

## MACKAY'S CVSC

### SURVEY RESPONSE

DECEMBER 2020

Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	The road to the east of the new expressway which will now be an access way was meant to be a local road for mixed use. Now there is to be truck traffic it will be necessary to provide a cycleway for cyclists travelling between Paekakariki and QE Park/Whareroa Farm.					Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual	Its a unsafe location due to the large number of reactional users of the area. The Mackays crossing interchange is used heavily by walkers, bikers, horse riders and people driving into QE2 park. Trucks on this road will put all these people at risk. Trucks using the area will all add to traffic noise as the will be engine breaking to exit the highway and unfairly affecting people who live in the north end of paekakariki.	If biking or heading south the Mackays crossing interchange, if heading north the Paekakariki one.	Yes I do now due to the proposed CVSC at Mackays crossing	Seriously no trucks. The road from Paekakariki to MacKays crossing would be muck better without additional trucks. If this proposal was to go ahead a safe crossing /path of some kind would need to be sorted out	Look for a new location for the CVSC	Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual		Mackays as we live in Raumati South and our horses are at Emerald Glen	Yes	Our horses are at Emerald Glen, we will need safe passage into the park. Big trucks going last will be scary and dangerous.		Raumati	At least once a day
Individual		When we go to QE2 Park, we often use Mackay's crossing as it's easier to get back on the road South	The current system seems to work well. I'd be concerned if there was less visibility for the rail crossing, it's already on a bit of an angle	It's important to have enough space, especially if there are more heavy trucks		Wellington	Occasionally
Individual	As an actual site i dont have problems. But i am very concerned about trucks getting in and out of Mackays Crossing interchange.	Paekakariki	I am concerned about trucks on the Mackays interchange. I regularly cycle through there. When trucks were carting sand through here it was very dangerous for cyclists	There needs to be a good quality separated path under SH1 to keep off the road where trucks are travelling. But getting through the roundabout will still be difficult.		Paekākāriki	Rarely
Individual	A stupid place to out it. Why was this not built into the original highway plans?	Would be on the motorway as would be coming to and from Paraparaumu	Make sure the run in lanes are long.	You have designers with degrees in traffic engineering and pay a fortune to them. Why do you need to ask us?		Elsewhere	Weekly



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	In terms of safety the sandpit area is no better than the Emerald Glen site as both options seem to think the use of an undersized underpass is ok. Previously we were informed that if the Emerald Glen site was to go ahead the north bound traffic to re enter the expressway would have to travel south and access via the Paekakariki interchange to avoid two way traffic through the underpass which was deemed too narrow and unsafe. Now it seems two way traffic is fine and there are no safety issues.	I live in Waterfall Road and use the Mackays Crossing interchange daily to access Queen Elizabeth Park and to access the Expressway to Paraparaumu and Wellington. There is no need for me to travel the extra distance to Paekakariki.	Mackays Crossing is undersized (5.2m stud) and was not built with heavy use of commercial vehicles in mind. It is simply not fit for purpose. What seems particularly bizarre is the Paekakariki interchange underpass has been built to size and fit for purpose and it is proposed not to use it. At the very least south bound trucks should exit at Paekakariki and if safety is a concern at the intersection a second roundabout should be constructed on the other side of the underpass the same as the poplar Ave. interchange. This would give trucks the right of way and would halve the traffic through Mackays Crossing and would mean the traffic through Mackays would also then be one way only. Ideally southbound traffic should re enter the expressway via Poplar Ave although its probably outside the 5k diversion distance.	There is nothing you can do at Mackays Crossing other than replacing it with a full size fit for purpose underpass. Mackays will become an accident waiting to happen. Horse riders, cyclists, walkers transition between Queen Elizabeth Park and Whareroa Farm via the underpass, not to mention the private vehicles that access both areas.	If safety is your objective then the use of Mackays Crossing should not be a consideration at all. It is undersized and not suitable for heavy vehicle use.	Elsewhere (please specify)	At least once a day
Individual	I support the proposal.	Mackays. I live in Paraparaumu and rarely travel to Paekakariki now.	I am concerned at the risk of SH1 traffic both northbound and southbound not receiving sufficient warning of heavy trucks returning to SH1 after inspection. I suggest 'slow traffic entering' warning signage.	See above		Elsewhere (please specify)	At least once a day
Individual	We were told that we would have a quiet local road with a cycleway. Now, this is no longer the case as Paekākāriki drivers and cyclists will now be negotiating the road with heavy trucks. I don't think the potential impacts on local road users has been sufficiently investigated. Having heavy vehicles exiting right the outside QE Park gates is dangerous to recreational park users. The existing road was not built for such heavy traffic and the parks (Whareroa and QE) are extremely busy with horse-riders, cyclists, children and joggers who use this roadway to access both parks. We must value our natural amenities and this proposal does not. Having the site at Peka Peka will catch more trucks while also providing an off-ramp for residents. I would like to see the Peka Peka site explored in more detail. This proposal comes across as hurried and ill-thought-out and not in the best interest of the Kāpiti community and regional visitors.	Mackays Crossing. As I live in Paekākāriki.	Mackays Crossing interchange is not suitable for heavy vehicles. The underpass is narrow, and already busy with cyclists, horse-riders, joggers and children. The safety of park users has not been considered in this proposal.	Lights. A dedicated cycleway from Paekākāriki to Mackays Crossing, now that our quiet local road is to be no longer. Southbound trucks forced to use the Paekākāriki interchange, not Mackays.	I am disappointed to see that your comms are incorrect. There is much talk of 'community' in your information sheets, however, the community has never been consulted before. This is not good enough, and we expect better from NZTA. This proposal is hurried.	Paekākāriki	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	<p>As a Paekakariki resident I do not support the proposed site for the CVSC. The area should be returned to its natural state of wetland, an environment that is precious. Heavy vehicles and noise from the CVSC will have a big, negative impact on the nearby park and recreation ground, making what is a haven for recreation and relaxation unsafe, noisy and smelling of heavy vehicle exhausts.</p> <p>The noise from trucks grinding up through their gears as they ascend Transmission Gully will also have a big impact on local residents, as noise travels over the flatlands towards residential areas.</p> <p>This proposal reeks of laziness on the NZTA's part - because you have already established your presence in the area and flattened the land you would like to continue doing so.</p> <p>Do the right thing and return the land to its natural state, as it has been for decades before you arrived and used it.</p>			<p>Traffic lights that allow them to cross safely, and dedicated walkways for them to navigate the highway with space and safety.</p>	<p>The proposed asphalt plant is very concerning. It would be located on the banks of Wainui Stream - a taonga. The proximity of the Asphalt plant - known to emit toxins - to the waterway is deeply concerning. I absolutely protest the establishment of the plant and recommend you move it away from the stream. Government legislation does not allow cows near streams - why on earth are you proposing to put a toxic plant near a precious waterway?</p> <p>The stream has been the subject of work by local environmental groups for decades. It has a healthy population of native fish, edible plants, and endangered eels that are very popular with local children and that can be fed by hand. To risk the health of the stream with your asphalt plant is deeply immoral and very lazy on your part - take your toxic plant elsewhere, away from the stream and from residents.</p>	Paekākāriki	Weekly
Individual	Accepting that the CVSC is required to be somewhere, it seems logical to put it in the latest proposed location	Paekakariki	No major concerns	Ensure that there is indication/directions to use the current QE2 cycle track		Paekākāriki	Weekly



