

# Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report

Wellington to Hutt Valley Walking and Cycling Link



## Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report

Wellington to Hutt Valley Walking and Cycling Link

Client: NZ Transport Agency

ABN: N/A

Prepared by

**AECOM New Zealand Limited**

Level 3, 80 The Terrace, Wellington 6011, PO Box 27277, Wellington 6141, New Zealand  
T +64 4 896 6000 F +64 4 896 6001 www.aecom.com

**In Association with Incite Wellington.**

Level 2 11 Tory Street Wellington 6011, PO Box 2058 Wellington 6140  
T: +64 4 801 6862, www.incite.co.nz

10-Nov-2014

Job No.: 60306339

AECOM in Australia and New Zealand is certified to the latest version of ISO9001, ISO14001, AS/NZS4801 and OHSAS18001.

© AECOM New Zealand Limited (AECOM). All rights reserved.

AECOM has prepared this document for the sole use of the Client and for a specific purpose, each as expressly stated in the document. No other party should rely on this document without the prior written consent of AECOM. AECOM undertakes no duty, nor accepts any responsibility, to any third party who may rely upon or use this document. This document has been prepared based on the Client's description of its requirements and AECOM's experience, having regard to assumptions that AECOM can reasonably be expected to make in accordance with sound professional principles. AECOM may also have relied upon information provided by the Client and other third parties to prepare this document, some of which may not have been verified. Subject to the above conditions, this document may be transmitted, reproduced or disseminated only in its entirety.

## Quality Information

Document      Community and Stakeholder Consultation Report

Ref              60306339




Date            10-Nov-2014

Prepared by    Rachel Birrell and Lindsay Daysh

Reviewed by    Louise Miles, Matthew Hinton

Final Review   Lindsay Daysh (Incite)

### Revision History

Revision	Revision Date	Details	Authorised	
			Name/Position	Signature
Draft Final	10.04.14	For issue with Draft Final DBC	Chris Ballantyne Project Director	
Final DBC	06-Oct-2014	For issue with Draft Final DBC	Chris Ballantyne Project Director	
Final DBC Rev 3	10-Nov-2014	For issue with Draft Final DBC	Chris Ballantyne Project Director	

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1.0 Wellington to Hutt Valley Walking and Cycling Link	3
1.1 Purpose of this report	3
1.2 Project scope	3
1.3 Structure of this report	4
2.0 Approach to Consultation	5
2.1 Consultation Principles	5
2.2 Consultation Objectives	5
2.3 What We Consulted On	5
2.4 Who We Consulted	6
2.4.1 Statutory or Regulatory Stakeholders	6
2.4.2 Community Interest Groups and Organisations	6
2.4.3 Directly Affected Landowners	6
2.4.4 Road and Transport Providers	7
2.4.5 NZTA Project and Maintenance Teams	7
2.4.6 Network Utility Providers	7
2.4.7 Emergency Service Providers	7
2.4.8 Other Stakeholders	7
2.4.9 Wider Community	7
2.5 How we Undertook Consultation	7
2.5.1 Steering Group	7
2.5.2 Enquiry by Design Workshops	8
2.5.3 Council Briefings	8
2.5.4 Publicity	8
2.5.5 Consultation Website	8
2.5.6 Public Information Day	9
2.5.7 Displays and Information Boards	9
2.5.8 Meetings	9
2.5.9 Phone Line and Email	9
2.5.10 QR Cards	9
2.5.11 Responding to Information Requests	9
2.5.12 How Feedback Could Be Provided	10
3.0 Feedback Analysis Method	11
3.1 Managing Feedback	11
3.2 Analysing Feedback	11
4.0 Consultation Feedback	12
4.1 Number of Responses Received to the Feedback Forms	12
4.2 Responses from the Public – Feedback Form 1	12
4.3 Responses from the Public – Feedback Form 2	19
4.4 Email and Phone Feedback	23
4.5 Open Days and Inquiry by Design Workshops	24
4.6 Feedback from Statutory Organisations and Key Stakeholders	24
4.6.1 Hutt City Council	24
4.6.2 Wellington City Council	24
4.6.3 Greater Wellington Regional Council	25
4.6.4 KiwiRail	25
4.7 Other Stakeholder Feedback	25
5.0 Engagement with Iwi	28
6.0 How Consultation Feedback Informed Option Development	31
6.1 Design Responses to Consultation Feedback	31
6.2 Response to Alternative Proposed Options	31
Appendix A	
Consultation and Engagement Plan	A

Appendix B		
	Media Releases and Publicity	B
Appendix C		
	Feedback Form 1	C
Appendix D		
	Feedback Form 2	D
Appendix E		
	List of Walking and Cycling Groups	E
Appendix F		
	Workshops and Public Open Day	F
Appendix G		
	QR Code Cards	G
Appendix H		
	Formal Submissions from Stakeholders	H

## Executive Summary

The purpose of the Wellington to Hutt Valley Walking and Cycling Link project is to investigate options to deliver a safe and efficient, dedicated route for cyclists and pedestrians firstly along State Highway 2 between Petone Interchange and Ngauranga Interchange while also investigating the Hutt Road connections to Thorndon and connections north of Petone to Melling.

It is a project led by the Transport Agency in conjunction with Hutt City Council, Wellington City Council, KiwiRail and Greater Wellington Regional Council.

Public consultation is a key part of this work, and this report outlines the results of the consultation that was held on this project from November 2013 to March 2014.

The existing Ngauranga to Petone shared path is on the western side of the Wellington harbour between State Highway 2 (SH2) and the railway corridor. The existing cycleway has a number of issues, including

- poor maintenance
- debris on the path
- uneven, rough surfaces, and
- varying widths that are inadequate for a two-way shared facility.

Importantly there is a gap in the path from Petone to just south of Horokiwi. This means that pedestrians and cyclists currently have to use the SH2 shoulder for either their whole journey (because of the standard of the path) or for the part of their journey that includes the gap. Closing this gap is a key part of this project.

In addition to “closing the gap” of the existing cycleway along State Highway 2, the project aims to improve the current facilities for pedestrians and cyclists and encourage more people to walk, run or cycle between the Hutt Valley and Wellington, particularly during peak hours.

A number of studies have been done into options for a walking and cycling link from Petone to Ngauranga (refer to section 1.2 for more detail). Each has included some level of targeted consultation, and a formal public consultation phase was held from November 2013 to the end of March 2014.

Members of the public, walking and cycling interest groups, potentially affected land owners and tenants were all invited to participate. Key stakeholders such as Greater Wellington Regional Council, Wellington City Council, Hutt City Council and KiwiRail were also consulted as options were developed, ensuring that potential issues and constraints would be considered throughout the process. The main forum for consulting with stakeholders in the latter group has been through the formation of a Steering Group, individual meetings as required, and briefings to both Hutt and Wellington City Councils.

Workshops and meetings were also held with a project-specific walking and cycling reference group and key stakeholders such as Cycle Aware Wellington, Hutt Cycling Network and the Great Harbour Way Coalition.

Potentially affected land owners and lease occupiers have also been consulted, and this consultation will continue into the next stages of the project. Relevant iwi groups have been consulted throughout the development of the short list of options.

In February 2014, a public information day was held jointly with the Petone to Grenada project. Feedback could be provided using a paper form on the day, by filling out the form online, or by email or phone.

Public consultation was split into two phases. The first was a survey seeking feedback on the existing problems and opportunities along the SH2 corridor between Petone and Ngauranga, the northern connections into Lower Hutt and the southern connections into Wellington along the Hutt Road. This feedback was analysed and a short list of options was developed.

The second phase of consultation sought feedback on which option was preferred. In this phase, submitters were also asked whether improved walking and cycling links would encourage them to walk or cycle between Wellington and Lower Hutt at least one day a week.

Submissions showed significant support for improving the walking and cycling link. A total of 778 responses were received, only three of which opposed any investment. The submissions helped define the current issues and concerns people have with the safety and maintenance of the current shared path along SH2. Concerns were also raised about the connection points to the south along the Hutt Road in Wellington and north from Petone.

The sea side alignment received significant support, because the path width would be more consistent and people viewed it as safer and more pleasant to be further from SH2 and closer to the harbour. As well, this option may provide wider economic and social benefits for the region in terms of tourism, recreation and health.

Supportive comments for the roadside option centred on its affordability, ability to be built sooner and that it separates pedestrians and cyclists from traffic. However, it was clear the roadside option was not preferred because of its proximity to SH2 and lack of consistent width. Other responses did not express a preference, noting that both options are an improvement and provide separation from vehicles.

