INTRODUCTION TO SUBMISSION

1 Introduction

1.1 This submission on the Land Transport Management Amendment Bill (the Bill) represents the views of the Waikato Regional Council (WRC). The submission has been formally endorsed by WRC at their full Council meeting on the 25 October 2012.

1.2 The WRC supports the Government’s overall intention to review the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA) with the purpose of simplifying the planning and funding framework and is appreciative of the opportunity to provide feedback on the Bill. However, the WRC differs in its view on the way in which a number of the LTMA provisions should be amended to meet the Bill's purpose. In particular, the WRC is very concerned at implications arising from the Bill that may result in the weakening of long-term strategic planning and integrated planning across the land use and transport interface.

1.3 The WRC supports the detailed submission prepared by the Waikato Regional Transport Committee on the Bill and reinforces the Committee’s key concerns and submission points, as outlined in this submission.

1.4 This submission is structured into two main parts. Part 1 provides an introduction to the WRC's main concerns with the Bill in the context of what the region is aiming to achieve for its integrated land use and transport system over the next 30 years. Part 2 then examines each submission point in more detail, providing discussion around key amendments to the transport planning framework and public transport provisions of the Bill, and the rationale for requested wording changes to better meet the aims of the Bill's purpose. A summary of key submission requests for ease of reference is provided at the end of this submission.

1.5 The WRC wishes to be heard before the Transport and Industrial Relations Select Committee to present this submission.

1.6 Our contact details are:

Councillor Peter Buckley
Chairman Waikato Regional Council
Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240
Ph 07 859 0999
Fax 07 859 0998
PART 1: THE IMPACT OF THE LTMA BILL ON INTEGRATED TRANSPORT PLANNING & TRANSPORT OBJECTIVES FOR THE WAIKATO REGION

2 Key changes to the LTMA

2.1 The main changes to the Land Transport Management Act (LTMA) proposed in the Land Transport Management Amendment Bill (the Bill) include:

- a focus on the effectiveness and efficiency of public expenditure, reflected in a new purpose and streamlined decision-making criteria that will emphasise effectiveness, efficiency, and safety;
- consolidation of the regional land transport strategy and regional land transport programme into a new transport planning document to be known as the regional land transport plan;
- a single government policy statement on land transport;
- the removal of non-voting members from regional transport committees (the economic development, safety and personal security, public health, access and mobility, environmental sustainability and cultural interests representatives);
- enabling the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to borrow to fund future land transport projects;
- repeal of the regional fuel tax provisions;
- a simplified process for approving road tolling schemes;
- the establishment of a new policy framework for planning and contracting public transport, known as the public transport operating model (PTOM); and
- repeal of the Public Transport Management Act 2008, carrying over its provisions as modified by the Bill.

2.2 Some of these amendments are likely to have implications for regional transport governance, planning and funding and in the view of the WRC, will impact on the ability of Council to meet the region's longer-term transport objectives. Most concerning as a consequence of the Bill's amendments, is the apparent weakening of long-term strategic integrated land use and transport planning, which has been a key policy focus for WRC. It is therefore important to provide the context for the WRC's submission on the Bill by outlining what the Waikato region has been working towards with respect to an integrated regional land transport system.

3 What the Waikato region is trying to achieve for its land transport system

3.1 The Waikato region is part of the "golden triangle", the fastest growing area of New Zealand comprising the Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty regions. Inter and intra-regional transport corridors provide vital economic and social links between the upper North Island and its nationally important shipping ports (Ports of Auckland, Port of Tauranga, Northport), and the rest of New Zealand. The Waikato's strategic transport network is key to supporting economic growth and development, the core policy agenda of Government.

3.2 The WRC is part of the Upper North Island Strategic Alliance (UNISA) which is working towards a more integrated planning approach to ensure appropriate land use, transport and funding policies are planned for to support the infrastructure that is
necessary to support economic growth. Transport is a key focus area for UNISA and currently UNISA partners are working on developing an Upper North Island Freight Story.

3.3 At the regional level, the WRC and Waikato Regional Transport Committee are working towards a more integrated transport system for the Waikato region. Successive RLTS’s have focussed on providing the long-term strategic policy framework for developing the land transport system to meet the desired transport outcomes identified by our region's communities. The WRC has been working in partnership with the region's territorial authorities and transport partners to ensure the development of robust regional land use and transport policy with the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and latest operative Waikato Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS) developed in tandem to ensure complementary, supportive and integrated land use and transport policy.

3.4 The operative Waikato RLTS 2011-2041 is based on an integrated planning framework that not only recognises the vital role of strategic transport corridors in providing for the region’s (and New Zealand's) economic development, but also ensures that other community transport needs are given regional policy weight. The provision for urban and rural public transport services to address the access and mobility needs of our regional communities, the promotion of walking and cycling modes as a means of addressing future energy demand and public health issues, implementation of a range of demand management tools to ensure proactive management of future transport issues, and ensuring the safety of our regional land transport system are all equal imperatives under our regional planning framework. This policy is fully integrated with the Proposed Waikato RPS to ensure that land use decisions support the provision of well-planned transport infrastructure to meet the varied transport needs of the region.

3.5 Unfortunately, the funding gap between what this balanced policy approach is trying to achieve and what can be funded is growing and national funding priorities mean that other regionally desired transport outcomes cannot be realised. The WRC is concerned that proposals contained in the Bill may exacerbate this situation and potentially unravel the good integrated planning work that is being undertaken at regional and wider regional levels.

4 Key concerns with LTMA Bill

4.1 The WRC's main concerns with the LTMA Bill are introduced below. Detailed discussion on these issues is provided in Part 2 of this submission. Key concerns include:

- lack of integration with wider reform of the planning framework;
- lack of long-term strategic planning for land transport;
- watering down of integrated planning;
- narrowing of the purpose of the LTMA and consequential potential to exacerbate funding of other transport needs;
- statutory removal of non-voting members of RTC that enhance integrated regional transport policy development; and
- the purpose and amount of prescription around Regional Public Transport Plans that may restrict the flexibility for the Waikato region to implement the public transport operating model (PTOM).
4.2 **Wider planning reform**

The LTMA has been reviewed at a time when the wider planning framework is being reformed. Parallel reviews of the Resource Management Act (RMA) Phase II reforms and the Local Government Act with the recent release of the Local Government Amendment Bill 2012 are taking place. The WRC is concerned that the reform process is not fully integrated, with the LTMA Bill provisions as currently worded resulting in a potential gap in long-term strategic transport planning and weakened integrated planning across the key RMA/LTMA interface. Wider reform of the planning framework has potentially major implications for future regional transport planning, funding and governance so it is important that amendments to one arm of the LMTA, RMA, LGA planning framework are complementary across the board and that transport partners are not left with contradictory or inconsistent messages.

