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1. Executive Summary

The Government has identified seven roads of national significance that are linked to New Zealand’s economic prosperity. The Peka Peka to North Ōtaki Expressway is one of eight sections of the Wellington Northern Corridor road of national significance. The NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) is charged by the Government to deliver these highway projects as a priority within the next 10 years.

This report provides a summary of the feedback received on the NZTA’s expressway proposal for the section of State Highway 1 (SH1) between Peka Peka and North Ōtaki. It describes the consultation process, the methodology for analysing feedback and the key themes raised in the feedback received.

Following earlier engagements in 2001, 2002 and 2009 the objective of this consultation has been to re-engage with the community and to consult on the form, function and location of interchanges and local road connections.

The six-week consultation took place from 7 February to 18 March 2011 and included sending brochures to over 23,000 postal addresses in the Kāpiti Coast District, two public open days and meetings with key stakeholders, including potentially affected property owners, the Kāpiti Coast District Council (KCDC) and local iwi.

A total of 473 submissions were received and the content of the submissions reflected a number of views and interests ranging from support to opposition to the proposals, and a combination of both.

The feedback from the community on the proposals for the interchanges and local road connections suggests a high level of support for the interchanges to the north and south of Ōtaki. At Te Horo, there is a clear preference for a connection across the expressway around Te Horo Beach Road (Proposal B from the consultation brochure), and a desire to maintain the existing vehicular link to the Mill Road roundabout via Rahui Road.

Other key themes by the community through submissions include environmental effects such as flooding, noise, business viability, and safety, along with some concerns about the design for local access and interchanges being raised.

The NZTA thanks the community for providing feedback which will be carefully considered before moving to the next stage of design. In the coming months the NZTA will advise how the community’s views have helped to determine the scheme concept. There will be further consultation with the community early 2012 on detailed matters such as landscaping, urban design, walking & cycling and mitigation of effects.
2. Consultation Purpose

2.1. Objectives

The primary objective of this consultation on the Peka Peka to North Ōtaki Expressway (the Expressway) is to:

- Gain public feedback on the form, function, and location of interchanges and connections.

The secondary objectives are to:

- Provide balanced and objective information on the intent of the project, the decisions that have already been made and the impending project decisions that key stakeholders and the community can provide input into.
- Gather data to help the project team understand stakeholder aspirations and concerns about connectivity and safety for all road users and pedestrians, and potential concerns about the social and environmental impacts of construction.
- Gather community input to the decisions about interchanges, land purchases and transport linkages that can be influenced by stakeholders.
- Build positive relationships between the NZTA, local stakeholders and the community.

This consultation took place from 7 February to 18 March 2011. It included the mail out of a newsletter informing the public of the consultation phase, a project brochure and two open days. Consultation with iwi, directly affected landowners, and regulatory authorities is ongoing.

Ascertaining the level of support/opposition to the Expressway was covered by the consultation undertaken in 2009 and so is not an objective for this consultation.

2.2. Consultation Activities

This section of the report outlines the activities that have occurred before, during, and after the formal six week consultation period from 7 February to 18 March 2011.

2.2.1. Consultation with Mana Whenua and Tangata Whenua

The desired outcome of consultation with mana whenua and tangata whenua is to build a positive relationship with each of the identified iwi groups and to engage with iwi in a way that is respectful to the cultural beliefs of those iwi groups involved.

Consultation also allows the NZTA to meet its responsibilities under the Resource Management Act (RMA) and to make sure that a response is obtained that is clear and useful in the RMA and wider context, to assist with the preparation of the Assessment of Effects on the Environment (AEE) for the project. The process for consultation with iwi has been documented through the production of the Consultation Strategy for the Peka Peka to North Ōtaki Expressway. Ongoing consultation will be guided by Memorandums of Understanding (under development) between the NZTA and Raukawa/Nga Hapu o Ōtaki and Muaupoko as the project moves into detailed design and construction.

The NZTA as a Crown Agency has a ‘contract’ with iwi, through the Treaty of Waitangi, that is recognised in the RMA. In relation to iwi consultation, the NZTA needs to be able to answer:

1. How has the NZTA recognised and provided for the relationship of tangata whenua and the taonga (land, streams, sea) affected by the Peka Peka to North Ōtaki Expressway.
2. What the kaitiakitanga statement/principles is/are of each iwi and how the NZTA will have particular regard to the principles when determining the Peka Peka to North Ōtaki Expressway route.
3. What the tangata whenua Treaty position is and what (if any) Treaty principles need to be taken into account, when determining the Peka Peka to North Ōtaki Expressway route.

These outcomes are being met through engagement (refer Table 1) with Raukawa/Nga Hapu o Ōtaki/Muaupoko including the development of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the NZTA and Raukawa/Nga Hapu o Ōtaki/Muaupoko.
Table 1: Iwi Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Team Meetings/Workshops/Open Days with Iwi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtaki Maori Racing Club (OMR), NZTA, Opus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial briefing of project with OMR at Trentham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raukawa/Nga Hapu o Ōtaki, NZTA, Opus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial briefing of project with iwi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muaupoko, NZTA, Opus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial briefing of project with iwi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memorandum of Understanding workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raukawa/Nga Hapu o Ōtaki, Opus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 &amp; 23 December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial workshop to facilitate a process to develop MoU with Raukawa and Nga Hapu O Ōtaki.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First MoU workshop with Nga Hapu O Ōtaki to discuss and prepare MoU context and content inputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MoU meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Hapu o Ōtaki, Opus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU update meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MoU workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muaupoko, Opus, NZTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial workshop to develop MoU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation briefing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raukawa/Nga Hapu o Ōtaki, NZTA, Opus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief on consultation material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open day</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raukawa/Nga Hapu o Ōtaki, NZTA, Opus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open day at Raukawa Marae Ōtaki.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation briefing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtaki Maori Racing Club (OMR), NZTA, Opus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief on consultation material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MoU meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Hapu o Ōtaki, Opus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU update meeting with Reuben Waaka.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2. Consultation with Directly Affected Landowners

Directly affected landowners (landowners who may have land purchased or have the access to their properties severed) were contacted by letter in 2009 informing them that their property may be affected. Most directly affected landowners have now had at least one site visit from the NZTA or the directly affected landowner liaison person from the project team. These meetings continue to take place as required.

