

LGWM Community and Stakeholder Workshops – March/April 2017

Questions: asked by attendees

Answers: from Let's Get Wellington Moving

At Let's Get Wellington Moving's community and stakeholder workshops, participants were encouraged to submit any questions on postcards. LGWM committed to responding to the questions. Attendee questions and LGWM's answers are listed below under the following themes:

1. Integration/interdependencies
2. Traffic flow/roads/congestion
3. Light rail
4. Pedestrians
5. Cars/parking
6. Public transport/buses
7. Miscellaneous
8. Cycling
9. Environment

1. Integration/interdependencies
<p>Does the presentation reflect the draft GPS on land transport 2018?</p> <p><i>The project is taking into account the strategies of the three partner organisations, which are guided by the GPS on transport.</i></p>
<p>How will plan improve ease of transport across modes in region; for students, for families, for older, for disabled? Not just buses and rail but also integration with shared electric cars, bicycles.</p> <p><i>We'll be considering multimodal approaches and access needs of the whole community – as embedded in our principles – when we assess the scenarios</i></p>
<p>How would a new international airport at e.g. Otaki change your thinking? (covered by a high speed rail service)</p> <p><i>We're working on the basis that the airport remains where it is. If there were significant land use changes, that would have an impact on what we propose.</i></p>
<p>One smart card? Is that not snapper?</p> <p><i>Snapper is currently available on only one bus provider. As part of the package of bus improvements in 2018 Snapper will be rolled out on all bus services within the region. This is an</i></p>

interim system until a full integrated ticketing system can be put in place on all public transport including rail. Current estimates are that this will be phased in from 2020.

How can we change the relationships between pedestrians and cyclists and cyclists and motorists?

Some of the possible interventions we are considering include providing increased priority for people walking or cycling on certain routes. Shared spaces in priority areas is another option.

2. Traffic flow/roads/congestion

Why can't extra lanes be put in existing tunnels? Assume there is a technical reason?

The number of lanes you can get in a tunnel is limited by the width of the tunnel, and operational and safety considerations. Widening tunnels is an option and would be considered in any future detailed investigation of tunnel duplication.

Whatever happened to the proposal to build the 2nd Mt Vic tunnel from the top of Wellington Road through the hill to emerge between the hospital and government house? Would reduce conflict between east to west and north to south traffic at SE corner of Basin Reserve!

We are not yet at the stage where we are able to determine preferred options for a route to the airport.

Why is the second Mt Vic tunnel only for cars? (as opposed to being for LRT?)

A second Mt Victoria tunnel wouldn't just be for cars: one of the things we will need to determine is how we would allocate any additional capacity to move people and goods, using cars, public transport, cycling and walking.

Why can't we consider a stacked tunnel for Mt Vic?

Options for any duplicated Mt Vic tunnel have not been determined.

What percentage of the vehicles entering the Basin Reserve roundabout (from any direction) actually go to the Airport itself?

The data we have collected indicates that, in the morning peak (6am - 10am), approximately 1300 vehicles go to the airport out of the 6000 vehicles that enter the Basin Reserve roundabout (or 22%). In the evening peak (3pm - 7pm) approximately 680 vehicles go to the airport out of 6400 who enter the Basin Reserve roundabout (11%).

ALSO what's happening to freight – long/oversized/dangerous goods freight that uses the coast road where you have the flattest cycle route? Thence need the Mt Vic 2nd tunnel for pedestrians and vehicles only

We're considering the needs of and implications for freight as part of our work, and the conflicts

between modes of transport. One of our assessment criteria is the improved throughput of people and goods on strategic corridors

Why does “bus spine” go through Mt Vic tunnel not bus tunnel?

Why does “spine” not go to airport?

The 2013 Public Transport Spine Study recommended that the public transport spine should go through a duplicated Mt Victoria Tunnel to Kilbirnie and separately to Newtown. However, we are re-testing and confirming the route for a preferred mass transit spine and how it would connect to the airport as part of our work.

