

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
1.	Donald Borrie	Operational matters regarding early involvement in set-up of day-to-day management of Whitireia Park	1. Requests inclusion of Whitireia Park in parks plan	1. Whitireia Park may be included at a later date by amendment to the plan. Park governance arrangements will be subject to Ngati Toa's Treaty Deed of Settlement. It would be premature to include in the plan at this time 2. Operational matters referred to parks operations staff	No change required
2.	Graham Ebbett - Titahi Bay Residents Association	Operational matters regarding early involvement in set-up of day-to-day management of Whitireia Park	1. Requests inclusion of Whitireia Park in parks plan	1. Whitireia Park may be included at a later date by amendment to the plan Park governance arrangements will be subject to Ngati Toa's Treaty Deed of Settlement. It would be premature to include in the plan at this time 2. Operational matters referred to parks operations staff	No change required
3.	Nancy Pollock	A. Confirms Greater Wellington has right balance between conservation, heritage management and recreation in park network B. Mainly concerned with Queen Elizabeth Park – shoreline conservation and replanting		Noted	No change required
4. Oral	Ray Hyndman	A. Requests changes to GWRC mountain bike brochure including a larger map, and more clearly marked tracks B. Concerned over poor access and track conditions from Cross Creek to Wairarapa road-end – would like this upgraded	1. Request changes to GWRC mountain bike brochure 2. Concerned over track conditions /access at Cross Creek	1. Refer request for changes to mountain bike brochure to marketing & design team and parks operations staff 2. Refer concern over access at the Wairarapa end of the rail trail to DOC as this land is under their administration	No change required
5. Oral	Transpower New Zealand	A. Transpower interests extend across Battle Hill, Belmont and Queen Elizabeth parks B. Transpower supports integrated parks plan C. Transpower requests that the plan enables ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrading of the national grid without unnecessary constraints D. Current policy gives authority for GWRC staff to require maintenance or upgrading of public utilities – Transpower requests that only they may enter and inspect, maintain and upgrade the national grid and not GWRC staff to ensure health and safety requirements are met E. All vegetation planted in the vicinity of Transpower lines should comply with the Electrical (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 F. Consultation should be undertaken with Transpower prior to planting any vegetation within the vicinity of its lines G. Transpower requests appropriate framework to be prepared by GWRC for cases where new transmission lines are required to traverse existing regional parks or significant landscapes H. Undergrounding of lines is not always practical due to cost I. Approval by GWRC of transmission design and colour schemes is not considered appropriate as these are determined by engineering requirements and not by	1. Re-word policy 48 to include a restriction on planting of trees in close proximity to utilities – a) safe distances from network utilities for activities including tree planting... b) the removal or trimming of vegetation near utilities, including transmission lines and underground services and pipelines 2. Amend Policy 50: b) It is not inconsistent with the policies in this management plan and they are to the extent practicable of a scale.... (adjustment to clause b) e) the works are of direct benefit to the region or nation (new clause) 3. Delete requirement in Policy 52 for approval conditional on design and colour scheme 4. Amend Policy 52 to recognise that health, safety and operational restrictions may apply where access is sought by Council officers ...subject to compliance with health and safety requirements... 5. Add new policy to address reverse sensitivity issues between park activities and existing utilities “To ensure that activities and development within regional parks do not generate effects (or reverse sensitivity effects) on existing infrastructure” 6. Amend explanatory text to utilities policy for the operation, maintenance, upgrading, replacement and	1. Proposed amendments are appropriate 2. Adjustment to clause (b) does not add value to the clause e) Wording ‘works that are of national interest’ would better reflect national guidance 3. Opportunity for input on colour scheme and design is covered in Policy 50 4. This clause is about GWRC being able to require maintenance or restoration of a site to ensure conditions are being met. Proposed amendments do not fit within the context and are unnecessary for this plan 5. This plan is about managing parks rather than utilities 6. Agree that further explanation may be required	1. Amend Policy 48 as per submitter's comments 2. Include new clause 50 (e) ‘works that are of national interest’ 3. Delete wording in Policy 52as per submitter's suggestion. 4. No change required 5. No change required 6. Review explanatory text

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		visual amenity J. Subdivision, activities and development within the transmission corridor are managed through a corridor management policy (permission from Transpower limited in this zone)	relocation of existing transmission lines to be consistent with National Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities (NESETA) 7. Part 7 – Use and Development rules: remove the requirement for Transpower to consult with GWRC in cases of emergency 8. Amend Rule 7.2 to include works permitted under the NESETA	7. Transpower and other utility providers must have a duty to inform the landowner as soon as practicable 8. These would be allowed as a result of approval of the activity in the park and conditions in a lease	(after Policy 52) in light of NESETA 7. Amend to inform GWRC as soon as practicable 8. No change required
6. Oral	PowerCo Ltd	A. PowerCo have gas network infrastructure in Belmont Regional park B. PowerCo supports integrated parks plan C. PowerCo requests that the plan enables ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrading of its gas assets without unnecessary constraints D. Requests no interference with ability to inspect and weed spray around infrastructure, and no planting of vegetation within the immediate vicinity of gas lines E. Requests provision of new assets if required in parks or on significant landscapes F. Request that all development and activity undertaken close to gas assets meet Gas Act 1992 and relevant NZS standards and consultation is undertaken with PowerCo G. Supports definition of utilities in plan H. Request for gas assets to be shown on map of Belmont Regional Park	1. Policy 48 – refer to managing vegetation rather than just trimming and include restriction on planting of trees in close proximity to utilities by amending 48 (b) The removal or management of vegetation near utilities, including transmission lines and underground services and pipelines... 2. Amend Policy 50: <i>b) It is not inconsistent with the policies in this management plan and they are to the extent practicable of a scale.... (adjustment to clause b)</i> <i>e) the works are of direct benefit to the region or nation (new clause)</i> 3. Delete requirement in Policy 52 for approval conditional on design and colour scheme 4. Amend Policy 52 to recognize that health, safety and operational restrictions may apply where access is sought by Council officers ...subject to compliance with health and safety requirements... 5. Add new policy to address reverse sensitivity issues between park activities and existing utilities “To ensure that activities and development within regional parks do not generate effects (or reverse sensitivity effects) on existing infrastructure” 6. Part 7 – Use and Development rules: remove the requirement for PowerCo to consult with GWRC in cases of emergency and amend reference from vegetation trimming to vegetation management 7. Amend Rule 7.3 (managed activity with permit from ranger) to add minor upgrading “Minor upgrading of existing network utilities here the effects of the utility on the park will remain of the same character, intensity and scale” 8. Amend 7.3 to add a requirement for notice to be given for developments and activities in close proximity to gas pipelines and emergency works “Where works are proposed within close proximity to gas assets, plans and locations of works and either 72 hours or 48 hours prior notice must be given to Natural Gas Corporation (Transmission) or other	1. Agree with submitter 2. Adjustment to clause (b) does not add value to the clause e) Disagree- wording ‘works that are of national interest’ would better reflect national guidance 3. Opportunity for input on colour scheme and design is already covered in Policy 50 and is not necessary to repeat in Policy 52 4. This clause is about GWRC being able to require maintenance or restoration of a site to ensure conditions are being met. Proposed amendments to the plan do not fit within this context and are unnecessary for this plan 5. This management plan is about managing parks rather than utilities 6. PowerCo and other utility providers must have a duty to inform the landowner as soon as practicable 7. Disagree. Maintenance and repairs are allowed but it is difficult to define ‘minor’ and ‘major’ upgrading. These should remain activities that are restricted and considered on a case by case basis 8. It is the responsibility of the developer to consider affected parties, including utility providers located on the park and give sufficient notice to these parties	1. Amend Policy 48(b) as per submitter’s comments 2. Include new clause 50 (e) ‘works that are of national interest’ 3. Delete wording as per submitter’s suggestion. 4. No change required 5. No change required 6. Amend to include words: inform GWRC as soon as practicable 7. No change required 8. No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<i>gas companies respectively (except in cases of emergency, as long as the Corporation/Company is advised of the works as soon as practicable thereafter and all legal obligations for works around gas assets are met)”</i>		
7. Oral	Bill Nairn	A. Supports integrated parks plan B. Support overall content, especially Heritage precinct at Queen Elizabeth Park C. Suggestion to signal future train platform at MacKay’s Crossing when funding is available	Signal future train platform at MacKay’s Crossing when funding is available	While the Regional Land Transport Strategy supports more efficient public transport across Wellington region, the Regional Rail Plan does not include MacKay’s stop in the next 10 years. However, this could be investigated for possible funding in the longer term	No change required
8.	Graeme Lyon	A. Supports content of plan B. Requests a correction to Belmont map – Normandale road entrance C. Supports development of tracks in Speedy’s Stream – access and track/route to SH58 Haywards C. Requests a correction to East Harbour description – include reference to North Island robin not black robin D. Requests additional description around Pakuratahi relating to continued encouragement with DOC to improve access and make suitable family cycling from Lake Wairarapa to Cross Creek	1. Page 58 – entrance to say Normandale Road (Normandale) and Kaitangata Cres (Kelson) 2. Amend reference to robin in East Harbour description from black robin to North Island robin 3. Pakuratahi: include reference to ongoing liaison with DOC to improve access and make suitable family cycling from Lake Wairarapa to Cross Creek	1. – 3. Agree - all changes appropriate	1. Amend park entrance names, p.58 2. Amend reference to robin, p.16 3. Include new clause to Partnership in Parks p.72 as per submitter’s recommendation
9.	Kapiti Model Aero Club – V.A Rivers	A. Considers plan is weighted more heavily on conservation and selective heritage management with little emphasis on the provision of recreation facilities and opportunities B. No reference in the plan to Queen Elizabeth Park being gazetted as recreation reserve C. Original submission not acknowledged D. Plan must recognize individual features and goals of each park	1. QEP to be listed as “recreation reserve”	1. QEP is listed as being gazetted under the Reserves Act 1977 on page 75 in the current draft, but could provide better detail in appendix for QEP Note: All submissions have now been acknowledged	1. Amend appendix to clearly show land status as a recreation reserves
10.	Robert West	A. Too much emphasis on conservation in current draft plan B. No reference in the plan to Queen Elizabeth Park being gazetted as recreation reserve	1. QEP to be listed as “recreation reserve”	1. QEP is listed as being gazetted under the Reserves Act 1977 on page 75 in the current draft, but could provide better detail in appendix for QEP	1. Amend appendix to clearly show land status as a recreation reserve
11.	Ted White - The Printing Museum	A. Supports construction of railway stop/platform at MacKay’s Crossing B. Requests a clearer definition of heritage C. Considers proposed printing museum will add heritage interest to QEP without any adverse effects on parks natural and environmental attractions D. Happy to see “heritage precinct” in projected future changes map for QEP	1. Train stop at MacKay’s 2. Clearer definition of “heritage”	1. While the Regional Land Transport Strategy supports more efficient public transport across Wellington region, the Regional Rail Plan does not include MacKay’s stop in the next 10 years However, this could be investigated for possible funding in the longer term 2. Not necessary to tightly define heritage in this context.	1. No change required 2. No change required
12.	Anthony Dreaver	A. Commends draft plan B. Suggestions for improvement relating to history references – history of parks, tangata whenua, QEP C. Concerns over the karaka tree being under attack on the QEP dunes – karaka is a valuable food for native birds and significance to Maori D. Page 30 Landscape and geological features –	1. Page 5 paragraph 1: include reference to the period before WW1 with rising standards of living, greater leisure time and an effective rail network. Exploring outdoor NZ was no longer just by surveyors, engineers and settlers 2. Page 9 tangata whenua – plan needs to clearly state the point when Native land became Crown land	1. This would be better included in the history in appendix 2. and 3. Not considered necessary for the purposes of park description.	1. Amend history in appendix to reflect submitters comments 2. and 3. No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>Parangarahu Lakes and Baring Head</p> <p>Kaitoke</p> <p>M. Support ecology changes proposed in plan</p> <p>N. Suggestions for ecological corridors – along Mangaroa River and Hutt River corridors; higher land above SH2 to indigenous forest on south-east of park; from higher ground above SH2 above Stuart Macaskill lakes connecting to SW park indigenous vegetation (Southern Hills to Akatarawa Forest) – Kaitoke to Pakuratahi Forest</p> <p>Pakuratahi</p> <p>O. Support ecology changes proposed in plan</p> <p>Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP)</p> <p>P. Request for confirmation from GWRC whether ecological corridor along SH1 would return previous Kahikatea wetland to original state</p> <p>Wainuiomata Recreation Area (WRA)</p> <p>Q. Support proposed ecology change in plan</p>	<p>how this is noted in the plan</p> <p>4. Management of bush remnant at Battle Hill</p> <p>5. Allow indigenous forest to regenerate when plantation forest is harvested</p>	<p>done on improving fish passage</p> <p>4. Noted, the management of covenanted area of bush opposite Battle Hill by GWRC is an operational manner rather than a policy matter. The suggestion will be referred to parks operational staff</p> <p>5. The choice to replant or revert is covered in Policy 12 and Policy 38</p>	<p>4. No change required</p> <p>5. No change required</p>
14. oral	Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc. – Betty van Gaalen	<p>A. Support consolidated plan and draft plan including tables, purpose of plan, individual parks values</p> <p>B. Supports desire by GWRC to ensure access will be retained to parks with Transmission Gully</p> <p>C. Request for rights of access to Baring Head to stay protected</p> <p>Queen Elizabeth Park</p> <p>D. No mention of possible effects of proposed NZTA options for MacKays - PekaPeka expressway</p> <p>Part 5</p> <p>E. Page 35: Policy 46 needs to be well published in line with Policy 47 so that public are well informed of park closures</p> <p>F. Page 37: Policy 56 – there is unqualified support given to prohibition of mining etc.</p> <p>G. Page 39: Policy 69 – unqualified support given – the separation of recreational activities may require monitoring</p> <p>H. Page 39: Policy 66: recommendation that signs and track markers are colour coded</p> <p>I. Supports GWRC working with NZTA and other agencies to ensure access links to and across parks</p> <p>J. Supports prohibition of wind farm construction</p> <p>Queen Elizabeth Park</p> <p>K. Notes importance to Kapiti Coast community of future management of NE area of park that may be affected by future roading expressway</p> <p>L. Encourages GWRC to work with NZTA and other agencies to maximize recreational opportunities from roading proposals</p>	<p>1. Part 9 – need page number reference from projected changes map to text</p> <p>2. Page 17 – proposed Pencarrow Regional Park 1975 also included Wainuiomata town</p> <p>Queen Elizabeth Park</p> <p>3. Include discussion on likely effects of proposed MacKays - Pekapeka expressway road</p> <p>Part 5</p> <p>4. Page 33: Policy 36 should be Policy 37 and vice-versa</p> <p>5. Policy 53 is missing</p> <p>5.5 Visitor Services</p> <p>6. Page 35: Objective 13 – include reference also to provision of public transport, partnership with KiwiRail for trains to stop at Queen Elizabeth park</p> <p>7. Page 37: Objective 12 - request to be re-written to remove reference to “different ethnicities” and include “mobility impaired”</p> <p>8. Page 39: Policy 70 – suggest rewording “<i>To specifically focus on developing easy to moderate trails close to park entrances giving increased opportunities for the elderly etc..</i>”</p> <p>5.7 Partnerships in parks</p> <p>9. Objective 18: add “<i>where possible</i>” at end of clause</p> <p>10. Policies 88-90: not all volunteers will belong to Friends organisations – add “<i>volunteers</i>” into 88</p> <p>11. Policy 94: add additional clause to give protection to private property rights</p> <p>Part 6</p> <p>12. Cross reference text projected changes with</p>	<p>1. Editing comment</p> <p>2. Detail not necessary for the park description</p> <p>3. The plan is not an appropriate place to discuss the effects of a possible roading option that has not been finalised</p> <p>4. and 5. Editing comments only, need to swap policies and re-number</p> <p>6. While the Regional Land Transport Strategy supports more efficient public transport across Wellington region, the Regional Rail Plan does not include MacKay’s stop in the next 10 years However, this could be investigated for possible funding in the longer term</p> <p>7. Encouraging different ethnicities to use the parks is part of broadening both the activities offered and the marketing strategy. This is also covered in Policy 67</p> <p>8. Re-word as suggested by submitter</p> <p>9. and 10. Editing comments</p> <p>11. Protection of private property rights are outside the scope of the network plan and legislative requirements for GWRC</p> <p>12. These need to be reviewed to ensure consistency</p>	<p>1. Officer to review maps as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. & 5. Review edits by submitter and amend</p> <p>6. No change required.</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. Amend policy as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>9. & 10. Adopt edit suggested by submitter</p> <p>11.No change required</p> <p>12. Review as suggested by</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		M. Recommends partnership with KiwiRail to provide recreational stop at QEP Part 7 N. Supportive of prohibited activities meaning no development or activities allowed Part 8 O. Supportive of plan being reviewed every 10 years P. Acknowledges monitoring of plan is important to ensure adherence to policies and rules	projected changes map Wainuiomata Recreation Area 13. 6.8.5 – add the word “centre” after interpretation and based Appendix 1 14. History: penultimate sentence add “local” before government	13. Interpretation could include signage only or a bigger area or centre 14. Would change meaning of the sentence; the sentence is currently correct	submitter 13. No change required 14. No change required
15.	Samantha Hutcheson	A. Supports Paekakariki Community Board submission (number 21) especially in relation to the uniqueness of each park B. Considers important for QEP to exclude motor sports and high priority given to commuter cycle track		Noted	No change required
16.	East Harbour Environmental Association Inc. – Felicity Rushbrooke	A. Supportive of integrated plan B. Suggests postponing the adoption of plan to incorporate management of Baring Head (following recent purchase) C. Supports inclusion of ecological corridors D. Main focus of submission on East Harbour Regional Park (EHRP) E. 5.4.3 Climate Change Policy 45 – support climate change considerations F. 6.4.1 – note absence of any record of SNR’s G. 6.4.4 (n)– note appreciation for support given by GWRC H. 6.4.5 – concern over projected changes (possible recreational link over Wainui Hill) due to conflict with mountain bikers and other users	East Harbour Regional Park (EHRP) 1. Page 84 - 7.1: mountain biking symbol should reflect managed activity 2. Need to confirm if EHRP was established as a regional park in the 1970’s 3. Note absence of track hierarchy at East Harbour 4. 6.4.4 (h) – no primary entrances marked for East Harbour, only secondary 5. 6.4.4 (i) – concerned provisions made for removing natural materials for commercial purposes in the Parangarahu Lakes area – not compatible with special values of this area 6. 7.1 Table 1: recreational hunting should be prohibited in East Harbour 7. 7.2.5 Dogs: dogs should be both under control and on leash at all times	1. A footnote to the table would clarify 2. Need to correct that East Harbour was first proposed as a regional park in the 1970’s 3. Submitters concern noted, maps should be reviewed to ensure track hierarchy consistency across network 4. There are no major entrances at East Harbour due to the nature of the entrances (parking constraints and so on) 5. Noted, no decisions have been finalized for the Parangarahu Lakes area. The clause specifies it should be considered by the advisory group. 6. Recreational hunting remains in East Harbour as decided in East Harbour management plan 2007 7. Dogs provision remains as consistent with legislation and East Harbour RP management plan decisions in 2007	1. Review table in 7.1 and amend to give clarity 2. Amend as per officers comment 3. Review maps with regard to track hierarchy 4. No change required 5. No change required, refer to advisory group when established 6. No change required 7. No change required
