively unique city, trading patterns, relationships etc





The opportunity

The City hosts 60,000 people a day –
large capacity for intensity



The history


Inner city has grown by 12,000 in the last decade – could do three at 15,000+

Our experience over 33 years:
2 Carparks to 0 Carparks



The consequence

- Save money
- Lower rates
- Reduce carbon
- Improve the City



Lets Get Wellington Walking

Item 2.1 Attachment 5




Some suggestions

- Postpone for 3–5 years whilst incentivizing inner city living (so as to minimize the effects of the plan when/if implemented).
- Consider removing the suburban buses from the centre city.
- Support seismic and insurance work to lower the cost effects.
- Study the benefits of the intensification thus far to prove the case.

This can't be decided in 10 minutes, please give us time to prove it?



Inner city residents emit 80% less than national average



Source: Sense Partners, Statistics New Zealand



Lets Get Wellington Walking

Item 2.1 Attachment 5



THE
WELLINGTON
COMPANY

Thank you.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL , THURSDAY 15 JUNE 2023

MY NAME IS ROBERT FISHER. I HAVE BEEN A RATE PAYER FOR 60 YEARS.

I REPRESENT APPROX 40 WELLINGTONIANS...PROFESSIONALS, ACCOUNTANTS, LAWYERS, MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS EX POLITICIANS AND RETAILERS.

COLLECTIVELY, WE'VE WATCHED WELLINGTON DETERIORATE OVER THE LAST 13 YEARS. IT'S BECOME A SHAMBLES, INFRASTRUCTURE FAILING, VACANT SHOPS, INADEQUATE PARKING, SMALL BUSINESSES STRUGGLING AND EXCESSIVE RATES.

OUR CITY HAS LOST ITS MOJO.

DURING KERRY PENDERGRAST'S REIGN, WE HAD THE RUGBY SEVENS, VOLVO ROUND THE WORLD YACHT RACE, THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SPORTS CENTRE IN KILBIRNIE, THE SCULPTURE TRUST AND A SAND BEACH IN ORIENTAL BAY.

IT OFTEN APPEARS AS IF THE STAFF ARE RUNNIG THE COUNCIL MORE THAN THE COUNCILLORS.

WE'VE COME TO THE CONCLUSION POLICIES HAVE BEEN DIRECTED TOWARDS 'NICE TO HAVE' AND NOT CONTROLLED BY PRUDENT FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.

I HAVE OWNED OR PART OWNED SEVERAL COMPANIES, ONE WITH 1500 EMPLOYEES. A BUDGET IS SET AND ADHERRED TO. ANY OVERRUNS ARE FINANCED SEPARATELY OR SAVINGS MADE ON 'NICE TO HAVES'.

INFRASTRUCTURE SHOULD BE FIRST SECOND AND THIRD. CYCLE WAYS WHILST GREAT FOR THE CITY SHOULD BE PUT ON HOLD IN FAVOUR OF INFRASTRUCTURE SPENDING. REDUCED CARPARKING, IRRATIONAL WIDENING OF FOOTPATHS THE MISGUIDED GOLDEN MILE POLICY AND THE DISASTROUS 'LET'S GET WELLINGTON MOVING' SHOULD BE SCRAPPED. THE HUTT CYCLE WAY IS QUESTIONABLE FROM A COST BENEFIT POINT OF VIEW.

THE ONLY POSITIVE PLUSSES WE CAN THINK OF RECENTLY ARE THE RESEVIOR AND TAKINA.


THE WARD SYSTEM SHOULD BE REFINED. A MAXIMUM OF 8 WARDS AND 10 COUNCILLORS, 2 OF WHOM ARE APPOINTED OUTSIDE THE WARD SYSTEM WITH FINANCIAL EXPERTISE.

THE CURRENT SYSTEM HAS FAILED WITH OBVIOUS NON-COHESIVE ATTITUDES.

CONCILLORS ARE ELECTED TO SERVE THE COMMUNITY AND TO EXERCISE PRUDENT MANAGEMENT

FINALLY, WHAT ABOUT ELIMINATING APPROX 50% OF THE ORANGE CONES AROUND THE CITY WHICH ARE SUPERFLUOUS AND CANCEL THE ILL THOUGHT OUT REMOVAL OF 80 CARRPARKS IN ARO STREET. R

Rex Nicholls



14 June 2023

Submission to LGWM, Golden Mile

Having been a Councillor 1983-89, 92-98, I realise you are going ahead with this project anyway, so I'm trying to suggest compromises, not fight against you. First some preliminary comments:

Manners St is car free now. It has degenerated into poor quality shopping, shut shops, reduced pedestrian flows, unsavoury behaviour. This street could well be an indicator of the future Lambton Quay without its car-using shoppers

Lambton Quay has always had NZ's highest pedestrian foot-traffic count over lunchtimes. People enjoy busy footpaths; humans like interaction. Wellington's current footpaths are never congested compared to larger cities

Shops on the Golden Mile rely on deliveries at irregular times, and only when shops are open

Using side streets with turn-arounds at the end will not work – they will frequently be blocked with illegally stopped and parked vehicles

The fly-throughs show dangerous bike/pedestrian areas. Accidents will abound

The future of road transport will be autonomous electric vehicles. People will not own cars, just call up a ride or ride-share. Extremely cheap, fast, simple. The CBD won't need parking but will need access to drop off points.

Idea 1:

Allow some access: West Waring-Taylor, along LQ, east Johnston
West Brandon, along LQ, east Panama. (As per plan)


Idea 2:

Buses create the biggest congestion: Therefore have suburban buses turn around at the Bunny St depot, make another at the end of Courtenay Place with covered change-over points and continuous ticketing. Run a non-stop single-level bus service, very cheap or free, along then Golden Mile. Many fewer and much fuller buses. Lower congestion.

Presently there can be 7 buses nose to tail, each with only 2-5 passengers. With fewer buses, Courtenay Place will certainly not be congested, so current car access status quo should remain. Elderly and disabled people, as well as young, fit, people need to access entertainment, theatres, etc.

Page 1 of 1
Printed from my Mac

Te Ika-a-Māui/North Island
Wellington



Golden Mile

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: GM (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, May 23, 2023 9:11:40 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, May 23, 2023 9:48:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:37:12

Page 2: Would you like to share quick or detailed feedback about this project?

Q1 Respondent skipped this question

Would you like to complete the quick or the detailed survey?

Page 3: Area 1: Lambton Quay

Q2 Unsupportive

Do you support the proposed changes to the road on Lambton Quay?

Q3 Unsupportive

Do you support the proposed changes to the location of bus stops and pedestrian crossings on Lambton Quay?

Q4 Unsupportive

Do you support the proposed changes to side streets connected to Lambton Quay?

Q5 Unsupportive

Do you support the proposed plans for managing vehicle access to Lambton Quay?

Q6
Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed road changes for Lambton Quay?

I am very disappointed in the LGWM process and proposals as the whole project is dependent on flexible, people-, and business-serving public transport which does not exist. I am an experienced business person, CEO and Managing Director and am very concerned that the LGWM project will not serve the businesses of Wellington or their customers. A city cannot thrive on one street of grunge no matter how 'cool' and diverse that grunge is.

Golden Mile

Q7

Is there anything about how you use Lambton Quay that you would like us to consider?(This feedback may not change the roading plans, but helps us better understand the impacts of any changes and how we might improve the authorisation system and/or mitigate any disruption.)

I am bitterly disappointed in the LGWM process. I want to see:

1. A Commitment to meaningful engagement with Wellington's business community. Questionnaires do not constitute 'meaningful engagement.
2. We need to see the priorities for unlocking progress on the wider LGWM transformative programme before progressing with changes to the Golden Mile!
3. Where is the comprehensive impact assessment of the proposals on businesses along the Golden Mile?
4. I understand the Golden Mile is one of the largest retail precincts in the world relative to city size. The Golden Mile needs customers and right now the only convenient way to get there and to move around is by car. (PS I have a Hybrid vehicle to reduce my emissions profile.
5. I would like to see a detailed assessment of the costs associated with LGWM projects, including the proposed changes to the Golden Mile
6. I would like to see a clearly set-out governance and funding arrangement for all LGWM projects
7. Councillors and the public must communicate a clear and well-reasoned view of how much Waka Kotahi, Greater Wellington Regional Council and Wellington City Council are expected to contribute, and which organisation is the ultimate decision-maker
8. And finally who on earth would expect cyclists to be the major customers of the CBD? and what possible rationale is there for removing 450 carparks at this time? Get the public transport in place first!

Page 4: Area 2: Willis Street

Q8

Unsupportive

Do you support the proposed changes to the road on Willis Street?

Q9

Unsupportive

Do you support the proposed plans for managing vehicle access to Willis Street?

Q10

Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed road changes for Willis Street?

This is a deeply disingenuous statement, 'The roading changes prioritise people and buses'. People need to be able to shop and visit other CBD public facilities in a timely and flexible manner. Most cannot bike and must drive given the paucity of public transport options and routes in this city

Q11

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything about how you use Willis Street that you would like us to consider?(This feedback may not change the roading plans, but helps us better understand the impacts of any changes and how we might improve the authorisation system and/or mitigate any disruption.)

Golden Mile

Page 5: Area 3: Manners Street

Q12 **Unsupportive**

Do you support the proposed changes to the road on Manners Street?

Q13 **Unsupportive**

Do you support the proposed plans for managing vehicle access to Manners Street?

Q14

Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed road changes for Manners Street?

See my overarching statement above

Q15 **Respondent skipped this question**

Is there anything about how you use Manners Street that you would like us to consider?(This feedback may not change the roading plans, but helps us better understand the impacts of any changes and how we might improve the authorisation system and/or mitigate any disruption.)

