

Willis Street Assessment Form

Questions	Score	Willis Street Do Minimum								Score	Willis Street Option 1								Score	Willis Street Option 2								Score	Willis Street Option 3																						
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H															
IO - Bus Travel time and reliability What are bus travel times along each segment? What is the variance of travel time / reliability of services along the segment? What is the bus volume throughput along the segment?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Marginal improvements to travel time only.	Provide a description of how the scoring may change if loading bays were to be retained on the Golden Mile.	Provide a description of how the scoring may change if taxi's and loading bays were to be retained on the Golden Mile.	n/a	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	2	Removal of general traffic provides significant benefits to reliability in particular. Score rounded up from 1.5	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Provide a description of how the scoring may change if loading bays were to be retained on the Golden Mile.	Provide a description of how the scoring may change if taxi's and loading bays were to be retained on the Golden Mile.	n/a	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	2	Slight decrease in JT, but significant improvement in reliability due to removal of general traffic. Rounded up from 1.5.	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Provide a description of how the scoring may change if loading bays were to be retained on the Golden Mile.	Provide a description of how the scoring may change if taxi's and loading bays were to be retained on the Golden Mile.	n/a	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.42
IO - Bus passenger boarding and alighting comfort and convenience How many passengers may be cleared from bus stops? What is the wait time at buses? How much bus stop crowding is there?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5B bus stop is to far away from bus stop on Lambton Quay, but marginal improvement in space provides marginal improvements. Score rounded up from 0.5.	Loading bay adjacent to stops is a particular problem, delaying buses access to the stop.	n/a	0.25	0.25	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	1	Delay to bus customers much reduced, however stop location (particularly 5B) degrades customer access and experience.	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Loading bay adjacent to NB stop is a particular problem, delaying buses access to the stop.	n/a	0.25	0.25	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	2	Stop location considered optimal of the three options, as well as providing decreased wait time. Rounded up from 1.75.	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Loading bay adjacent to NB stop is a particular problem, delaying buses access to the stop.	n/a	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.42			
IO - Pedestrian safety What is the potential for pedestrian accidents to be reduced?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Side roads closed reduces conflicts.	Negative impact if within pedestrianised areas otherwise negligible change.	Subject to location of taxi ranks.	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	1	General traffic removed & Mercer St closed which removes ped v vehicle conflicts.	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Subject to locations of loading zones - potential slight reduction in score.	Subject to locations of taxi ranks - potential slight reduction in score.	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	1	General traffic removed and Mercer Street closed which reduces ped vs vehicle conflicts.	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Subject to locations of loading zones - potential slight reduction in score.	Subject to locations of taxi ranks - potential slight reduction in score.	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	0.25			
IO - Pedestrian capacity How many pedestrian crossings are along the corridor? What is the pedestrian delay per crossing? How many pedestrian crossings are across the corridor? What is the pedestrian delay per crossing? What is the level of footpath pedestrian density? What is the level of bus stop overhang? Level of pedestrian amenity (using VQAT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Reduced signal timings will reduce pedestrian delays and no change to available foot path	No changes to available footpath width or signal times assumed	No changes to available footpath width or signal times assumed	0.2	0.2	0.25	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	1	Reduced signal timings will reduce pedestrian delays and no change to available foot path	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	No changes to available footpath width or signal times assumed	No changes to available footpath width or signal times assumed	0.2	0.2	0.25	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	2	Reduced signal timings will reduce pedestrian delays coupled with some improved bus stop capacity	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	No changes to available footpath width or signal times assumed. Therefore score would change to 1	No changes to available footpath width or signal times assumed. Therefore score would change to 1	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.36			
IO - Improve Place quality Composition and relationship of buildings and space How connected does the place feel? What is the level of activity generated? How comfortable does the place feel?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	primarily relates to Mercer St being able to be used as connection to civic sq and along Willis	change (probably not enough to reduce by 1 point) if street widths remain without footpath widening	change (probably not enough to reduce by 1 point) if street widths remain without footpath widening	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	1	primarily relates to Mercer St being able to be used as connection to civic sq and along Willis	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	change (probably not enough to reduce by 1 point) if street widths remain without footpath widening	change (probably not enough to reduce by 1 point) if street widths remain without footpath widening	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	1	primarily relates to Mercer St being able to be used as connection to civic sq and along Willis	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	change (probably not enough to reduce by 1 point) if street widths remain without footpath widening	change (probably not enough to reduce by 1 point) if street widths remain without footpath widening	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.25	0.33			
E - Social What is the range of relevant stakeholder and community feedback?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	greater PT efficiency, little change in public space	minimal change	minimal change	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.25	0.25	1	greater PT efficiency, little change in public space	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	minimal change	minimal change	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.25	0.25	3	PT & AT as more viable modes for all, greater ease of movement, more space for social opportunities	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	minimal change	minimal change	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.505	0.75	0.57	0.57			