17. oral	Wellington Tramway Museum Inc. – Trevor Burling	A. Supportive of vision and guiding and principles but consider additional guiding principle needed to make it easier for people to visit GWRC parks Leases B. Consider relationships with lease holders are not recognised in guiding principles (14) on a par with the recognition of volunteers and community groups given in guiding principle 14 6.7 Queen Elizabeth Park C. Support for park specific management and policies D. Note things of relevance to Tramways including: - provision of family recreation opportunities - development and maintenance of heritage precinct - recognition of cultural heritage of museum - MacKay’s Crossing as a “primary” entrance - maintaining interpretation panels	1. Additional guiding principle “to make it easier for people to visit GWRC parks” and additions to objectives, policies and methods 2. Addition to guiding principle 14 to recognize strategic relationship with lease holders 3. Recognise tramline from MacKay’s to Whareroa Beach as a rail corridor (Railways Act 2005) 4. Include reference to ongoing maintenance of existing infrastructure including	1. Suggest broadening guiding principle 15 to include access provision for general population, not just reference to youth, elderly and so on: “Make the Greater Wellington Parks Network accessible to the community, including youth, different ethnicities, the elderly, and those with disabilities” 2. Suggest broadening guiding principle 14 to include leaseholders as more appropriate: “Promote community participation and sense of ownership by supporting volunteers and community groups and working cooperatively with leaseholders” 3. Agree 4. Levels of service will be stated in operational plans, rather than the Parks Network Plan. Operational	1. Amend guiding principle as per officers comment 2. Amend guiding principle 14 as per officers comment 3. Adjust maps 15/16 to include tramline. 4. No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>-projected changes including Whareroa and MacKay's as key development nodes for locating facilities and activities</p> <p>Rail corridor</p> <p>E. Note that the tramline from MacKay's to Whareroa Beach is defined as a rail corridor under the Railways Act 2005</p> <p>6.7.4 Visitor Services (j-l)</p> <p>F. Consider some visitor services are not acknowledged that should be in addition to entrances and memorials</p> <p>Existing services</p> <p>G. Consider existing infrastructure should be maintained into the future with recognition in plan of this – provide assurance for lease holders and community etc</p> <p>Access</p> <p>H. Request for specific reference to be made to provision of public transport (rail) at Queen Elizabeth Park in projected changes map to complement development of heritage precinct</p>	<p>-Whareroa Road (MacKay's Crossing to Whareroa Beach</p> <p>-Associated drainage works, car parks at MacKay's Crossing and Whareroa Beach</p> <p>-Potable water supply at MacKay's Crossing</p> <p>-Toilet facilities/changing facilities at Whareroa Beach)</p> <p>-Facilities at Wainui</p> <p>5. Reference to provision of future public transport (rail) at MacKay's Crossing in projected changes map</p> <p>6. Request that tramline be recognised as a "Rail Corridor" in plan</p>	<p>matters referred to parks operations staff</p> <p>5. While the Regional Land Transport Strategy supports more efficient public transport across Wellington region, the Regional Rail Plan does not include MacKay's stop in the next 10 years. However, this could be investigated for possible funding in the longer term</p> <p>6. The tramline is not used for commuting or part of the rail network, but rather a leisure activity and learning experience</p>	<p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. No change required, but will be included in the maps (refer to 3 above)</p>
18.	Edmond and Judith Soja	<p>A. Consider not right emphasis on conservation, heritage management and recreation across parks network</p> <p>B. Particular interest in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>C. Consider the development of wind farms and infrastructure in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest is inconsistent with the plan's vision statement and management guiding principles</p> <p>D. Concern over plan's intention to allow industrial activity e.g. wind turbine installations (Battle Hill and Akatarawa)</p>	<p>Part 6</p> <p>6.1 Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - Delete clause (primary focus for Akatarawa Forest is protection of water resource)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) Allowing for development of approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill – Delete clause (inconsistent with primary focus of Akatarawa Forest)</p> <p>6.2.4 Battle Hill</p> <p>3. 6.2.4 (c) Delete clause and reinstate with wording from Nov 2009 Battle Hill management plan</p> <p><i>"To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>European style pastoral character</i> • <i>The combination of unbroken pastured river flat to forested steepplands</i> • <i>The eastern hills</i> • <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> • <i>Native bush remnant"</i> <p>4. 6.3.4(e) Land Management – amend to read</p> <p><i>"Prohibit the construction of wind turbines within the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park together with any infrastructure associated with wind farm, any blade flyover from turbines located adjacent to the park</i></p>	<p>1. – 2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and the forested steepplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the</p>	<p>1. -2. No change required</p> <p>3. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>4. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p><i>boundaries and prohibit any form of access to and from the wind farm through any part of Battle Hill Farm Forest Park</i></p> <p>5. Battle Hill projected changes map 4 April 2010 – delete reference to windfarm road</p>	<p>roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	5. No change required
19.	Maxine Olsen	<p>A. Concern over emphasis on making park network “sustainable” e.g. provision of major industrial developments like wind farms</p> <p>B. Particular interest in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>C. Concern that access will be granted for wind farms</p> <p>D. Considers GWRC is not protecting the parks values by supporting adjacent wind farm development</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>E. Considers values of forest not being protected by plan due to possible renewable wind energy development</p> <p>F. Requests that GWRC oppose any other proposed neighbouring windfarm developments that may threaten the values of Battle Hill Park</p>	<p>1. Part 6.1.3 (7) Delete (wind energy development on selected ridgelines)</p> <p>2. Delete reference to wind farm development on Projected changes Map 4 April 2010</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p>	1. – 2. No change required
20.	Suzanne Thomas, Christine Pascoe, Shane Thomas, Jason Warnock (Moonshine Road residents)	<p>A. Consider right balance between conservation, heritage management and recreation across parks network</p> <p>B. Oppose any wind farm developments</p> <p>C. Particular interest in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest</p>	<p>6.1 Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind farm development on selected ridgelines - Delete this clause (inconsistent with primary focus of Akatarawa Forest – 6.1.3 (1))</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) Allow wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill and associated utility infrastructure - Delete clause</p> <p>3. Delete reference to wind farm on Map 2 Projected changes Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Construction of wind turbines within Battle Hill – amend clause to read: <i>“Prohibit the construction of wind turbines within the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park together with any infrastructure associated with wind farm, any blade flyover from turbines located adjacent to the park boundaries and prohibit any form of access to and from the wind farm through any part of Battle Hill Farm Forest Park”</i></p> <p>5. Delete reference to wind farm development in Map 4</p>	<p>1. – 2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>3. Map signals proposed development approved by Council</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa</p>	1-5 No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			Projected changes Battle Hill	Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.	
21. oral	Paekakariki Community Board – Adrian Webster	A. Support for integrated plan so long as the unique characteristics of each park are retained B. Notes that management success of GWRC parks is largely due to partnership relationship with parks friends groups and contributions of individuals and other organizations – considers draft plan only contains “lip service” to this – especially around parks levels of service and park budgets C. Notes opposition to any form of motorised recreation at Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP), but ok to this in Akatarawa Forest D. Opposes use of QEP for the proposed NZTA expressway	1. Delete 7.4.3 (f) to exclude motorised recreation from all other parks except Akatarawa Forest. Amend 7.5 to include motorised recreation as a prohibited activity (currently restricted activity) 2. Request for plan be more permissive for a future technology precinct at QEP 3. Request priority be given for the completion of the commuter cycleway between Paekakariki and Raumati South	1. The location of motorised recreation requires careful consideration of locations. The plan currently has some inconsistency between Table 9 and 7.4.3 (f). It is proposed to retain ‘motorised recreation’ as a prohibited activity in all other parks other than Akatarawa Forest, but to acknowledge that one-off events may be authorized through a concession process (namely, Belmont, Battle Hill and Pakuratahi) Suggest new clause in 7.5 “Motorised recreation is generally a prohibited activity in all parks other than the Akatarawa Forest. However concessions for one-off events may be considered where any conflicts of interest and potential environmental impacts can be managed”. Further amend Table 9 to include an asterisk (*) against motorised recreation and a footnote saying “Concessions for one-off events may be considered on a case by case basis (see 7.5) 2. The current plan provides for a heritage precinct, which would need to be compatible with the key characteristics of the park. There is general support for this proposal in submissions, rather than a technology precinct 3. Noted, this will be determined through operational planning and opportunity to support its progress is through the LTCCP and annual plan.	1. Delete clause 7.4.3 (f) and insert a new clause relating to motorised recreation in prohibited activities (7.5) 2. No change required 3. No change required
22.	G.E Filer	Akatarawa Forest A. Considers proposal for water storage dam and lake on Whakatikei River would destroy significant area of indigenous forest and Draper’s wetland – alternatives need to be considered e.g. conservation policies to reduce water demand, increasing capacity of Te Marua lakes, construction of new storage lake e.g. west of Totara Park or east of Birchville, construct low water intake weir on Whakatikei River B. Considers proposed windfarm corridors would destroy indigenous vegetation, visually detrimental and is contrary to policies in network plan – recommends corridors are restricted to areas of plantation or grass East Harbour C. Considers removal of plantation forestry near Ferry Road is important so no visual detracting to adjacent indigenous vegetation Battle Hill D. Considers front paddocks of park used for picnicking and camping are not compatible with livestock	1. Consider alternatives for water storage 2. Restrict windfarms to plantation forestry or grasslands 3. Remove plantation forest in East Harbour 4. Retire front paddocks at Battle Hill from grazing 5. Replace pine trees at Oakleigh Street with indigenous vegetation	1. Water options are not discussed in detail in network plan and more appropriately discussed in other council documents (e.g. water strategy). Submission will be referred to officers working on the Water Strategy. Operational matters referred to parks operations staff 2. Part of the proposed windfarm is on plantation forestry. The detailed siting of wind turbines will be considered as part of a subsequent RMA application 3. Removal of plantation forest in East Harbour, Belmont is an operational manner not discussed in the network plan 4. The retiring of the front paddocks at Battle Hill is an operational manner not appropriate to be discussed in the network plan 5. The rapid replacement of pines at Oakleigh Street with indigenous vegetation is an operational manner more appropriately addressed in parks activity plans / operational planning	1.-5. No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>droppings – recommends retiring these areas from grazing</p> <p>Belmont</p> <p>E. 4.1 Plantation forest removal – recommends rapid replacement of pine trees at Oakleigh St entrance to park and replacement with indigenous plants</p> <p>F. 4.2 Walking track access during lambing – recommends tracks are open to walkers during lambing period (e.g. Boulder Hill summit to Belmont Road) because it is a significant recreation area</p>			
23.	Vivian Pohl	<p>A. Support for amalgamation of management plans into one network plan</p> <p>B. Suggests more work required to have a consistent language and terminology across the plan e.g. descriptions of park entrances (page 53 Battle Hill – reference to focal points and no mention of entry points; page 63 East Harbour – no primary entrances, only secondary; page 67 Kaitoke reference to focal points and key development nodes; page 71 Pakuratahi no identification on maps of four recreation areas; page 77 QEP mix of primary and secondary park entrances; page 81 Wainuiomata reference to whole park as a recreation area, need to confirm if these are the same as the recreation areas in Pakuratahi. Maps do not show primary or secondary entrances</p> <p>C. Suggestion for classification of tracks, routes, shared tracks etc similar to DOC</p> <p>D. Considers plan focuses on maintaining present rather than looking forward to future</p>	<p>1. Review consistency of terminology between text and maps</p> <p>2. Consider a clearer track classification across the network similar to DOC</p> <p>3. Page 9 - 2.4: Suggestion to add more about the contributions of the voluntary sector</p> <p>4. Page 11, 3.1: suggest wording change in paragraph 2 where there is reference to “many unique plants and animals” – change to “<i>many rare plants and animals OR many species endemic only to those regional parks and not found elsewhere in NZ</i>”</p> <p>5. 4.3 Guiding Principles Guiding principle 1 – considers word “important” is not significant enough in light of vision Guiding principle 2 – considers all degraded ecosystems should be restored not just “significant” ecosystems Guiding principle 3 – suggests farming and production forestry do not increase above 2010 levels Guiding principle 5 – recommends enhancement of existing ecological connections and creation of new connections where these no longer exist Guiding principle 15 – considers “appropriate opportunities” will need more precise identification so each park will not have full range of facilities/opportunities for each minority group Guiding principle 18 – request for more recognition of intent to acquire/purchase or exchange land when opportunities arise which will enhance access/recreation/environmental values</p> <p>6. 5.1.2 Policy 8: question about what happens to fallen exotic trees around Korokoro stream area</p> <p>7. 5.1.3 Policy 14(b) – introduced plants - considers amenity value not a good reason for keeping exotics unless (i) – (have specific purpose) or (ii) – (pose low</p>	<p>1. Editing comments</p> <p>2. Like DOC, GWRC currently uses the NZ Standard classification for tracks. However, the maps in this plan are referring to recreation use rather than service levels</p> <p>3. Current reference is considered sufficient. Note that ‘volunteers’ are acknowledged in the policy section of the plan in the partnership in parks section.</p> <p>4. Agree with changes</p> <p>5. Agree with changes Need to have some way of prioritizing degraded ecosystems to decide priorities (as per policy) This plan does not currently set standards. Farming practice will be determined by sustainable farm management plans The priority is on linking areas that currently exist to improve ecological connectivity, not to start anew Considered an unnecessary change</p> <p>Covered in Policy 95</p> <p>Refer submitter to 5.1.3, Policy 12. The emphasis is on reversion and replanting in natives.</p> <p>7. 5.1.3 Policy 14 (b): Amenity value is important, for example: exotics provide a shaded area for picnicking.</p>	<p>1. Cross-check maps and text for consistency</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. Amend 3.1 to read “many rare plants and animals”</p> <p>5. Principle 1: replace “important” with “significant” Principle 2: no change required Principle 3: no change required Principle 5: no change required Principle 15: no change required Principle 18: no change required</p> <p>7. No change required to 5.1.3 Policy 14 (b)</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>threat to indigenous vegetation) are also present</p> <p>8. 5.4.1 Policy 34 (protection of soil resources) – suggestion to add (c) “retiring of land with significant risk of erosion”; Policy 36 (pastoral farming) – suggestion to model best sustainable land management practices; 9. 5.4.3 - Policy 45 (climate change) – suggest (a) (acquisition of parks and open spaces) and (c) (location of new park infrastructure) is stated in the guiding principles 10. 5.5.1 - Policy 59 (b) – request to add Maori historical knowledge and cultural practices 11. 5.9 - Objective 21 (provide variety of open space settings that meets needs of community) – should be stated in some way in the guiding principles and shouldn’t be just a management objective</p>	<p>8. Policy 34: The policy could be expanded to include retirement of land Policy 36: Unnecessary level of detail for the plan</p> <p>9. 5.4.3 Policy 45 –Consider that policy is at an appropriate level</p> <p>10. 5.5.1 Policy 59 (b): Agree with submitters suggestions 11. 5.9 Objective 12: considered covered in principle 8</p>	<p>8. Amend Policy 34 to include submitter’s suggestion. No change required</p> <p>9. No change required</p> <p>10. Re-word Policy 59(b) as suggested by submitter 11. No change required</p>
24.	Daphne Steel		<p>1. Page 4 - 1.4 Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP) description: suggest include horse riding, swimming ,camping, geological features 2. Page 7 - 2.3 and page 27 - 5.0: need clearer description of the relationship between DOC (owner) GWRC (land manager) e.g. at QEP, parts of East Harbour 3. Page 43 - 5.8 Monitoring: query where specific dates are for publishing monitoring results 4. Page 44 - 5.9 Land tenure, acquisition: request for GWRC to be more involved with promotion of Whareroa with DoC to complement the work at QEP 5. Page 75 - 6.7.2 QEP key characteristics: add “systems connections – ecological and biodiversity” as a key characteristic at QEP 6. Page 79 - 6.7.4: suggestion to add more geological features to QEP map</p>	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. Title details are already listed in park specific chapters</p> <p>3. 5.8 Page 43 – Monitoring as referred to should be primarily to monitor the effectiveness of the plan. Detailed monitoring requirements will be covered in operational plans 4. Section on Partnership in parks is a more appropriate place to emphasise GWRC working with DOC 5. ‘Systems connections’ is a difficult term for people to understand. Alternative wording that relates to an interconnected ecosystems (sea to mountains via Whareroa farm) 6. 6.7.4 Page 79: Consider more geological features</p>	<p>1. Page 4, 1.4: amend as suggested by submitter</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. Review references to monitoring to focus on monitoring of plan.</p> <p>4. Amend 6.7.4 Partnership in Parks</p> <p>5. Amend 6.7.2 Key Characteristics</p> <p>6. Amend if necessary</p>
25.	Peter and Monique Leerschool	<p>A. Consider more emphasis could be placed on conservation and protection of biodiversity especially pest control B. Mainly use Kaitoke and East Harbour parks C. Recommend access to regional parks remains free of cost</p>	<p>1. Use word “conservation” in plan to show importance of protecting the environment</p> <p>2. Clearly state that access to regional parks will remain free of cost</p>	<p>1. The guiding principles in Section 4.3 and management objectives and policies in Section 5, provide an appropriate management framework for the parks. Conservation implies little or no change will occur which does not accurately reflect the overall plan 2. Parks are free to enter</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. No change required</p>
26.	Michael Nicholson	<p>A. Considers rights emphasis between conservation, heritage and recreation across network Queen Elizabeth Park B. Considers tram tracks from MacKay’s to Whareroa Beach should be extended to shops at Paekakariki with potential to extend again to Raumati Beach</p>		Noted	No change required
27.	Beth Reille	A. Considers rights emphasis between conservation,	Belmont		

