3 July 2017

Lisa Rossiter
Acting Director Regional Relationships (Lower North Island)
Office of the Chief Executive
NZ Transport Agency
PO Box 5084
WELLINGTON 6145

Dear Lisa

SUBMISSION ON THE DRAFT LONG TERM STRATEGIC VIEW

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the draft Long Term Strategic View (LTSV) of the land transport system. We participated in the development of the regional feedback provided through TAG and endorsed by the RTC ("regional feedback"), but also wanted to provide a separate submission from the Kāpiti Coast District Council.

Our submission is divided into sections, ranging from a broad focus on the role of the LTSV and the transport system more generally, down to more localised comments about the Kāpiti District and specific content within the document.

Purpose of the LTSV

1. Kāpiti Coast District Council agrees with the comment in the regional feedback that the LTSV is a "good initiative ... but requires further work to represent a robust and shared view"[1].
2. The first two paragraphs of the LTSV state that the document "is the Transport Agency's view of the land transport system ... [and] the first step towards developing a shared view" (p1)[2]. However, the diagram on the bottom of the same page says, "The LTSV sets out *the Agency's view* of issues and opportunities and appropriate interventions" (emphasis added).
3. While these internal inconsistencies may appear minor, they highlight an important point – the draft LTSV is a first step towards a shared view, but is not *yet* a shared view. We support the contention in the regional feedback that more time is required for collaboration, feedback and amendment to ensure the development of a truly shared view.
4. For territorial authorities this concern is of utmost importance due to our understanding that the LTSV will be used to form guidance for the funding of regional and national land transport programmes.

[1] Regional Transport Committee. 19 May 2017. Feedback on the NZTA's Long Term Strategic View.
[2] NZ Transport Agency. Long Term Strategic View. Note that page numbers correspond to the page numbers from the pdf.

175 Rimu Road, Paraparaumu 5032 | Private Bag 60 601, Paraparaumu 5254 | T: 04 296 4700 F: 04 296 4830 | www.kapiticoast.govt.nz

Importance of transport for all New Zealanders

5. The LTSV does well to capture many of the ways in which transport is important to New Zealanders (i.e. safe journeys; effective urban systems; connectivity; resilience; inter-regional journeys; and regional economic development), but ultimately the document does not do equal justice to each. Our overall impression is that the document leans towards a primary focus on roads and economic development, causing some of the other factors to appear relegated to secondary considerations.

Ageing populations

6. The document rightfully notes in the section on population and social change that the Kāpiti District population is ageing (p16). Currently, 25% of the usual resident population is over 65 years of age, and this is expected to grow to 32% by 2043.[3]

7. The 2013 Census found that nearly 40% of the Kāpiti usual resident population over 15 years of age are not in the labour force. There will be a range of reasons why these residents are not in the labour force, but it is reasonable to assume that a large percentage of these residents are retired.

8. The LTSV document notes "there is a significant decrease in overall travel at age 65 as travel to work declines" (p16). What we are finding in Kāpiti, however, is that these seniors continue to travel for other reasons (e.g. social outings, medical appointments, etc). Many of these outings occur in the middle of the day on public transport, which places their requirements for reliable midday travel at odds with a public transport system that is simultaneously pressed to provide for morning and evening commuters.

9. A recent example of this was evident in Greater Wellington Regional Council's review of the Kāpiti bus service. GWRC understood that commuters in Ōtaki required improved morning and afternoon bus service to the Waikanae train station. GWRC was able to provide this service, but only by removing some of the midday bus runs. While this was useful for the commuters, it disadvantaged the residents who require the busses midday. It is important to note that, while we highlight this need for seniors, it also applies to school children, young adults, families with young children, and those who are accessibility challenged.

10. The LTSV document suggests that the lower North Island transport system is "fit for purpose" (p91), but we agree with the regional feedback which states that the network requires further significant investment before it can be described in this way. The section in the LTSV on Drivers of Change correctly identifies population and social change as an emerging challenge, but then appears to undervalue the significance of this challenge. We find that these changing demographics lead to population groups with different transport needs, and the current transport system struggles to meet all of these needs simultaneously.

Distance from urban centres

11. In the section on the Wellington Urban Areas, the document notes the "significant number of commuters journeying into the CBD from as far afield as Waikanae to the north" (p75, and again on p91). Local evidence suggests, however, that many daily commuters live much farther north than Waikanae. Commuters from Ōtaki are disadvantaged because their transport options are

[3] To access Census data and current population projections for Kāpiti Coast District Council, go to http://profile.idnz.co.nz/kapiti?WebID=10.

limited, although they lie within the boundaries of the Kāpiti Coast District and the Greater Wellington Region.