E - Retail Impact Assessment What is the likely impact/opportunity to retailers and businesses?	0	Increased pedestrian congestion from population growth, but CBD will always attract people and patronage, not deter especially for Willis Street which is the main 'high end' retail precinct along with LQ. Hence, in the event of 'do minimum', it would be expected to see growing levels of patronage as this is Wellington's premier retail precinct.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Increased foot traffic and pedestrian activity from 30% more footpath space, however loss of efficiency/higher goods damage/theft risk for businesses from relocation of loading bays. No parking spaces anyway in do minimum so this would not be impacted and very little/no	Willis Street has 3 large loading bays that are well utilised. Larger businesses such as New World have loading bays on Boulcott Street. Score could increase.	NA as no taxi stands on Willis Street.	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.25	0.25	1	In addition to Option 1, two bus lanes in each direction would improve transport networks, but no general traffic would limit access. However, very little private transit and no parking as is, hence limiting access would not be a significant issue.	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	NA as no taxi stands on Willis Street.	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.25	0.25	2	Significantly increasing amenity with 75% more footpath space and provisions for bikes and scooters outweigh the same magnitude of negative impacts from Options 1 and 2. Modal shift allowances create medium to long term benefits. Hence the higher score. But questions around the reduced buslane causing bus stacking, hence	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	NA as no taxi stands on Willis Street.	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.25	0.25	0.4					
E - Cycling Level of Service What is the effect to cycling level of service? What is the effect on perceived safety and comfort of cycling on the segment?	0	No cycle provision for southbound cyclists. Northbound cyclists mix with general traffic in a low speed environment.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Still no cycle provision for southbound cyclists. Northbound cyclists continue to use general traffic lane. See further comments in "Fit with LGWM Programme"	Minimal change as northbound cyclists generally take the lane already. Door zone is not a particular concern for this section of Golden Mile.	Minimal change as northbound cyclists generally take the lane already. Door zone is not a particular concern for this section of Golden Mile.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Still no cycle provision for southbound cyclists. Northbound cyclists to use bus lane. See further comments in "Fit with LGWM Programme"	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Minimal change as northbound cyclists generally take the lane already. Door zone is not a particular concern for this section of Golden Mile.	Minimal change as northbound cyclists generally take the lane already. Door zone is not a particular concern for this section of Golden Mile.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	Still no cycle provision for southbound cyclists. Northbound cyclists continue to use general traffic lane. Removal of indented bus stops and marking of in-lane bus stops means people on bikes have limited space to pass stationary buses. See further comments in "Fit with LGWM Programme"	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Minimal change as northbound cyclists generally take the lane already. Door zone is not a particular concern for this section of Golden Mile.	Minimal change as northbound cyclists generally take the lane already. Door zone is not a particular concern for this section of Golden Mile.	-0.17	-0.17	-0.17	-0.1	-0.1	-0.167	-0.1	-0.16	-0.16			
E - General Safety What is the general effect to road safety on the segment? What is the general effect to road safety on adjacent streets?	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	RT conflicts at Mercer St removed.	Reduction in score due to manoeuvring of service vehicles.	Reduction in score due to manoeuvring of taxis.	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.1	0.19	1	General traffic removed & Mercer St closed	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Reduction in score due to manoeuvring of service vehicles.	Reduction in score due to manoeuvring of taxis.	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.1	0.19	1	General traffic removed and Mercer Street closed which reduces ped vs vehicle and vehicle v vehicle conflicts.	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	Reduction in score due to manoeuvring of service vehicles.	Reduction in score due to manoeuvring of taxis.	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.1	0.19	0.19			
E - Sustainability To what extent does the option deliver against sustainability issues and aspects relevant and important to Wellington and Aotearoa?	0	Continued PMV preference, growth, and bus congestion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Minor improvement on key sustainability criteria	minimal change	minimal change	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.1	1	Minor improvement on key sustainability criteria	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	minimal change	minimal change	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.1	0.1667	0.1	0.16	3	Potentially significant improvement on key sustainability criteria	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	minimal change	minimal change	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.505	0.5	0.46	0.46				
E - Fit with LGWM Programme What is the alignment with linked projects such as MBT or central city cycling network? How much flexibility is there to integrate with linked projects?	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	minimal opportunity to provide a safe and convenient cycling movement between Willis Street northbound and Mercer Street	minimal change	minimal change	-0.17	-0.17	-0.17	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1667	-0.1	-1	challenging to accommodate improvements for people on bikes or buses on these north-south corridors.	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	minimal change	minimal change	-0.17	-0.17	-0.17	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1667	-0.1	-0.1	-1	challenging to accommodate improvements for people on bikes or buses on these north-south corridors.	Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	minimal change	minimal change	-0.17	-0.17	-0.17	-0.1	-0.1	-0.167	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1				
DM&O - Delivery	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5				0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.5		Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.			0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	1.1667		Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.			0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04			
DM&O - Operations and Maintenance	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1		No change in score	No change in score	-0.33	-0.33	-0.33	-0.3	-0.3	-0.333	-0.4	-1		Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	No change in score	No change in score	-0.33	-0.33	-0.33	-0.3	-0.3	-0.333	-0.4	-2		Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	No change in score	No change in score	-0.67	-0.67	-0.67	-0.7	-0.6	-0.666	-0.666	-0.6	-0.6					
DM&O - Timeframe for Delivery	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		No change in score	No change in score	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.0666	0.1	2		Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	No change in score	No change in score	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.0666	0.1	2		Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.	No change in score	No change in score	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.0666	0.0666	0.1	0.1					
	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0	0	-0.02	-0.333	-0.333		Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.			-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0	0	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-1		Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.			-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0	0	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02				
	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.5				0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0	0.06	0.14	0.1	1.5667					0.1	0.1	0.2	0	0.04	0.14	0.09	0.16	1.7667		Provide an explanation of the rationale behind the score.			0.2	0.2	0.2	0	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.08	0.08			

Released under the Official Information Act 1987