



Report 09.241  
Date 7 May 2009  
File SP/04/02/5

Committee Proposed 10-Year Plan Hearing Committee  
Author Jane Bradbury

## Summary of submissions received on the Proposed 10-Year Plan 2009-19

### 1. Purpose

To provide an overview and highlight trends in the submissions Greater Wellington received on the Proposed 10-Year Plan 2009-19.

### 2. Significance of the decision

The matters for decision in this report are part of the special consultative procedure as required by section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

### 3. Background

The consultation period on the Proposed 10-Year Plan 2009-19 ran from 23 March to 24 April 2009. Four hundred and sixty-four submissions were received. The total includes eighty-five late submissions which were accepted and processed. Seventy-nine submitters asked to be heard.

This is more submissions than the Council has received previously. The 2007/08 and 2008/09 annual plans attracted 80 and 125 submissions respectively and the 10-Year Plan 2006-16 resulted in 402 submissions. The submission form in the summary document for the Proposed 10-Year Plan 2009-19 attracted a large number of submissions.

Copies of the submissions have been previously circulated to Councillors for consideration. Printouts from our submissions database, which include submission summaries and Divisional Managers' responses, accompany this report.

The Committee must consider all written and oral submissions and make recommendations for any proposed changes to the Proposed 10-Year Plan resulting from the submissions process, for consideration at the Council's meeting on 9 June 2009. Officers will also report to that meeting on matters identified by the Committee as requiring clarification or further information.

## **4. Comment**

### **4.1 Information provided to the community**

A Proposed 10-Year Plan 2009-19 summary document was sent to all households in the region. A submission form was also published in the Dominion Post. The summary document identified six key issues and two other issues, together with the key projects proposed for 2009/10 within each of the Council's groups of activities. The summary document also provided a financial overview and rating information for the 10-year period 2009-2019 and information about a proposed increase to the hourly charge for processing and monitoring resource consents.

The document provided information about how to access the full Proposed 10-Year Plan 2009-19 on Greater Wellington's web-site.

### **4.2 Origin of submissions**

Submissions were received from residents in the following areas:

Carterton District Council	7
Hutt City Council	82
Kapiti Coast District Council	78
Masterton District Council	21
Porirua City Council	28
South Wairarapa District Council	14
Upper Hutt City Council	35
Wellington City Council	147

In addition:

- 4 submissions were received from Wairarapa-wide groups
- 8 submissions were received from region-wide groups
- 3 submissions were received from individuals outside the region
- 11 submissions were received from national bodies
- 26 submissions gave no locality information about the respondent.

### **4.3 Key issues - submitters' responses**

4.3.1 Submitters were invited to assign a number to each of six key issues (i.e. Public Transport, Water Supply, Parks, Flood Management, Land Management and Climate Change). The instructions were "Thinking about each key issue..., please enter a number that best represents your thoughts on the approach set out...". The numbers were described as follows:

1= Not enough

2= About right

3 = Too much

4.3.2 In each of the local authority areas, the following numbers of submissions fully or partially responded to the survey:

Carterton District Council	1
Hutt City Council	49
Kapiti Coast District Council	50
Masterton District Council	11
Porirua City Council	16
South Wairarapa District Council	7
Upper Hutt City Council	14
Wellington City Council	95

4.3.3 The table below shows the number responses received for each key issue:

	<b>Public Transport</b>	<b>Water Supply</b>	<b>Parks</b>	<b>Flood Protection</b>	<b>Land Management</b>	<b>Climate Change</b>
<b>Total responses</b>	251	236	229	235	230	232
<b>Not enough (1)</b>	130 (52%)	72 (31%)	47 (20%)	29 (12%)	41 (18%)	79 (34%)
<b>About right (2)</b>	96 (38%)	147 (62%)	141 (62%)	167 (71%)	146 (63%)	100 (43%)
<b>Too much (3)</b>	25 (10%)	17 (7%)	41 (18%)	39 (17%)	43 (19%)	53 (23%)

4.3.4 Differences in response between local authority areas are outlined below:

Public Transport

- A large majority of Kapiti Coast District respondents allocated a “1”.
- Across the other areas “1” and “2” were fairly evenly allocated.

