

Te Aro Workshop

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Time: | 2.00pm – 4:00pm | |
| Date: | Thursday 5 July 2018 | |
| Location: | WSP-Opus, L9, Majestic Centre, Willis St | |
| Attendees: | Facilitator Acting Project Director GWRC Owner Interface Manager WWC Chief City Planner NZTA Manager Design Portfolio 1 WCC Owner Interface Manager GWRC Regional Transport Manager | Stantec Technical Consultant AECOM - Civil Infrastructure Manager WCC Transport Strategy Manager WCC Programme Development Team Lead LGWM Engagement Lead NZTA Principal Transport Planner |
| Apologies / Circulation | WCC Chief Executive Officer | GWRC Chief Executive Officer |

Workshop Notes

| Item | Notes | Who | Due Date |
|------------|--|-----|----------|
| | Key points | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At-grade improvements do not provide a long-term solution to the issues identified (north-south conflicts, low amenity and severance, access to regional destinations). A fully covered trench is recommended as part of the draft RPI. Pricing is an integral part of the draft RPI: providing extra capacity on the state highway route without pricing will induce more traffic and cancel out the transport benefits of undergrounding SH1. The location of on- and off-ramps requires more work to get the best balance of benefits between attracting traffic away from the central city streets, improving amenity along Vivian St and Karo Drive, facilitating access to regional destinations and enabling mass transit along Taranaki Street. The one-way system needs to be revisited accordingly. Consenting of a covered trench is expected to be difficult under the traditional RMA route or EPA process. Special legislation may be required to deliver this in a timely manner. | | |
| 1.0 | Introduction | | |
| 1.1 | <p>Workshop purpose and format</p> <p>The purpose of the workshop was to undertake a structured evaluation of the proposal to underground Karo Drive and to determine a preferred design to include in the draft RPI.</p> <p>The Programme Development Team Lead presented a brief history of the Inner City Bypass and some data (traffic volumes by all modes at key junctions, crash heat map, amenity index) and context (heritage buildings and areas, sensitive land use activities). Graeme presented a summary of physical constraints (contaminated sites, underground services, property requirement, consenting requirements, construction methodology and impacts).</p> <p>The current RPI proposals for undergrounding Karo Drive were then debated.</p> | | |