During the week before the start of the consultation, all directly affected landowners were contacted by mail (refer Appendix B) inviting them to the open days. This was followed up by a phone call within the week before the consultation started.

All directly affected landowners were encouraged to identify themselves as such at the open days and were then directed to the project team member who had the job of liaising with these people.
Arising from changes to the proposals that were prepared by the design team, there were approximately eight newly affected landowners. These landowners received a site visit during the week before the start of consultation to discuss the impact on their properties. If the landowners were unable to be contacted, letters were left on site with full contact details of the project liaison person.

2.2.3. Consultation with Key Stakeholders

Consultation with key stakeholders such as community groups, transport and environmental groups has occurred on an ongoing basis. This includes detailed discussions with emergency services with regard to the effective operation of their roles and functions once the Expressway is constructed.

While Kāpiti Coast District Council, Greater Wellington Regional Council, and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust are key stakeholders, their roles are slightly different from other key stakeholders. These stakeholders have been/are involved in workshopping issues and opportunities, and the assessment of options to identify suitable solutions for consultation.

All key stakeholders (Table 2) received a letter (refer Appendix C) in the week before the start of consultation informing them of the upcoming consultation phase.

Table 2: Key Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Territorial Authorities/Organisations</td>
<td>Greater Wellington Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington Regional Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāpiti Coast District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ōtaki Community Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KiwiRail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Agencies</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry for the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Historic Places Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry groups</td>
<td>Automobile Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāpiti Coast Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Road Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Transport Forum NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington Regional Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Interest Groups</td>
<td>Nature Coast Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Fish and Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>NZ Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Te Horo Rural Fire Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington Free Ambulance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St John’s Ambulance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Fire Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Affected/potentially affected property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep Ōtaki Beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>Te Runanga o Raukawa Inc/Nga Hapu o Ōtaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muaupoko Tribal Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ōtaki Maori Racing Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4. Communication with Regulatory Authorities/Central Government

Several meetings and workshops were held during the scoping phase of the project (initial project design and information gathering phase) with the regulatory authorities and other central government agencies. These meetings were to ensure that firstly the project team captured the key project issues and constraints, and secondly to involve the stakeholders in the option identification and development process.
Table 3: Meetings/Workshops with Regulatory Authorities/Central Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Name</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) Technical Meeting</td>
<td>GWRC, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>Aug 2010</td>
<td>To confirm available flood data and known flood management issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Options Technical Stakeholder Workshop No. 1</td>
<td>KCDC, GWRC, KiwiRail, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>17 Aug 2010</td>
<td>To confirm that the key project issues and local areas of concern had been captured for consideration in further option development and preliminary assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Liaison Meeting – KCDC</td>
<td>KCDC, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>26 Aug 2010</td>
<td>To discuss stormwater design principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Liaison Meeting – KCDC</td>
<td>KCDC, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>1 Sep 2010</td>
<td>To review and discuss the stakeholder workshop outcomes and further option development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Liaison Meeting – KiwiRail</td>
<td>KiwiRail, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>2 Sep 2010</td>
<td>To agree high level design assumptions, and specific opportunities and constraints along the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Historic Places Trust (HPT)</td>
<td>HPT, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>3 Sep 2010</td>
<td>Introduction of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Presentation to Ōtaki Community Board (OCB)</td>
<td>OCB, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>15 Sep 2010</td>
<td>Briefing on Peka Peka to North Ōtaki Expressway project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Liaison Meeting – KCDC</td>
<td>KCDC, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>17 Sep 2010</td>
<td>To provide an update on progress and option development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Stakeholder Workshop No. 2</td>
<td>KCDC, GWRC, KiwiRail, HPT, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>23 Sep 2010</td>
<td>To confirm the outcomes of the screening process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCDC Stakeholder meeting</td>
<td>KCDC, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>6 Oct 2010</td>
<td>To report back and discuss further option development at Te Horo and options at Rahui Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Liaison Meeting – KiwiRail</td>
<td>KiwiRail, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>1 Nov 2010</td>
<td>To discuss the options and opportunities around Ōtaki Railway Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Meeting</td>
<td>KCDC, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>19 Nov 2011</td>
<td>High level officer briefing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation briefing</td>
<td>HPT, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>21 Dec 2010</td>
<td>Briefing before start of consultation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Council briefing</td>
<td>KCDC, NZTA, Opus</td>
<td>4 Feb 2011</td>
<td>Full Council briefing before start of consultation period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.5. Consultation with the Community

The community was consulted with by sending the brochure and holding two open days during the six-week period.
3. Consultation Process

Several methods were used to consult with different groups, individuals and affected parties.

3.1. Project Consultation Database

The project is using a data analysis tool called Darzin to manage the submissions and feedback received during the consultation period and through the current phase of the project. Darzin allows the project team to record and summarise high volumes of public feedback, before feeding that knowledge back into the project. It is also used to record any meeting/contact that takes place across the project as a whole.

All submissions are sorted by submitter location (refer Appendix D) and location of issue(s) being commented on (refer Appendix D).

Darzin uses a ‘classification tree’ to summarise all submissions. The classifications used reflect the project’s specific needs and consultation objectives, and contain a number of headings and subheadings. For example the heading ‘environmental effects’ then has subheadings such as noise, ecology, air quality, and cultural effects. This allows the project team to classify the large amount of information received so that trends and themes can be identified and fed back into the design process.