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	It's ok but I think the option near QE park is a better place for it.	I will use the nearest one that suits the direction I will be traveling coming and going from Paekakariki.	Just that the roads that will be used are up to a good enough standard to handle a lot of use from heavy vehicles and we don't end up with roads full of pot holes and constant repair work being done.	Make sure there is good walking and cycle access between QE park and Whareroa farm for hiking and mountain biking access.	Vehicles on the local road to and from Paekakariki must have priority and the increase in traffic should have little to no effect on their travel times. Access to QE park and Whareroa farm for recreational use is imperative that it is easy and daft to use.	Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual		mckays crossing. I regularly cycle through here and will be using mckays for all journeys from the south	trucks will need to turn across the new local road	the interchanges are a confusing hodgepodge that will add a lot of unusual need for vehicles to turn across the new local road, which ill add dangers for cyclists and pedestrians. the existing small roundabout at mckays will be hazardous when big trucks are negotiating it	this seems designed for the convenience of those building it, not for its users or local road users	Raumati	At least once a day
Individual	I dont agree with putting it here for 2 reasons: 1. Support vision of having a regional park that joins up QE2 park and whareoa farm, recreational hub for biking, hiking, running and horse riding for families, including my young children. Concept if trucks crossing through a high pedestrian area does not support that vision. Over 3 years talking of this vision weigh station proposal only seems to have popped up fully public on last 6 months. 2. Concerns over potential environmental impact. Area is historical wetlands. Be good to see plan for any run off from this station, how it will be managed etc. NOTE: I totally agree need for these stations, just seems to ge a last minute thought with this gully highway, and now hunting for convenient site rather than factored in to inital design.	Mackey's crossing - would be heading south and no on ramp south at paekakariki as far as I am aware.	McKays crossing, pedestrian and cycle safety.	Sorry I am not a roading planning/safety expert so not able to advise on this. I would really like to see safety proposal and options from NZTA as how to best achieve that based on options with site and proposed traffic flow, and forecast users of interchange between QE2 and waterfall road.  I was disappointed at community engagement event at StPeters hall on 14th October I was advised for me to tell them what I thought would be good measures. I would look to experts for this.	I would like to see forecast of numbers of traffic in future in this area. As program manager at open day mention local traffic in other areas when expressway increased. Team on ground at open day didnt seem overall informed on types of people using parks, where coming from etc.	Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual	Wrong place. The point that trucks are coming off and on the expressway is not designed to carry all those trucks. Very dangerous to locals and park users. Move it to peka peka	Both.	Can't believe either get safety approval, especially mckays crossing. Huge safety risks there.	No trucks.	This looks like an after thought by nzta. The criteria includes soil type and not having to spend much on infrastructure. If it's such a necessary thing then you should pick a decent site and spend the money needed, not try and make this terrible spot work	Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual	It is a terrible idea and clashes with what is developing as a key cycling walking and horse riding network based around QE2 park.	Which ever is closer and easier	Just do it the right way not the cheapest most compromised way. This area is developing into one of wellingtons key	Less heavy vehicles would be a main wish	I am concerned about the noise impact of trucks using their air	Paekākāriki	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	Having dozens of trucks sharing the road with these is courting disaster. Find somewhere else away from these activities.		recreational areas and is only going to get heavier use. Do it once and do it right		brakes coming down the motorway heading north		
Individual	<p>Not acceptable. This is a high use recreational area between two parks of tremendous local significance. Having continuous traffic from trucks along those narrow roads, roundabouts, and tunnel is not viable and downright dangerous. Your suggested safety measures of signs show that you are not up to the task of making thus safe which is probably reflected by the limitations of the site.</p> <p>Putting the weigh station here will change how the community can access and interact with our most prized parks and that cannot happen.</p>	<p>I use the Mackay's crossing most often when accessing Whareroa farm.</p> <p>This is a bogus question as you know there are not a lot of people using Mackay's to solely access the highway but that does not make it a better option as it's smack bang in between our two most significant parks. You should be asking if people use the park.</p>	Yes, it's dangerous and negatively impacts our natural parks with big, noisy, polluting trucks.	<p>Your suggested options are inadequate but you see probably limited.</p> <p>At minimum there should be a dedicated bike and horse paths to protect users from content trucks.</p>	There is a great spot up peka peka. Don't punish us for your lack of planning.	Raumati	Weekly
Individual	<p>Not keen on the location. My house is on the transmission side of the hill in Paekakakriki - I can hear noise of trucks all the time. I believe I will have a direct line of sight to the CVSC - so I would definitely be affected regarding any additional noise. Paekakariki is a haven, it's a bit of magic here and definitely no not want to be affected by truck vibration and noise.</p>	I would be using the Mackays interchange to get to Wellington and back to Paekakariki.					
Individual	<p>This is a terrible place for this - the underpass is not built for large vehicles, the fact that all large vehicles are now coming around the roundabout - this is a recipe for disaster!</p> <p>At the entrance to QE Park, at the entrance of Whareroa farm. If you want this here, then you must build decent ingress/egress away from these entrances and with fit-for-purpose infrastructure away from recreational users, local road users, horses and children.</p> <p>I looks like you didn't do your homework! Your 'consultation' sucks. Lack of response to the council (recent briefing was for a different plan re trucks heading in and out), maps were unreadable, no response at all to community board emails.</p> <p>New design doubles the trouble at Mackays Crossing.</p>	I'll be avoiding this unsafe area.		<p>No large trucks! Build a fit-for-purpose overpass/underpass away from recreational users.</p>	<p>This will impact ins and outs for park users. At a time when a major regional park is being considered, this is short-sighted.</p>	Paekākāriki	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	<p>Is the suggestion that heavy vehicles won't travel along the Coastal Route a serious one?</p> <p>I spoke to the manager of a heavy haulage company today who said he plans to always use the Coastal Route when he stops for the vehicle testing station. He didn't want to put the extra strain on his vehicles to travel up the gorge. Has the Road Transport Forum been consulted?</p>	Probably the northern one, but the more important question is what has happened to the other site considered/ This is nothing more than a token consultation if the other sites are not still under consideration.		<p>For the pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists, the northern accessway to the Weigh Station is dangerous.</p> <p>Can you drive a class 5 truck and trailer around the prepared hairpin corner??</p>	<p>Given your level of competence as an organisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Otaihanga roundabout</li> <li>- Resealing of M2PP</li> <li>- Delay of completing the motorway</li> </ul> <p>Can we trust you to do at least a competent job? You'll forgive any cynicism.</p>	Paekākāriki	
Individual	Not keen on this but if it is inevitable, put lights in at the Beach Road/SH1 intersection, which would keep locals happy and push all the trucks around the Gully Road.	Seems too tight for trucks - get a view from truckers.	Seems too tight for trucks - get a view from truckers.	Lights at intersection plus a pedestrian crossing across the old SH1.	Keep the community in loop with further open days.	Paekākāriki	Weekly
Individual	<p>Site J(2) – Mackays Crossing (Transmission Gully 'sand pit'): Not previously considered as it was expected to be needed to take soft material from Transmission Gully construction. Needs to be released by Transmission Gully contractor. Firm ground. This is our preferred site.</p> <p>It seems it was intended using the material unsuitable to the road. This is okay. But now the promises given at consultation meetings to the community are being ignored and forgotten. We are just expected to wear it - and the 'sand pit' is needed for further construction. THIS IS AN ADDED ON BURDEN TO PAEKAKARIKI. \$20 million to fix peaty ground conditions at QE park.</p> <p>What about compensation to Paekakariki for the noisy/busy trucking hub on its doorstep and highway entrance/exit. And the loss of peaceful, quiet, safe, ambience. The town should get at least half what is saved.</p> <p>Also the engineer told me they intend to have number plate recognition and high speed vehicle weight assessment to pull in overloaded trucks. This is no guarantee for the future as the traffic numbers grow.</p> <p>Taylor's road Otaki is a more appropriate site for the Vehicle safety centre.</p>					Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual	I feel there's already enough inspection weigh stations, a waste of money, maybe a better idea to go after the many tailgaters.	?	Too slow coming, feels like a big con with the people writing the checks in the middle of it.	Service station, rest area may be a good idea.	Let a reputable company do an audit, a very poorly planned project. Ridiculous that you wait until this stage to ask these type of questions.	Elsewhere (please specify)	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	not good to put all those trucks under the narrow underpass between two significant recreational parks with cyclists, walkers and horse riders using this underpass also, as well as local traffic from Paekakariki once TG opens	McKays crossing as i would be accessing the parks for recreational riding	Many concerns on behalf of Equestrians	No trucks	This has been very poorly planned to be trying to stick a weigh station in after the EWY has been designed and nearly built. Why was this not a consideration in the original design? Kapiti Equestrian Advocacy group (KEAG) is very concerned about the safety of local road users on this road, and leisure groups that use our wonderful parks QE and Whareroa. We would like to be part of ongoing discussions about this weigh stn and believe we are stakeholders in this going forward.	Ōtaki	Weekly
Individual	My concerns are not with the location of the CSVC itself, but with the mixed use of the interchange proposed to reach it. The safety report states Mackays Crossing to be a 'moderate' risk of injury. I question how this is an acceptable risk level, over other potential locations, that do not present the same level of risk to 'vulnerable road users'? This risk comes about as a consequence of this interchange being highly used by recreational users (e.g. it's right in between two Regional Parks). This is the only location along the whole new SH1 expressway from Wellington to Levin, with recreational facilities in such close proximity to an interchange. Therefore, I do not understand how this has been chosen to be the optimal site. It may be the 'most-preferred' in your definition, because it is the cheapest option, but at what cost? E.g. how do you put a price on 'moderate risk of human injury'. I would like to see more in-depth information about safety assessments at other potential locations along SH1 as there hasn't to date been a lot of information (e.g. safety assessments) available to compare.	Mackays Crossing. Because it's the closest to where I live.	Yes, numerous concerns. See above, and comments added to the map. I don't understand how you can justify sending large trucks through an interchange that is right in between two recreational areas that are well frequented by adults and children from not only the local areas but the whole Wellington region and beyond. This seems very shortsighted and cost-driven, rather than thinking about the bigger picture and has the risk of reducing the amount of recreational users in the area if people have a negative experience with the changes proposed. Usage by people on bikes is only going to increase with population growth in the area and more people accessing e-bikes and similar.	Visibility is poor when exiting northbound at Mackays Crossing currently. - Widen the underpass so trucks coming off northbound can see traffic (including cyclists) coming through the underpass. - Put in pedestrian crossing signals for the Southbound offramp for pedestrians/cyclists/horseriders coming along the bridle path to cross the off ramp safely, as due to the slope of the ramp, and bushes/lamposts, it's hard to see what's coming down the offramp. A large truck would not be able to stop in time if someone was already mid-way through crossing the road.	Yes. If this ends up being the only viable site, then the trucks should be forced to use the Paekakariki Interchange, rather than Mackays, as there won't be the same level of recreational users at this interchange, so the risk of harm to vulnerable road users would be lower.	Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual	Terrible location	Mackay due to the wanting saddle hill and possible brake failure	How does a truck pull up the Wainui saddle hill after being at the weigh station. 1st gear??	There is already enough options		Waikanae	Weekly