Page 6: Area 4: Courtenay Place

Q16 **Unsupportive**

Do you support the proposed changes to the road on Courtenay Place?

Q17 **Unsupportive**

Do you support the proposed plans for managing vehicle access to Courtenay Place?

Q18

Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed road changes for Courtenay Place?

Currently the only way to time-efficiently use the CBD is by car. The public transport services and routes are poor. The CBD will not survive the proposed changes that will 'transform' the Golden Mile into a park

Golden Mile

Q19

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything about how you use Courtenay Place that you would like us to consider? (This feedback may not change the roading plans, but helps us better understand the impacts of any changes and how we might improve the authorisation system and/or mitigate any disruption.)

Page 7: Authorisation system

Q20

Unsupportive

Do you support the proposed authorisation system to restrict private vehicle access to the Golden Mile?

Q21

Do you have any feedback on the proposed authorisation system?

Another disingenuous statement, 'To enable the changes to the Golden Mile that prioritise buses and make it a more pleasant place to be'. People go to the Golden Mile to shop and access services, not for recreation!

Page 8

Q22

Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed changes for the Golden Mile?

See my earlier full statement. We need to see the assurance processes that LGWM have put into place to quality assure, and manage risk for this project. It is based on a fallacy - that Wellington has or will soon have efficient, flexible and affordable public transport

Page 9: Public transport and public spaces

Q23

Strongly disagree

Do you agree that the proposed changes will improve bus travel on the Golden Mile?

Q24

Strongly disagree

Do you agree that the proposed changes will make the area more attractive?

Page 10: A bit about you

Golden Mile

Q25

What is your main relationship to the Golden Mile?

I shop there, and access services. Occasionally I eat there but only occasionally outside! This is Wellington. You must listen-to and look after the Golden Mile businesses! I have to say I been recently been travelling to Petone, Johnsonville, and lower Hutt for access to shops, theatres and malls which are very convenient. In addition I don't pay \$10 to park there which adds to the cost of supporting their businesses

Q26

How do you normally get to the Golden Mile?

I drive my hybrid vehicle. Bus routes my suburb (Northland) are terrible having been better so I have lost faith in city decision-makers. But busses are rarely convenient and flexible

Q27

How do you normally get around the Golden Mile?

I either walk or drive. Bus routes are unreliable. And as I age walking is more challenging. It's easier to leave the city for a mall.

Q28

Respondent skipped this question

Would you like to upload a file to support your submission?

Q29

Name

Neale Pitches

Q30

Email

[REDACTED]

Q31

An individual

Are you providing feedback as:

Q32

Respondent skipped this question

If providing feedback as a school/organisation, what is your school/organisation's name?

Golden Mile

Q33

Yes

Would you like to speak to Councillors at the Committee hearing in support of your submission? (Date likely to be in mid-June)

Q34

If yes, please leave your phone number.

██████████

Q35

Northland

Suburb

Q36

Male

Gender

Q37

■

Please choose the age group you belong to:

Q38

■

Do you live with any accessibility issue?



From: Ian Cassels [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 23 May 2023 2:06 pm
To: Golden Mile <GoldenMile@lgwm.nz>
Subject: Our view

CAUTION: The sender of this email is from outside Waka Kotahi. Do not click links, attachments, or reply unless you recognise the sender's email address and know the content is safe.
Thank you for the opportunity to present our view.

We believe that disruption to the existing trading patterns is injurious and not well understood.

We believe that there are better ways of reducing transport emissions.

We have been developers and ratepayers within the CBD for 33 years and possess considerable experience and understanding of the city.

We wish to be heard.

regards

Ian Cassels
Managing Director



This message, together with any attachments, may contain information that is classified and/or subject to legal privilege. Any classification markings must be adhered to. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not peruse, disclose, disseminate, copy or use the message in any way. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by return email and then destroy the original message. This communication may be accessed or retained by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency for information assurance purposes.

SUBMISSION TO LGWM AND WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL – SOS COURTENAY PLACE.



The proposal to eliminate Cars and Goods Vehicles from Courtenay Place has been entirely rejected, including the WCC resolutions that aimed to validate them.

Who are we?

We are businesses in Courtenay Place and are affected significantly. Our assets and jobs are on the line. The weighting of our submission is individual (not counted as one as before). We 100% support SOS Courtenay Place and are in support of all "Golden Mile" businesses "Car free" is a pipe dream. Previous interventions (i.e., Tory Street one way and the Bond Street parklet) led to a 50% drop in turnover – (Dragons/Joels Garage and Swan Barbers). The south side 'Taxi trial' from 6pm by WCC led to a 40% drop in turnover along there. WCC has been profoundly naïve before.

A Car Destination Always

Courtenay place is so obviously a car dependent destination. Tradies, and even police arrive from 7am and all day and customers to 4am... For over 150 years a car street always, even horses and carts in the old days. Car admission only after 9pm to 7am is absolutely unworkable. Where will they park? And what trade will they do? How will trade exist in the morning or afternoon? In effect you close a whole town by day. A deep betrayal of rate payers and successful status quo.

Goods Delivered, Truck Interaction receivers.

Goods cannot be delivered daily, all weather, from limited distant zones. Tons arrive daily. The Grand gets 120 Kegs in one delivery. The 'permit idea' is hopelessly slow, costly and could only be conceived by a bureaucrat. The Council has always been ordinary at timely interactions. 'Time is money' and deliveries are on a random schedule to demand and often urgent. Great cost and paperwork maybe "dream time" to a bureaucrat but not to people busy like us. We have tea breaks at our stations. Many people work 6 days, 10 hours or more.

- Trucks, even smaller (less than 8m), cannot turn without 6 to 8-point turns on Allen/Blair. What if 4 or 5 arrive at a similar time, as happens now regularly?
- What of noise pollution of constantly sounding backing horns? How will this sound in Ora and Kura all day long and the offices above? A legal nuisance? Probably.
- What of danger to the elderly, infirm, disabled, mothers with prams and toddlers of blind backing canopy trucks, with very limited vision and in the often blizzard weather of these streets, orientation north/south.
- Will trucks be forced to back all the way out to Wakefield for extremely dangerous conflict? Very likely. Almost certainly.
- Taxis will enter their stand adjacent to the Turnaround. If the stand is full, they will be forced to turn or, in the congestion caused, be more likely to back out. Result chaos. You have refused our request to trial this fiasco design. Why?
- Why on earth would you place disabled parking next to a difficult truck/taxi turnaround?
- This is an accident in the making. An absurd design. Who are the liable actors? This is a clear sign you are scrambling to make things work with no risk aversity or maturity. This is a reckless pilot idea.



Car Park Loss

- Why should Istana Malaysia, Big Thumb, Masala, Rockyard Monsoon Poon, and others, suffer more loss of parking needed especially on bad weather nights. Turnover harm will occur for certain. Will you Top up? Compensate? Of course not. But this is so foreseeable.
- How will galleries Kura, Ora and WJL survive as destination shops needing to sell large items with lessened access?
- How will the UFS pharmacy survive (120 years old...) when many older and disabled, used to parking nearby (even double park harmlessly), cannot any longer access from nearby.
- How can Kafe Eis continue to serve takeaway coffee and gelato all day long? J&M serve 30% of their business in takeaway form. Similar to KC Cafe. You have no experience relevant, no facts or data to mandate radical change.

Weighting of 'Transform'

You rate climate change at 40% weighting in your 'transform' decision and business harm/survival nil. This was by complete amateurs. So called 'directors' of LGWM, which is not even a proper legal entity. They cannot be 'directors' of a mere agreement, a bit of paper. There is no such status in law. Whatever the legal basis you claim, for Daran Ponter and Sarah Free (amongst others) to deliberate and solemnly 'decree weighting' is absurd, it may be considered ultra vires therefore void.



Your planned interventions increase emissions markedly, without any doubt. Cars will circle looking for parking proximity. Cars removed from this 'Victim Route' for your climate posturing just go to the nearest route, hence polluting more and creating more delay and congestion, your number one enemy. This is a completely unacceptable Own Goal. These are very clear and obvious consequences. These are facts not guesses.

Reckless Risks You Run

- What of the stress, cost and time lost to these pointless grandstanding changes, that do absolutely zero to assist climate change concerns?
- What of the hundreds of jobs at stake?
- What of hundreds of millions of investments in leases/fit out/stock?
- What of rent guarantees linked to personal assets i.e., homes?
- What of health, both physical and mental? Do you realise a dark cloud has hung over Courtenay Place for over 4 years, while the place has declined dramatically under three successive failure Councils?
- Do we want suicides as caused by similar absurd interventions in Sydney and Auckland? Sadly, you are not believed or trusted. Both LGWM and WCC are biased with predetermined closed minds. This is profoundly illegal.

Bus Design Folly

- Buses travelling in single file is not feasible. The absurd, head-to-head approach (see picture attached) is very dangerous. Driver illness or inattention and pedestrian mistakes are obvious injury or fatality risks. The design is so bad, it's only a "have to", but you don't have to. You just want to. You are just groomed by LGWM to a

mantra, blinkered and headstrong. And as a sign of your predetermination, we are advised that the bricks have been ordered for your Soviet-like 'plaza of the people'.



