

Questions for LGWM

1. What's the intent of LGWM's current consultation process (is this to come up with a preferred option?)

In 2019, we completed the Programme Business Case that outlined a vision for an improved transport system for Wellington and strategic response to the problems identified. It recommended investment that had a strong focus on people and improved quality of life. From this, a final package of transport changes was developed for Wellington that complemented transport investments for the wider Wellington region.

Since then we've:

1. **carried out a range of investigations** on a range of projects and potential benefits
2. **revised our programme objectives** following investigations and considerations. This included a much greater focus on urban development, mode shift and climate change and the opportunity this provides to achieve outcomes that fulfil the objectives.
3. **developed and assessed a long list of options.** The mass rapid transit and state highway improvement investigations were the starting point for the development of the LGWM programme long list – because they are the largest components. Each programme long-list option has also been supplemented by elements from the wider LGWM packages. We carried out multi-criteria assessments on the 16 long-list options, testing against programme objectives, environmental and social impacts and design, delivery and operational criteria.
4. **arrived at four high-level options** to consider.

This public engagement is about which elements should be in the programme, not the details of those elements. Considerable work has been done on the programme to develop these options, but we need to check in with the community before going further.

Community feedback will help us decide which option moves forward for more detailed investigation. We want to hear from people what you like, dislike, or think is missing from our options.

2. If groups or individuals want to advocate for a mix of options, what's the best way of doing this?

We considered hundreds of complex option combinations, including different mass rapid transit vehicle types and routes, multiple Mt Victoria Tunnel designs and a range of different ways of improving the Basin Reserve.

Some combination options didn't perform well against the programme objectives and assessment criteria and some were too expensive so didn't make the final shortlist. The options we are presenting give the best performance against the programme's objectives, while still having acceptable costs and levels of construction impact.

We recommend that you provide feedback via the online survey telling us what you do and don't like about each option and why. If you have suggestions around hybrid options / solutions, please submit these in the survey under "Is there anything missing" question. After consultation closes, your feedback will be analysed and a summary of the feedback will be shared online.

3. We would like more detail around options 1 – 3 and the impacts/configuration around the Basin (e.g. like the at-grade pedestrian crossing at the Basin entrance off Cambridge/Kent).

The new proposals at the Basin include two general concepts. This first concept, included in options 1, 2, and 3, removes the Basin operating as a roundabout. It uses an extended Arras Tunnel that allows north and south transport movements over the top of the tunnel extension to be separated from the State Highway east-west traffic underneath. The second concept, included in Option 4 provides minor alterations to the existing roundabout function of the Basin to allow Mass Rapid Transit to skirt around the southwestern corner of the Basin Reserve and connect to Adelaide Road.

We note that there are also pedestrian access routes over the tunnel extension that would be available when large crowds are to access the Basin.

We're currently in the indicative business case phase, which means our concept's plans are in the early stages of development and we do not have more detailed plans for the Basin Reserve. Once consultation closes, we'll analyse all your feedback, incorporating that into the indicative business case report.

Once these reports are endorsed by the partner organisations, we start the detailed business case which would involve detailed analysis of the costs, risks and benefits of the preferred option identified in the indicative business case. During this phase more detailed plans will be produced and shared with the community for feedback.

4. Whatever option is chosen, we want the opportunity to be involved in the design process as it affects the Basin Reserve. What opportunity will there be to do this?

Yes, there will be further opportunities to work with us on more detailed proposals in the next and future stages.

5. We want clarity around the Hataitai bus tunnel. Does this turn Pirie Street into SH 1?

The Hataitai Bus Tunnel will continue to be used by bus services in all four of the options as it is today. The number of buses using Pirie Street will be reduced in Options 1 and 2, as buses from Miramar and the airport will be routed via a new Mt Victoria tunnel. Local buses serving Hataitai and Mt Victoria would still continue to use the existing bus tunnel.

6. In a resource management context, for each of the four options, what designations will LGWM / Waka Kotahi need to seek, and what process do you expect will be used to consider these?

We still have lots of work to do in terms of developing designs before we can confirm what planning approvals will be required and which consenting pathway we will followed.

7. The design of the new diagonal tunnel going from Basin Reserve through to the vicinity of the Badminton Centre: where does the tunnel start and end? What's the rationale for this?

At this early stage in our investigations the end-to-end location of any new tunnel has not yet been determined.

A diagonal tunnel is shown on the maps for Options 1 and 2 for representative purposes only. It would likely be longer and slightly more expensive than a parallel tunnel and so, to be conservative, we have shown it in the engagement information for these options.

All tunnels, including the possible diagonal tunnel would need to consider the impacts on the Town Belt.