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	<p>The proposed CVSC at Mackay's Crossing can only be accessed via a convoluted and circuitous route that brings commercial vehicles into the constrained Mackay's Interchange, the primary purpose of which is to provide access to, and between, Queen Elizabeth Park and Whareroa Farm for the 250,000 Wellington regional park users that visit these sites annually.</p> <p>Ideally a Commercial Vehicle Safety Centre (CVSC) should facilitate the timely compliance of commercial vehicles while simultaneously ensuring minimal disruption to journeys by ensuring CVSC sites are easily and safely accessible. Commercial vehicles will be expected to share an interchange, acknowledged by NZTA as being small and with no intention to enlarge it, with vulnerable road users that include pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. These road users have historically held dominion over Mackay's Interchange, using both the walkway/cycleway/bridle path provided, and the road, which they are perfectly entitled to do.</p> <p>It therefore appears to me that the proposed "Sandpit" site fails to adequately take into account the needs of the two parties it affects most - that is the commercial vehicle driver and the recreational road user.</p> <p>NZTA analysis of the impacts of requiring commercial vehicles to transit the Mackay's Interchange barely acknowledges who the affected parties are. Aside from commercial vehicle drivers they are families walking from one park to the other, joggers, cyclists and horse riders of all ages. They may be alone, or in groups participating in the numerous official events that are hosted by and held in the parks. NZTA also fails to acknowledge the impacts of future growth in both commercial vehicle volumes and regional park use in its site analysis. When Transmission Gully opens Wellington Regional Council who administer Queen Elizabeth Park, and the Department of Conservation who administer Whareroa Farm both anticipate significant increases in visitor numbers.</p> <p>Based on current analysis NZTA have identified a low accident risk while simultaneously acknowledging the result of any realised accident as being serious or fatal to the vulnerable road user. In fact, by routing commercial vehicles through Mackay's Interchange and failing to take into account future growth NZTA also fail to meet the needs of both affected parties by creating an environment of elevated risk to the safety of both now and into the future.</p>	I live in Emerald Glen Road and therefore use (and will continue to use) the Mackay's Interchange on a daily basis.	<p>I certainly do have concerns in the context of the CVSC at Mackay's Crossing. The continued safety of the thousands of recreational park users who currently use the Mackay's Interchange to access Queen Elizabeth Park, Whareroa Farm and the Mataihuka Walkway in Emerald Glen Rd is now threatened by the introduction of heavy commercial vehicle traffic that solely arises because of the CVSC location. While many park visitors simply drive into their park of choice and stay within its environs, just as many park their vehicles and move through the wider recreational area provided by the network of parks and interlinking roads, which means they cannot avoid being exposed to large commercial vehicle traffic movements through the Mackay's Interchange as a result of the proposed "Sandpit" CVSC. My view is that the largest of road users will be brought directly into conflict with the smallest and most vulnerable of road users.</p> <p>Despite repeatedly hearing the concerns of Emerald Glen Road residents on this subject I do not believe NZTA fully appreciate the number of recreational road users moving through the Mackay's Interchange. Nor have NZTA taken any measures to quantify current and/or projected park patronage and assess whether that data might impact their site choice.</p>	<p>Safety can only be improved by not introducing further heavy commercial vehicle traffic into the Mackay's Crossing Interchange environment.</p> <p>The Mackay's Interchange was designed to facilitate access to and between Queen Elizabeth Park and Whareroa Farm. It is already acknowledged as being a small Interchange. The extension of Emerald Glen Road through part of Whareroa Farm into the Interchange has significantly increased traffic volumes in the area and increased pressure on the Interchange, but has simultaneously opened up further recreational opportunities to park users, such as the Mataihuka Walkway.</p> <p>The introduction of heavy commercial traffic into the Interchange fails to acknowledge the fragile relationship that already exists between motorised and non-motorised traffic within the constraints of the Interchange. Motorists are frequently required to follow cyclists and horse riders through the Interchange and do so because they understand the inherent recreational value of the area. If commercial traffic transit through the Mackay's Interchange that balance will tip irrevocably towards trucks dominating the space and the unspoken but intrinsic value of the space being for recreation will be lost.</p>	<p>Emerald Glen Road residents met with NZTA in September of 2019 to discuss a proposal to construct a CVSC in Emerald Glen Rd. While a number of environmental and conservation issues were raised at that meeting, by far the greatest concern expressed was reserved for the continued safety of the recreational park users we currently share our small local road network and Interchange with. I think many of us realised for the first time, not only how much we value their presence, but also how vulnerable they would be should commercial vehicles be allowed to transit through Mackay's Interchange as a matter of course.</p> <p>As you know there are plenty of commercial vehicles travelling through the Mackay's Interchange currently as part of the Transmission Gully construction process, but these are being constantly monitored by traffic management teams and are aware of, and respectful towards recreational road users in the area. This would change should NZTA's proposal to build a CVSC at the "Sandpit" go ahead.</p> <p>Emerald Glen Road residents have repeatedly voiced our concerns regarding the safety of recreational road users in the Mackay's Interchange to NZTA while maintaining that we do not and cannot speak for the wider community. We have been consistent in our view that conversations with us do not constitute community consultation.</p>	Elsewhere (please specify)	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
					<p>Given that the Mackay's Interchange is the gateway not only to two of the Wellington Regions most visited parks, but to the Kapiti Coast, we would like to see a genuine effort on the part of NZTA to engage with the community so that the recreational values the community places on this area can be fully represented and factored into the decision making process.</p>		



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	<p>Submission on Proposed Commercial Vehicle Safety Centre (CVSC) Located South of MacKays Crossing</p> <p>The Addendum to the Road Safety Audit of Detail Designs, recommends directing all heavy traffic moving on and off Transmission Gully to the CVSC via the MacKays interchange. It reaches this recommendation primarily because.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vulnerable users are in conflict at the double X-intersection</li> <li>2. North bound cars are accelerating through the double X-intersection as they approach the Paekakariki north bound on ramp, creating a hazard.</li> <li>3. Maneuvering trucks are likely to find it difficult to drive through the geometry of the double X-intersection.</li> </ol> <p>Vulnerable users Vulnerable users are defined to be pedestrians, horse riders and bicycle riders. The Road Safety Report has no information on the numbers of vulnerable users. Therefore, on Sunday afternoon of 18/10/2020, I spent four, one hour sessions counting vulnerable users. To get accurate results one would need to do counts on multiple occasions. However four hours of counting is a lot better than no counts.</p> <p>The first one-hour count started at MacKays roundabout at 12:58 pm, the second one-hour count started at the Paekakariki underpass at 2:03 pm, the third one-hour count started back at MacKays roundabout at 3:13 pm, the last one-hour count started back at the Paekakariki underpass at 4:17 pm.</p> <p>No horses or pedestrians were counted during the afternoon. During the total of 2 hours spent counting at MacKays roundabout, 16 bicycle riders were recorded using the roundabout. That is an average of 8 bicycle riders per hour used Mackays roundabout. In sharp contrast to this, the number of bicycle riders using SH 1 beside the Paekakariki underpass during the two hours of counting was one. That is an average of 0.5 bicycle riders per hour using State Highway 1 beside the Paekakariki underpass.</p> <p>There were 16 times more bicycle riders using MacKays roundabout than were using State Highway One by the Paekakariki underpass. This is not surprising because the MacKays underpass links two large regional parks.</p> <p>The day this survey was carried out was an overcast day. If this survey was carried out on a sunny summer's day during the school holidays there would certainly be horses and pedestrians recorded.</p> <p>On page 8 of the Addendum to the Road Safety Audit of Detail Designs, The Safety Engineer comments that "Trucks accessing the</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>CVSC using the MacKays crossing off ramp need to cross the shared path once at the end of the off ramp, if trucks were directed to the Paekakriki interchange they would need to cross the shared path three times.” Looking at figure 2 on page 7 of the report, I am only able to see that trucks would cross the shared path twice at the Staggered X-intersection by the Paekakariki underpass.</p> <p>Even if the Safety Engineer is correct and the trucks cross the shared path three times, by the Paekakariki underpass, then because there is only 0.5 cyclists per hour, this results in the possibility of only <math>3 \times 0.5 = 1.5</math> truck / bicycle conflict per hour. At the MacKays roundabout, with 8 bicyclists per hour and one conflict point, this gives the possibility of trucks crossing the path of a bicyclist as <math>8 \times 1 = 8</math> times per hour. The possibility of conflict between truck and bicycle per hour at MacKays is <math>8 / 1.5 = 5.3</math> times greater for the MacKays roundabout, than SH 1 by the Paekakariki underpass.</p> <p>In conclusion, the MacKays Crossing roundabout is much more likely to cause accidents as a result of truck/bicycle conflict because of the very high bicycle use. I consider this to be so despite the faster vehicles by the Paekakariki underpass (bullet point 2 at the beginning of this report). It would be safer to take south bound heavy vehicles off the Highway at the south-bound Paekakariki off ramp.</p> <p><b>Problem with the MacKays Roundabout</b>  The MacKays roundabout has an island in the middle of it. The perimeter ring of the central island is made of concrete. The width of the concrete ring is about 900mm wide. Truck drivers understand this to be a strip where the inside wheels may mount, if they are having trouble staying on the main carriageway. Some local pedestrians perceive this ring of concrete around the traffic island to be a safe haven or footpath for pedestrians. This difference in perception or understanding could lead to accidents between heavy vehicles and pedestrians. The very fact that this central ring of concrete needs to be there for trucks, strongly points to the existing roundabout being undesirably small. In fact the Addendum to the Road Safety Audit states in section 2.2, page 9, “... MacKays interchange is considered smaller than most interchanges and somewhat tight...”  In conclusion we think a new safer roundabout should be built on the highway by the Paekakariki underpass and heavy vehicles directed to use this new roundabout instead of the MacKays roundabout.</p> <p><b>MacKays Underpass, Horse Safety Improvements</b>  To improve the safety for horses we ask for a substantial dividing</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>wall to be built between the existing shared pathway and the carriage way. As it stands now, a startled horse, that rears up could easily go completely or partly over the existing low fence, and into the path of a heavy vehicle. It would add to the safety if this wall was to have some sound reducing properties. To further improve the safety of horses and riders in the underpass, an illuminated sign telling drivers that horses are going through the underpass would be very helpful. The sign would need to be activated by pressings strategically located buttons, on both the east and west side of the underpass.</p> <p>Rail Crossing The Mackays Transport Assessment Report states in section 5.1.1 that "Using the expected future traffic flows, it is estimated that around 8 HCVs would be pulled into the CVSC during the peak hours. It is understood that the maximum number of HCVs that would be pulled into the CVSC during an hour period would be around 40 vehicles" It is understood that the above maximum of 40 vehicles over an hour would only be done during a safety blitz. It is also understood that during off-peak hours fewer than 8 HCV would be pulled off the highway per hour. The CVSC is expected to be open more or less 24 hours per day otherwise overloaded vehicles will by-pass it. To calculate the yearly number of north traveling trucks crossing the rail level-crossing, let us take the very modest average value per hour of two north traveling trucks being checked at the CVSC. It is proposed to send north traveling trucks over the rail level-crossing once tested. Two trucks per hour x 24 hours x 365 days = 17,520 trucks crossing the rail level-crossing every year. These trucks would not normally have crossed the rail level-crossing, unless they had been checked at the CVSC. The Mackays rail level-crossing has barrier arms, so there is a very low probability that an accident will occur between a heavy vehicle and a train. This is a case where we should use the Resource Management principal of considering consequences of very low probability events, when the resulting possible effects are very large. Buses heavily laden with passengers will be tested at the CVSC. Although remote, it is possible that, if running late, a bus driver may be tempted to try to beat the barrier arms and get stuck on</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>the rail tracks. A heavy truck could stall on the rail tracks. In both these cases the consequences could be catastrophic and therefore must be considered.</p> <p>In conclusion, to avoid the remote possibility of a catastrophic accident, north-bound, heavy vehicles should not be sent north via MacKays Crossing. Instead they should be sent via the Paekakariki on ramp.</p> <p>Points 2 and 3 at the beginning of this submission would be solved by swapping the double X-intersection at Paekakariki underpass for a roundabout.</p> <p>Overall conclusion It is clearly difficult to find a very good site for a CVSC and the one now proposed may be the only realistic possible solution. To make this solution safe the double X-intersection by the Paekakriki underpass needs to be replaced with a roundabout. This would significantly improve all three bullet points noted at the beginning of this submission.</p> <p>We have been told that an earlier consultation with the community wanted the double X-intersection and not a roundabout. This earlier consultation is no longer valid because at the time of the consultation no one knew that a CVSC would be located nearby. The safety implications for this intersection have changed enormously with the introduction of a proposed CVSC.</p> <p>We may have to live with this on-ramp / double X-intersection for a hundred years, unless we fix it by changing the intersections for a roundabout before the road is completed.</p> <p>The suggested safety improvements to the MayKays underpass will improve horse and rider safety significantly.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. [REDACTED]</p>						
	<p>It will be so unsafe for trucks to be using the same road space as the hundreds of cyclists, walkers and definitely horses that use that under pass every day and especially at the weekends. You are insane if you think this is a SAFE option. The lighting pollution is bad now and i imagine that it will be worse if a CVSC is placed there. Please please do not put it there.</p>	<p>Mackays...i live on waterfall road</p>	<p>It is insanelly unsafe</p>	<p>Trucks not there at all. One incident will be one too many ....let alone death if a horse rears etc</p>	<p>Safety is a huge factor for me on my cycle or walking. Light pollution is a terrible thing. The regularity of trucks entering and exciting the area will impact on everyone using this area. Dont do it please dont do it</p>	<p>Elsewhere (please specify)</p>	<p>At least once a day</p>