For cyclists who currently use the SH2 shoulders, safety concerns such as inadequate shoulder width along the northbound shoulder, parked cars or undercutting in the shoulder, and a lack of separation from traffic were all raised (the lack of separation was a particular concern because of the suction effect created by heavy vehicles travelling at high speeds). The merges at Petone, Ngauranga, Dowse and Melling, as well as the lack of available road shoulder at Melling, were also highlighted as areas where cyclists feel most vulnerable. Moreover, the consultation also revealed significant concerns along the Hutt Road in Wellington, including conflict with parked and turning vehicles, obstacles along the corridor, poor surfacing and a lack of width.

The next steps are for the NZ Transport Agency and its partners to agree on the recommendations in the Detailed Business Case report and agree to a recommended option. The Transport Agency will then undertake detailed design on the recommended option.

## 1.0 Wellington to Hutt Valley Walking and Cycling Link

### 1.1 Purpose of this report

This report outlines the process used, feedback received and results of the consultation that was held on this project from November 2013 to March 2014.

### 1.2 Project scope

The Project's study area focuses on the corridor between Petone and Ngauranga and also covers State Highway 2 (SH2), between Ngauranga and Melling Interchanges, together with Ngauranga Interchange to Aotea Quay on Hutt Road, and Petone Esplanade and Hutt Road/ Railway Avenue to their respective crossings of the Hutt River. This is outlined in Figure 1 above.

The existing Ngauranga to Petone shared path is on the western side of the Wellington harbour between State Highway 2 (SH2) and the railway corridor. The existing cycleway has a number of issues, including

- poor maintenance
- debris on the path
- uneven, rough surfaces, and
- varying widths that are inadequate for a two-way shared facility.

In addition, there is a gap in the path from Petone to just south of Horokiwi. This means that pedestrians and cyclists currently have to use the SH2 shoulder for either their whole journey (because of the standard of the path) or for the part of their journey that includes the gap. Closing this gap is a key part of this project.

A number of studies have been done into options for enhancing the currently substandard walking and cycling link from Petone to Ngauranga. The previous studies include a Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) in May 2006 and SAR Addendum in October 2006, a Strategic Study as part of the Ngauranga Triangle Study in 2010<sup>1</sup> and a Strategic Feasibility Report in October 2012<sup>2</sup>. There have been varying degrees of consultation in the previous studies, and in each one local councils and KiwiRail have been consulted. Targeted consultation with cycling groups was also undertaken as part of the 2006 SAR and the Feasibility Report in October 2012.

The purpose of this project is to provide a detailed analysis of the costs, risks and benefits of improving cycle and pedestrian facilities between Wellington and Lower Hutt. A detailed business case will then be developed with a recommended option for a dedicated facility for cyclists and pedestrians between Petone Interchange and Ngauranga Interchange. This project also considers the connections to the north beyond the Petone Interchange up to the Dowse Interchange, and to the south of the Ngauranga Interchange up the Hutt Road Thorndon Quay / Tinakori Road junction. Considering north and south connections were necessary to ensure that any new cyclist and pedestrian path has safe and efficient links to and from Wellington and Lower Hutt. Otherwise, it may not be used to its full capacity.

Consultation with the community is key to ensuring that the options are supported by (and will be used by) existing and potential cyclists and pedestrians along the corridor. Given the constrained nature of the corridor it has also been critical to consult with KiwiRail, Iwi, the NZTA Petone to Grenada and Ngauranga to Aotea Quay project teams, and other stakeholders potentially affected by the project.

Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Consultation Plan approved by NZTA and the Steering Group, attached in Appendix A.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Ngauranga Triangle Study is a strategic transport study for the Wellington region and recommended that facilities for cyclists and pedestrians between Petone and Ngauranga along SH2 are improved.

<sup>2</sup> The Feasibility Report was written by NZTA and Opus, and provided a summary of the options that had been considered for improving walking and cycling links between Petone and Ngauranga since 2006.

\\nzwl1p001\projects\603X\60306339\6. Draft Docs\6.1 Detailed Business Case\DBC Part A Draft Sept 14\Appendices\Appendix N - Consultation Report\Word Version\Cycleway Consultation LD Final V2.docx

Revision 3 – 10-Nov-2014

Prepared for – NZ Transport Agency – ABN: N/A



### 1.3 Structure of this report

This report is arranged in six chapters:

- **Chapter 2 – Approach to Consultation**
  - Consultation principles
  - Consultation objectives
  - What we consulted on
  - Who we consulted
  - How we undertook consultation
- **Chapter 3 – Method for Analysis of Feedback**
  - Managing feedback
  - Analysing feedback
- **Chapter 4 – Presentation of Findings**
  - Number of Comments
  - Feedback from the public – Feedback forms 1 and 2
  - Feedback from statutory and key stakeholders
  - Feedback from other stakeholders
  - Feedback from potentially affected landowners
- **Chapter 5 – Iwi Consultation**
- **Chapter 6 - How Consultation Feedback Informed the Short List of Options.**

## 2.0 Approach to Consultation

### 2.1 Consultation Principles

Consultation requires a genuine commitment to communicate effectively with individuals and groups, and it is generally fundamental to the success of a project. When done well, it can improve both the quality of the project and the level of community buy-in to it.

This project has been based on the following key consultation principles (as identified in the Consultation Plan):

- Consultation will be based on a commitment to open and honest communications with stakeholders and the wider community;
- Consultation is a genuine dialogue about a proposal not yet decided upon;
- Provision of regular and relevant information on the Project to inform affected parties and the wider community, and minimise the risk of misinformation;
- Sufficient time for consultation must be allowed;
- Opportunities for feedback must be provided;
- The views received in the feedback must be taken into account;
- Every effort will be made to resolve any issues raised by stakeholders or members of the wider public in a proactive, timely and appropriate manner; and
- The consultation approach should be flexible and able to be adapted if required.

### 2.2 Consultation Objectives

The objectives of this consultation are (as identified in the Consultation Plan):

- Identify and engage with all affected parties, including directly affected landowners, stakeholders, iwi and the wider community;
- Provide clear and concise information and communication;
- Create a platform for honest and open communication;
- Gain maximum participation in engagement and feedback;
- Encourage active participation and collaborative input into the route selection and design process;
- Ensure that feedback is adequately documented and fed back into the design process;
- Receive maximum buy-in from stakeholders and the wider community;
- Gain positive /balanced media coverage; and
- Meet NZTA's obligations under the Resource Management Act 1991 and Land Transport Act 2003 and Local Government Act 2003.

### 2.3 What We Consulted On

To help develop the preferred option, consultation was undertaken on:

- The adequacy of the existing facility, including:
  - The shared path along part of SH2 between Petone and Ngauranga and the north and south connections
  - The existing provision along Hutt Road, from the Ngauranga intersection to the intersection with Tinakori Road, and
  - The existing provision to the north of Petone, including along SH2 and on the Hutt Road up to the Dowse Interchange.

- Existing travel patterns (for example whether people currently walk or cycle along the corridor, use SH2 shoulders or the existing path along SH2);
- Whether improving the existing facility would encourage people to walk or cycle (to work or for recreation) rather than driving or using public transport, or whether they would use a shared path rather than cycle along the SH2 shoulders; and
- Feedback on the two short listed options (Option 1: roadside and Option 2: seaside).

The conclusion of the consultation was communicated to key stakeholders and the walking and cycling reference group via email. The public were notified via the project website.

## 2.4 Who We Consulted

The parties consulted in previous studies formed the basis of the initial list of parties to be consulted for this project. Advice was also taken from officers at the Wellington City Council and Hutt City Council, community groups and walking/cycling groups that may have an interest in this project, and information from community databases was reviewed. From this, we identified parties who may have an interest in or be affected by the project.

Consultation with the majority of identified parties began early in the project, beginning with a phone call to confirm their interest, establish a contact person and find out how they wished to be consulted.

### 2.4.1 Statutory or Regulatory Stakeholders

The following key stakeholders had either a statutory or regulatory interest in this project:

- Wellington City Council
- Hutt City Council
- Greater Wellington Regional Council
- KiwiRail
- Iwi
- Heritage New Zealand and
- Department of Conservation.

### 2.4.2 Community Interest Groups and Organisations

This group includes organisations that represent local interests:

- Walking, cycling and running groups in Wellington and Hutt City (a list of the groups is provided in Appendix E)
- Korokoro Environmental Group
- Petone Planning Action Group – advised following initial contact that they did not wish to be consulted further on this project
- Petone Community Board, and
- NZ Cycle Trail (as part of the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment).

### 2.4.3 Directly Affected Landowners

This group includes landowners and occupiers of properties that may need to be purchased, have their designation altered, have their existing property access arrangements changed or are in close proximity:

- KiwiRail
- Wellington Rowing Association
- Wellington Water Ski Club
- Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust / Wellington Tenths Trust, and
- A potentially affected private land owner

#### **2.4.4 Road and Transport Providers**

- NZ Road Transport Association
- NZ Trucking Association
- Heavy Haulage Association, and
- Automobile Association (AA).

