



# Transmission Gully Project

## Consultation Report on Preferred Route

Prepared by:  
TRANSMISSION GULLY PROJECT TEAM  
Level 13, Tourism & Travel House  
73 Boulcott St, Wellington

# Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Consultation process	4
2.1 Objectives	4
2.2 Consultation activities	4
3. Feedback mechanism/Feedback sought	6
4. Analysis methodology	6
5. Statistical summary of responses	7
6. 'Support' respondents - Summary of comments	8
6.1 Comments on preferred route	8
6.2 Comments on actions needed to be taken	9
6.3 Comments on Public Private Partnerships/Funding	9
6.4 Comments on construction	10
6.5 Comments on alternative route	10
6.6 Comments on who should pay and why	11
6.7 Comments on transport convenience	11
6.8 Comments on lack of progress on building Transmission Gully	11
6.9 Comments on Coastal Route	12
6.10 Comments on the environment	12
6.11 Comments on Transmission Gully and the community	13
6.12 Comments on additional steps needed with Transmission Gully	13
6.13 Comments on earthquakes, storms, floods, slips	14
6.14 Comments on tolling	14
6.15 Comments on Transmission Gully and economic growth	15
6.16 Miscellaneous comments	15
7. 'Don't mind' respondents - Summary of comments	16
7.1 Comments on construction	16
7.2 Comments on who should pay and why	16
7.3 Comments on tolling	16
7.4 Comments on additional steps needed with Transmission Gully	16
7.5 Miscellaneous comments	17
8. 'Oppose' respondents - Summary of comments	17
8.1 Comments pertaining to design of preferred route	17
8.2 Comments not specific to design of preferred route	18
9. Specific submissions	20
10. Outcomes	21
11. Next steps	21
11.1 Pull-off and vehicle inspection areas	21
11.2 Property impacts at Paekakariki	21
11.3 Parks and reserves/Farming operations	22
11.4 Bulk water main	22
11.5 Access to existing properties at SH58	22
11.6 Whitby and Waitangirua link roads	22
11.7 Kenepuru link road	23
12. Summary	23

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document provides a report on the consultation undertaken between 14 July–20 August 2008 with the public and stakeholders in the Greater Wellington region on the preferred route through Transmission Gully so as to obtain feedback which would allow the scheme design of the proposed highway to be finalised.

The consultation process was carried out within a framework of stakeholder, affected community and general public engagement on the preferred route that met the requirements of the relevant legislation viz. the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA), the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Historic Places Act 1993 (HPA).

In undertaking the consultation process, the widest possible range of engagement was utilised to ensure that those being consulted were aware of and understood all aspects about the preferred route through Transmission Gully, and had all possible avenues for their views to be passed on to the project team for consideration.

The formal consultation process undertaken resulted in a total of 2411 responses received on the preferred route with 2137 (88.6%) supporting, 103 (4.3%) didn't mind, and 171 (7.1%) opposing.

Based on the consultation undertaken and feedback received, the project team noted the diversity of perspectives within the community but has given consideration to all relevant feedback that can be incorporated into the design of the preferred route through Transmission Gully.

These have been distilled down to specific suggestions on different issues and are currently being worked on for inclusion in the design of the preferred route through Transmission Gully.

As the project team develops the Transmission Gully scheme further, it will continue to work closely at all levels with the various territorial authorities in the Greater Wellington area to ensure that the final alignment represents the best achievable outcome for the region.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Since May 2007, the NZ Transport Agency (formerly Transit New Zealand) has been working with territorial authorities in the Greater Wellington Region on investigations to provide a preliminary design and cost estimate for a route through Transmission Gully. This work (Phase 1 of the project) was completed in August 2008 with the public release of the preferred route through Transmission Gully, cost estimate, and the draft Scheme Assessment Report (SAR).

Phase 2 of the Transmission Gully project, currently being undertaken, includes the task of consulting with the public and stakeholders on the preferred route through Transmission Gully so as to obtain feedback which would allow the scheme design of the proposed highway to be finalised.

## 2. CONSULTATION PROCESS

### 2.1 Objectives

The objectives of the consultation process were to

- Provide a method of stakeholder, affected community and general public engagement on the preferred route through Transmission Gully that met the requirements of the relevant legislation viz. the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA), the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Historic Places Act 1993 (HPA).
- Provide the opportunity for statutory agencies, affected communities, individuals and other organisations with an interest in the Transmission Gully project to fully understand the proposal and preferred option.
- Provide the opportunity for such parties to have input into the scheme design of the final alignment of the route through Transmission Gully.
- Provide Transmission Gully project decision-makers with an indication of the views of those consulted on the preferred route.

### 2.2 Consultation Activities

The prime intention of the consultation process was to provide all interested and affected parties with the widest possible range of mechanisms for them to be aware of, understand and have their views on the preferred route through Transmission Gully passed on to the project team and considered. The methods used and activities carried out were as follows:

**Affected property owners:** - Property owners along the preferred route were initially contacted on 24 June 2008 to coincide with the announcement by the Minister of Transport about the preferred route that day. This was followed up by personal visits from project representatives a fortnight later to discuss the potential impact of the preferred route on properties. The property owners were given customised information packs along with details of the mechanisms through which their feedback could be received. The timing of communication with landowners was designed to precede the

publication of a four-page insert on the preferred route in the Dominion Post on 11 July 2008.

In addition, the project team worked jointly with the Porirua City Council to communicate with potentially affected residents on the intended link roads from the preferred route into Porirua City.

