

Part 3

ROUTE ANALYSIS: KEY ISSUES

From the detailed route sector descriptions, several key issues emerged as set out below. Some of these have been evident from the outset and have been around for a long time whereas some have become evident through this study.

There are some major development constraints, such as ‘fixing the gap’ on SH2 and access through restricted port areas, whereas other issues are more localised and could be resolved by either specific works as part of the GHW project, or by being taken into account when various routine or other engineering works are carried out along the route (eg. sea wall upgrade and /or replacement, road widening, footpath upgrade or replacement, etc).

There are also some potential statutory constraints, especially in terms of developing the GHW within parts of the Coastal Maritime Area (CMA) and along the natural foreshore.

GHW Route Development Summary

The analysis of the GHW route has identified possible development opportunities for various locations and sections of the route. For each sector a number of opportunities and options have been suggested, some of which could occur along all or part of the sector, or instead at particular locations, or in conjunction with other suggested alternatives. Note: the distances quoted below will therefore, collectively add to more than the total route length.

The extent of physical works required along the GHW route can be summarised as:

- GHW branding, way-finding and interpretation signage would be required along the full 66km length of the route;
- The majority of the existing footpaths (about 32km of the route) are not wide enough for the purpose of the GHW. Therefore widening existing footpaths and assigning them as shared paths is required for approximately half the length of the route. Widening existing paths would either require utilisation of available space on the seaward side of the path (about 13.6km) or reassigning of existing road carriageways or parking areas (up to 18.4 km).
- Construction of new or modification of existing sea walls is anticipated (along about 17.8km of the route). Such works would have statutory planning implications.
- Up to 30km of new paths or additional alternative paths are also identified.
- Traffic calming measures were identified as a possible measure for 5.5km of the route, and assigning new cycle lanes for 9.2 km.
- Up to 14 km of the route would not require any physical upgrade because there is a suitable path width (eg Eastbourne promenade and parts of the Wellington Waterfront), or because it is better to leave the rugged nature of the coastline undeveloped (eg Burdans gate to Pencarrow and Owhiro Bay to Red Rocks).

Tangata Whenua

Like WCC, HCC, and GWRC, tangata whenua have significant ownership and management interests in the majority of the GHW route. Accordingly, they are significant partners and should be engaged throughout the planning and design of the GHW.

Statutory Planning Options for the GHW

There are the statutory requirements of the GWRC, HCC, WCC, DoC, to be satisfied to ensure that development allows for public access to and along the foreshore. The the only restriction to access to the foreshore is valid only in exceptional circumstances such as in the vicinity of port activities where personal safety is an issue.

GWRC and WCC cycling strategies specifically recognise and provide for the GHW in terms of committing support to the concept of the GHW. HCC also recognises and provides for improving cycling and walking networks but is yet to specifically recognise the GHW. However, these strategies are non-statutory documents and the GHW is yet to have any statutory provision that specifically recognises or provides for its development.

There are two principal reasons for seeking statutory recognition. One is to enable its use and development over time, so reducing the need for an incremental and inconsistent consenting process. The second is to secure the route within policy that has statutory ‘weight’ and so ensures any other activities or proposals are not inconsistent with it. In addition, if political support within Councils shifts it could lead to lesser or a significant reduction in support for the GHW .

In addition, the non-statutory documents are not true public policy documents as they have not been established through a statutory consultation process (as is the case with all of the statutory documents). In this regard, without statutory recognition and provision for the GHW, there will always be an argument that the GWH does not have collective community support (and would therefore be less favourable than preservation of natural character (i.e. no development) or any development/activity that is provided for at a statutory level (e.g. conservation reserves and the railway.)

There are a number of options that could be pursued for securing statutory recognition and provision for the GHW, as summarised in Table 2 .