#### **2.4.5 NZ Transport Agency Project and Maintenance Teams**

- Petone to Grenada Project Team
- Ngauranga to Aotea Quay Project Team, and
- Transport Agency's Network Maintenance Management Consultant.

#### **2.4.6 Network Utility Providers**

- Telecommunication providers
- Gas providers
- Electricity providers, and
- Capacity (now Wellington Water).

#### **2.4.7 Emergency Service Providers**

- NZ Fire Service
- NZ Police, and
- Wellington Free Ambulance.

#### **2.4.8 Other Stakeholders**

- Fulton Hogan/Horokiwi Quarry
- Greater Wellington Regional Council Workplace Travel Plan Network
- Hutt Chamber of Commerce, and
- Petone Rotary (advised following initial contact that they did not wish to be consulted further).

#### **2.4.9 Wider Community**

Opportunities were provided for the wider public to learn about and give feedback on the project, including media releases, project newsletters, the Transport Agency's website, an Open Day, the delivery of flyers at Bicycle shops and stations and displays at several public venues.

### **2.5 How we Undertook Consultation**

Consultation was undertaken over a period of approximately seven months, from September 2013 to March 2014. A variety of methods were used to inform stakeholders and the wider public and to seek feedback.

#### **2.5.1 Steering Group**

A Steering Group was established at the start of the project and included representatives from:

- Hutt City Council
- Wellington City Council
- KiwiRail
- Greater Wellington Regional Council, and
- NZ Transport Agency.

From the commencement of the Project there have been 4 steering group meetings. As this is a multi-agency Project the purpose of the Steering Group is to provide the Project Team with guidance and to ensure that each organisation is appropriately engaged.

### 2.5.2 Enquiry by Design Workshops

A walking and cycling reference group was established to enable end users (cyclists, pedestrian, and runners) to contribute to the development of options and the design of a preferred option. Local cycling, walking and running groups were approached to provide advice on who best to approach to be on the reference group. The reference group comprised 18 members, including cyclists across a range of abilities and members representing walkers and runners.

Two workshops were undertaken as part of the development of the short list of options. The first was held on 15 October 2013 and sought to clarify the current route's issues. A second was held on 2 February 2014 and sought feedback on the short list of options under consideration. Material provided at the workshop and more detailed notes from the workshops is provided in Appendix F.

### 2.5.3 Council Briefings

Hutt City and Wellington City Councils received briefings after the formal consultation process had been carried out. Hutt City Council (which included Petone Community Board members) was briefed on 11 February 2014 while a briefing to the Transport and Urban Development Committee of Wellington City Council was held on 8 April 2014.

The briefings entailed

- Background and an Overview to the Project
- The objectives of the Project i.e. what the Project is seeking to achieve
- Consultation and Design Development to that point
- Likely time frames going forward.

There was also the opportunity to answer any questions

### 2.5.4 Publicity

Media releases and advertising included the following:

- Media release 29 November 2013, to raise awareness of the project, and to encourage people to provide feedback on the existing issues and concerns and how they currently use the route
- Media Releases 13 and 21 February 2014, giving details of the short list of options and encouraging people to attend the joint Open Day with the Petone to Grenada Project on 22 February
- Print Advertising in the Dominion Post, Hutt News and Wellingtonian (February 2014), to raise awareness of the Open Day and encourage people to provide feedback on the short list of options
- Radio Advertising on two networks in Wellington (one-week span, February 2014), to raise awareness of the Open Day and encourage people to provide feedback on the short list of options, and
- A newsletter (February 2014), which was emailed to the walking, running and cycling user groups and reference group, as well as other key stakeholders/contacts. It was also available on the project website and was the basis for a double page spread in the Dominion Post, Hutt News and Wellingtonian.

Copies of the media releases and newsletters are provided in Appendix B.

### 2.5.5 Consultation Website

The project website went live on 2 December 2013 at: <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/network/projects/project.html?ID=235>

Information on the website includes the project purpose, benefits and key objectives, previous studies and information on community engagement. Plans showing key design areas for both of the short listed options, feedback forms, and newsletters are also available here.

### 2.5.6 Public Open Day

An Open Day was held on Saturday 22 February 2014, between 10am and 4pm at the Opus Research and Training Facility in Petone. It was held jointly with the Petone to Grenada Link Road Project team, because of links and influences between the two projects (including the design of the Petone Roundabout, the timing of the two projects and the possibility of using surplus material from the Petone to Grenada earthworks to help build the new walkway/cycleway). The Open Day was attended by approximately 170 people, with 106 people specifically indicating on the meeting register that they were attending due to an interest in this project.

Information included display boards outlining the two short-listed options, rollout aerial plans showing the entire route, newsletters and feedback forms. Members of the AECOM project team and Transport Agency representatives were on site to answer questions and to encourage and record feedback.

Along with advertising the Open Day as per the activities in section 2.5.4, an invitation was emailed to all community interest and user groups, and to members of the Reference Group, to circulate to their contacts.

### 2.5.7 Displays and Information Boards

Smaller versions of the Open Day boards, along with newsletters and feedback forms, were also available at three venues:

- Hutt City Council War Memorial Library, 5<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> March 2014
- Wellington City Library 17<sup>th</sup> – 27<sup>th</sup> March 2014, and
- Petone Railway Station 18<sup>th</sup> – 26<sup>th</sup> March 2014.

Information encouraging feedback on the shortlist of options was also available at Massey University.

### 2.5.8 Meetings

Individual face to face meetings have been held with all directly affected landowners and occupiers, including:

- A private landowner was consulted on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2014 via a face meeting with the Transport Agency
- The Wellington Rowing Association was consulted via a meeting with the Project team and the Transport Agency on 17 January 2014
- Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust was consulted throughout the development of options. The record of these meetings is included in section 5 Engagement with Iwi.
- Ongoing consultation with KiwiRail, including as part of the steering group.

A joint meeting, to which all the walking, cycling and running groups were invited, was held in the evening of 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2013. The purpose of the meeting was to inform groups of the shortlist of options and get their feedback. This meeting was attended by 28 people.

Members of the AECOM project team or Transport Agency representatives have also attended meetings at the request of several cycle groups, including Cycle Aware 14 March 2014 and the Great Harbour Way Trust .

### 2.5.9 Phone Line and Email

A dedicated project email (w2hmlink@nzta.govt.nz) and free phone number (0508 W2HV LINK/0508 9248 5465) were set up in December 2013.

### 2.5.10 QR Codes

Cards with project-specific QR codes were developed to promote the project and encourage people to complete the online feedback forms. These cards were given out at locations around Wellington and Petone and the feedback forms were provided for people to complete. A copy of the QR code cards is provided in Appendix G.

### 2.5.11 Responding to Information Requests

Comments received via email received an automatic response which thanked them for their feedback and noted that the feedback had been forwarded to the project team for consideration. Where email queries required a response these were generally provided within five days of receipt.

### **2.5.12 How Feedback Could Be Provided**

Feedback was primarily provided through the use of feedback forms, which were available online and in hard copy (the feedback forms are included in appendices D and E). Feedback could also be given through the dedicated email address, phone number, the postal address or at the Open Day itself.

## 3.0 Feedback Analysis Method

### 3.1 Managing Feedback

All stakeholder contact details and records of consultation (including meetings, phone conversations, and emails) were recorded in a consultation application called Darzin.

Feedback was recorded via the following route:

- Feedback received from the online survey was downloaded from Survey Monkey on a regular basis (typically every 1 – 2 weeks) and a copy of each download saved electronically. All paper feedback forms were also scanned and saved electronically
- All phone conversations were recorded by hand, scanned and saved electronically
- All email correspondence was saved in Darzin, and
- Feedback recorded at the public Open Day, the workshop with walking and cycling groups and the two Enquiry by Design workshops. This feedback was collated and saved electronically.

### 3.2 Analysing Feedback

All feedback was copied into an excel database where it was analysed, collated into themes and consolidated to provide a summary of the feedback. All comments were numbered which meant that the number of responses to a particular comment could be quantified.

Comments received on the first feedback form were managed and analysed separately to the second feedback form because the information sought and provided for each were distinct.

Similarly, email and phone feedback were both analysed as correspondence, but separately to the feedback forms because the formats for providing feedback are distinct. The comment themes and format of the feedback forms did however provide a template for sorting and analysing comments received via phone or email.



## 4.0 Consultation Feedback

### 4.1 Number of Responses Received to the Feedback Forms

We received a total of 778 responses during the consultation period. The table below provides a breakdown of the responses received 6 December 2013 – 4 April 2014.

