

Report 2016.81
Date 23 March 2016
File CCAB-8-468

Committee Council
Author Natasha Hayes

Variation to the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2015: SH2 Carterton to Masterton Safety Improvements

1. Purpose

To seek Council's approval for the proposed variation of the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 described in this report.

2. Consideration by Committee

The matters raised in this report were considered by the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) at its meeting on 22 March 2016 (Report 2016.34 refers). The recommendations contained in this report have been endorsed by the RTC, for the Council's consideration and decision.

3. Background

3.1 The Regional Land Transport Programme

The current Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 (RLTP) was prepared by the RTC, and subsequently approved by Council 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).

4. 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 activity the subject of this report.

Section 18D of the Act states that if a good reason exists to do so, the RTC may prepare a variation to its RLTP during the six years to which it applies. This can be at the request of an Approved Organisation or the NZTA, or on the RTC's own motion.

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

Once the RTC has considered and endorsed the variation, it is then forwarded to Greater Wellington Regional Council for approval. As is the case with the programme itself, Council must either accept the recommendation or it can refer the variation back to the RTC once with a request that it be reconsidered.

5. Proposed variation

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

Name of activity: SH2: Carterton to Masterton Safety Improvements

Request by: NZ Transport Agency (Transport Agency)

Description of variation: To add a new, previously unidentified, activity to the six year programme – ‘SH2 Carterton to Masterton Safety Improvements’.

The project proposes a range of safety interventions along SH2 between Carterton and Masterton. These will be fully explored within a single stage detailed business case, and the benefits of actual and predicted DSI (death and serious injuries) savings will be compared with the costs of implementation. A recommended option will be put forward by the Safe Roads Alliance² (the Alliance) for approval by the Transport Agency.

Reason for the variation: The route between Masterton and Carterton has been identified as a contributor project for meeting the Government’s objectives in Safer Journeys and to NZTA’s Safe Roads Programme. (**Attachment 2** provides background crash statistics for the subject route). The route presents a number of ‘quick-wins’ for potential safety improvements which can be completed in the short term through the Safe Roads Alliance work programme. The Alliance is now in a position to progress and accelerate proposals for priority safety investments such as this project and reap the benefits earlier.

A Strategic Case for SH2 from Te Marua to Masterton was developed in August 2015 which concluded that the route would be suitable for investment as part of NZTA’s Minor Safety Programme. The SH2 Te Marua to Masterton Programme Business Case is currently underway and likely to be completed by August 2016. It is expected that this Programme Business Case will recommend efficiency and safety projects for inclusion in the RLTP.

A variation to the RLTP is requested in order to progress the subject activity to the detailed business case phase in parallel to the development of the SH2 programme business case, to allow these safety improvements to proceed as soon as possible.

Estimated total cost: The indicative total cost of this project is \$2.7M. However, this cannot be confirmed until options are assessed through the business case process and a recommended option is approved.

² The Safer Roads Alliance was formed in July 2015 to help deliver a programme of road safety projects outlined in the Safer Journeys, Roads and Roadsides Programme Business Case over 6 years with the aim to reduce deaths and serious injuries on the state highway network.

Proposed timing and cash-flow: The business case is planned for 2015/16 and the physical works for this project are expected to commence in July 2016, with all funding expected to be spent within the 2016/17 financial year.

Funding sources: The project will be nationally funded.

Full details of the proposed variation for inclusion in Figure 50 of the RLTP 2015 are set out in **Attachment 1** to this report.

6. Determination of Significance

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

A record of the key factors considered by RTC in making that 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 \$2.7 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 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 positively supports the Government Policy Statement's strategic priority on road safety through improvements that give effect to Safer Journeys and the implementation of the 'Safe System' approach.
<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	Depending on the preferred option determined through the business case process, the variation has the potential to have a minor impact on a small number of residents along the project corridor. It is not intended that any properties will be directly affected by the proposed activity. In the event that any option impacts on properties, we will consult accordingly with affected residents/property owners.
<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 	No

than \$20M	
<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? 	No
<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? 	Delays due to public consultation at this stage will result in the physical works being delayed, which will expose the public to greater safety risk.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the relative costs and benefits of consultation? 	<p>The works will be undertaken within the existing road corridor and are not intended to directly affect properties.</p> <p>Given the potential safety consequences of delays to the project, the associated costs are considered to significantly outweigh the benefits of public consultation on the variation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has consultation with the community or relevant stakeholders been undertaken already? 	<p>A workshop was held on 2 November 2015 as part of the business case process with representatives from: New Zealand Police, Masterton District Council, Carterton District Council, Road Transport Association New Zealand and the NZ Transport Agency.</p> <p>A public engagement plan will be developed to outline how we intend to provide information and get feedback from the wider public.</p>

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

7. Next Steps

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.

There is no obligation for the NZTA to vary the NLTP by including the new activity. However, it must give written reasons for any decision not to do so.

8. The decision-making process and significance

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.

8.1 Significance of the decision

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 RTC 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 adopted plan.

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.

9. Recommendations

That the Council:

1. *Receives the report.*
2. *Notes the content of the report.*
3. *Agrees to adopt the variation to the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 as set out in **Attachment 1**.*
4. *Agrees to forward the variation to the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 to the NZ Transport Agency, requesting it be included in the National Land Transport Programme.*

Report prepared by:

Natasha Hayes

Senior Transport Planner

Report approved by:

Harriet Shelton

Manager, Regional Transport
Planning

Report approved by:

Luke Troy

General Manager Strategy

Attachment 1: Proposed variation to RLTP 2015: SH2 Carterton to Masterton Safety Improvements

Attachment 2: Background crash statistics and information from NZTA