The information classified from each submission includes the location of where the submitter lived, the project area that the comment relates to and the appropriate heading/subheading classification. This allows the project team to run reports under different categories of the classification tree (e.g. all comments that relate to noise) and to also pick and choose combinations from the tree (e.g. noise by the Te Horo area, by people who live in the Te Horo area).

It is important to note that with Darzin each submission can have multiple classifications depending its content. If a submission only made reference to a preference for the proposal for North Ōtaki A, then there would be one classification. However, if the submission also commented about such things as noise, landscape, and cycling then there would be a classification for each of these issues as well.

The Darzin system lets the project team take a completed submission form and quickly and accurately log where the submitter lives, which area the submitter is commenting on and the issues that have been raised (while also providing an electronic record of the submission for future reference). This allows the project team to identify issues/concerns/opportunities/trends from the submission made and report these to the NZTA and wider project team.

3.2. One-on-One Discussions and Meetings

One-on-one meetings were held with key stakeholders and directly affected landowners. Other one-on-one meetings took place where they were specifically requested and in relation to consultation with the following people and organisations:

- Meetings with directly affected people – those whose land may be purchased or otherwise encumbered.
- Government agencies and other organisations including KiwiRail, Historic Places Trust, emergency services.
- Meetings with Council officers to discuss technical issues.

3.3. Open Days

Two open days were held during the consultation phase:

- 12 February 2001 at the Otaki Town Hall (10am to 4pm).
- 17 February 2011 at the Te Horo Memorial Hall (2pm to 8pm).

The open day format had 12 display boards featuring information on the design process, the options for the interchanges and the process moving forward. Two sets of strip maps showing the entire alignment, interchange options, and an indicative route corridor were also provided for easy reference and discussion with the project team. The photographs below show the Ōtaki open day. The open day material (refer Appendix E) was supported by project team specialists and the NZTA. Each open day had a breakout room where meetings with directly affected landowners could occur in private.
A total of 457 people attended the open days, with 263 at the Ōtaki open day and 194 at the Te Horo open day.

Ōtaki Open Day

3.4. Website, Free-phone Number and Email

A dedicated Peka Peka to North Ōtaki Expressway email address (info@pp2o.co.nz) and free-phone number (0800 7726 4636) have been available during working hours over the consultation period and will continue to operate for the near future. All email queries and phone calls are recorded in Darzin and answered promptly. This will continue to take place as the project progresses through the current phase.

There is also a dedicated project website (www.nzta.govt.nz/pp2opproject).

Summary and detailed information about the history of the project is on the NZTA website including the material on display at the public open days.
3.5. **Brochure**

A 20 page brochure (refer Appendix F) was prepared for the consultation phase. This brochure contained information to support the objectives of the consultation period and included information on the design process, the options for the interchanges, and the process moving forward.

The brochure was distributed on 4 February 2011 to 23,000 addresses across the Kāpiti Coast District. The brochure was also available from the libraries in Paraparaumu and Ōtaki.

3.6. **Feedback Form**

Feedback forms (included with the consultation brochure) were sent to every Kāpiti household seeking their feedback on the form, function, and location of interchanges and connections. Copies of the feedback form were also available on the project website, at the Council offices and libraries.

Information sought on the feedback form included contact details, location of respondent and comments on what the different aspects of the proposals meant to the submitter, plus any general comments and feedback. A copy of the feedback form is attached as Appendix G.

Feedback forms were able to be lodged online, posted, or handed over personally at the open days. The closing date for lodging feedback forms was 18 March 2011. Some submitters chose to send in letters and not use the feedback forms, these were accepted and recorded accordingly.

3.7. **Media Statements**

Media statements were released to announce the consultation timeline, publicise the start of consultation, and remind people of the closing date. Three media statements were issued during December 2010 to March 2011 to Wellington and Kāpiti Coast media. Copies of these media statements were posted on the project website and are attached as Appendix H.
4. Submission Methodology and Analysis

As detailed above, feedback forms were received online, by hand at the open days, via email and by post. Every submission received has been recorded in the project consultation database (Darzin).

From the data collected, issues, concerns, opportunities and preferences have been identified. An analysis of the summary of comments has been undertaken with a set of common submission themes being produced as a result (discussed under summary of submissions below).

In recording and summarising the content of the submissions the following protocols were applied.

4.1. Form of Submissions

Submissions were received in the form of the feedback form, letters and emails. All of these different forms of feedback have been included in the submission analysis and summary contained in this report.

4.2. Anonymous Submissions

Fifteen anonymous submissions were received (names and/or addresses were not stated). These submissions have been recorded in the consultation database and are included in this report’s submission analysis and summary.

4.3. Pro-forma Submissions

Two pro-forma type submissions were received i.e. template submissions which contained exactly the same content, but which were lodged or signed by individual submitters. These submissions were treated and summarised as individual submissions, recorded under the name of the individual submitter.

4.4. Multiple Submissions

In some cases multiple submissions have been received from one individual submitter i.e. different submissions lodged on different dates, but from the same submitter with the same contact details. These submissions were treated and summarised as one submission entry, with each multiple submission detail being added into the initial submission summary entry.

4.5. Late Submissions

Ten submissions were received after the consultation period closed on 18 March 2011. These submissions were summarised in the consultation database and are included in this report.
5. Summary of Submissions

This section provides a summary of the submissions received during the consultation period from 7 February to 18 March 2011. An analysis of the submission comments identified a number of themes which are reported in the following pages. A total of 473 submissions were received and Figure 1 below shows where the people and organisations that made submissions are located.

Figure 1: Location of Submitters

5.1. Te Horo

The consultation material (refer Appendices D and E) presented two options for linking areas either side of the proposed Expressway (east to west) at Te Horo. Proposal A links Te Horo Beach Road to School Road via a vehicle bridge crossing over the existing SH1, railway and Expressway, and includes provision for pedestrians and cyclists. This crossing is to the south of the Red House Cafe at Te Horo. Proposal B is a similar crossing linking Te Horo Beach Road and School Road, but is located to the north of Te Horo Beach Road.