Table 2: Statutory Planning Options for the GHW

	Option	Comment
1	Submit on each LTCCP to seek recognition of the GHW	Securing recognition of the GHW in a Council's LTCCP is essential for enabling significant and specific funding to be provided by the Councils for the development and implementation of the GHW. Without recognition in a LTCCP, the chances of securing significant funding from Council's for developing the GWH is greatly diminished. However, this option on its own will not achieve the recognition sought for GHW. Submissions have been made on the current LTCCPs.
2	Seek new provisions in the RPS, RCP and District Plans to recognise and provide for the GHW	Securing recognition of the GHW in these planning documents ensures that: the importance and value of the GHW as a significant resource is recognised and provided for in a statutory sense; - any development required for implementing the GHW will generally be encouraged and existing/potential 'red tape' will be lessened; - any activity or development within the GHW route that might be detrimental to the GHW can be discouraged.
3	Amend the HCC and WCC District Plans to create a zoning or overlay specific to the GHW	Creating a specific zone for the GHW takes the statutory recognition identified in option 2 a step further by identifying the anticipated location of the GHW. That is, zoning the GHW puts a statutory line on a map confirming the anticipated GHW route/corridor. An overlay to existing zones is likely to be less complicated and more appropriate compared to creating a new zone because of the consequential changes required to the Plans if a new zone is created.
4	Seek to designate the GHW	Designating a GHW route provides the most 'concrete' option in terms of providing for a GHW. A designation, once approved, overrides any national, regional or district planning document. However, seeking a designation for the GHW may not be very practical given: - the complexities and risks in some GHW body becoming the requiring authority (which becomes responsible for managing and maintaining the resource); - the effort (cost and resources) required to secure a designation, particularly considering the likelihood of key stakeholders opposing a GHW designation because of risks to their own interests (e.g. NZTA, NZ airport, Centre Port, tangata whenua) - that much of the GHW route is already owned and managed by Councils and the Crown, requiring authorities in their own right.
4a	Amend existing designations	It is possible to amend existing designations so that they provide for the GHW. An example would be the railway, motorway, and airport designations, which could be amended to ensure that any future development of the infrastructure will consider the impact on, and provision for, the GHW. This option requires partnership with the existing requiring authorities – who have the right to decline any request to support the GHW (see Option 4 above).
5	Review each reserve management plan along the GHW route and seek provision for the GHW where appropriate. [Note: this could not secure the whole GHW route].	This option enables any potential constraints and opportunities for developing the GHW through a reserve to be explored and addressed, especially where development of structures along the foreshore compromises dune restoration projects that might be key objectives of certain reserve management plans. If this option is not implemented then there is a possibility development of certain aspects of the GHW could be discouraged within certain parts of the many reserves along the GHW route.
6	Seek inclusion of the GHW in any proposed Iwi management plan	Recognition of the GWH in an Iwi Management Plan would formalise tangata whenua support for the GWH and would have a similar effect as securing recognition of the GHW in the RPS (because all regional and district plans need to have regard to iwi management plans).

SH 2 Sector ('The Gap')

The Sectors of the route between Petone and the Wellington Waterfront pose the greatest physical challenges and are the only part of the route where the path is not immediately adjacent to the harbour edge.

The first challenging sector is 'the gap'; or the 4.6km section between Ngauranga Gorge and Petone. The existing shared path, located between the road and railway lines has a 750m 'gap' at the northern end between the Horokiwi turn off and Petone Beach, where the separate path stops and users are forced onto the hard shoulder of SH2, which is both unpleasant and dangerous. At this point the coastal platform between the fault escarpment and the sea is extremely narrow (approximately 35m wide) and currently accommodates the railway line and SH2. Therefore to provide any form of defined and safe cycle and pedestrian path would require significant construction works.

This issue has long been recognised and several potential solutions have been proposed at various times, several of these have involved engineering investigations. In 2006 Transit New Zealand commissioned Opus Consultants to prepare a Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) for the Ngauranga to Petone cycleway¹⁵. Several solutions were proposed in relation to 'fixing the gap', each with varying degrees of complexity and cost.

Transit NZ subsequently requested Opus to undertake further investigation of low cost off road options¹⁵, with particular consideration of the following:

- "Closure of the right turn bay at Horokiwi and whether the need for rail relocation can be avoided, or reduced.
- Review of an acceptable minimum standard for a 2-way off road cycle facility.
- Possible utilisation of some existing carriageway shoulder for 2-way cycle provision with delineation but without crash barrier separation from the carriageway.
- Whether existing northbound lanes could be re-configured, or the shoulder reduced to enable a shift in central median to provide the space required for a 2-way cycleway.
- Whether additional cutting and widening to the north is likely to be a cost effective option."

This additional investigation confirmed Opus' conclusion from the original SAR, that is, "Low cost 2-way off-road alternatives are not possible due to the narrow width of the corridor between Horokiwi and Petone."¹⁶

The Opus report advanced one particular option (Option 5B) that involves a lower cost rail relocation to that advanced in the original SAR and that also utilises additional space created by the closure of the right turn bay at Horokiwi.

¹⁵ Ibid
¹⁶ Page 1, ibid

It is understood that a solution that simply fixes the gap from a cycling and pedestrian perspective will not be possible. Instead, the solution will be something which will be achieved only in the long term as part of a much wider project involving realignment of SH2 and the rail line, and it will be expensive.

The recommendations made as a result of these additional investigations were:

"1. If Transit wishes to proceed with the extension of the Horokiwi to Ngauranga off road cycle path north to Petone we recommend:

(i) Either the construction of Option 1 with an over bridge over the rail line to avoid the need for rail relocation or,

(ii) Option 5B with realignment of the existing double track rail line and closure of the right turn bay into Horokiwi, which provides a more attractive cycle route by avoiding the need for a cycle crossing over the rail corridor.