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	As a heavy haulage operator i think the spot is fine as long as the road and interchanges leading to the CVSC centre are build correctly as to allow over dimension operators to access with ease	it would all depend on the load i am carrying as a over dimension carrier, It would be what ever route puts less stress on my gear (currently with Plimmerton and even Bulls weight station no turning required to access drive in drive out)	yes that when building the interchanges/ road's that it is going to be build more to favour the public rather than the heavy vehicle operators, As in putting in centre islands and tight turns and or roundabouts that make it hard to get around or put extra stress on our gear when carrying over weight dimension loads (loads up to and or over 5 m and 5m wide with 4x8 and 2x8 dolly trailer set ups running up to 100 ton )	Only issue I would really see with this is enough clear space for pedestrian's, cyclists. As for horse - riders I would say they would be best kept further away from the trucks driving by as can be loud banging or creaking with flashing lights going that could spook some horse easily	I think this could be a great spot and be good to have new system up and running here, As long as it is build correctly from the start and that all oversize heavy vehicles are consider when designing not just build to fit a standard truck	Wellington	Weekly
Individual	This area is consistently used for recreational walkers, horse riders and cyclists in small and large groups - it would be unsafe to all involved to add commercial trucks into this mix especially coming directly off an expressway travelling at high speed. No matter how careful the truckers think they are - slowing to 5-15km/hr to avoid children and animals is an unfair ask.			Definitely avoid commercial trucking etc using the MacKays crossing interchange		Elsewhere (please specify)	Weekly



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	<p>My primary concern is the for the safety of the recreational users of Queen Elizabeth Park and Whareroa Farm. The Mackay's Crossing interchange was designed purely as a link between these 2 major recreational parks - a hub for recreation of all kinds on the Kapiti Coast with over 450,000 visits per year to QEP alone. With horses, cyclists, walkers, major recreational events etc this small road and underpass were only ever meant to service the 2 parks and never designed for large trucks. Not only will it now have increased traffic with the new road from Paekakariki accessing the expressway onto Transmission Gully, NZTA now wish to have all trucks using the CVSC to exit at Mackay's and all southbound and some Northbound to re-enter the expressway.</p>	Mackays Crossing.	<p>I am no expert, but I am concerned about the following issues in regard to the new proposed use of the Mackay's Crossing interchange as the entrance and exit off the expressway to access the new proposed CVSC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Safety concerns due to the increased amount of industrial traffic through a very small interchange at Mackay's Crossing that is the link between 2 major recreational parks</li> <li>* The poor sight lines for both the Northbound and Southbound vehicles exiting the expressway at Mackay's crossing</li> <li>* The increased of number of other road users with the new link road from Paekakariki for those wishing to head south on Transmission Gully</li> <li>* For the Northbound trucks exiting at Mackay's the angle of the left turning lane will make it difficult to look back at traffic coming through the underpass</li> <li>* The southbound trucks exiting at Mackay's Crossing have a short ramp with a gradient to enter the roundabout</li> <li>* Southbound trucks exiting the expressway at Mackay's will cross a cycle/bridle/walkway as it enters the roundabout to the underpass</li> <li>* The southbound exit at Mackay's has very poor sightlines Right into the unlit underpass and cycle/bridle/walkway</li> <li>*The roundabout they enter at the southbound exit is very small and tight</li> <li>* The underpass is very narrow with a cycle/bridle/walkway and cannot be widened. It is also not particularly high so it will not capture all large vehicles heading south</li> <li>* This new site now means trucks will go bothways through the underpass whereas the Emerald Glen option they only went through one way</li> <li>* Horse riders and cyclists are entitled to use the road through the underpass and around the round-about. This will create</li> </ul>	No trucks using Mackay's Crossing interchange!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	<p>I would prefer the trucks are required to exit at Paekakariki and that a roundabout is put in at Sue's corner to make it safer for the trucks and traffic accessing the CVSC and the parks.</p> <p>Why was the CVSC not built in to the expressway???? I just cannot understand that after years of planning and just as the project is about to be completed you are now looking at where to put a weigh station. No foresight!!</p> <p>Plus all the taxpayer money that was wasted in designing a CVSC at Emerald Glen Road. Maybe you could have consulted earlier with the community.</p> <p>In regard to consultation - there has been none with main users of the area. An open day 3 weeks before the feedback was due is not enough time. It has been the few residents on Emerald Glen that had bought this to the attention of the Community Board and other stakeholders and I do not believe those who will be directly affected - the 450,000 park users per year - have been made aware of the consequences of putting the CVSC at the new site and using the Mackay's interchange.</p> <p>It is all unbelievable and I do not believe those in charge of the Weigh Rite Programme nor police that will man it, are completely aware of exactly how this area is used and the hazards of an interchange not built for anyone other than park users.</p>	Paekākāriki	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
			<p>hazards for the truck drivers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* One cannot predict how horses might react in the underpass either on the bridleway or on the road</li> <li>* Trucks exiting the CVSC heading North may choose to turn left and use the on-ramp in front of QEP. This means they cross the rail corridor (dangers of stalling, tight turn into the crossing with the new lay out) and also they will again cross the cycle/bridle/walkway as it crosses the road to enter QEP.</li> </ul> <p>No one comes off lightly when they interface with a truck. Users of the parks do not all visit regularly and will not be looking out for ALL the hazards, as they try to navigate the other users of the road, both vehicular and non-vehicular, large overloaded trucks, the railway crossing - trying to work out how to enter the parks.</p> <p>I do not wish to come across any sort of incident where a recreational road user interfaces with a truck.</p>				



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposed location of the CVSC due to the impacts that it would create at the Mackays interchange. These impacts are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant danger imposed on other road users and footpath users of the interchange by large numbers of trucks passing through the intersections on each side of the SH overbridge and the underpass under the SH overbridge,</li> <li>2. The ruin of the current nature of the interchange as a location for recreational pursuits.</li> </ol> <p>I prefer that the CVSC is located somewhere that far less danger and impact is created. Two such locations would be at the PekaPeka interchange and somewhere alongside the new highway south of Otaki. I understand that both these sites would be more costly but believe that protecting lives is worth the cost. The purpose of the Weighright programme is to make roads safer and therefore protect lives. Creating greater risk to those using interchanges and side roads is counter to that purpose. Another alternative solution is to locate the CVSC at the proposed site with the addition of a new roundabout at the Paekakariki interchange which would alleviate most truck movements from the Mackays interchange. However I am still opposed to this solution as some truck movements would still be through Mackays.</p>	<p>Mackays Crossing. This is the most convenient access for me when coming from my home and when visiting the two parks there.</p>	<p>I strongly feel that the Mackays interchange should not be used for truck movements associated with the CVSC for the reasons mentioned above, i.e. safety of other road and footpath users at the interchange, and the nature of the area for recreational pursuits.</p> <p><b>SAFETY</b> I have huge concerns for the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders using the intersections and underpass at Mackays if the interchange was to be used by trucks heading to and from the proposed CVSC location. Many forms of these users use the intersections and underpass to get both to and from the two parks and to go between them. They include young families with kids at toe, mountain bikers still buzzing after the thrill of a down hill ride, and horse riders, sitting two metres up on an animal whose behavior can never be totally predicted. The imposition of trucks at close quarters to these users is a disaster waiting to happen. Trucks would cross paths with these users at some points and be up close alongside them, two abreast at times in the confined underpass. One unconcentrated moment from a cyclist or a small child, or a spooked horse could easily end in a fatality. I have grave fears that this will be the outcome of the imposition of the conflict of heavy vehicles and people here. I beg you not to put it to the test. I have seem teenagers riding their horses on the road through the underpass, while texting! I don't condone this but it demonstrates that people don't expect heavy vehicle traffic coming in any direction let alone all directions in this area. And they won't be ready to react quickly when they, or a truck driver, makes an error.</p> <p><b>NATURE OF THE AREA</b> This area is used by hundreds of thousands of people every year as they enter and move between the two recreational parks. Mackays is a point at which people leave</p>	<p>No trucks using Mackays interchange for travelling to and from the CVSC. You cannot improve safety for these users whilst directing heavy vehicles at them. There will be no horse riders, very, very few pedestrians and few cyclist passing through the Paekakariki interchange so this is a mute point. The issue is that even with a roundabout installed and most trucks using this interchange some will still have to use Mackays (southbound trucks reentering the SH) and this is not safe for these users there.</p>		Paekākāriki	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
			<p>behind the hassles and noise of busy lives, and this includes highway traffic. The highway exists are currently points at which one breaths a sigh of relief and feels stress slip away. The route between the two parks is treated as, and feels like an extension of them. It is part of the park experience to be able to move freely and relatively safely from one to the other. The management plans for both parks identify the development of this recreational connection as an objective. This is the only recreational hub of this type on the Kapiti Coast and the Mackays entrance to QE Park is the most frequented regional park entrance by seekers of recreational pursuits in the Wellington region. However, the frequent use of the interchange by trucks travelling to and from the proposed CVSC location would destroy this nature of Mackays and destroy the experiences of many park visitors.</p>				



