



Report 10.249  
Date 3 May 2010  
File SP/04/03/05

Committee Annual Plan Hearings Committee  
Author Julia White, Consultant

## Summary of submissions received on the Proposed Annual Plan 2010/11

### 1. Purpose

To provide an overview and highlight trends in the submissions Greater Wellington received on its Proposed Annual Plan 2010/11.

### 2. Significance of the decision

The subject matter of this report is part of a decision making process that will lead to the Council making a “significant” decision within the meaning of the Local Government Act 2002. The decision making process is explicitly prescribed for by section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002. This process includes the use of the special consultative procedure.

### 3. Background

This report complements Report 10.242 which sets out the submissions process and background information on submissions received.

### 4. Comment

#### 4.1 Origin of submissions

In total 119 submissions have been received on the Proposed Annual Plan. Below is the number of submissions grouped according to organisations, local authorities, government departments and individuals.

Organisations (including community groups)	17
Local government	3
Central government	0
Individuals	99

#### 4.2 Submitters' responses to key issues

An Annual Plan summary newspaper was sent to all households in the region. This identified key projects proposed for 2010/11 and key changes from the

2009-19 Ten Year Plan, categorised by eight activity groups. The summary document also contained details of proposed rates and a public transport fares review. A proposed new separate legal entity for Creative HQ was also concurrently consulted on which has been referred to the Wellington Regional Strategy Committee for consideration.

Table 1 is a snapshot of the number of submissions made on each topic. Sections 4.2.1-4.2.9 summarise key themes in the submissions by activity group.

**Table 1: Number of submissions made on each topic**

<b>Topic Name</b>	<b>Used</b>
Transport: public transport fares review	37
Finance: proposed rates	29
Resource Management: Porirua harbour and catchment modelling programme	2
Community	10
Transport: public transport operations	12
Transport: regional transport network planning	16
Transport: planning public transport services	23
Land Management: pest (animal and plant) management	9
Resource Management: groundwater research	3
Engineering Services: renewable energy	1
Water Supply: fluoridation	45
Resource Management: Natural Resource plan	9
Resource Management: Take Care programme	3
Parks and Forests: recreational, facilities and services	9
Parks and Forests: consultation and community relations	2
Safety and Flood Protection	6
Water Supply	10
Resource Management	16
Regional Sustainable Development	7
Finance	6

#### **4.2.1 Transport**

21 submitters were opposed to the proposed passenger transport fare increase, generally arguing that by raising fares public transport becomes a less attractive alternative to private transport. 13 submitters considered that the fare increase was reasonable as long as there was improved service (eg improved reliability of train services and communications with commuters about problems by the operator). Three submitters were neither opposed nor in support but sought more information or asked that Greater Wellington more actively engage with the Government to ensure that charges for public transport are equitable with fees charged to private users of cars.

Submissions on planning public transport services ranged from timetabling matters to service improvements that could be made to the bus and rail network

(eg discontinuing bus services during off peak times and prioritising the roll-out of real-time information).

Many submitters were keen to see Transmission Gully prioritised and asked why money was not allocated to designated cycle and walkway paths.

#### **4.2.2 Resource management**

Many submitters supported the development of the Natural Resource Plan and the consolidation of five different documents into one comprehensive plan, seeing the potential to identify key issues and reduce costs in the process.

Some submitters raised particular resource consent issues or hoped that the savings in groundwater research did not come at the expense of continued work in this area. Many submitters advocated for greater publicity of Greater Wellington's Take Care programme.

#### **4.2.3 Water supply**

45 submitters asked the Council to discontinue the fluoridation of water in the Wellington Region on the basis that adding fluoride to the water supply is a violation of human rights and has negative health effects. Many of these submitters followed a standard format for their submission provided by Fluoride Action Network (NZ) Inc.

Some submitters asked that Greater Wellington take a stronger position to drive and fund sustainable water conservation/ demand management strategies to ensure adequate water supply.

#### **4.2.4 Parks and forests**

Three submitters asked that Greater Wellington fund a purchase of a 284 hectare property at Baring Head, currently on the market under mortgagee sale.

Many submitters expressed interest and support for the Friends Group programme.

#### **4.2.5 Safety and flood protection**

Most submitters supported Greater Wellington's work in this area.

#### **4.2.6 Land management**

While some submitters were opposed to the use of 1080 to control possums many submitters expressed their support for Greater Wellington's pest management strategy and asked that funding be continued in this area.

#### **4.2.7 Regional sustainable development**

Many submitters questioned why Greater Wellington was getting involved in the Government's home insulation scheme and considered that it should instead focus on core business activities.

Many submitters were supportive of the broadband project and asked that Greater Wellington take a more proactive role in this area.

#### **4.2.8 Community**

Submitters commended Council on the ‘many activities it does well’. Some submitters asked that Greater Wellington get ‘back to grass roots’ (eg questioned why Greater Wellington engages with iwi and has a disability reference group when ‘this should be the responsibility of central government’).

#### **4.2.9 Finance**

Submitters were balanced as to those who supported and were opposed to the increased rates (13 either way). Some of those who opposed said that it was not fair that Upper Hutt had the greatest increase. Of those who thought the increase was reasonable many commended Greater Wellington on keeping the rates increase to a minimum 2.2%, compared with the 11% forecast in the 2009-19 Ten Year Plan.

Some submitters considered that there is a disparity between the rating of rural and urban properties and proposed that Council adopt a Uniform Annual Charge to achieve an even contribution from ratepayers.

Other submitters sought additional financial information, such as clarification on investment management funding, and more information on administration costs.

## **5. Recommendations**

*That the Committee:*

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

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

**Julia White**  
Consultant

**Jane Davis**  
General Manager, Strategy  
and Community Engagement