### Water Supply

- A large majority of Kapiti Coast District respondents allocated a “1”.
- In most other local authority areas “2” was the dominant rating.
- South Wairarapa District’s small number of respondents allocated “1” and “2” fairly evenly.

### Parks

- In most local authority areas “2” was the dominant rating.
- “2” was most clearly the dominant rating among Kapiti Coast District respondents.
- No Masterton District Council respondent allocated a “1”.

### Flood Protection

- In Wellington City, Hutt City, Porirua City, South Wairarapa District and Kapiti Coast District “2” was the very dominant rating.
- In Upper Hutt City “1” was more frequently allocated but “2” was still dominant.
- No Masterton District respondent allocated a “1”.

### Land Management

- “2” was the dominant number allocated.
- Most had fairly evenly balanced “1” and “3” ratings.
- “3” was the dominant rating among Masterton District respondents, but numbers are very small.
- Porirua City had only one “3”.

### Climate Change

- Kapiti Coast District and Porirua City respondents provided ratings dominantly and fairly equally split over “1” and “2”, with very few “3” ratings.
- Wellington City respondents had high and even numbers of “1” and “2” ratings and a lesser, but fairly high, proportion of “3” ratings.
- Hutt City and South Wairarapa District respondents’ dominant rating was a “2”, after which “1” and “3” ratings appeared fairly evenly.

- Upper Hutt City Council had a dominant “2” rating, but there were more “3” ratings than “1” ratings.
- Masterton District Council’s dominant rating was a “3”.

#### **4.4 Submitters’ comments on Groups of Activities**

**4.4.1** Key themes in submitters' responses in relation to the Council’s groups of activities are set out below:

##### **4.4.1.1 Transport**

The submissions on the whole showed very strong support for the need for a reliable, frequent and comfortable public transport system. There was a view from some submitters that resources should be applied to improving the basics of that system before being applied to enhanced services, such as network-wide ticketing and real time scheduling information. More submissions, however, supported such enhancements.

Quite a number of submissions commented on the poor condition of railway stations, the lack of toilets on trains and at stations, and the lack of easy availability of tickets at stations. There was some call for more cycle facilities at stations, and an extension of current facilities for carrying cycles on trains.

Two rail issues dominated submissions. One was the absence in the plan of a new station at Raumati South. The other concerns the proposal to introduce fees for Park and Ride facilities. At least thirty submissions expressed opposition to this proposal, considering it to be counterproductive to encouraging people to use public transport and likely to lead to a number of undesirable outcomes. Many considered that there must be better solutions to the problem of over-use of current facilities, particularly increased use of shuttle buses.

Many submissions also addressed roading, cycling and walking, freight and transport energy issues. These submissions will be addressed when the Regional Land Transport Programme is considered by Council.

##### **4.4.1.2 Land Management**

There was strong support for the maintenance of Greater Wellington’s role in bovine Tb vector control programme in the immediate future. A number of submissions called for the extension of the control programme across the region, particularly into the Western Hills.

There was also strong support for the development of the Akura Conservation Centre from those who use it.

With respect to both erosion and pest control, there were a number of submissions about funding. Those who directly benefit from these programmes urged that central government funding be accessed where

possible. There were some submissions suggesting that landowners should be bearing more of the expense of these programmes.

Some submissions gave strong support to whole of catchment management, particularly in regard to the Ruamahanga River catchment.

A number of submissions from the Porirua area urged a greater contribution from Greater Wellington than that outlined in the Proposed 10-Year Plan, for support of biodiversity protection around Porirua harbour extending from the work being undertaken in the Pauatahanui Inlet.

#### **4.4.1.3 Water Supply**

Many submissions recognised the need for demand management and conservation. About equal numbers supported and did not support water meters. There was considerable and more unanimous support for councils to facilitate and/or subsidise domestic collection of rain water and grey water.