**News media publicity:** - A four-page pull-out insert was published in the Dominion Post of 11 July 2008 to provide detailed and authoritative information about the preferred route along with information on how to engage in the feedback process.

**Local territorial authorities:** - Mayors and Chief Executives of all territorial authorities in the Greater Wellington area were advised prior to the Dominion Post insert of 11 July 2008. In addition, briefings were offered to all affected territorial authorities, including mayors - with the Porirua City Council, Wellington City Council and the Regional Land Transport Committee requesting and given presentations on the preferred route.

**Project website:** - The Transmission Gully website was updated to contain comprehensive information, including detailed illustrations, on the preferred route through Transmission Gully. Provision was also made on the website for feedback forms to be downloaded and for comments on the preferred route to be emailed to the project team.

**Information stands:** - Information stands were manned at the following shopping malls in the Greater Wellington area:

- North City Plaza, Porirua
- Trentham City Shopping Centre, Upper Hutt
- Johnsonville Shopping Centre, Johnsonville
- Westfield Queensgate, Lower Hutt
- BNZ Centre, Willis Street, Wellington
- Coastlands Shoppingtown, Paraparaumu.

**Project information 0800 line:** - A 0800 telephone line was established and staffed during normal office hours throughout the formal consultation period (14 July-20 August 2008). General inquiries about the preferred route and/or the feedback process were answered by a dedicated call-centre person while callers requiring specific advice were referred to the appropriate project representative for further assistance.

**Feedback brochure mail drop:** - An eight-page A4 brochure with comprehensive details on the preferred route through Transmission Gully, and containing a postage paid feedback form, was sent to all residents in the Greater Wellington area. The brochure was also made available at all public libraries throughout the Greater Wellington area.

**Emergency services:** - Presentations on the preferred route were given to:

- Wellington Police
- Wellington Free Ambulance
- New Zealand Fire Service.

**Community/interested groups and Agencies:** – Briefings were offered to identified agencies and community/interested groups - with the following requesting and given presentations on the preferred route:

- Ngati Toa
- Pauatahanui Inlet Community Trust
- Guardians of Pauatahanui Inlet
- Paremata Residents Association
- Greater Wellington Regional Council – Parks Division
- New Zealand Road Transport Association
- Whitby Residents Association
- Tawa Community Board
- Waitangirua Residents
- New Zealand Transport Forum
- Plimmerton Residents Association
- New Zealand Historic Places Trust
- Pauatahanui Residents Association
- Linden School
- Fish & Game New Zealand

### **3. FEEDBACK MECHANISM/FEEDBACK SOUGHT**

To facilitate the receipt of feedback and input on the preferred route through Transmission Gully, a special free-post feedback form was incorporated as part of the consultation brochure sent to all households in the Greater Wellington area. The consultation brochure was also obtainable from all public libraries in the Greater Wellington area as well as made available on the Transmission Gully project website.

On the form, feedback was sought on what respondents thought about the preferred option through Transmission Gully. In this respect they were asked to tick one of three boxes ( Support,  Oppose or  Don't Mind) as well as invited to offer any comments. No criteria or subject matters were specified for submitters to comment on.

In addition they were also asked to tick any of four boxes ( I believe my property will be affected by the preferred Transmission Gully route  I live in the project area  I represent an organisation that has an interest in the Transmission Gully project. Please specify what organisation.  I do not live in the project area but am interested in the project because.....)

Lastly they were asked to provide their names and addresses (or email) if they wanted to be included on the mailing list to receive future information on the Transmission Gully project.

### **4. ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY**

A wide and diverse range of comments were received from respondents relating not only to the preferred route through Transmission Gully but also other matters pertaining to the Transmission Gully project or transport issues relevant to the Wellington region. In collating the responses received, a coding framework which would effectively capture and group together comments or sentiments relating to a particular theme (subject) was adopted. The collation task was undertaken separately for all three groups of respondents - 'support', 'don't mind' and 'oppose'.

## 5. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

A total of 2411 responses were received on the preferred route through Transmission Gully with

- 2137 (88.6%) supporting
- 103 (4.3%) didn't mind
- 171 (7.1%) opposing.

Further statistical breakdowns are as follows:

### **Respondents living in the project area:**

364 respondents (15.1% of total respondents) identified themselves as living in the project area. Of these, 321 were 'support' respondents (15% of 'support' respondents), 10 were 'didn't mind' respondents (9.7% of 'didn't mind' respondents), and 33 were 'oppose' respondents (19.3% of 'oppose' respondents).

### **Respondents not living in the project area:**

1628 respondents (67.5% of total respondents) identified themselves as not living in the project area. Of these, 1453 were 'support' respondents (68% of 'support' respondents), 71 were 'didn't mind' respondents (69% of 'didn't mind' respondents), and 104 were 'oppose' respondents (60.8% of 'oppose' respondents).

### **Respondents not specifying whether they lived or did not live in the project area:**

419 respondents (17.4% of total respondents). Of these, 363 were 'support' respondents (17% of 'support' respondents), 22 were 'didn't mind' respondents (21.3% of 'didn't mind' respondents), and 34 were 'oppose' respondents (19.9% of 'oppose' respondents).

### **Respondents who believed their properties would be affected:**

56 respondents (2.3% of total respondents). Of these, 35 were 'support' respondents (1.6% of 'support' respondents), 4 were 'didn't mind' respondents (3.9% of 'didn't mind' respondents), and 17 were 'oppose' respondents (10% of 'oppose' respondents).