(iii) That the existing cycleway between Horokiwi and Ngauranga be upgraded to cater for two way commuter cyclists as outlined in the Scheme Assessment Report.

2. Once a preferred option is confirmed further discussions with OnTrack will be needed to discuss design details and constructability issues.

3. Due to the high capital costs associated with the cycleway extension/upgrade and the low benefit/cost ratios, it is suggested that any proposal taken forward needs to consider future transport developments in the vicinity which may influence the cycleway construction or provide some synergy."¹⁷

NZTA released proposals regarding closure of the median and the right turn bay to Horokiwi earlier this year. Horokiwi residents are unhappy with this proposal and a residents group has been established to continue discussions with NZTA. A decision on this has therefore been put on hold until later in the year. The proposal put forward by NZTA for closure of the median and right turn would however not involve any widening; it would be accommodated within the existing seal.¹⁸

In 2008 NZTA commissioned consultants SKM to undertake investigations into a new road network connections between Tawa-Ngaranga- Petone, known as the 'Triangle Study'. It is understood that provisions for walkers and cyclists are included as part of these investigations, however, details from the SKM Triangle Study report will not be available until September 2009¹⁹. Whatever the outcome of these investigations to providing walking and cycling access, it is understood that they will be

¹⁷ Pages 1-2, ibid
¹⁸ Pers comm., Fabian Marsh, NZTA
¹⁹ Pers comm., Gunther Wild, NZTA.

long-term and very costly to implement.

A short term, 'temporary' solution to 'fixing the gap' has been considered by NZTA but it is understood that to implement this it will face significant hurdles given the safety and operational requirements of OnTrack in relation to the railway line and the current upgrade that OnTrack are undertaking²⁰.

²⁰ Pers comm. Mark Edwards, NZTA



Competition for space on the narrow coastal platform



Separate path ends, cyclists and pedestrians need to use hard shoulder of SH2

Hutt Road Sector

The second challenging sector is the Hutt Road between Nauranga Gorge and Thordon Quay. While there is currently an off-road shared path along Hutt Road it is disconnected from the coast (by the motorway and the rail corridor) on going conflict between cyclists and vehicles crossing the shared path to access businesses is an issue²¹. A shared path on the coastal side of the road and rail corridor would provide an off-road alternative for cyclists and access to the coast where there is currently none.

WCC are very conscious of the cycle related safety issues along the commercial activity section of the route with the numerous vehicle crossings present. WCC have carried out some preliminary investigations that involve alternative routes, however all are long-term solutions. These are shown on the map for Sector 31 (Hutt Road).

The Interisland Ferry terminal is also a potential block to establishing a coastal path, yet direct cycle and pedestrian connections to the GHW would be essential. Options to locate a path under the motorway over bridges in this vicinity appear to be feasible, these have been considered and would require further investigation.

Thorndon Quay Sector

The third challenging section; the 1.7km section along Thorndon Quay is also completely disconnected from the coast. This section of the route passes through a busy retail area with a distinct urban character, unrelated to the harbour. While there is a footpath along both sides of the road, there is no off-road option for cyclists who have to use the carriageway. Angle parking is provided along much of this section of the route. For cyclists angle parking is inherently dangerous due to the speed that cars enter parking spaces, together with the restricted visibility for cars reversing from parking spaces. WCC are well aware of the hazards to cyclists that the angle parking on Thorndon Quay presents and have considered options for the route to avoid Thorndon Quay, such as re-routing this sector along Aotea and Waterloo Quays. This is shown on the map for Sector 30 (Thorndon Quay).

While these sectors may be challenging the opportunity to develop a coastal path offers great potential to enhance the harbour edge and provide access to the coast.

²¹ Pers comm. Paul Barker, WCC

Competition for Coastal Space

Wellington's topography and increasingly growing population means that there is increasing demand for limited coastal space. In this regard there are many land use activities and opportunities that potentially constrain development of the GHW; these include:

- Preservation of natural, cultural and historic features through prevention of new development;
- Provision of infrastructure that requires restriction of public access (eg motorway, railway, port);
- Private and commercial development desires to restrict public access.

Within the GHW route there is competition between vehicles, cycles and pedestrians for the limited space along the narrow coastal corridor. To encourage maximum use of the GHW, the level of actual and perceived safety needs to be high, particularly for cyclists, who currently have to use the district's narrow roads.

While it is a shared route for pedestrians and cyclists, a key issue relating to the need for improvements to the GHW relates to creating a cycle friendly environment (ie off-road cycle options).