Median Removal

- No grown-up could mandate the median strip removal. Physical separation is "GOLD" in a road crisis. A pedestrian impulse, or a simple mistake by a child, puts that person in harm's way. The median is a place to seek safety and refuge from harm. It's a no brainer to retain - that's why they were invented in the first place. Many Jay walkers are down there and after 5pm, especially later, many are alcohol affected. But it seems you are prepared to convert road space to a bike/walking/scooter velodrome. For people who don't even exist 5 nights each week when the place is quiet.
- At the expense of a safe haven. This is madness with the speed of scooters and bikes on your velodrome. How will you separate pedestrians from harm of speedsters? Or reckless exhibitionist youth, a fact of life. We all have been there. Why are you so obsessed with a slow bus highway?
- Do you intend to 'revitalize' Courtenay Place as a playground? Really? You have had secret agendas. You have also made it up as you go along. Don't kids go to school Monday to Friday? So, who plays and when? How will people "hanging around" help the economy of Courtenay Place? We don't want more space takers. They lower our offered experience now. How do you plan to lessen street living for those who in reality have benefits and places to go? Will they pitch tents on your boulevard footpaths?

Wild West Policing

- How will you police the transport chaos of your posturing Plaza! Police are mainly absent 95% of the time now. We want a police station. How will you compensate retailers for construction chaos?

Bus Stops

- Bus stops must be retained on Courtenay Place, The St James stop is absolutely vital for elderly Theatre goers. To force children from

matinees to walk past the street people on Eat Street side (takeaway/dining) is poor, gross, and unnecessary.

- Tory St is a high wind zone, and the walk and crossing have dangerous levels and sleet like rain. Why force it on us to walk this gauntlet?

- Why are you obsessed with reducing bus access by limiting stops? All you are saving is deceleration /acceleration time. Dwell time is doubled by 2 stops into 1, but probably more.

A wetter, windier experience standing and. waiting to what purpose? To save TWO MINUTES!! You claim. Reducing 50kph to 30kph was an overaction, 40kph should have been chosen. In the theatre of the absurd you have caused more delay than you have resolved! Life and buses cannot be that precise!!

- There are so many factors causing bus delay. Most have nothing to do with 'a car in front'. That's just a procession, not congestion. A mother with a pram, little old folks, disability, Snapper Card problems, tourists asking directions, fumbling for cash. This is everyday bus theater. Accept it.

Business Harm

- You will gravely harm our business (down already though COVID, recession, now deepening), and the image of grit and grime with the 'Golden Mile Curse' Council neglect for 9 years. More shops will close, going broke one by one. We have lost Glengarry 2 years ago due to brazen everyday theft. Many are down 30-40% now.
- Street misbehavior will worsen with more vacant space to "play up" on CP/Taranaki. Turnover loss translates to weaker tenancies and lesser rental ability. That, in time, leads to devaluation. You will thus attack your very own rate base.

DERISK THIS FOLLY

- There will be more accidents/deaths by making our CBD roading a desperate, forced design. You have undertaken no peer review of plans/danger or police review of obvious hazards – blind backing and nil bus separation.
- We believe you have looked through the wrong lens completely, and you are not qualified to design a complex area like ours. Nor have you listened but patronise us and ignore everything we have said.



- We are 14 ethnicities and you have made no effort to engage in a way many folks in CP can react to. People feel marginalised. We have over a thousand years of common experience In Courtenay Place. You do not. It is day and night, two shifts. Two economies, changing all the time during each day. And not to be judged by 8 or 10 hours on Friday – Saturday of youth mischief.
- It requires grownup maturity to intervene and revitalize. We have ideas, of course, but you never really asked except in controlled meetings where you talk 'at us.' We do not approve your social engineering. People don't dine from bikes or behave to your overseas dreams. We are Wellington. That is just obvious. Your plans are pop up cadet level. It's that simple. You will increase bus frustration/delay/conflict with single file, passing will be more difficult. Your plans/interventions will greatly increase emissions across the whole vehicle spectrum, with delay.
- In effect, you have a groomed "in house" mantra, supported by a compliant cheerleader the Dom post. They never print 'our side' indeed have refused to do so. This has grown into a cult now a sect where it is 'bad' to disbelieve in your shallow takes on solutions to real world situations which requires effective action, not hubristic posturing.
- In effect, a traffic Taliban has formed in Wellington obsessed with cycles which we like, but not as Rulers of the Road. In CP, less than 1% of users are on bikes (probably less than 0.5%!). To spend \$100 million (\$43,478 per metre) on this reckless experiment on a victim route where our hero retailers are ram raided by their very own Council is utterly repugnant, cruel, and Green with envy. No proper balance has been applied.
- The closure and restrictions proposed on Courtenay Place of 7am to 9pm is a completely overreaching limit on road use, civil liberties, and rights of movement. This 14-hour closure, even with permits, equates to 58.3% of the day and is an abuse of the power of regulation, and they may well be illegal and void for being excessive. This is like taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut.



- Please take Courtenay Place completely out of your Golden Mile mistake. The whole route change is crass overreach, but Courtenay Place seeks only refurbishment, continued proper care, and the adaption of a design theme reflecting its ethnic diversity - mainly Asian. Courtenay Place is New Zealand's largest ethnic cluster, at least 80 years in situ.
- Overwhelming opposition exists in Courtenay Place to these proposals. This extends to the Quay. For this radical ruinous change to occur on a few mere votes of a very few poorly informed, blinkered and Beehive tied Councillors is an all-time nadir of good and fair governance in Wellington, and a breach of Councillor's oaths to ratepayers. This is actionable and liable.



Footnote

We regard these opt-in online polls as virtually meaningless. They are contrived to a format grooming result and harvested to suit. The 'Big Lie' of LGWM has always been (so often linked to the tedious) that there is 'overwhelming support' for the 'Transform Option'. In fact, an online poll about four years ago, where cyclists were alerted by WCC 10 days before Courtenay Place received notice (pushed under doors) received 1300 reactions (in a city of 220,000 people):

- Of those, only 58% supported the transform option. There is nothing 'overwhelming' about 58%. That's only 754 odd people changing the whole way a CBD functions! SOS and the Chamber of Commerce were counted as one vote each!

The 'Big Lie' has evolved to 'The Preferred Option' – or 'People have told us' – 'What you want' etc. No, they have not, and it is a civic mischief that known facts and figures are misrepresented or lots of falsehoods often in creepy spin are often entrenched or exaggerated to bolster a flimsy case. Furthermore, falsehoods like "crowded footpaths" feature frequently in LGWM propaganda. Your very own consultants, Cagney, can see that our footpaths, even on the Quay, are 30% below crowded.

Because SOS folk are fatigued and cynical about this 'poll', the following have not bothered to enter your online quiz. They have in effect boycotted:

Pizza Napoli, Majestic, KC Café, J&M, UFS Pharmacy, The Tasting Room, 7 Mart, Mr. Circle, Kura Gallery, Ora Gallery, and many more. For over four years, all they have signaled is total opposition to this folly. This is a sad indication of how regular hardworking retailers really are, but they are vitally financially concerned. What weight can be given to Mary from Maungaraki or Peter from Plimmerton in your polls? What weight? What interest? You just treat these polls as a number game that Cycle Network distorts with a ring in crowd, numbers of largely disconnected people.

Barry Wilson
Former Lawyer/ Transport Consultant
Representing SOS Courtenay Place and Golden Mile



1 This is the most dangerous type of bus interaction.



23 May 2023

Let's Get Welly Moving - Golden Mile traffic resolution and City Streets consultation
Via email to: goldenmile@lgwm.nz

RE: Golden Mile and City Street projects consultation May 2023

Introduction

1. Retail NZ is a membership organisation that represents the views and interests of New Zealand's retail sector. We are the peak body representing retailers across Aotearoa, our membership accounts for two thirds of all domestic retail turnover. Retailers contribute around \$112 billion a year to the New Zealand economy.
2. New Zealand's retail sector comprises of approximately 27,000 businesses and employs around 220,000 Kiwis.
3. In preparing this submission we sought feedback and comments from retailers across Wellington. This submission should be taken to be more than one submission and an accumulative representative voice of Wellington retailers.
4. Retailers are clear to us that despite many opportunities for LGWM to engage productively and constructively, they have been yet again let down by a lack of willingness to understand or hear businesses perspectives throughout this process.

Opening comments

5. We recommend that LGWM read our previous submission on the Golden Mile dated 14 August 2022, and for ease is attached as an appendix to this document.
6. The vast majority of concerns raised through consultation, numerous meetings, and engagement with LGWM still had not be resolved and Retail NZ and the retail community in Wellington have serious concerns about the Golden Mile project. These concerns are now projected across the City Streets project.
7. Retailers continue to be firm that these proposals will seriously threaten, or force the closure of, their business. A number of retailers have left Wellington City due to the impending proposals by LGWM.
8. Larger business and chain stores will also be seriously impacted, although they could be cushioned from the immediate impact as they have larger business structures.
9. Planners and decision-makers must be aware that implementing these proposals will result in retailers leaving the Golden Mile and surrounding Wellington CBD.
10. We note that, at the date of writing, Retail NZ and other industry groups (Wellington Chamber, Hospitality NZ and Property Council) have an extensive list of questions and information requests sitting with LGWM that have not been answered in time for full consideration of these consultations. This approach is unhelpful for genuine engagement. As a result Retail NZ considers that it will be making additional consultation comments in a piecemeal approach as LGWM provides the required information.

Significant concerns still unresolved by LGWM about the Golden Mile project

11. The current focus should be on **connecting wellington 'as a whole'**, not on irrelevant pieces of the city that will not make changes to mode transport - 12 additional buses will not do this. To date no answer

RETAIL NZ // HQ
Level 9, 175 Victoria Street, Wellington 6011
PO Box 12-086, Wellington 6144

P // 0800 472 472
E // info@retail.kiwi
W // www.retail.kiwi

Connect with us:



Supported by:





has been provided as to why the Golden Mile project cannot be paused with the focus moving to the big projects first that will unlock congestion in the city. Instead of piecemeal projects that will have significant impacts on Wellingtons businesses.