3. Light Rail

Re public transport – why assume buses only? What about rail network?

There are no plans as part of this project to extend the existing rail network but improvements to service levels on the existing network are one of the options that we are considering. We are also looking at how we might future-proof a route for light rail along the public transport spine.

What is meant by “future proof for light rail?”

We haven’t defined what that looks like just yet. But as a starting point it means not doing anything on a route that could make it harder to build light rail in future. See the answer below.

Is light rail practical for Wellington?

Why future-proof for light rail? Is this just pandering to the lobby?

The 2014 Public Transport Spine Study (PTSS) determined that light rail was not the preferred option but it was decided that the public transport spine should be future-proofed for light rail. We are re-testing the assumptions used in the PTSS to select the spine route, and considering whether a future LRT system would require any different route.

Has LGWM gone back and looked at the studies which took place in the 1990s? SUPERLINK, WORKS/MVA, RLTS of 1999. Why not? – no evidence that it has (so far).

We have done a study on Wellington’s transport history, which included reviewing a number of previous reports and studies. This is available on our website here:

<http://www.getwellymoving.co.nz/assets/Uploads/Wellington-Transport-History-20-04.pdf>

4. Pedestrians

Where are choices that give liveable walkable city in 20–30 years’ time?

One of our five key objectives is to enhance the liveability of the central city. We included a number of possible interventions in the active transport improvements focus area at the workshops that

would help improve liveability. For example, widening footpaths at busy locations, reducing waiting times along priority walking routes, lowering the speed limit in the CBD, removing traffic from selected inner-city streets.

5. Cars/Parking

How many cars at peak time on Cobham Drive are taxis?

This data was collected as part of the previous Mt. Victoria Tunnel project. It showed that, during peak hours, approximately 15% of cars on Cobham Drive are taxis, and 30% of cars travelling around the Bays are taxis.

6. Public Transport / Buses

What will future bus capacity be for wheelchair travellers, for travellers with pushchairs, and for mobility limited travellers? Questions specifically on routes where double deckers will replace single level buses.

“Accessible, healthy, and safe” is one of our guiding principles. We are considering the needs of disabled users as part of our work and will be assessing options against the accessibility principle. All new buses will be required to have accessible access.

Why not reduce the number of bus stops by making it AT LEAST 200 metres between stops? Or even 500 metres? (e.g. Wallace Street)

Optimising bus stop spacing is one of the things we’re considering in this project.

Reducing buses: does this mean multiple fares for the same journey?

As part of the package of bus improvements in 2018 free transfers between services will be introduced.

Does “remove traffic” on the active transport high option means public transport as well?

It could do. It would likely depend on the location. You might, for example, remove all traffic from one street, and remove all traffic except for buses on another street.

7. Miscellaneous

How are we making sure the views of the disability sector are included? Key to make sure actions are accessible

We are considering the needs of disabled users as part of our work and will be engaging with disabled groups to get their input into this project.

Does the waterfront route mean the Quays?

The waterfront route mentioned in the workshop presentation included the route along Waterloo Quay, Jervois Quay, and Cable Street.

8. Cycling

What of bikes on buses?

A trail of bike racks on buses has been completed and it is expected that bike racks will be introduced on all buses as part of the package of bus improvements in 2018.

9. Environment

If the waterfront is a key component of active transport how can we invest in its resilience?

Resilience is one of the project objectives, which will be used to assess the different options. The resilience of infrastructure, such as roads, is the responsibility of individual organisations, in this case the Wellington City Council. They have recently published a Resilience Strategy.

The objectives do not mention/include sustainability, environmental impacts – WHY?!

The objectives are complementary to the principles which do mention sustainability and environmental impacts. The objectives of enhancing the central city’s liveability and reducing reliance on private vehicles directly relate to these principles. There are many measures used to assess the performance of different options, some of which are focused on environmental impacts. These measures will contribute to the objectives related to liveability and reducing reliance on private vehicle travel.