Encouraging cyclists on to the same path as pedestrians will create new conflicts because of different requirements and travel speeds. This issue has been recently highlighted on New Plymouth's Coastal Walkway, which is also used by cyclists. Despite its generous width, some pedestrians have complained about cyclists who move up quietly behind and surprise them. From local media reports and letters to the editor this has affected the pleasure of some local pedestrians using the walkway. Such issues are not easily overcome, especially in the Wellington context where the width of the coastal platform is limited, in some stretches markedly so.

The GHW also has the potential to improve access to the harbour edge where there is currently none, such as the seaward side or the railway line adjacent to SH2. If implemented this will increase the coastline available for recreational activities.

Road Conditions for Cyclists

Currently for large sections of the route there is no shared path or off-road cycle path. Therefore, cyclists have to either use the hard shoulder, if it exists, or the carriageway where there is no hard shoulder. If cars are parked on the hard shoulder, cyclists are forced to use the carriageway, which is generally narrow. Having to contend with moving traffic as well as parked vehicles, often on relatively narrow roads, reduces the perceived and actual safety for cyclists, particularly for children and unskilled cyclists.

Without a shared path on the coastal side of the road, cycling the GHW in one direction will mean having to cross the road to access the harbour edge. Therefore, the direction of travel along the route will have a significant effect on the overall harbour edge experience of the journey and the safety.

If the GHW is to be a cycle friendly and safe facility (perceived and actual) for a wide range of abilities off-road paths for cyclists are essential.

Road Speed Zones

While the maximum traffic speed along most of the route is 50km, the relatively narrow roads and lack of hard shoulder space increases the feeling of vulnerability for cyclists. This is especially so when being overtaken by buses or other large vehicles. In some places, reduction of the traffic speed would improve the perceived and actual safety for all road users.

The sections of the route where the speed limit is not 50kmph are:

Cobham Drive (70kmph)
Hutt Road (60 and 70kmph)
SH2 (100kmph)
Marine Drive (60 and 70kmph) (Eastern Bays)

Reducing traffic speeds in some locations would increase the safety for cyclists and pedestrians particularly where there is no footpath such as the Eastern Bays in HCC and along the Miramar Peninsula.

Pedestrians and Footpaths

Footpaths exist on the seaward side of the road for much of the route, and for many stretches they are on both sides of the carriageway. It is likely that recreational pedestrians would prefer to use a footpath adjacent to the coastal edge rather than one on the landward side of the road where both the road and the traffic interrupt the enjoyment of the coastal experience. However, in high seas the waves and sea spray in some places make a footpath on the landward side more attractive.

Most of the footpaths along the route are relatively narrow 1.0 - 1.5m and conflicts are likely to arise between cyclists and pedestrians if cyclists choose to use the footpaths rather than the road for safety reasons. Even on designated shared paths, conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians arise; for example, along the promenades – Lambton Harbour waterfront, Oriental Parade.

Features along the route

The route passes through a variety of environments ranging from the wild and remote at both ends of the route, though to the urban centre of Wellington city, as well as commercial and residential areas and marinas. The route essentially circumnavigates the harbour offering a full range of views and perspectives of the harbour environment and skyline.

In addition to the ever-changing views along the route, there are many specific features; some of these can be taken in at a glance, while others warrant a stop or a pause. The route offers many opportunities to highlight and to provide interpretation of these features.

While there are many publications, reports and other documents that record information about features along the GHW route, a study commissioned by the former Wellington Harbour Maritime Planning

Authority in 1988 is particularly relevant in that it focuses on the harbour edge. This report, *Historical and Cultural Resources of the Wellington Maritime Planning Area*²² describes and maps the key pre-European sites around Te Whanganui-a - Tara and the historical and cultural places and sites in the coastal area since European settlement. The report that records and describes these sites and areas is in two parts, one by archaeologist and then lecturer in Maori studies at Victoria University, Dr Peter Adds, and the other by history researcher, Barbara Fill.

While information on a few of the sites needs to be updated and new sites added, given changes including the alteration and relocation of a few of the structures and elements during the past 20 years, the report provides a good starting point to identify sites that could be marked and interpreted along the GHW route.

The Te Ara O Nga Tupuna Hertiage Trail that starts at Pipitea Marae in Thorndon Quay and finishes at Owhiro Bay, identifies numerous sites along the proposed GHW route. The Wellington Tenth Trust in association with WCC have prepared an informative brochure identifying many sites. Interpretation of these sites could be readily incorporated as part of the GHW.

Given that the GHW includes both Wellington City and Hutt City, the way in which features are identified and interpreted needs to be carefully considered to ensure there is a level of consistency and integration along the route. However, this does not mean that this has to be exactly the same throughout; it is something that needs consideration as part of the brand strategy (see *Areas for further investigation*).