12. **The \$117 million plus proposed for the Golden Mile should be re-invested into increasing the resilience of our existing public transport infrastructure.** This is critically important with the wider transport infrastructure of Wellington failing to deliver services and without the required maintenance to be of service. The Council needs to consider there are must haves and nice to haves. **Given the now 49 per cent cost on the Wellington City Council and LGWM having no legal control over spending decisions by the Council. This project must be halted and clear communication from the Council as to how this project will be funded?** Especially with the current rates planning out for consultation and the 49 per cent liability not on the Council books.
13. **No crime prevention** through environment design, putting the safety of retailers, and the public at risk. This is incredibly important due to the endemic nature of retail crime in New Zealand and the most recent cases of smash and grab incidents in locations with eerily similar design to what is proposed along the entire Golden Mile.
14. **Is this the right design** to encourage customers to shop in the CBD? We have significant concerns that [REDACTED] to enable interaction with the majority of retail business has not been considered and the city is potentially not gaining the best design to enable a thriving retail environment.
15. **Still no modelling on courier and e-commerce business impacts.** There continues to be no modelling in the LGWM documentation on the impact this project has on delivery timeframes in the central city. This must be undertaken as a priority to understand impacts on businesses and the wider community.
16. **Impact of construction will be significant.** Compensation for businesses loss of earnings must be the priority and factored in immediately.

Other comments on Golden Mile

17. The proposed limitation of private vehicles in certain parts of the Golden Mile being available between 9pm and 7am does not recognize the day time need of retail businesses in these areas - like chemists, beauty businesses and homewares stores. From conversations with LGWM officials we understand that this was a decision made by NZ Police. We ask why? Why were the agencies given the authority to dictate this and what date or evidence is it based on? Furthermore despite significant feedback from the business community that this timeframe must be changed we do not see any of these feedback reflected in the traffic resolutions.
18. Given the outstanding questions and information requests sitting with LGWM at time of consultation closing, Retail NZ will have further comments.

Comments on City Street projects consultation

19. It is incredibly disappointing to see the lack of detail opening available on this project for businesses in the impacted areas. All front facing communications on the consultation does not lead with the main point that there is planned options in these proposals to significantly change how these roads are used, nor are proposed layout plans been provided up front - these are buried through multiple clicks on the LGWM website or buried deep in online surveys. For those with accessibility issues and have only received a less than complete A4 document that does not show maps or detail - this is a barrier for adequate consultation.
20. Business and the wider community require maps with full details of what is proposed in their city - upfront and easily accessible. On this basis alone we know many businesses in these impacted areas will not have the required information to make an informed submission - nor does the wider Wellington Community. We question the validity of this consultation given this approach.



21. It is strongly recommended by Retail NZ that LGWM does not make any changes to any of streets in the City Street project. Retail NZ picks the option of no change, these areas have full access and space for all modes of transport and that is the best option. This option is the best value for money for Wellington (especially with no costings), and the best option for businesses in those areas.

We thank you for the time for us to be able to made a submission, but as noted until the requested detailed information is provided by LGWM to the numerous outstanding and unresolved issues, this submission will have additions as further information is provided.

Kind regards,

Aimie Hines
Manager Public Affairs and Advice, Retail NZ
[REDACTED]



APPENDIX 1: Copy for most recent Retail NZ submission on Golden Mile proposals

14 August 2022

Let's Get Welly Moving - Golden Mile consultation
Via email to: goldenmile@lgwm.nz

RE: Golden Mile consultation August 2022

Introduction

22. Retail NZ is a membership organisation that represents the views and interests of New Zealand's retail sector. We are the peak body representing retailers across Aotearoa, our membership accounts for two thirds of all domestic retail turnover. Retailers contribute around \$112 billion a year to the New Zealand economy.
23. New Zealand's retail sector comprises of approximately 27,000 businesses and employs around 220,000 Kiwis. [REDACTED] in preparing our submission we sought feedback and comments from retailers across Wellington. Retailers are firm that these proposals will seriously threaten, or force the closure of, their business. Larger business and chain stores will also be seriously impacted, although they could be cushioned from the immediate impact as they have larger business structures. Planners and decision-makers must be aware that implementing these proposals will result in retailers leaving the Golden Mile and surrounding Wellington CBD.
25. Retailers are also clear to us that despite many opportunities for LGWM to engage productively and constructively, they have been let down by a lack of willingness to understand or hear businesses perspectives throughout this process.

Opening comments

26. The project isn't business driven - we are concerned these proposals will significantly impact couriers and e-commerce viability and are not supported by the affected businesses.
27. The project risks forcing retailers to leave the Golden Mile and potentially the entire Wellington CBD- *we continue to hear* from several smaller/independent retailers that these proposals seriously threaten, or even force the closure of their business - these businesses don't feel listened to.
28. Costing and projections for the project are outdated and don't reflect the realities of the post-COVID environment.
29. Many of the reports referenced by LGWM as cornerstone proof points have not been reviewed considering the impact of COVID-19 and how people are using the city differently.
30. The project should be delayed until MRT is implemented.
31. The project no longer has the intention of increasing bus capacity.
32. Crime prevention measures need to be considered by LGWM as part of its environmental design for the Golden Mile, these are not in the current designs.
33. The original Golden Mile 'transform' option did not include dedicated cycle paths. This was included post consultation into the business case for Councillors only consideration.
34. The original Golden Mile consultation did not have the objectives and weighting that is currently being used by LGWM. These were implemented post consultation and used as the basis to pick the 'transform' option. We are significantly concerned by the lack of natural justice by not allowing the public to comment on the project again due to the new weight system for objectives.
35. Significant work remains to be done in delivering a realistic Golden Mile project, including further modelling of foot traffic and public transport numbers, economic impact, and on courier and freight impacts.



36. It is important that a full economic analysis is undertaken that considers the real economic impacts on retailers. This has not been delivered.

Focus on the big picture

37. The current focus should be on *connecting wellington 'as a whole'*, not on irrelevant pieces of a utopian transport fantasy. Focus on moving the big projects first that will unlock congestion in the city, instead of piecemeal projects that will have significant impacts on Wellingtons businesses.
38. Currently, Wellingtons existing rail connections require significant investment - this is one of many examples highlighting the need to reprioritise transport investment in our city. Wellington's inadequate freight transportation situation is another useful example. There is no point in significant spending on other transport projects when issues with the existing infrastructure needs to be addressed.
39. LGWM feels pursuing the Golden Mile project is necessary to successfully deliver its plans for MRT due to the pressure it will alleviate from current strains on our public transports system - 12 additional buses will not do this.
40. The \$117 million plus proposed for the Golden Mile should be re-invested into increasing the resilience [REDACTED] public transport infrastructure.

The Golden Mile changes should be delayed until MRT is implemented

41. It will be extremely damaging to make sweeping changes while businesses continue to recover from the economic and social shocks of the COVID-19 pandemic - with respect to this, Retail NZ requests any further work on the Golden Mile be delayed until the MRT project is implemented
42. In December of 2021, when submitting on MRT options, we asked for better clarity on the compounding impacts of LGWM transport projects. 9 months later, we still think these impacts are not well, or widely understood by those who will be most affected
43. Retail NZ Supported option 2 'Bus Rapid Transit to seas and skies', we view this a flexible solution that will make the most of existing public transport infrastructure
44. A comprehensive economic impact report of the project needs to be completed before a final decision is made
45. The consultation is lacking a plan to better support freight from the airport to Wellington City and further northbound
46. Given the recent opening of Transmission Gully and on-going government incentives related to electric vehicles (EVs), the compounding impact LGWMs various projects will have on private vehicle access need to be better understood

Golden Mile

47. The project is focused on making the "Golden Mile" look nice, on the flawed assumption that this will increase vitality in the CBD. We recommend that the project adopt the objective of encouraging customers to shop in the CBD. The project needs to be halted and fundamentally reviewed on that basis.
48. Outright removing private vehicle access from the Golden Mile and surrounding areas will have significant impact on shoppers, store owners, and staff.
49. Car parking in and around the Golden Mile is already limited - losing a further 300 plus carparks will put further pressure on CBD accessibility.
50. Before any car parking is removed, alternative parking options must be considered - the reality being private parking and public transport in/to the CBD is unaffordable for many families.
51. Relocating loading zones along the Golden Mile will significantly reduce delivery efficiency for retailers and impact viability of ecommerce options.



52. These proposals will encourage shoppers *away* from the city centre and towards suburban centres or retail parks where car parking is available and free. This has already happened with a significant upturn in sales in the outer suburbs in Wellington - by at least 20 per cent.
53. As part of LGWMs 2019 'Problem Definition' improving bus capacity along the Golden Mile was identified as a key objective, due to most Golden Mile users accessing it via bus. However, at some point between the 'Problem Definition' being released and June 2020, this objective was omitted. The focus is now on improving bus *travel times* and increasing *reliability* across the Golden Mile.
54. Based on LGWM modelling, a minimum increase of 50 buses/hour in each direction will be required to accommodate population growth over the next 30 years. The big problem here being the same modelling states the capacity of the CBD bus corridor as being capped at 100 buses/hour in each direction (the solution for this has yet to be discussed in detail). Effectively the Golden Mile investment will deliver 12 extra buses, and assuming these buses are double decker's, they will shift an approximate extra one thousand people.

