

January 18, 2018

Let's Get Wellington Moving
PO Box 5084, Thorndon
Wellington 6145

Submitted by email to getwellymoving.co.nz

Submission on Scenarios

This submission is made on behalf of **Save the Basin Campaign Incorporated (STBC)**. The society was incorporated in 2013 and its purpose is to:

- (a) Promote, preserve and protect the historic character of the Basin Reserve area*
- (b) Promote high quality urban design and environmental management of the Basin Reserve area*
- (c) Promote an appropriate role for the Basin Reserve area in the development of a high quality, sustainable transport network, recognising the importance of the Basin to the public transport spine, and the importance of walkability and public transport for the users of the area*
- (d) Do anything necessary or helpful to the above purposes.*

Contact: Tim Jones, Co-convenor
Phone: 027 359 0293
Email: tjonescan@gmail.com

1. Summary

- STBC supports Scenario A.
- It rejects Scenarios B, C and D.
- In supporting Scenario A, STBC also urges that it be accompanied by additional actions such as transport demand management and serious option development and assessment of public transport options such as light rail. This could be called Scenario A+.

2. General

STBC appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the Scenarios. However, it finds the presentation of these scenarios by Let's Get Wellington Moving (LGWM) disappointing as it simply presents NZTA's defeated Ngauranga to Airport strategy in a staged and slightly different format. At the same time, roading/bridge/tunnel proposals around the Basin Reserve are vague and unclear but potentially involve even more bridges and therefore adverse impact on the character of the Basin Reserve. LGWM's table comparing the scenarios, for instance, states under *Built environment and heritage* that there will be an impact on heritage items "due to works at Basin/Mt Vic" for Scenarios B, C and D.

This is especially disappointing as such proposed solutions were resoundingly rejected by both the Board of Inquiry into the Basin Bridge Proposal Decision in August 2014 and the High Court Appeal against the Report and Decision of the Board of Inquiry into the Basin Bridge in August 2015.

3. Support for Scenario A

STBC supports Scenario A because by giving priority to public transport and improving cycle lanes it encourages active transport and a move to public transport. Improved Basin layout will enhance traffic movement around the Basin Reserve, with minimal adverse effect on the Basin Reserve itself. Expert witnesses for STBC during the Board of Inquiry into the Basin Bridge provided ample evidence that this can be done effectively.

We support Scenario A because of the unique values of the Basin Reserve to the heritage and environment of Wellington. These values should not be compromised any further.

Also, as LGWM acknowledges, all indications are that traditional vehicular transport in western urban centres is on the point of undergoing a radical change. Building more 'traditional' roads, on the basis of plans that are essentially decades old, does not make sense.

While STBC's focus is on the Basin Reserve, our support for Scenario A supports other Wellington groups and neighbourhoods that would suffer from the environmental degradation caused by Scenarios B, C and D.

4. Significance of the Basin Reserve

The significance of the Basin Reserve, and its surrounding area, has been conclusively acknowledged. It is a unique environmental and heritage feature, which helps define Wellington and plays an important role in collective memory and current and future recreational activities.

The Final Report and Decision of the Board of Inquiry into the Basin Bridge Proposal thoroughly investigated and analysed the significance of the Basin Reserve and reasons why its unique values should not be compromised, so they will not be repeated in depth here. (The report can be found at: http://old.epa.govt.nz/Resource-management/previous/Basin_Bridge/Final_Report_and_Decision/Pages/default.aspx) A summary of just a few of the Board's decisions highlight the importance of the Basin Reserve and surrounds:

Decision

Para No.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 618 | That the heritage is of local, national and international significance was not disputed by any of the heritage experts |
| 630 | All heritage experts acknowledged that the extent of the heritage area is "considerably larger than the designation area" |
| 648 | All experts agreed that historic heritage values extend beyond the Basin Reserve to its surroundings and its surroundings, specifically for example Kent and Cambridge Tces |

- 812 Significant adverse effects arising from dominance of the new structures in a sensitive heritage setting, permanent loss of historically significant views, and severance.
- 859 Pivotal component within the network of open spaces, Basin Reserve is a cricket ground and open space of international and historic significance which justifies particular consideration of any interventions in and around it.
- 1140 Openness of the existing environment is important.
- 1148 WCC Key Issues Report emphasised the need to protect the Basin Reserve from development and “visual obstruction”.
- 1149 Basin Reserve landscape and surrounding area particularly important and significant element in the Wellington landscape for historical associations, topographical setting and urban setting (followed by why)
- 679 In terms of representativeness and rarity, Basin Reserve is considered by many to NZ’s premier test cricket ground, as well as being internationally unique in allowing spectators the freedom to walk all around boundary fence
- 681 Integrity of form of Basin Reserve is and has been a heritage value appreciated by cricket spectators and other Basin users
- 702-3 Ambience of ground important to spectators and to future of test cricket – current ambience is peaceful, relaxed. View of traffic would negatively impact spectator experience

5. Scenario A, plus additional measures

Scenario A, plus some additional measures, would best meet LGWM’s own stated principles, a number of which are actively ignored or given little consideration or in other Scenarios (e.g. principles 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9).

Similarly, Scenarios B, C and D contradict LGWM’s own objectives, in particular the objectives to enhance the liveability of the central city, reduce dependence on private vehicle travel., and be adaptable to future disruptions and uncertainty.

STBC believes, in particular, that investigation and implementation of traffic demand management, and serious and genuine investigation of light rail, should be added to Scenario A to achieve maximum benefits.

We would want to see details of any light rail proposals before giving formal support but we do not agree with LGWM’s assertion that “the point at which demand would justify mass transit is about 10 years away”. Now is the time to seriously develop and assess an option for such a mode of transport because:

- a) it is widely known that residential densification follows installation of good public transport
- b) to start investigating when the demand is already there shows a lack of strategic thinking
- c) to start investigating after massive investment in roading and post-dwelling intensification does not make sense.
- d) it will take up to and over 10 years to put in place mass transit if you started today on this transport option.

Therefore, we support Scenario A but urge that this be enhanced by additional investigations and actions.

We would like to receive a copy of the engagement report. We would like to receive a printed copy by mail as well as an electronic copy by email (addresses above), please.