Facilities along the route

There are various facilities and destinations along the route that add to or enhance the GHW experience – cafes, wharves, jetties and other potential fishing spots, toilets, boat ramps, as well as bus stops, train stations and harbour ferry stops. These have been recorded as separate GIS layers from datasets obtained from Wellington and Hutt City Councils, and supplemented with details collected through field work. The location of these facilities is shown on the corridor sector maps, identified by an icon and also listed by type or name.

Public Transport

Providing a well integrated, comprehensive public transport system is vital in encouraging more sustainable transportation choices in the region. The decision to continue to allow bikes to be carried on trains for free is positive as it will continue to promote integrated use of the public transport system. However, the success of such a system relies on ensuring public transportation is an attractive option and removing potential barriers which might discourage its use. This necessitates

²² *Historical and Cultural Resources Study of the Wellington maritime Planning Area*, Boffa Miskell Partners for Wellington Harbour Maritime Planning Authority, December 1988.

that public transport be cost-effective, reliable and convenient.

The harbour ferry service is an integral part of the GHW concept and it needs to be widely publicised as such. There is significant scope and potential to develop the ferry service further by including new destinations which would link up with the GHW.

The current system for transporting bicycles on trains lacks reliability and convenience. Current bicycle capacity and storage options are inadequate for current demand and would be under additional pressure should the GHW be progressed. Existing storage systems at train stations is limited and managed in an ad hoc manner. Serious thought needs to be put into how the new and reconditioned trains may be reconfigured to accommodate additional bicycles, otherwise passengers will be discouraged from using the service. The new Matangi trains due to come into service in 2010 do not have a separate luggage compartment, and up to three bikes can be carried within the passenger saloon area which contains flip-up seats. This arrangement is not a significant improvement from the current situation. The potential to transport bicycles on buses also needs to be explored.



Interpretation signage Mt Victoria, Wellington

Branding and Interpretation

For the GHW to become recognised and readily identifiable it will require a distinctive brand. Branding is not simply about getting a logo designed or erecting signs along the route. These elements are likely outcomes of a brand strategy; developing a brand strategy requires preparation of a clear comprehensive brief and engagement of a professional branding and design organisation.

The uptake and long term success of GHW will be as dependant on the brand strategy and the implementation of this as it will be on the physical attributes and qualities of the GHW route itself. “Great brands succeed because they set up and play a key part in telling engaging stories.” The GHW in itself is an engaging story but there are also a myriad of stories to tell all along the GHW route that are for the most part, hidden or untold. GHW provides a tremendous opportunity to tell these stories in a variety of ways and means.

A brand is sometimes referred to as memory that holds value – emotionally, practically and commercially. The GHW brand will need to be able to be successfully adapted for all situations and a variety of media. For the GHW to have its own identity it will require a well crafted brand strategy and widespread collaboration amongst all the stakeholders. Given that the GHW Coalition has already succeeded in getting most of the stakeholders on board, including securing funding to undertake this study, a similar approach could be adopted for developing a brand strategy.

A brand strategy needs to be truly integrated, well conceived and well delivered. A brand strategy will consider the concept of the GHW in its entirety, embracing the philosophy and purpose through all aspects of how it is delivered.

The GHW Coalition should engage professional assistance to help it develop its brand strategy. GHW is an exciting and engaging concept; it would be unwise for the Coalition to immediately focus on developing and adopting a logo or route markers, etc without first developing the brand strategy.

To engage someone to assist with the brand strategy requires spending time and energy on developing a good brief. This report, which draws together a great deal of material and ideas on the GHW would form part of the brief. The name finally adopted for the route, interpretation of natural history and cultural heritage features along the route, and signage are all tied in to the brand strategy and so need to be included in the brief.

GHW Name

Great Harbour Way as a name, is snappy and engaging. While it has been a convenient working title it says little about what the Great Harbour Way is or where it is located.

From our investigations, these two aspects have been key ingredients of successful similar projects in both New Zealand and overseas (eg the Otago Rail Trail, San Francisco Bay Trail, Penine Trail, etc). Consideration

of the name should be an integral part of the brief for the brand strategy. It may transpire that the Great Harbour Way is permanently adopted as name but at this stage it should be included and tested as part of the brand strategy.

Interpretation

There is significant opportunity along the GHW route to enhance natural history and cultural heritage aspects and understanding through interpretation. A great deal is known about the natural, cultural and heritage sites and much of it is documented. The GHW provides an opportunity to tell these stories in an engaging and site specific way.

Collation of natural history and cultural heritage material along the GHW route is a task the Coalition could undertake, working closely with tangata whenua, Museum of City to Sea, Petone Settlers Museum, Te Papa, and local historians and natural history experts.