Inadequate design consideration

- ██████████ have told Retail NZ that they made the decision to prioritise the widening of the seaward side of Lambton Quay by placing this as design element to be signed off by Councillors in the business case stage (post public consultation).
56. At no point was alternative designs for the widening of the Terrace side of Lambton Quay considered as part of design work by LGWM.
 57. Despite LGWM own documents stating that wider pedestrian space in retail areas creates a better environment they have not investigated widening the retail dominant side of Lambton Quay - and despite requests from the retail community to do so.
 58. We have significant concerns that the best design to enable interaction with the majority of retail business has not been considered and the city is potentially not gaining the best design to enable a thriving retail environment.

Impact on couriers and e-commerce

59. The removal and moving of several loading zones and closing of subsequent side-streets along the Golden Mile is going to significantly impact couriers and other commercial vehicles.
60. Recently the popularity of e-commerce has exploded due to COVID-19, placing further pressure on retailers to have efficient methods for handling/shifting freight.
61. As per the detailed design: Smaller commercial vehicles (couriers/trade vehicles) will no longer be able to access Golden Mile, and any large commercial vehicle (8m+) wanting access to Courtenay Place, Willis Street or Lambton Quay will need to obtain a permit to do so (giving them access between on weekdays 10am-3pm & 7pm-7am).
62. While there are alternatives loading zones being provided, these alternatives are far less efficient than the status quo, and will favour some businesses more than others given their location.
63. From our conversations with freight and courier companies the changes proposed will significantly change the delivery timeframes for the entire central city. The best estimate is that these changes will mean that what is delivered in a day could take up to three days. This is not just for retail store deliveries; this is for all deliveries to office buildings and residential residents.
64. There is no modelling in the LGWM documentation on the impact this project has on delivery timeframes in the central city. This must be undertaken as a priority to understand impacts on businesses and the wider community.

Construction disruption will be significant

Retail

65. The construction disruption caused by the project will be significant due to the length of time and the work required.
66. There is currently no information publicly available for retailers on the plans for construction e.g. planned phases, impact, and scope. This must be considered alongside any design consultation for retailers to provide feedback on both construction impact and finished project.
67. Retail NZ understands from LGWM officials that there will be significant construction impacts, not just at evenings like previously stated.
68. Construction in the Golden Mile will require all above and below ground elements to be removed and updated - streets and paths included. Access by customers, for couriers and workers will be limited.
69. Construction will also be stop and start and in parts due to impacts by major events like the FIFA World and bus route relocations.
70. The proposed the initial starting point will be Manners and Willis Streets with LGWM saying as it will have minimum impact. But the issue here is this construction segment can only maintain one bus route through in one direction through the Golden Mile as a result. The other way will need to be rerouted, with no clarity of location. This will have a significant impact on getting the public into the central city.
71. The subsequent stage to rephase traffic signals on side streets needs to have modelling undertaken to [REDACTED] low on impact to the rest of the city.
72. Then "big ones" Lambton Quay/Courtney in sections - these will take years and have significant construction impact on businesses.
73. Compensation must be the priority and factored in immediately.

Economic impact on retailers

74. The economic position of Wellington is on a knife edge, retailers and hospitality are significantly impacted by the Alert Level settings due to the Omicron outbreak, two years of COVID-19. Furthermore, the protests in Wellington again impacted sales and foot traffic to dire levels. Businesses are stressed, under financial strain and many unsure how they can continue operating. We are concerned for the mental health and wellbeing of many in the sector.
75. The project risks forcing retailers to leave the Golden Mile - the required construction work will be a key factor, as will the removal of carparks, the restriction of private vehicle access and restriction on courier access and delivery timeline impacts.
76. The reports used by LGWM to justify a minimal perceived economic impact did not include the retail sector, understanding of consumer spending or the change in foot traffic due to COVID-19.
77. The LGWM retail assessment EY report reports states that "quantifying impacts is further challenged by the difficulty in isolating variables, leakage effects and the long- term nature of the impacts being measured, which often goes beyond the evaluation period." Despite being urged to undertake further reports that includes the sector LGWM has chosen not to.
78. Furthermore, the report has significant limitations as "has not quantified any economic impacts on retailers and instead obtained quantitative data".
79. The construction required to deliver the project will, for a significant amount of time, keep shoppers away from Golden Mile and surrounding areas. This, coupled with no private vehicle access will seriously impact footfall of which has already failed to bounce back to pre-COVID levels.
80. Retail NZ strongly recommends affected retailers should be able to apply for financial compensation during the construction period. We are prepared to discuss designing this further with LGWM and costing needs to be undertaken urgently to be incorporated into the project costs.

No quicker buses or increased capacity

81. The project has no intention of increasing bus capacity. LGWM no longer considers increasing bus capacity as a key objective, coupled with a lack of investment/low budget means consultants could not consider the purchase of more land to widen road space.



82. Originally, *increasing bus capacity along the Golden Mile* was a key objective for the project, however sometime between August 2019, and June 2020, this changed
83. Over the next 30 years, Wellington expects an additional 50,000-80,000 commuters, with the CBD bus corridor capacity needing to increase from 90 buses/hour in each direction to 140-170.
84. LGWM has confirmed that currently there isn't adequate road space at key locations on Willis and Manners Street to increase capacity (via 'offline' bus stops). This means the CBD bus corridor capacity is capped at 100 buses/hour in each direction. Therefore, the CBD bus corridor, in its current state will not be able to support the increase in buses/hour over time.
85. Dedicated bus lanes, improved signals, and fewer private vehicles does little to address the long-term capacity issues Wellington transport system is facing (particularly the CBD corridor) - although LGWM considers these options to be the solution.
86. Retail NZ would like to hear more about the unspecified north-south bus corridor that will service bus volumes beyond 100 vehicles/hour in a direction.

No crime prevention by environmental design

██████████ measures need to be considered by LGWM as part of its environmental design for the Golden Mile.

88. Current environmental considerations per the detailed design only include street furniture, paving and planting.
89. The current 'at level' nature of the design (footpaths and roadway) creates a significantly high risk for ram raids, smash and grabs or a mass casualty event.
90. Retailers or furthermore businesses safety is not considered as a priority stakeholder in the current design report.
91. Given the spike in retail crime (ram raids especially), crime prevention measures need to be considered as part of environmental design. While this design, in its current form, is primarily focused on the safety experience of those using active modes of transports and ensuring they are safe from each other, the safety of retail and hospitality businesses and consumers while on the Golden Mile deserves equal recognition.
92. Crime prevention through environmental design is incredibly hard to retro fit, and expensive. Crime prevention environmental design must sit alongside all plans due to the need to consider going underground to secure objects to stop vehicles entering buildings or public spaces. We are concerned that no costing for crime prevention design is included in the project.
93. The lack of consideration for safety due to crime, or an incident of significant impact/mass casualties into the design at this stage is a significant risk that must be addressed.

Cycle way inclusion

94. The original 'transform' option did not include dedicated cycle paths, Retail NZ is concerned this sets a bad precedent for subsequent LGWM consultations.
95. To move the goal posts and add new components post consultation is not best practice in engagement.
96. As per the detailed design: There is a dedicated cycle path for Lambton Quay (between Parliament and Panama Street) and Courtenay Place (between Cambridge Terrace and Taranaki Street)
97. While we agree the proposal should support a range of transport options, LGWM should not feel they can circumvent the consultation process and include new features where they see fit
98. There is meant to be dedicated cycle ways included in the City Streets project and other projects.

Who pays for this?

99. Final costs are yet to be provided, with many elements still requiring more costing and the inclusion of additional elements.

Retail ^{NZ}

100. There is no clear information on how this project will be paid for or if Wellington City can afford a project with this level of costs.
101. Treasury has consistently raised concerns and concerns that the LGWM projects cannot be funded, whilst questioning who will pay.
102. Businesses are stretched and cannot handle a commercial rates increase to pay for the project. Especially with the expected downturn in sales that the construction and final project will create.
103. Increases in public transport rates will not get people back into the city either.
104. A congestion charge will limit the viability of the central city and the ability for people to access the city - as will a targeted tax on public and private carparks.

General wider comments

105. There is no inclusion of EV charging locations into car parking planning.
106. There is no change to the number of carparks assigned for the dedicated use of the Wellington City Council in the central city. Also included in having no change is the dedicated diplomat carparks.
107. The amount of disability carparks provided is significantly low.
[REDACTED] projects will impact CBD retailers and remove further carparks e.g., City Streets, and Wellington City Council projects.

Retailers are defeated and disheartened Comments from Wellington retailers

109. "To be honest I feel rather defeated by WCC and their constant calls for consultation which they then ignore! I have got to the point where it all seems a bit pointless and disheartening. Their very expensive independent reports are all very well but not necessarily relevant here."
110. "I have had a lot of conversations with people who say they will stop coming into the city. In fact, a lot already have, with the exorbitant cost of parking! And post-covid, the streets are already substantially quieter than pre-covid days. I'm already struggling for customers."
111. "I am located on Manner Street, a previous example of a failed pedestrianization in Wellington. Yet officials won't talk to me about the issues with the approach from direct experience."
112. "I have signed a 9-month lease, after 20 plus years in the city like many others I doubt I will remain"
113. "How are we expected to evolve our business to meet the growing demand of ecommerce when LGWM removes or significantly limits the ability of couriers to access our stores"
114. "After the 2009 removal of Manners Mall happening outside my shop I am aware that these projects always take much longer than they predict and the consequences are very real!! I'm not convinced that retailers are very high on their list of priorities. But without a vibrant retail and hospitality sector, why would people visit our city?"
115. "Easy access to the Golden Mile for people with disabilities will be nigh on impossible, especially with the fewer bus stops much further apart. And with most of the bus stops being in the traffic lane, it is hard to believe that travel times for buses will be much improved. It is buses holding up other buses at stops that is the problem now and this doesn't look like it will improve with the new proposals."
116. "My concerns are that there is a lack of focus and planning for improving the state of our sewage systems. No point in spending this amount of money if it's going to be under water before it's paid off."