4.3 The WRC has made submissions on the Local Government Act Amendment Bill 2012 (LGA Bill) and on the New Zealand Productivity Commission’s Issue paper on Local government regulatory performance. This submission on the LTMA Bill has been formulated with Council’s previous submission points in mind and reinforces key messages about Council’s view on the need for effective regional integrated land use and transport planning. Key supporting comments from these previous submissions are reinforced in the discussion below.

4.4 **Weakening of integrated transport planning**

This disjoint between the reform processes is evidenced in several key components of the Bill. The WRC has serious concerns that the Bill as proposed, will result in weakening integrated planning processes. The removal of the existing statutory links between the LTMA and RMA are difficult to understand and are at odds with the original intention behind reform of the planning framework to not only streamline planning processes but to better integrate across the key planning statutes. This is also inconsistent with the reform proposals arising out of the RMA Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Report which advocates the promotion of integrated transport and infrastructure planning. WRC's submission on the LGA Bill advocates the need for local government to become more strategic, integrated and co-ordinated and at the regional level, to undertake effective strategic integrated planning for land use, infrastructure (including transport) and economic development.

4.5 **Long-term strategic planning gap**

Another major concern is the long-term strategic transport planning gap left by the proposal to amalgamate the RLTS and regional land transport programme (RLTP) into one plan, with only what is an essentially national funding strategy to guide strategic transport policy (the GPS on Land Transport). The WRC understands this was not the Government's original intention with initial thinking around reform of the LTMA premised on the support of strengthened spatial planning under the RMA. Thus, the new regional land transport plan with a shorter planning horizon could be supported by longer-term spatial planning that would integrate land use and transport and set the longer-term transport outcomes sought by regions currently in the domain of RLTS's.

4.6 With no progress on this front, questions arise as to where regional transport planning will ultimately fit: under a shorter-term regional land transport plan which will have to accommodate both strategy and funding components; under the regional policy statement or a non-statutory spatial plan, all with potential drawbacks; or across all strategic planning tools? In the absence of the future strategic planning
framework yet to be determined through the reform process, is it really desirable to delete the long-term strategic transport planning tool (the RLTS) from the LTMA? These issues are discussed further in Part 2 of this submission.

4.7 In any event, the WRC advocates that territorial and regional planning, whether under the RMA, LGA or LTMA, needs to have a strategic basis that provides high level guidance on what the various planning activities are aiming to achieve. Under both the Productivity Commission and LGA Bill submissions, Council explicitly advocates for the need for regional strategic or spatial planning.

4.8 Narrowing of Purpose

Added to this concern that the separate components of the wider reform process are out of step is the retrospective wording change of the purpose of the LTMA in the Bill from what was originally proposed. The new purpose has been retrofitted to be consistent with the proposed deletion of the four well-beings from the purpose of the LGA. The corresponding deletion of objectives and broad range of social and environmental criteria from the LTMA, with a much narrower focus on economic effectiveness, efficiency and safety, concerns the WRC. Potentially, this could result in the erosion of integrated transport planning and reduced funding for wider social transport needs. The removal of the non-voting representatives from the RTC could be viewed as further exacerbating this situation, by potentially down-playing the consideration of wider transport objectives.

4.9 Public transport provisions

Given the discussion above, the Bill as currently drafted, raises a number of serious implications with respect to integrated transport planning. Added to this is the seeming rush to incorporate the public transport operating model (PTOM) provisions in the Bill, the implications of which are still being worked through for our region’s public transport system.

4.10 The subsequent parts of this submission outline possible solutions around some of these issues to assist in better meeting the aims of the LTMA and wider planning reforms.
PART 2: DETAILED COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE TRANSPORT PLANNING FRAMEWORK

5 New purpose and stream-lined decision-making criteria

5.1 The new purpose of the LTMA as proposed in the Bill is:

"The purpose of this Act is to contribute to an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system that supports the public interest."

The result of this is a change from a much broader purpose that focussed on an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable land transport system upon which considerable regional planning processes have been based over the last decade. The new purpose now only focuses on an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system. The supporting objectives that contribute to the purpose under section 3(2) of the LTMA have also been deleted, removing important planning themes such as providing an integrated approach to land transport funding and management, improving social and environmental responsibility and improving long-term planning. So too, have the broad range of decision-making criteria including the New Zealand Transport Strategy objectives to assist economic development, assist safety and personal security, improve access and mobility, protect and promote public health and to ensure environmental sustainability.

5.2 The Government's rationale for this change in purpose is to streamline the long list of economic, social, cultural and environmental considerations in order to focus on the effectiveness and efficiency of public expenditure in advancing socio-economic outcomes. The aim is to make the purpose simpler, clearer, easier to understand and interpret as well as simplifying processes through the reduction in decision-making criteria. The new purpose has also been written to align with the purpose of the LGA 2002 as proposed under the LGA Bill.

5.3 While the new purpose will certainly reduce the amount of decision-making criteria to consider in the development of regional land transport policy, thus simplifying planning processes, the question is, will this result in better policy outcomes? The more detailed planning requirements under the existing LTMA have resulted in robust and integrated transport planning for the Waikato region. This has ensured that a wide range of integrated transport issues and community needs have been scoped and considered in the context of a long-term planning horizon, with all transport modes integrated in an holistic way. The narrower purpose proposed in the Bill could erode the consideration of wider transport issues and as previously discussed, exacerbate the ability to fund alternative transport modes and wider community transport needs.

5.4 Public interest clause

The new purpose of the LTMA replaces the multiple objectives and contributing attributes in the existing purpose with the term "public interest". On the one hand, it could be argued that the "public interest" clause can be interpreted as widely as a region sees fit, as it is noted there is no definition of what is meant by public interest in the context of transport planning under the LTMA. Planning considerations could continue to include (as they should) wider socio-economic and cultural and
environmental issues. However, the WRC is concerned that the extent to which interpretation of the term “public interest” can be exercised by local government will be heavily influenced, and potentially restrained, by other LTMA provisions, particularly by the GPS on Land Transport and how the New Zealand Transport Agency will give effect to the LTMA.

5.5 The WRC is also concerned that without a more prescriptive purpose that explicitly encapsulates the requirement to consider wider social transport needs and outcomes, local government interpretation could be challenged. A broader purpose statement will provide much better policy definition to decision-makers and also reduce the danger that inconsistent regional policy will result.

5.6 It is noted that the original intention as outlined in the Regulatory Impact Statement dated April 2012 was to retain reference to the well-beings before this was changed to be consistent with the LGA Bill. Cabinet had agreed to a new purpose in May 2011 “to contribute to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system that supports New Zealand’s economic, social, cultural and environmental wellbeing.” The Regulatory Impact Statement noted that retaining reference to the well-beings would, amongst other things, “provide a balance between decision-making based on objective inputs (generally empirical and ‘economic’ in nature) and subjective inputs (generally value based and ‘strategic’ in nature)”. Presumably then, the need to identify a wider purpose for the LTMA than that currently proposed, was recognised by the Ministry of Transport prior to the LGA Bill being drafted.