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		heritage and recreation across network Belmont B. Specifically interested in Belmont C. Heritage, cultural and recreation aspects of Speedy's Reserve/Kilmister Block omitted in plan (Pareraho Pa, path Old Belmont Hill Road (pre-dates Old Coach Road), Bridle Track)	1. Include reference to Pareraho Pa, path Old Belmont Hill Road (pre-dates Old Coach Road), Bridle Track – detailed history notes included with submission 2. 6.3.2 Key park characteristics – include reference to Belmont Stream	1. Each park has reference documents that contained detailed information about history, geology, ecology and so on. This should be included in these documents 2. Not considered a key park characteristic	1. No change required 2. No change required
28.	Bruce Gillanders	A. Object to windfarm provisions in plan B. Special interest in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest		In December 2006 Council approved making part of Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and extended this area in 2008	No change required
29.	Kelly Bennington-Barr	A. Specifically interested in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest Battle Hill B. Plan does not adequately identify park values - omission of some key landscape areas identified in the 2009 Management Plan specifically the Eastern Hills C. Plan does not protect values of the park because it allows for commercial activities (specifically wind farm access) that are inconsistent with other park values Akatarawa Forest D. Plan does not protect values of the Akatarawa Forest or the primary focus of the park because it allows for commercial activities (specifically wind energy development) that are inconsistent with other park values	Akatarawa Forest 1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development) 2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the Greater GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development) Battle Hill 3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22: <i>"To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i> <i>- European style pastoral character</i> <i>- The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steplands</i> <i>- The eastern hills</i> <i>- Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i>	1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding. 3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steplands	1-2 No change required 3. Amend 6.2.4(c)

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>- Native bush remnant"</p> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines</p> <p>- Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	4.-5. No change required
30. oral	Friends of Maara Roa Inc – Sylvia Jenkin	<p>A. Support for integrated policies and standards for parks into one document</p> <p>B. Supportive of emphasis on protection and enhancement of natural environment, restoration of biodiversity and ecological corridor concept</p> <p>C. Specifically interested in Belmont</p> <p>Access - Belmont</p> <p>D. Request for access to all of Belmont – especially in light of Transmission gully plans – retention of Maara Roa-Cannons Head Track, Takapu Track, Duck Creek airstrip and one new entrance/exit at Whitby; year round access from Takapu to Cannon Creek (area not used for lambing)</p>	<p>1. Request for reference to Resource Statements in plan</p> <p>2. New entrance at Whitby</p> <p>3. Request for family friendly 1 hour bush walks be prioritized at Cannon Creek – upgrade existing tracks</p> <p>4. Request for more signage on Wellington-Porirua side of park – limitation to public access</p> <p>5. Request for “connector” in Cannons Creek headwaters – council/public partnership</p> <p>6. Request for more erosion control in Cannons Creek gorge</p> <p>7 Request for GWRC assistance with re-siting Porirua College “trees for survival” nursery</p> <p>8. Request for more educational projects and activities in the Porirua area</p>	<p>1. Where Resource Statements (referenced documents for detailed information about history, geology, ecology and so on for each park). This should be included in these documents</p> <p>2. Possible links to Whitby indicated on the maps.</p> <p>3.-8. Track types, signage and ecological enhancements are all activities that can be more appropriately addressed in parks activity planning. Operational matters referred to parks operations staff</p>	<p>1. Review section ‘for more information’ in each park chapter to ensure Resource Statements are referenced</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3.-8. No change required</p>
31.	Dean and Lisa Whiteman	<p>A. Consider generally right emphasis for plan</p> <p>B. Interested in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>C. Support management focus of Akatarawa Forest</p>	<p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p>	1-2 No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22:</p> <p><i>“To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>European style pastoral character</i> - <i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steeplands</i> - <i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant”</i> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steeplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	<p>3. Amend 6.2.4 (c)</p> <p>4.-5. No change required</p>
32.	Don Polly	<p>A. Believes right emphasis in plan between conservation, recreation, and heritage management</p> <p>B. Concerned that park specific values and policies may be lost in a corporate plan</p> <p>C. Specifically interested in Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP)</p> <p>D. Concern over minimized role community groups and volunteers have at QEP</p>		Noted	No change required
33. oral	Friends of Queen Elizabeth	<p>A. Main interest in Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP)</p> <p>B. Policy 86, page 41 (partnerships' in parks) Strongly</p>	<p>1. Part 1: outline relationship this plan, the LTCCP(s), RPS etc including the cycles of review and when there is</p>	<p>1. Agree that a hierarchy of plans, referenced to asset management plans, operational plans would be useful</p>	<p>1. Include diagram of plan relationships in Part 1</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
	Park – Denise Davis	<p>support - would like to be involved in the partnership process with Iwi and Hapu</p> <p>C. Policy 88 (page 42): strongly support consultation with Friends - a MOU would better support a more productive interaction</p> <p>D. Part 6.7.3, page 75- Management focus -strongly oppose appropriation of part park for expressway development. Land likely to be affected by expressway development is prime wetland, of which only 2-3% remains nationally. If the road went ahead, only appropriate compensation for loss would be for the ~60 hectares of land adjacent to and just south of Mackay’s Crossing, which is currently in private ownership, to be purchased and added to the park.</p> <p>E. Rules for use and development (Part 7) (page 83) – strongly in favour of retaining the activity categories as they are stated in the document. We are particularly opposed to any relaxation of the rules relating to firearms, fires, fireworks, hunting and motorised recreation. This is the most accessible park for families and we believe that these activities are potentially dangerous to visitors to the park, to the ecology of the park, to the cultural and spiritual sanctity of the park and should remain prohibited</p> <p>F. Queen Elizabeth Park projected future changes (Map 14)</p> <p>Main issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Expressway route for the proposed takes ~60ha of wetland on NE corner of park. Concern that NZTA has made decision without consultation with public or DoC or GWRC -Designation of an area of parkland as “heritage precinct”. The current status of this park is ‘Recreation Reserve’. If there is a move to create a heritage precinct in the park, an application to change status under Reserves Act would be necessary. This proposal contravenes values of Queen Elizabeth Park as a recreational reserve -Cycle Tracks: High priority is a “family friendly” cycle track on western side of the park. Regard proposal for “commuter” cycle track adjacent to SH1 as a lower priority 	<p>opportunity for public input</p> <p>2. Page 12- Part 3: section does not state strongly enough that parks provide many ways in which physical and mental health is enhanced by restoration activities such as planting and greenhouse work - having access to open space for ‘time out’ has been shown by local research to improve human mental health and physical health thereby enhancing the physical and social well being of the community.</p> <p>3. Page 41- Part 5.7: important to recognise Friends groups are elected annually as community representatives and hold local knowledge of and interest in the well-being of the parks. Friends groups also provide continuity that is frequently missing when GWRC staff and Councilors change. Note Friends of Queen Elizabeth Park have drafted a MoU</p> <p>4. Part 5.8, page 43 Monitoring - not clear how success or otherwise of this plan is determined - research, monitoring and reporting on the effectiveness of the policies outlined in this plan are inadequate. Include in plan set of indicators reflecting current position in each policy area for each park, which could be compared to other parks and to the same park over time.</p> <p>Need well researched criteria so that changes kept to minimum and information gathering methods are consistent.</p> <p>5. Page 75- Part 6.7.2 - Objectives in Part 5.1 (biodiversity and ecosystems) not carried through to the characteristics of QEP in Part 6.7.2. (land)</p> <p>6. Page 76 - Part 6.7.4– QEP specific policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Landscape and geological features: add Raumati coastal escarpment to the list and mark on QEP map (b) Cultural Heritage (page 76): include known and potential archaeological sites within the park (c) Page 77 - Visitor services – request to list and protect Kahikatea planted by the Governor General Dame Silvia Cartwright <p>7. Page 79 Projected changes (Part 6.7.5), for more information: add <i>“Restoration and Re-vegetation Sites in Queen Elizabeth Regional Park 2009” (Greater Wellington, 2010) and “A heritage and archaeological study of Queen Elizabeth Park” (Susan Forbes. Kotuku Consultancy, 2005).”</i></p> <p>8. Request to add to QEP projected changes list and maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Whareroa Farm: indicate joint relationship with Whareroa Farm 	<p>2. Agree</p> <p>3. No change required, partnership with ‘friends’ groups is already included in the plan</p> <p>4. 5.8 Page 43 – Monitoring as referred to should be primarily to monitor the effectiveness of the plan. Detailed monitoring requirements will be covered in operational plans</p> <p>5. Key park characteristics are a summary of the key features of the park only</p> <p>6. (a) Agree (recognising that it is not managed by GWRC) (b) This information should sit within a Resource Statement for Belmont (detailed information) (c) There are a number of commemorative plantings in the parks. These do not need to be listed in a network plan.</p> <p>7. Agree</p> <p>8. (a) Section on Partnership in parks is a more appropriate place to emphasise GWRC working with DOC</p>	<p>2. Revise Part 3 to include submitters concerns</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. No change required</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. (a) Include the coastal escarpment on map (b) No change required (c) No change required</p> <p>7. Include reference</p> <p>8. (a) Amend 6.7.4 Partnership in Parks (Ref. Sub. 24) (b) No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>(b) Transport connections: Indication on future plan map for a railway platform at Mackay's Crossing.</p> <p>9. History of Parks (APPENDIX 1) – request to add history of the name of the park - <i>park was named Queen Elizabeth Park because the naming occurred after the death of George VI and prior to the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, hence the omission of "second" from the name.</i></p> <p>10. Include statement in plan that states how the public benefit from well managed open spaces in perpetuity</p> <p>11. Page 19 - 3.2 'Queen Elizabeth Park' para. 1. The last sentence should read: "The eastern length of the park is adjacent to"</p> <p>12. Page 78: 7.4 'Specific Policies' Table - Under 'Reasons for significance' Para.1 last line should read: ...'data of the area'.</p> <p>13. Under 'Description' in the second block is the word 'Generally'. This word is meaningless by itself! -Under 'Land Management' i (top page 77) 'Ordnances' misspelt.</p> <p>14. APPENDIX 3 Under 2 Definitions - Animal. The given sequence is incorrect. The correct zoological sequence of animals mentioned would place 'finfish, shellfish' AFTER 'amphibian'. The word 'other' should then be placed BEFORE 'invertebrate'</p>	<p>(b) While the Regional Land Transport Strategy supports more efficient public transport across Wellington region, the Regional Rail Plan does not include MacKay's stop in the next 10 years</p> <p>9. Better placed to be a footnote in the park description.</p> <p>10. This comment does not add significant value to statements already contained in the plan</p> <p>11. Agree, SH1 runs along the eastern length of the park, not the western length</p> <p>12. and 13. Grammar corrections</p> <p>14. This would be an amendment to the bylaws which are only included as an attachment in this plan</p>	<p>9. Include footnote in 3.2 on name significance</p> <p>10. No change required</p> <p>11. Amend as per submitter's comments</p> <p>12. – 13. Amend as per submitter's comments</p> <p>14. No change required</p>
34.	Linda Hoyle and Steven Nutt	<p>A. Specific interest in Akatarawa Forest and Battle Hill</p> <p>B. Consider allowing wind farm development, utility infrastructure and roading through Battle Hill does not protect values and amenities of both Akatarawa and Battle Hill and contrary to plan's vision, principles and policies</p> <p>C. Battle Hill Plan 2009 should have been incorporated in network plan in its entirety</p> <p>D. Policy 6.1.4(f) – allowing wind farm development of GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent t Battle Hill – consider this wording suggests GWRC is acting in a bias and pre-determined position</p>	<p>1. Include provisions of 2009 Battle Hill Plan in 2010 network plan</p> <p>2. Battle Hill - refer to eastern hills as an area to protect (as per 2009 plan) Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>3. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>4. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected</p>	<p>1. The plan deals with the current issues which includes some changes from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Plan 2009</p> <p>2. See 5 below</p> <p>3.-4. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p>	<p>1. No change</p> <p>2. See 5 below</p> <p>3.-4. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill 5. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22: <i>“To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i> <i>- European style pastoral character</i> <i>- The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steeplands</i> <i>- The eastern hills</i> <i>- Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> <i>- Native bush remnant”</i></p> <p>6. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>7. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>5. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steeplands</p> <p>6. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over. 7. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	<p>5. Amend 6.2.4 (c)</p> <p>6.-7. No change required</p>
35.	Wellington City Council	<p>A. Support for comprehensive plan</p> <p>B. Belmont Only park that includes Wellington City Council (WCC) land in or adjacent – 105ha Horokiwi block is WCC land managed by GWRC: note WCC proposing to reclassify as reserve WCC Northern Reserves Management Plan recommends track linkages between Tawa and Newlands and Horokiwi</p> <p>C. Belmont adds to an important “inner green belt” link</p>	<p>Links between principles and objectives</p> <p>1. Strengthen links between principles and objectives – each objective should have specific policies rather than being included in a separate section</p> <p>2. Ensure all proposed changes listed in the text are reflected in the maps</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>3. Consider these do not add anything by themselves</p>	<p>1. The plan acknowledges that policies may contribute to multiple outcomes, and therefore cannot be easily listed together. There is some repetition between the principles and objectives and suggest these be reviewed</p> <p>2. Agree</p> <p>3. The methods provide some description to plan</p>	<p>1. Review principles and objectives to remove any repetition</p> <p>2. Amend as per submitter's request</p> <p>3. Review methods sections</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		east-west to connect with the WCC Outer Green Belt reserves e.g. Tawa Bush and Otari-Wiltons – identified D. Important ecological connection to Takapu Valley for terrestrial and freshwater habitat could be enhanced	<p>Priorities 4. Consider giving priority (or criteria by which projects will be assessed) or timeframes against proposed works and link to policies and objectives</p> <p>Information on parks 5. Give indication of relative use of individual parks</p> <p>Combine park description and maps 6. Follow each park description with proposed maps, values, what’s provided and what’s proposed</p> <p>Relevant policies 7. Refer to Wellington Regional Strategy – Open Space Strategy and how the plan links to this</p> <p>Park maps 8. On maps, clarify what “forest health” means and associated works – identify work to be implemented and not ongoing work</p> <p>Belmont Map 9. Request an additional link track arrow added from Horokiwi reserve south towards Newlands (current link track identified is to Grenada North) Belmont ecological connections</p> <p>Appendix 2 10. Page XII - Remove Lot 7 DP 49151 – change to Pt section 14-16 and pt section 20 Horokiwi Road District (see submission for full details) 11. Map 2 – does not include all WCC land – WCC can supply this</p>	<p>readers as to how policies will be implemented. These could be reviewed to reflect more generic groups of activities</p> <p>4. Noted, further work on levels of service and operational plans is required before priorities can be determined. Suggest that these are reviewed at a later date</p> <p>5. While interesting, this information dates quickly. It is regularly updated and easily obtainable by the public through the parks annual report</p> <p>6. Agree, would be useful to have projected future changes section close to the park maps</p> <p>7. Agree</p> <p>8. Agree, include a definition of what is meant by ‘forest health’</p> <p>9. Agree</p> <p>10. Agree, add to plan the correct legal description of Horokiwi Block</p> <p>11. New information should be included on the map</p>	<p>as per officers comment</p> <p>4. No change required</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>7. Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>8. Amend</p> <p>9. Include arrow on Belmont map</p> <p>10. Amend plan as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>11. Request more information from WCC to update regional open space map (Map 2)</p>
36.	Kate and Barry Malcolm	<p>A. Plan does not adequately describe Korokoro Valley</p> <p>B. Disagree that "Native vegetation covers the Korokoro...valley" - valley floor below forks is weed-infested with little or no natural regeneration occurring. The only canopied over bush alongside the stream here is what has been planted.</p> <p>C. Endorse concept of linking Korokoro Valley with Petone foreshore – request for a “beach to bush” bridge over SH2 and rail</p>	<p>1. Include reference in Belmont section of plan to re-vegetation project in Korokoro Valley begun in 1994 and ongoing still (now under auspices of Lower Hutt Forest and Bird Kiwi Conservation Corp)</p> <p>2. Amend statement "Native vegetation covers the Korokoro...valley"</p>	<p>1. The plan already supports a partnership approach for working with groups in the Korokoro Valley</p> <p>2. Native vegetation dominates the Korokoro valley, but at varying levels of regeneration</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. Use the word ‘dominate’ rather than ‘cover’ on page 15</p>
37.	Janie Cook	<p>A. Considers plan has right emphasis between conservation, recreation and heritage management</p> <p>B. Specifically interested in Belmont</p> <p>C. Park characteristics are well captured</p> <p>D. Farm under Landcorp management could do better with enhanced access, especially lambing restrictions</p> <p>E. 6.3.3 Management Focus (2) and (5) - farm should serve the values of the park and not the park serve the farm</p> <p>(4) Ensure preservation of Old Coach Road, and</p>	<p>Belmont</p> <p>1. 6.3.4 Policies - Request for more strongly-worded commitment that values of the park are not compatible with wind farm development</p> <p>2. 6.3.5 Projected Changes – Request protection of Old Coach Road and possibly Belmont Road</p>	<p>1. Current policy considered sufficient. The underlying legislation of the park confirms the intended use for the park</p> <p>2. Include Old Coach road in the list of heritage features in 6.3.4(d).</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. Amend 6.3.4</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>consider Belmont Road near Hill Road (6) Use NZTA's mitigation resources to best advantage for park Visitor services (h) & (i) GWRC should lobby NZTA for better access to Stratton St -Request for Hill Road to be upgraded F. 6.3.5 Projected Changes –support but also need: -Protection of Old Coach Road and possibly Belmont Rd -expanded access to Waitangirua Farm - time and space -Hill Road access moved uphill to near Shearer's Quarters -Active planning around Transmission Gully to give park maximum benefit</p>			
38.	Rimutaka Forest Park Charitable Trust - Melody Mclaughlin	<p>A. Request for increased opportunities to expand biodiversity B. Specifically interested in Wainuiomata Rec Area C. Projected changes: linkage to Rimutaka Forest Park (Nikau Track opening) – risk of endangering 41 brown kiwi if known predators are not reduced or managed D. Supportive of new wetland area – suggest educational opportunities for the community be offered</p>		Noted	No change required
