

From: [Andrew Wharton](#)
To: [Joe Hewitt](#)
Cc: [Adam McCutcheon](#); [Gunther Wild](#)
Subject: RE: To review - content for officers submission to GWRC draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2021
Date: Tuesday, 16 March 2021 11:32:49 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.jpg](#)

Hi Joe, just FYI Liam Hodgetts and Moana came by our way to discuss how the RPTP treats rapid transit lines, stops, and service upgrades. There may be some more staff submission content coming your way after discussions with the Mayor on this.

[Andrew Wharton](#) (he/him)

Principal Advisor Planning (LGWM) | City Design and Place Planning | Wellington City Council
021 365 051

From: Joe Hewitt <xxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>
Sent: 16 March 2021 7:29 AM
To: Andrew Wharton <xxxxxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>
Cc: Gunther Wild <xxxxxxx.xxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Elliot Higbee <Elliot.Higbee@wcc.govt.nz>; Sherilyn Hinton <xxxxxxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Lucie Desrosiers <Lucie.Dxxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; John McSweeney <xxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Siobhan Procter <xxxxxxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Adam McCutcheon <xxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.nz>
Subject: RE: To review - content for officers submission to GWRC draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2021

Will do – thanks, Joe

From: Andrew Wharton <[xxxxxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx](#)>
Sent: Monday, 15 March 2021 4:34 pm
To: Joe Hewitt <[xxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx](#)>
Cc: Gunther Wild <[xxxxxxx.xxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx](#)>; Elliot Higbee <[xxxxxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx](#)>; Sherilyn Hinton <[xxxxxxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx](#)>; Lucie Desrosiers <[xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx](#)>; John McSweeney <[xxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx](#)>; Siobhan Procter <[xxxxxxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx](#)>; Adam McCutcheon <[xxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx](#)>
Subject: FW: To review - content for officers submission to GWRC draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2021

Hi Joe,

Lucie has made some good points, so I've edited two of my comments accordingly, with the changes in blue. No-one else has raised other concerns or edits. Please include with other staff comments as technical input and improvements for the GW team working on the plan, or however the comments will be processed.

Thanks

Page 67 para 5 (below). Likewise, I support the overall message of this paragraph, but the first and second sentences are different from the NPS-UD and the earlier paragraphs. The first sentence says

there is work to “further define” rapid transit corridors, but above it already states that rapid transit corridors include the Kāpiti, Hutt, Melling and Johnsonville rail corridors, and the LGWM future rapid transit corridor. [Though the Plan may have meant to reference investigating if any high frequency bus routes qualify as rapid transit corridors.](#) The second sentence is inconsistent with the NPS-UD definition: “rapid transit stop means a place where people can enter or exit a rapid transit service, whether existing or planned.” Whether there is “significant urban development” is [not definitive.](#)

[Metlink will work with the Territorial Authorities in our region to further define rapid transit corridors including to define which individual train stations on the rail corridors are access points to rapid transit. These access points will be at stations where there is already significant urban development.](#) Metlink will work with its local and central government partners to communicate and discuss any proposed network policy change to communities on the core public transport network. Ultimately, any urban planning decisions relating to intensification are subject to each Territorial Authority’s district planning process.

A better way to phrase these highlighted sentences could be something like: “Metlink will work with the Territorial Authorities in our region [to define any other rapid transit corridors, and](#) ensure transport and land-use planning around rapid transit stops is done in an integrated and iterative way, including which rail stations provide access to rapid transit services.” The former clause references NPS-UD guidance, and the latter references the rapid transit definition – as some stations may not have frequent services yet (due to express trains passing them by).