5.7 The WRC strongly advocates for the purpose of the LTMA as worded in the Bill to be broadened to accommodate other key aims for the land transport system. It is important to get the purpose statement right to guide planning, development and funding of the land transport system to achieve effective transport outcomes. Without amendments to the current wording, the purpose only enables us to know how land transport is to be managed (efficiently, effectively and safely) and not what specifically should be achieved (with only reference to the broad notion of “public interest”).

5.8 We note that the WRC submission on the LGA Bill strongly advocates for retention of the four well-beings in the purpose statement of local government. The rationale for this is that the purpose has worked well, is clearly understood by stakeholders and allows communities the ability to seek what they need from local government. The same arguments apply to ensuring a broadened purpose statement for land transport under the LTMA.

5.9 Transport objectives

The multiple objectives and attributes of the purpose of the LTMA are repeated throughout the legislation as a high level test. The Regulatory Impact Statement points out that the transport objectives are difficult to interpret and sometimes conflict with each other. Whilst the WRC has not found interpretation difficult at the regional policy level, some stream-lining is supported, particularly in the context of repetitive tests. However, the complete deletion of all of the social, environmental and cultural evaluation criteria, in the view of the WRC, goes too far. The evaluation criteria are designed to influence the content of transport planning documents and therefore the types of land transport activities funded and delivered (we note this is explicitly acknowledged in the Regulatory Impact Statement). Without a statutory link to other transport objectives beyond the three contained in the new purpose, there is no direct link to funding of these objectives (with only fall back to the "public interest" clause).
5.10 As drafted, there is no balance in the objectives and decision-making criteria that should be considered in developing regional land transport plans, and flowing from this the assessment of transport projects. They are purely economic and safety outcomes. This is likely to result in a reduced ability to plan for social needs, such as access and mobility needs of ageing populations, and to ensure environmental considerations are taken into account (alongside issues of economic efficiency and effectiveness) in planning decisions. Furthermore, integrated land use considerations are no longer in the mix as is discussed in section 6 below.

5.11 Reinstatement of purpose and objective themes

It is the view of the WRC that the Government's aims of simplifying and streamlining the LTMA can still be achieved with a broadened purpose statement and objectives/evaluation framework beyond what is currently proposed in the Bill. The key outcomes that the WRC strongly recommends be reinstated to the purpose of the LTMA include:

- reference to an integrated approach (vital to ensure the continued integration of transport and land use and to reflect the essential role of transport in all aspects of society's well-being).
- reference to a broader range of transport outcomes to ensure a more holistic approach to transport planning, and a balance of social and other well-beings against the dominant GPS efficiency, effective and safety focus.
- if Government intends to proceed with deleting reference to the well-beings in the planning framework (including under the LTMA), the WRC would then recommend the need to provide some clarity about what the term “public interest” might mean in the context of transport.

5.12 The WRC also recommends that reference to all of the well-beings (and/or existing transport objectives) be reinstated to the LTMA as evaluation criteria for developing regional land transport plans (also discussed in section 7.3 of this submission).

Submission

Preferred purpose amendment

1. The WRC requests that the purpose of the LTMA as drafted be amended to include explicit reference to an integrated land transport system and to economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being as re-drafted below:

"The purpose of this Act is to contribute to an effective, efficient, and safe, and integrated land transport system that supports the public interest New Zealand’s economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being."

and notes that this wording is consistent with the original drafting in the Regulatory Impact Statement prior to its change to fit the LGA Bill, and is consistent with the WRC’s submission on the LGA Bill.

2. The WRC recommends in the situation that the Government decides to delete all reference to well-beings under the LGA and LTMA that the LTMA purpose is supported by a definition that provides greater clarity around the term public interest, to reflect the broader role of transport in contributing to communities’ well-being.
Transport objectives

The WRC requests that the transport objectives as outlined in the existing LTMA are retained as a high level test supporting the purpose of the LTMA through regional land transport plan evaluation requirements [refer also to section 7.3 of this submission].

6 Changes to the transport planning framework

6.1 The Bill proposes changes to the national and regional transport planning framework, with the aim of simplifying the complex planning structure currently required under the LTMA. The WRC supports the overall intention to simplify national and regional planning documents and to provide a clear and simple planning hierarchy, with national priorities well articulated. This is also advocated for in WRC’s submission on the LGA Bill. The WRC is supportive of moves to advance central government's strategic guidance on transport planning and sees the lack of uptake to produce a National Land Transport Strategy since the LTMA was enacted in 2003 as a lost opportunity to provide clear long-term national policy for land transport.

6.2 Based on this, the idea of having one national strategic document to guide transport policy and decision-making and one regional transport planning document has merit. There are however, a number of important consequences arising from the way in which this concept is prescribed in the Bill. These concerns are outlined separately below:

6.3 Lack of long-term strategic planning

The new national and regional planning arrangements as proposed leave a critical gap in long-term integrated transport planning. The WRC is very concerned that the amalgamation of the RLTS with the Regional Land Transport Programme (RLTP), with a reduced planning horizon from 30 years to not less than a 10 year timeframe, may result in the shorter-term programming requirements of the plan dominating (particularly as the plan must be consistent with the GPS on Land Transport). This lack of a statutory provision for long-term transport planning may result in a narrower, less strategic focus for regional integrated transport planning.

6.4 This is even more concerning in light of the Government's sole reliance, as proposed in the Bill, on the GPS on Land Transport to guide the long-term strategic vision for land transport in New Zealand. The decision to not uptake the existing LTMA's provision for developing a National Land Transport Strategy and instead to incorporate wider national strategic policy components with the existing GPS is worrying. The new GPS on Land Transport focuses on the results the Crown wishes to achieve from the allocation of funding from the National Land Transport Fund over a period of at least ten years. The content requirements of the GPS on Land Transport as outlined in the Bill are devoid of any requirement for the longer-term strategic setting of a vision for transport, merely stating the GPS may include "the background of the GPS on land transport including any relevant land transport policies" (including funding policies) and "any other relevant matters". There is no guidance on what other policy considerations could be.

6.5 Furthermore, the GPS has a powerful influence on the system, particularly in the absence of a National Land Transport Strategy. The WRC is very concerned that the focus on short-term economic priorities could ultimately constrain the ability of
regional and local government to deliver on longer-term transport objectives and the individual transport needs of their communities. This is putting regional government in a reactive position, focussing on implementing Government's transport policy rather than working in partnership to satisfy national priorities whilst also ensuring that local transport needs and desired objectives are met.

6.6 There are likely to be down-stream consequences (some of which have been discussed above) arising from the absence of a more strategic statutory national land transport document outlining a long-term vision and broader goals and objectives for the land transport system in New Zealand. Potentially, a new government every three years is likely to want to change the GPS to reflect its own policy position. For this reason, the WRC advocates for an overarching long-term apolitical strategic policy document for land transport, separate from the GPS on Land Transport, which can be consulted on.

