

REPORT 5
(1215/12/IM)

RATIFICATION OF TAWA COMMUNITY BOARD SUBMISSION TO WESTERN CORRIDOR STUDY

It is recommended that the Tawa Community Board:

1. *Receive the information.*
2. *Ratify the Tawa Community Board submission to the Western Corridor Study.*

Attached as appendix 1 is a copy Tawa Community Board submission to the Western Corridor Study.

Submission of the Tawa Community Board

Regional Land Transport Strategy

Proposed Western Corridor Plan

Consultation Document – 1 October 2005

Proposal

1. The Tawa Community Board (TCB) generally supports the Passenger Transport and Travel Demand Management aspects of the Western Corridor Plan, subject to detailed design and costing work showing that individual projects meet Regional Land Transport Strategy objectives, including a Benefit Cost Ratio of greater than 1.

Background

2. The TCB position is based on advice that the submission should be limited to that which is contained within the consultation document and its associated reports, and not statements since the consultation commenced.
3. We have found making a submission on the Plan very difficult, due to the fact that during the consultation period Central Government (and politicians in general) have started moving the goalpost, in response to what they believe is public opinion.
4. The TCB position is based on its assessment of regional needs rather than a narrower interpretation of what is best for the city, or small pockets of individuals within city boundaries.
5. The TCB wishes to acknowledge the success of the Regional Land Transport Committee in securing additional government funding of \$885m this year, versus \$900m obtained by Auckland, which has much greater congestion and access problems. It will be hard for Government to justify granting a substantial further sum to Wellington without creating precedents elsewhere.
6. The final Plan needs to meet the Government's Transport Strategy objectives and the objectives in the draft Regional Land Transport Strategy and comply with the Land Transport Management Act 2003. In particular, the benefits of the Plan and any component parts need to outweigh their costs.

Comment

7. TCB has considered the Plan as a whole and firmly believes that an increased capacity route out of Wellington city to the north is imperative to the social and

APPENDIX 1

fiscal health of the Wellington region as a whole. However we also believe that relieving congestion at the base of the Ngauranga Gorge is equally important, in particular for the industrial and business sectors. For this reason the TCB supports the Grenada – Petone link as we believe that this link would make a significant impact on the peak travel times for vehicles travelling to and from the Hutt Valley and Wellington City.

8. TCB would like the detailed design to recognise local issues when implementing the upgrade of rail services, as it relates to existing level crossings, and to include opportunities to mitigate both existing effects, in particular of any increased effects in relation to local road congestion, waiting periods and pedestrian safety issues.
9. We believe the key issue in the draft Plan is the choice between the Coastal Highway option and the Transmission Gully Route.
10. TCB acknowledges that there is considerable popular support for Transmission Gully and its variants, even though these options are deficient in a number of essential aspects. For this reason, we have endeavoured to take cognisance of popular support and an analysis based approach.
11. We acknowledge that elements of Transmission Gully and some of the roading projects which make up the Coastal option have undesirable impacts on local communities. However, on balance we believe that the Transmission Gully route will cause less adverse effects on the people living within its path.
12. We note that there is a funding shortfall, and a major deficiency in the draft Plan is to treat the Coastal option as a single project when comparing it to Transmission Gully. If treated in this way, neither option is affordable or justifiable given current traffic levels. There is a funding shortfall of \$220m to build the complete Coastal Highway, and a funding shortfall of \$580m for Transmission Gully.
13. We acknowledge that additional funding from Central Government will be extremely difficult to secure. And as such we believe that the only option for the region is to accept that which is tantamount to second best and to support the implementation of the Coastal option as a long-term blueprint for the corridor as traffic levels grow and funding is made available (the “incremental Coastal option”).
14. The majority of TCB members believe that too much time has already been lost and it is our understanding that it may be a further 10 years before a sod is turned, should the Transmission Gully option prevail. We believe that this option should be fully funded and fast tracked or accept second best allowing the region to take advantage of the benefits of an improved route out of and into Wellington in the near future.
15. We are aware that an alternative option involving building the northern section of Transmission Gully together with an upgraded SH58 is being promoted within the

region. If this option is to be given serious consideration, it needs to be analysed to determine its effects on congestion and impacts on funding of other projects within the region. Further analysis needs to be undertaken to fully understand the effects, in particular the environmental effects from Pauahatanui back into Porirua.

Conclusion

16. We acknowledge that there are many roading projects in the region that will give substantially greater benefits to the Greater Wellington Region than Transmission Gully, or certain parts of the Coastal option, and these should be funded first e.g. Grenada-Petone link.
17. We believe that Central Government should be responsible for addressing the road funding needs for the Region, in particular Transmission Gully and the Grenada – Petone Link. The region can no longer afford to procrastinate in addressing the most urgent of roading needs and as such we believe there is little option but to accept second best and accept the incremental development of the coastal route and advocate for the additional funding required to allow the Grenada-Petone link to be developed.