Of the total submissions received for the Te Horo proposals (shown in the left pie chart below), a slight preference for Proposal B (53%) over Proposal A (43%) is shown. However, when looking at submissions from just the local Te Horo community (shown in the right pie chart below) there is a clearer preference for Proposal B (65%) over Proposal A (27%).

Figure 2: Te Horo proposals
Support for Proposal B from the local Te Horo community includes the following common themes:

- Less impact on the Red House Cafe if Proposal B is chosen
- Less impact on the community, St Margaret’s Church and that part of the community on SH1 not being ‘sandwiched’ between two roads
- Proposal B is cheaper.

Importantly, the community appear to recognise that for Proposal B to be constructed, there will need to be works undertaken on the Mangaone Stream, and that this will be a major environmental issue in this area.

The ‘other’ proposals identified in submissions included an overbridge/interchange at or near the southern end of Gear Road.

5.2. South Ōtaki interchange

The consultation material (refer Appendices D and E) presented two options for the interchange at South Ōtaki, located south of the Ōtaki River. Proposal A is a local road crossing over the railway and Expressway towards Ōtaki Gorge Road at approximately the location of the existing Ōtaki Gorge Road railway bridge. Proposal B moves the existing Ōtaki Gorge Road bridge south to provide a crossing that aligns with Ōtaki Gorge Road while having a larger sweep across farmland to enable access. Both options provide for a northbound off ramp and a southbound on ramp to the Expressway.

Of the total submissions received for the South Ōtaki interchange proposals (shown in the left pie chart below), there is large support for Proposal A (87%). A similar level of support for Proposal A (88%) was received from people living in the project area (shown in the right pie chart below).

Figure 3: South Ōtaki interchange proposals
5.3. North Ōtaki interchange

The consultation material (refer Appendices D and E) presented two options for the interchange at North Ōtaki, located north of Ōtaki town. Proposal A provides a southbound off ramp which crosses over the existing SH1 bridge over the Waitohu Stream, and a northbound on ramp that crosses the railway slightly north of the town. Proposal B is located south of the Waitohu Stream with a new road bridge over the Expressway and railway which connects with Waitohu Valley Road.

Of the total submissions received for the North Ōtaki interchange proposals (shown in the left pie chart below), there is large support for Proposal A (80%). A similar level of support for Proposal A (82%) was received from people living in the project area (shown in the right pie chart below).

The ‘other’ options identified in submissions include requests for a full interchange to be constructed to the north of Ōtaki in the Taylor’s Road vicinity, and for an interchange to be incorporated in the Rahui Road area.

Figure 4: North Ōtaki interchange proposals

5.4. Rahui Road

The consultation material (refer Appendices D and E) presented two options for the treatment of Rahui Road. The project team preferred Proposal A for Rahui Road, which is a pedestrian and cycle link over both the railway and Expressway, with vehicle access to Rahui Road along a widened County Road and the North Ōtaki Expressway interchange. Proposal B for Rahui Road is a vehicle bridge over the Expressway and railway line in the location of the existing Rahui Road.

Of the total submissions received on the Rahui Road proposals (shown in the left pie chart below), 46% prefer Proposal A, while of the submissions received from people living in the project area 41% prefer Proposal A (shown in the right pie chart below). Proposal B received 27% preference from all the submissions received and 27% preference from submissions where the submitter lives in project area.

The submissions received for the two proposals at Rahui Road show a deviation from the pattern established at the other interchanges/connections in that there is a large portion of the submissions (27% of all submissions and 32% of submissions where the submitter lives in project area) which identified an alternative option to those shown in the consultation material.

Many submissions, while not supportive of the two proposals presented in the consultation material, have reinforced the importance of this connection across Ōtaki and highlight the importance of maintaining this link.
The ‘other’ options identified in submissions include requests for Rahui Road to pass under the Expressway, with the Expressway at grade (ground level) and Rahui Road tunnelled underneath, or Rahui Road at grade and the Expressway elevated to pass over.

Figure 5: Rahui Road proposals

5.5. Environmental Effects

A number of submissions comment on a range of environmental effects (refer Figure 6). The common themes are summarised below with the various issues within each theme identified, and broken down by the area from which the submitter is located. This is to provide a local context around these issues. Where there is no comment in each section of this report in relation to an area, there were no clear issues able to be identified for the theme. This does not mean that the theme is not an issue for that area merely that the issues are more generic than the specific issues discussed.

Figure 6: Environmental Effects
5.5.1. **Hydraulics**

The issues raised under the hydraulics theme include:

**Te Horo:**
- The effect that Te Horo Proposal B would have on the Mangaone Stream and the importance of dealing with this correctly.

**North Ōtaki:**
- The effect of the Rahui Road proposals on the flooding potential, or lack of flooding potential, in this area.

5.5.2. **Social/Community/Recreation**

The issues raised under the social/community/recreation theme include:

**Te Horo:**
- Proposal A will have adverse effects on the approach to and the ambience of St Margaret's Church and the Red House Cafe as historic sites. Also it would be a shame to have an overbridge so close to this community cafe.

**South Ōtaki:**
- Effects on the rural community from the increased time that emergency services take to reach the area due to the closure of the existing local connections.
- The negative effects of ‘boy racers’ on the community.

**Central Ōtaki and North Ōtaki:**
- Any closure of Rahui Road will split the community in two (Ōtaki village and the plateau area).

5.5.3. **Business Viability**

The issues raised under the business viability theme include:

**South Te Horo and Te Horo:**
- Effects on local business from the removal of passing trade from the Te Horo straights area.
- Consideration of a northbound exit to provide access into Te Horo for passing trade.
- The need for good signage before Te Horo to promote local businesses.
- The negative impact on the Red House Cafe by Proposal A.