6.7 Transport infrastructure - a long term asset

Another aspect to this issue is the very nature of transport infrastructure. Long-term strategic planning (beyond ten years) at both the national and regional level is essential to support the long lead-in times for transport projects that have planning, design, consenting, funding and implementation stages to work through. The Waikato Expressway is a point in case. First mooted over 20 years ago with key sections still yet to be built, it is useful to consider whether planning for this strategic asset may have been compromised under the narrower planning framework now proposed in the Bill. Successive RLTS's have prioritised this long-term project as the region's number one transport priority, regardless of the ability to fund it. It is crucial that the planning framework supports the early planning and anchoring in of our long-term transport infrastructure assets, regardless of whether the transport solutions are affordable or can be realised in the minimum ten year planning period proposed in the Bill.

6.8 The role of spatial planning

As discussed in section 4.5 of this submission, the original intention was to support the proposed changes to the transport planning framework with enhanced spatial planning tools under the RMA. This would have filled the gap in long-term transport planning. Because RMA reform has not progressed on this issue in time to consider the ramifications for transport planning under the LTMA amendments, we are left with no certainty as to where the longer-term strategic planning components of RLTS's will ultimately lie: under a shorter-term regional land transport plan which will have to accommodate both strategy and funding components; under the regional policy statement; under a spatial plan; or across all strategic planning tools?

6.9 The RLTS is an effective strategic planning tool because under the current LTMA provisions, it not only integrates land use and transport but it is responsive to change. The operative Waikato RLTS was prepared and adopted in 18 months (compare this with the lengthy timeframes for RPS’s to become operative). RLTS's are also statutory documents that carry weight in decision-making processes. Non-statutory plans or strategies, however, cannot formally guide planning under the LTMA unless specific provision is made for this. Reliance on non-statutory spatial plans could therefore compromise transport outcomes, particularly when advocating for transport projects under RMA legislation. Spatial plans would need to be statutory and integrated across the planning framework (statutory links between the RMA, LTMA and LGA) in order to fully support the shorter-term regional land transport plan.
6.10 The WRC advocates in its submissions on the LGA Bill and to the Productivity Commission for a “regional strategic plan” which could combine many elements of the current RPS and RLTS, with a new statutory function of spatial planning as provided for in Auckland. The advantages of this would include providing a clear long-term strategic direction for integrated land use and transport and infrastructure planning, and would also advance economic objectives of the region, including the more efficient planning of and return on infrastructure.

6.11 In any case, the future strategic planning framework is yet to be determined through the reform process. The WRC would have more comfort in supporting the provisions of the Bill as drafted if there was corresponding support of long-term integrated planning through associated planning tools. The WRC therefore considers there are three options for ensuring long-term integrated planning without compromising the reform's aims to provided simpler and more flexible planning processes. These options include:

- retain RLTS's, but with simplified requirements [not supported as discussed in section 7 of this submission];
- require regional land transport plans to include a 30 year planning horizon [supported and recommended in section 7 of this submission]; and
- require the development of integrated spatial plans, statutory and with linkages across the planning framework [supported as set out below].

Submission

The WRC advocates the need for an overarching long-term national transport policy document separate to the GPS for land transport, to guide development of New Zealand's land transport system.

In the event the Government decides to retain the amendment to only require the national GPS on Land Transport, the WRC recommends that the Bill be amended to require a long-term strategic policy component with a requirement to consult on this aspect of the GPS. This could take the form of broadening the prescription around clause 68(3)(a) and (d), "the background of the GPS on land transport, including any relevant land transport policies" and "any other relevant matters".

The WRC advocates the need for statutory provision of spatial plans with links across the planning framework to support long-term integrated transport and land use planning. This is supported by corresponding submission requests to the Productivity Commission and on the LGA Bill.

6.12 Weakening of integrated planning

Section 4.4 of this submission discussed the WRC’s concerns that the wider planning reform process is not aligned resulting in the undesirable weakening of integrated planning linkages across the RMA/LTMA interface. Not only is longer-term strategic planning at both the national and regional level eroded as has been discussed above, the Bill removes altogether the existing statutory links between the management and development of land use under the RMA and land transport planning and investment under the LTMA. Furthermore, reference to the theme of integration is now completely deleted throughout the Bill.
6.13 Remon of statutory links between LTMA and RMA

Of significant concern is the removal of the requirement in section 76(g) of the LTMA to take account in the development of RLTS's, regional councils function under section 30(1)(gb) of the RMA to consider the strategic integration of transport infrastructure with land use through objectives, policies and methods. This clause is not transferred to the new requirements for the regional land transport plan. Further to this is the removal of section 77(d) of the LTMA that requires RLTS's to contain a statement of any relevant regional economic or land use considerations, and the likely funding of any land transport infrastructure associated with those considerations.

6.14 Further weakening the statutory links between the LTMA and RMA is the change in language from the current requirement for the RLTS to "be consistent" with any relevant RPS or regional plan prepared under the RMA to the new requirement for the regional land transport plan to only have to “take into account” regional policies and plans. It is noted this is the only statutory link between the LTMA and RMA remaining in the LTMA.

6.15 The statutory linkage between the LTMA and RMA is critical to ensure that land use planning supports long-term infrastructural transport needs. It is also crucial in providing the supporting framework for the implementation of transport projects that have been planned and programmed under LTMA requirements but then move through the RMA designation and consenting processes. This statutory linkage is also important viewed the other way, where transport planning provides the infrastructural backbone to support land use development. A good example of this is the Ruakura multi-use inland port proposal in Hamilton, which requires the Hamilton section of the Waikato Expressway to be built in order to fully realise the proposed development.

6.16 The removal of the existing statutory links between the LTMA and RMA is difficult to understand at a time when transport stakeholders are putting energy into integrated land use and transport planning at sub-regional, regional and even wider spatial levels. In the Waikato region, the Proposed RPS and operative RLTS were developed in tandem to ensure complementary and supportive outcomes. At the sub-regional level through Future Proof planning (a partnership between local government stakeholders to plan for growth in the fastest growing part of our region), the focus has been on ensuring land use development does not compromise the Waikato Expressway. And in the upper North Island, the Upper North Island Strategic Alliance (UNISA) is engaged in integrated planning to determine what land use, transport and funding policies will need to be put in place to support the infrastructure that is necessary to support economic growth.

6.17 RMA TAG Report

There appears to be inconsistent thinking around this issue with the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Report on RMA Principles recommending strengthening of integrated planning via the proposed elevation of the planning, design and functioning of the built environment and of significant infrastructure to RMA principles. The Report also recommends broadened functions for regional councils to provide for significant infrastructure and by consequence strengthening of the RPS. So, on the one hand the RMA reform process proposes to strengthen the integration of land use and infrastructure yet on the other hand, there is apparent weakening of these relationships under the LTMA reform process. The WRC is most
concerned that integrated planning between the planning statutes is retained as a fundamental principle and the explicit statutory links between the LTMA and RMA remain.

