

13 March 2017

Barry Mein
Programme Director
Let's Get Wellington Moving
info@wellymoving.co.nz

Dear Barry

Re: Let's Get Wellington Moving Progress Report (February 2017)

This submission is from the Architectural Centre, an incorporated society dating from 1946, which represents both professionals and non-professionals interested in the promotion of good design.

1. Thank you for circulating a copy of the February 2017 progress report. This is appreciated. We particularly appreciate the level of detail included in the report. We have the following comments on the document:
2. While we support accurate information gathering and transport modelling, we consider the most critical aspect of this project is understanding where we want to be in the future, in terms of the kind of transport use, rather than simply building a more efficient status quo. That is to say: "What is the transport system we want, rather than the transport system we have?"
3. The project hence needs to understand both how we get to physical places as well as, more importantly, how we change our current transport dependencies. We consider that vital to this is the expertise of psychologists and behavioural change experts. Marketing expertise might also be critical to this, as such a change will require a fundamental cultural change to be "sold."
4. We note that the document does not acknowledge the importance of school traffic and transport. We understand that during school holidays issues of congestion reduce significantly, presumably due to fewer multi-destination trips at (morning) peak times. We also consider that developing a culture of walking, bike-use and bus-use in school students is vital for transportation now and in the future, and hope that these issues are anticipated in the scenarios to be considered. We also understand that this is not simply a matter of pragmatics or perceptions of safety by parents, but also peer-pressure and low-status associations (e.g. poverty) with walking and cycling. Again this is beyond the conventional skillset of transport engineering and requires input from developmental psychologists and behavioural change experts.
5. In a similar vein there may be legislative incentives used to change road behaviour. An example could be to borrow Dutch and Danish laws of strict liability in collisions involving vulnerable road users (e.g. cyclists and pedestrians). This requires that, unless there is clear proof that the vulnerable user was at fault, the more powerful road user will be liable by default. This law is credited with improving car driver behaviour around



the architectural centre inc.
PO Box 24178 Wellington

more vulnerable road users. We acknowledge that law change will likely be outside of your brief, but we encourage the Get Welly Moving group to lobby central government to make this or similar changes to support the work done at the regional and local level.

6. We similarly note that the document is silent on multi-destination trips which we understand are the tricky part of mode shift to achieve, especially given Wellington's current public transport fare structure which does not include the possibility of a transfer fare. We consider this might be usefully considered as one part of the problem definition (p. 15).
7. We strongly agree with the finding that "[i]nfrastructure for cycling in the central city is currently limited, resulting in safety issues and a very poor level of service for cyclists" (pp. 3, 18).
8. We support that objective to "[r]educe reliance on private vehicle travel" (p. 4), and consider that reduced car *ownership* will be a key part of achieving this.
9. We appreciate the analysis on inner-city intersections and the relative use of different modes, highlighting the significant numbers of pedestrians (e.g. p. 16). Understanding of car occupants (e.g. % of single-occupant vehicles) would give further insight into appropriate priorities.
10. We acknowledge that there are points in the current network where there is simply insufficient space for transport demands across the modes. There is a risk that in these areas the cultural default of prioritising cars will seemingly naturally occur. We understand that in some parts of Europe traffic calming and the use of truly shared spaces, which require all modes to mix and accommodate each other, occurs, and we recommend that such strategies are investigated here.
11. We note that the document focuses on public transport travel times, but consider that bus frequency (i.e. time waiting at bus stops) may be as, if not more, critical to understand. We support bus priority and dedicated bus lanes because mass public transport is a far more efficient use of constrained road space than private cars.
12. We acknowledge the importance of changing technologies, both information as well as transport technologies. We note with respect to electric bikes that consideration will be needed regarding whether grouping these with manual bikes (given speed differentials) is appropriate for safety.
13. We suggest the following ideas to feed into the scenario development:
 - (a) that road space allocations for both moving cars and stationary cars (i.e. parking) be distinguished in modelling. We appreciate the observation with respect to constrained corridors (p. 15) that "[p]arking further encroaches on this limited space." We note the following figures from the WCC. Wellington has 957 km of pedestrian paths, 694 km of roads, and 33 km of cycle ways. While we acknowledge multiple modes use roads, these figures do indicate the priorities of space currently given to support different modes of travel - though admittedly not necessarily the quality of these spaces.
 - (b) that, even though the government does not allow for it yet, the effects of congestion charging be understood and modelled.
 - (c) that school traffic be distinguished in modelling.

- (d) that carbon emissions be modelled for each scenario.
- (e) scenarios which include reduced car ownership (and so greater dependency on, say, electric taxis and public transport, occurs)
- (f) that the impact of a light rail along the Golden Mile (from Wellington Railway Station) to Wellington Airport via the hospital in Newtown, be modelled. We suggest this in terms of our understanding that high-quality light rail tends to attract more people to public transport and have greater capacity than bus and so potentially would increase road space available for allocation to a dedicated public transport route, which would increase travel time reliability. We suggest this in the context of the observation that "[i]n the morning peak a bus trip from Courtney Place to Wellington Railway Station can take up to 19 minutes" (p. 17).

The observation that transport contributes to 60% of Wellington City's carbon emissions (p. 19) is a poignant reminder that our short-term future must enable active and sustainable transport decisions. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Let's Get Wellington Moving February 2017 progress report. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully



Christine McCarthy
President, Architectural Centre
arch@architecture.org.nz