A lesser number commented on the need for new water sources and storage capacity. Some considered that demand management and conservation would be sufficient but many considered that the need for more water was inevitable. There were concerns about drawing more water from the Hutt River, and support for more dams in the Otaki, Akatarawa and Wairarapa areas.

A number of submissions showed concern about the relationships between councils on water issues with a lack of appropriate responsibility and leadership being perceived on issues such as demand management and conservation, including system loss issues. Where the draft Regional Water Strategy was mentioned, it was supported.

#### **4.4.1.4 Parks and Forests**

Submissions expressed considerable appreciation of the region's parks and forests, with most wanting to see further development of the network at a measured pace.

Issues raised included that of access to parks for those who use public transport, and the issue of mixed use. Strongest comments were about the conflict between natural values and power generation and any other commercial enterprise. There was both support and concern about the possibility of extending historical and technology aspects of QEII Park. There was some support for the further development of cycling facilities in parks and forests.

A number of submissions considered a Parks Network Strategy would assist in balancing uses. It was suggested that the Parks Network Strategy and the Open Space Strategy should be developed together.

#### **4.4.1.5 Regional Sustainable Development**

A few submissions were sceptical about the benefits or need for the Wellington Regional Strategy (WRS), while others wrote in support of specific aspects of

it. The Council was urged not to allow the WRS to impinge on the autonomy of individual councils.

Only a small number of submissions dealt with Greater Wellington's involvement in broadband provision, and there was a split view about whether the Council should be involved.

The majority of submissions addressing Climate Change supported the direction the Council is taking and urged the Council to continue to be active in this area. There was considerable support for Greater Wellington having a role in increasing the availability and uptake of renewable energy, including providing subsidies or loans secured by rates to households. This support was prevalent, but not unanimous.

The majority of submissions addressing the use of council-owned land for the development of windfarms supported that option. However, a number limited their support by suggesting circumstances, such as proximity to people and outstanding natural values, where such developments should not be allowed. Some submissions were strongly opposed to windfarms in parks and forests.

#### **4.4.1.6 Safety and Flood Protection**

Most submissions addressing this activity were supportive of the flood protection works programme.

Some submitters were keen that those who most directly benefit from flood protection works should bear most of the costs.

A theme emerged from a number of submissions about the opportunities and challenges flood protection provides for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and protection of species and stream environments.

A number of submissions also addressed the need for better water management at source and the opportunities available for developing drainage systems that utilise stormwater effectively.

#### **4.4.1.7 Resource Management**

The proposal to increase the resource consent charge-out rate drew slightly more disapproval than approval. However, it was clear from comments that many confuse Greater Wellington's resource consent functions with the building consent functions of other councils.

A number of submissions urged the Council to be stronger and more vigilant with respect to environmental protection.

More than twenty submissions requested that Greater Wellington fund a Regional Co-ordinator position for the EnviroSchools programme.

#### **4.4.1.8 Community**

Few comments were received about this activity. A number of submitters suggested that the Council is not genuine in its attempts to consult. There was a

significant set of submissions suggesting that a shift towards the new Auckland super-council model might be good for the region.

#### **4.5 Submitters' responses to proposed rates**

Seventy-three submissions included comments about the proposed rates over the life of the 10-Year Plan. Most were concerned about the affordability of the rates in a time of recession, particularly for people on low and fixed incomes. Many considered that rates should not rise above the rate of inflation and urged that plans be modified accordingly or that more use is made of user-pays revenue. Council's return on assets and ownership of assets were queried by a small number of submitters.

#### **4.6 Other responses**

There is mixed support for the Council's rationale for a new Masterton Office. In addition, many submitters addressing the issue were concerned that the alternatives to building a new office such as leasing, or buying an existing building and undertaking refurbishing may not have been sufficiently explored.

### **5 Recommendations**

*That the Committee:*

1. ***Receives the report.***
2. ***Notes the content of the report.***

Report prepared by:

**Jane Bradbury**  
Divisional Manager,  
Corporate and Strategy