Submission

The WRC request that the existing statutory links under section 76(g) and 77(d) of the LTMA are retained under the requirements for the new regional land transport plan [sections 14 and 16 of LTMA Bill] to ensure integration between land use planning under the RMA and transport planning under the LTMA.

The WRC request that the LTMA Bill reinstates the requirement for the new regional land transport plan to “be consistent with” any relevant regional policy statement or regional plan (rather than “to take into account” as proposed).

7 New regional land transport plan

7.1 The Bill proposes to remove the requirement to produce a regional land transport strategy (RLTS) and in its place, require one regional land transport plan which will amalgamate the RLTS and the RLTP. The reason behind this is to rationalise transport planning documents and to reduce planning churn under the LTMA. It is also argued that this will provide a better link between strategy, planning and implementation at the regional planning level.

7.2 Whilst the rationale for this is understood and in general supported, the mechanics of amalgamating two very different transport planning documents with specific roles and responsibilities and the implications of this, are of some concern. At a philosophical level, it is not entirely desirable to merge the development of strategic transport policy setting with a programming document intended to "bid" for funding from the National Land Transport Fund. The development of the strategic policy framework should be determined before development and consultation on the funding and programming component, thus enabling the programme to respond to the strategic transport direction set for the region. The risks that over time the strategic policy component of the document could become diluted, as the programming requirements to be consistent with the shorter-term priorities of the national GPS on Land Transport prevail, has already been discussed.

7.3 Content requirements of regional land transport plan

Not all of the strategic components of the RLTS have been transferred to the requirements for the new regional land transport plan. As drafted, the plan would essentially look like a slightly broadened RLTP, with only section 16(1) in the Bill giving strategic guidance by requiring the plan to set out the region’s land transport objectives, policies and measures for at least ten years.

7.4 Some content amendments contained in the Bill need further explanation. Instead of requiring the examination of strategic options for achieving transport outcomes, the Bill introduces a new requirement to consider alternative regional land transport objectives that would contribute to the purpose of the Act, and the feasibility and affordability of these objectives. The WRC seeks further clarification on what this really means and how this would be applied, for example, to inform policy thinking or as criteria for project prioritisation?
7.5 The WRC believes that in order to support the proposed amendment to amalgamate the RLTS and RLTP, considerable redrafting would need to be required to the plan content requirements to balance the programming aspects with the strategic policy setting aspects. This is particularly important to ensure the regional land transport plan examines regional land transport issues from a wider land use and network approach (as opposed to a RLTP project focus approach).

7.6 The strategic elements of the RLTS the WRC believes should be carried into the content requirements for new regional land transport plans include:

- requirement for a 30 year planning horizon (section 73(1) of LTMA);
- stronger statutory links to the RMA, particularly the RPS as recommended under sections 6.13 to 6.17 of this submission (i.e the regional land transport plan should be consistent with any regional policy statement or regional plan and any national policy statement);
- the need to take account of the regional council’s function under section 30(1)(gb) of the RMA to consider the strategic integration of transport infrastructure with land use;
- the requirement to consider inter-regional and intra-regional outcomes relevant to the region to enhance integrated land use and transport planning and to support wider spatial planning processes (section 77(a) of LTMA);
- a statement of any relevant regional economic or land-use considerations, and the likely funding of any land transport infrastructure associated with those considerations (section 77(d) of LTMA); and
- measurable targets to be achieved to ensure regional policy is meeting national and regional outcomes (section 77(k) of LTMA).

In addition, the WRC recommends that the clause pertaining to the requirement for RLTS’s to take into account the relevant GPS (section 75(b)(i) of LTMA) be retained for the new regional land transport plan [refer to section 7.11 below].

7.7 Process issues and consultation requirements

The regional land transport plan is to be issued every six years and reviewed every three. The provisions also require a review of the plan during the six month period before the expiry of the third year of the plan, which must have regard to the views of representative groups of land transport users and providers. It is unclear what the purpose of this review is, what discretion there is for change and how this aligns with LGA requirements for preparation of Long Term Plans.

7.8 Furthermore, the requirements to be consistent with the GPS on Land Transport will mean that the programme component of the plan will need to be reviewed every three years in order to meet GPS and National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) requirements. Contrary to the intent of the review, there is likely to be considerable planning churn as a result. The WRC recommends timeframes for the different planning processes (regional land transport plan, GPS, NLTP, LGA processes) be reviewed further in order to prevent planning churn.

7.9 One way around this issue would be to separate the regional land transport plan into two components with a separate strategy and policy component to the programme requirements. In this case, regions would also have the ability to consult on the policy and programme elements separately.
7.10 The LTMA currently has a number of specific clauses around consultation. The Bill reduces the prescription around consultation requirements, linking consultation with LGA provisions as opposed to having prescriptive requirements solely for transport. While the WRC supports the amendments to consultation requirements, the challenge will be how to meaningfully consult on the strategic policy component of the regional land transport plan ahead of the programme component.

7.11 **Language changes that weaken statutory linkages between plans**

Most concerning to the WRC are the amendments in the Bill that change the existing statutory linkages between key national and regional planning documents and their relationships (as depicted in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 to this submission). The new statutory planning framework under the Bill illustrated in Appendix 2 requires the regional land transport plan to "be consistent" with the GPS on Land Transport, rather than to “take account of” the GPS as currently worded in the LTMA. This is a higher test than currently exists between the RLTS and the GPS. This creates a stronger top-down link from national expectations to regional implementation, and will be driven through a document that has a clear emphasis on short-term funding priorities that are based on the views of the incumbent Government. This will make it difficult for desired transport outcomes identified by regional communities with longer term funding horizons such as improved rural public transport services to be progressed under this planning framework.

7.12 The WRC is also concerned with the proposed amendment to section 20(3) of the LTMA, which removes the consideration of regional transport planning documents by NZTA when considering funding for a proposed activity or combination of activities. The current legislation requires the NZTA to "take into account" the RLTS and RPTP when considering funding for transport activities. These regional documents provide the policy context to support the funding case for regionally significant activities. By removing the statutory links under section 20, this will create a mismatch between the NZTA funding process and the regional planning process that is proposed under the Bill. Local government is a significant contributor to the New Zealand transport system but is increasingly challenged in terms of its ability to influence national funding outcomes. There is concern that the huge amount of work that regions will put into developing a regional land transport plan that would give effect to the region’s priorities, will not necessarily be reflected in the NLTP. Therefore the WRC recommends the regional land transport plan is given due consideration in the NZTA funding process.

### Submission

The WRC supports the amendment to have one regional land transport plan contingent on the following requirements:

- the plan can be separated into two parts with a separate strategy/policy component and a separate programming component with the ability to consult on these parts separately.