Table 1 Means of feedback

Means of providing feedback	Number of responses
Paper and online feedback forms – Feedback form 1	643
Paper and online feedback forms – Feedback form 2	82
Phone correspondence	11
Email correspondence	42

The online and paper feedback forms did not identify personal details or assign a particular ID to a user, however, to prevent one person submitting an online feedback form more than once the online survey only allowed one submission per IP address. Some caution is still necessary when interpreting the results, as one person could have completed both an online and paper feedback form.

The first feedback form went live in early December 2013 and was completed in January 2014. Its purpose was to:

- identify existing issues along the corridor, whether walking or cycling
- find out whether participants currently use the existing path along SH2 or the shoulders, and
- get feedback on the short-list of options.

The second feedback form went live in January 2014 and feedback was received until the end of March 2014. This form sought feedback on:

- the two options, particularly in terms of how differences in cost and timing between the roadside and seaside options affected preferences
- the effects of potentially holding this project back so its construction timing coincided with the P2G project, and
- whether the shortlist of options would encourage people to walk or cycle along the corridor.

The second feedback form also more specifically targeted those that currently cycle along the shoulders, drive or take public transport in order to understand how the options addressed a potential suppressed demand while also accommodating the 'fast and fearless' cyclists that use the shoulder.

### 4.2 Responses from the Public – Feedback Form 1

The tables in this section provide an overview of feedback received from the first feedback form.

All responses highlighted the inadequacies of the existing path along SH2 in terms of the lack of maintenance and debris on the path, the inadequate width, the missing link and the fact that cyclists and pedestrians are forced onto SH2 either northbound or part of the way southbound. Wellington's Hutt Road was highlighted as particularly unsafe due to parked cars along the footpath, turning vehicles at driveways and areas of inadequate width.

Issues raised by cyclists currently using the SH2 shoulder highlighted poor safety at the Petone overbridge, Dowse Interchange and Melling interchange because of the inadequate shoulder / no shoulder in parts, merges and the speed of vehicles, particularly heavy vehicles, creating a suction effect.

**1. Types of cyclists**

Type of Cyclists	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Bold and Fearless	156	24%	643
Enthusied and confident	368	57%	
Interested but concerned	109	17%	
No way, no how	10	2%	

**2. Gender**

Gender	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Male	471	74%	635
Female	164	26%	

**3. Age Group**

Age (years)	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
18-25	21	3%	637
26-35	106	17%	
36-45	204	32%	
46-55	168	26%	
56-65	101	16%	
66+	37	6%	

**4. Existing mode of travel along the Wellington to Hutt Valley corridor**

Mode of travel	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Cycle all or part of the route	381	66%	578
Walk all or part of the route	20	3%	
Do not currently walk or cycle any part of the route	177	31%	

**5. Use of the existing path**

Use of existing path	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Yes north and southbound	81	28%	293
Southbound only	57	19%	
Northbound only	25	9%	
No, use SH2 shoulders	130	44%	

**6. Main issues along the corridor**

Location / main issues	Detailed Issues
Issues with the existing path along the Hutt Road	- Too narrow for two-way movements and shared use between pedestrians and cyclists

Location / main issues	Detailed Issues
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poor quality with a rough surface, debris from the road, overgrown vegetation, infrequent and poor maintenance</li> <li>- It is not continuous which means use of SH2 is necessary either for part of the journey southbound, or northbound (counter-flow to traffic), or use of the Northbound shoulder is necessary.</li> <li>- Insufficient lighting</li> </ul>
Issues with the Hutt Road in Wellington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conflict with turning vehicles because of parking on the footpath, driveways and angled parking</li> <li>- Dangerous when trying to cross west across the Ngauranga Interchange. The first lane is signalled and dangerous as vehicles drive fast round the corner</li> <li>- Dangerous when crossing the junction at Kaiwharawhara and Hutt Road on the southern side as there is no pedestrian crossing</li> <li>- Conflict with vehicles pulling out of the effluent trailer tunnel along Hutt Road</li> <li>- Obstacles along the Hutt Road, including lamp posts, signs and bus stops</li> <li>- Conflict with turning buses, particularly at the northbound bus stop at the bottom of Ngauranga Gorge</li> <li>- The kerb height of the access point onto the off-road cycle path is too high</li> </ul>
Existing provision on SH2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Petone ramps, Dowse Interchange and Melling Interchange are dangerous due to the lack of shoulder provision or dedicated cycle facility, and the need to cross the traffic lane if continuing past the Petone on-ramps. It is a high speed traffic environment with no provision for cyclists</li> <li>- The Petone overbridge is too narrow for cyclists</li> <li>- The SH2 shoulders are too narrow, particularly northbound</li> <li>- Rock fall on the northbound shoulder</li> <li>- Proximity to high speed motor vehicles and lack of separation is dangerous</li> <li>- Heavy vehicles travel at high speeds and cause a suction effect when passing cyclists</li> <li>- The cycle flashing light on SH2 towards Petone is not working</li> <li>- Issues with stationary traffic on the SH2 shoulders and motorists under-passing in the shoulder to avoid congestion</li> <li>- Driver animosity and poor awareness of cyclists</li> </ul>
Attractiveness of existing corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The corridor is unattractive for pedestrians due to fumes and noise from vehicles, as well as being cut off from nature</li> <li>- Lack of rest and bike repair areas</li> </ul>
Shared paths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Combining pedestrians and cyclists is unsafe</li> </ul>
Lower Hutt cyclist provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poor and sporadic cycle lane along Petone Esplanade, particularly at the roundabout</li> </ul>
Connections to/from existing path along SH2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poor transitions to and from existing cycle path</li> <li>- The existing path is not easy to access southbound</li> </ul>

#### 7. People that would consider walking or cycling along the corridor (for respondents not currently walking or cycling along corridor)

Use of existing path	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Yes	242	90%	268
No	26	10%	

**8. What would encourage people to walk or cycle along corridor?**

Location / main issue	Detailed Issues	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
Design and maintenance	Amenities including shelter from wind, seats, picnic spots, a view of the sea and landscaped areas	34
	Improved cycle parking in Wellington and Hutt City	1
	Open to other users such as scooter, skaters etc.	1
	A smooth surface, lighting and regular maintenance	95
Connections	A path that is well connected to the Petone Esplanade, the Hutt River trail and other transport modes such as Ngauranga train station. The path should have legible and safe connections	39
	A path that extends to the Petone overpass and beyond the Petone roundabout so that cyclists could avoid the busy and fast traffic	1
	A quick and direct route	1
Separation from motorised vehicles	A wide two-way, continuous, safe and dedicated path separated from motor vehicles is needed. It should be wide enough for pedestrians and cyclists to use	208
On-road improvements	Wider on-road shoulders or cycle lanes, particularly at Melling Intersection and Petone ramps	7
	Better on-road separation northbound along Hutt Road before getting to SH2	1
Hutt Road, Wellington	Improvements to Hutt Road to provide protection from driveways and turning vehicles	5
Other	No improvements are needed	5

**9. Feedback on Section 1 (Hutt Road in Wellington)**

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
Design and maintenance	Improve surfacing, signage, maintenance, removal of obstacles such as lamp posts and improved drainage and lighting. Widen the cycle path	159
Reduced conflict with turning or parked vehicles	Reduce conflict with driveways, parking and bus stops along Hutt Road, Wellington	147
	Provide a clearway at peak times, removal of diagonal parking and parking on cycle lane, rationalisation of parking. Remove parking from footpath	89
	Signs to tell buses to give way to cyclists (not speed up and cut across) - dedicated paths - at least a metre wide - bright paint	1
Separation from motorised vehicles	Provide a segregated cycle path from Thorndon Quay. Connect Thorndon Quay cycleway to Aotea Quay for commuter/tourist path or provide a cycle path along railway corridor e.g. off Hutt Road	16
	Separate the cycle lane from vehicles entirely with a barrier	20
On-road improvements	Increase width of road shoulders. On road cycleway preferred. Wider shoulder at tricky bits like the merge at Aotea Quay	8
Shared facilities	Reduce conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.	46

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
Improved connections	Better crossing to Onslow Road off Hutt Road. Safe crossing point to cycle path from western side of Hutt Road, Safe crossing across Thorndon Quay to Tinakori Road	7