8. There have been significant changes to the original MRT route (Taranaki St): in Options 1-3 it's now on Cambridge/Kent. Why is this?

Due to the wider carriageways on Cambridge/Kent Terrace, there is more space in which to provide dedicated MRT lanes and still provide space for other transport modes. This additional space can assist in reducing conflicts between modes and improve safety.

Locating the MRT route on Cambridge/Kent Terrace retains the current and historic public transport connectivity of the southern suburbs to Mt Victoria and Courtenay Place. If the Taranaki Street route is used, there may need to be an additional bus route created to retain that connectivity.

It also avoids further disturbing Te Aro Pa, towards the northern end of Taranaki Street. Due to the wider carriageways on Cambridge/Kent Terrace there are safety opportunities with a reduction in exposure and potential conflict.

9. The costs – Light Rail vs BRT? What are they going to do to capture the enhanced value for properties along the LR route?

Costs for options outlined below.

How the options perform

Measure	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
State Highway journey times – Airport to Terrace Tunnel in morning peak	Up to 3 min* less		little change	
Vehicles removed from local streets in the morning (per hour)	500 fewer vehicles		350 fewer vehicles	200 fewer vehicles
30-year Cost	\$7.4 billion	\$7.0 billion	\$6.6 billion	\$5.8 billion
Construction duration	10-15 years (assuming concurrent construction of some aspects)		8-12 years (assuming concurrent construction of some aspects)	

* Depending on the configuration of the Mt Victoria tunnel. This result assumes a diagonal tunnel.

At this stage, strategies around value capture have yet to be determined.

10. Is LGWM engaging with local schools? Four thousand students a day coming and going from the area. Safety issues and pollution?

Yes, we are engaging with a number of schools located near the proposed mass rapid transit routes, and also engaging with Massey University.

11. How will our roads cope with the extra heavy buses?

Road pavement and utility renewals are expected in all of the options. The full extent of the renewals will be determined in future project phases once the vehicle fleet is confirmed and more detailed investigations are completed, including geotechnical field testing.

12. Does bus priority mean no cars? What does it mean in neighbourhoods like Pirie Street? No residents' car parking?

Bus priority treatments provide opportunities for buses to travel without being impeded by cars. These treatments can include dedicated bus lanes, bus priority at intersections, and improvements to bus stops to make it easier for buses to pull in and out.

Our Enhanced Bus options proposals provide for extensive lengths of kerbside bus lanes, where they can be accommodated. However, in some streets like Pirie Street, traffic congestion doesn't significantly delay buses and the improvements we propose focus more on improving intersections and bus stops and may include adjusting how on-street parking is provided. We might also upgrade kerbs, footpaths and pavements as part of this process.

The location and number of car parks to be removed will be explored further in the detailed business case stage.

13. Options 1 and 2: Do you have more details about space allocation?

The new Mt Victoria Tunnel included in Options 1 and 2 will have four lanes of total capacity. There will be a lane for private vehicles (i.e. no additional lane capacity) and a lane for public transport in each direction. Either side of the tunnel, the road space allocation will be investigated during future project phases.

14. Shared paths are not great for pedestrians. Has this been thought through? What opportunity will there be for pedestrians and local residents to be involved in the design of the cycling and walking facilities?

We are still in the early phase of developing designs and as yet have not confirmed the locations of shared paths vs separated facilities. This will be explored further in the detailed business case stage. There will be opportunities to work with pedestrians and local residents on these facilities.

15. Recently, the media have reported on a disparity between LGWM’s headline messages about the climate change effects of the various options, and the detailed analysis that shows Option 4 as the lowest-emissions option. Do you consider that the performance of the options against LGWM’s evaluation criteria has been properly communicated in the engagement materials? If not, what do you plan to do to ensure that it is?

We have removed the leaf rating visual icons that described how ‘climate friendly’ each option is. These ratings over-simplified the carbon story.

We’ve replaced the leaf ratings with written descriptions. These provide a fuller picture of carbon.

Here are the new option snapshot descriptions:

Carbon snapshot

Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher carbon emissions from construction of a new Mt Victoria Tunnel and Arras Tunnel extension • Very good carbon reductions from more people walking, biking and using public transport • More people can live closer to town, reducing the distances people need to travel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher carbon emissions from construction of a new Mt Victoria Tunnel and Arras Tunnel extension • Good carbon reductions from more people walking, biking and using public transport • People can live closer to town, reducing the distances people need to travel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much lower carbon emissions from construction • Good carbon reductions from more people walking, biking and using public transport • More people can live closer to town, reducing the distances people need to travel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much lower carbon emissions from construction • Very good carbon reductions from more people walking, biking and using public transport • More people can live closer to town, reducing the distances people need to travel