12. According to the 2013 Census, nearly 15% of the Ōtaki labour force commutes out of Ōtaki for work. For the Ōtaki commuters who travel to Wellington, some will drive all the way into Wellington (a distance of approximately 150km round trip); some will drive to the Waikanae train station; some will bus to the Waikanae train station; and some will take the Capital Connection train, which stops two times a day in Ōtaki, once in the morning and once in the evening.

13. While the Wellington Northern Corridor Roads of National Significance (RoNS) are expected to reduce drive times between Wellington and Levin, other forms of transport remain important. Electrified rail services from Wellington only go as far as Waikanae. Despite our persistent advocacy efforts for improved rail services for Ōtaki, including via alternative options such as diesel connector trains, the commuter service continues to stop at Waikanae. While the Capital Connection provides one alternative, its ongoing existence is difficult to ensure. Presently, the Capital Connection relies on a 5-year funding guarantee from Horizons and GW regional councils.

14. Meanwhile, for the Ōtaki commuters who travel north to Levin or further afield to Palmerston North, their only option is by car. Recently, Horizons and GW regional councils established a Levin-Waikanae trial bus service, but feedback suggests this service is geared towards bringing Levin residents to Ōtaki and Waikanae for the day, rather than helping residents of Ōtaki travel to Levin. This is because the bus leaves Levin in the morning traveling south, and then returns north to Levin in the afternoon.

15. While we highlight this issue in relation to Ōtaki commuters, it is important to note that this is a challenge faced by many residents of Ōtaki, including those who want to travel north for goods and services. While Ōtaki falls within the boundaries of the Kāpiti Coast District Council and GWRC, their health and other social services are based in the north and there are few public transport options available to these residents.

16. This is particularly disconcerting because these are some of the most vulnerable residents in our District. According to the 2013 Census, 32% of households in Ōtaki earn less than $30,000 per annum; 59% of households in Ōtaki are families with children; and 48% of those families with children are sole-parent. Many of these residents reside in areas of high deprivation, and their relative geographic isolation (i.e. distance from urban growth centres) compounds their disadvantage. While we understand why the LTSV would place greater focus on New Zealand's growth centres, this should not be to the detriment of those who live outside of those areas.

The Lower North Island

17. To improve the lower North Island section overall, existing regional plans should be included. Every territorial authority is legislatively mandated to develop Long Term Plans that include 30-year infrastructure strategies. The LTSV should incorporate these documents and use them as the basis for information around the transport needs and strategic issues for each region. (We think they should also be referenced in the table called 'Where does the LTSV fit?' at the start of the document.)

18. We agree with the assertion in the regional feedback that the document appears to downplay the significance of the Wellington region to the lower North Island and New Zealand more generally. Eleven per cent of New

Zealand's population resides in the Wellington region, and it is the 3rd largest region in the country.[4]

19. With this in mind, we were surprised that the introduction to the section on Connecting the Lower North Island listed Palmerston North as the region's hub (p63).

20. While Palmerston North might be a major connector for freight and distribution, that does not automatically equate to it also being a hub for the transportation of people. In fact, we would posit that the majority of people traveling by car through the lower North Island will generally bypass Palmerston North altogether.

21. In this regard, the LTSV document appears to muddle an important distinction that might need to be made: transportation of people versus the transportation of goods. This highlights, once again, the challenge of meeting multiple transport demands with one system on a limited budget.

Kāpiti and the new Roads of National Significance

22. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS) identifies only 10 high and medium growth areas in New Zealand; Kāpiti and the Wellington Region are the only two identified in the greater Wellington region.[5] As such, it seems to us that Kāpiti, as a medium growth centre, may merit more specific mention in the strategic context section for the lower North Island (see p90). Kāpiti is not specifically mentioned in this strategic discussion, nor is it included in the map entitled Key Locations of Focus, which identifies high and medium growth centres in accordance with the NPS (p31).

23. Our Council's vision is for a vibrant, diverse and thriving Kāpiti.[6] The new Transmission Gully Motorway, Mackays to Peka Peka (M2PP) and Peka Peka to Ōtaki (PP2O) expressways, and the Ōtaki to north of Levin project (Ō2NL) will undoubtedly drive significant change across the District, and Kāpiti Coast District Council is committed to ensuring these new RoNS contribute to this vision.