### **Respondents representing an organisation with an interest in the Transmission Gully project:**

34 respondents (1.4% of total respondents). Of these, 25 were 'support' respondents (1.2% of 'support' respondents), 5 were 'didn't mind' respondents (4.9% of 'didn't mind' respondents), and 4 were 'oppose' respondents (2.4% of 'oppose' respondents).

### **Respondents wanting to receive future information on the Transmission Gully project:**

1352 respondents (56% of total respondents). Of these, 1210 were 'support' respondents (56.6% of 'support' respondents), 58 were 'didn't mind' respondents (56.3% of 'didn't mind' respondents), and 84 were 'oppose' respondents (49.1% of 'oppose' respondents).

### **Respondents not wanting to receive future information on the Transmission Gully project:**

1059 respondents (44% of total respondents). Of these, 927 were 'support' respondents (43.4% of 'support' respondents), 45 were 'didn't mind' respondents (43.7% of 'didn't mind' respondents), and 87 were 'oppose' respondents (50.9% of 'oppose' respondents).

**Respondents identifying themselves by name and address:**

1390 respondents (57.7% of total respondents). Of these, 1238 were 'support' respondents (58% of 'support' respondents), 59 were 'didn't mind' respondents (57.3% of 'didn't mind' respondents), and 93 were 'oppose' respondents (54.4% of 'oppose' respondents).

**Respondents choosing to remain anonymous:**

1021 respondents (42.3% of total respondents). Of these, 899 were 'support' respondents (42% of 'support' respondents), 44 were 'didn't mind' respondents (42.7% of 'didn't mind' respondents), and 78 were 'oppose' respondents (45.6% of 'oppose' respondents).

**Respondents who opposed the preferred route and offered comments pertaining to the design of the preferred route:**

24 respondents (14% of total 'oppose' respondents).

**Respondents who opposed the preferred route and offered comments not pertaining to the design of the preferred route:**

130 respondents (76% of total 'oppose' respondents).

**Respondents who opposed the preferred route but offered no comments:**

17 respondents (10% of total 'oppose' respondents).

## **6. 'SUPPORT' RESPONDENTS - SUMMARY OF COMMENTS**

On the feedback form, submitters were invited to offer any comments in support or otherwise of their submissions but no criteria or subject matters were specified for comments to be received on. Consequently, a diverse range of comments were received and in the overall summary provided below, the comments have been categorised under respective headings and summarised as succinctly as possible to reflect, as accurately as possible, the overall theme/message and flavour behind the comments received. In many cases, the same or similar comments have been received from submitters but these are only shown once in the summary below.

### **6.1 Comments on preferred route**

Overall, 'support' respondents felt that engineering experts had determined the best possible route through Transmission Gully which offered much better advantages than the previous designated route. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Preferred route is much more sensible alignment.
- Preferred route appears to be a good one.
- Engineering aspects are more straightforward.
- New route is much better as it avoids steep terrain.
- New route has many advantages over original proposal.
- A better compromise between environmental and financial considerations.
- Fully support environmental improvements and cost savings identified.
- Best option for cost and environmental reasons.
- Preferred option makes the project viable.
- Good choice as it will reduce risks.
- Far better and cheaper route.
- Good route for regular commuters.
- Route seems to be well thought-out.
- Safer and more cost-effective route than previous proposal.

- More quicker and appealing route than current Coastal Route.
- Safety and time-saving advantages through not having to go through built-up areas.
- Well-engineered and thought out.
- Most commonsense cost-effective solution.
- More consideration and better planning with preferred route.
- Changes will correct various unfavourable aspects of existing designation route.
- Advantages are significant.
- Previous delays a blessing as we now have best route at best cost.

## 6.2 Comments on action needed to be taken

‘Support’ respondents were unanimous and unequivocal in demanding that further studies and consultation should cease and that work on the project should start immediately. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Just get on with it.
- Make it happen as soon as possible.
- Stop procrastinating and start building.
- Proceed at once to minimise costs.
- Sooner this can start the better.
- Start needed urgently.
- Essential for decision to be made quickly.
- The quicker a start, the cheaper it will be.
- Forget about consulting every man and his dog and build the road.
- Extensive research already undertaken so get on with it.
- Estimated savings and safety advantages will become a joke – make it happen!
- Commonsense should apply irrespective of the cost.
- It’s never going to go away so do it.
- Cost savings will be eaten up if there are more delays.
- Important for final decision to be made and work started.
- Public consultation is vital but so is action.
- Good forward planning necessary.
- Fast-track the project.
- The sooner we get consultants off site and bulldozers on the better.

## 6.3 Comments on Public Private Partnerships (PPP)/Funding

‘Support’ respondents felt that Private Public Partnerships (PPP) or private sector money should be investigated as possible mechanisms to fund the Transmission Gully project. Listed below are sample comments received:

- PPP the way to make progress on Transmission Gully.
- Debt funding to build Transmission Gully.
- Money would be more easily found if positive commitments are made to Transmission Gully.
- \$500m public infrastructure bond listed on NZX @9% - Govt guaranteed for five years.
- PPP should be investigated as a means to pay for the project.
- PPP could be best method to finance TG.
- Get private enterprise to build it.
- Private money from overseas would assist.
- Use of more private sector investment including PPP and borrowing to fund the road.

- Raise loans.
- Build a wind farm to pay off the project.
- Get Maori to loan some of their Treaty money.