39.	Neil and Juliet Bellingham	<p>A. Consider right balance between conservation, recreation and heritage management B. Supportive of integrated plan C. No specific policies included relating to educational functions of parks Belmont – tracks D. Tracks from Cannons Creek to Takapu Road and Cannons Head need upgrading E. Short ½ hour loop walks in Maara Roa area recommended</p>	<p>1. Include more reference to educational functions of parks – especially Battle Hill (Ken Gray centre primary function as an education centre) and Belmont (e.g. Maara Roa re-vegetation project and involvement with school children and outdoor classroom) Belmont - access 2.Specify intention to improve access and gateways from Takapu Road, Cannons Creek, Waitangirua and Duck Creek (Whitby) and show on maps 3. 6.3.2 Belmont Key park characteristics, under 'People' add: <i>"The park provides opportunities for learning and first hand experience of land, vegetation, agriculture and history"</i></p>	<p>1. Include reference to Ken Gray Centre in 6.2.2 People Key Characteristics (education opportunities) 2. Takapu road: operational matter that will be referred to operational parks staff. New entrances from the north are contemplated on the 'projected future changes' 3. While this is true that these experiences are available, it is not a 'key characteristic' of Belmont or unique to Belmont as compared to other parks</p>	<p>1. Amend 2. No change required 3. No change required</p>
40.	Marianne Ackerman	<p>A. Consider right emphasis on conservation, heritage management and recreation Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP) B. Request for no motorsports in QEP C. Request for land to not be taken for expressway D. Very positive about how QEP is managed</p>		Noted	No change required
41.	Simon Muckley – Wellington Wildfowlers	<p>A. Supportive of integrated plan B. Specifically interested in East Harbour C. Request for interests of wildfowlers to be heard, understood and considered</p>		This submitter is particularly interested in duck shooting at the Parangarahu Lakes area. The provisions for this area will be revisited when the advisory group with iwi is established	No change required
42.	Sharon Gullery	<p>A. Does not consider plan has right emphasis on conservation, heritage management and recreation B. Concern over allowing wind farm access through parks</p>		Noted	No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
43.	Shona McCahon	A. Consider plan has right balance of conservation, recreation and heritage management B. Endorsement of integrated network plan C. No reference to definition of open space in introductory section	1. Include reference to open space definition in introductory section 2. Page 30 - Policy 24: wording implies there are only visual aspects of landscape and geological features that people appreciate – suggest amend to: <i>“To give consideration to the values appreciated from viewing and experiencing important landscapes and geological features...”</i> 3. Include reference to Baring Head land – statement about access, purchase of land in 2010	1. Include Open Space Strategy (Wellington Regional Strategy) definition of open space (section 3.1) and reference to the this strategy in section 2.3 2. Agree 3. Baring Head will be included through a subsequent amendment to the plan	1. Amend 2. Amend Policy 24 as per submitter’s request 3. No change required
44.	Federated Mountain Clubs (FMC) of NZ (Inc) – Phil Glasson	A. Consider plan successfully manages to balance numerous competing interests regarding the parks while at the same time keeping as on overarching goal the ongoing preservation of the parks in their natural states B. Strongly supportive of plan C. Very supportive of guiding principles 7 and 8, 10		Note	No change required
45.	Wellington Amateur Radio Club Inc – Brian Miller	A. Consider plan provides right balance between conservation, recreation and heritage management B. Requests plan be modified to make specific provisions for amateur radio recreational and emergency services activities within parks network C. Portability and simplicity of amateur radio communications when compared with mainstream communications systems can be a significant advantage in times of emergency D. Amateur radio operators have significant and ongoing interest in being able to access GWRC Parks network for recreational and emergency communications purposes E. Wellington Amateur Radio Club Inc works closely with Wellington City Council’s Emergency Management Office to provide it with technical expertise and experienced radio operators F. Interested in establishing a semi-permanent amateur radio facility within Belmont G. Strongly supports prohibiting wind turbines in Belmont due to possible interference with any future radio facility	1. That plan be modified to make specific provision for amateur radio recreational and emergency services activities within parks network – three types: a. Casual operations - involving individuals or small groups of amateur radio operators. Such operations would not involve camping overnight and would be limited to the use of lightweight portable equipment that can be carried by hand within the park. Club recommends these operations should be identified as Allowed activities within plan b. Organised short-term operations that would typically be organised by a small group of amateur radio operators and might involve camping overnight for one or two days, plus vehicle access. Such operations are likely to require the temporary installation of portable antennas (including supporting poles), AC power generators and shelters. Vehicles may be required to assist with the transportation of the equipment within the park. The club recommends these operations should be identified as Managed activities within the plan c. Organised long-term operations that would involve the installation of semi-permanent fixed facilities. Such operations would typically be organised by a larger group of amateur radio operators (e.g., a club) and for a period of ten years or longer. They would involve substantial investments in the development of semi-permanent antennas, masts/poles, power supplies, and accommodation. Vehicle access is likely to be required. The club is of the view that these operations should be	1.a Casual operations referred to by the submitter would come under allowed activities within the plan as it currently stands b. Would be considered a restricted activity in the plan. Such activities can have significant impact on other users and park staff’s time c. This proposal has already been raised with officers and is currently being considered as a restricted activity. We are seeking advice from DOC on whether this activity is appropriate for a recreation reserve. As a specific activity that may only arise infrequently it is not considered necessary to provide specific reference in the plan	1. a-c. No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			identified as Restricted activities within the plan		
46. oral	Wellington Hang Gliding and Paragliding Club Inc – Kris Ericksen	<p>A. Plan does not mention hang gliding or paragliding</p> <p>B. This club made submissions on both the Battle Hill and East Harbour management plans (Battle Hill – permit use of park for hang gliding and paragliding with approval of ranger – may be restricted for management purpose); East Harbour – allow within Zone 1 and 4</p> <p>C. Club members have also been flying at Mt Climie (Pakuratahi), Whitireia Park</p> <p>D. Seek “allowed” activity status across park network -</p> <p>E. Hang Gliders and Paragliders are defined as “aircraft” under Civil Aviation Act 1990</p> <p>F. There are a number of references to aircraft within the plan: 6.2.4; 6.3.4; definitions; activities requiring approval 4.1</p>	<p>6.2.4 Specific policies for Battle Hill (pg 59) Land management</p> <p>1. To permit the use of aircraft for farming, management purposes or emergency purposes within the park</p> <p>2. To permit the use of the park for Hang Gliding and Paragliding with prior approval of the Ranger. This activity may be restricted for management purposes</p> <p>6.3.4 Specific policies for Belmont Park (pg 63)</p> <p>3. To allow hang-gliding and paragliding, and to permit the use of aircraft for farming, management purposes or emergency purposes within the park.</p> <p>NEW Specific policy for East Harbour Regional Park</p> <p>1.1 Land management</p> <p>f. To allow hang-gliding and paragliding within Zone 1 and Zone 4 [including the new Baring Head acquisition], and to permit the use of aircraft for farming, management purposes or emergency purposes within the park.</p> <p>4. Activities requiring approval (pg 138) The following activities can only be carried out in a park, reserve or forest with the prior written approval of the Council, or where the activities are permitted by signage:</p> <p>4.1 Except for hang gliding and paragliding (unless otherwise specified elsewhere) launch or land in an aircraft or having landed, allow the aircraft to remain in any regional park or forest [except in an emergency]</p>	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. – 3. Appropriate to include hang-gliding as a managed activity which requires ranger approval for Battle Hill and Belmont which are the main locations. East Harbour (including Baring Head) may be included at a later date through a plan change</p> <p>4. This would require an amendment to the bylaws (which were last reviewed in 2009). This plan process is not the appropriate place to amend the bylaws. Suggest that the submitter requests this amendment when the next bylaw review occurs</p>	<p>1. Amend 6.4.2 regarding aircraft at Battle Hill</p> <p>2. – 3. Amend plan to provide for hang gliding type activities in Battle Hill and Belmont (as managed activities).</p> <p>4. No change required</p>
47. oral	Forest and Bird Wellington Branch – Peter Hunt	<p>A. Support general approach of plan</p> <p>B. Some contradictions/repetitions within text</p> <p>C. Recommend professional editing of final draft plan to increase readability of plan</p> <p>D. Pleased to see reference to ecological connectivity in plan</p> <p>E. Concerned that “native ecology” links indicated are vague and that when more detailed planning is carried out could result in little actual improvement to connectivity</p> <p>F. GWRC should not be looking to create any new reservoirs while wasteful practices are commonplace in local industry and homes</p> <p>G. Support proposed policies 43–45 (section 5.4.3, <i>Climate change</i>)</p> <p>H. Policy 44 “to investigate opportunities for reversion and planting that will meet the criteria for receiving</p>	<p>1. Include clear statements of how ecological connectivity could be achieved in practice (for example: by planting, fencing, stock removal, plant and animal pest control)</p> <p>2. Advocacy links – include some guidelines on what GWRC would be advocating <i>for</i></p> <p>3. Define “forest health”</p> <p>4. Request stronger link “native ecology link between the Horokiwi Bridleway and Grenada West (currently advocate for improved links)</p> <p>5. Policy 20 (section 5.1.5, Water) - avoidance of obstructions in waterways – request for stronger wording — <i>prohibition</i> on the creation of obstructions</p>	<p>1. This should be stated in the Methods section</p> <p>2. There are a number of policies relating to advocacy which are linked to particular areas of work. Current references are sufficient</p> <p>3. Agree – as per submission 21 more clarity is required</p> <p>4. These links could have a stronger emphasis in the plan and are supported by territorial authorities</p> <p>5. The draft plan considers the possibility of dams for renewable energy generation as well as water supply. In Akatarawa and Pakuratahi forests this is supported by legislation. In some circumstances a proposal for an activity in a park may require a balancing of the plan’s</p>	<p>1. Review methods to reflect submitters concerns.</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. Define ‘forest health’ in the plan (as per submission 21)</p> <p>4. Amend plan as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>5. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>credits under the Government’s Permanent Forest Sink Initiative scheme” – consider growing trees and logging them is carbon neutral activity, since the CO₂ is captured and then released again – consider much better for GWRC to leave existing trees standing and plant some more</p> <p>I. Support wind turbine use in combination with farming activity - do not support wind turbine installations that involve removal and destruction of native forest or prevent regeneration of natural ecosystems needed to protect and enhance remnant forest and other at-risk ecosystems</p> <p>J. Support references to pest plants in Policies 15 to 19 (section 5.1.4, <i>Pest plants and pest animals</i>) and in Policy 43(c) (section 5.4.3, <i>Climate change</i>)</p> <p>Belmont</p> <p>K. Only park that falls partly within the boundaries of the Wellington Branch of Forest & Bird – support reference to corridor between the Korokoro Stream and Cannons Creek</p> <p>L. Section 6.3.4, <i>Specific policies — Land management</i>, we note the policy: g. To prohibit the construction of wind farm in Belmont Regional Park. Comment: Climate change and the need for use of renewable energy needs to be a factor when considering wind turbines in the park. Individual turbines within a farmed area should be seriously considered. The experience at Brooklyn shows they can co-exist near a protected area (Karori Wildlife Reserve) and be an asset to the community (visitors to the site)</p>	<p>6. Section 6.1.3, Akatarawa Forest, Management focus, move statement “(3) the native forest vegetation is protected” should be moved from secondary focus to primary focus — the care of native forest is of primary concern and should be listed</p> <p>7. Include framework that indicates how each policy is to be viewed with respect to other policies (identify key policies / priorities)</p> <p>8. Page 23 - Section 4.1 Management framework summary Para 4.1 (3) Recommend definitive statement about fauna as well as flora as being a key characteristic of the Parks</p> <p>9. Para 4.1(4) ... suggested wording change to: “For each park there is a list of actions consistent with the objectives and policies of part 5”. Guiding Principles p.41-</p> <p>10. <i>Para 1 — Protect and care for ecosystems of important ecological value</i> Suggested wording change to: “Each park and forest contains important ecological areas of remnant forests, wetlands, streams and dunes. These will be protected and managed to maintain their important environmental values.”</p> <p>11. <i>Para 3 — Sustainably manage modified ecosystems, such as those on farms and forests</i> Suggested wording change to: “Farming and forestry will continue where they are economic and follow sustainable management practice and enable access for recreational activities.”</p> <p>12. <i>Para 5 — Enhance ecological connections between natural areas</i> Suggested wording change to: “The preservation and enhancement of ecosystems will be undertaken by creating strong ecological connections (ecocorridors and buffer zones), through natural regeneration and other means, so as to protect the biodiversity of the parks network, adjoining land and the region.”</p> <p>13. <i>Para 6 — Effects of climate change are mitigated through resilient ecosystems and carbon sequestration Processes</i> - unclear as to how “informed management” mitigates climate change — what specifically does this mean? Suggested wording change to: “The active protection and restoration of indigenous ecosystem and also management methods of modified ecosystems that limit greenhouse gas</p>	<p>objectives and policies if there is conflict between them</p> <p>6. Legislation states primary focus of Akatarawa Forest – water supply purposes, this must be reflected in policy</p> <p>7. Consider the current framework is sufficient. Policies may have greater value depending on the underlying legislation of the land</p> <p>8. Flora and fauna are part of the physical landscape</p> <p>9. Agree</p> <p>10. Agree</p> <p>11. Disagree with rewording. While economics is a consideration for a leaseholder, GWRC must consider a number of factors when determining whether farming is the appropriate way to manage the [park]land</p> <p>12. Current wording sufficient</p> <p>13. Agree</p>	<p>6. No change required</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p> <p>9. Amend 4.1 (4) as per submitter’s request</p> <p>10. Amend as per submitter’s request</p> <p>11. No change required</p> <p>12. No change required</p> <p>13. Change wording to provide clarification</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>emissions and improve soil carbon sequestration.” 14. Para 8 — Provide for a range of settings and facilities for people to enjoy time out, explore nature and learn in a safe environment - suggest hazards be made a separate topic. (Risk from natural hazards to people and assets is minimized) Suggested wording change to: “The park will be maintained in a manner that will reduce risk of injury to people from natural hazards such that the risk is commensurate with the natural environment and accepted standard of safety for the activity.”</p> <p>15. Para 9 — Encourage stewardship of the resources found within Greater Wellington’s parks network Suggested wording change to: “Greater Wellington will promote the parks as places for the community to participate in a range of conservation projects, and will support groups and events that offer participants outdoor experiences and skills enrichment in activities such as camping, mountain biking and hunting and bird watching.”</p> <p>16. Para 14 — Promote community participation and sense of ownership by supporting volunteers and community groups working in Greater Wellington parks - note title is as long as the explanation and suggest an alternative: “14 — Promote community participation and sense of ownership “Greater Wellington will encourage and engage in partnerships with different interest groups and organisations, to accomplish mutual goals for the benefit of the parks, forests and ecosystems of the region. It will support volunteers and community groups working in Greater Wellington parks and seek to enhance park visitor experience.”</p> <p>17. Para 15 — Make the Greater Wellington parks network accessible to youth, the elderly, those with disabilities and different ethnicities - title is as long as the explanation. New wording suggested: “15 — Make the Greater Wellington parks network accessible “Greater Wellington recognises the diversity of ages, abilities and interests of people visiting parks and will provide appropriate opportunities to youth, the elderly, those with disabilities and different ethnicities.”</p> <p>18. Para 16 — Manage all activities in parks to ensure that they do not compromise what makes the park a special place for visitors</p>	<p>14. Not considered necessary to have additional guiding principle for management of risk</p> <p>15. Not considered necessary to specifically mention bird watching</p> <p>16. Agree that title could be shortened</p> <p>17. Agree</p> <p>18. Disagree, current policy wording more appropriate</p>	<p>14. No change required</p> <p>15. No change required</p> <p>16. Review 4.3(14), taking into account submission</p> <p>17. Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>18. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>- suggestion for word “on” before “parks” be replaced by “within” in the heading and that explanatory text be changed slightly to: “Greater Wellington will manage activities within parks to make certain that traditional informal activities are retained and that restricted activities, such as large events, and leases on land, have minimal short term impact on park values and the quality of visitor experience (outlined in the park characteristics).” 19. Para 17 — Provide up-to-date, quality information on which to make decisions about the future of Greater Wellington’s parks network Suggested wording change: “Decisions will be better informed through the use of research and monitoring; input will be sought from the public, interest groups and existing stakeholders.” 20. Section 5.1 Biodiversity and ecosystems (pp 27–30) – suggest additional objective: “Objective: Reduction and eventual elimination of invasive weed and pest species within park boundaries.” 21. Policy 3: To consider when assessing and implementing enhancement and restoration projects – suggestion of a slight rewording, and two additional clauses: “Policy 3: When assessing and implementing enhancement and restoration projects consider and actively pursue: “d. The opportunity for the involvement of community, industry and not-for-profit organisations. “e. The recreational and educational opportunities.” 22. Policies 10 and 11- Removal of natural materials - note discussing same issue and could be combined Suggested amended wording to: “Policy 10: The removal of natural material for commercial purposes may be permitted where it can be demonstrated there is a public good and the impact on species, ecosystems and landscape is insignificant. In deciding on the merits of a commercial activity with regard to this policy the Regional Council shall take account of: “a.d” “e. The impact on ecological diversity and connectivity; “f. The impact on existing users of the park; and “g. The policies set down in this document.”</p>	<p>19. Agree</p> <p>20. The submitters suggested objective is more specific than other objectives listed in 5.1 and is covered under the objective restoration of degraded ecosystems and policies in 5.1.4</p> <p>21. Amend policy and insert additional clause d. – not e (covered in visitor services)</p> <p>22. Policy additions (e) and (f) suggested by submitter are useful additions to describe what officers take into account.</p>	<p>19. Amend para. 17as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>20. No change required</p> <p>21. Amend policy 3(d) as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>22. Amend Policy 10 (e) and (f) as suggested by submitter</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>23. Policy 13: Introduced plants Suggested amended wording to - <i>“To plant introduced plants only where: a. – c” and d. They are not invasive and do not attract pests.”</i></p> <p>24. Policy 15: Pest plants and animals Suggested re-wording to: <i>“Policy 15: To actively reduce and remove pest plants and pest animals to assist the recovery of indigenous ecosystems and sustain their life-supporting capacity.”</i></p> <p>25. Policy 16: Pest plants and animals Suggested re-wording to: <i>“Policy 16: To provide additional levels of pest control at sites of significant ecological value.”