Pages 75 – 79: the Smarter Connections Strategy (about Park and Ride areas) misses an opportunity about enabling transit-oriented development there, following the existing TOD directions in pages 67 and 84. It’s mentioned a bit under Effective Design, but deserves more discussion given Wellington’s housing crisis and this Plan’s content on TOD. This is also consistent with the GPS on Transport and on Urban Development that generally promote transit-oriented development. I recommend adding in some text similar to:

Expand to four key principles, adding –

- Transit-oriented development

Transit-oriented development

[Wellington has a significant shortage of housing. Some Park and Ride areas next to train stations could be suitable for apartments over the car parks, either as public-led affordable housing developments, or by selling air rights above the parks. The Park and Ride areas would need to be zoned for medium or high density development, be owned by local government, and should be free of hindering designations. Car parking for train users could still be provided.](#)

[Greater Wellington and the Territorial Authorities will work together to investigate whether certain Park and Ride facilities are suitable for residential development and how that development could occur on the site to optimise transit-oriented development.](#)

Also add a bullet point reflecting this point into f) in the table on page 120, e.g.: “Investigate with Territorial Authorities whether certain existing Park and Ride Facilities could be developed for affordable or market housing above car parks.”

[Andrew Wharton](#) ([he/him](#))

Principal Advisor Planning (LGWM) | City Design and Place Planning | Wellington City Council

021 365 051

From: Lucie Desrosiers <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx>
Sent: 15 March 2021 3:59 PM
To: Andrew Wharton <xxxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx>
Subject: RE: To review - content for officers submission to GWRC draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2021

One question and one comment – in red below. Thanks

Lucie Desrosiers
Principal Advisor | City Design and Place Planning
P +6448038553 | M +64212478553
E [.@..](mailto:..@..) | W Wellington.govt.nz

From: Andrew Wharton <xxxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx>
Sent: 12 March 2021 16:05
To:
Cc: Subject: To review - content for officers submission to GWRC draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2021

Hi Gunther, Elliot, Sherilyn, Lucie, John,

I've drafted up some comments for the officers' submission on the draft Regional Public Transport Plan, about: rapid transit, affordable housing above Park and Rides, growth in the Regional Growth Framework, and to LGWM. Can you please check, and edit the text by return email if needed, as soon as possible, so we can forward it to Joe H for combining into our submission.

Page 66 last sentence, and page 67 para 1 (below):

The GPS defines rapid transit as "A quick, frequent, reliable and high-capacity public transport service that operates on a permanent route (road or rail) that is largely separated from other traffic." The National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) shares the same definition for 'rapid transit service', but extends it to "any existing or planned" service. "Planned" means planned in a regional transport plan such as this plan.

The NPS-UD introduces a new requirement for Wellington's regional policy statement, and the district plans of Wellington City, Hutt City, Upper Hutt City, Porirua City and Kāpiti Coast District, to potentially enable building heights of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of current and planned rapid transit stops. This means that rapid transit identified in this plan has a connection to the land use controls in these RMA documents.

I don't think that's correct – the NPS-UD refers to "a regional land transport plan", not any regional transport plan. This public transport plan isn't included for the purpose of that definition. I suspect the text is largely copied from the draft RLTP, and not adjusted to the purpose of this public transport plan.

Page 67 para 3 should have the following clause added to reflect the draft RLTP text:

The rapid transit network and services for the Wellington region comprises the Kāpiti, Hutt,

Melling and Johnsonville rail corridors. The Mass Rapid Transit corridor proposed by the Let's Get Wellington Moving (LGWM) programme (once the rapid transit network and stops are confirmed) will also form part of this rapid transit network.

Page 67 para 4 (below). This paragraph contains an important message, which I support. However, the last sentence is unclear. What programme is being referred to here? And the LGWM mass rapid transit corridor is new infrastructure, not an upgrade. May be best to delete or replace the highlighted sentence.

The rail corridors are part of Metlink's core public transport network. Plans to upgrade this network to increase service frequency and capacity are signalled in this plan. These upgrades will ensure that the rail services are "quick, frequent, reliable and high-capacity" to enable greater intensification around the rail stations. The Let's Get Wellington Moving Mass Rapid Transit corridor will be developed as part of that programme.

Page 67 para 5 (below). Likewise, I support the overall message of this paragraph, but the first and second sentences are different from the NPS-UD and the earlier paragraphs. The first sentence says there is work to "further define" rapid transit corridors, but above it already states that rapid transit corridors include the Kāpiti, Hutt, Melling and Johnsonville rail corridors, and the LGWM future rapid transit corridor. [could any high frequency bus routes qualify as rapid transit corridor?] The second sentence is inconsistent with the NPS-UD definition: "rapid transit stop means a place where people can enter or exit a rapid transit service, whether existing or planned." Whether there is "significant urban development" is irrelevant.