**South, Central, and North Ōtaki:**
- Recovery package needed for town promotion and future development.
- Full interchange north and south of Ōtaki so that people can stop and ‘impulse’ shop.
- Good signage to Ōtaki and shops.
- Legible access into the town and shops for passing trade (road layout).

5.5.4. **Noise/Vibration**

The issue raised under the noise/vibration theme in all areas is:
- There is already a lot of road noise from the existing SH1, and the Expressway is going to have a greater impact on this, so mitigation is required.

5.5.5. **Traffic/Transportation/Safety**

The issues raised under the traffic/transportation/safety theme include:

**South Te Horo and Te Horo:**
- There should be closure of local road level rail crossings along the route.
- The impact on access by emergency services from the Expressway.
- Disaster management of the Expressway and surrounding areas i.e. tsunami threat and the ability for people to clear the area fast with the Expressway in place.
South Ōtaki:

- Effect of extended travel time if Old Hautere Road is closed.
- The impact on access by emergency services from the Expressway.
- An increase of 'boy racers' using the existing roads and the impact of this with alterations to local roads creating extra 'race circuits' (i.e. closure of Old Hautere Road or any extra local road connections).
- The level railway crossing at Old Hautere Road should be closed.

Central and North Ōtaki:

- Adequate access to the Ōtaki Maori Racing club on race days.
- Emergency services and any impact on their ability and/or increased time to access the Plateau Area.
- Route security with only one access point to the Plateau Area and what would happen if the bridge was compromised or there was an accident on the bridge.

5.5.6. Landscape/Visual

The issues raised under the landscape/visual theme include:

South Te Horo:

- The effects of any lighting of the road over rail bridge and the impact of light spill from this on a flat rural area.
- The effects on the trees in the Mary Crest area if the alignment were to go through this area.

Te Horo:

- The visual impact and scale of any structure across the Expressway in what is essentially a rural area.
- The effect of lighting on this structure on the surrounding rural area.

Central and North Ōtaki:

- The visual impact of any structure associated with the Rahui Road connection on what is a low density area (lowdispersed population and number/height of buildings).
- The impact of the Expressway on the Pare-o-Matangi Park and mitigation associated with the destruction of this park.

5.6. Design Issues

A number of submissions comment on a range of Expressway design issues. The more common themes are summarised below (refer Figure 7). As with section 6.5 above, where there is no comment in relation to an area in this report, there were no clear issues able to be identified for the theme. Again, this does not mean that the theme is not an issue for that area merely that the issues are more generic than the specific issues discussed.

The spike in the alternative corridor section is from the 145 submissions received as part of the two pro-forma type submissions which raised this as an issue.

Of the subheadings within Figure 7 below, design standards, local access, and interchanges/connections are summarised in further detail. The low number of submissions received for the other subheadings prevented any clear issues within these themes from being established.
5.6.1. **Local Access – All Submissions**

The issues raised under the local access design theme in all submissions, broken down by area (refer Figure 8) include:

South Te Horo:
- Need to have a slip road(s) onto the Expressway from/to local roads.

Te Horo:
- The need for local road access to the north to link in with Old Hautere Road.
- The physical effects on School Road and the properties in School Road (number of properties required for the construction of the proposals) from the options at Te Horo.
- Need to have access onto the Expressway from Te Horo.

South Ōtaki:
- Need to cul-de-sac Old Hautere Road.
- Do not cul-de-sac Old Hautere Road.
- Access to the south linking in with Te Horo.
- Extra travel time and distance if Old Hautere Road became a cul-de-sac.
- Impact of ‘boy racers’ on the community in relation to the treatment of local roads and any increase in the use of the local roads by ‘boy racers’.
- Impact on emergency services by any alteration of the current local roads.
- Reduction in cross expressway connectivity.

Central Ōtaki:
- The treatment of Rahui Road.
- Access to/from the Ōtaki Maori Racing Club on race days.

North Ōtaki:
- The treatment of Taylor’s Road.
- The link into and connections of Rahui Road.
5.6.2. Local Access – Submitter Lives in Location

When the local access design theme is broken down by the submissions received from people living in those areas it is clear that South Ōtaki and specifically Old Hautere Road, remains the location that received the most submissions.

The local access submission themes from those that live in each location (refer Figure 9) include:

Te Horo:
- Need to have access onto the Expressway from/to local roads.

South Ōtaki:
- The closure or retention of Old Hautere Road.
- The impact on the emergency services and their ability, and time taken, to access the area.

Figure 9: Local Access Lives in Location
5.6.3. **Design Standards**

The issues raised under the design standards theme in submissions include:

South Te Horo and Te Horo:
- The gradient of the cross bridges needs to be to an appropriate design.
- Speed limits need to be taken into account when designing any local roads i.e. will the local road be 80km/h or 100km/h speed environment.

Central and North Ōtaki:
- That the design of any County Road upgrade will need to take into account width, gradient and the different types of vehicles that will be using it.
- Bridge design needs to take into account oversize vehicles entering different sites.
- Design of any subways needs to take into account flooding levels.

5.6.4. **Interchange/Connections**

The issues raised under the interchange/connections theme in submissions (refer Figure 10) include:

South Te Horo:
- There is a need to provide an exit off the Expressway heading north.

Te Horo:
- There is no access for the Te Horo community onto or off the Expressway.

South Ōtaki:
- No main themes were apparent.

Central and North Ōtaki:
- The upgrade of County Road is inadequate and will not work.
- Rahui Road should not be closed and this connection between the two parts of the town should be maintained.

Figure 10: Interchanges/Connections by Area
5.7. Property Issues

A number of submissions comment on a range of property issues across the entire Expressway alignment. The most common themes are general impact, physical effects and value. The other themes are access, the purchase process and future land use.

General impact on properties is dominated by two issues:
- Impact on the properties at Te Horo by Proposal A (number of properties required).
- General impact on property from the alignment and environmental effects associated with the Expressway.