#### 10. Feedback on Section 2 (Hutt Road in Wellington)

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
Minor Improvements	Minor Improvements only / happy with existing	78
Reduced conflict with turning or parked vehicles	Reduce conflict with driveways and restriction of traffic on shared path, such as fork lift trucks, speed bumps and signage for traffic exiting driveways and raised driveways. Remove parking	37
Separation from motorised vehicles	Provide a two-way dedicated wide cycle path separated from vehicles. Improve safety	23
Design and maintenance	Clear obstacles such as lampposts and clear glass and sharp stones. Improve surface, markings, signage, lighting and drainage, widen. Clear obstacles such as lampposts, debris and vegetation. Improve maintenance	116
Ngauranga Interchange	Issues at Ngauranga Interchange: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No longer possible to move from shared path at Onslow Road due to traffic islands added adjacent to path's kerb crossing</li> <li>- Cycle routes are needed through the Ngauranga interchange to facilitate clear and obvious transitions between road and path use</li> <li>- Improve crossing at Ngauranga Interchange if travelling northbound onto the SH2 shoulder, either from the shared path or on road shoulder. The first crossing from the shared path to join the northbound on-road shoulder is uncontrolled with poor visibility, and cars speed around the corner</li> <li>- Northbound hook turn to SH2 (via Jarden Mile) would help when cannot cross to cycle line at Ngauranga lights</li> <li>- A clear and fast route for pedestrians from Ngauranga Station to Kaiwharawhara is needed given the closure of Kaiwharawhara station</li> </ul>	22
On-road improvements	Put a two-way cycle path on-road	8
	Widen northbound shoulder	9
Improved connections	Better access from cycleway to Onslow Road	1
	Make it possible to travel northbound from shared path up to Petone.	1
Shared facilities	Separation of cyclists and pedestrians	3

#### 11. Preferred option: Roadside or Seaside?

Option	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Roadside	134	31%	428
Seaside	294	68%	

## 12. Feedback on the roadside and seaside options

Seaside Option	Details	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
General feedback	<p>It would provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A pleasant commute</li> <li>- Healthier cleaner air</li> <li>- Reduce road debris on the path</li> <li>- Provide resilience for transport corridor and an alternative mode out of Wellington following an earthquake</li> <li>- Boost tourism and recreation</li> <li>- Solve illegal crossing of railway track, and</li> <li>- Attract more people.</li> </ul> <p>These benefits were contingent on issues such as the need for good design so it is useable in high winds, maintenance and an efficient route.</p>	45
	<p>The issue of exposure of the seaside path to weather conditions was also raised. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seaside path will be more exposed to storms and bad weather</li> <li>- Likely to collect debris from storms</li> <li>- Won't be used in bad weather</li> <li>- The rail bridge would need to be positioned to avoid wind, particularly at Ngauranga which can have a 'wind tunnel' effect</li> <li>- Maintenance will be an issue particularly after a storm. Because of its distance from the road maintenance may not be prioritised.</li> </ul>	47
	<p>Likely to take longer and be most expensive. Would prefer a solution that can be implemented quicker, and not prohibited by cost.</p>	21
Connections	<p>Comments on the proposed crossings for the seaside option included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Crossing over the rail for the seaward option would delay commuters and it wouldn't get used</li> <li>- A level crossing would delay cyclists and consideration should be given to additional commute time due to connections</li> </ul>	10
	<p>Seaward side option likely to be easier and quicker to construct, and cause less disruption to road and rail.</p>	13
	<p>Comments on access to/from the path included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cyclists should be allowed to cross the rail lines at Petone to allow connectivity to Eastbourne (note this is only an issue for the roadside option)</li> <li>- Access for Horokiwi residents needs to be considered</li> </ul>	16
	<p>Access could be improved by extending the seaside path past Ngauranga.</p>	2
Costs	<p>Cost for seawall is likely to be expensive, but minor compared to RoNS. Peak oil and global warming should be considered over the cost.</p>	1

Roadside Option	Details	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
General feedback	Positive comments on the roadside option included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is adequate for commuting</li> <li>- It could happen sooner and would be more affordable</li> <li>- It is more direct with fewer detours</li> <li>- Provides better uncomplicated transition for cyclists through Petone Interchange—good for fast cyclists</li> </ul>	13
	Comments opposed to the roadside option included concerns about oncoming traffic lights, riding against oncoming traffic (albeit with a barrier) and the narrowness of the upgraded path or that it would only be acceptable if there was adequate space from motor vehicles.	4
	Less prone to debris from the sea but more prone to debris from SH2. This would need to be addressed.	1
Other feedback	Details	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
Feedback on both options	Both seaward and roadside options are fine, any improvements that separate cyclists/pedestrians from motorised traffic are welcomed.	83
Path width	Comments on width included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The shared path should be wide enough for pedestrians and cyclists</li> <li>- the existing cycle path should be upgraded to 3.5m</li> <li>- 3.5m is not wide enough</li> </ul>	24
Shared facilities	Likely that fast cyclists will still use the road shoulder due to slower cyclists and pedestrians using the path.	15
	Comments on shared facilities included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The path will not be safe due to the speed of cyclists and unpredictability of pedestrians when cyclists are passing</li> <li>- Less need to consider pedestrians due to the low volume of walkers compared to cyclists</li> <li>- The path should be reserved for pedestrians only and cyclists should remain on the SH2 shoulders</li> </ul>	6
Feedback on Design and Maintenance	Comments on maintenance and design included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the importance of safe crossing points and intersections</li> <li>- the provision of child friendly routes</li> <li>- A smooth surface clear of debris, good drainage and regular maintenance</li> </ul>	28
	New path needs vegetation to provide cover.	1
SH2 Improvements	Prefer a dedicated cycle lane on each side of SH2, not shared with pedestrians, Seaside path could be provided for pedestrians and leisure cyclists.	7
	Road shoulders should be improved through for example rumble strips, widening northbound shoulder, bike traffic signal to cross merge with Ngauranga traffic.	7
	Interim improvements are needed, including a barrier from the Petone onramp to existing cycle path.	2
Need for Improvements	Opposed any improvements due to the low patronage and need to focus on other routes with more demand.	8
	The SH2 shoulder is wide and safe southbound.	2
	Get rid of the cycle path altogether to provide a consistent road	1

Seaside Option	Details	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
	median.	

### 4.3 Responses from the Public – Feedback Form 2

This section overviews the feedback received from Feedback Form 2.

The majority of responses indicated a preference for the seaside option because of the benefits it would provide in terms of scenery, reduced noise and air pollution, additional safety of being further from SH2 and the consistent width that can be provided. The majority of responses opposed delaying the project until 2019 to coincide with the Petone to Granada Link Road project. The majority stated that improvements would encourage them to use the path instead of the SH2 shoulders if improvements were made (if they currently cycle), and a majority also indicated they would cycle to work at least one day a week rather than drive or take public transport if improvements were made. Ongoing maintenance of the path was highlighted as critical in getting people to use the path.

#### 1. Feedback on the roadside option

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
Path Width	Path is not wide enough for pedestrians/cyclists to share and pass each other. Lack of consistent width will put people off.	15
Maintenance	Doesn't solve the issue of road debris.	9
	A rebuild of the current cycle track will have to put the track above the road or provide barriers otherwise debris will simply be flushed from the road onto the track.	5
	Sufficient maintenance would be needed.	2
Adequacy of Option	Inadequate for bunch and or commuter riding for confident cyclists.	3
	It is an improvement but not a long-term solution: would limit growth or existing cyclists would continue to use SH2 shoulders.	11
	Adequate for cyclists and would be better than existing and is cost effective. Support something happening sooner.	7
	Would use option 1 as long as it doesn't add time compared to SH2 shoulders.	1
	It does not match the Great Harbour Way concept.	8
	It is close to SH2, so fast and confident cyclists using the SH2 shoulder could cross onto the path if they needed to fix their bike.	1
	Would provide an alternate facility for less confident cyclists but need SH2 shoulder for confident cyclists.	1
Amenity and Safety	It would prevent SH2 widening and block views of the harbour.	1
	Would prefer to be further from SH2.	1
	It is not an attractive route for potential new cyclists and would have no amenities.	6
	It would be more sheltered than the seaside option.	5
	This option would be less safe.	3
	A roadside option would not change the perception of safety and	2



Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
	pleasure of walking and cycling, so demand would not increase to meet the cost.	
Connectivity	Most direct cycling route and thus most likely to be used. The connections at Petone are more efficient.	6

## 2. Feedback on the seaside option

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
Adequacy of Option	Great option, but concerned about impact of sea and storms on path. Need to understand how much it would be closed in bad weather, the cost of repair and what protection will be provided, e.g. a sea wall. Cyclists likely to still use SH2 for protection from weather. The sea spray may damage bikes.	29
	Concerned about debris from railway tracks.	1
	Moving path away from SH2 will reduce debris.	2
	Would provide resilience.	8
Amenity and Safety	Safer option as removed from traffic, more attractive and better option for the future, would attract more people and provide an important asset for the region with potential for amenity areas and access to the sea.	24
	Provides slightly nicer views.	1
	Unsafe due to no public visibility.	1
Connectivity	Concerned about route through Petone station car park.	1
	The path could link to the Great Harbour Way.	3
	There would need to link to Hutt Valley and Wellington for it to realise the suppressed demand.	1
	Connection at Petone onto SH2 needs considering.	1
	The bridges would add too much time to the journey.	1
	Provides better connections at Petone.	1
	The overbridge at Ngauranga is the main drawback.	2
Cost and Implementation	Downside is cost and timing. Not preferred as will take longer to complete.	13
	Great option, just build it don't wait.	3
	Prefer roadside option - the difference in costs could improve the Petone foreshore and Hutt Road.	1
	Better to use existing infrastructure (e.g. McKenzie Bridge) to cross SH2, in order to save money. The savings can then be used to deliver enhanced improvements along Melling to Dowse section.	4
	Could install bus / carpool lane on SH2 in place of existing cycle path.	1
	It would need regular maintenance.	1

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
	Would take too long to be implemented. Not superior enough to be worth the delay and improvements on safety for cyclists would be delayed.	2
Design	A raised platform would have less environmental impact than land reclamation. Any impact on rocky shore communities would need to be mitigated.	1
	Don't have barriers, may catch cyclists panniers/handle bars etc.	1
Path Width	Would need to be wide enough for two way movement and accommodate faster commuters.	4
	Provides opportunity for a wider path.	2
Social and environmental	Land reclamation is unjustified on environmental and cost grounds, Tangata Whenua do not support option.	1

### 3. Preferred option

Option	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Roadside	26	32%	82
Seaside	56	68%	

### 4. Considering the seaside option is more expensive and may take longer to implement, does the preferred option change?