Signage

Signage along the route is likely to be the most visible element of the GHW and what it is all about. Signage will be required for various aspects – direction, wayfinding, information, and safety. Many routes and tracks suffer from a proliferation of signs; good design can obviate the need for signs in many instances and so care needs to be taken on the number, location, design and content of all signs along the route. Given that the GHW is a shared route the placement and design of signs is important; a cyclists should be able to readily comprehend signs in the same way as a pedestrian moving at much slower pace. Poorly placed signs that create obstructions can create hazards and there are currently numerous examples of this along the route.

Distance markers along routes such as the GHW are often used and these are helpful to many users. Funding has already been provided to WCC to design and install distance markers from Queen Wharf to Seatoun and if distance markers are to be adopted then ideally they should be used along the entire route or at least most of it. The design of such markers can be relatively discreet, such as those used on the Coastal; Walkway in New Plymouth but their design and content needs to be consistent and form part of the overall GHW brand.

An important part of the signage developed for the GHW will be promoting a user code of etiquette; this is particularly important for shared routes where both actual and perceived conflicts exist.

Linkages and Connections

The GHW route itself, as a lineal corridor, will provide a linkage between many of the existing walkways and reserves. The walkways are shown where this information was supplied on the GIS datasets. These are shown on the sector maps. The public transport routes are shown on a separate map (page 72).



Way-finding signage New Plymouth Coastal Walkway



Distance markers can be a discreet component of the way finding and branding signage. Such as this example from the New Plymouth Coastal Walkway

Areas for Further Investigation

Fortunately, the further investigations discussed below do not need to be carried out immediately, nor do they prevent the GHW becoming a reality along some stretches as discussed above. However, certain of these investigations will need to be carried out first before others are tackled.

As a concept GHW should be design-led rather than engineering-led. The GHW concept is about providing a quality experience to users; to showcase Wellington harbour, Whanganui-a-tara, and to reveal its many stories. While the construction and safety of the path, the sea walls, barriers, and traffic engineering aspects, are incredibly important to the success of the project, if GHW is approached primarily as a civil and traffic engineering exercise then the character and quality of the concept and the route will be adversely affected and the overall aim of the GHW concept may not be achieved.

Importantly the development and promotion of the GHW will require widespread public engagement and consultation.

There are several areas where further work and investigation is required, and these are discussed below.

Statutory Planning

While the development of the GHW would benefit if the District Plan provisions specifically recognised and provided for the GHW, the District Plans themselves do not present a significant hurdle to developing the GHW, except where land is designated for alternative uses.

Accordingly, it is considered appropriate that the GHW coalition actively engage with the key stakeholders to:

- Pursue changes to the RPS, RCP, HCC District Plan and the WCC District Plan so that developments required to implement the GHW are encouraged, including an overlay identifying the GHW (as opposed to a new zone)
- Review the various Reserve Management Plans to determine potential issues and the appropriateness of providing for the GHW
- Actively pursue inclusion of the GHW in the LTCCP's to ensure public buy-in and enable funding for the GHW to be provided
- Encourage HCC to ensure their cycling and walking plans specifically recognise and provide for the GHW
- Seek buy-in and partnership from the key stakeholders in cementing statutory recognition and provision for the GHW, including:
 - Opportunities for private land owner agreements regarding any private land or where public access is restricted (i.e. tangata whenua land and the CMA, port areas, Wellington waterfront, and DoC in conservation reserves)
 - Tangata whenua, in terms of iwi and reserve management plans

- Councils in regard to reserve management plans and the CMA
- NZTA in terms of the motorway designation
- OnTrack in terms of the railway designation
- CentrePort in terms of the sea port activities
- Wellington Airport in terms of the airport designation
- DoC in terms of the CMA, CMS and various reserve management plans

Formal Involvement and Collaboration Between Stakeholders

The GHW Coalition was formed because the parties could see merit and advantages in working together. This has led to the funding of this study during which there has been mostly excellent cooperation and support from the various agencies and stakeholders. However, to advance the GHW beyond a concept and to implement some of the initial stages it needs formal political and stakeholder support and funding.

A formal governance structure for GHW needs to be established. The scope, membership and details fall outside this study; the Coalition should seek professional advice to develop an effective governance structure.

Given the Prime Minister's and the Government's national cycleway initiative, the timing for advancing the GHW concept is ideal. GHW is a concept that could readily capture public imagination and support and with local body elections in late 2010 GHW could become a major political focus at both regional and district level.

In the interim, following release of this report, the Coalition should focus its efforts on gaining formal political, community and stakeholder support through the establishment of a joint committee and forum. Consideration should be given to this group being chaired by someone independent of the TAs or other main stakeholders.