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	The site itself is fine -it is the HV access and departure routes that are the problem.	Mackays Crossing -I use it often for access to QE Park and Whareroa Farm.	Major concerns around Mackays underpass. It was designed for local traffic and users of QE Park and Whareroa Farm. It is tight, narrow, has poor sight-lines in places and is not fit-for-purpose. Putting heavy vehicles through creates a serious hazard for other users. Greater detail below.	Usage of the Mackays underpass in fine weather can be heavy. Some form of complete separation between heavy vehicles is required, which may entail widening of the underpass, provision of safe crossing-points and for example a prohibition on engine braking (an issue on the southbound off-ramp?) to keep other users safe.	See above. I understand a short traffic survey was done in July; the wrong time of year. Midsummer, usage can be very heavy indeed. The Park and farm regularly host national-level mountainbike, equestrian and orienteering events, sometimes with several hundred vehicles constantly entering and leaving as well as competitors. For events such as Xterra Wellington (already consented for 2021) the underpass is part of the race route for several hundred off-road triathletes. Mixing heavy vehicles with athletes in race conditions is a recipe for disaster. On any summers day there is a constant stream of walkers, runners, mountainbike riders and equestrians, sometimes in quite large groups, passing to and fro through the underpass. Considerable redesign work will be needed to provide safe passage for all users through this point; it could be that the only safe option is to close the location to heavy vehicles during times of major non-vehicle use.	Te Horo	Weekly
Individual	I think it is foolish ....and as it requires trucks to cross the middle ....if one of the busiest recreational parks which will hugely increase the hazard for all users. I do not see how this can be alleviated in reality ....and would like to see who ever makes the decision to take responsibility for any accidents that occur instead of standing behind some faceless bureaucracy.	Mackays as it is our msin thoroughfare to home.	Light polution.we look down on the new road there are an awful lot of loght posts. Currently we have few lights in pur view these will make a huge impact on our night view.	Trucks discourageds from using the underpass as opposed to being forced to access the weigh station. The uber is ....is too narrow for shared traffic. Let alone increased truck numbers.	Its not safe. Consultation has been mimimal forced and attended reluctantly by officials. The answers have not been honest . With the agency representatives no better than bullies.	Raumati	At least once a day
Individual	I think this site selection is flawed and being preferred as it is available to NZTA and can effected through fast track as a permitted activity.	MacKays Crossing as I live on Waterfall Road.	Yes I have concerns! I think you are setting up a safety disaster allowing trucks to use the small roundabout and underpass at Mackays Crossing in both directions when the area is regularly used by other cars, cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.	We want the CVSC trucks kept out of MacKays Crossing as you are endangering the safety of all its users by directing heavy traffic there.	The open day on 14 October was a very poor example of what community consultation should be. Barely advertised at the last minute, no traffic safety experts available.	Raumati	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	I am concerned about the impact of the heavy vehicle movements on this recreational area and the safety of local outdoor users of the Whareroa Farm area and QE Park. I am a local walker and cyclist. I live in Paraparamu.	As a road cyclist I would use the local road between Paekakariki and Mackays Crossing, together with Emerald Glen Road to access Waterfall Road..	No.	I would like to see mitigation against the impact of heavy vehicles, especially proximity to vulnerable road users such as equestrians, cyclists, and walkers. I am especially concerned about the contact with passing trucks beneath the Mackays Crossing Bridge, where horses may be alarmed by trucks in a partly closed environment.		Elsewhere (please specify)	Occasionally
Individual		McKays Crossing as I would be biking from Waterfall Rd into the Park.	Yes. At present traffic at the roundabouts at the Crossing is mostly light vehicles. The NZTA proposal means there will be numerous heavy trucks using the roundabouts to access the CVSC And this will present a danger to cyclists.	No heavy trucks.		Waikanae	Weekly
Individual	Don't like or agree with the idea: MacKay's Crossing is the wrong location for a truck stop, not only does it utterly change the ambience of the area, from a safety perspective it is quite ridiculous to plan to have heavy vehicles around the entrance to both Queen Elizabeth Park and Whareroa Farm, they are well used recreational areas.  Considering the effort we have gone to in the past to save the Park from motorized activities and the selling off of Whareroa Farm, I can imagine there will be a lot of local opposition to this idea.	N/A, plus I don't understand the question, I mainly cycle through this area.	It is used a lot by recreational users of the Park and Farm, especially a concern for the safety of many cyclists, walkers and horse riders who use the road from QE Park to get to / from Whareroa Farm -- this road and underpass was designed and created not with heavy vehicles in mind but for recreational users.	Actually maintain safety and the ambience of the area by keeping heavy vehicles away from this area!  Cycles, horse riders and walkers and heavy vehicles do not go together, an alternative to what you are proposing must be found, away from the QE Park to Whareroa Farm connection.	I cycle through Mackays Crossing at QE Park probably 2-3 times a week, and sometimes with young children, so I'm very concerned future safety in this area, and feel strongly that this encroachment on what is largely a recreational area is bad and inappropriate planning.	Raumati	Rarely
Individual	I know it seems like an under-utilised space that could be made available for this, but community groups in the area have been active for years working on improvements for recreational users, so families and individuals are able to access the area on foot or by bike. Now we hear that the underpass - designed as a local road and for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians to access Whareroa Farm and Queen Elizabeth Park - will have the trucks routed through it. This doesn't feel safe.	Our family will likely use the on-ramp at Poplar Rd. We tend to favour off-road transport - so use our bikes through QEP to get to the mountain bike trails at Whareroa, volunteer gigs in the park, social events in Paekākāriki.		Not using the underpass for trucks to access the CVSC.		Raumati	Occasionally
Individual	I recognise the need for the the CVSC but am baffled by the choice of location. Mackays Crossing is the centre for many recreational activities and to place a significant industrial site in the middle of this area, especially with the issues with so many trucks going through the intersection, feels like a make do rather than a good choice. This will affect the future development of this area for recreational activities and I don't believe the community has been	It will depend on whether i am going north or south	Yes, I think this design is very dangerous as trucks traveling north will effectively have to do a u turn when coming off the highway, this is a very bad design. We already have a lot of road noise from Trucks using engine braking on the way into the Village. I am worried that there will	The only safe option is not build it at Mackays crossing. To make it safer, a traffic light control system would be a good idea and/or pedestrian, equestrian and cycling lanes	A major concern is additional noise from engine braking. It would be good if engine braking could be banned from the whole area, on/off ramps, site access etc and that this rule is properly enforced.	Paekākāriki	Weekly



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	properly or adequately consulted about this. It feels like NZTA are 'bulldozing' this through.		be more noise pollution from trucks braking and this won't be policed.	that are fenced off from the trucks.			
Individual		Mackays Crossing is my primary access for cycling upto the Valley Road from the QE2 park.	The underpass and small local roads are not sufficient for the additional heavy traffic of the proposed truck traffic. Add to this the truck drivers will be driving to timetables, there is a potential for reduced road focus, couple this with the reduced road space and vulnerable road users including, walkers, horse riders and cyclists there is increased potential for someone to get seriously hurt or killed.	Separating the slower and vulnerable road users (walkers, cyclists and horse-riders from the main flow of the traffic also reduces the potential for accident during peak-flow times	PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE - increase the signage around Te Hapua road while the expressway is under construction, drivers are not aware they have to allow merge traffic from peka peka side into the main of traffic. It is a weekly occurrence that a member of my family is forced to emergency stop to avoid hitting the concrete barriers. I'm praying the expressway is completed very quickly, before someone is killed on that very dangerous piece of road.	Te Horo	At least once a day
Individual	This McKays Crossing interchange was designed for local traffic and recreational access between Whareroa Farm and QE Park, not for heavy transport use. The turns are tight, the underpass is narrow, vertical-sided and badly-lit. Compare it with purpose-built interchanges such as those for TG at Pauatahanui and it is clear that this is not fit for purpose. Essentially, an interchange for local traffic is being taken over by a user-group for which it was never intended.	Paekakriki	This McKays Crossing interchange was designed for local traffic and recreational access between Whareroa Farm and QE Park, not for heavy transport use. The turns are tight, the underpass is narrow, vertical-sided and badly-lit. Compare it with purpose-built interchanges such as those for TG at Pauatahanui and it is clear that this is not fit for purpose. Essentially, an interchange for local traffic is being taken over by a user-group for which it was never intended.	Preserve this area /interchange for recreational use-for which it was designed. Do not allow heavy vehicles/ trucks through here as not fit for that purpose		Waikanae	Occasionally
Individual	Heavy Vehicles and heavy volumes of traffic on the access road between Whareroa Farm and Queen Elizabeth Park, will inevitably cause conflict with the many recreational users in this area. Horse, cycle and pedestrian traffic moves between the farm and park 7 days a week and in all weather conditions. This is a major recreational route.	If driving South from Paraparaumu, the Paekakariki interchange looks like the most likely option but until it is finished, can't say for sure.	Heavy vehicles and heavy volumes of traffic on the access road between Whareroa Farm and Queen Elizabeth Park, will inevitably cause conflict with the many recreational users in this area. Horse, cycle and pedestrian traffic moves between the farm and park 7 days a week and in all weather conditions. This is a major recreational route.	If heavy vehicles are present on the access road between Whareroa Farm and Queen Elizabeth Park, recreational users will need an alternate way to move between the two areas. Tunnel or over-bridge I guess.		Elsewhere (please specify)	Weekly