#### 6.4 Comments on construction

Comments from 'support' respondents largely centred on the need to tender internationally on the project with a view to potentially employing overseas contractors, and to build the road in different stages. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Get army engineers to assist in building it to save costs.
- Tender internationally.
- Get the Chinese to do the job.
- Seek tenders from South East Asia.
- Italian building expertise needed to guide to construction.
- Hire overseas contractors.
- Learn from Dubai.
- Need at least two contractors as competition is a great speedster.
- Complete construction in five years.
- Suggest three tenders for northern, central & southern.
- Provide for expansion but just get a single lane each way up and running for now.
- Should be done in two stages 1. MacKays to Pauatahanui, 2. Pauatahanui to Linden.
- Start first at southern end to show something concrete is being done.
- Build northern section first as it would remove traffic bound for Hutt.
- Earth embankments preferred to concrete viaducts in earthquake-prone areas.

#### 6.5 Comments on alternative route

Almost all 'support' respondents were resolute in the need for an alternative route to the existing Coastal Route for traffic in and out of Wellington on the Western Corridor. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Important to have secure alternative route to Coastal Route.
- Alternative route necessary in event of disaster or emergency.
- Transmission Gully will offer an alternative when there are problems to the existing highway.
- The Capital should have more than one route north.
- Transmission Gully is needed as the Coastal Route is vulnerable to disruptions.
- Imperative to have new route into Wellington and the Hutt from north.
- Recent weather events see a need for Transmission Gully.
- Need quicker alternative route to reduce congestion.
- Need a highway that does not run through communities.
- Wellington is vulnerable with only one access road.
- Will relieve traffic congestion on present SH1.
- Alternative route urgently required on economic and safety grounds.
- Any road is better than what is there now.

## 6.6 Comments on who should pay and why

The majority of 'support' respondents suggested that Central Government should provide funding because Transmission Gully would be a national highway but alternatively, a rates levy, fuel tax or tolling should also be considered. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Government because Transmission Gully is a national asset and State Highway.
- Government should fund 100%.
- Transmission Gully should be funded solely by Government.
- Local authorities should not be expected to pay.
- PPP or tolling, just do it.
- Shortfall should be made up from fuel tax.
- Should be funded by all New Zealanders as everyone will benefit through better transport.
- May need to consider private funding and repayment via rates levy.
- It's a national infrastructure and should be funded from general taxation.
- Should be funded by Government and supported by tolling - similar to that in Australia.
- User toll charge or regional/national rate increase.
- Tax/rate payer should not pay, user pays.
- Local government needs to sort out with central government.
- Funding should be a mix of central and local government funding, tolls and PPP.
- Combination of central and local funding, tolling as well as investment from funds companies.

## 6.7 Comments on transport convenience

Comments here mainly centred on quicker travel times in and out of Wellington with the added bonus of safer travel, reduced traffic through residential areas and fewer hold-ups during the holiday season. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Less travel time into Wellington particularly during peak hours.
- More direct route into Wellington.
- Will make driving safer.
- Will reduce traffic through coastal communities.
- Less hold-ups during the holiday season.
- Will ease pressure on the Coastal Route.
- Will relieve congestion and improve traffic flows in and out of Wellington.
- Less pollution and fuel savings.
- Will reduce accidents.
- Be easier for freight companies.
- Will provide more surety to travel times.

## 6.8 Comments on lack of progress on building Transmission Gully

Respondents felt there has been too much procrastination on the project and a fixation on ongoing debate and constant consultation while costs continue to escalate. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Too many meetings, debates and consultations.
- Time and money being wasted on one study after another.
- Forgo current mandatory procrastination on the project.
- Should have been built years ago.

- Long overdue.
- Stop going round and round.
- Wellington has stood still while other cities such as Auckland have strode forward.
- No more consultants on the gravy train.
- Too many hidden agendas with local bodies and Government.
- Every excuse has been used to slow down the project.
- Too much Political Correctness.
- Talkfest can't solve congestion problem.

#### 6.9 Comments on Coastal Route

Respondents painted a dismal picture of the Coastal Route's adequacy for today's traffic demands highlighting frequent closures because of weather impacts and the high rate of accidents. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Recent storms which closed part of the Coastal Route illustrates why Transmission Gully must be built.
- Coastal Route is slow, sub-standard, and a disgrace to the Capital.
- Current highway is clogged with frequent delays.
- Current SH1 is dangerous particularly between Pukerua Bay & Paekakariki.
- High volume of traffic and accident rate on Coastal Route.
- Coastal Route is woefully inadequate for current, let alone future traffic volumes.
- Widening the Coastal Route is a waste of money because of weather and flooding.
- Coastal Route often blocked or closed in stormy weather.
- Tired of bottle-neck traffic in Paremata/Paekakariki area during peak and long weekends.
- SH1 is too narrow and vulnerable to crashes, slips, high seas and closures.
- When accidents occur on the Coastal Route, there is no alternative route.
- Coastal Route should be protected and used as a beautiful recreational route, not as a major thoroughfare.

#### 6.10 Comments on the environment

Comments received varied from support for efforts to protect the environment to stressing a need for likely environmental impacts to be fully mitigated and the environment protected as best as possible. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Ensure no erosion or disruption to streams, wetlands or historic sites.
- Modified route has reduced environmental impact especially on waterways.
- Route is much lower down and has more stormwater runoff.
- Preferred route in-keeping with landscape.
- Keen to see least damage to environment and wildlife.
- The more forests and steep cuts that can be avoided the better.
- Environmentally conducive and greater sensitivity to land form and runoff protection.
- Large scale vertical climbs and descents will result in larger vehicle emissions and fuel consumption. Stormwater runoff into streams will also be much greater. Extensive sediment traps will be needed.