The impact:

117. Furthermore, from a snapshot survey (previously provided to LGWM) of Wellington retail, hospitality and close contact businesses told us that if LGWM projects progress we will see a significant impact on the city. Businesses across the city told us -
 - o 28 per cent will close their businesses;



- 25 per cent will relocate their business to an outer suburb in Wellington, Porirua or Lower/Upper Hutt;
- 25 per cent will undertake processes to initiate staff redundancies;
- 9 per cent will reduce operating hours.

118. This is the vast majority of businesses taking significant steps that will have economic impact on the city - 87 per cent. This is not a viable position for the city to be in and will not enable a thriving city for Wellington.

Our recommendations and further work to be undertaken:

119. Speed up the big project - MRT.
120. Stop Golden Mile, Cobham Drive and the Thorndon Quay/Hutt Road projects. They are not required for MRT to progress.
121. Undertake an urgent review to update figures of the movements of people in the city to be incorporated into LGWM projects.
122. Undertake a genuine economic impact studies for all projects - include retail, hospitality and close contact businesses views and partner for genuine consultation.
123. Undertake a study to understand the impact on delivery timeframes for freight and courier deliveries in the central city.
124. Move investment into existing public transport infrastructure that requires urgent investment.
125. Provide a plan for construction phasing for businesses to understand what parts of the city will be impacted through construction.
126. Design compensation for businesses impacted by construction and incorporate these costs into the project.

Golden Mile

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: GM (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, May 23, 2023 4:44:17 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, May 23, 2023 4:50:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:35
IP Address: 202.50.95.43

Page 2: Would you like to share quick or detailed feedback about this project?

Q1

Would you like to complete the quick or the detailed survey?

Quick (three questions about the overall proposed roading and access changes for the Golden Mile, plus a bit about you)

Page 3: Area 1: Lambton Quay

Q2

Do you support the proposed changes to the road on Lambton Quay?

Respondent skipped this question

Q3

Do you support the proposed changes to the location of bus stops and pedestrian crossings on Lambton Quay?

Respondent skipped this question

Q4

Do you support the proposed changes to side streets connected to Lambton Quay?

Respondent skipped this question

Q5

Do you support the proposed plans for managing vehicle access to Lambton Quay?

Respondent skipped this question

Q6

Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed road changes for Lambton Quay?

Respondent skipped this question

Golden Mile

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything about how you use Lambton Quay that you would like us to consider?(This feedback may not change the roading plans, but helps us better understand the impacts of any changes and how we might improve the authorisation system and/or mitigate any disruption.)

Page 4: Area 2: Willis Street

Q8

Respondent skipped this question

Do you support the proposed changes to the road on Willis Street?

Q9

Respondent skipped this question

Do you support the proposed plans for managing vehicle access to Willis Street?

Q10

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed road changes for Willis Street?

Q11

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything about how you use Willis Street that you would like us to consider?(This feedback may not change the roading plans, but helps us better understand the impacts of any changes and how we might improve the authorisation system and/or mitigate any disruption.)

Page 5: Area 3: Manners Street

Q12

Respondent skipped this question

Do you support the proposed changes to the road on Manners Street?

Q13

Respondent skipped this question

Do you support the proposed plans for managing vehicle access to Manners Street?

Q14

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed road changes for Manners Street?

Golden Mile

Q15

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything about how you use Manners Street that you would like us to consider?(This feedback may not change the roading plans, but helps us better understand the impacts of any changes and how we might improve the authorisation system and/or mitigate any disruption.)

Page 6: Area 4: Courtenay Place

Q16

Respondent skipped this question

Do you support the proposed changes to the road on Courtenay Place?

Q17

Respondent skipped this question

Do you support the proposed plans for managing vehicle access to Courtenay Place?

Q18

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed road changes for Courtenay Place?

Q19

Respondent skipped this question

Is there anything about how you use Courtenay Place that you would like us to consider? (This feedback may not change the roading plans, but helps us better understand the impacts of any changes and how we might improve the authorisation system and/or mitigate any disruption.)

Page 7: Authorisation system

Q20

Respondent skipped this question

Do you support the proposed authorisation system to restrict private vehicle access to the Golden Mile?

Q21

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any feedback on the proposed authorisation system?

Page 8

Golden Mile

Q22

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any feedback on any of the proposed changes for the Golden Mile?

Page 9: Public transport and public spaces

Q23

Respondent skipped this question

Do you agree that the proposed changes will improve bus travel on the Golden Mile?

Q24

Respondent skipped this question

Do you agree that the proposed changes will make the area more attractive?

Page 10: A bit about you

Q25

Respondent skipped this question

What is your main relationship to the Golden Mile?

Q26

Respondent skipped this question

How do you normally get to the Golden Mile?

Q27

Respondent skipped this question

How do you normally get around the Golden Mile?

Q28

Would you like to upload a file to support your submission?

WCC_LGWM_May%202023.pdf (131KB)

Q29

Name

Ed Gibbs

Q30

Email

[REDACTED]

Golden Mile

Q31

On behalf of an organisation or school

Are you providing feedback as:

Q32

If providing feedback as a school/organisation, what is your school/organisation's name?

Wellington Chamber of Commerce

Q33

Respondent skipped this question

Would you like to speak to Councillors at the Committee hearing in support of your submission? (Date likely to be in mid-June)

Q34

Respondent skipped this question

If yes, please leave your phone number.

Q35

Respondent skipped this question

Suburb

Q36

Respondent skipped this question

Gender

Q37

Respondent skipped this question

Please choose the age group you belong to:

Q38

Respondent skipped this question

Do you live with any accessibility issue?

wecc.org.nz | info@wecc.org.nz

Level 7, JacksonStone House, 3-11 Hunter Street, Wellington, 6011



Wellington Chamber of Commerce: Submission on Let's Get Wellington Moving – Gold Mile Traffic Resolutions

Introduction

The Wellington Chamber of Commerce and Business Central (the Chamber) is a business membership association, representing over 3,600 organisations throughout Central New Zealand (Gisborne to Taranaki and down to Nelson). We have represented business in the Wellington Region for over 165 years and work with a range of organisations to help them network, share ideas and experiences, learn and develop, and represent their interests to local and national government. Our service offerings include Employment Relations support and help with export and growth opportunities.

The Chamber works closely with the Wellington City Council (WCC) to ensure Wellington's business community is consulted on the changes that impact them and a connection is provided between the Council and business. The Chamber welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on Let's Get Wellington Moving: Golden Mile Traffic Resolutions.

Understanding the proposals

As we understand them, the current proposals for the Golden Mile will:

1. Remove all car parks, including mobility parks, and key loading zones from the GM, to build wider footpaths and cycleways
2. Restrict vehicular access from side streets (including Balance, Stout, Waring Taylor, Johnston, Brandon, Mercer, Cuba, Allen and Blair) to the GM
3. Effectively restrict vehicular access to Courtenay Place, Willis Street & Lambton Quay, with the exception of buses and cycles and some permitted vehicles
4. Prevent private cars from driving down Courtenay Place between 7am and 9pm
5. Remove over 450 car parks from Featherston, Victoria, Dixon and Ghuznee streets
6. Restrict Taranaki Street to one traffic lane each way

Our concerns

The Chamber is concerned that individually, and collectively, these proposals do not work for Wellington and risk significant economic harm if implemented as currently envisaged. We are also concerned that the proposals present various health and safety risks (i.e. the removal of loading zones could force service and delivery vehicles to park on the pavements and cycleways). Furthermore, the resultant loss of parking revenue will have a substantial impact on Council income and the traffic measures proposed risk significant additional congestion.

The Chamber is supportive of the submissions made by our fellow trade associations – Property Council New Zealand (Wellington Branch), Retail NZ and Hospitality NZ. These submissions clearly outline the practical concerns of businesses in the city that will be directly impacted by the proposals for the Golden Mile as currently envisaged.

Wellington is crying out for significant infrastructure investment, of the kind envisaged by the wider LGWM transformative programme, but for too long progress has stalled. The transformative programme would see mass rapid transport and encourage urban density within Wellington city. In comparison, the Golden Mile project tinkers around the edges, seeking to remove private vehicle access, causing the likely flow-on effect of adding congestion to other parts of the City, and reducing access to the Golden Mile, well before a mass rapid transit system is introduced.

wecc.org.nz | info@wecc.org.nz

Level 7, JacksonStone House, 3-11 Hunter Street, Wellington, 6011



In addition, the Chamber is concerned about the lack of information being made available to Councillors, and the public, as they are being asked to make decisions that will have long-term and far-reaching implications for the future of our City.

Given the continued pressure on the Council's finances and successive increases in annual rates, we are particularly concerned that there is a lack of transparency around the costs of LGWM projects and the proportion that WCC will be expected to contribute. For example, it's recently been reported that WCC will fund 49% of the Golden Mile project – not the 20% that Councillors originally voted for.

Furthermore, while the proportion WCC is responsible for has risen dramatically, no updated costings for the project have been made public. The Chamber is therefore extremely concerned that plans are being progressed when there is no clear view of how much, and over what time horizon, Wellington rate-payers will be expected to cough up. In light of the Council's debt position, this is particularly problematic against the current economic backdrop where there is great uncertainty around the cost of borrowing.