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual		Will use both	Yes. It will mean too many trucks on the local road from Sang Sues corner to Mackays crossing	The Mackays underpass is heavily used through out the day by cyclists and walkers and horses. The off road path is only on one side - it has a low barrier and it is very noisy in the when big trucks come through. It would need a off road path on both sides - safety barrier would need raising and strengthening and sound baffles . The exit off the Expressway from north is really short and steep and trucks will have been travelling at 100 km p before exiting - will make stopping at the round about hard . I have seen trucks not stopping here for pedestrians and cyclists	The present proposals make every one of my trips - about 10 per week unsafe. It could be fixed by making a roundabout and using the Paekakariki entrance to the proposed Weigh station.	Paekākāriki	
Individual	(We) I was at the information meeting in Paekakariki. We understand that the Mackay's Crossing area is the most suitable for a necessary CVSC. We also heard that NZTA will be calling in for checking at least 95% of the time, vehicles which roading and visual sensors find something 'wrong' - dirty number plates for example. There will be considerable time and cost pressure on road haulers etc to really obey rules and regulations. The disruption to commercial and ordinary road users is likely to reduce in time. We were also told that visual mitigation via trees/shrubs will happen.	We live in Paekakariki. If going north using the new SH1, then the Mackay's Crossing on-ramp would be fine. However, if wanting to go south, the nearer access would be preferable (an extra 5-6km/carbon footprint with Mackays). However I understand that the lie of the land would make an extra on-ramp/slip road deficient.	We can walk to Mackays Crossing via QE Park (so could cyclists use that route) - but if we wanted to access 'Whareroa Farm' or Emerald Glen etc we would use a car (of eventually buy electric bikes?). But for those who walk, cycle, horse-ride and want/need to access the east of SH1 careful design of access road/tracks [is needed].			Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual	I think it is incredibly dangerous especially for residents of Paekakariki who will need to be using this part of the road constantly in order to access TG.It is awkward for heavy trucks to manoeuvre & will lead to a whole lot of misery from all road users.	I live in Paekakariki but will be using McKays crossing regularly.	They are not safe enough.	Traffic lights to exit Paekakariki. Pedestrian crossings/ over bridge.		Paekākāriki	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	The new proposed location of the CVSC at Mackays Crossing makes no difference (from the last proposal) to the safety of vulnerable road users that use Mackays Crossing interchange and I feel the proposal is short sighted and falls short of NZTA road safety policy for all road users.	I use Mackays Crossing when accessing the highway and parks because this is the most direct link from Waterfall Rd where I reside.	<p>Yes I have many concerns regarding the Mackays interchange.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Concerns</li> <li>• Safety of all vulnerable road users'</li> <li>• Interfacing with large overloaded trucks</li> <li>• Risks to personal safety</li> <li>• Safety issues for vulnerable road users have not been properly identified in road safety audit.</li> <li>• Mackays Crossing Interchange underpass and roundabout is undersize (Not fit for proposed purpose)</li> <li>• Poor sightlines</li> <li>• Poor Lighting</li> <li>• Higher traffic demand on a rural interchange (Not designed for this proposed purpose)</li> <li>• Conflict with recreation area users.</li> <li>• Conflict with long term development of a recreation area.</li> <li>• No clear indication on the number of trucks to use the interchange at peak hour.</li> <li>• Increased traffic flow</li> <li>• At odds with NZTA Road and traffic guidelines RTS 16 Guide to</li> </ul>	Regardless whether this proposed site is successful or not I think the introduction of another roundabout at Paekakariki interchange on the old state highway would be an improvement to the road system	<p>NZTA could implement all sorts of safety mitigations however, the fact still remains Mackays interchange is still undersize for this proposal making it harder to guarantee the safety of all road users.</p> <p>If the CVSC starts at capacity there is no room for expansion for increase volume, surely this is short sighted, furthermore the increased traffic though Mackays interchange once TG opens not only to and from Paekakariki but the expected additional increase in traffic because of the direct access into Whareroa and Queen Elisabeth Parks, from the Greater Wellington area.</p> <p>The CVSC will add increased pressure on what is a small country interchange. Furthermore there is no mention of a geometric design study to whether the roundabout is safe for overloaded trucks to negotiate and the concern around poor sight lines from northbound and southbound off ramps though the underpass will remain.</p> <p>Please find another site away from Mckays Crossing. Why not pick a site that's it fit for purposes. Do it right the first time (Money well spent to have the right outcome for the CVSC program and the right outcome for vulnerable road users).</p> <p>I think this scheme is fraught with the risk of reaching false mitigation safety conclusions, care must be taken to identify all of the real safety concerns that have been raised and that this project will not be pushed through to meet deadlines or budget, at the expense of vulnerable road users.</p>	Raumati	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	I am against the proposed CVSC at this location due to safety concerns for vulnerable road users travelling on the current state highway from north to south and travelling through the underpass at the Mackays underpass.	Paekakariki as it is safer for vulnerable road users at the Mackays Crossing	I don't believe NZTA are adequately considering these users in any of their plans as was evidenced by comments from representatives at the recent presentation in Paekakariki. I was told by one representative when I raised concerns around my own safety and asked how NZTA were going to keep me safe and was told it 'was my responsibility'. Another representative told me to avoid the area.	Segregated shared paths. An overbridge to cross the expressway south of Mackays crossing where the topography is already raised above the level of the road. This will reduce the number of vulnerable road users navigating the treacherous underpass as vehicle movements increase.	As a car drive, I have concerns on the quality of the current plans in terms of turning right at the bottom of the northbound off ramp from the expressway. I also have concerns about turning right on to the feeder road then heading south near the Paekakariki interchange	Paekākāriki	Weekly
Individual	I have concerns about the narrow underpass that trucks will navigate which is regularly used by cyclist, horse riders and pedestrians. There are safety issues to be considered and I believe haven't been addressed adequately.						Weekly
Individual		McKays Crossing; going to and leaving Q E Park and Whareroa Farm	I am very concerned about sharing this interchange with a lots of large trucks	Have different access to/from the CVSC. The underpass was designed for recreational users not large numbers of large trucks. Putting these two types of users together is dangerous and possibly lethal		Elsewhere (please specify)	Occasionally
Individual	Very concerned as a cyclist sharing the road with multiple large trucks at a junction that is regularly used going from QEII Park to Whareroa Farm, Waterfall Rd and Valley Road, that will turn what is currently a safe junction to a hazardous ones. Large trucks are often a concern for cyclists as we seem very blind to them on roads already.	Mackays Crossing as this is more direct to Valley Road as mentioned above	There seems a conflict between road design and road use here, recreational walkers, horse riders and cyclists have different priorities and use than trucks having to stop for weighing and likely be in a hurry to meet their own deadlines, in my opinion seems a large safety conflict	Separation for vulnerable road users vs trucks, already have trains to be mindful of at the controlled crossing	As a road user but a regular cyclist, I constantly encounter road rage from motorists who seem to object to me being on the road, which also reflects regular social media tirades that many motorists object to having to share the road with other road users, as a female who sometimes rides solo this can be scary at times and is even more intimidating if the vehicles are big. I'm also a motor vehicle driver concerned with the aggression and lack of courtesy regularly demonstrated every time I drive on our roads. In light of this I believe any and all safety improvements are necessary to protect those vulnerable road users.	Te Horo	At least once a day
Individual	It is not a good idea, being neither safe nor sensible. The underpass was created as part of the network of recreational activities. It is used by horses and young people.	Paekakariki For safety reasons	Yes Why take a facility from the community? Much is already being lost with an	Safe areas for horses. The McKays to Peka Peka plans promised these and failed to deliver the safe continuous	Please plant more trees and vegetation especially in the areas where this was committed and	Waikanae	At least once a day



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
			expressway cutting through. NZ needs safe places and spaces for people, horses etc.	bridle paths that were committed. Please do not further degrade the safety of riders.	there is still no plantings. Thank you		
Individual	<p>I recognise the need for the the CVSC but am baffled by the choice of location. Mackays Crossing is the centre for many recreational activities and to place a significant industrial site in the middle of this area, especially with the issues with so many trucks going through the intersection, feels like a make do rather than a good choice. This will affect the future development of this area for recreational activities and I don't believe the community has been properly or adequately consulted about this. It feels like NZTA are 'bulldozing' this through.</p> <p>It will depend on whether i am going north or south</p> <p>Yes, I think this design is very dangerous as trucks traveling north will effectively have to do a u turn when coming off the highway, this is a very bad design.</p> <p>We already have a lot of road noise from Trucks using engine braking on the way into the Village. I am worried that there will be more noise pollution from trucks braking and this won't be policed.</p> <p>To make if safer, a traffic light control system would be a good idea and/or pedestrian, equestrian and cycling lanes that are fenced off from the trucks.</p> <p>A major concern is additional noise from engine braking. It would be good if engine braking could be banned from the whole area, on/off ramps, site access etc and that this rule is properly enforced.</p>					Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual	I don't think it is an appropriate place to site it. I t will take far too many heavy trucks into the Mackay's Crossing/Whareroa farm area which is not designed or planned for such usage and will be downright dangerous for tourists, cyclists, walkers and horse riders	I am not sure at this stage, will need to see which is the most convenient and safest, but probably Paekakariki to avoid the trucks at the interchange.	Not happy with all the heavy trucks that will use the Mackay's interchange, it was not designed for large traffic volumes or heavy vehicles	Keeping the heavy trucks away is the only real answer, other options are bandaids	I think your consultation on this issue has been very poor, the impact affects far more than just those that live nearby, the access is used by huge numbers of visitors to the area that will not be aware of the dangers. While traffic lights or compulsory stops may help it is just not appropriate for huge volumes of heavy trucks	Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual		Mackay crossing, for access to QE park	I don't want to meet large vehicles on the roundabout or at the road tunnel while towing my horse float	It's ok as it is, the speed bumps at the park entrance are a bit	Nope, all good.	Te Horo	Weekly



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
				high but manageable towing a float.			
Individual			Residents are concerned about the number of trucks that will be using the narrow underpass. The underpass is used by cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders. This raises safety issues.				
Individual	I am opposed to the CVSC being located at any of the proposed sites. Situating the CVSC at any of these locations will negatively impact the local eco-system, recreational use of the area and more importantly will create noise pollution for residences within the area. Trucks slowing and stopping in both directions will cause excess noise through engine breaking. Trucks accelerating away from the CVSC This will be especially so for south bound trucks as they attempt to get up to speed and gain momentum to climb the steep hill leading to transmission gully. will cause excess noise. Local residents have already endured years of road-building noise and should be allowed some peace and quiet once the road is complete.	Paekakariki - I am a resident		Reduced road speed and controlled intersections at Paekakariki township. Cycle/horse lanes and footpaths to provide safety zones for recreational users. Over or under pass for pedestrians at Paekakariki township so that walkers and cyclists can safely cross the road (escarpment/Paekakariki Hill Road users)	Paekakariki needs a rainbow crossing in the village centre. A rainbow crossing will ensure the safety of all residents and reduce complaints. Maybe you could offer a rainbow crossing as a bargaining measure when negotiating these sites.	Paekākāriki	At least once a day
Individual	The location is OK but the access to it is poor. The Mackays Crossing interchange should not be used because of public walk and horse use between significant recreation reserves and a small cutting under the expressway	Our members use Mackays because they are walking or cycling or riding a horse between Queen Elizabeth Park and Whareroa Farm.	Yes. Mackays is small and trucks are big.	All traffic through Paekakariki interchange. It does not have any pedestrian etc. traffic. Or put a separate pedestrian/cycle/horse slot through Mackays	Yes. The Raumati interchange is also not used by pedestrians. A solid site is available on an industrialised sand dune in Queen Elizabeth Park. Raumati people would buy this if you offered them northern expressway access. 2 Why was this not thought about when the expressway was first designed. Did you not realise that your present Waystation would be on the wrong road? Then the Paekakariki interchange could have been designed to suit.  Below How do we specify. Our members come from Kapiti and walk, cycle, horse ride and drive	Elsewhere (please specify)	At least once a day
Individual	I think it's a great idea and will get a lot of through traffic	Paekakariki, appears easier but hard to tell as not up and going	No			Porirua	Weekly