</i></p> <p>26. Policy 18: Pest plants and animals Suggested re-wording and additional requirements: <i>“ To take all practicable steps to prevent new pest plant and pest animal infestations by minimising opportunities for their introduction and spread through: a. A requirement on staff and visitors to clean equipment to reduce the spread of didymo; b. Regular monitoring and surveys for new infestations (including the locations, nature and extent); c. Obtaining plants and material from approved suppliers and sources; d. Use of buffer zones to impede the spread of pests into areas of vulnerable and at-risk ecosystems; and e. Proactive containment and eradication at the early stage of infestation detection.”</i></p> <p>27. Policy 19: Pest plants and animals Suggested re-wording and additional requirements: <i>“To control pest plant and animal impact by: a. Using the most effective and efficient techniques available; b. Measuring the effectiveness of each process; and c. Observation of non-target species, the environment and human health for adverse effects.”</i></p> <p>28. Policy 20: Aquatic ecosystems Suggested re-wording and additional requirements: <i>“To maintain aquatic ecosystem values by: a. Monitoring and measuring the health of our wetlands against accepted environmental standards; b. Protecting wetlands, and restoring damaged wetlands to a healthy state; c. Rehabilitating any degraded aquatic habitat in</i></p>	<p>23. Addition (d) does not add value to the current policy</p> <p>24. Current policy wording is sufficient</p> <p>25. Current policy wording is sufficient</p> <p>26. Clause (e) as suggest by submitter a useful addition to the current policy</p> <p>27. Agree - Policy could be better worded</p> <p>28. Consider that current policy is sufficient</p>	<p>23. No change required</p> <p>24. No change required</p> <p>25. No change required</p> <p>26. Include new clause Policy 18 (e) as suggested by submitter</p> <p>27. Reword Policy 19 as per submitter’s suggestion</p> <p>28. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p><i>the stream catchment;</i> <i>“d. Ensuring fish passage is not impeded when constructing tracks and culverts, and constructing fish passages where required;</i> <i>“e. Where possible, developing fish passage over obstructions within the park;</i> <i>“f. Workplace procedures that dispose of toxic substances and general pollutants safely; and</i> <i>“g. Restricted use of pesticides and herbicide use within parks.”</i></p> <p>29. Policy 21: <i>Water quality/quantity</i> Suggested re-wording to: <i>“Policy 21: To minimise threats to the water quality and quantity in streams, rivers, lakes and wetlands by preventing activities within the park that would compromise the ability of freshwater systems to function.”</i></p> <p>30. Section 5.2 Landscapes and geological features (pp 30–31) Suggested re-wording of Objective 4 to: <i>“Protect the integrity of important landscapes and geological features from development that is inconsistent with the character of the location and its intrinsic value.”</i></p> <p>31. Policy 24: Suggested re-wording to: <i>“To give weight to the values placed on these landscapes and features when protecting or enhancing them.”</i></p> <p>32. Section 5.3 Cultural heritage (p 31) Policy 26: Suggested additional consideration: <i>“f. flora regrowth considerations.”</i></p> <p>33. Section 5.4 Land management (pp32–37) Suggested re-wording Objective 7 to: <i>“Modified ecosystems (such as farming and forestry) use sustainable management practices.”</i></p> <p>34. Policy 34: Suggested re-wording and additional requirement to: <i>“b. Avoiding using methods that cause erosion; and</i> <i>“c. Taking immediate remedial action to minimise erosion when it occurs.”</i></p> <p>35. Policy 35 – <i>farming and plantation forestry practices:</i> Suggested re-wording to: <i>“a. Encouraging regeneration of indigenous vegetation along riparian margins;</i> <i>“b. Maintaining a minimum 20m undisturbed riparian buffer zone between any water course, lake</i></p>	<p>29. Agree – Policy could be better worded</p> <p>30. Consider current policy is sufficient</p> <p>31. Agree – previous wording referred to ‘viewing’ which is problematic when determining where these views are from</p> <p>32. Current wording is sufficient</p> <p>33. Current wording is sufficient</p> <p>34. Current wording is sufficient</p> <p>35. Current wording is sufficient</p>	<p>29. Reword Policy 21 as per submitter’s recommendation</p> <p>30. No change required</p> <p>31. Amend Policy 24 as per submitter’s recommendations</p> <p>32. No change required</p> <p>33. No change required</p> <p>34. No change required</p> <p>35. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p><i>or wetland and a plantation forest; and</i></p> <p>36. Policy 36: Pastoral farming Suggested re-wording and additional requirements: <i>“To allow pastoral farming where it is economic, provides income for the upkeep of the park, and: ...</i> <i>“d. Is contained to avoid encroachment on significant ecosystems and land set aside for ecological restoration;</i> <i>“e. Is in accordance with, and models sustainable soil management practices and animal husbandry; and</i> <i>“f. Is contained to avoid encroachment on historical and cultural heritage features.”</i></p> <p>37. Policy 37: <i>To review the contribution ...</i> Policy appears to be at odds with Policy 36 - suggest Policy 36 cover conditions that apply to pastoral farming that is permitted and Policy 37 cover <i>whether</i> and <i>when</i> farming and forestry is permitted and what the criteria should be when making a determination. The issue of alternative land use is covered under other headings within the document.</p> <p>38. Policy 38: To maintain current forestry where on assessment it: ... <i>c. It is more than or as effective as indigenous vegetation in protecting unstable slopes; and</i> request the inclusion of an additional policy under the heading of 5.4.1 <i>Farm and plantation forestry:</i> <i>“Policy: To actively monitor for poaching and both educate the public and prosecute offenders.”</i> We further suggest the need for an additional sub-section, possibly entitled <i>People hazards</i>, which could include such items as: <i>“Policy: To ensure people using the park are aware of their responsibilities and provide sufficient information in an appropriate form so people who use the park, do so in a way that will not harm ecosystems, foul waterways, cause damage to infrastructure or frustrate farming and forestry activity.”</i> <i>“Policy: To provide adequate public conveniences and temporary shelter.”</i></p> <p>39. Policy 43: <i>To respond to the impacts of climate change ... by:</i> Suggested re-wording: <i>“a. Adopting sustainable land management practices</i> <i>“b. Restoring ecosystems, enhancing their viability and connectivity; and</i> <i>“c. Encouraging and assisting natural regeneration</i></p>	<p>36. Current wording is sufficient</p> <p>37. Agree – policy 37 is not a policy but rather an action that would feed into determining how pastoral farming would be managed</p> <p>38. Additions not considered necessary</p> <p>39. Agree</p>	<p>36. No change required</p> <p>37. Delete policy 37</p> <p>38. No change required</p> <p>39. Reword Policy 43 (a) and (c) as suggested by submitter</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>of the native ecosystem by controlling browsing animals and weed pests.” (Note that browsing animals include farm, game and pest animals and birds) 40. Policy 49: Assessments of new network utilities - suggested re-wording to: “To consider applications for the installation of additional network utilities within the parks and forests as restricted activities, and assessed according to the process set out in part 7 (Rules).” 41. Policy 50: Utilities - Notwithstanding policy 49, to provide for all new utilities on regional parks by way of a license or an easement where: ... Suggested re-wording: “Additional utility facilities approved under policy 49 and part 7 rules will be subject to a license and/or easement as appropriate where: ...” 42. Policy 52: Utilities Suggested re-wording: “To make any approval for a public utility conditional upon approval of the design and colour scheme, and Greater Wellington employees being empowered to enter, inspect, require maintenance or upgrading, require restoration and maintenance of sites after the completion of work, and require all cables and lines to be placed underground.” 43. 5.5 Visitor services (pp 37-38) Objective 14: Suggested re-wording: “That the regional parks include recreation corridors such as walking trails and cycle tracks.” 44. Suggest inclusion of additional objective under heading 5.5 Visitor services: “Objective: That the regional parks include the opportunity for the public to experience ecosystems that are representative of the region’s biodiversity.” 45. Policy 58: Education and promotion Suggested additional wording: “To promote parks and forests as places to learn about the environment, cultural heritage and best practice of the sustainable management of land and native ecosystems.” 46. 5.6 Park infrastructure (pp 38-41) Policy 64 - suggested alternative wording: “To ensure any new park infrastructure ... : “a. Meets national design standards relevant to the structure and use; ... “f. Complements other activities and park users; “g. Is constructed only when alternative locations and means are not viable (including use or</p>	<p>40. Agree – provides clarity for how new/additional network utilities will be dealt with</p> <p>41. Agree – rewording provides clarity</p> <p>42. Disagree – current wording sufficient</p> <p>43. Agree</p> <p>44. No additional objective necessary</p> <p>45. Agree</p> <p>46. Disagree with (f) and (g) but agree that any national standards should be met.</p>	<p>40. Amend Policy 49 as per submitter’s suggestion</p> <p>41. Reword Policy 50 as per submitter’s suggestion</p> <p>42. No change required (refer to recommendations on submissions 5 and 6)</p> <p>43. Amend Objective 14 as per submitter’s suggestion</p> <p>44. No change needed</p> <p>45. Amend Policy 58as per submitter’s suggestion</p> <p>46. Amend Policy 64 to include reference to national standards</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>adaptation of existing infrastructure); and”</p> <p>47. Policy 68: Access - To develop existing and new outdoor recreational opportunities ... Comment: This policy expresses two different ideas in one sentence. Suggested re-wording: “Policy 68: To extend or expand existing recreational opportunities in line with use and provide for new needs for outdoor recreation deemed suitable for the particular park (outlined in Part 6).”</p> <p>48. Policy 71: Access - suggest alternative wording that expands on the idea and provides more scope: “To develop better ecological and recreational linkages by way of trails and ecological corridors between existing areas, or potential areas, of open space by: “a. Working with councils, public agencies and community groups; “b. Working with not-for-profit societies and associations representing conservation and recreation interests; “c. Working with private landowners; “d. Working with developers of subdivisions and infill housing; and “e. Advocating for public transport and non-vehicular links to the parks and forests.”</p> <p>49. Policy 73: Access - suggest alternative wording to make it clear we are giving priority to the features: “To give priority to protecting environmental and heritage features when developing linkages by way of circuits and loop tracks.”</p> <p>50. Policy 75: Naming and commemorations <i>When naming areas, tracks or features</i> <i>e. An individual or organisation that significantly contributes to the park or facility through gifting or sponsorship.</i> Clause as it stands is inappropriate. The list a to d is sufficient; the monetary size of a gift or sponsorship as a criteria for naming rights is out of place in the context of a park. Suggest amending the sub clause to: “e. an individual associated with the track or feature.”</p> <p>51. Policy 79: Suggested alternative wording: “To permit commemorative tree planting in designated areas only.”</p> <p>52. Section 5.7 Partnerships in parks (pp 41-42) Objective 16: Suggest alternative wording, stated as</p>	<p>47. Agree that wording could be improved</p> <p>48. Agree that private landowners should also be included in the list, but consider other amendments too detailed</p> <p>49. Disagree with recommendation as main policy relates to an emphasis on circuits and loop tracks. Suggest removing “whilst protecting environmental and heritage features” to avoid interpretation confusion</p> <p>50. Retain current wording, the submitter’s alternative wording would change the intended meaning</p> <p>51. Agree</p> <p>52. Current wording sufficient</p>	<p>47. Review Policy 68 in light of submitters suggestion</p> <p>48. Amend Policy 71 to include landowners</p> <p>49. Amend Policy 73</p> <p>50. No change required</p> <p>51. Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>52. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>an objective: <i>“Park staff and management maintain good relations with other parties through co-operation, understanding and good faith.”</i></p> <p>53. <i>Objective 17: Suggest alternative wording, stated as an objective:</i> <i>“Where land or features are owned or under the control of tangata whenua, or other organisations, a joint management regime is in operation.”</i></p> <p>54. <i>Objective 18 and 19: Suggest alternative wordings:</i> <i>“Objective 18: The management of parks and forests reflects the needs of park users.”</i> <i>Objective 19: Promote community participation and sense of ownership.</i></p> <p>55. <i>Policy 86: Tangata whenua relationships - Suggested alternative wording:</i> <i>“To foster good relationships with tangata whenua by:</i> <i>“a- c”</i> <i>“d. Involvement in the identification of areas of cultural importance and the interpretation of tangata whenua histories as provided to the public</i> <i>“e. Promoting awareness of, and respect for, tangata whenua culture, interests, heritage, language and place names within the parks; and</i> <i>“f. Consulting with tangata whenua on the planning, development and management of the park.”</i></p> <p>56. <i>Policy 87:</i> Suggested additional wording: <i>“To work with the Department of Conservation, neighbours, local authorities, landowners, conservation and recreational groups to ensure that: ...”</i></p> <p>57. <i>Policy 88: Community group involvement</i> - The list of items a to e is not exhaustive and belongs in the Actions/Methods part of the plan, not the policy section. Suggested alternative wording: <i>“To encourage and support community group involvement in parks and forests using methods appropriate for the purpose.”</i></p> <p>58. <i>Policy 89: - suggested alternative wording and additional sub-clause:</i> <i>“To promote and provide opportunities for tangata whenua, individuals, businesses, community groups, trusts, and incorporated and friendly societies to be involved in the park on activities that support the objectives and policies in this plan for: ...</i> <i>“f. other purposes related to the upkeep, planning and management of parks.”</i></p>	<p>53. Agree that current wording is confusing</p> <p>54. Agree</p> <p>55. Current wording sufficient</p> <p>56. Disagree, this policy is intended to focus particularly on organisations</p> <p>57. Agree, these are methods rather than policy</p> <p>58. Do not consider upkeep, planning and management required to be specified in plan</p>	<p>53. Review wording of Objective 17 to improve clarity of purpose</p> <p>54. Amend Objectives 18 and 19 as per submitter’s suggestion</p> <p>55. No change required</p> <p>56. No change required</p> <p>57. Delete Policy 88 (a) to (e) and include list in ‘methods’</p> <p>58. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>59. Section 5.8 Research and monitoring (pp 43–44) Suggested additional objectives: <i>“Objective: Have systems of data collection and analysis that accurately measure the effectiveness of management programmes.”</i> <i>“Objective: Have systems of data collection and analysis that accurately measure the health of park ecosystems.”</i></p> <p>60. <i>Policy 91: To undertake ... research ...</i> Suggested additional sub-clause: <i>“d. Increases knowledge of the habitat and ecosystem requirements of indigenous fauna and flora.”</i></p> <p>61. <i>Policy 93</i> Suggested additional policy: <i>“Policy: Adopt and use methods that comply with national standards of monitoring and recording of data.”</i></p> <p>62. Section 5.9 Land tenure, acquisition and disposal (pp 44–45) Suggested additional objective: <i>“Objective: To enhance biodiversity across the region and improve habitat resilience to the impact of climate change and built infrastructure.”</i></p> <p>63. <i>Policy 95: To negotiate, where appropriate, for the lease ...</i> Suggested additional sub-clauses: <i>“h. enhance biodiversity and habitat; and</i> <i>“i. enhance or add to ecological corridor opportunities.”</i></p> <p>64. <i>Policy 96: To consider the acquisition of new parks where: ...</i> Suggest that sub-clauses be rearranged to create one idea per sub-clause and include additional criteria: <i>“a. There is a deficiency in large open space (greater than 150 hectares) within the locality;</i> <i>“b. Acquisition has the potential to provide a variety of recreational opportunities that will benefit the region;</i> <i>“c. The open space is accessible from urbanised areas or areas of significant projected growth;</i> <i>“d. It will provide protection to areas that have regionally or nationally significant ecological, landscape or heritage values;</i> <i>“e. Acquisition has the potential to improve ecological connectivity and enhance habitat survival;</i> <i>and</i> <i>“f. It does not replace, but complements, other open space opportunities in the area (such as local</i></p>	<p>59. These additions are better included as policies rather than objectives</p> <p>60. Disagree with addition, as this is covered under natural heritage, clause (a)</p> <p>61. Where national standards exist and are appropriate these are used, but this is not mandatory</p> <p>62. Covered in biodiversity section</p> <p>63. Agree that (i) is a consideration and could be included in the policy</p> <p>64. Current criteria sufficient</p>	<p>59. Include submitters suggestions as additional policies under research and monitoring</p> <p>60. No change required</p> <p>61. No change required</p> <p>62. No change required</p> <p>63. Amend Policy 95 to include reference to ecological corridors</p> <p>64. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p><i>parks).</i></p> <p>Section 6.3 Belmont Regional Park (pp 55–60) 65. Section 6.3.1, Legal status – provision to not use the provision of 2 hectare utility reserve for a future water reservoir until water use efficiency measures are in place in Porirua 66. In section 6.3.3, Management focus, suggest following additional clauses: “(5) Preserve and protect water courses through riparian planting and stock control. “(6) Encourage community group involvement in restoration and ecological connectivity improvement.” 67. Section 6.3.3 Management focus – identify need for better catchment management to prevent erosion and silt runoff, especially into Porirua Harbour 68. In section 6.3.4, Specific policies — Biodiversity and ecosystems, suggest the additional clauses: “To enhance remnant forest through the use of buffer zones and corridor connectivity. “To protect at-risk and recovering ecosystems from browsing animals.” 69. In section 6.3.4, Specific policies — Landscape and geological features, we suggest adding a bullet: “_ Gullies and streams that form or have potential to extend ecocorridor connectivity.” 70. Section 6.3.4, Specific policies — Visitor services, suggest adding Takapu Road to the list of main park entrances 71. In section 6.3.4, Specific policies — Partnership in parks, we note that clause k is: <i>To support a partnership approach to improving the Korokoro Stream catchment through:</i> _ Maintaining water quality of the Korokoro Stream; _ Protecting and enhancing the indigenous forest cover and insect and bird life; and _ Maintaining the habitat for indigenous fish. Suggest GWRC apply same criteria and approach for other main watercourses within park — in particular the Cannons Creek and Takapu Stream catchments. 72. Section 6.3.4, Specific policies — Partnership in parks, clause m - Suggested alternative wording: “To support the partnership with the Friends of Belmont and Friends of Maara Roa (Cannons Creek) in meeting the objectives of this plan and with other formal groups or associations that wish to improve</p>	<p>65. This matter is outside the scope of this plan</p> <p>66. Consider that these additions are sufficiently covered in other policy sections</p> <p>67. Sustainable Farm Plans will consider retiring and fencing to reduce erosion and runoff. These are referred to in the plan</p> <p>68. Disagree with addition, covered in general policies</p> <p>69. Disagree, too detailed</p> <p>70. Takapu road is only a secondary park entrance but was omitted in the draft</p> <p>71. Reference to Korokoro Stream is appropriate and reflects the appropriate emphasis on the restoration of this valley</p> <p>72. Agree that current policy does not reflect all groups in the area and should be reviewed</p>	<p>65. No change required</p> <p>66. No change required</p> <p>67. No change required</p> <p>68. No change required</p> <p>69. No change required</p> <p>70. Include Takapu road as a secondary entrance</p> <p>71. No change needed</p> <p>72. Review 6.3.4 (m) to be inclusive of all groups working in the area</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p><i>the park and implement the plan.</i></p> <p>73. Section 6.3.5, <i>Projected changes</i>, under the “Work with community groups to” bullet point, we suggest adding a further sub-bullet point: <i>“o Develop ecocorridor connectivity between Cannons Stream catchment and Korokoro Stream catchment and similar stream-based corridors within the park.”</i></p> <p>74. Some confusion between objectives and policies, and the inclusion, in some parts, of “Methods” could be misleading-recommend clear statement that the list of methods is indicative and not comprehensive</p> <p>75. “Native ecology” linkage improvement” and “forest health” appear frequently on maps of Plan, but not appear well-defined in text. Term “forest health” on the “projected future changes” maps indicates that work is to be done in the areas marked, but nature of work unclear</p>	<p>73. ‘Projected future changes’ maps should match associated text</p> <p>74. Agree, the methods section gives an indication on the likely methods to be used</p> <p>75. Agree</p>	<p>73. Review maps and text of ‘projected future changes’, amending as required</p> <p>74. Amend plan to give clarity about ‘methods’ being indicative</p> <p>75. Include explanation of ‘forest health’ (see submission 13)</p>