Physical effects issues are:
- Impact on the Te Horo community by Proposal A with parts of the community sandwiched between two roads.
- Environmental effects on properties that are next to the Expressway but where land is not required.

The value issue is:
- The impact on the value of properties that will have the Expressway as a neighbour.

5.8. Construction Issues

A number of submissions comment on a range of construction issues. The common themes are timing and staging, cost and commercial viability.

Timing and staging:
- ‘Get on with it please.’

Cost:
- Proposal B is cheaper than Proposal A at Te Horo so build that option.

Commercial viability:
- Can the country afford this Expressway at this point in time?
- Where is the money coming from to construct the Expressway?
- The cost benefit ratio is not sufficient to warrant the Expressway.

5.9. Other Transport Issues

A number of submissions also comment on a range of other transport issues. The common themes are:

- Cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians must have safe links to roads which are easily accessible.
- Keep cyclists and pedestrians separated from the cars, this will increase safety.
- The bridle/cycle/walkway needs to be constructed as part of the Expressway.
- That double tracking and electrification of the rail line should continue to Otaki.
- Cycle/pedestrian link at Rahui Road and the effects of not having this link on the connection with the community.

5.10. Process Issues

A number of submissions comment on a range of process issues. The common themes are:

- Information in the brochure was different from the open day information.
- Why keep consulting?
- If there are changes to the proposal that was consulted on you will need to come back to the community with those changes.
- NZTA need to give the community some certainty around the process that it is taking, especially around property purchase.
5.11. Submissions from Iwi

5.11.1. Ōtaki Maori Racing Club

This submission is included in the earlier analysis and is discussed in more detail below to recognise that the Otaki Maori Racing Club is a key stakeholder for the project.

The Otaki Maori Racing Club state that the Expressway must:

- Maintain east to west connectivity through Rahui Road to Main Street for all vehicles.
- Pedestrians and cyclists must have safe access across and on to current SH1.
- Access into and out of town and the Ōtaki -Maori Racing Club racecourse must be of good quality and without severance from our community.
- Expressway should cross over the top of Rahui Road improving the safety through separation of local and highway traffic.
- Provide connectivity between the local road network and the Expressway.

5.12. Submissions from Key Stakeholders

These submissions are included in the earlier analysis and are discussed in more detail below to recognise that these organisations are also key stakeholders for the project.

5.12.1. New Zealand Historic Places Trust

The New Zealand Historic Places Trust’s (HPT) submission is summarised as:

- Further information is needed in regards to the effects of the proposed new road on the archaeological record.
- The historic heritage values of the Ōtaki Railway Station need to be recognised in the planning process and further consideration is given to options in discussion with HPT.
- The heritage values of the Rahui Milk Treatment Station and social hall need to be further investigated to inform the decision making process.
- The heritage values of Mary Crest, Mirek Smisek Pottery, the Ranui Cottage, and the Red House Cafe need to be investigated to inform the decision making process.
- There is a need to consider all Part 2, Section 6 matters of the Resource Management Act and not to be selective.

Overall, the submission from HPT states a belief that there is insufficient detail to form an opinion as to the relative merits of the proposed options in respect to the effects on historic heritage, and in particular archaeological and built heritage. In order for the HPT to form an opinion more information needs to be provided and, therefore, more in depth survey of archaeological, cultural, and historic features is recommended.

5.12.2. Automobile Association of New Zealand

The Automobile Association (AA) state that they strongly support the construction of this Expressway as soon as practicable. The submission from the AA states:

- They support Proposal B at Te Horo.
- That there are potential shortcomings with both options at South Ōtaki due to the number of roundabouts (difficult for heavy goods vehicle to negotiate), potential safety issues, and land to the north for future on and off ramps.
- They support Proposal A at North Ōtaki.
- They do not support either the preferred proposal of a pedestrian and cycle overbridge or the alternative of a very steep vehicle overbridge at Rahui Road.
- That further work be carried out on the subway option.

Regarding other road users the AA states that ‘we cannot accept that allowing pedestrians, cyclists and horses on the same carriage-way which is carrying heavy volumes of trucks and other motorists travelling at up to 100km per hour is the safest design possible for a brand new highway’. The AA would support the establishment of separate cycle lanes on the existing highway once the Peka Peka to Ōtaki Expressway is completed.

Finally the AA state that ‘we therefore request that for safety reasons this expressway be designated as a motorway so that high speed traffic is separated from slower road users’.
5.12.3. **Heavy Haulage Association**

The Heavy Haulage Association submission states that the Expressway should be designed as the primary overdimension and overweight route through the area. Overall requirements for the Expressway, in order to futureproof this route, must have suitable capability to be able to provide for the transport of overdimension and overweight loads. In basic terms the designs must allow for height clearance up to 6.5m to any overhead structure, unencumbered width clearance of 11.5m, capability on all bridges and culverts for overload capacity (HN-HO-72). Overall the Association has no preference between the proposals presented as long as they were designed to suit these requirements.

5.12.4. **Kāpiti Chamber of Commerce**

The Kāpiti Chamber of Commerce supports the building of the Expressway as soon as possible. Commercial traffic to and from the River Road Clean Tech Centre and adjacent areas should find it simple and quick to get to these areas from the Expressway. That ease and simplicity of access to and from the outlet shops on the current SH1 is very important, and in particular north-south Expressway traffic should not find it off-putting to break their journey at Ōtaki.

5.12.5. **Wellington Employers Chamber of Commerce**

The Wellington Employers Chamber of Commerce submission focuses on the regional importance of the proposed investment rather than the specific route. The Chamber is a strong supporter of the road of national significance between Levin and Wellington Airport. The Chamber believes it is critical that the Peka Peka to Ōtaki Expressway be constructed. The Chamber submission goes on to state that the Expressway will address severe congestion, will futureproof the road for the expected population growth, improve travel times between Wellington and areas to the north, and assist the economic development of the Kāpiti Coast District.