Despite the increased cost and time to implement the seaside option the majority of people remained supportive (63%), compared to 6% of responses that indicated their preferred option would be change to the roadside option.

Option	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Preferred option remains option 1 (roadside)	25	31%	82
Preferred option changes to option 1 (roadside)	5	6%	
Preferred option remains option 2 (seaside)	52	63%	
Preferred option changes to option 2 (seaside)	0	-	

### Comments on question 4

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
Prepared to wait for seaside option	Better long-term solution with benefits for pedestrians and cyclists, KiwiRail, Greater Wellington Regional Council and NZ Transport Agency. Demonstrates long-term vision. Would be more enjoyable and an optimal solution despite the cost.	22
	There are considerable benefits in cost reduction through linking with P2G project.	1
	Prepared to wait for seaside option but a low cost solution to connect Petone to existing cycleway needs implementing in the interim.	2

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
	Other improvements could happen in the meantime, such as Hutt Road in Wellington.	1
Don't support delay	Don't want to wait for the seaside option because it might not happen.	10
	Seaside option isn't worth waiting for, something needs doing now.	6
Don't support greater cost of seaside option	Would rather the cost difference between roadside and seaside options was spent on other projects or to construct the Cross Valley Link and reduce traffic on the foreshore, which will improve cycle safety also.	1
	If cost and time period the same then seaside option would be preferred as further from traffic and closer to sea.	1
	Seaside will be waste of money.	1

#### 5. Feedback on project being delayed until 2019 to coincide with P2G

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue	No. times issues/comment raised in feedback
Interim changed needed if delayed	Delay is not ideal but if necessary then interim changes would be needed to address most unsafe areas.	6
	If delayed then the current path would need to be maintained.	1
	Prioritise dangerous areas first such as the Hutt Road.	1
Prepared to wait	Take time to get it right.	4
	Delay not ideal but if it makes it affordable then ok.	2
	No problem/issues with delay but project needs to be guaranteed.	7
Do not support delay	- Do not support delay. The number of cyclists using the road indicates there is a need now - Cyclist safety needs to be prioritised - P2G may not go ahead it should be independent of the road	20
	If delayed due to seaside option then progress roadside option.	2

#### 6. For people cycling along SH2 shoulders would improvements encourage use of a dedicated path instead?

Use of existing path	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Yes	62	91%	68
No	6	9%	

#### 7. Comments on continuing or discontinuing to use SH2 shoulders if improvements were made

The majority of people indicated that they would use a dedicated path instead of the SH2 shoulders if improvements were made. However, this would be contingent on addressing the comments below:

- The path needs to be maintained with the ability to ride at 30-45km/h safely in a bunch. Level surface kept clear from debris, no pedestrians/dogs/fishermen, merges parallel to traffic not at acute angles, clear line of sight, no tight radii or steep grades, or flooding

- Safety. Cyclists are safer when separated from vehicle traffic. Especially if the traffic is travelling at 100km/h. The journey would also be more pleasant. It needs to be maintained though, have a smooth surface and be wide enough for two-way movement
- Only if the path is accessible from SH2 north of Petone
- Would use path but want the option to use SH2 shoulders
- Would not use a convoluted path or anything else that required slowing down to manoeuvre into and out of, especially when there's a perfectly good and wide enough shoulder to ride on
- Would need the ability to cross from Petone overbridge to Horokiwi against the traffic, otherwise Horokiwi residents would have no choice but to continue riding along the motorway which is inadequate on the northbound side
- A road cycle (as opposed to a commuter or mountain bike) is not safe on a narrow route. However, because most traffic using the route is one-way, it would be relatively safe, and if asphalted, comfortable.
- Only option 2 - unless option 1 is clearly a lot more attractive - it would still be slower than the road verge so benefit isn't as great.

**8. Feedback on whether improvements would encourage people to cycle or walk at least once a week to work along the corridor rather than driving or using public transport if improvements were made.**

Use of existing path	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Yes	40	56%	72
No	5	7%	
n/a currently walk or cycle	27	38%	

**9. Feedback on whether improvements would encourage people to cycle or walk for recreation along the corridor if improvements made**

Use of existing path	Total responses	Percentage	Total Responses to question
Yes	61	81%	75
No	14	19%	

#### 4.4 Email and Phone Feedback

A total of 35 emails were received from the public, and an overview of the feedback is provided in the table below. This feedback is generally aligned with the feedback received via the feedback forms.

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue
Existing SH2/Path Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overgrown vegetation, poor riding surface and debris on the path</li> <li>- Missing section near Petone</li> <li>- The path is too narrow</li> <li>- Dowse interchange is dangerous</li> </ul>
Existing Hutt Road in Wellington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obstacles</li> <li>- Poor riding surface</li> <li>- Traffic crossing shared path</li> <li>- Parked vehicles</li> </ul>
Roadside Option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cheaper solution</li> <li>- Less exposed to bad weather</li> <li>- Exposed to vehicle fumes</li> <li>- 3.0m is not sufficient</li> </ul>

Location / main issue	Detailed Issue
Seaward Option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exposed to wind and bad weather</li> <li>- Sea wall will need to be very large</li> <li>- Too expensive</li> <li>- Isolated in an emergency</li> <li>- Provide a better connection at Petone</li> <li>- Bridge must provide safe crossing</li> <li>- Would provide a scenic route</li> <li>- 3.0m is not sufficient</li> <li>- Safer as further from SH2 traffic</li> <li>- It would collect less debris from SH2</li> <li>- The seaside path should not be delayed for the Petone to Grenada project</li> <li>- Cyclists and pedestrians should be able to use the McKenzie Avenue overbridge</li> </ul>
Interim improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the interim the SH2 shoulder between Petone overbridge and the start of the current path should be separated from the road carriageway by posts to provide a safe walking/cycling option</li> </ul>
Additional options Suggested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The seaside option could be extended south to Kaiwharawhara railway station. A return subway could be excavated beneath the motorway and railway line to connect at the end of Westminster Street, with access ramps up to the station platforms. This would solve the current problem with the unsafe overbridge which connects to Kaiwharawhara railway station but had to be closed last year due to the unsafe bridge and lack of funding to repair the bridge. This will reduce the need for cyclists to cross driveways along the Hutt Road from Kaiwharawhara and Ngauranga</li> <li>- The cyclist and pedestrian path could be moved to the hills above SH2. This will mean cyclists and pedestrians are exposed to less atmospheric pollution, have better views and it could also withstand a large earthquake and potential Tsunami</li> <li>- Cyclists wishing to continue north past the Petone Interchange currently have to merge with traffic. To improve, a ramp could be provided from the Petone overbridge down to SH2, which means cyclists would avoid the dangerous merge under the overbridge</li> <li>- A level crossing should be considered as an alternative to a bridge crossing the railway line for the seaside option</li> </ul>

## 4.5 Open Days and Inquiry by Design Workshops

A summary of feedback received from the Enquiry by Design workshops (15 October 2013 and 2 February 2014) and Public Open Day (22 February 2014) is provided in Appendix F. Overall the feedback received was in line with the feedback received via the feedback forms particularly in relation to the existing facility and the preferences for an upgraded facility.

## 4.6 Feedback from Statutory Organisations and Key Stakeholders

### 4.6.1 Hutt City Council

A position on the options is yet to be established. However Hutt City Council was briefed on 11 February 2014.