- prescription around the strategic planning requirements for the regional land transport plan is strengthened as follows:
  
  - the regional land transport plan is required to have a 30 year planning horizon as currently exists for RLTS's;
- stronger statutory links to the RMA are retained, particularly to the RPS as recommended under sections 6.13 to 6.17 of this submission (regional land transport plans should be consistent with any regional policy statement or regional plan and any national policy statement);
- the need to take account of the regional council’s function under section 30(1)(gb) of the RMA to consider the strategic integration of transport infrastructure with land use is retained;
- the requirement to consider inter and intra-regional outcomes is retained to support integrated land use and transport planning;
- the requirement for a statement of any relevant regional economic or land use considerations, and the likely funding of any land transport infrastructure associated with those considerations is retained; and
- measurable targets are required to ensure outcomes are being met.

- the regional land transport plan is supported by strengthened spatial planning requirements, as recommended in section 6 of this submission.

The WRC requests that the Bill be amended to require the regional land transport plan to take into account the GPS on Land Transport, consistent with current provisions under the LTMA for RLTS's. The change from being “consistent with” the GPS as proposed to “taking into account” the GPS will ensure regional government has the flexibility to address its own particular transport needs.

The WRC requests that the Bill be amended to retain the current clause in the LTMA that requires the NZ Transport Agency to take into account the regional land transport plan when considering funding for transport activities.

The WRC supports the Bill’s amendments with respect to streamlining consultation processes under the LTMA.

The WRC requests that the review timeframes for the transport planning cycles are given further consideration in the context of LGA planning cycles.

8 Proposed changes to Regional Transport Committees

8.1 The LTMA Bill removes the current requirement to appoint non-voting members to the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) to represent the various transport objectives under the LTMA (economic development, safety and personal security, access and mobility, public health and environmental sustainability objectives), and cultural interests. The Government's rationale is that smaller committees would provide an improved basis for decision-making.

8.2 Whilst the existing RTC committee structure might not work well for smaller regions (where non-voting members may outnumber voting members), this has not been the experience for the Waikato region. The Waikato region has benefited from the inclusion of non-voting members where wider committee input has enhanced regional transport policy and planning processes and outcomes. Representation from the various transport objectives has ensured that all transport issues have come to the table and a balanced debate has resulted in the development of robust regional transport policy.

8.3 A good example of this has been the enhancement of access and mobility and public health transport policy over the last two RLTS planning processes. Public health
perspectives ensured that a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) was applied to the policy development process for the operative RLTS whilst collaborative planning was enhanced by having an access and mobility representative on the RTC who ensured that substantive policy was developed to provide for the access and mobility needs of our varied communities and transport disadvantaged. We are now starting to see these policies implemented via accessibility evaluations feeding into district planning processes in the region and implementation of rural community transport projects.

8.4 Similarly, having Police representation around the Committee table has been instrumental in developing integrated regional road safety policy. The NZ Police are a key partner in the development and delivery of road safety policy and implementation projects. The existing national and regional policy framework requires key stakeholders at every policy level (political, technical and operational). Safety is identified as one of the Government’s three strategic directions for transport under the operative GPS on land transport funding and is also one of the three strategic pillars of the Waikato RLTS underlying other transport objectives. Removal of the Police as a key transport partner at the RTC could be perceived as watering down the importance of this national and regional priority transport issue. It could also potentially undermine the successful policy model operating in the Waikato region, with less integrated or misaligned policy amongst key road safety partners resulting (something road safety partners in the Waikato region have worked hard to avoid over the last few years).

8.5 Overall, the WRC is concerned, as is the Waikato RTC, that removal of non-voting representatives from the Committee may further erode the consideration of longer-term regional transport issues that are currently off the funding radar. It is possible that a streamlined RTC could also potentially upset community groups who have been successfully engaged in the transport policy development process through outcome representatives.

8.6 Whilst RTC’s will still have the flexibility under the Bill to decide who they need to hear from, there is an obvious difference between having permanent members representing the broader transport sectors on the Committee (regardless of voting rights), fully informed of regional transport issues and proactively engaged in developing regional transport policy, as opposed to being called in on an ad-hoc, often project by project or "problem" basis. Equally, this argument could apply to the smaller RTC as proposed under the Bill, who would no longer be regularly kept abreast of emerging integrated transport issues or corresponding policy development in other transport-related sectors.

8.7 For the reasons above, the permanent removal of the non-voting members of the RTC seems like a backward step at a time when the region is actively trying to cut across sector silos in the realm of integrated regional transport planning.

8.8 As the current requirements for RTC membership serve the Waikato region well, the WRC request that the Bill is amended to provide a formal mechanism to allow co-opting of key transport representatives as individual regions see fit. This would protect current representation structures and policy development models that are working well.

**Submission**

The WRC **request** that statutory provision be made for formal representation of the New Zealand Police on the Regional Transport Committee.
The WRC request that a formal mechanism be provided for in the Bill to allow the co-opting of key transport representatives on regional transport committees.

9 NZTA borrowing to fund future projects

9.1 Currently the LTMA only allows the NZTA to borrow to manage cash flow but the Bill will allow NZTA to borrow to fund future land transport projects. The WRC, as does the Waikato RTC, consider this desirable, particularly where it can result in fast-tracking transport projects of national and regional significance and where it can enable key sections of priority roading projects that are holding up wider project completion due to project costs to be programmed earlier (Waikato Expressway, for example).

Submission

The WRC supports the proposal to enable the NZTA to borrow to fund future land transport projects.

10 Repeal of regional fuel tax

10.1 The primary purpose of a regional fuel tax is to enable regions to raise funds for land transport capital projects where these would not otherwise be funded through the National Land Transport Programme. The Bill proposes to repeal the current provision for regional fuel taxes. The rationale for this is twofold: that it will avoid the likely costs of such a tax in a single region being spread across all regions within the nation-wide fuel market, and that the cost of collecting the regional tax will largely fall upon the productive sectors of the economy. To counter this potential loss of alternative funding, the Minister of Transport has stated that smaller adjustments to roading excise and road user charges across New Zealand will make more funding available for roading across the country. This will be insufficient to address the serious funding gap that is required to build and maintain the transport infrastructure necessary to support national and regional economic growth.

10.2 Funding constraints and the potential use of alternative funding sources is a key issue for the Waikato RTC and for the WRC. This is especially important in the context of the upper North Island planning work that is collaboratively being undertaken though UNISA and the future ability to fund the transport infrastructure necessary to support upper North Island growth. The Waikato RTC and WRC have signalled their concern through the operative Waikato RLTP at the inability to fund some of the core transport policy directions of the RLTS (for example, the desire to deliver on the public transport needs of the region).

10.3 The WRC and Waikato RTC do not, however, endorse the use of regional fuel tax as an alternative funding mechanism to fund future transport projects in the Waikato region. The Bill's amendment to repeal the regional fuel tax provisions is therefore supported. However, the WRC believes there is a need for the explicit provision of other alternative funding mechanisms under the LTMA to address the widening funding gap for land transport and seeks amendments to the Bill to address this issue.
Submission

The WRC supports the Bill’s repeal of the regional fuel tax provisions.

The WRC requests that other alternative funding mechanisms are identified in the LTMA to address the funding gap for land transport.