5.12.6. **New Zealand Police Ōtaki**

**Rahui Road**
The Police in Ōtaki submission states that the closure of the Rahui Road railway crossing will have little effect on emergency services response time to the Te Roto Road area. The submission states the Police believe that the changes will enhance emergency service travel to the vast majority of the people living east of the railway line due to the improved ‘ramp’ overbridge and removal of the clash with through (SH1) traffic.

Traffic flow from the Ōtaki Racecourse to points north and south will be better, especially at peak SH1 traffic flow times.

**Old Hautere Road**
The Police submission states that public safety will be enhanced by the closure of the western end of the road. It will no longer be attractive to those who presently like to use it as part of a racing circuit.

**Te Horo**
Police highlight in their submission a belief that the Expressway overbridge and road arrangements will make little difference to response times to properties east of the railway line. They further believe that removing peak traffic from the existing SH1 will improve response times to properties west of the railway line. Tsunami response will be enhanced because evacuee traffic will not need to cross SH1 traffic to get to the Civil Defence/Welfare posts on School Road.

**The Expressway**
The Police have stated that initial concerns about response to incidents on the Expressway have been allayed by emergency services turning sites being included in the design. As a divided carriageway, the Expressway will be far safer than the present SH1 where opposing traffic is only divided by painted lines.

5.12.7. **New Zealand Fire Service Ōtaki**

The main theme of the submission from the New Zealand Fire Service at Ōtaki is that there is limited access for emergency vehicles to get onto the northbound lanes of the Expressway in the area between Peka Peka and Waitohu Valley Road, with the same on the southbound lanes from the Otaki Gorge Road interchange to the north for about six kilometres to whatever access is provided at Ōtaki North.
5.12.8.  **Te Horo Rural Fire Force**

The Te Horo Rural Fire Force submission states that they are called out for immediate assistance in the 'no man’s land' between Peka Peka and North Ītaki as the unit likely to provide a fast response. Their main concern is the extra response time to attend an emergency on the new Expressway between Peka Peka and Ītaki due to there being no access to the Expressway at Te Horo.

5.13. **Submissions from Regulatory Authorities**

5.13.1.  **Kāpiti Coast District Council**

The submission of the Kāpiti Coast District Council (KCDC) advises of their position on a number of aspects of the proposal. A summary of their position on the more significant issues surrounding the proposal follows:

**The need for certainty** – It is essential that the community and property owners are provided with certainty in terms of the Government’s intentions for this part of the road of national significance.

**Local road connection across the Expressway** – KCDC will not accept any outcome where the community is left with a lower level of east-west connectivity across the proposed Expressway than that which currently exists, both in the town and the rural areas. KCDC will not accept any outcome where the ability of the community to have access to essential and other services is compromised, and it will not accept reduced overall resilience for the town or rural areas, as a result of the Expressway development.

**Left-off access to Te Horo** – KCDC supports the idea of a left-off interchange (from the south only) to provide access to the Te Horo businesses, however, the KCDC submission also states that KCDC strongly supports no direct access at Te Horo, as a way of minimising growth pressures.

**Other comments on interchanges and alignment** – Supports Proposal A at the northern end of Ītaki as the formation which pulls access into Ītaki as close as possible to the town.

KCDC supports Proposal A at the southern end of Ītaki as the least intrusive option which takes up as little land as possible.

KCDC supports any modification to the alignment which avoids damage to the very substantial areas of bush and wetlands in the Mary Crest area. The alignment may affect the Te Horo Pa site and investigations and discussions with tangata whenua are underway. KCDC expects that the concerns of tangata whenua on this matter will be addressed.

**The rail station** – KCDC supports the option of moving the rail station slightly on its axis to accommodate a realigned rail line.

**Pare-o-Matangi Park** – The proposed Expressway will destroy Pare-o-Matangi Park, a place which has been the focus of immense community effort by Keep Ītaki Beautiful over a number of years. The NZTA must factor into its overall costs the need to provide an equivalent area of land as close as possible to the vicinity and a level of resourcing sufficient to bring that land to an equivalent quality.

**Design quality** – At this stage detailed design has not yet been completed. KCDC has a high expectation that the next phase of detailed design work on the Expressway itself will be at a best practice level, particularly in terms of how design and landscaping can mitigate visual, noise and air quality impacts.

**Current State Highway 1** – As yet there has been no explicit discussion with the NZTA on what will happen with the old state highway. KCDC believe that its current formation (SH1) is inappropriate as a local arterial and the need to design it down will place an unacceptable burden on the local community.

**Economic impacts** – The question of economic impacts on the town is a serious one. The issue is not just one of protecting affected businesses; it is an issue of local employment for a town which has a high level of vulnerable and less well off households. KCDC welcomes the fact that the NZTA is taking the issue of the economic impacts of the Expressway seriously and that it is considering early investment in mitigation by providing funding for marketing and managing impacts. This is innovative.
Cost – KCDC is concerned that there is an explicit and transparent discussion of cost, and any trade-offs between cost and design are able to be discussed in an open way.

5.13.2. Ōtaki Community Board

The submission of the Ōtaki Community Board (OCB) advises of their position on a number of aspects of the proposal. A summary of their position on the more significant issues surrounding the proposal is provided as follows:

Process – OCB continues to have concerns that there is a lack of clarity about what aspects of the proposed Expressway are open to consideration and potential change through the consultation process.