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	<p>Paekakariki weigh station...it is quite simply the wrong place for a weigh station.</p> <p>This is a short-sighted shortcut, based on the fact that the machinery is there, the site is there, but the sense is not!</p> <p>It will be extremely difficult for trucks to manoeuvre the spider web of new roading..... T junctions and tiny roundabouts. How a double trailer truck gets in and out of the proposed weigh station seems not to have been thought through.</p> <p>What is the cost to the environment? There will be extra fumes created by trucks braking and then accelerating from standstill up the very steep gully road.</p> <p>What cost to trucks of all the extra time fiddling about on sideroad switchbacks?</p> <p>What is the cost to the truckers having to slow right down to pull off, then go from stationary to grind up the gully? Again what is the cost to the environment the extra fumes caused by this?</p> <p>There will be more light pollution.</p> <p>There will be more noise pollution near a small peaceful settlement.</p> <p>There will be increased risks to cyclists and private vehicles using the same road as traffic accessing the weigh station.</p> <p>How do the weigh station controllers, tucked behind the dune, make sure trucks turn off as required? Will there need to be more buildings either side, to house more staff, to 'catch' the defaulters?</p> <p>Will trucks be using noisy airbrakes?</p> <p>Will the site also be used for breathalyser testing and other checks currently carried out at Plimmerton?</p> <p>Why is a large building required when the Plimmerton weigh station just has two small offices? Surely the Plimmerton model would suffice for a new weigh station wherever it is.</p> <p>Will the access roads, some already built, have a road surface to</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>cope with so many trucks?</p> <p>If a truck uses the T junction south of the 'sandpit' and gets into difficulty, such as jack-knife, then Paekakariki would be completely cut off to the north.</p> <p>The exit going south from the weigh station to Paekakariki is dangerous, with two opposing off set T junctions. Trucks going to Paekakariki will have to cross the only access road to and from the township to the north.</p> <p>All traffic heading south on the Centennial Highway will have to use this intersection. That means all Paekakariki residents, and others south as far as Porirua maybe, will have to use this intersection.</p> <p>More trucks crossing the road used by those not on the motorway therefor this will cause more risk of accidents.</p> <p>Below in italics from NZTA website listed as pros.  Site is shielded from the state highway by natural landforms  Surely this is not a pro?! This makes it difficult for weigh station staff to monitor the passing traffic.  Fewer conflicts between heavy motor vehicles and recreational users at the CVSC entrance  But there is still conflict with walkers, also with bike and horse riders at Mackays crossing. Once an area for a relaxing trip out, no more.  Heavy vehicles will not cross the formed bridle path (a concern with the previously proposed Emerald Glen site)  Where is the bridle path? I couldn't get an answer to this at the so-called consultation at St Peters Hall. I think communication is a better title, telling the community what has been decided already.  Many questions asked I was advised to talk to one of the others...equally ill informed. So many trucks even near a bridle path will scare the horses which could be dangerous. They will also be a hazard to walkers and recreational users of the park.</p> <p>Emerald Glen site.  Through our engagement process in 2019, we heard concerns from people in the community about this site, including safety of recreational users, noise and light pollution, stormwater discharge, impact on the area's character, construction effects, and loss of access.</p> <p>The new site [sandpit] does not seem to alter any of these earlier concerns, they just moved the site slightly.  It is totally inappropriate to put a weigh station, and the convoluted roading to get to it, so near a protected wetland, a</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>regional park, walking tracks and so on.  The Pekapeka site would be more appropriate, safer, have less effect on wildlife, walkers, horse riders and so on.  I look forward to the answers to my questions above, and to hearing that the weigh station will be put at a more appropriate site.</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	<p>The Kapiti Mountain Bike Club has been involved, and building MTB tracks, in Whareroa Farm for 15 years. Within that time, we have seen a huge increase in the use of Farm as a destination for local, and regional, riders. The attraction is not only the tracks being developed in the Farm but the combination of the facilities that are available in Queen Elizabeth Park to the West, and Campbells Mill Rd, and Akatarawa Forest Park to the East. This increase is set to continue due to a number of factors. The completion of Transmission Gully highway will enhance the connection to the greater Wellington region. The recognition of the combined recreational resources available.</p> <p>The other attraction of the area is its connectiveness, both from the local communities and from SH1 via the Mackays Crossing interchange. The interchange plays an integral part to the use of this mountain biking resource. Riders can ride from the local communities of Paekakariki to the south and Raumati, Paraparaumu, and Waikanae to the north. A typical ride will involve a trip both ways through the interchange, to and from the farm. If riders are coming to the area by vehicle, they are often parking on the QE Park side of the interchange (due to safety concerns), and again riding through the interchange both ways.</p> <p>We have made submissions to the GWRC 10-year plan process seeking a coordinated approach to the development of this resource.</p> <p>All this means is that the Mackays Crossing interchange forms a vital, and increasingly used, link in the recreational resource that is QE Park, Whareroa Farm, Campbells Mill Rd, and Akatarawa Forest Park. This resource is unmatched within the Wellington Region.</p> <p>This brings the use of the Mackays Crossing interchange by cyclists, into conflict with other users in a confined area. This is only made worse when the vehicles are large, i.e. trucks.</p> <p>Although there is a shared path available, it is not well formed around the roundabout with signs and streetlights encroaching into the path way. We have noted that the Safety Audit Team (SAT) has only considered the shared pathway to Emerald</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>Glen Road and not to Whareroa Farm.</p> <p>Any reduction of heavy traffic, through the underpass and around the roundabout, will lower the impact, conflict, and danger to the cycling community. To this end we would support the southbound access to the CVSC be routed through the Paekakariki interchange. As noted by the SAT, this can be made acceptable by altering the X intersection there to a roundabout.</p> <p>There is also the added danger of heavy vehicles using the existing Mackays southbound offramp. The sightline to the roundabout is poor and the down slope could cause problems as the off-ramp crosses the shared path. Users, especially horses and their riders are in a very vulnerable position here.</p> <p>It is noted by the SAT, that because heavy vehicles would have to cross the shared path more often at the Paekakariki interchange than the Mackays interchange, it would be safer. This does not take into account the much higher numbers of users of the Mackays interchange over the Paekakariki interchange.</p> <p>The Kapiti Mountain Bike Club feels that the Mackays interchange is already a complex area to negotiate. There are many roads feeding into the area along with a highly used double track railway line. Adding a large number of heavy vehicles to this confined area will severely affect the existing users. This is only heightened when existing events, which use the interchange, take place.</p> <p>The Club believes the design of the shared path through this complex area, if the CVSC goes ahead, is vital to get right if it is to be used properly and safely. This is an extremely dangerous area, and we would like to be involved in any discussions around proposed solutions to this problem.</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
Individual	<p>The Addendum to the Road Safety Audit of Detail Designs, recommends directing all heavy traffic moving on and off Transmission Gully to the CVSC via the MacKays interchange. It reaches this recommendation primarily because.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vulnerable users are in conflict at the double X-intersection</li> <li>2. North bound cars are accelerating through the double X-intersection as they approach the Paekakariki north bound on ramp, creating a hazard.</li> <li>3. Maneuvering trucks are likely to find it difficult to drive through the geometry of the double X-intersection.</li> </ol> <p>Vulnerable users Vulnerable users are defined to be pedestrians, horse riders and bicycle riders. The Road Safety Report has no information on the numbers of vulnerable users. Therefore, on Sunday afternoon of 18/10/2020, I spent four, one hour sessions counting vulnerable users. To get accurate results one would need to do counts on multiple occasions. However four hours of counting is a lot better than no counts.</p> <p>The first one-hour count started at MacKays roundabout at 12:58 pm, the second one-hour count started at the Paekakariki underpass at 2:03 pm, the third one-hour count started back at MacKays roundabout at 3:13 pm, the last one-hour count started back at the Paekakariki underpass at 4:17 pm.</p> <p>No horses or pedestrians were counted during the afternoon. During the total of 2 hours spent counting at MacKays roundabout, 16 bicycle riders were recorded using the roundabout. That is an average of 8 bicycle riders per hour used Mackays roundabout. In sharp contrast to this, the number of bicycle riders using SH 1 beside the Paekakariki underpass during the two hours of counting was one. That is an average of 0.5 bicycle riders per hour using State Highway 1 beside the Paekakariki underpass.</p> <p>There were 16 times more bicycle riders using MacKays roundabout than were using State Highway One by the Paekakariki underpass. This is not surprising because the MacKays underpass links two large regional parks.</p> <p>The day this survey was carried out was an overcast day. If this survey was carried out on a sunny summer's day during the school holidays there would certainly be horses and pedestrians recorded.</p> <p>On page 8 of the Addendum to the Road Safety Audit of Detail Designs, The Safety Engineer comments that "Trucks accessing the CVSC using the MacKays crossing off ramp need to cross the shared path once at the end of the off ramp, if trucks were</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>directed to the Paekakriki interchange they would need to cross the shared path three times." Looking at figure 2 on page 7 of the report, I am only able to see that trucks would cross the shared path twice at the Staggered X-intersection by the Paekakariki underpass.</p> <p>Even if the Safety Engineer is correct and the trucks cross the shared path three times, by the Paekakariki underpass, then because there is only 0.5 cyclists per hour, this results in the possibility of only <math>3 \times 0.5 = 1.5</math> truck / bicycle conflict per hour. At the MacKays roundabout, with 8 bicyclists per hour and one conflict point, this gives the possibility of trucks crossing the path of a bicyclist as <math>8 \times 1 = 8</math> times per hour. The possibility of conflict between truck and bicycle per hour at MacKays is <math>8 / 1.5 = 5.3</math> times greater for the MacKays roundabout, than SH 1 by the Paekakariki underpass.</p> <p>In conclusion, the MacKays Crossing roundabout is much more likely to cause accidents as a result of truck/bicycle conflict because of the very high bicycle use. I consider this to be so despite the faster vehicles by the Paekakariki underpass (bullet point 2 at the beginning of this report). It would be safer to take south bound heavy vehicles off the Highway at the south-bound Paekakariki off ramp.</p> <p><b>Problem with the MacKays Roundabout</b>  The MacKays roundabout has an island in the middle of it. The perimeter ring of the central island is made of concrete. The width of the concrete ring is about 900mm wide. Truck drivers understand this to be a strip where the inside wheels may mount, if they are having trouble staying on the main carriageway. Some local pedestrians perceive this ring of concrete around the traffic island to be a safe haven or footpath for pedestrians. This difference in perception or understanding could lead to accidents between heavy vehicles and pedestrians. The very fact that this central ring of concrete needs to be there for trucks, strongly points to the existing roundabout being undesirably small. In fact the Addendum to the Road Safety Audit states in section 2.2, page 9, "... MacKays interchange is considered smaller than most interchanges and somewhat tight..."</p> <p>In conclusion we think a new safer roundabout should be built on the highway by the Paekakariki underpass and heavy vehicles directed to use this new roundabout instead of the MacKays roundabout.</p> <p><b>MacKays Underpass, Horse Safety Improvements</b>  To improve the safety for horses we ask for a substantial dividing wall to be built between the existing shared pathway and the carriage way. As it stands now, a startled horse, that rears up</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>could easily go completely or partly over the existing low fence, and into the path of a heavy vehicle. It would add to the safety if this wall was to have some sound reducing properties. To further improve the safety of horses and riders in the underpass, an illuminated sign telling drivers that horses are going through the underpass would be very helpful. The sign would need to be activated by pressings strategically located buttons, on both the east and west side of the underpass.</p> <p>Rail Crossing The Mackays Transport Assessment Report states in section 5.1.1 that "Using the expected future traffic flows, it is estimated that around 8 HCVs would be pulled into the CVSC during the peak hours. It is understood that the maximum number of HCVs that would be pulled into the CVSC during an hour period would be around 40 vehicles" It is understood that the above maximum of 40 vehicles over an hour would only be done during a safety blitz. It is also understood that during off-peak hours fewer than 8 HCV would be pulled off the highway per hour. The CVSC is expected to be open more or less 24 hours per day otherwise overloaded vehicles will by-pass it. To calculate the yearly number of north traveling trucks crossing the rail level-crossing, let us take the very modest average value per hour of two north traveling trucks being checked at the CVSC. It is proposed to send north traveling trucks over the rail level-crossing once tested. Two trucks per hour x 24 hours x 365 days = 17,520 trucks crossing the rail level-crossing every year. These trucks would not normally have crossed the rail level-crossing, unless they had been checked at the CVSC. The Mackays rail level-crossing has barrier arms, so there is a very low probability that an accident will occur between a heavy vehicle and a train. This is a case where we should use the Resource Management principal of considering consequences of very low probability events, when the resulting possible effects are very large. Buses heavily laden with passengers will be tested at the CVSC. Although remote, it is possible that, if running late, a bus driver may be tempted to try to beat the barrier arms and get stuck on the rail tracks. A heavy truck could stall on the rail tracks. In both these cases the consequences could be catastrophic and therefore</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>must be considered.</p> <p>In conclusion, to avoid the remote possibility of a catastrophic accident, north-bound, heavy vehicles should not be sent north via MacKays Crossing. Instead they should be sent via the Paekakariki on ramp.</p> <p>Points 2 and 3 at the beginning of this submission would be solved by swapping the double X-intersection at Paekakariki underpass for a roundabout.</p> <p>Overall conclusion It is clearly difficult to find a very good site for a CVSC and the one now proposed may be the only realistic possible solution. To make this solution safe the double X-intersection by the Paekakriki underpass needs to be replaced with a roundabout. This would significantly improve all three bullet points noted at the beginning of this submission.</p> <p>We have been told that an earlier consultation with the community wanted the double X-intersection and not a roundabout. This earlier consultation is no longer valid because at the time of the consultation no one knew that a CVSC would be located nearby. The safety implications for this intersection have changed enormously with the introduction of a proposed CVSC.</p> <p>We may have to live with this on-ramp / double X-intersection for a hundred years, unless we fix it by changing the intersections for a roundabout before the road is completed.</p> <p>The suggested safety improvements to the MayKays underpass will improve horse and rider safety significantly.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>The Whareroa Guardians Community Trust has a Management Agreement with the Dept. of Conservation to jointly manage restoration and recreational use at Whareroa Farm Recreation Reserve. The Guardians have been actively involved since 2005, having planted 60,000 native trees and developed a number of walking and horse tracks and other facilities. The Kapiti Mountain Bike Club has developed and manages their tracks.</p> <p>The Whareroa Guardians accept the proposed new location for the CVSC in the old "sand quarry".</p> <p>However it is essential that heavy traffic around the Mackays/Whareroa roundabout and under the overbridge be minimised as there is potential for accident between the different users of this zone. There needs to be a safe and well managed way to minimise risk at the connection between Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP) and Whareroa Farm Recreation Reserve.</p> <p>Summary: NZTA proposals presented would have the majority of heavy trucks (some with trailers) using the Mackays interchange to enter and leave the CVSC.</p> <p>The Guardians feel that this is quite wrong from a safety point of view given the high recreational usage of the zone between QEP and Whareroa and the complexity of the roading system.</p> <p>We recommend that heavy traffic using Mackays should be minimised and only that traffic for which there is no alternative should be directed to use the underpass and Whareroa roundabout.</p> <p>Recreational Users</p> <p>Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP) and Whareroa Farm Recreation Reserve form a continual recreation facility with considerable flow between the two sites. Annual users of these parks are in the many thousands.</p> <p>Transit from QEP to Whareroa involves crossing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Expressway heading north on-ramp then</li> <li>• the railway then</li> <li>• passing the end of the new Paekakariki Road then</li> <li>• the Transmission Gully motorway off-ramp from the south then</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• passing through the narrow underpass then</li> <li>• negotiating the tight Mackays/Whareroa roundabout with:</li> <li>• the Expressway travelling south off-ramp then</li> </ul>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>• Emerald Glen Road to reach the entrance of Whareroa Farm.</p> <p>There are thus 7 potential sites for interaction/conflict between cyclists, horses, walkers and trucks and of course other vehicles within a 270m distance.</p> <p>Many bikers come from Paekakariki and Raumatī/Paraparaumu and access the Whareroa bike tracks through QEP using the underpass. Unaccompanied children aged from about 10 are often riding these trails. When bikers are young, in a hurry or in a group they may not be as careful as they should be. Bikers may not always be easily visible to truck drivers. NB Most bikers use the road rather than the offroad track on entering and leaving Whareroa Farm.</p> <p>Walkers/trampers frequently use this crossing. Horses cross between the two parks as well as approach Whareroa from Waterfall Road. Horses also come from afar eg Levin to ride at Whareroa and QEP, transported in horse floats.</p> <p>Current statistics for use will not reflect the future as these parks will become much more accessible to users from the south when Transmission Gully opens, and as awareness of the recreational opportunities at Whareroa increases. New tracks and facilities are being developed in both QEP and at Whareroa.</p> <p>Since Whareroa Farm opened to the public in 2011 several new tracks for trampers, mountain bikers and horses have been created; a further bike track is currently being built and an extended horse track loop is under proposal. Recreational usage will increase.</p> <p>At weekends there is very heavy usage, the Whareroa carpark is often full and there is discussion about increasing its capacity. When full, visitors use QEP to park then walk/cycle/ride across.</p> <p>When specific events such as mountain bike races and multisport events such as Xterra are held there are hundreds of competitors (750 took part in Xterra Feb 2020) plus their support crews – these park at QEP and cross between the parks. Such events are expected to increase in number and size.</p> <p>Safety considerations Safety is not just a matter of road layout but also of considering users and how best to mitigate the potential impact of heavy</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>trucks, some with trailers, upon other, much more vulnerable, users.</p> <p>Those trucks being summoned to the CVSC are likely to be non compliant in some way eg overloaded or imbalanced, meaning their risk of incident is higher.</p> <p>Some of these truck drivers will be anxious especially if they know that they are not compliant and may be distracted or not expecting other users. The drivers will be coming off a 100k road to negotiate a complex and unfamiliar roading system to access the CVSC.</p> <p>We recommend the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Trucks coming downhill from Transmission Gully travelling north will have to leave the motorway at the Mackays Crossing exit and turn immediately left onto the new road to Paekakariki and then right into the CVSC.</li> <li>2. Traffic being called in to the CVSC from the north must leave the motorway at the Paekakariki exit. This exit and roundabout carries much less traffic than Mackays as well as not having the conflicting recreational use. In order to ensure that south bound traffic does not leave at the Mackays exit the sign instructing the driver to exit should be placed SOUTH of the Mackays exit.</li> <li>3. Trucks leaving the CVSC to go north must turn right and then re-enter the motorway via the Paekakariki on-ramp – NOT turn left to go north, cross the railway line and access the Mackays on-ramp.</li> <li>4. Traffic leaving the CVSC to go south onto Transmission Gully will have to turn left, then right to go through the underpass then round the Mackays/Whareroa roundabout to the south on-ramp.</li> </ol> <p>This last group of trucks should be the only ones using the underpass and Mackays/Whareroa roundabout ie about 25% of total CVSC truck traffic.</p> <p>Reducing the number of truck movements through the underpass and the Mackays roundabout will reduce (though not eliminate) the risk of conflict between trucks and recreational users.</p> <p>This protocol would mean only 25% CVSC vehicles would use the narrow underpass at Mackays.</p>						