11 Repeal of Public Transport Management Act 2008 & Establishment of Public Transport Operating Model (PTOM)

11.1 The LTMA Bill will repeal the Public Transport Management Act 2008 (PTMA), carrying over its provisions as modified by the Bill into the LTMA. The purpose of this is to improve accessibility for users of land transport management legislation, presumably by having land transport regulations under one Act.

11.2 The key change in the LTMA Bill is the introduction and establishment of a new policy framework for planning and contracting public transport, known as the public transport operating model (PTOM). PTOM is the new framework for building a long-term public transport public-private partnership between regional councils and public transport operators. Key parts of the model are incorporated into the Bill including the requirement for all public transport services in a region to be segmented into units and provided under exclusive contract to the regional council. Regional councils must identify these units in their regional public transport plans. Exempt services that do not form part of a region’s core urban public transport network are required to be listed in a register held by the relevant regional council.

11.3 Regional public transport plans

The Bill prescribes an extensive set of requirements for inclusion in regional public transport plans, which seems at odds with the simplification and stripping back of requirements for the regional land transport plan. While this is partly a consequence of incorporating two different pieces of legislation under the one Act, it does not aid the purpose of LTMA reform to reduce complexity and prescription of transport legislation.

11.4 The relationship between the regional land transport plan and the regional public transport plan (RPTP) has been changed. The Bill now requires the RPTP to be “consistent with” the regional land transport plan (as opposed to the current requirement to “give effect to” the RLTS). The RPTP is likely to include policies on matters that are too detailed to be referred to in the regional land transport plan. For this reason, the WRC believe it would be more appropriate for the RPTP to be “not inconsistent”, rather than “consistent” with the regional land transport plan.

11.5 RPTP’s must also be “consistent with” the GPS on Land Transport under the Bill, the concern being this could prevent the inclusion of valid regional public transport initiatives (even where these are fully funded at regional or local levels) if they are not consistent with current GPS policy. Consistent with WRC’s request in section 7 of this submission relating to the regional land transport plan, WRC requests that the Bill be amended to require the RPTP to “take into account” the GPS on Land Transport.
11.6 The purpose of RPTP’s has been changed to correspond with the new purpose of the LTMA. In line with previous submission points, the WRC is concerned at the implications of narrowing the purpose focus to efficiency criteria, with the funding of services and introduction of new services for access and mobility reasons potentially at risk. As worded in the Bill, the purpose is unclear and is devoid of any reference to ensuring an integrated public transport network that meets the publics needs. It is also unclear as to what role the RPTP has with its apparent focus on the relationship between bus operators and regional council as opposed to a plan for community input and consultation. WRC submits that the purpose of the RPTP under section 116 of the Bill be broadened to:

- incorporate reference to how the plan will give effect to the public transport components of the regional land transport plan;
- enable the integrated management of public transport services; and
- to encourage a competitive, efficient and fair market for public transport services.

11.7 The WRC is concerned that the level of prescription will mean that a small change in operations may result in the RPTP needing to be amended and consulted on. This is particularly true of section 119(1)(c) of the Bill (the requirement to specify routes, capacities, times and frequencies of public transport services) which can make the RPTP out of date very quickly, unless the Bill specifies that such variations can be considered "non-significant". Flexibility is needed to ensure that regional variations can be taken into account and to make it easier to respond to changes in travel patterns and demand.

11.8 The WRC is also concerned with potential costs associated with the broadening of the grounds upon which the RPTP can be appealed. These grounds for appeal are not defined, and WRC is concerned that operators could potentially appeal against any part of a RPTP. This could potentially see operators using the appeal process to unreasonably delay progress in implementing public transport improvements, or attempting to use the appeal process to obtain a commercial advantage. WRC believes that the grounds for appeal should be restricted to operators of a unit on matters which affect the definition and allocation of units in the RPTP.

11.9 **Concerns with PTOM**

The WRC has a number of concerns with how the PTOM model has been incorporated into the LTMA Bill. The public transport operating model is largely a contracting model, with the legislation intended to be enabling and high level. PTOM is primarily focussed on urban public transport networks and thus is more appropriately tailored to the larger metropolitan cities that have extensive public transport networks. This one size fits all approach does not sit comfortably for other regions with smaller cities and predominantly rural districts with low population density.

11.10 Most concerning to the WRC is the amount of detail in the PTOM provisions that still requires better definition to enable regions to assess the implications of PTOM and for the Waikato region, to ascertain whether overall the new model will provide benefits over the current system of operation. For the Waikato region, many of the PTOM provisions look like we will have to adopt a more complicated system with resourcing and cost issues arising from this. WRC is also concerned that the unit model approach will compromise the region’s integrated network approach.
11.11 The PTOM provisions of the Bill raise a number of questions about how the unit model will work operationally. Each unit is supposed to have exclusivity but overlaps of units are inevitable and there is no guidance on how this will work in practice. Clarity is needed around the key concepts in the model: the definition of units, exclusivity, risk and reward. There are a number of issues yet to be ironed out and the WRTC is concerned that the PTOM provisions of the Bill are being rushed through without the operational implications fully understood. The WRC is aware that while the Bill is being considered the NZ Transport Agency is consulting on Draft Guidelines which will give effect to the Bill in its current form, assisting the implementation of PTOM. Whilst WRC supports the development of PTOM guidelines, which we understand are to be finalised before the legislation is enacted, Council has some concern as to how these guidelines and the PTOM amendments will work together.

11.12 For the reasons outlined above, the WRC contends that the Bill’s provisions need to be high level and flexible enough that once enacted, will not result in disadvantaging smaller regions’ public transport operations. This will require some reworking of the Bill’s amendments in their current form.

Submission

The WRC requests that the Bill be amended to require the Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) to be *not inconsistent* with the regional land transport plan.

The WRC requests that the Bill be amended to require the RPTP to *take into account* the GPS on Land Transport.

The WRC requests that the purpose of the RPTP be *broadened* to:

- incorporate reference to how the plan will give effect to the public transport components of the regional land transport plan [and thereby the redrafted purpose of the LTMA as requested in section 5 of this submission];
- enable the integrated management of public transport services; and
- to encourage a competitive, efficient and fair market for public transport services.

The WRC requests that the detailed prescription around the content of RPTP’s be *reduced* in order to ensure that regions have the flexibility to change how PTOM will operate on the ground (this is particularly important for regions with smaller scale public transport operations).

The WRC requests that the grounds for appeal be restricted to operators of a unit on matters which affect the definition and allocation of units in the RPTP.
### PURPOSE OF LTMA

**Preferred purpose amendment**

1. The WRC requests that the purpose of the LTMA as drafted be amended to include explicit reference to an integrated land transport system and to economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being as re-drafted below:

   "The purpose of this Act is to contribute to an effective, efficient, and safe, and integrated land transport system that supports the public interest, New Zealand’s economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being."

   and notes that this wording is consistent with the original drafting in the Regulatory Impact Statement prior to its change to fit the LGA Bill, and is consistent with the WRC’s submission on the LGA Bill.