### 4.6.2 Wellington City Council

After the briefing on 7 April 2014, Wellington City Council has provided the following feedback on the short list of options:

- The roadside option, while lower cost, would deliver a sub-optimal solution more rapidly than the seaside option
- The seaside option, while more expensive, addresses broader corridor resiliency issues and will deliver a superior outcome for walking and cycling, and
- A clear understanding of the different timeframes and the relationship with the Petone to Grenada project is needed.

#### 4.6.3 Greater Wellington Regional Council

A position on the options is yet to be established.

#### 4.6.4 KiwiRail

A position on the options is yet to be established.

### 4.7 Other Stakeholder Feedback

Feedback from stakeholders was received via letter or email are summarised below. The full responses from the stakeholders (where available) are provided in Appendix H.

Figure 1 Stakeholder feedback

Organisation	Contact	Date	Comment
Greater Wellington Regional Council	Simon Kennett	4 December 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Debris is big issue on the SH2 shoulder and existing path</li> <li>- Many cyclists ride near edgeline since this is generally free of debris</li> <li>- Seaward option would have debris after storm</li> <li>- New users likely to be less experienced recreational cyclists</li> <li>- SH2 north of Melling is unlikely to change</li> <li>- New users are expected to come from Petone, Alice town, Woburn and Moera</li> <li>- The rail overbridge at Ngauranga Interchange could provide a viewing platform</li> </ul>
Regional Transport Society	Paula Warren	5 December 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matangi EMUs (Electric Multiple Units) can reach 110km/h; however curvature of the track means they cannot travel that fast</li> <li>- There are seven curves with 70km/h speed boards within the Petone to Ngauranga section. Three of these curves could be realigned to increase the speed through this section</li> <li>- Realignment work could also be completed on three curves near Petone station, however the Korokoro Stream crossing and the Petone on-ramp will need to be considered</li> <li>- If sea water reaches the tracks there are potentially major effects on rail operations. In the worst case, trains will not be able to run since they would not be able to stop at signals</li> <li>- Storm surges can damage the tracks</li> <li>- Anecdotal evidence was that six trains per year are unable to stop at Ngauranga Station, due to the effect of 2-3 weather events</li> <li>- 12-20 days per year the ability to stop is affected by wave actions</li> </ul>
Department of Conservation	Kate Blakemore	21 January 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project site is not prime breeding penguin habitat. No sign of nesting material or excrement from penguins</li> <li>- Moulting penguins may use rock and concrete wall during February and March; they are vulnerable during a 2-3 week period since they cannot swim or feed. Construction activity should consider these species</li> <li>- Rare spinach growing on the beach below the car park</li> <li>- Korokoro Stream is an important fish habitat</li> <li>- Stream in culvert just south of 'train building' at Ngauranga Interchange has few natural features and low ecological value</li> </ul>

Organisation	Contact	Date	Comment
NZ Cycle Trail	Jonathon Kennett	8 January 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rimutaka Cycle Trail, one of NZ's Great Rides, was opened in November 2013. This trail starts at Petone Wharf</li> <li>- Negative aspect is that there is no safe facility for tourists from Petone to Wellington</li> <li>- NZ Cycle Trail is seeking to create a network of safe routes. Therefore the link from Petone to Wellington is very important</li> <li>- NZ Cycle Trail Design Guide has geometric design standards. Cycleway located between railway and SH2 may not meet width criteria of Design Guide. Therefore, recommend adopting seaward option</li> <li>- Seaward option would have tourism value, and would become part of the Cycle Trail network</li> </ul>
Heritage New Zealand	Jillian Kennemore	26 February 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The only historic site is the Korokoro Roman catholic urupa (1853 – 1953) located near the Korokoro Road/Hutt Road intersection. This has significance to Maori as the burial place of chiefs. Consultation with tangata whenua would be needed if the site was to be affected</li> </ul>
Destination Wairarapa	David Hancock	21 January 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will support the project if the cycleway meets NZ Cycle Trail Design Guide requirements</li> <li>- The recently opened Rimutaka Cycle Trail starts in Petone, but will be extended to Wellington once a safe route between Wellington and Petone has been established</li> <li>- The new Cycle Trail has encouraged businesses to establish within the region; five companies have recently opened, four of which are cycle trail- or tourism-orientated</li> <li>- The Wellington to Petone link will add economic value to the Rimutaka Cycle Trail, and operators and communities along its length</li> </ul>
Ngaio Crofton Downs Residents Association	Ritchie Wards	8 March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prefers seaward option</li> <li>- This option will provide an attractive journey; one removed from the noise and pollution of SH2 traffic, and is likely to encourage some motorists to use their bikes</li> <li>- The current path is not inviting</li> <li>- Additional benefits: the shoreline will become available, providing access to Kaiwharawhara Beach and opportunities for fishing. The railway can also be protected from storm surges</li> </ul>
Wellington Rowing Association	Alex Tait	28 March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Wellington Rowing Association (WRA) is comfortable with option 1 noting that this will have minimal or no negative impact on the activities it conducts in and around its green rowing shed adjacent to the railway line at Korokoro</li> <li>- This is the WRA's preferred option as long as it includes necessary re-development of the Petone end of the cycleway, improvement of the area's amenities and continued ability of the WRA to both access its facility and conduct its operations (rowing training and regattas) without inhibiting cycleway users</li> <li>- Option 2 (seaside) is preferred as the cycleway will more safely accommodate a diverse cycling/walking community, provide the catalyst and opportunity for water sports operating out of the Korokoro portion of the cycleway and to collaborate with central Government on overdue</li> </ul>

Organisation	Contact	Date	Comment
			significant enhancements and developments in the area
Great Harbour Way Trust		28 March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Trust clearly favours option 2, for the Hutt to Ngauranga section, but has reservations about the Ngauranga to Tinakori section (sections 1 &amp; 2). This latter section should only be seen as a short term response until a seaward-side cycle and walkway can be provided from Ngauranga to Wellington City</li> <li>- Option 1 is not favoured by The Trust because it is not suitable for walkers, the width is not satisfactory and it would not provide a scenic or attractive route</li> <li>- An interim solution to use the existing cycleway while building the Petone to Horokivi section would be supported</li> <li>- The costs of the two options are not comparable because option 2 (seaside) would provide additional benefits including resilience</li> </ul>
Cycle Aware Hutt Valley		31 March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cycle Aware's preferred Option is Option 2. A wide, high quality path is required for the project to succeed in shifting current cyclists from the road to the path, and if the project is to succeed in encouraging new people to cycle the route. Issues of drainage and debris that affect the current path would not be significantly improved by the roadside Option 1. Better linkages are needed into Lower Hutt and to the Ngauranga Gorge shared paths than are currently described for either option</li> <li>- Option 1 is a poor investment. It will not attract many existing cyclists off the road, and will certainly not attract walkers. It is unlikely to attract new cycle commuters</li> <li>- Option 2 would attract most existing users off the road, and attract new users. Although it is not part of the project's brief, this is the best option for recreational riders. We argue that providing a recreational opportunity will be the first step in converting recreational users to commuters</li> </ul>



## 5.0 Engagement with Iwi

### 5.1 Approach to Consultation

#### 5.1.1 Consultation Framework

The principles in the tangata whenua component of the Consultation and Engagement Plan were used in consultation. These principles are:

- Consultation should be conducted in good faith based on mutual trust and cooperation
- All parties should be open minded and open to discussion such that the proposal may evolve or be amended in response to issues raised during the consultation process
- Consultation is about meaningful discussion and may not always result in agreement
- Tangata whenua should be enabled to present their views in a way that is appropriate and relevant to them, and
- If parties, having had both reasonable time and opportunity to state their views, for any reason fail to avail themselves of the opportunity, then they cannot consider consultation not to have been completed.

#### 5.1.2 Pre-Consultation Hui

The process of pre-consultation hui is premised on the principle of kawa and tikanga (protocols). “Kanohi ki te Kanohi” (face to face) meetings are an important part of the consultation process with tangata whenua. The traditional tikanga was adapted as part of the consultation, and included:

- Face to face meetings, relationship building, and information sharing are the most obvious outcomes. The key to this phase of the consultation framework is in proposing and agreeing with tangata whenua how they wish to be consulted and what further information may be required in order to make the consultation meaningful for both parties
- An information protocol will be established to protect the taonga status of any traditional information gathered
- Details of the consultation will be captured in written format, and
- Maps [GIS] of the historic environment (landscape) and Maori place names will be provided, if required, and at least one site visit will be completed to enhance the value and depth of the information gathered.

#### 5.1.3 Consultation Hui

The formal consultation phase is undertaken once the tikanga of engagement have been agreed, tangata whenua are satisfied that they have any necessary information that they may need to provide meaningful input into the engagement process and have identified a way in which the outcomes from the hui are disseminated to all parties to the consultation.