Local road connection across the Expressway – OCB is satisfied with the general approach to access on and off the Expressway, particularly given its concerns about growth impacts, but fails to see how the loss of connectivity across the Expressway can be justified. OCB feels that insufficient information has been provided about the Rahui Road crossing point for it to make a clear judgement on this matter at this stage, although it is absolutely opposed to the overall loss of connectivity. OCB has stated that the same issue of loss of local connectivity exists at Old Hautere Road where NZTA’s proposal is to close the road. The OCB is unclear as to the NZTA’s rationale. Closure of Old Hautere Road creates problems for emergency vehicle access into this area. OCB believe that the overriding question is why the level of cross-expressway connectivity is being reduced in these areas. OCB can see no justification for doing so.

Left-off access to Te Horo – OCB supports the idea of a left-off interchange (from the south only) to provide access to the Te Horo businesses.

Other comments on interchanges and alignment – OCB supports Proposal A at the northern end of Ōtaki as the formation which pulls access into Ōtaki as close as possible to the town.

OCB supports Proposal A at the southern end of Ōtaki as the least intrusive option which takes up as little land as possible.

OCB supports Proposal B at Te Horo as the option which is less intrusive on the settlement.

OCB supports any modification to the alignment which avoids damage to the very substantial areas of bush and wetlands in the Mary Crest area. The alignment may affect the Te Horo Pa site and investigations and discussions with tangata whenua are underway. OCB expects that the concerns of tangata whenua on this matter will be addressed.

The rail station – OCB supports the option of moving the rail station slightly on its axis to accommodate a realigned rail line.

Pare-o-Matangi Park – The proposed Expressway will destroy Pare-o-Matangi Park, a place which has been the focus of immense community effort by Keep Ōtaki Beautiful over a number of years. The NZTA must factor into its overall costs the need to provide an equivalent area of land as close as possible to the vicinity and a level of resourcing sufficient to bring that land to an equivalent quality.

Design quality – At this stage detailed design has not yet been completed. OCB has a high expectation that the next phase of detailed design work on the Expressway itself will be at a best practice level, particularly in terms of how design and landscaping can mitigate visual, noise and air quality impacts.

Economic impacts – The question of economic impacts on the town is a serious one. The issue is not just one of protecting affected businesses; it is an issue of local employment for a town which has a high level of vulnerable and less well off households. OCB welcomes the fact that the NZTA is taking the issue of the economic impacts of the Expressway seriously and that it is considering early investment in mitigation by providing funding for marketing and managing impacts.

Cost – OCB is concerned that there is an explicit and transparent discussion of cost, and any trade-offs between cost and design are able to be discussed in an open way.
5.14. Submissions from Interested Parties

5.14.1. Keep Ōtaki Beautiful

Keep Ōtaki Beautiful (KOB) have stated that over the past decade they have developed the park known as the Pare-o-Matangi Park and that this has been achieved with voluntary labour. KOB have planted approximately 500 trees, 900 shrubs and 600 grasses and this will be destroyed by the proposed expressway. KOB have stated that they ‘do not wish to stand in the way’ of the NZTA, they merely seek compensation in the form of land for development of a similar reserve for the people of Ōtaki.

5.14.2. Te Horo Road Action Committee (THRAC) and County and Rahui Roads Group (CRRG)

The submissions entered by Peter Curling on behalf of THRAC (and the 231 signatory/submitters to the 2009 consultation), and also on behalf of CRRG (and the 23 signatory/submitters to the 2009 consultation) are summarised as follows.

THRAC and CRRG have stated that in the consultation brochure:
- There is no reference to any investigation of or proposals for disaster separation.
- There is a lack of clarity and specific detail relative to the alternatives being contemplated.
- Display materials at the consultation open day varied from those included in the consultation brochure.
- The consultation brochure made no reference to any minimisation or mitigation of the immense level of disruption which will occur during construction.
- That by virtue of the failings in the current consultation, residents have been confused and unclear with respect to the possible alternatives, none of which may necessarily be adopted anyway.
- That this has served as a discouragement to many residents to enter submissions as they do not sufficiently understand the possibilities and what they are, to be able to comment on.

Regarding the options at Te Horo, South Ōtaki, North Ōtaki, and Rahui Road THRAC and CRRG have stated, for a number of reasons, that the options ‘are accordingly opposed and rejected as unsuitable and unacceptable relative to alternatives available’.

THRAC and CRRG have also commented on the process that the NZTA have followed over the past 10 years of the development of the Expressway and have challenged the legality of this process.

5.14.3. Te Horo Business Group

The Te Horo Business Group state that they are located on the Te Horo straights and employ at peak between 70 and 80 people as full time, part time and casual employees. Customers for these businesses come from three main sources, locals (Te Horo area), wider Kapiti residents, and casuals (passing travellers). The Group have major concerns about the effect on their businesses from the removal of passing trade. A northbound exit/slip road north of Peka Peka for access to Te Horo is desired and failure to provide adequate convenience for travellers to exit the Expressway and access Te Horo before passing the businesses on the Expressway will mean a significant loss of current trade, as well as loss of future business opportunities.
6. Next Steps

6.1. Confirm proposals

The priority for the project team will be to complete the assessment of community feedback and finalise proposals. Once this has been completed, we will report back to the community on how their submissions have assisted NZTA to refine their proposals.

6.2. NZTA Board approval

The next stage for the project is to seek approval from the NZTA Board for the Scheme Concept. The project team will prepare a Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) with details of the alignment, location of interchanges and details of local connecting roads. Part of this process will include a Safety Audit and peer review of the proposed design to ensure compliance with design standards.

At the same time, the team will also request approval to prepare an application to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for resource consents and to designate the route for expressway purposes.

6.3. Further community engagement

Once formal approval from the Board has been gained, the project team will develop the scheme design further by considering aspects such as urban design features, landscaping, stormwater design and mitigation of noise and visual effects. There will be further community engagement on these details in early 2012 and before the final application to the EPA is made.

6.4. Ongoing communication and information

The NZTA will ensure that as information about the project is developed, it will be made available to the public in the form of project updates (newsletters) and updates to the project websites. The NZTA also intend to open an Information Centre in Otaki late 2011 to provide this information conveniently for the community.