The Coalition, following the adoption of this report, should formally engage with the Ministries of Economic Development and Tourism to discuss how the GHW would fit into the Governments National Cycleway network.

Design

GHW is pitched to achieve as high a quality design as possible within certain constraints. The success of the GHW concept relies heavily on the intrinsic character and quality of the landscape along and viewable from the route. Part of the assessment undertaken as part of preparing this report has been to describe this character and its attributes overall and sector by sector.

In many places along the route the character and quality has been compromised, with some sectors and stretches of the route where the landscape character is bland and / or of low quality. There are also examples along the route of areas that were once of poor quality but through progressive efforts and funding, landscape quality has been improved, such as at Hikoikoi Reserve.

With a clear understanding and appreciation of the landscape character and quality along the route it provides an ideal platform to advance the GHW concept as a design-led exercise. This does not mean that the entire route has to be designed and detailed at the outset but instead, before any engineering or other works are carried out, the overall route should be subject to a design-led process, based on the principles outlined on Page 7 of this report.

The principles have been developed from the overall vision and objectives of the GHW concept and provide an appropriate framework to advance the GHW to the next stage of investigation, providing there is political and stakeholder support and cooperation.

A systematic approach is required. The approach Hutt City Council adopted for the eastern bays Marine Drive is a good model; it:

- Is design-led;
- Involved the community from the outset and on an ongoing basis;
- Has ongoing funding based on an implementation plan.
- Has been implemented progressively along its length as opposed to dealing only with priority areas.

The appointment of a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) such as that appointed for the management of the redevelopment of Wellington Waterfront has merit; proposals are scrutinized by this group of professionals appointed to assess the appropriateness and details of against the overall design objectives. Appointment of a TAG should be considered as part of establishing a governance structure for the GHW.

Civil Engineering

The coastal platform around much of Wellington Harbour is narrow, significantly so, and this places significant constraints on safely accommodating cyclist and pedestrians along the harbour edge. In places, such as the 'gap' on SH2, engineering issues and potential solutions are of an enormous scale and will require huge costs to solve satisfactorily. However, in other places the solutions are much more site specific and achievable.

The analysis of the Sectors has identified specific parts of the route where further engineering investigations are required. These investigations, should initially identify the scope and magnitude of the constraining issues for the GHW path and the works required to address these.

Wellington and Hutt City Councils and other agencies along the GHW carry out various engineering and traffic works as part of the regular functions and delivery of services – replacement of sea walls installation and repair of footpaths, parking areas fences, bollards, lightings, signs, litter bins and other street furniture. All of these have a bearing on GHW and how it is perceived.

Consequently, if the GHW is to become a reality it will not just be the works that are carried out specifically as part of GHW that have to be considered but these regular day to day upgrading or maintenance works as well. Failure to do this will compromise or possibly undermine the GHW concept. That is why it is critical that GHW as a concept needs some form(s) of statutory recognition; without this, it is likely to remain only as a great concept.

Brand Strategy

The GHW Coalition should avoid falling into the trap of developing one off, ad hoc solutions to specific issues surrounding the GHW concept. To do so will confuse and dilute the concept and despite the best intentions, it is also likely to result in a fragmented and uncoordinated result. The proposed design and location of markers around the waterfront being advanced by Wellington City Council, as a result of a generous donation by a Wellington businessman who wants to see distance markers installed every 500m from Queens Wharf to Seatoun Wharf, is an example of something being implemented in isolation and before a strong brand and identity has been developed.

While this initiative has merit and fits very comfortably with the GHW concept, to embark on designing a marker in the absence of a carefully crafted brand strategy would be a mistake. The markers should be installed by the Council as independent distance markers but at this early stage it would be unwise to directly associate these with the GHW by way of a logo or brand. This aspect could be added later.

First the Coalition should develop a brief and engage a professional consultant to develop a brand strategy. This will provide a sound framework for all aspects of GHW.

Traffic, Roading and Parking

Given that a substantial part of the GHW route will be accommodated on the existing road reserve, and shared by cyclists and pedestrians, traffic movement, speeds, and vehicle parking on roadsides need thorough investigation and review. The nature of the topography around the harbour edge results in narrow winding roads, often with little physical separation between vehicles and pedestrians and cyclists and also limited opportunities for passing.

Parking on grass berms along the coastal edge is prevalent, especially along the south coast in Wellington City. Often it is not just vehicles parked on the coastal edge and thereby forcing both pedestrians and cyclist on to the carriageway, but also boats and trailers. In addition where there is no hard shoulder, parking on footpaths is quite common. While the limited space on individual residential properties along many parts of the GHW route makes it understandable why people park on the harbour edge, parking there creates a significant obstacle in places to the GHW.