- Less impact on Belmont Regional Park and Battle Hill.
- Concerns for the Takapu Conservation Covenant in Belmont Regional Park.
- Plant native trees and shrubs.
- Great consideration and planning has been made in relation to Pauatahanui Inlet.
- Site run-off must be prevented from entering Pauatahanui Inlet and other streams along the route.
- Must preserve as much as possible the natural habitat, historical and recreational areas.
- Appreciate efforts to minimise impacts to streams and wetlands.
- Preferred option a balanced response to environmental needs of region.

#### **6.11 Comments on Transmission Gully and the community**

Respondents largely felt that the wider community would benefit from the shift of traffic to Transmission Gully – particularly those living in communities along the existing Coastal Route. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Transmission Gully will benefit and be safer for the community.
- Possible advantages to the Waitangirua community.
- Transmission Gully will open up Battle Hill Forest Park to the public.
- Reduced traffic will be advantageous to communities on the present Coastal Route.
- Hutt Valley will be a major beneficiary of the Transmission Gully route.
- Will allow present seaside communities to prosper with the diverting of traffic to Transmission Gully.
- Benefits to Waitangirua village centre.
- Will protect Paekakariki and other coastal features.
- Will provide safer walking along Mana Esplanade.
- Transmission Gully will improve access to health services.
- Will reduce the traffic using the roads around the Pauatahanui Inlet.
- Motorways should be kept out of residential areas.

#### **6.12 Comments on additional steps needed in tandem with Transmission Gully**

Comments received touched on a variety and diverse range of other actions deemed necessary for consideration in conjunction with any plans to build Transmission Gully in the future. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Bypass needed for Pukerua Bay as Coastal Route will be busier with trucks.
- Upgrade Haywards and Grays Rd.
- Transmission Gully should continue to Levin.
- Make shoulders wide enough for vehicles breaking down.
- Reduce speed limit on James Cook Drive exit.
- Should look at improving SH58 as well.
- Should make it six lanes now as this will be cheaper than adding on in the future. Also provide service facilities (fuel stations) along the route.
- Would like a Warspite connection sometime in the future.
- Provide three lanes on the inclines.

- Need to buttress hills with special chain wire and also spray them with liquid concrete to stop erosion.
- Flyover ramps instead of roundabouts.
- Put a fifth lane down the middle for emergency services.
- Build a light rail track adjacent to preferred route.
- Consider a gravel arrester (as in Adelaide) on the downhill side of the steep road – a runoff for runaway vehicles.
- A tunnel to lessen the gradient at Wainui Saddle is worth considering.
- Provide lighting at interchanges and in dark sections where the highway travels along the valley floor.
- Provide rest facilities (with safe exits and entries and appropriately signed) especially on the long section from SH58 to MacKays Crossing.
- Provision made for walking and cycling access under or over the new highway from existing tracks starting at Cannons Creek and Takapu Rd to rest of Belmont Park, and from Battle Hill Park to Akatarawa Forest.
- Redesign Linden Interchange with on and off ramps to accommodate traffic from north and SH58 to and from Porirua and Kenepuru Hospital.
- Ensure as best as possible that the route is not visible from urban areas of Whitby & Eastern Porirua and traffic cannot be heard.
- Should be an interchange at Battle Hill reserve with a link to Paekakariki Hill Rd for recreational, residential and emergency traffic.
- Main exit for Transmission Gully should be at Takapu Rd not Linden as it is most 'straightest' and direct route. However there should still be a link at Linden.

#### 6.13 Comments on earthquakes, storms, floods, slips

Respondents here mainly highlighted the reduced risk or extent for Transmission Gully to be disrupted in the event of earthquakes, storms, floods or slips. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Less chance of Transmission Gully highway disruption in event of earthquake or storm.
- Possibility of flooding on valley floor.
- Transmission Gully will minimise geological and other hazards.
- New Zealand is one fault line, get over it and build it.
- More resilience to earthquakes.
- Be more easily repaired than coastal highway.
- Lower risk of closure from weather events.
- Preferred route avoids more earthquake risk areas.
- Makes sense to build it in the Gully where there is less chance of closure due to natural events.

#### 6.14 Comments on tolling

Comments received predominantly indicated a willingness to accept a 'users pay' approach to Transmission Gully and a preparedness to pay a toll charge (similar to that overseas) to use the road. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Toll Transmission Gully to pay it off.
- Happy for Transmission Gully to be tolled as long as it does not drive traffic back to the Coastal Route.
- Don't mind paying a toll. Most places overseas have a toll, why not Transmission Gully?

- Toll it but increase speed limit to 130km/h as in France to give value to motorists.
- A toll road is better than no road.
- Get it done privately and toll it.
- User pays so burden doesn't fall on non-user ratepayers.
- Be happy to pay small toll each way (\$1-\$3) for use
- Charge tolls – similar to Melbourne
- Toll it rather than funding through rates and petrol tax.
- Prepared to pay a \$5 toll.
- Angry if it is tolled and not paid through fuel tax.
- Toll would be best way to pay for shortfall. Once paid, keep the toll for maintenance or improvements.

#### 6.15 Comments on Transmission Gully and economic growth

Respondents here saw the building of Transmission Gully as the key to increased economic growth not only for the Wellington region but also for the rest of New Zealand. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Transmission Gully is important for Wellington's growth.
- Important infrastructure not only for the Wellington region but the whole country.
- Increased access to Wellington will be good for the national economy.
- Transmission Gully is a vital national link and therefore of national importance.
- Will open up Wellington to the Manawatu.
- Will create growth and draw money into the region.
- Transmission Gully will improve transport infrastructure in Wellington region.
- Will open up Wellington region to tourism.
- Transmission Gully is essential to ensuring future growth and prosperity of the region.
- Represents good future planning and investment in infrastructure.
- Region/country needs to grow to provide desired services. Without provision of infrastructure, this will not occur.