48.	Ron and Tricia Segal	<p>A. Specific interest in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>B. Consider there are a number of proposed policies contrary to management principles</p> <p>C. Akatarawa Forest not adequately protected because values, primary focus, And its role as a water catchment area undermined by draft plan’s support for commercial wind energy development activities</p> <p>D. Battle Hill not adequately protected for similar reasons - omission of Eastern Hills identified in the 2009 Management Plan.</p>	<p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22:</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steepplands</p>	<p>1. – 2. No change required</p> <p>3. Amend 6.2.4 (c)</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p><i>“To protect the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>European style pastoral character</i> - <i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steeplands</i> - <i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant”</i> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	4.-5. No change required
49. oral	Kapiti Coast District Council (KCDC)	<p>A. Supportive of integrative approach to plan – purpose</p> <p>B. Page 13- Akatarawa description: support inclusion of indigenous biodiversity as important outcome</p> <p>C. Page 19 – support for Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP) description</p> <p>D. Page 23 management framework – supportive of this</p> <p>E. Page 24 parks vision – supportive of this</p> <p>F. Page 25 guiding principles of management – Kapiti Coast District Council (KCDC) supportive of 6</p> <p>G. Page 25 general management objectives and policies supported</p> <p>H. Page 34 natural hazards and climate change – strongly supportive</p> <p>I. Page 37 – Policy 56 (mineral exploration etc) – support prohibition</p> <p>J. Page 39 Policy 66 (clear signage and track markers) – supportive</p> <p>K. Supports table format for rules</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>L. Page 47 Management Focus Akatarawa forest – support wind energy development on selected ridgelines providing it cannot be seen from populated areas</p> <p>M. Page 51 – Akatarawa Forest projected future</p>	<p>1. Page 3 - include hunting and horse riding in summary of Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>2. Page 4 – include horse riding, radio controlled model plane and Tram activity in short summary of QEP</p> <p>3. Page 4 – QEP: include reference to “industrial heritage precinct” along with WW2 and Maori archeological features</p> <p>4. Page 11 – make biodiversity and eco-system service concepts more explicit</p> <p>5. Page 20 – QEP description should include cycling opportunities (recreational and commuting) as they are important current uses of park</p> <p>6. Page 20 – reference traditional links between QEP and Whareroa Farm</p> <p>7. Reference Expressway plans and give support for maintenance of QEP’s values and current uses throughout expressway project</p> <p>8. Page 25 guiding principles for management - include “waahi tapu” in parenthesis currently mentioning historic places and associations</p> <p>9. Page 30 – Policy 24 (landscape and geological</p>	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. Useful to include activities as examples of leases in the park</p> <p>3. A heritage precinct is proposed in the future changes to the park not necessary limited to ‘industrial heritage’</p> <p>4. Agree –biodiversity and ecosystem services contribute to making parks valuable</p> <p>5. Agree</p> <p>6. Agree</p> <p>7. This is outside the scope of the plan and plans for any future roads are not finalised</p> <p>8. Agree</p> <p>9. Policy needs rephrasing to be more specific on its</p>	<p>1. Amend page 3 as suggested by submitter</p> <p>2. Review park descriptions and include lease activities as appropriate</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. Add reference in Part 3 to biodiversity and ecosystem services as suggested by submitter</p> <p>5. Include reference to recreational cycling as suggested by submitter</p> <p>6. Amend page 20 as suggested by submitter</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. Amend page 25 as suggested by submitter</p> <p>9. Reword Policy 24</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>changes: support recreational links to Kapiti Coast and QEP</p> <p>N. QEP management focus – support</p> <p>O. Supports proposed heritage precinct at MacKay’s</p>	<p>features) – clarify where landscapes are being viewed from (may result in different perspectives)</p> <p>10. Page 33 – Policy 35 (farm and plantation forestry) – clause b. recommend buffer zone planted in riparian vegetation where applicable</p> <p>11. Page 34 – Methods: include “pest control” under fencing</p> <p>12. Page 34 – climate change – include reference to adaptation of plant and animal species to climate change</p> <p>13. Page 37 – Objective 12 Visitor Services – suggest removing reference to “different ethnicities” (implies reverse discrimination)</p> <p>14. Page 37 – Objective 13– include “and fitness” at end of sentence</p> <p>15. Page 37 – Objective 14 – suggest removing objective as better covered elsewhere</p> <p>16. Page 38 – Policy 64 - Design principles – include specific reference of park infrastructure relating to safety and security (e.g. signage, lighting facilities, handrails where appropriate)</p> <p>17. Page 39 – Policy 71 – Note submissions from community advocating for a railway platform at QEP</p> <p>Monitoring / review</p> <p>18. Strengthen monitoring needs – show how results from monitoring will be reported – include extra column in Table 1 with reporting methods</p> <p>19. Monitoring table – visitor services add count data for cycling (QEP) – considered important for successful funding bids from NZTA for commuting cycle lane through QEP</p> <p>Park specific</p> <p>20. Add additional sub-heading of relevant TLA following legislative status to help show cross-boundary issues</p> <p>Akatarawa</p> <p>21. Current map – check reference to tracks for non motorised recreation (large number marked compared to other non-motorised recreation)</p> <p>QEP</p> <p>22. Strengthen non-motorised requirement for QEP</p> <p>23. Strengthen potential for playing fields within QEP. Informal playing fields not mentioned in management focus (Paekakariki end of park)</p>	<p>focus and intent. Reword Policy 24 to “To consider the impact of any proposals or activities on important landscape and geological features including the views of these form within the park”</p> <p>10. Retain current clause which is intended to be specific to plantation forestry</p> <p>11. ‘Methods’ need review to provide a consistent level of detail</p> <p>12. Policies on climate change refer to positive actions that we take to mitigate climate change, not reactions of the environment</p> <p>13. This appropriate reflects guiding principle 15. 7)</p> <p>14. Abilities covers levels of fitness</p> <p>15. Disagree, objective relates to policies in this section</p> <p>16. Agree – that park infrastructure should be designed to minimize crime and the perception of crime</p> <p>17. While the Regional Land Transport Strategy supports more efficient public transport across Wellington region, the Regional Rail Plan does not include a MacKay’s stop in the next 10 years</p> <p>18. Reporting occurs 6 weekly in the managers report, as well as annual through the Parks Annual Report. Consider this level of detail is not needed in the plan</p> <p>19. Could include ‘count data’ as one of the monitoring methods</p> <p>20. Helpful to cross-reference TA</p> <p>21. Agree</p> <p>22. Recognise the tranquil experience of being in the park in the key park characteristics (6.7.2)</p> <p>23. As stated in Section2.3 of the plan, regional parks are not focused on the provision of sports fields or playgrounds which required intensive management.</p>	<p>10. No change required</p> <p>11. Review ‘methods’ to improve consistency in level of detail</p> <p>12. No change required</p> <p>13. No change required</p> <p>14. No change required</p> <p>15. No change required</p> <p>16. Amend Policy 64</p> <p>17. No change required</p> <p>18. No change required</p> <p>19. Update monitoring table as per officers comment</p> <p>20. Amend to include TA jurisdiction within legal status for each park</p> <p>21. Review Akatarawa maps and Appendix 4 to check tracks</p> <p>22. Amend 6.7.2</p> <p>23. Review text and maps to ensure consistency</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>24. Page 75 Key park characteristics – under ‘people’ include Aperahama Urupa (south end of QEP)</p> <p>25. Include reference to cycle track and investigation into provision of playing fields during construction of planned expressed way</p> <p>26. Page 79 - give more priority to working with community groups...to implement cycle plan linking Raumati and Paekakariki –</p> <p>27. Add “dog walking” as additional activity in projected changes section</p> <p>28. Future plan text – amend Map 16 (replace A, B and G) and add “including cycle links” to enhance links</p>	<p>There is however a ‘potential neighborhood park’ is included in the ‘projected future changes map’. Depending on community need this may require management by Kapiti Coast District Council. This proposal should also be referenced in the text (6.7.5)</p> <p>24. This urupa is part of the treaty claim. It would require iwi approval to include on maps</p> <p>25. This is considered outside the scope of the current plan but note that a general statement is made under 6.7.5 ‘Projected changes’</p> <p>26. This is already identified in 6.7.5 Projected changes as a priority</p> <p>27. Dog walking is a current activity occurring on the park</p> <p>28. Further discussion is required with KCDC about the map which includes the potential future cycle path</p>	<p>24. Consult with iwi over inclusion of urupa in key park characteristics</p> <p>25. No change required</p> <p>26. No change required</p> <p>27. No change required</p> <p>28. Officers to work with KCDC to confirm map</p>
50.	Sandra and Wayne Estment	<p>A. Consider right balance between conservation, heritage management and recreation</p> <p>B. Strongly disagree with large scale Puketiro wind farm proposal in the Puketiro/Akatarawa forest - because a large scale wind farm development is absolutely inconsistent with the management plans of both of the abovementioned parks. Live in elevated position overlooking (at close range) significant part of the proposed Puketiro wind farm development.</p>	<p>1. Seek total deletion of policy 6.1.3(7) – management focus wind energy development on selected ridgelines and policy 6.1.4(f) - allow wind farm development and associated utility infrastructure in Battle Hill</p> <p>2. Seek removal of all wind farm related items - indicative locations - from map 2 (Akatarawa Forest future changes 2010)</p> <p>3. Seek all references to wind farm road are deleted from map 4(BHFFP future changes 2010).</p>	<p>1.-2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>3. The Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act provides for the construction and operation of electrical installations and works for renewable energy on land administered under the Wellington Regional Water Board Act. This includes the Akatarawa and Pakuratahi Forests. The Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south, utilizing existing forestry roads.</p>	1.-3. No change required
51.	Renwick Wright	<p>A. Consider right balance between conservation, heritage management and recreation</p> <p>B. Specifically interested in Queen Elizabeth Park</p> <p>C. Need to explicitly allow for both Friends of the Park and local individuals to have serious input into ongoing park management that will actively be considered by GWRC</p> <p>D. Totally opposed to any form of motor sport within park boundaries</p> <p>E. Totally opposed to any area of the park being taken by proposed motorway</p> <p>F. Supports idea of extending the tramway - if possible</p>		Note that there will be no motorised recreation in QEP	No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		from Paekakariki to Raumati or at least part way G. Supports commuter cycleway from Paekakariki to Raumati but this should be in addition to the existing coastal & inland tracks H. Supports proposed location of printing museum			
52.	Rodney Welch	A. Generally considers right balance between conservation, heritage management and recreation B. 6.1.3 Management focus Agree with the primary focus in clauses (1) and (2) and request that these be retained. Agree with the secondary focus in clauses (3) (4) (5) (6) and request that these be retained.	<p>Battle Hill</p> <p>1. Plan does not adequately identify park values through the omission of some key landscape areas identified in the 2009 Management Plan specifically the Eastern Hills</p> <p>2. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features “6.2.4 (c) plan omits the key landscape features identified in 2009 Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request that 6.2.4 c be replaced with wording from 2009 Management Plan adopted in November 2009 <i>Change requested because the Eastern Hills, mature specimen trees and native vegetation are key features and should be identified, as they were in the November plan.</i></p> <p>3. The plan does not protect the values of the park because it allows for commercial activities (specifically wind farm access) that are inconsistent with other park values</p> <p>4. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010 Possible wind farm road Disagree with the wind farm road. Request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4.</p> <p>5. 6.2.4(e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines Agree with the prohibition of wind turbines within the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Request this be extended to include the prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure. Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>6. Plan does not protect values of Akatarawa Forest or primary focus of park because it allows for commercial activities (specifically wind energy development) that are inconsistent with other park values</p>	<p>1.-2. As per previous submissions, there should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steepplands</p> <p>3. In December 2006 Council approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and extended this area in 2008.</p> <p>4. The Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act provides for the construction and operation of electrical installations and works for renewable energy on land administered under the Wellington Regional Water Board Act. This includes the Akatarawa and Pakuratahi Forests. The Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south, utilizing existing forestry roads.</p> <p>5. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>6. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific</p>	<p>1.-2. Amend 6.2.4 (c)</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. No change required</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>7. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines <i>Disagree with secondary focus.</i> Request that 6.1.3 (7) be deleted in its entirety <i>(because allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest). It is also inconsistent with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 b that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development.</i></p> <p>8. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure <i>Disagree with allowing wind farm development in Park.</i> Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted in its entirety (because allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest namely future water collection. It is also inconsistent with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 b that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p>	<p>information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding. 7. A substantial part of the proposed wind farm development is on pine plantation ridgelines. The RMA consenting process will consider any environmental impacts of development and any mitigation required.</p> <p>8. See comments from officers above</p>	<p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p>
53, 54, 55 oral	Jan Nisbet – Personal submission; Cycleways Walkways and Bridleways Advisory Group for Kapiti Coast District Council (KCDC); and Sport Kapiti and Wellington	<p>A. Main interest in Queen Elizabeth Park</p> <p>B. 6.7.3 (2) Horse access Concern over no public access in farm leased area – request for farm track to be available for linkage from the Pony Club lease area through to the Equestrian area at MacKay's crossing</p> <p>C. 6.7.3 (6) the Road - oppose use of park land for the expressway - request for a commuter track through the park as compensation</p> <p>D. 7.4 Visitor Services Raumati South Access – need for easier access at Raumati South with easy gradient/ good surface for older residents at Raumati South entrance</p>	<p>1. Key park characteristics: 6.7.2 People camping - should be allowed somewhere in the Park similar to Kaitoke and Battle Hill</p> <p>2. Request for no removal of any natural resources for commercial use</p> <p>3. Request strong statement about no motorised recreation in this park</p> <p>4. Suggest removing model aeroplanes from park due to noise</p> <p>5. Map changes Track shown in pink and labeled A and B should be shown as the commuter route – the track labeled as G is through swamp land and finishes at MacKay's crossing where cyclists either need to go back onto the SH1 or cut down to track A. There is no easy route through to the south that stays on the east side of the Park. By putting the track labeled G on the map and calling it a commuter route it is less likely that KCDC will be able to attract NZTA subsidy for the route A and B which is the easiest route to build</p>	<p>1. Camping is provided in a leased area of QEP as part of a formal camping ground leased from DoC. Considered sufficient for current needs</p> <p>2. There is an approval process for the removal of any natural materials from all of the parks</p> <p>3. Recognise the tranquil nature of the park in the key park characteristics</p> <p>4. This has a lease and will be reconsidered at the end of the lease term. Refer comment to operational staff.</p> <p>5. As per officers comment to submission 49 (KCDC), tracks should be reviewed with KCDC officers.</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. Amend key park characteristics</p> <p>4. No change required</p> <p>5. Review cycle tracks with KCDC and amend as necessary</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>6. Request for access through present farmland in the northern sector to the beach, to the Inland track and a north south link (using the present farm track) to the Equestrian area at MacKay's crossing</p> <p>7. Request for link off the present farm track known as the Horse track or the Yankee Trail that links across to the forest remnant</p> <p>8. New track labeled 1 – (forest remnant extension and wetland restoration) should be built as a multi use track for walkers, bikes and horses.</p>	<p>6. A sustainable farm plan is currently being undertaken for this area which will guide decision making on what areas are leased, available to the public and retired. Comments will be referred to operational staff</p> <p>7. Noted, refer comments to operational staff</p> <p>8. No track standard has been set for this track. Refer comments to operational staff</p>	<p>6. No change required</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p>
56.	Featherston Community Centre – Heather Kary	<p>A. Consider plan will ensure a consistent approach in terms of management and policy implementation</p> <p>B. Consider inclusion of Wairarapa Moana in Parks Plan in the future would bring benefits to its long term management and success</p>		Wairarapa Moana Wetlands is mentioned in the Chairperson's foreword. It will be the subject of a separate amendment to the plan. Once governance arrangements have been finalised	No change required
57. oral	Film NZ/Film Wellington – Sandra Clark / Nicci Lock	<p>A. Supports integrated management plan</p> <p>B. Recommend development of Filming Protocol to provide greater clarity and transparency to the filming and permitting process</p>	<p>1. 7.2.2 (e) Filming or photography for personal, family and non-commercial purposes Definition of “non-commercial” – Recommended wording change to: ...are not receiving any form of payment or gain for the activity. (clarify intention of clause covering family and personal use and exclude the likes of student films, short films, music videos and charitable TVC's)</p> <p>2. 7.3.2 Request to add “non-commercial” projects under 30 people into Managed Activities (7.3.2)</p> <p>3. 7.4.3 Restricted Activities (b) Filming and photography: Outline intention of GWRC to work with the screen production industry (through Film New Zealand and Film Wellington) to develop a set of filming protocols that acknowledges the GWRC desire to facilitate filming in the regional parks.</p> <p>4. 7.4.4 Public notification criteria 7.4.4 (d) In the opinion of Greater Wellington that it is in the public interest. Suggest statement requires further clarification and could be further clarified in Appendix 4 and the subsequent Filming Protocol document.</p> <p>5. 7.4.6 Application Timeframe – 1-3 month application process. Suggest filming (specifically television commercials) may require a 1-5 days turnaround on applications. The ability for GWRC to grant urgent applications could be addressed in Appendix 4 and the subsequent Filming Protocol document.</p> <p>6. 7.5 Prohibited Activities - inclusion of open fires, firearms, fireworks and animals as Prohibited Activities</p>	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. Disagree. Rangers have reported no issues to date.</p> <p>3. GWRC is currently working with Film Wellington on a brochure which will set out the process/protocol for filming and photography on GWRC. This will not be inconsistent with the current concessions policy included in this plan but will outline how processes can be managed to support filming activities that add value to the regions economy</p> <p>4. This is a generic policy for all activities and developments not specific to filming</p> <p>5. Refer to Officers comment (3.) above</p> <p>6. Fireworks are prohibited under the bylaws. Fires would require a permit and this should be clarified in the plan</p>	<p>1. Amend as suggested by submitter</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. Add footnote to 7.4.3(b) to refer to separate brochure on filming activities</p> <p>4. No change required</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. Review policies regarding open fires to clarify that fires require a permit</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			in the park. Suggest in some circumstances listed activities may be part of the filming requirements – request to be moved to restricted activity – address specifically in an appendix and filming protocol document		