Submitter	Please let us what you think about the location of the proposed CVSC at Mackays Crossing.	Which interchange would you be more likely to use when accessing the highway: Mackays Crossing or Paekākāriki? Why?	Do you have any concerns or comments about the planned interchanges?	We are also considering what the interchange options mean for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. What sorts of things would you like to see at Mackays Crossing and Paekākāriki to improve safety for all users?	Any other comments or feedback you'd like to provide about impacts of the interchanges on your journeys, local roads in the area, or anything else you'd like to be considered?	Where do you live?	How often do you travel on the existing SH1 in the area?
	<p>It would also mean no CVSC traffic would cross the railway crossing at Mackays.</p> <p>Other suggestions:</p> <p>A speed limit eg 20km between QEP entrance and Whareroa Farm entrance.</p> <p>An effective barrier to separate recreation users from the road carriage way along the whole distance between the rail crossing and Whareroa. There is of course also a hazard with these recreational users crossing the railway line. The current barrier under the overbridge does not look strong – is it intended to protect pedestrians and horses from vehicles or just keep them off the road? Should this barrier be high enough to prevent horses jumping onto the road if spooked? Should riders be required to dismount and lead their horses through the underpass?</p> <p>Trucks should not enter the underpass if there are horses already in there.</p> <p>The CVSC should not be calling trucks off the motorway if there are significant recreation events occurring at Whareroa or QEP. There needs to be good liaison between all parties. How can this be coordinated?</p>						