#### 6.16 Miscellaneous comments

Comments covered a range including work carried out by the project team, information sent out to the public on the preferred route, the definition of "project area", and a suggestion that younger people be employed on the project. Listed below are sample comments received:

- Congratulations to the project team - great job so far.
- Civil engineers have done a great job on preferred route.
- Impressed with the diligence and forthrightness of Transit on this project.
- Sensible contemporary engagement with the public through public meetings, shopping malls and media.
- Fantastic brochure. Well-explained, well-designed, informative, clear and easy to follow.
- Map was easy to read and understand.
- Look forward to receiving updates and further information as the project develops.
- Would be helpful if "project area" was better defined.
- Project need younger people as the older heads are in a time warp.

## **7. 'DON'T MIND' RESPONDENTS - SUMMARY OF COMMENTS**

In the overall summary provided below, comments have been categorised under respective headings and summarised as succinctly as possible to reflect, as accurately as possible, the overall theme/message and flavour behind the comments received. In some cases, the same or similar comments have been received from submitters but these are only shown once in the summary below.

Because of the small number of comments received from this group and the diverse range and self-explanatory nature of such comments, no summary of comments is provided under each heading. Listed below are sample comments received:

### **7.1 Comments on construction**

- Get the road built by Italians who are reliable and not afraid of hard work.
- Get overseas contractors who can work 24/7.
- Build the best route - not the cheapest or the most expensive.

### **7.2 Comments on who should pay and why**

- Don't burden the ratepayer as this project should be funded by Central Government.
- I hope my rates are not funding it. I don't want to fund it.
- Regional petrol tax would not be popular.
- Any shortfall should be met by a toll and not petrol tax or rate hikes.
- As long as ratepayers do not have to pay.
- Funding should be paid by Central Government as it is also SH1.
- Don't mind subject to additional Central Government funding.

### **7.3 Comments on tolling**

- I would be reluctant to pay a toll for this new route.
- There should be a toll on the road so that people who use it help pay for it.
- Should be paid off by tolls at no cost but only to the user.
- Happy to pay a toll.
- Put a toll rather than petrol tax.
- Would use new road even if it is tolled.
- Have the courage to make it a toll road.

### **7.4 Comments on additional steps needed in tandem with Transmission Gully**

- Need to upgrade the link between Pauatahanui and Lower Hutt (SH58) too.
- Build a two-lane road, southbound for the morning and northbound for the afternoon.
- Concerns about access to properties off the new alignment of SH58. Also traffic noise, natural water supply to properties and impact of route on potential sale of properties.
- Wants agreement with Transit over the Range at Sievers Grove to be kept.
- Consider measures to alleviate unsightliness of earthworks on hillsides.
- Area around the summit is often fog-bound. Also World War II tips in area may still contain explosives. In addition, land to

SH58 is of lake-bed type sediment and prone to liquefying when opened up as well as slipping easily.

- Consider mitigation for areas of native habitat that will be affected.
- Build opposing lanes sufficiently far apart to avoid headlight glare. Consider crawler lane for electric cars.
- Think 20 years ahead and make it three lanes each way, total of six lanes.

#### 7.5 Miscellaneous comments

- Have not seen an assessment of cost or problems in widening Coastal Route.
- Main thing current road lacks is an extra two lanes.
- Concern for aquatic life in area.

### 8. 'OPPOSE' RESPONDENTS – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

In the overall summary provided below, comments have been categorised under respective headings and summarised as succinctly as possible to reflect, as accurately as possible, the overall theme/message and flavour behind the comments received. In many cases, the same or similar comments have been received but these are only shown once in the summary below.

As with the previous 'don't mind' section, no summary of comments is provided under each heading because of the diverse range and self-explanatory nature of the comments received. Listed below are sample comments received.

#### 8.1 Comments pertaining to design of preferred route

- Proposed route is steeper than most of the existing routes. Steep gradients increase fuel consumption.
- Consider proposed route to follow main power lines ssw from Pauatahanui to link up with existing road south of Porirua East.
- Drive a tunnel from Whenua Tapu to north end of Pukerua Bay – about 9kms. Must be cheaper than the 27kms proposed.
- Should be from Kenepuru or Takapu Road instead of Linden so no schools would be affected.
- Will create increased traffic noise to communities along the route.
- Oppose Whitby/Waitangirua interchange as both suburbs are adequately served.
- Heavy vehicles coming down James Cook Drive would not be desirable through a residential area.
- The Transmission Gully route should be moved further away from private properties adjacent to the route so as to provide better noise and visual protection for local residents
- Tolling could create more noise with vehicles having to slow down and then speed up again.
- Some properties will have limited options for grazing and stock management.
- The new route will impact adversely on some existing businesses and properties.
- New route will contribute to more pollution and block the sun on some properties.

## 8.2 Comments not specific to design of preferred route

### Public transport

- Invest in better public transport and get the cars off the roads.
- Better to improve the railway. Rail is also more efficient way to move passengers and freight.
- Wellington should lead the way with a light rail system.
- Rapid rail from Otaki to Airport.
- Spend money on electric trains all the way to Palmerston North.
- Increasing fuel prices should see public transport options revisited.
- Upgrading of public transport would be less costly option.
- Expenditure should be on rail and a modest upgrade of coastal highway.
- All funding should be directed to enhancing public transport infrastructure and walking/cycling facilities.