24. Council worked closely with the M2PP Alliance on the construction of the M2PP Expressway[7], and looks forward to a similar collaboration with NZTA and its construction partners throughout the design and construction of the PP2O Expressway.

25. The SH1 RoNS programme will largely address the safety and access issues that plagued the old SH1, but we add that further investment is still required to ensure integration of these new expressways with the local communities they bisect. Council has planned and developed other programmes of work to further such integration – in particular improvements to local roading networks; cycleways, walkways, and bridleways; and town centre redevelopments.

26. The map of immediate priorities for the Wellington Growth Centre identifies two projects that are underway in our District: the Kāpiti Road Relief Route (which

---

[4] Statistics New Zealand. 2013 Census QuickStats about a place: Wellington Region. Downloaded on 1 June 2017 from http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/quickstats-about-a-place.aspx?request_value=14322&tabname=Transport.

[5] Ministry for the Environment and Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. 2016. Proposed National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity: Consultation Document. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment, p26.

[6] Kāpiti Coast District Council. *Future Kāpiti: Long term plan 2015-35.*

[7] Kāpiti Coast District Council received the 2017 BERL Collaborative Government Action Award in recognition of the Council staff and members of the M2PP Alliance who worked collaboratively and in partnership to deliver the M2PP Expressway.

has been renamed the East West Connectors Project) and the Kāpiti Urban Cycle Programme (p78). We are pleased to see these projects included, even though they are not fully funded. As these projects relate to expressway integration, Council continues to collaborate with NZTA to deliver these projects.

Resilience

27. Environmental change and resilience stand out as being of particular importance, especially since the Christchurch and Kaikoura earthquakes, but we note that they are not included in the Chief Executive's foreword.

28. Whilst the larger document discusses potential impacts of environmental change, it fails to identify one significant impact: environmental change may eventually start to influence, not only where people work and live, but how they commute between the two and how goods and services are transferred as well.

29. Resilience is enhanced by offering more transport options and a greater choice of transport routes. We contend that Kāpiti is well positioned for the movement of goods due to its geographic location, its airport, its rail services, and the development of the new SH1 RoNS. This potential opportunity for Kāpiti does not appear to be considered anywhere in the document.

Other comments

30. Throughout the document, the first part of each geographic area section (i.e. South Island, Lower North Island, etc) describes the strategic context of the area. We note that the section on the lower North Island contains the strategic context on the upper North Island (see pp60-62), while the section on the upper North Island contains the strategic context on the lower North Island (see pp90-92). These two sections have simply been misplaced in the document and need to be switched.

31. The map at the end of the strategic context for the lower North Island (see p92) is actually of the South Island. Presently, we are not able to find a strategic context map for the lower North Island anywhere in the document. We suspect that this is also a simple error that needs to be corrected.

32. The section on Connecting the Lower North Island identifies Palmerston North to Piarere as one of four key inter-regional journeys. We were not familiar with Piarere and had to search online to learn more about it. It appears to us that Piarere is strategic from NZTA's point of view, but this may not hold true for other readers. As such, we recommend that Piarere be identified on the Focus Objectives map where the Piarere to Palmerston North route is mentioned (p65).

33. The map of immediate inter-regional priorities for the lower North Island identifies the PP20 Expressway as under 'investigation', but this project is now 'committed' (see p66). The same map identifies the Ōtaki to north of Levin project (Ō2NL) as under 'investigation' as well, although this project appears to be nearly 'committed'.[8]

34. We note that the map of the Wellington Growth Centre shows a light blue circle for expected population growth for Paraparaumu, an amber circle for expected business growth, and a darker blue circle inside of the light blue circle (see p76). This dark blue circle does not correspond to anything on the legend. We suspect that this should be a pink circle for existing employment centres, but

[8] See: NZ Transport Agency. May 2017. *Ōtaki to north of Levin Project Scope and Community Influence*; NZ Transport Agency. May 2017. *Ōtaki to north of Levin: Frequently Asked Questions.*

the overlay of the light blue and pink circles have led to a darker blue circle. This appears to be a layout issue.

35. We would also contend that a rail constraint should be shown on the NIMT line between Pukerua Bay and Paekākāriki (see map on p76). This is a 'single track' section that is prone to congestion and vulnerable to hazards.

Once again, Kāpiti Coast District Council appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft LTSV. We thank you for considering our feedback.

Yours sincerely

Pat Dougherty
CHIEF EXECUTIVE