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 2.0 | Discussion | | |
| | <p>2.1 Problem definition</p> <p>Major concern is addressing the conflicts between SH1 and local traffic, including PT, walking and cycling. At times, there are more people travelling across SH1 (northbound or southbound) than there are travelling eastbound or westbound on the SH.</p> <p>LGWM aims to reduce vehicle movements in the central city. A bypass could help divert some vehicles away from the city streets (including the waterfront). However, less than a quarter of vehicles on SH1 (southbound) travel from tunnel to tunnel and fewer have a destination elsewhere outside Te Aro and the CBD (eg Newtown, Brooklyn).</p> <p>Whether vehicles use a bypass will depend on where they can access it from and where they can exit it to reach their destination. There is a tension between connectivity and amenity whereby more on- and off-ramps allow more vehicles to use the bypass but this negates some of the benefits of undergrounding the SH in the first place.</p> <p>Using Vivian Street as both an entry point (northbound) and an egress (southbound) to the SH from Te Aro limits the possible vehicular traffic reduction along this street. One of the original motivations behind the relocation of SH traffic from Vivian to Karo Drive was reducing severance along Vivian Street.</p> <p>Pricing (eg cordon charging) has the potential to de-incentivise vehicles entering the CBD / Te Aro and to incentivise a transfer from local city streets (including the waterfront) to SH1 around the CBD. This transfer will affect trips with a destination outside the CBD.</p> <p>Safety issues tend to be in the central city and not on the state highway – one of the justifications for relocating traffic out of the central city.</p> <p>The undergrounding of Karo Drive has to be considered as part of the wider programme which includes the Terrace Tunnel duplication, Basin grade separation and Mt. Victoria Tunnel duplication. These components form a network that allows traffic to be relocated from within the central city, Newtown/Constable Street, and Oriental Bay/The Bays, to provide space for public transport priority routes, including mass transit, and separated cycling lanes.</p> | | |
| | <p>2.2 At-grade improvements</p> <p>We asked whether we can enhance the network at-grade, to reduce conflicts and improve amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transport benefits stem from additional capacity on SH1. Just relocating the same capacity (from Vivian St to a Karo Drive alignment) will not deliver transport benefits. Additional capacity is necessary to allow the relocation of traffic from local streets and waterfront route to the SH. This transfer will be encouraged through pricing. • Removing parking along Vivian Street (creating 3 permanent lanes) may alleviate this a little by providing more 'stacking' space for vehicles but this will be offset by the desire to increase pedestrian priority across SH1. • Additional capacity on the SH is necessary to improve access to regional destinations (hospital and airport). • Shifting SH traffic from Vivian St to Karo Drive at-grade would worsen amenity and severance issues along Karo Drive, hence moving the problem rather than solving it. <p>Agreed that an at-grade solution doesn't address the issues identified (north-</p> | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | south conflicts, low amenity and severance, access to regional destinations). | | |
| 2.3 Network issues | <p>Undergrounding SH1 along Karo Drive contributes to the overall transport benefits of the complete RPI (this includes the duplication of the Terrace tunnel, undergrounding of Karo Drive, grade separation at the Basin and duplication of the Mt Vic tunnel, amongst other investments) which are currently estimated at between \$300 million (regional model) and 900 million (AIMSUM). The cost of the undergrounding alone (not the wider SH improvements listed above) range from \$960 to \$1,100 million.</p> <p>Pricing is absolutely necessary to deliver the above transport benefits. Without pricing, induced demand will quickly wipe out any travel time or variability benefit.</p> <p>HOV lanes on the wider SH network should be considered.</p> <p>Resilience will be improved from moving people away from Vivian Street eg narrow corridor with potential for falling buildings.</p> | | |
| 2.4 Design refinements | <p>The current on- and off-ramps arrangement may lead to an increase of traffic volumes along Vivian St (proposed to be two-ways) and pressure on Taranaki Street (our identified preferred LRT corridor – requiring two dedicated PT lanes).</p> <p>More work is needed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vivian St interchange. • Taranaki St interchange. • Consider other combinations of on- and off-ramps at the next stage. • SH capacity in the new tunnel – this depends on the level of pricing and how many lanes are removed from the waterfront. More detailed modelling will be needed to determine this – during the next stage. • Taranaki St capacity - assuming mass transit is on Taranaki as far as Karo Drive. It may be necessary to limit access to/from Taranaki and use Victoria St instead / in addition. • Review the one-way system through the city (next stage). • Explore HOV lanes. | | |
| 2.5 Urban park | <p>It costs approximately \$140 million more for a fully-covered tunnel (compared to the same 'tunnel' with some covered parts and some open trenches) which allows a greatly expanded urban park. Acquiring a similar area of land in the existing urban area to create open spaces would be difficult. Linear park would link town belt areas east and west of Te Aro.</p> <p>The area of urban park (1.5ha) described seems low given its footprint and needs to be checked.</p> <p>A covered trench significantly improves walking and cycling access and safety across the state highway, but also along it.</p> <p>Agreed that fully covered option is preferable to a part-covered option.</p> | | |
| 2.6 Pricing | <p>Information is needed on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of through traffic now and in the future and which route they use. Show traffic volumes on all links. • Cordon charge – how much traffic can be attracted off the Quays and Evans Bay | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>Unless pricing is an integral part of the RPI, providing extra capacity on the state highway route will induce more traffic.</p> <p>Agreed that pricing is a requirement for the Karo Drive undergrounding to go ahead.</p> | | |
| 2.7 Development/consenting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to encourage development to occur in the vicinity of the realignment to ensure the most is made of the investment. We need to work with Heritage NZ and others early to develop a strategy to address heritage and cultural values. The project has the potential to improve the setting of some heritage buildings and to create a valuable open space. Consenting will be a challenge. Enabling legislation may be a consideration. Designation of the route needs to be considered early. | | |
| 2.8 Constructability/sequencing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sequencing: Need to do PT first and then pricing. Opportunity to lock in behaviour change. Enabling works for the realignment of utilities / buried infrastructure will be significant. | | |