### Traffic

- Transmission Gully will further increase traffic down already congested Ngauranga Gorge. Transmission Gully does nothing to solve this.
- Traffic gridlocks from Raumati South northwards to Waikanae and Transmission Gully does nothing to alleviate this.
- Will increase traffic noise in my neighbourhood.
- No incentive for heavy trucks to use Transmission Gully because of steep gradients.
- TG only caters as far as MacKays crossing, further delays at peak time at Lindale and Otaki.
- Traffic problems could be reduced by discouraging weekend travel.
- Trucks will still use the Coastal Route and this will still impact negatively on Paekakariki, Pukerua Bay and Plimmerton.
- Transmission Gully will eventually be grid-locked.

### Costs

- \$1b could be used better for the benefit of the region.
- Not prepared to pay for road through tax, rates or petrol levy.
- Too expensive just to fix a couple of hours of traffic jams.
- Can't seriously spend \$1b to save 10 minutes travel time.
- 10-minute time saving would not be enough to encourage people to pay a toll.
- Opposed to paying even \$1 for this road. The people who want it should pay for it.
- Insane to invest billions of dollars when oil prices are increasing.
- Wasteful use of money considering the economic situation in New Zealand at present.
- Will vigorously oppose any fuel tax.
- Rising price of fuel makes the project a fantasy.
- Cannot afford to pay through rates or fuel tax to build this road.
- Waste of taxpayers' money.
- Costs will escalate to \$2 billion.
- Wairarapa should not have to pay for Transmission Gully.

- Region cannot afford to fund Transmission Gully.
- Transmission Gully not affordable and has low cost benefit ratio.

### Environmental

- Transmission Gully will mean more cars and heavy traffic using the road and more damage to the environment.
- Without Transmission Gully, there would be no threat to sediment entering Horokiri Stream or Pauatahanui Inlet, or slips damaging native forest.
- Putting SH1 through Battle Hill Farm Park will ruin it.
- We need to reduce our carbon footprint.
- Concerned at huge amount of burnt fuel that is going to be emitted into the environment.
- Will impact adversely on Belmont and Battle Hill Regional parks no matter how much cosmetic planting is done.
- Route cuts Battle Hill in half.
- Transmission Gully does not reduce environmental impacts but merely transfers them to another area.
- Environment will suffer.

### Coastal route

- Nothing wrong with existing road. A road is a road.
- Upgrading and widening Coastal Route is logical, cost-effective and environmentally-sensible solution.
- Coastal Route should be upgraded to four lanes.
- Spend 1/3 of cost of Transmission Gully to upgrade the Coastal Route to four lanes.
- Transmission Gully can wait another 20 years. Just improve existing road for now.
- Build an overhead road over the existing highway.
- Existing highway between Pukerua Bay and Paekakariki should be developed using reclaimed land and bridge structures.
- More long-term benefits in upgrading the present route to four lanes.
- Coastal Route should be upgraded with bypasses around Pukerua Bay, Waikanae and Otaki.
- Only 11 kilometres of current 50-km Coastal Route needs widening and will cost a fraction of the cost to build Transmission Gully.
- Land-filling the seaside of Coastal Route and expanding the highway would be less costly.
- Gully route is much inferior to Coastal Route.

### Miscellaneous

- There should be less reliance on oil-based transport.
- Transmission Gully will require vehicles to expend more energy to ascend the route.
- Increasing fuel costs will see less car usage and need for projects such as this.
- Need a solution first for Ngauranga to Airport.
- Money better spent on a bypass at Paraparaumu.
- Money should be spent on building facilities such as hospitals, medical centres and schools.
- More traffic translates to more pollution and deaths.

- Transmission Gully will impact adversely on recreational activities currently being undertaken in the area just to save on 10 minutes travel time during peak periods.
- Land transport strategy needs rethinking. Cost of developing Transmission Gully is beyond region's funding capability.
- Government should subsidise public transport travel and just upgrade the existing route.
- Make SH2 the main route with a tunnel through the Rimutakas.
- Set up a car-pooling network.

## 9. SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS

In addition to the input received from submitters (on the official feedback forms) either in the 'support', 'don't mind' or 'oppose' categories, the project team also received separate and more specific submissions from affected parties on the preferred route's impact(s) on the activities or operations of the parties concerned.

Comments and concerns centred on the following:

- Ensure that at least two dedicated service areas of sufficient width are in place on both north and southbound lanes between Wainui Saddle and SH58 interchange. Ensure that the length of the dedicated service area is sufficient to allow for a B-train unit to turn in and out.
- Compensation for the relinquishing of any farming land for the project must include the provision of equally productive farming land adjacent to the affected farm or incorporation into it, allowing continued sheep and cattle grazing, as well as hay feed to levels currently enjoyed.
- Current farming, forestry and recreation access along the preferred Transmission Gully route must be maintained.
- The route will cause significant reduction in the quality of landscape, access and recreational experience in regional parks.
- Mitigation measures must be put in place to offset any environmental impacts on local creeks, streams, catchments, habitat and vegetation.
- There must be an investigation of possible traffic issues to ensure continued safety for pedestrians on feeder roads leading from and to the Transmission Gully route.
- Concerns about access to private properties as a result of the preferred route and feeder roads as well as traffic noise, natural water supply to properties, and impact on potential sale of properties already on the market or earmarked for sale.
- The operations and activities of some private businesses will be impacted on by the preferred route.
- Concerns about issues arising from the closer relocation of the motorway to local properties.