58. oral	Peter Sinke and Robert Austin – Rotary Club of Plimmerton	A. Request the ability to be able to run occasional events for Charitable fund raising purposes – provision in plan to do so		1. Note that in general fee waivers for events are currently at the discretion of the Manager, Parks. Previous discussion by Council concluded that waivers for charitable events were not appropriate, given that these are effectively donations of ratepayers money	1. No change required
59. oral	New Zealand Transport Agency – Selwyn Blackmore	A. Support for integrated plan B. Main interest to ensure operational and development of state highway network adequately recognised and provided for C. Supports Policy 71 (b) – advocating public transport D. Supports Policy 50 (c) – restrictions on public access to utilities	1. 5.4.5. Utilities – request network utilities section includes reference to transport infrastructure: “Network utilities such as transport infrastructure , water, gas, electricity supply, and telecommunications have an important role...” 2. Request for all references to transmission gully to be replaced with term “Transmission gully route” Belmont 3. Page 53 - 6.2.1: request for Transmission gully route to be included in description “The Belmont Regional park is subject to the existing Transmission Gully designation.” 4. Page 56 Footnote 17: request for change in wording to “The Transmission Gully route is a proposed 27 kilometer expressway between MacKay’s Crossing and Linden. The project is one component of a package of rail and road options that are intended to address congestion, traffic flow and road safety in the Wellington region as contained in the Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy.” 5. Belmont Regional Park map: request for addition of Transmission Gully route designation to be shown on current map and projected changes map (also show proposed link roads from Transmission Gully to Whitby and Waitangirua) Battle Hill 6. Page 53 6.2.1: request Transmission Gully route designation described in consistent way to Belmont (see wording in 59 (4) above and add “17” after Transmission gully route” and delete “possible” before future	1. Agree 2. Agree 3. Agree 4. Agree 5. Agree 6. Agree	1. Amend 5.4.5 as requested by submitter 2. Amend as requested by submitter 3. Amend 6.2.1 as requested by submitter 4. Amend page 56 as requested by submitter 5. Amend map as requested by submitter 6. Amend page 53as requested by submitter
60. oral	New Zealand Historic Places – Ann Neill	A. Support for integrated plan B. Baring Head complex very unique – especially integrity of the complex with lighthouse and associated buildings – one of only 3 intact lighthouse complexes remaining in NZ and the most accessible to a large urban centre	1. Request for inclusion of Baring Head lighthouse complex and new park into plan	1. Currently only the lighthouse is included. Evaluation of the Baring Head area will be considered in a subsequent amendment to the plan as part of the new block of land. Research will be undertaken to establish heritage values	1. No change required
61.	Upper Cannon’s	A. Support ‘Native Ecology Linkage improvement’		Noted	No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
oral	Creek Catchment Steering Committee – Jay Davison	between Cannon’s Creek Catchment and Upper Korokoro Stream indicated on the Belmont Regional Park Map – Projected Future Changes B. Support ‘advocating improved recreational links with other land management agencies’ – especially from Porirua City and Tawa to mitigate the psychological effect of cutting off the main body of Belmont Regional Park with proposed Transmission Gully route			
62. oral	Michael Taylor	A. Supports environment guiding principles for management 1-5 B. Supports 4.3.10 recreation principle C. Supports 4.3.11 heritage guiding principles D. Supports 5.1.3-5.1.5 (introduced plants, pest plants and animals, water) E. Page 35 – 5.4.4 Park closures – oppose policy (c) as plan is too vague about what activity or event could warrant restriction of access by public F. Supports Policy 47 – 5.4.5 (existing utility infrastructure) G. Opposes construction and operation of electric power generating plants in parks H. Supports Policy 56 (prohibiting mineral exploration etc) – notes this may not be listed in rules table I. Supports 5.6.2 Access J. Supports GWRC’s recent decision to acquire Baring Head K. Opposed to motorised recreation in all GWRC parks – suggests eliminating them except for emergency purposes within the lifetime of the 10 year plan	1. Need consistency of terminology “parks” rather than “parks and forests” throughout document e.g. 4.3.1, 5.4.1 2. Request for ‘future water collection area’ to be referred to in plan as “ potential future water collection area” 3. Request for clarification of what is meant by “passive recreation” e.g. page 15 4. Request for reference to “hiking” through plan to be removed and replaced with tramping 5. Chairman’s Foreword page (i) – suggest adding in need for people to “get away from it all” that is creating requirement for open spaces 6. Map 1, 2.1 and Appendix 1 – request reference to regional park in Makara not yet eventuated 7. Page 6 2.2 – request for GWRC to apply for regional parks that are protected in perpetuity – e.g. those not gazetted under Reserves Act 8. Page 24 vision statement – considered too “vague” – suggest re-working to make it clear parks are themselves natural places before reference connecting...e.g. “ <i>To enrich lives by providing healthy natural places and connected people to them</i> ” 9. Page 24 - 4.2(1), (2), (3) - request for public access to be recognised as being more significant than heritage features (in terms of priority) – swap 2 and 3 around 10. Page 24 - 4.3 (6) Environment guiding principle and 5.4 Objective 9 - include reference to effects of climate change being “avoided”- separate “avoidance” and “mitigation” into two separate principles 11. Page 25 – 4.3(7) – Recreation guiding principle – Reword so park network does not reflect the needs of all the region as this is not possible – important that “activities and attractions are appropriate to the park setting” and “reflect the environmental values of the park	1. Agree – the plan covers both regional parks and forests. For simplicity these have been referred to as ‘parks’ though the document. This should be consistent. When specific reference is made to one of the forest areas this should be clearly stated as ‘Pakuratahi Forest’ or ‘Akatara Forest’. 2. Future water collection area is defined in the Water Board Act 1972 legislation 3. Agree, need to clarify what is meant by passive recreation to avoid confusion of plan interpretation 4. Agree 5. Noted. This will be passed onto the chairperson 6. This is a historical account, not projecting forward as to what parks may yet be created 7. Currently the majority of land in the Parks is either covered by the Reserves Act or the Water Board Act 1972, with the exception of Battle Hill. No changes are currently proposed 8. Vision is clear and proposed rewording provides no improvement. 9. These are not listed in terms of priority 10. Disagree – climate change cannot be avoided, we can only mitigate or adapt our management to take into account the effects of climate change 11. Unnecessary change, current wording is sufficient	1. Review for consistency as per officers comment 2. No change required 3. Explain meaning of passive recreation 4. Amend as requested by submitter 5. No change required 6. No change required 7. No change required 8. No change required 9. No change required 10. No change required 11. No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>12. Page 25 – 4.3 (8) – request to delete “in a safe environment” – there is always some degree of risk in any activity</p> <p>13. Page 25 – 4.3(9) – request to place “hunting” with “tramping”</p> <p>14. Page 26 – 4.3 (18) – clarify what “lands acquired, held and managed by GWRC” means</p> <p>15. Page 27 – 5.1.1 Policy 4 (b) – request for wording change to “provide a high chance of their survival in the area”</p> <p>16. Page 28 – 5.1.2 Policy 10 – request wording change (oppose removal of natural materials for commercial purposes)</p> <p>17. Page 30 - 5.2 Landscape and geological features – request for objectives and policies to be strengthened – add RMA consent application processing to methods</p> <p>18. Page 34 – Policy 38 (d) – request to start with same (a) – (d) as Policy 36 and continues with proposed 38 (a) to (c)</p> <p>19. Page 34- Policy 43 (climate change) – mix of avoidance and mitigation measures – refer to point 10 above</p> <p>20. Page 36 – Policy 50 (licence and easements) – strengthen policy by inserting “only” immediately before “where”</p> <p>21. Page 36 – Policy 54 (renewable energy) – request for public consultation prior to these activities taking place in parks</p> <p>22. 6.1.3 and 6.6.3 (Akatarawa and Pakuratahi Forests future water collection areas) – considers management focus for these areas in next 10 years unlikely to relate to water collection - request to remove water collection from primary management focus</p> <p>23. 6.1.4n Akatarawa Forest public notification of forest closure – clarify policy – is this just for closure of the whole forest or also include part closures?</p> <p>24. Map 3 page 51 (significant indigenous environmental areas in forests) – request for key to map to explain meaning of cross hatching</p> <p>25. Page 52, 6.2.3.6 – management focus Battle Hill: include reference to compensation funding from central government (including necessary land purchases and restoration) as result of Transmission Gully route</p>	<p>12. While activities do have some degree of risk, GWRC provides a range of services to ensure the public are not exposed to unsafe structures and so on.</p> <p>13. Agree</p> <p>14. Agree</p> <p>15. Agree</p> <p>16. The ‘commercial purposes’ generally referred to are eco-sourcing seeds and cuttings by nurseries, flax used for weaving and samples for research. Officers consider that the current system gives sufficient scrutiny to each application. If officers are concerned by a request it would either be denied or require special approvals</p> <p>17. RMA processes are not included in this plan</p> <p>18. Disagree this would change the intent of these policies, which has purposefully been separated</p> <p>19. No change required, refer to point 10 above</p> <p>20. Agree</p> <p>21. There are a number of triggers for public consultation set out in the plan. Note that reasons for public consultation are also defined under legislation (Local Government Act 2002 and Reserves Act 1977)</p> <p>22. Does not meet Water Board Act 1972 purpose for land</p> <p>23. Agree – need to review wording to clarify that public notification applies to both part or whole closure of the park</p> <p>24. Agree</p> <p>25. While compensation in some form may be provided, this is outside the plan</p>	<p>12. No change required</p> <p>13. Amend 4.3(9) as suggested by submitter</p> <p>14. Clarify 4.3(18) as requested by submitter to refer to ‘owned and managed’</p> <p>15. Amend Policy 4as requested by submitter</p> <p>16. No change required</p> <p>17. No change required</p> <p>18. No change required</p> <p>19. No change required</p> <p>20. Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>21. No change required</p> <p>22. No change required</p> <p>23. Review wording</p> <p>24. Amend Map 3 as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>25. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>26. Page 56 – Policy 6.3.4f (Battle Hill land management) – request to insert “only” immediately after “aircraft”</p> <p>27. Page 80 6.8.3 Management focus Wainui Rec Area – request for additional focus on adequate treated water</p> <p>28. Page 85 7.2.3 Allowed activities – considers too many restrictions on allowed activities</p> <p>29. Page 86 7.2.5 (dogs) – request for dogs to be leashed at all times in East Harbour, Kaitoke, Pakuratahi and Wainui Rec Area</p> <p>30. Page 90 7.4.3 – Restricted activities – motorised recreation included here for all areas except Akatarawa but noted earlier in plan as “prohibited”- confirm which is correct</p>	<p>26. Unnecessary addition</p> <p>27. Treated water is more appropriate in Wainui/Orongorongo catchment which has own management/access plan</p> <p>28. This was not raised by any other submitters. It is considered the current restrictions are appropriate</p> <p>29. Dog Control Act only requires dogs to be under control. No dogs allowed at Parangarahu Lakes Area</p> <p>30. Agree – the plan identifies two categories for motorised recreation. It should be prohibited (with explanation). Refer to Submission 21.</p>	<p>26. No change required</p> <p>27. No change required</p> <p>28. No change required</p> <p>29. No change required</p> <p>30. Review plan to ensure consistency (Refer to submission 21)</p>
63.	Raumati South Residents' Association Inc – Chriss Bull	<p>A. Support for integrated plan</p> <p>B. Main interest in Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP)</p> <p>C. Fear that individual park values and characteristics may be compromised with one management plan</p> <p>D. Request for park characteristics to be primary consideration for the management of each park</p> <p>History and Heritage and Public Education</p> <p>E. Management focus (6.7.3 paragraph 5) and specific policy (6.7.4 e/f) and projected changes – identifies history of Maori and European occupation and preservation of cultural heritage sites acknowledged but no indication of how this will be done</p> <p>Partnerships with local community</p> <p>F. Page 42, section 5.7, policy 88 mentions community involvement over park issues - particularly important for groups such as the Friends of Queen Elizabeth Park - request for more emphasis when discussing community involvement</p> <p>Transport and Technology Site</p> <p>G. Support for the current tramway museum and stables barn be incorporated into small transport and technological site near the MacKay's Crossing Entrance - could include the printing museum</p> <p>Recreation concept plan</p> <p>H. Request for a recreation concept plan for QEP be developed in partnership with appropriate partners and open for public consultation – see point 1</p> <p>I. Request for linking Raumati South and Paekakariki as an immediate priority</p> <p>Biodiversity/Education</p> <p>J. Current focus of QEP on preservation and restoration with no mention of educational objectives – suggest partnerships developed with local and regional experts</p>	<p>1. Section 6.7.3 (4) and (5) – request for these to be replaced with statement of intent to develop long-term concept plan for a) Maori history, b) WW2 marines, c) transport and technology - acknowledge likely future increase in visitors, need for public transport (a recreational railway stop at MacKay's) and associated visitor attractions</p> <p>2. Request to state explicitly motor sports prohibited in park - Paragraphs 6.7.3 and 6.7.4 (pp 75-6)</p> <p>Pests</p> <p>3. Page 29- 5.1.4 - request to reduce the number of cats within the vicinity of regional parks and reserves - that GWRC work with local councils to educate public about damage cats can do to wild-life e.g. skinks and lizards</p>	<p>1. This level of detail is not required for a plan. Refer comments to operational staff.</p> <p>2. As per previous submissions, officers recommend that the tranquil experience of being in the park is reflected in the key values of the park.</p> <p>3. Policy could be strengthened to refer to working with adjacent landholdings to reduce pests.</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. Amend key park characteristics</p> <p>3. Include an additional clause in Policy 19</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>K. Support for page 79 investigation into wetland reversion potential north of MacKay's and north/eastern margins of park</p> <p>Expressway proposal</p> <p>L. Strongly oppose any use of QEP for NZTA proposed expressway</p> <p>Motor sports</p> <p>M. Opposed to any motor sports in QEP</p>			
64. oral	Whareroa Guardians Community Trust – Bob Zurr	<p>A. Main interest in Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP)</p> <p>B. Concerns over generic approach to all regional parks</p> <p>C. Critical QEP does not lose its unique identity</p> <p>D. Individual character of each park should be primary consideration in determining the management policies for the park</p> <p>E. Close ecological, cultural, historical and recreational links between QEP and Whareroa Farm must be recognised and enhanced through integrated management - Guardians have active re-vegetation programme within Whareroa Farm currently working with DoC on Strategic Plan for Whareroa Farm.</p> <p>F. QEP is open space gateway to Porirua and Wellington city for those travelling from the north and gateway to Kapiti and the Nature Coast for those travelling from south</p> <p>Single regional information centre</p> <p>G. Suggestion for one information centre to be developed for QEP and Whareroa Farm so that information, activities and features of both of these parks are coordinated at a central point</p> <p>Mackay's Railway Platform.</p> <p>H. Platform at MacKay's Crossing would provide cost effective opportunity for direct public access to QEP and Whareroa Farm</p> <p>Motorised recreation</p> <p>I. Confirmation of no motorised recreation within QEP Queen Elizabeth Park</p>	<p>1. 6.7.2 Key park characteristics Land: request to add <i>reference to:</i> <u>"Ecological links through Whareroa Farm to Akatarawa Forest Park"</u>.</p> <p>2. 6.7.2 Key park characteristics People: request for addition: <u>"historic and current links through to Whareroa Farm"</u>.</p> <p>3. 6.7.3 Management focus Request for <i>Plan to be amended so that the management focus is also to:</i> <u>"Work with the Department of Conservation to integrate the management, where appropriate, of Queen Elizabeth Park and Whareroa Farm"</u>.</p> <p>4. 6.7.4 Biodiversity and ecosystems - request for <i>Plan to be amended</i> <u>"To have particular regard for the high priority indigenous areas and links with Whareroa Farm when determining ecosystem protection and enhancement priorities"</u>.</p> <p>5. Landscape and geological features - request for <i>Plan to be amended to add:</i> <u>"To integrate the management of the following significant geological features which contribute to the landscape experience of Queen Elizabeth Park - Whareroa Farm."</u></p> <p>6. Visitor services – request for <i>Plan to be amended to add:</i> <u>"Prohibit motorised recreation in the Park."</u></p> <p>7. Add. "To liaise with the Department of Conservation in the planning of a visitor centre for the Queen Elizabeth Park / Whareroa Farm area."</p> <p>8. Partnership in parks – request for <i>Plan to be amended</i> <u>"p. To liaise with, in regards to decision making, Kapiti Coast District Council and the Department of Conservation (especially in relation to Whareroa Farm), on the management.... recreational activities"</u></p>	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. Agree</p> <p>3. A stronger emphasis on working alongside DOC with regard to Whareroa Farm is appropriate. This should be included in the park specific policies.</p> <p>4. Agree</p> <p>5. Inclusion of amendment 3. above will also cover this point, no further detail necessary</p> <p>6. Need to emphasize the tranquil environment the park provides</p> <p>7. This emphasis is not in the submission by DOC. This is covered by amendment to 6.7.4 as per (3) above</p> <p>8. Agree, this is covered by amendment to 6.7.4 as per (3) above</p>	<p>1. Amend 6.7.2 as requested by submitter</p> <p>2. Amend 6.7.2 as suggested by submitter</p> <p>3. Amend 6.7.4</p> <p>4. Amend 6.7.4 as requested by submitter</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. Include as a key park characteristic</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p>
65. oral	Tara Cooper and Tony Elliott	<p>A. Specifically interested in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>Battle Hill</p>	<p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that</p>	<p>1.-2. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>B. Plan does not adequately identify park values - omission of some key landscape areas identified in the 2009 Management Plan specifically the Eastern Hills</p> <p>C. Plan does not protect values of the park because it allows for commercial activities (specifically wind farm access) that are inconsistent with other park values</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>D. Plan does not protect values of the Akatarawa Forest or the primary focus of the park because it allows for commercial activities (specifically wind energy development) that are inconsistent with other park values</p>	<p>development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22:</p> <p><i>“To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>European style pastoral character</i> - <i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steepplands</i> - <i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant”</i> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are</p>	<p>development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steepplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing</p>	<p>3. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>4.-5. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			deleted from Map 4	forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.	