Finally, we would like to note our frustration that, despite regular engagement with the LGWM team throughout the consultation process, we have experienced significant delays, and even failure, to provide basic information that would have helped to inform our consultation response and engagement with members. For example, at the outset of the consultation process the LGWM team committed to share a series of case studies that would help to explain the impact on businesses located at key points along the Golden Mile. This information would have aided understanding of the proposals and demonstrated that the LGWM team had thought through the impact on business. However, despite repeatedly promising to share these examples, no such information has been published.

Our recommendations

In light of these concerns, the Chamber therefore urges LGWM to:

1. Commit to meaningful engagement with Wellington's business community to prioritise unlocking progress on the wider LGWM transformative programme before progressing with changes to the Golden Mile
2. Carry out a comprehensive impact assessment of the proposals on businesses along the Golden Mile – there is no retail precinct in the world as big as the Golden Mile relative to city size, this must be taken into account
3. Publish a detailed assessment of the costs associated with LGWM projects, including the proposed changes to the Golden Mile
4. Clearly set out the governance and funding arrangements surrounding all LGWM projects: Councillors and the public must have a clear view of how much Waka Kotahi, Greater Wellington Regional Council and Wellington City Council are expected to contribute, and which organisation is the ultimate decision maker
5. Apologise for failing to follow through on commitments to provide additional information prior to the conclusion of the consultation period

The Chamber is grateful for the opportunity to contribute to this consultation process. Thank you for taking the time to review this response – we would be delighted to discuss our concerns and recommendations in more detail.

Simon Arcus

Chief Executive, Wellington Chamber of Commerce

For queries or more information, contact Ed Gibbs. E: [REDACTED]



Hospitality New Zealand

TO

SUBMISSION ON

**THE PROPOSED TRAFFIC RESOLUTIONS CONSULTATION FOR THE GOLDEN
MILE**

19th May 2023

CONTACT DETAILS: Hospitality New Zealand

Contact: Adam Parker

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

www.hospitality.org.nz

About Hospitality New Zealand:

1. Hospitality New Zealand (“Hospitality NZ”) is a member-led, not-for-profit organisation representing around 3,000 businesses, including cafés, restaurants, bars, nightclubs, commercial accommodation, country hotels and off-licences.
2. Hospitality NZ has a 121-year history of advocating on behalf of the hospitality and tourism sector. We work tirelessly on behalf of our members to promote the industry, partner with government to prevent restrictive legislation, protect commercial interests and to spearhead innovation for a sustainable future.
3. As the trusted body, we seek to unlock the industry’s full potential as a significant engine for growth in the New Zealand economy and to ensure that the industry’s needs are represented by engaging with the Government and wider industry.
4. Hospitality NZ has recently launched the Accommodation Association NZ. The purpose of the Accommodation Association is to ensure that the accommodation sector is well understood by central, local government and the regulators.
5. This submission relates to the proposed traffic resolutions consultation for “Lets Get Wellington Moving”.
6. Enquiries relating to this submission should be referred to Adam Parker, Regional Manager at Hospitality New Zealand.

General Comments:

7. Hospitality New Zealand welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposed traffic resolutions

Specific Comments:

8. Hospitality New Zealand understands that Let’s Get Wellington Moving (LGWM), plans to remove upwards of 450 to 550 car parks across Wellington city. We have several concerns around this proposal.
9. Hospitality New Zealand believe that the car parks are due to removed because Wellingtonians have asked for this. To date, we have seen no evidence FROM LGWM around who these people actually are, what their requests were, and why they requested it. We are also concerned that when the initial proposal was released, there was absolutely no consultation with any businesses across the Golden Mile. We understand that although there has been consultation with these businesses recently, the initially plans still remain, despite the concerns of a loss of parking availability voiced from Hospitality New Zealand and its members across the Golden Mile.

10. Hospitality New Zealand also have concerns over the claims from LGWM around their intention to become a “low carbon” capital. If the team at Let’s Get Wellington Moving are under the impression that removing necessary parking from the city will reduce carbon emissions, we would like to see some evidence and data around this. To date, we have not been provided with any actually evidence to support this claim.
11. Hospitality New Zealand also have concerns around the claims that restricting access to the CBD by vehicle will actually improve our ability to move around the city. Again, we simply don’t see any actual evidence for this. Considering we have a failing public transport system across the entirety of the Wellington Region, we feel that it would be a detrimental decision to remove parking and access to the city before improving the public transport system itself. We urge the team at LGWM to prioritise the improvement of the public transport system before going ahead with actually restricting access to the city.
12. Hospitality New Zealand have major concerns around the restriction of taxis and other public transport systems across the CBD for the young patrons who frequent our entertainment precinct. At present, both NZ Police and the team at District Public Health have concerns over the rise in alleged alcohol related harm across Wellington CBD. Hospitality New Zealand can only see this problem increasing with the lack of public transport availability down the Golden Mile. Potentially meaning that young patrons will have to walk further and longer through the CBD in order to access public transport during the early hours of the morning.
13. Finally, Hospitality New Zealand would like to express concern over the proposed access for private vehicles on the Golden Mile. We note that the team at LGWM have decided to make the Golden Mile available for private vehicles between 9pm and 7am. We also understand that this was a decision made by NZ Police. We ask why? Why were the agencies given the authority to dictate this and what date or evidence is it based on? Our Wellington Hospitality business were not able to dictate these time yet they are the ones who are actually affected by this the most.

Recommendations:

14. Hospitality New Zealand recommends that the team at LGWM puts a halt to any construction to the Golden Mile before actually improving the Public Transport system across Wellington City.
15. We also urge the team at LGWM to actually consider the concerns that associations like ourselves and small business across Wellington have before proceeding with construction across the Golden Mile.
16. Finally, we urge the team at LGWM to provide evidence, data and facts to back up their claims to any association, business or individual that has concerns over this project.

Conclusion:

17. We thank the team at Let's Get Wellington Moving for the opportunity to provide input into the consultation.
18. We would be happy to discuss any parts of this submission in more detail, and to provide any assistance that may be required.



Property Council New Zealand

Submission on Let's Get Wellington Moving: Golden Mile Traffic Resolutions

23 May 2023

For more information and further queries, please contact
Sandamali Ambepitiya [Redacted]

Property Council New Zealand
Foyer Level, 51 Shortland Street
PO Box 1033, Auckland 1140
09 373 3086
propertynz.co.nz

Corporate Sponsors





Submission on Let's Get Wellington Moving: Golden Mile Traffic Resolutions

1. Summary

- 1.1 Property Council Wellington Branch ("Property Council") welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on Let's Get Wellington Moving: Golden Mile Traffic Resolutions.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 At a high level, we recommend that Let's Get Wellington Moving:

- Amend TR28-23 to allow for service vehicles to access the Golden Mile without having to complete a bureaucratic application process for approval from Wellington City Council each time they wish to enter the Golden Mile; and
- Allow for service vehicles to access the Golden Mile without an application process, and review with the industry six months into the project.

- 2.2 At a high level, if TR28-23 remains unchanged for authorisations, we recommend that Let's Get Wellington Moving amend the process to:

- Allow for emergency situations (service vehicles to access Golden Mile without Authorisation if there is a risk to health or safety, e.g. a person is stuck in a lift);
- Allow for a one-day turn-around for authorisations; and
- Allow for authorisations to occur once per vehicle for a 12 month period (rather than on a per job basis).

3. Introduction

- 3.1. Property Council is the leading not-for-profit advocate for New Zealand's most significant industry, property. Our organisational purpose is, "Together, shaping cities where communities thrive".
- 3.2. The property sector shapes New Zealand's social, economic and environmental fabric. Property Council advocates for the creation and retention of a well-designed, functional and sustainable built environment, in order to contribute to the overall prosperity and well-being of New Zealand.
- 3.3. Property Council is the collective voice of the property industry. Property is the fourth largest industry in Wellington. There are around \$40.4 billion in property assets across Wellington, Wellington (10 percent) and employment for 20,640 Wellington residents.
- 3.4. We connect property professionals and represent the interests of 134 Wellington based member companies across the private, public and charitable sectors.
- 3.5. This document provides Property Council's feedback on the [Golden Mile: Traffic Resolution](#) consultation. Comments and recommendations are provided on issues relevant to Property Council's members.



4. General Comments

- 4.1. The Golden Mile is a key inner-city project that will fundamentally change traffic flow and place greater pressure on congestion elsewhere in the city.
- 4.2. Property Council continues to have questions around who will be funding the project, and concerns as to whether the project will meet its urban development objectives by encouraging residential density.
- 4.3. We have continued concerns about the removal of private vehicle access along the Golden Mile, given that there is limited access currently. We ask that the Council provide the public with statistics on how many private vehicles currently use the Golden Mile on a daily basis.
- 4.4. We are also extremely concerned with Traffic Resolution 28-23 (“TR28-32”), which would require any service and goods vehicle to obtain authorisation to use the Golden Mile for each individual trip and time required, whilst waiting up to five working days for a response. This is an onerous burden that will slow down productivity in Wellington.
- 4.5. Finally, we have health and safety concerns for pedestrians, given the amount of foot traffic Let’s Get Wellington predicts will increase on the Golden Mile. Currently, 80 buses travel along the Golden Mile per hour and it is unclear how public safety will be managed.