2. The WRC recommends in the situation that the Government decides to delete all reference to well-beings under the LGA and LTMA that the LTMA purpose is supported by a definition that provides greater clarity around the term public interest, to reflect the broader role of transport in contributing to communities’ well-being.

### TRANSPORT OBJECTIVES

The WRC requests that the transport objectives as outlined in the existing LTMA are retained as a high level test supporting the purpose of the LTMA through regional land transport plan evaluation requirements [refer also to section 7.3 of this submission].

### LONG TERM STRATEGIC PLANNING

The WRC advocates the need for an overarching long-term national transport policy document separate to the GPS for land transport, to guide development of New Zealand’s land transport system.

In the event the Government decides to retain the amendment to only require the national GPS on Land Transport, the WRC recommends that the Bill be amended to require a long-term strategic policy component with a requirement to consult on this aspect of the GPS. This could take the form of broadening the prescription around clause 68(3)(a) and (d), "the background of the GPS on land transport, including any relevant land transport policies" and "any other relevant matters".

The WRC advocates the need for statutory provision of spatial plans with links across the planning framework to support long-term integrated transport and land use planning. This is supported by corresponding submission requests to the Productivity Commission and on the LGA Bill.
INTEGRATED PLANNING

The WRC requests that the existing statutory links under section 76(g) and 77(d) of the LTMA are retained under the requirements for the new regional land transport plan (sections 14 and 16 of LTMA Bill) to ensure integration between land use planning under the RMA and transport planning under the LTMA.

The WRC requests that the LTMA Bill reinstates the requirement for the new regional land transport plan to “be consistent with” any relevant regional policy statement or regional plan (rather than “to take into account” as proposed).

REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT PLAN

The WRC supports the amendment to have one regional land transport plan contingent on the following requirements:

- the plan can be separated into two parts with a separate strategy/policy component and a separate programming component with the ability to consult on these parts separately.

- prescription around the strategic planning requirements for the regional land transport plan is strengthened as follows:
  - the regional land transport plan is required to have a 30 year planning horizon as currently exists for RLTS’s;
  - stronger statutory links to the RMA are retained, particularly to the RPS as recommended under sections 6.13 to 6.17 of this submission (regional land transport plans should be consistent with any regional policy statement and regional plan and any national policy statement);
  - the need to take account of the regional council’s function under section 30(1)(gb) of the RMA to consider the strategic integration of transport infrastructure with land use is retained;
  - the requirement to consider inter and intra-regional outcomes is retained to support integrated land use and transport planning;
  - the requirement for a statement of any relevant regional economic or land use considerations, and the likely funding of any land transport infrastructure associated with those considerations is retained; and
  - measurable targets are required to ensure outcomes are being met.

- the regional land transport plan is supported by strengthened spatial planning requirements, as recommended in section 6 of this submission.

The WRC requests that the Bill be amended to require the regional land transport plan to take into account the GPS on Land Transport, consistent with current provisions under the LTMA for RLTS’s. The change from being “consistent with” the GPS as proposed to “taking into account” the GPS will ensure regional government has the flexibility to address its own particular transport needs.

The WRC requests that the Bill be amended to retain the current clause in the LTMA that requires the NZ Transport Agency to take into account the regional land transport plan when considering funding for transport activities.

The WRC supports the Bill’s amendments with respect to streamlining consultation processes under the LTMA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT PLAN continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The WRC requests that the review timeframes for the transport planning cycles are given further consideration in the context of LGA planning cycles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL TRANSPORT COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The WRC requests that statutory provision be made for formal representation of the New Zealand Police on the Regional Transport Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WRC requests that a formal mechanism be provided for in the Bill to allow the co-opting of key transport representatives on regional transport committees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NZTA BORROWING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The WRC supports the proposal to enable the NZTA to borrow to fund future land transport projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL FUEL TAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The WRC supports the Bill’s repeal of the regional fuel tax provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WRC requests that other alternative funding mechanisms are identified in the LTMA to address the funding gap for land transport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The WRC requests that the Bill be amended to require the Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) to be &quot;not inconsistent&quot; with the regional land transport plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WRC requests that the Bill be amended to require the RPTP to &quot;take into account&quot; the GPS on Land Transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WRC requests that the purpose of the RPTP be broadened to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- incorporate reference to how the plan will give effect to the public transport components of the regional land transport plan [and thereby the redrafted purpose of the LTMA as requested in section 5 of this submission];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- enable the integrated management of public transport services; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to encourage a competitive, efficient and fair market for public transport services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WRC requests that the detailed prescription around the content of RPTP’s be reduced in order to ensure that regions have the flexibility to change how PTOM will operate on the ground (this is particularly important for regions with smaller scale public transport operations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WRC requests that the grounds for appeal be restricted to operators of a unit on matters which affect the definition and allocation of units in the RPTP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1: STATUTORY PLANNING FRAMEWORK FOR LAND TRANSPORT UNDER EXISTING LTMA 2003

Resource Management Act 1991

National Policy Statement

Take into account

Regional Policy Statement & Regional Plan

Consistent with

Take into account

Government Policy Statement

Issued every 3 years and covers a period of 10 years

Consistent with

Take into account

Land Transport Management Act 2003

Purpose: Achieving an integrated, affordable, safe, responsive and sustainable transport system

Objectives: economic dev, safety and personal security, access & mobility, public health, environ sustainability

Take into account

National Land Transport Strategy

Prepared every 6 years and covers a period of 30 years

Consistent with

Take into account

Regional Land Transport Strategy

Prepared every 6 years and covers a period of 30 years

Consistent with

Take into account

Regional Land Transport Programme

Prepared every 3 years and covers a period of 10 years

Take into account

Regional Public Transport Plan

Reviewed every 3 years and covers a period of 10 years

Take into account

Gives effect

Gives effect to
APPENDIX 2: STATUTORY PLANNING FRAMEWORK FOR LAND TRANSPORT AS PROPOSED UNDER LTMA BILL

Land Transport Management Amendment Bill 2012

**Purpose:** Contribute to an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system that supports the public interest

Resource Management Act 1991

National Policy Statement

Government Policy Statement

National Land Transport Programme

Regional Land Transport Plan

Regional Public Transport Plan

District Plan

Resource Management Act 1991 contributes to the effective, efficient, and safe land transport system.

National Policy Statement is issued every 3 years and covers a period of 10 years. It gives effect to the Resource Management Act 1991.

Government Policy Statement is issued every 3 years and covers a period of 10 years. It contributes to the National Land Transport Programme.

National Land Transport Programme is prepared every 3 years and covers a period of 10 years. It takes into account the Regional Public Transport Plan.

Regional Land Transport Plan is prepared every 6 years, reviewed every 3 years, and covers a period of 10 years. It takes into account the Regional Public Transport Plan.

Regional Public Transport Plan is reviewed every 3 years and covers a period of 10 years. It takes into account the District Plan.