

Report 15.577
Date 30 November 2015
File TP/01/18/17

Committee Regional Transport Committee
Author Mark Edwards, Senior Transport Planner

Proposed variation to the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2015: Sealing and widening Hutt River Trail

1. Purpose

To seek the Regional Transport Committee's (the Committee) support for a proposed variation of the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 (RLTP) to include the new activity 'Sealing and widening Hutt River Trail' at the request of Upper Hutt City Council. This involves the section of the Hutt River Trail from Silverstream through to Te Marua (Beachwood Lane).

2. Background

2.1 The Regional Land Transport Programme

The current Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 (RLTP) was prepared by the Committee, and subsequently approved by Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) in April 2015.

The RLTP contains all the land transport activities proposed to be undertaken throughout the region over 6 financial years, and the regional priority of significant activities (costing >\$5m).

The activities in the RLTP are submitted by the NZTA and 'Approved Organisations' (including the eight territorial authorities and GWRC).

3. Process for considering a variation

The Land Transport Management Act 2003 (the Act)¹ includes provision for changes to some types of activities without the need for a variation to the RLTP. However, this provision does not apply to the proposed new or amended activity subject of this report.

Section 18D of the Act states that if a good reason exists to do so, the Committee may prepare a variation to its RLTP during the six years to which it

¹ As amended by the Land Transport Management Amendment Act 2013.

applies. This can be at the request of an Approved Organisation or the NZTA, or on the Committee's own motion.

Section 18D(4) of the Act requires the Committee to consider any variation request promptly.

Section 18D(5) of the Act notes that consultation is not required for any variation that is not significant or that arises from the declaration or revocation of a state highway.

4. Proposed variation

The details of the proposed variation to be considered by the Committee at this meeting are set out in the table below:

Name of activity:

'Sealing and widening Hutt River Trail'

This involves the section of the Hutt River Trail from Silverstream in the south through to Te Marua (Beachwood Lane) in the north as highlighted on the map below.



Request by:

Upper Hutt City Council

Description of variation:

The proposed variation is to commence construction of the 'Sealing and widening Hutt River Trail' project. This is expected to commence in March 2016 (year one of the RLTP programme) and is required to be completed by 30 June 2018 (year three of the RLTP programme).

Reason for the variation:

The subject activity was originally identified as a recreational project in the Upper Hutt City Council Long Term Plan (LTP) at the time the RLTP was

finalised. Funding was included in that LTP to allow the project to be completed over a ten year period.

However the commuter benefits of the route have since been identified and it has been included as a project for the New Zealand Government's Urban Cycleway Programme and has received funding from the Urban Cycleway Fund.

As a result Upper Hutt City Council is in a position to commence construction within the current financial year, and to complete the work within the next three financial years.

Details of the subject activity:

The project is to upgrade and widen sub-standard portions of the Hutt River Trail between Silverstream and Te Marua and then seal the full length in order to create an arterial commuter cycle route.

Estimated total cost:

The estimated total cost of the project is \$1,453,900.

Proposed timing and cash-flow:

The subject activity is expected to commence in March 2016 and is required to be completed by 30 June 2018.

The estimated total cost of the project is \$1,453,900. This total expenditure is across three financial and RLTP programme years as follows:

- \$355,165 of the construction funding is proposed to be spent in 2015/16 of the programme
- \$395,316 in year 2016/17
- \$703,419 in year 2017/18

The Agency has continued to support this project through its development over a number of years and that it is being delivered under a package of cycling improvements that was endorsed by the Agency in 2014.

The proposed variation will have no material effect on the balance of the overall RLTP programme.

Funding sources:

The project is proposed to be funded through the National Land Transport Fund (as part of the National Land Transport Programme) and Council local share. This project was included in the Upper Hutt City Council's LTP and was adopted as part of that plan along with the related budget commitments.

In addition the project has been included in the national Urban Cycleway Programme and is part funded over the three years (\$540,000) from the national Urban Cycleway Fund.

Full details of the proposed variation for inclusion in Figure 50 of the RLTP 2015 are set out in **Appendix A** to this report.