5. Let’s Get Wellington Moving Vision and Objectives

- 5.1. In 2021, the Let’s Get Wellington Moving Vision and Objectives alongside the weighting of the objectives changed. The programme objectives a for a transport system that; enhances urban amenity and enables urban development outcomes, provides more efficient and reliable access for users, reduces carbon emissions and increases mode shift by reducing reliance on private vehicles, improves safety for all users and is adaptable to disruption and future uncertainty.
- 5.2. Despite the proposed vision and objectives, the consultation document called Golden Mile FAQs on page 13 states that: “In certain parts in the central city, at certain times of the day, there may be more traffic than now but, in a central city location where there are multiple routes and modes of transport, it is hard to predict exactly how things will change.”
- 5.3. The Golden Mile project is part of the Let’s Get Wellington Moving transformational programme. If the Golden Mile project is unable to predict the impact of removing traffic from the Golden Mile on the wider transport network, there would be a question around need for change, especially before the wider transformation programme of Let’s Get Wellington Moving is completed.
- 5.4. We recommend that the Let’s Get Wellington Moving team refocus on the transformative project of Let’s Get Wellington Moving. The transformative project would see mass rapid transport and encourage urban density within Wellington city. In comparison, the Golden Mile project tinkers around the edges, seeing to remove private vehicle access, causing the likely flow-on effect of adding congestion to other parts of the City, and reducing access to the Golden Mile, well before a mass rapid transit system is introduced.



6. Traffic Resolution 28-23

- 6.1. Let's Get Wellington Moving has not considered how these proposed changes will have an impact on businesses, on a daily basis. There will be significant flow on effects to the end consumer, if access for service and trade vehicles to these businesses, is limited.
- 6.2. We are concerned about the proposal (requiring service vehicles to apply for authorisation from Wellington City Council) will show down Wellington's productivity. Requiring authorisation, each time a service or delivery is required, will likely make providing a service or undertaking works "impracticable" to businesses or areas on the Golden Mile. In these cases, access to the Special Vehicle Lane on the Golden Mile, should be a given.
- 6.3. However, the number of logistical steps a service/trade vehicle driver must take in order to apply for a limited Special Vehicle Approval is alarming. Even with approval to enter, this is a one-off authorisation and may be revoked "if justified" by the Authorised Officer. Furthermore, there is no clear guidance on what is and what is not justified – making authorisation subjective to individual Council Officers.
- 6.4. Authorisation to enter the Golden Mile is only allowed for off-peak times and if access is needed for a time during on-peak hours, this will need to be obtained through a special circumstance authorisation. Businesses rely on the delivery of goods, and access to services and this cannot always be done at a set time. For example, if there is a faulty lift and people are stuck within it, there may be not time to seek authorisation or a special circumstance authorisation, especially given that it could be up to 24 hours that this authorisation comes through. Furthermore, even under a special circumstance, these vehicles are not guaranteed access to a loading zone. This poses a major health and safety risk as this could force service and delivery vehicles to park on pavements and cycleways.
- 6.5. Finally, we are concerned that these changes may pass on more costs to property owners on the Golden Mile. Despite there being no application fee for an authorisation application, we fear that this will become unsustainable for the Council, and that this cost will eventually be passed onto businesses on the Golden Mile. Furthermore, Let's Get Wellington Moving plans to remove upwards of 550 car parks across Wellington, which includes car parks on the Golden Mile. We are concerned that there is no information surrounding how the Council plans to make up for the income lost.
- 6.6. Imposing these extreme barriers on service and trade vehicles will see not only businesses impacted, but also shoppers and visitors needing access to those services whilst on the Golden Mile. We therefore recommend that TR28-23 be amended to allow for service vehicles to access the Golden Mile without having to complete an application process for approval from Wellington City Council each time they wish to enter the Golden Mile. Furthermore, we recommend that TR28-23 allow for service vehicles to access the Golden Mile without an application process, and review with the industry six months into the project.
- 6.7. However, if TR28-23 remains unchanged and authorisations are still required, we recommend that the authorisation process be reviewed to allow for emergency situations (service vehicles to access Golden Mile without Authorisation if there is a risk to health or safety, e.g. a person is stuck in a lift). If TR28-23 remains unchanged and authorisations are still required, we recommend that the authorisation process be reviewed to allow for a one-day turn-around of



responses, and service vehicles can apply for authorisation for a 12-month period (rather than on a per job basis).

7. Conclusion

7.1. In summary we have a number of concerns that the consultation document does not address as to the vision, purpose, outcomes and funding of the Golden Mile Project. We also have many suggested changes to the Authorisation of Service Vehicles, if this is not removed entirely.

7.2. Any further enquires do not hesitate to contact Sandamali Ambepitiya, Senior Advocacy Advisor, [REDACTED]

Yours Sincerely,

Gerard Earl
Wellington Committee Chair
Property Council New Zealand



23 May 2023

New Zealand Automobile Association Inc.

342-352 Lambton Quay, Wellington 6011
PO Box 1, Wellington 6140

Let's Get Wellington Moving
goldenmile@lgwm.nz

Let's Get Wellington Moving (LGWM) - Golden Mile Detailed Design

This submission is made by the Wellington District Council of the New Zealand Automobile Association (AA).

1. The District Council represents over 200,000 members. Although we are an organisation representing motorists, our members are also pedestrians, cyclists, and users of public transport.
2. We recognise and support the Let's Get Wellington Moving (LGWM) vision of creating an integrated package of transport improvements for all road users.
3. We would like to thank the members of the LGWM team who presented the proposals at our May Council Meeting. This short submission covers the ongoing areas of concern that Council has.

Shared pathways

4. The District Council remains concerned at the proposed shared pathways on Lambton Quay and Courtenay Place as they are generally not suitable for areas with high numbers of pedestrians, e-scooters and cyclists.
5. This is based on safety concerns. These modes do not like sharing the same space due to increased risk of collision, which is further heightened with e-scooters and e-bikes travelling at higher speeds.
6. We believe the current position of the shared path in the middle of the path on the corner of Tory Street and Courtenay Place is a safety issue for the large numbers of pedestrians in this area (see attached plan). We request the shared path be moved to the kerb edge so that there is an unrestricted area clear for pedestrians.

Bi-directional cycle-lane on Featherston Street

7. The District Council does not support the proposed bi-directional cycle-lane on Featherston Street as well as a bi-directional cycle-lane on Lambton Quay.
8. We believe that the safest option is to remove the cycle-lane proposed for Lambton Quay and have cyclists access Lambton Quay off the side streets connecting from Featherston Street. Those side streets are proposed to be closed to traffic so will be quiet traffic-wise.

Bicycle parking facilities

9. The District Council was surprised and disappointed that the proposal does not include any additional secure bicycle parking facilities.
10. This seemed at odds with the investment being made in cycle-paths to both keep cyclists safe and encourage increased use of this mode of transport.

Pedestrian cover

11. The proposal does not provide adequate pedestrian cover for Wellington's weather on the eastern side of Lambton Quay.

Bus stop outside the former David Jones Building

12. The District Council opposes the removal of the bus stop outside the former David Jones Building on Lambton Quay. As this is the busiest bus stop on Lambton Quay, providing great cover from adverse weather, we cannot understand why LGWM are proposing to remove it.
13. Given the plan to also remove the bus stop outside the Public Trust Building people in the middle of Lambton Quay would either have to walk to Bowen Street intersection or Grey Street to catch a bus.
14. Closing both these bus stops will not encourage greater use of public transport and will disadvantage less mobile and older Wellingtonians and visitors to the city.

Authorisation System

15. The District Council considers the proposed 5 working days timeframe for processing applications for authorisations for vehicle access unreasonable.
16. There are existing technology and apps that can be used to streamline this process and there should be a provision for pre-approved suppliers to gain quick access if needed.

Public education

17. The District Council feels strongly that there needs to be a commitment from LGWM to run a thorough public education campaign around the changes, with particular focus on shared pathways, authorised vehicle access and the proposed instant fines.
18. We base this request on past experience. From discussion with Members we are aware that there are still motorists unaware of the changes to 30km/h on most central city street introduced in 2020.
19. The proposed changes are significant. In the interests of fairness and transparency, as well to minimise people incurring fines unintentionally, we seek an assurance from LGWM that an appropriately funded, comprehensive, multi-channel education/awareness campaign will be implemented.
20. We strongly encourage LGWM to put the information in channels where their audiences already are rather than expecting the audiences to come to their social media and websites.

Loss of "drop-off" capability

21. The District Council remains deeply concerned about the removal of the "front-door" drop off capability for less mobile people, older people or people with disabilities attending events at both the Opera House and St James Theatre.
22. We believe this is unfair and specifically disadvantages these groups.

23. If access hours cannot be extended beyond the proposed 7am-9pm then we believe that local side streets in the vicinity of the Opera House and St James Theatre need to have adequate loading zones installed.

Investment in Park and Ride facilities

24. To support the proposed Golden Mile changes and encourage mode shift, the District Council seeks a commitment from LGWM to invest in improved Park and Ride facilities at rail stations and bus hubs.
25. We note that all of the Greater Wellington parking areas at railway stations are currently full with commuters during business hours from Monday to Friday.
26. If LGWM is not prepared to provide additional car parks as suggested above, then we believe the business case needs to be modified to factor in the economic disbenefit to the Wellington City of consumers who choose to spend their shopping and recreational dollars elsewhere, e.g., Upper Hutt, Lower Hutt, or Porirua, given they can't rely on a carpark in Wellington City and have no ability to Park and Ride.

One final thought

27. Many of the concerns we have noted above relate to the impact of the proposed changes on less mobile, less abled, and older members of the Wellington community and visitors to our city.
28. In our view many of the proposals would have benefited from increased focus on the practical implications for these groups.
29. We strongly encourage the LGWM partners to bear this in mind as they continue their work.

We thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on these important issues for LGWM and request to present our submission.

Yours sincerely



Geordie Cassin
Chairman – Wellington District Council
NZAA