## 10. OUTCOMES

The consultation on the preferred route through Transmission Gully has resulted in the following:

- (i) The consultation process has widened knowledge of the preferred route through Transmission Gully amongst residents of the Greater Wellington area and clearly identified those individuals and organisations in the community who have an interest in the final design of the preferred route.
- (ii) The consultation generated a diverse range of feedback from respondents in the Greater Wellington area which has provided the project team with a better understanding of the issues, problems and possible solutions felt in the wider community about the preferred route through Transmission Gully.
- (iii) The consultation feedback provided clearly-stated individual and organisational views on the preferred route through Transmission Gully. In this regard, a predominant 88.6% of respondents supported the preferred route, 4.3% “didn’t mind” while 7.1% opposed it.
- (iv) The feedback received will now allow the project team to proceed towards finalising the design of the preferred route through Transmission Gully.

## 11. NEXT STEPS

Based on the consultation undertaken and feedback received, the project team notes the diversity of perspectives within the community on various aspects of the preferred route through Transmission Gully.

Much feedback has been received about Transmission Gully and the environment and whilst overall feedback expressed support and confidence that the preferred route would reduce environmental impacts, respondents emphasised the need for continual “as best as possible” protection of the environment.

As design solutions and improvements are developed ahead of preparing the necessary resource consent documentation, all points raised specifically by respondents will be taken in consideration.

After a detailed analysis of the feedback received, a number of specific concerns have been highlighted and these will be addressed as part of the next stage.

### 11.1 Pull-off and vehicle inspection areas

A number of respondents have identified the need for additional shoulder width at a few locations to allow drivers of heavy vehicles to safely pull off the carriageway should they want to inspect their vehicles, change tyres, check loads, brakes etc. The project team will be incorporating the suggestions to the design in liaison with relevant sector groups.

### 11.2 Property impacts at Paekakariki

A number of properties at the northern end of the project are directly affected to different degrees by the preferred route. Whilst the preferred route was chosen in part because the impacts on properties would generally

be less overall, it deviates some distance from the existing designation at Paekakariki and therefore a number of properties previously unaffected are now affected.

With regard to specific properties, one owner has asked if the radius of a particular horizontal curve can be tightened to reduce the impact on the corner of the property. The project team, in consultation with the road safety auditors, will be looking at the geometry of this curve to see if this can be accommodated safely.

### **11.3 Parks and reserves/Farming operations**

Both the preferred route and existing designation pass through a number of parks and reserves, to differing degrees. Again while the overall physical and environmental footprint of the preferred route is less when compared to the existing designation, specific impacts from the preferred route need to be considered in detail.

At Battle Hill Regional Farm Forest Park, the potential impact of the preferred route on the viability of the existing farming operation needs to be considered in depth. The loss of productive pastoral areas, presently used for lambing and haymaking, as a result of the proposed highway and associated landscape mitigation, will need to be offset in some way. Work on this has already commenced and will be developed further as part of the consultation on any alteration to the Notice of Requirement for a change in designation.

Similarly at Belmont Regional Park while the overall effects are less than from the previous designation, the impacts on Waitangirua Farm need to be taken into consideration when finalising the scheme design. Access tracks, stock routes, fence lines and yards will all be considered when arriving at the optimum scheme design.

In addition, the potential impacts on farming operations and the various landholders along the entire route, as well as the varied needs of Park users, will all be taken into account in arriving at the final project design.

### **11.4 Bulk water main**

A number of utilities are affected by the preferred route and in particular, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has identified that the ability to inspect and maintain their bulk water main has been affected. Previously the provision of a bridge in the existing designation allowed the water main and access track to remain underneath the alignment. This is no longer possible in the preferred design.

The project team will be working with GWRC to determine how access can still be maintained and one possible solution may be to relocate the water main in the vicinity of the new bridge position, combined with new track construction to provide the access needed. It is likely too that this will fit well with the need to provide access for the Waitangirua Farm operations and for Transpower to maintain its transmission towers in the same area.

### **11.5 Access to existing properties at SH58**

In discussions with the adjacent property owners, and raised as a concern by the road safety audit team, the form of access for a number of properties in the vicinity of the SH58 interchange needs further design work.

Currently the proposal is to link a number of property accesses into a single connection to SH58. The current design has that access connecting into the

SH58 roundabout. Preliminary design work has been undertaken on possible alternative ways to provide access, but this needs to be investigated further.

#### **11.6 Whitby and Waitangirua link roads**

In discussions with the adjacent property owners and Porirua City Council, the alignment and form of these two local link roads needs further refinement.

The road safety audit team considers that the geometric design is to a higher than necessary or safe standard. The status of the link road (as a local lower speed arterial) needs to be reinforced by the nature of the design and access provisions. This may mean making the alignment more meandering and allowing direct access onto the road from adjacent properties.

Porirua City Council see the potential for the link roads to be incorporated into sub-divisional plans for the area in order to work with property developers to achieve the best overall solution in terms of land use, urban design and transport function.

#### **11.7 Kenepuru link road**

The scheme road safety audit also highlighted on-going concerns with the vertical alignment of this link road. The main concern is the short steep descent down onto a roundabout with limited advanced visibility.

Before finalising this design, the project team will be investigating possible minor adjustments to the alignment in conjunction with alternative design treatments in order to achieve the required level of safety.

## **12. SUMMARY**

As the project team develops the Transmission Gully scheme further, it will continue to work closely at all levels with the various territorial authorities in the Greater Wellington area to ensure that the final alignment represents the best achievable outcome for the region.