5. Determination of Significance

The significance policy for proposed variations to the RLTP is set out in Appendix B (page 191) of the RLTP 2015. Officers have assessed the significance of the proposed variation, for the purpose of consultation, against the RLTP significance policy.

A record of the key factors considered by officers in making a determination of significance is provided in the tables below:

1) Key considerations in determining significance – Would the proposed variation:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materially change the balance of strategic investment? 	No	The proposed cost variation of \$1.5 million associated with this activity is not considered to materially change the overall balance of strategic investment in the context of the \$1.3 billion programme cost.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negatively impact on the contribution to Government or GPS objectives and priorities? 	No	The proposed variation relates to a project that will make a positive contribution towards the Government Policy Statement objectives through the construction of improvements that will have a significant contribution to road safety and efficiency.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affect residents? (moderate impact on large number of residents or major impact on a small number of residents considered to be of more significance than those of minor impact) 	No	The variation would have a relatively minor impact on a small number of residents close to the project boundaries. No properties are directly affected by the proposed activity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affect the integrity of the RLTP, including its overall affordability? 	No	The proposed variation is not expected to affect the integrity of the RLTP or its overall affordability.

2) Several types of variations are considered to be generally not significant in their own right. Is the proposed variation:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An activity in the urgent interests of public safety? 	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A small scope change costing less than 10% of estimated total cost, or less than \$20M 	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement of a project within a group of generic projects by another project? 	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A change of the duration or priority of an activity in the programme which does not substantially alter the balance of the magnitude and timing of activities in the programme? 	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The addition of an activity previously consulted on in accordance with sections 18 and 18A of the Act and which comply with section 20 of the Act? 	No
<p><i>Note: A variation that is assessed as meeting any one of these criteria will generally not be considered significant, however the key considerations in the first table should still be assessed.</i></p>	

3) Other considerations –	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the likely impacts time delays or cost on public safety, economic social, environmental wellbeing as a consequence of undertaking consultation? 	<i>A condition for funding from the Urban Cycleway Fund requires the project to be completed by 30 June 2018. Delays due to any further consultation may put that funding at risk.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the relative costs and benefits of consultation? 	<i>The project formed part of Council's Long Term Plan Consultation process so has had adequate local consultation as part of that process.</i>

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To what extent has consultation with the community or relevant stakeholders been undertaken already? | <p><i>The project was included in the consultation carried out by Upper Hutt City Council for the Long Term Plan 2015-2025 and was adopted as part of that plan.</i></p> |
|--|--|

<p>Conclusion: The variation is therefore not considered to be significant for the purpose of requiring consultation.</p>

6. Next Steps

If the Committee agrees to the variation request, it will then be forwarded to GWRC for approval at its Council meeting on 9 December 2015. As is the case with the RLTP itself, GWRC must either accept the recommendation or refer the variation back to the Committee, with a request that it be reconsidered.

Once the variation has been approved by GWRC, the variation is then forwarded to the NZTA for consideration of inclusion in the NLTP for funding.

7. The decision-making process

The matter requiring decision in this report has been considered by officers against the requirements of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002. Part 6 sets out the obligations of local authorities in relation to the making of decisions.

The matters for decision in this report are subject to the legislative requirements of the Land Transport Management Act 2003. Section 18D(5) of the Land Transport Management Act 2003 requires the Committee to determine if a proposed variation to the RLTP is significant, in accordance with its significance policy adopted under 106(2) of the Land Transport Management Act 2003 and included in the programme.

An assessment of the variation against the RLTP significance policy is set out in section 5 of this report and concludes the matter does not trigger the requirement to carry out consultation.

7.1 Engagement

Engagement on this matter is not considered necessary.

8. Recommendations

That the Committee:

1. *Receives the report.*
2. *Notes the content of the report.*
3. *Agrees to recommend to Greater Wellington Regional Council that the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 be varied to include the proposed activities in Appendix A of this report.*

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

Mark Edwards

Senior Transport Planner

Luke Troy

General Manager Strategy

Attachment One: Appendix A – Proposed variation to the RLTP