Metlink will work with the Territorial Authorities in our region to further define rapid transit corridors including to define which individual train stations on the rail corridors are access points to rapid transit. These access points will be at stations where there is already significant urban development. Metlink will work with its local and central government partners to communicate and discuss any proposed network policy change to communities on the core public transport network. Ultimately, any urban planning decisions relating to intensification are subject to each Territorial Authority's district planning process.

A better way to phrase these highlighted sentences could be something like: "Metlink will work with the Territorial Authorities in our region to ensure transport and land-use planning around rapid transit stops is done in an integrated and iterative way, including which rail stations provide access to rapid transit services." The former clause references NPS-UD guidance, and the latter references the rapid transit definition – as some stations may not have frequent services yet (due to express trains passing them by).

Pages 75 – 79: the Smarter Connections Strategy (about Park and Ride areas) misses an opportunity about enabling transit-oriented development there, following the existing TOD directions in pages 67 and 84. It's mentioned a bit under Effective Design, but deserves more discussion given Wellington's housing crisis and this Plan's content on TOD. This is also consistent with the GPS on Transport and on Urban Development that generally promote transit-oriented development. I recommend adding in some text similar to:

Expand to four key principles, adding –

- Transit-oriented development

Transit-oriented development

Wellington has a significant shortage of housing, particularly affordable housing. Many Park and Ride areas next to train stations are ideal locations for apartments over the car parks.

They are right next to rapid transit stops, many also have bus and active transport options, and many are near town and neighbourhood centres with commercial and community services. They are large, flat areas that enable efficient comprehensive development, where building location and design can be optimised for amenity, public space, and access to transport and services. Some of the Park and Ride areas are already zoned for medium or high density development. Car parking for train users could still be provided underneath the new apartments and public spaces. The land itself could remain in public ownership. Greater Wellington and the Territorial Authorities will work together to:

- a. determine which Park and Ride facilities are most suitable for residential development, and the location and scale of that development
- b. investigate partnerships with affordable housing providers, and with apartment developers, to build affordable housing products or other apartments. [I'm supportive of the TOD idea but not sure we should conflate TOD with affordable housing. The reason for my reluctance is that building leasehold apartments over a public car park will be logistically difficult (think construction disruption, integration of rubbish collection and residents vehicular access (moving furniture, deliveries), etc) and likely expensive so the resulting dwellings are unlikely to be affordable. I think we should aim for air-rights development without the affordability constraint.]

Also add a bullet point reflecting this point into f) in the table on page 120, e.g.: "Investigate options with Territorial Authorities to use some existing Park and Ride Facilities for affordable housing above car parks."

Page 81 para 3 says that the Regional Growth Framework indicates 75% of the 200,000 population growth will occur in growth corridors north of Wellington's CBD. This is incorrect. In pages 3 and 4 of the Framework, 88% of housing growth will be in growth corridors. Of that, 1/3 is expected in the eastern corridor, and just over 40% in the western corridor. $33\% + 40\% = 73\% \times 88\% = 64\%$ of the 200,000 growth. The final paragraph on page 81 could explain how LGWM is relevant, with edits similar to: "the Let's Get Wellington Moving initiative, which will increase and service future rail demand by extending public and active transport services to areas south of Wellington Station, assumes 14.2 million peak patronage by 2035.

Page 98 para 1 sentence should be corrected to say: "There are a number of options for the type of MRT system suitable for Wellington, including bus rapid transit light rail, articulated buses and trackless trams."

Cheers,

[Andrew Wharton](#) (he/him)

Principal Advisor Planning (LGWM) | City Design and Place Planning | Wellington City Council
021 365 051

From: Gunther Wild <xxxxxxx.xxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>

Sent: 12 March 2021 8:18 AM

To: Andrew Wharton <xxxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Elliot Higbee <xxxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>

Cc: Siobhan Procter <xxxxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Joe Hewitt <xxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>

Subject: Fwd: Officers submission to GWRC draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2021

Hi gents

Given both of your involvement with GWRC on these kind of matters in recent times - can you please have a look over Joes points below from a WCC LGWM perspective and suggest any additions we might want/need?