Both Wellington City and Hutt City Council staff are well aware of the situation and the issues, constraints and solutions in their respective areas but there would be benefits in greater collaboration and consistency. Jointly, as a first step, both Councils should fund a study that investigates and records the nature of what is occurring in relation to traffic volumes and movement, traffic speeds and parking along the GHW route.

Land Tenure

While most of the land that GHW traverses is road reserve, there are places where there are other forms of land tenure. The GIS datasets and other details shown on the maps in this report have been overlaid on aerial photographs for ease of understanding and interpretation. However, in the next stage of planning and design of the GHW more detailed investigation and analysis of cadastral boundaries and services are required.

Public Consultation and Involvement

If GHW is to capture public imagination and support then there needs to be a process and a strategy to ensure that this happens. Residents groups can be particularly influential or obstructive, no more particularly so when it comes to the coast in relation to its use, facilities and views. For many residents who live on the coastal edge there will be resistance to any change; this has been evident on many occasions when particular projects have been suggested or planned. Changes proposed to the status quo and new proposals often have a tendency to polarise individuals and communities.. The GHW concept will be no exception and high levels of opposition can be expected along some sections of the route.

The contacts made with many stakeholders in the preparation of this report have generated interest and its completion and release will create further interest. The Coalition should develop a communications strategy and a programme to avoid ad hoc and uncoordinated messages being released to the media. The Coalition also needs to establish who are the media contact points. Misreporting, conflicting messages, and poor timing of release of information and details could adversely affect the project and unduly affect public response.

Staging

Given its scale and the number of stakeholders involved, the GHW will need to be developed in stages. In doing so GHW still needs to be planned and designed as an overall entity and to do so will require widespread cooperation, collaboration, commitment and long-term funding.

Obviously, the easy bits should be tackled first and in some places not a great deal of work will need to be done. On the ground for some sectors of the route, a definitive GHW brand by way of markers, directional and interpretative signage will be virtually all that is required. Introducing these to the route along these sectors, especially if they have a strong and distinctive design, will create strong and lasting impressions and elevate what is currently a cycle and pedestrian route to something, a 'place', with its own identity. However, even to do this much is likely to require considerable coordination and commitment.

The GHW Coalition has a pivotal role to play in advancing the GHW to the next stage but formal commitment and involvement of at least Wellington City and Hutt City will be necessary. A formal governance structure first needs to be established and ideally a 'GHW hub' in both Wellington City and Hutt City should be set up to help reinforce the cooperation and collaboration.

Early and clear consultation with the coastal communities will be essential; this needs to be undertaken as part of developing a brand strategy and a communication strategy.

Stage 1: Two GHW Hubs

In both cities there are logical places where these two hubs could be located – Lambton Harbour in association with Wellington Waterfront ,and the Petone Esplanade in Hutt City. Both are well-used promenades and neither would require significant amounts of work to introduce and formalise the GHW concept.

In Wellington City, the first stage of the GHW could be achieved from Lambton Harbour around the Miramar Peninsula to Seatoun Wharf (approximately 16km). Already most of the route comprises shared path or cycle lanes - from Lambton Harbour to Miramar Wharf. In Hutt City, the first stage of the GHW could be achieved from Petone Esplanade to Days Bay (approximately 10km). For both of these stages the harbour ferry service could play a key role (see page 72).

In addition, the 'Wild Coast' sectors, Owhiro Bay to Red Rocks and Burdan's Gate to Pencarrow Head could also be included in this first stage given that no physical upgrade is required - simply way-finding and interpretation signage.

However, before embarking on developing and formalising these first two sections of the proposed first stage, there is merit in undertaking further planning and design investigations for the overall concept and route. In doing so, it will help tease out situations and issues that are likely to affect the proposed first stage.

Having completed field work along the proposed GHW route, together with reviewing background reports and material, and after meetings and discussions with stakeholders, it has highlighted several areas where further work and investigations are required. Many of these will require specialist expertise and some will be costly to undertake. However, they are essential if the GHW is to become a reality.

Staging: Two GHW 'Hubs'



Recommendations

Several of the recommendations could be carried out simultaneously; however there are some that are a priority and need to occur before others.

The list below indicates the general order of priority:

- Continue to engage with tangata whenua
- Continue to engage with communities on detailed staging
- Establish governance structure
- Prepare brand strategy
- Prepare communications strategy
- Continue to engage with Ministry of Tourism Advisory Group re the New Zealand Cycleway Project
- Investigate options for securing route through statutory planning mechanisms
- Continue to formally engage with WCC, Wellington Waterfront, and HCC to implement Stage 1.
- Collaborate with other agencies for further engineering and other investigations (land tenure, traffic, roading, parking)
- Collate material for interpretation along GHW route