### 5.2 Consultation Undertaken

The following iwi were contacted at the start of the project in August 2013 to understand whether they wished to be consulted:

- Wellington Tenth Trust that was established to administer Maori Reserve lands, largely in urban Wellington.
- Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust was established in August 2008 to receive and manage the Treaty settlement package for Taranaki Whānui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika
- Ngati Toa Rangitira, and
- Atiawa/ Te Runanganui o Taranaki Whanui ki te Upoko o te Ika a Maui.

The following meetings were undertaken during the development of the options:

- Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust (2 October 2013) with Liz Mellish who is a trustee and is the main point of contact. The initial meeting discussed the project objectives and the opportunities and constraints

within the project area. A second meeting was undertaken on 17 December 2013 to discuss the short list of options. A third meeting was held on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2014, prior to the Open Day on 22<sup>nd</sup> February

- Wellington Tenth Trust (17.02.14). This was a joint meeting with Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust to discuss the short list of options that also included Morrie Love as Chair of the Tenth Trust
- Ngati Toa Rangitira. Meetings firstly with Jenny Smeaton (Communications and Resource Management Manager) on 2 October 2013 and then with Reina Solomon (Resource Management Administrator) on 13 December 2013 both at Takapuwahia Marae Porirua
- Atiawa/ Te Runanganui o Taranaki Whanui ki te Upoko o te Ika a Maui. This iwi organisation was happy to be kept updated but no consultation was required by them.

## 5.3 Issues and Opportunities

### 5.3.1 Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust

The following issues and opportunities were identified by the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust:

- The Honiana Te Puni Reserve was recognised as an area with historic importance. It could also be the location of a future water sports hub
- The three streams within the project area (Korokoro, Kaiwharawhara and Ngauranga) have significant historic and cultural value
- Culturally significant and historic food gathering sites and pa sites are located in the vicinity of the project
- Potentially historic burial caves are located near the BP station, however the project does not affect this area
- Reclamation was discussed, and the provision of space within this reclaimed land for recreational fishing was recognised as an important opportunity, and
- The importance of recognising the history and origins of the area by minimising the impact and reflecting the cultural landscape.

The Port Nicholson Trust recognised the benefits of the seaside option because of the potential opportunities to improve resilience, support the proposed Sports Hub and provide access improvements.

### 5.3.2 Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust and Wellington Tenth Trust (Combined Meeting)

The following issues and opportunities were identified in a joint meeting with the Wellington Tenth (Morrie Love), and the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trusts:

- The shared path will provide important health benefits
- The proposed sports hubs would potentially provide a range of facilities including rowing, water skiing, yachting, offshore swimming and waka ama groups. The location and access to the hub is yet to be defined. There are no clear plans or proposals yet but this might be a consideration in the future, and
- Within the project area aquatic life is evident in various places as well as according to Morrie Love the existence of a historic reef. This would need to be confirmed.

The Tenth Trust however stated that the roadside option was better since the seaward option would rely on KiwiRail to provide ongoing maintenance, which may be unreliable.

### 5.3.3 Ngati Toa Rangitira

The following issues and opportunities were identified in meetings with the Ngati Toa Rangitira.

- The impact of any reclamation and how this would be the most significant aspect to resolve should it form part of an option;
- The presence of some food gathering sites in the general vicinity as being culturally significant including reference to the fishing opportunities in the harbour.
- Overall there was "in principle" support for the project and there was recognition of the importance of the safe journey that the facility may support.

- There would also be the necessity to consult wider to gather views that the Project Team may need to consider when the options have been further developed.

#### **5.4 Post Consultation Hui**

- Any information gleaned from the consultation and outcomes agreed are to be circulated back to all parties for final agreement
- Any minutes (and alterations to them) are also circulated back to all parties participating in the consultation, to ensure a transparent process
- What can be agreed is formalised through accepting and signing the minutes, and
- An exchange of documentation and signing of documents of agreement with all parties will be the final outcome of consultation.

Ongoing consultation with the Wellington Tenth Trust, the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust and Ngati Toa Rangitira will be necessary as the project progresses to detailed design in order to address detailed issues and opportunities such as incorporating the cultural landscape into the design, providing recreational areas and considering potential developments such as the sports hub.

## 6.0 How Consultation Feedback Informed Option Development

### 6.1 Design Responses to Consultation Feedback

The following amendments were made to the short list of options as a result of the consultation feedback and to the Enquiry by Design process.

Issues raised	Response
Feedback during the workshop on 02.12.13 highlighted safety concerns about a southbound cycle path turning off the SH2 shoulder at the Petone station and going through the Petone Station car park to access a shared path to head south towards Wellington. The issues raised included concerns about conflict with vehicles pulling in and out of spaces.	The southbound cycle path was amended to avoid the Petone station car park.
Significant safety and level of service concerns along the Hutt Road in Wellington were raised throughout the consultation, including conflict with turning and parked vehicles, obstacles, poor surface and inadequate width.	Initially a default option to implement minor changes to the Hutt Road (section 1) was proposed. However following consultation feedback and safety analysis four options were considered in greater detail that all aim to reduce conflict between cyclists, turning vehicles and parked cars along the path. Full details are provided in the Detailed Business Case Report.

### 6.2 Response to Alternative Proposed Options

The table below summarises alternative options suggested in the consultation feedback and the reasons why they were not considered in the short list of options.

New option proposed	Our Response
The seaside option could be extended south to Kaiwharawhara railway station. A return subway could be excavated beneath the motorway and railway line to connect at the end of Westminster Street, with access ramps up to the station platforms. This would solve the current problem with the unsafe overbridge which connects to Kaiwharawhara railway station but had to be closed last year due to lack of funding to repair the bridge. This will reduce the need for cyclists to cross driveways along the Hutt Road from Kaiwharawhara and Ngauranga.	Extending the shared path south as part of the Great Harbour Way has been considered, however one of the project objectives is to provide connectivity to the outer Wellington suburbs. Extending the Harbourside alignment south of Ngauranga does not provide good connectivity as it is on the other side of the motorway and the rail line and has no connections to the Hutt Road. Therefore extending the seaward side option south of Ngauranga has not been selected as the preferred alignment.
The cyclist and pedestrian path could be moved to the hills above SH2. This will mean cyclists and pedestrians are exposed to less atmospheric pollution and have better views. It could also withstand a large earthquake and potential tsunami.	This option has been considered before particularly in previous work done by Opus. Costs would prohibit the construction of a cycle lane along the hill side of the transport corridor. A cycle lane along the harbour side of the rail corridor would provide greater protection and resilience for the wider transport corridor (road and rail).
Cyclists wishing to continue north past the Petone interchange currently have to merge with traffic. To improve this, a ramp could be provided from the Petone overbridge down to SH2, meaning cyclists would avoid the dangerous merge under the overbridge.	A ramp or separated cycle link from Petone as described has been considered and discounted because of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The connection back to the state highway shoulder would be sub-standard and unsafe due to the location of the left turn slip lane in front of Ulrich Aluminium and the Cornish Street</li> </ul>

New option proposed	Our Response
	<p>intersection, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Petone to Granada project proposed a complete rebuild of the interchange that would make this option unviable.</li> </ul>
<p>A level crossing should be considered as an alternative to a bridge crossing the railway line for the seaside option.</p>	<p>A level crossing is not being considered because the frequency of trains along the railway corridor and overall poor safety history of level crossings would cause significant safety issues. A level crossing is not supported by KiwiRail and will not be considered.</p>
<p>The northbound shoulder along SH2 should be widened to provide a separated on-road cycle path or wider shoulder for cyclists. This should be done by cutting into the escarpment.</p>	<p>One of the project's objectives is to provide a new or upgraded facility between Ngauranga and Petone that would attract existing and new cyclists to use the path. Providing an on-road cycle lane would not provide sufficient safety and would be unlikely to attract new cyclists. In addition it is not possible to cut into the escarpment along SH2 due to the delay construction would cause for traffic along SH2 and the potential destabilisation of the cliff.</p>
<p>The seaside path should be continued past Ngauranga and connect directly into Wellington via a seaside path rather than using the Hutt Road.</p>	<p>A seaside path all the way to Wellington would be far more expensive and unlikely to have more transport benefits than the Hutt Road options. There is also the necessity to avoid conflict with port and rail operations</p>
<p>In the interim, or as an alternative to realigning the missing link at the Petone end of SH2, poles or a barrier should be added to provide separation between cyclists, pedestrians and motor vehicles</p>	<p>Reducing the width of the SH2 shoulder would reduce the safety for motorised traffic along SH2.</p>

### 6.3 Next steps

The Steering Group and the Project Team will consider the issues that have been raised during consultation as well as carrying out more technical work where there is either incomplete or uncertain information. When that has been completed, a formal decision will be made as to what option is preferred. Further consultation on the preferred option will be carried out and will assist in developing the Project further including any measures to avoid remedy or mitigate adverse any effects.