Many thanks

Gunther Wild
Owner Interface Manager - LGWM
Wellington City Council

(Sent from my mobile device so please excuse brevity and typos)

From: Joe Hewitt <xxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2021 7:57 AM
To: Siobhan Procter; Gunther Wild
Subject: FW: Officers submission to GWRC draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2021

Hi Siobhan and Gunther,

My message to Liam says most of what you need to know. Jessica has asked me to check in with you two as to whether the direction we're proposing is appropriate from the perspective of LGWM sensitivities. If you're comfortable, I'll seek some time with the Mayor and DM next week, as if we're going to do anything, the window is rapidly closing.

Cheers, Joe

From: Liam Hodgetts <xxxx.xxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 March 2021 3:04 pm
To: Joe Hewitt <xxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Jessica Beyeler <xxxxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>
Cc: Vida Christeller <xxxx.xxxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Anna Blomquist <xxxx.xxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Annie Bruckner <xxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>; Nadine Dodge <xxxxxx.xxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>
Subject: RE: Officers submission to GWRC draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2021
Importance: High

Would prefer we sit down with them and ask their views first but also float your questions. Before that ~ can we get some guidance from Jess? – given the sensitivities around LGWM...

Kind regards,

Liam Hodgetts

Chief Planning Officer | Planning & Environment Group | Wellington City Council
| M +64 27 836 1476 | E [@..](mailto:..@..) | W Wellington.govt.nz |

From: Joe Hewitt <xxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xxxx.xx>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 March 2021 2:51 pm

To: Liam Hodgetts <xxxx.xxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx>

Cc: Vida Christeller <xxxx.xxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx>; Anna Blomquist <xxxx.xxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx>; Annie Bruckner <xxxx.xxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx>; Nadine Dodge <xxxxxx.xxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx>

Subject: Officers submission to GWRC draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2021

Importance: High

Hi Liam,

GWRC has recently released a draft Regional Public Transport [Plan](#) for consultation. Feedback closes on **19 March**, so there isn't time to get a submission done through a normal ELT/SPC process. Caro has suggested we do a CE submission since we will be voicing existing policy positions, but we should work with the portfolio leader and the Mayor to prepare it. **Are you happy for me to send the following to the Mayor, DM Free and Cr Condie, or can you suggest an alternative approach?**

Hi Mayor Foster, Deputy Mayor Free and Cr Condie,

GWRC has recently released a draft Regional Public Transport [Plan](#) for consultation. Feedback closes on **19 March**, so there isn't time to get a submission done through a normal SPC process. Given the matters we wish to raise are in line with existing policy, we can prepare a submission for the Chief Executive to sign.

An outline of what we wish to submit on is set out below:

Paragraph 1: Support the plan

- We support the vision and direction set out for public transport in the region set out in the plan.
- We support the three strategic areas of focus: fleet decarbonisation, customer experience, and mode shift.
- We agree that working with LGWM to deliver mass rapid transit and implement the Bus Priority Action Plan are critical to achieving a high quality, high capacity, high frequency core network.

Paragraph 2: We are looking forward to a PT Fare Review which addresses our concerns

- We note that the plan states that the period covered by the RPTP, you will continue working to improve fares and deliver integrated ticketing for all public transport travel. We support this.
- We support a fare review to promote fairness and affordability for customers, and also to consider how fares contribute to increased ridership and regional mode shift targets set out in the RLTP.
- Further to our 2017 PT Fare Review submission, we remain concerned that the current fare zone boundaries are fundamentally unfair and result in Wellington City customers paying more for equivalent journeys taken elsewhere in the region. We request that further consideration is given to this matter when the fare system is reviewed in the lead-up to implementing the national ticketing solution mid-decade.
- We look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with GW on these issues to

achieve our mutual goals.

Joe Hewitt

TL Transport Strategy | City Design & Place Planning | Wellington City Council

P 04 803 8650 | M 021 247 8650

E [.@.](#) | W Wellington.govt.nz | |

The information contained in this email is privileged and confidential and intended for the addressee only.

If you are not the intended recipient, you are asked to respect that confidentiality and not disclose, copy or make use of its contents.

If received in error you are asked to destroy this email and contact the sender immediately. Your assistance is appreciated.

