



**Report** 05.151  
**Date** 11 April 2005  
**File** SP/01/02/09

**Committee** Planning and Monitoring Subcommittee  
**Author** Amy Norrish Policy Analyst

## **Response to consultation on the proposed LTCCP amendment and the 2005/06 proposed annual plan**

### **1. Purpose**

To provide an overview of the submissions received on Greater Wellington's proposed amendment to the long-term council community plan (LTCCP) and 2005/06 proposed annual plan.

### **2. Background**

The consultation period on Greater Wellington's proposed amendment to the long-term council community plan (LTCCP) and 2005/06 proposed annual plan ran from 9 March to 11 April 2005. At the time this report was written the Council had received a total of forty-eight submissions. These have been compiled in a volume and have been circulated to all councillors for their consideration. Some seventeen submitters have also asked to be heard in support of their submission.

The big question councillors need to focus on through the Subcommittee meetings and the full Committee and Council meetings which follow is "Are there changes we should be making to our plan as a result of the views expressed?"

### **3. Comment**

#### **3.1 Origin of submitters**

The table below lists the origins of each submitter on the plan.<sup>1</sup> As usual, the majority of submissions come from Wellington, with the rest of the submissions spread over the other constituencies. The three submitters that are

---

<sup>1</sup> Because these figures are based on the origins of submitters and there is often more than one submitter per submission the total number of submitters will not equal the total number of submissions. Where submitters are individually identified on a submission they will be counted as separate submitters e.g. submission 39 includes a list of seventeen residents of Hathaway Avenue who support the submission. An organisation is counted as one submitter.

listed as “Unknown” have emailed their submission and have not provided any other contact details. The three submitters recorded under “Other” are the Property Council of New Zealand and Vector Limited, which are both based in Auckland, and Responsible Resource Recovery Ltd, which is based in Hastings.

Constituency	Number of submitters
Wellington	22
Lower Hutt	34
Upper Hutt	3
Porirua	5
Kapiti	6
Wairarapa	1
Other i.e. from outside the Wellington region	3
Unknown	4

The table below shows the numbers of submissions that have come from individuals, organisations, local authorities and government departments.<sup>2</sup> We have not received submissions from any government departments this year.

Individuals	50
Organisations (including community groups)	17
Local Authorities	2
Government Departments	0

### 3.2 Key themes

Unsurprisingly, many of the submissions the Council has received address transport issues. Some of the key points that have been discussed in more than one submission are noted below.

- 18 submissions generally support the Council’s proposed investment in rail
- 2 submissions recommend light rail options
- 3 submissions oppose the Council’s proposed investment in rail

---

<sup>2</sup> Some submissions have come from an organisation as well as individuals so again the total of this table will not equal the total number of submissions.

- 5 submissions disagree with how the rail upgrade is being paid for, although there is little agreement between them over who should pay i.e. costs should be divided across the region, central government should put more money in, Tranz Metro/Toll New Zealand should make a contribution, should be user pays, motorists should contribute to rail subsidies as they add to pollution, Land Transport New Zealand should pay 95% of the costs
- 12 submissions wanted more to be done to upgrade the rail system, including tracks, stations, extending of electrification, improved ticketing, parking facilities, replacement of rolling stock for Johnsonville line (not just refurbishment)
- 4 submissions recorded their support for trolley buses

Flood protection was another topic discussed in several submissions. Three submissions were concerned that the flood protection in the Hutt was inadequate. One of these submissions (submission 39) was made by two golf clubs and seventeen residents from Hathaway Avenue.

### 3.3 Specific requests for funding

Five organisations have specifically requested funding from Greater Wellington for projects.

The Wellington City Council notes in its submission that it has approved loans for two of these projects: from the Karori Wildlife Sanctuary Trust and the Wellington Marine Conservation Trust, subject to each of the Trusts getting funding from other sources. The Council recommends in its submission that Greater Wellington similarly approves the requests for the loans from this Council.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Amount</b>
The Friends of the Queen Elizabeth Park	Fencing of the remaining 1100 metres of Whareroa Stream	<b>\$20,000</b>
Karori Wildlife Sanctuary	Ongoing works and services support	<b>\$2m interest-free loan</b>
The Friends of Belmont Regional Park	Developing ammunition bunker in the park	<b>\$18,000</b>
The Friends of the Waikanae River	Clearance of weeds and non-natives along Waikanae River	<b>\$10,000</b>
Wellington Marine Conservation Trust	Construction of Marine Education Centre	<b>\$2m interest-free loan</b>

#### **4. Recommendation**

*That the Planning and Monitoring Subcommittee receives the report and notes the information.*

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

**Amy Norrish**  
Policy Analyst

**Wayne Hastie**  
Council Secretary