66. oral	Mainland Island Restoration Operation (MIRO)	<p>A. Support for integrated plan</p> <p>B. Especially supportive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of high ecological value of regional parks • Vision to improve biodiversity and restore ecosystems • Ongoing commitment to pest plant and pest animal control necessary to achieve (b) • Development of partnerships with Iwi and community organisations in management and restoration of parks <p>C. Particularly interested in East Harbour</p> <p>D. Parangarahu contains relatively pristine wetland that is nationally significant - focus on this part of the Park as in the Forest Block should be the conservation of the natural, cultural and scenic values Recreational Hunting of Deer and Pig, Northern Forest</p> <p>E. Pigs and deer are pest animals with detrimental effects on ecosystems. Recreational hunting ineffective in controlling numbers - these animals better targeted by contractors as part of pest control operations Fish Passage Parangarahu</p> <p>F. Research commissioned by Greater Wellington (Mike Joy Massey University) revealed low numbers of juvenile fresh water fish in the Lakes and streams - request for investigation of Lake outlets and how outcomes for fish might be improved</p>	<p>Reclassification of Parangarahu</p> <p>1. Request consideration be given to changing land classification from Recreation Reserve to Scenic Reserve</p> <p>2. Pages 22 and 63 – amend MIRO - Mainland Island Restoration <i>Operation</i></p> <p>3. Page 22 Paragraph 3: ‘<i>MIRO</i>’ is actively involved in undertaking predator control....</p> <p>4. ‘Black robin’ should be replaced by <i>North Island robin</i>.</p> <p>5. 6.4.2 Key Park Characteristics - request to include: ‘<i>A Mainland Island Sanctuary in the northern forest</i>’.</p> <p>6. Under ‘People’ – request to include: ‘<i>Historical Butterfly Creek walk and Picnic area</i>’.</p> <p>7. 6.4.3 Management Focus – request to include: ‘<i>Work with MIRO and other voluntary groups to protect and develop the Mainland Island and to assist in the reintroduction of species to the area</i>’.</p> <p>8. 6.4.4 Biodiversity and Ecosystems – request to include: ‘<i>To provide pest control operations in the Mainland Island at a level to ensure the ongoing viability of the Sanctuary</i>’.</p> <p>9. 6.4.5 Projected Changes Statement around investigating development of a marked route access from behind the Wainuiomata Golf Course linking the existing track network contradicts earlier comments with regard to land management: ‘to keep the Gollans Valley Remote Area free from formal tracks and developments’. - MIRO favours the status quo on tracks.</p> <p>10. Visitor Services Park entrances at Moana Rd, Days Bay and Broad Gully, Wainuiomata have not been listed</p>	<p>1. When this land was purchased, GWRC agreed that recreation was the appropriate designation. Any changes would require discussion with iwi and other agencies.</p> <p>2. -7 Agree with changes suggested</p> <p>8. Disagree, currently levels of service are not indicated in the plan</p> <p>9. Route indicated in the maps extends only as far as the ridgeline and not into Gollans Valley, need to link text to maps carefully to avoid confusion</p> <p>10. Review 6.4.4 (h) and update as necessary</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. – 7. Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>8. No change required</p> <p>9. Review text and maps to ensure consistency</p> <p>10. Review 6.4.4 (h)</p>
67. oral	Brett and Tracy Hall	<p>A. Specifically interested in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>B. Plan does not adequately identify park values - omission of some key landscape areas identified in the 2009 Management Plan specifically the Eastern Hills</p> <p>C. Plan does not protect values of the park because it allows for commercial activities (specifically wind farm access) that are inconsistent with other park values</p>	<p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p>	<p>1.-2. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>Akatarawa Forest D. Plan does not protect values of the Akatarawa Forest or the primary focus of the park because it allows for commercial activities (specifically wind energy development) that are inconsistent with other park values</p>	<p>approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill 3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22: <i>“To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i> - <i>European style pastoral character</i> - <i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steeplands</i> - <i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant”</i></p> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steeplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over. 5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	<p>3. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>4.-5. No change required</p>
68. oral	Preserve Pauatahanui Incorporated – Tara Cooper	<p>A. Consider right emphasis in plan on conservation, heritage and recreation B. Main interest in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest</p>	<p>Akatarawa Forest 1. Policy 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with this secondary focus - request 6.1.3 (7) deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected</p>	<p>1. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water</p>	<p>1.-2. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>C. Consider plan does not adequately protect values of Akatarawa Forest or primary focus of the park because it promotes commercial activities (specifically wind energy development) that are inconsistent with Guiding Principles for Management</p> <p>D. Consider GWRC have failed to provide public with evidence to show that construction of wind turbines will not adversely impact the primary focus of future water collection and protection of native vegetation.</p> <p>E. Consider wind energy development on selected ridgeline (6.1.3 (7)) is inconsistent with 6.1.3 (3) - ensures the native forest vegetation protected, as large areas of native forest vegetation would be destroyed by the wind farm footprint, comprising turbines, access roads and related infrastructure; and inconsistent with 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development.</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>F. Concern about omission of key landscape areas identified in 2009 Management Plan, specifically the Eastern Hills</p> <p>G. Plan does not adequately protect (rather conflicts with) values identified for Battle Hill Farm Forest Park - commercial activities (through the provision of wind farm access) inconsistent with Guiding Principles for Management</p> <p>H. Extremely disappointed to see changes and omissions to Battle Hill section compared to 2009 Battle Hill management plan – appears to be no justification for modifications</p>	<p>ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest - future water collection.</p> <p>2. Policy 6.1.4 (f) (allow for development of approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure) - request that 6.1.4 (f) be deleted along with all associated references to the wind farm shown on Map 2, Akatarawa Forest Projected Future Changes (disagree with wind energy development in the Akatarawa Forest Park)</p> <p>3. Policy 6.1.4 Land management - request addition of further clause specific to development in the Akatarawa Forest Park being: <i>"To avoid siting and retaining facilities and structures in natural hazard zones (i.e., areas prone to flooding, erosion, slope instability, such as near rivers or steep areas)."</i> - consider this further supports the Guiding Principles of Management, setting out to protect the values of the park</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>4. Policy 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features - disagree with the omissions from 6.2.4 (c) relative to the 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan (in particular the Eastern Hills) Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the 2009 Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22: <i>"To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i> <i>-European style pastoral character</i> <i>-The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steeplands</i> <i>-The eastern hills</i> <i>- Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> <i>- Native bush remnant"</i> (requested because Eastern Hills are key landscape feature)</p> <p>5. Policy 6.2.4 Land Management - request retention of Policy 1.17 from the 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan being: <i>"To avoid siting and retaining facilities and structures in natural hazard zones (i.e., areas prone to flooding, erosion, slope instability, such as near rivers or steep areas."</i> - important to ensure protection of park values</p>	<p>collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding</p> <p>3. Current policy wording on natural hazards is sufficient (Policy 39)</p> <p>4. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steeplands</p> <p>5. Current policy wording on natural hazards is sufficient (Policy 39)</p>	<p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>5. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>6. Policy 6.2.4 (e). Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - request policy be extended to read <i>“To prohibit, within the boundaries of Battle Hill Farm Forest Park, the construction of any wind turbines, blade flyover, commercial access (through or within the park) for wind energy development or the construction of any infrastructure or utilities associated with wind farms.”</i></p> <p>7. Request all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4 Battle Hill Forest Farm Park Projected Future Changes April 2010</p> <p>8. Request for Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan (November 2009) be adopted into the draft Park Network Plan in its entirety, without omissions and amendments</p>	<p>6. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>7. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p> <p>8. The plan deals with the current issues which includes some changes from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Plan 2009</p>	<p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p>
69. oral	Robin Maud – Rotary Club of Hutt city	<p>A. Commend draft plan provisions</p> <p>B. 6.1 – potential for foot/cycle trail to link Hutt River Trail to Kapiti Coast Kaitoke</p> <p>C. Request for steep gradient of track on left bank from bridge downstream from campground to be eliminated</p> <p>D. Request to alter Kaitoke Hill Track from switch-back fire-break to one gradient and look-out Pakuratahi Forest</p> <p>E. Request to improve signage from SH2 and show linkages to Tunnel Gully, Pakuratahi Rail Trail, Kaitoke Regional Park, Hutt River Trail</p> <p>F. Need to easy access and gradient tracks to cater for needs of aging population Omission of water catchment areas and river corridors</p> <p>G. Surprise these areas are omitted from network plan – assume a separate management plan applies to these areas Native butterflies</p> <p>H. Request provision in plan for locations for planting programme to support breeding of native butterflies Native fish ladders</p> <p>I. Recommendation that Environment Waikato’s braided rope ladders be investigated for use in GWRC parks National cycleway</p> <p>J. Request that plan allows for linkages this concept – and opportunities for approval of government funding</p>	<p>1. Policy 35 - Farm and plantation forestry – request rewording to ensure riparian margins are developed with indigenous vegetation Belmont</p> <p>2. 6.3.2 Key Park characteristics “people” – include reference to Bush Camp Sawmill and School located along Old Coach Road extension of Normandale Road East Harbour</p> <p>3. Table 5: significant indigenous environmental areas and features – include reference to Forest Ringlet butterfly Kaitoke</p> <p>4. 6.5.5 projected changes: request for plan for multi-use low level track between camp ground and water treatment plant Projected changes maps</p> <p>5. Maps only show changes park by park and not adjacent parks – this doesn’t illustrate linkages well Hutt River Trail</p> <p>6. Request for this to be included in network plan</p>	<p>1. Consider current wording is sufficient</p> <p>2. While this is a feature of the park, it is not a key characteristic</p> <p>3. Agree</p> <p>4. Noted, this is included on the map but the type of track is not indicated</p> <p>5. Noted, this would require large maps which are costly to put into the plan</p> <p>6. The Hutt River margins are already covered by the Hutt River Floodplain management plan. The trail is a key link but not part of the Regional Park network</p> <p>Operational suggestions will be referred to parks staff</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. Include referent to Forest Ringlet butterfly in Table 5</p> <p>4. No change required</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
70.	Wellington Tramway Museum Incorporate (submission 17)	Repeat of submission. Refer submission number 17	Refer submission number 17		
71. oral	Diane Strugnell	<p>A. Consider right emphasis in plan on conservation, heritage and recreation – especially guiding principles for management</p> <p>B. Main interest in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest Battle Hill</p> <p>C. Concern about omission of key landscape areas identified in 2009 Management Plan, specifically the Eastern Hills</p> <p>D. Consider the provision of commercial activities and infrastructure is inconsistent with other park values and are contradictory to 2009 Battle Hill management plan Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>E. Supports primary focus and secondary focus and requests these be retained</p> <p>F. Opposed to wind energy on selected ridgelines as is inconsistent with primary focus 6.1.3(1) and fails to be supported by adequate research. Also inconsistent with 6.1.3 (3) - ensures the native forest vegetation protected, as large areas of native forest vegetation would be destroyed by the wind farm footprint, comprising turbines, access roads and related infrastructure; and inconsistent with 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development</p> <p>G. Strongly disagrees with 6.1.4(f) allowing wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill – considers GWRC has a conflict of interest in ability to undertake assessment for wind energy as contract already entered into with RES NZ Ltd. Belmont</p> <p>H. Support prohibition of wind farm construction in Belmont</p> <p>I. No support for inclusion of renewable energy generation in parks network (5.4.6)</p> <p>J. Consider GWRC continues to have bias attitude towards wind development</p> <p>K. Re-inclusion of wind farm access within Battle Hill is inconsistent with GWRC press release 28/7/09 where GWRC “welcomed the fact wind farm access was not required through Battle Hill”</p>	<p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. Policy 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with this secondary focus - request 6.1.3 (7) deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest - future water collection.</p> <p>2. Policy 6.1.4 (f) (allow for development of approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure) - request that 6.1.4 (f) be deleted along with all associated references to the wind farm shown on Map 2, Akatarawa Forest Projected Future Changes Battle Hill</p> <p>3. Policy 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features - disagree with the omissions from 6.2.4 (c) relative to the 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan (in particular the Eastern Hills) Requests 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the 2009 Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22: “To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include: -<i>European style pastoral character</i> -<i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steeplands</i> -<i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant”</i> (requested because Eastern Hills are key landscape feature)</p> <p>4. Supports prohibition of wind turbines in Battle Hill – requests policy 6.2.4 (e). Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - be extended to include all activities associated with wind farm including access through park, blade flyover and associated infrastructure</p> <p>5. Request all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steeplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this</p>	<p>1.-2. No change required</p> <p>3. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>4.-5. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>Battle Hill Forest Farm Park Projected Future Changes April 2010</p> <p>6. Request for Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan (November 2009) be adopted into the draft Park Network Plan in its entirety, without omissions and amendments</p> <p>7. Request for wind energy development to be added as a “prohibited activity”</p> <p>8. Request for definition of utility to be amended to ensure wind energy development does not comply</p>	<p>includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p> <p>6. The plan deals with the current issues which includes some changes from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Plan 2009</p> <p>7. This would be inconsistent with the Water Board Act 1972</p> <p>8. Current definition in glossary is sufficient</p>	<p>6. No change required</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p>
72.	Porirua City Council – Christine Jacobson	<p>A. Support general policies</p> <p>B. Supports development of sustainable land management plans for Belmont and Battle Hill</p> <p>C. Support link signaled between Battle Hill and Flighty’s road – facilitate links between Belmont and Battle Hill</p> <p>D. Support wind farm prohibition in Battle Hill and Belmont</p> <p>E. Looks forward to working with GWRC and Ngati Toa in development of management plan for Whitireia</p> <p>Belmont</p> <p>F. Page 56 – note there are only limited recreation links between Porirua, Lower Hutt – note Duck Creek track from Belmont Batteries to Porirua not open to public</p>	<p>1. Request for plan to be strengthened by acknowledging importance of improved catchment management for health of Pauatahanui Inlet and Porirua Harbour</p> <p>Belmont</p> <p>2. Policy 70 - notes development of new access and facilities described on Belmont projected change map 6 focuses in Hutt Valley -request for stronger commitment from GWRC for development of entrances to Porirua</p> <p>3. Request Map 6 (area 3) specifically described in legend and add to text: <i>“Evaluate options for land management, including improved recreational access from Porirua suburbs to the Waitangirua Farm Block and across Transmission Gully to the rest of Belmont Regional Park”</i></p>	<p>1. Agree, include in the importance of this catchment in the Park Description</p> <p>2. A number of entrances have been signaled for the Porirua side of Belmont and are indicated on maps. This area requires further evaluation in light of Transmission Gully route and results of the sustainable farm plan</p> <p>3. Agree – text must be consistent with maps</p>	<p>1. Amend</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. Include text as per submitter’s comments</p>
73. oral	Simon Arnold and Anne Stapleton	<p>A. Disagree with wind farm and associated utility infrastructure in Akatarawa Forest and Battle Hill – inconsistent with plan’s vision and guiding principles for management</p>	<p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p>	<p>1.-2. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>Battle Hill</p> <p>3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22:</p> <p><i>“To protect the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>European style pastoral character</i> - <i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steeplands</i> - <i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant”</i> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steeplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	<p>3. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>4.-5. No change required</p>
74. oral	St. John and Diana Wakefield	A. Disagree with wind farm and associated utility infrastructure in Akatarawa Forest and Battle Hill – inconsistent with plan’s vision and guiding principles for management	<p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p>	1.-2. No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>(allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill 3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22: <i>“To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i> - <i>European style pastoral character</i> - <i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steepplands</i> - <i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant”</i></p> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steepplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over. 5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	<p>3. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>4.-5. No change required</p>
75. oral	Moonshine Road Residents' Association Inc – Jennifer Hutson	<p>A. Strongly supports coordinated approach to policy B. Consider reasonable balance between recreation, conservation and heritage management C. Specifically interested in Battle Hill and Akatarawa D. Major concerns over intention of plan to allow industrial activity e.g. wind turbine installations and infrastructure E. Agree with primary focus of Akatarawa Forest</p>	<p>Akatarawa Forest 1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer</p>	<p>1.-2. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22:</p> <p><i>“To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>European style pastoral character</i> - <i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steepplands</i> - <i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant”</i> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steepplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over.</p> <p>5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	<p>3. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>4.-5. No change required</p>
76.	Judith de Wilde	A. Does not consider right balance across conservation,	Akatarawa Forest		

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
oral		<p>recreation and heritage management due to wind energy development being proposed on “native” forested ridges and in a water catchment area</p> <p>B. Strongly opposes network plan and request current management plans remain to ensure each park is unique, has own set of issues</p> <p>C. Specifically interested in Akatarawa Forest and Battle Hill</p> <p>D. Support vision and guiding management principles of network plan (4.2-4.3)</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>E. Plan does not protect values as it promotes commercial activities (wind energy development) inconsistent with guiding principles of management</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>F. Concerned about omission of key landscape areas identified in 2009 management plan – Eastern Hills</p> <p>G. Plan does not protect and conflicts with values identified for Battle Hill</p>	<p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22: <i>“To protect the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i> <i>- European style pastoral character</i> <i>- The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steepplands</i> <i>- The eastern hills</i> <i>- Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> <i>- Native bush remnant”</i></p> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steepplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-</p>	<p>1.-2. No change required</p> <p>3. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>4.-5. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4	over. 5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.	
77. yes	Steve Lewis – Kapiti Mountain Bike Club	QEP A. Support improvements to inland track from Raumati to Whareroa Stream B. Request for existing grass trail along Whareroa Stream be improved with metal surface for multi-use purposes C. Support completion of new inland track between Paekakariki and Whareroa Beach Road D. Support for retaining and where possible improving existing network of trail E. Possibility of running mountain bike enduro/relay events 6 or 12 hours in length in the future		Noted, operational suggestions will be referred to parks staff	No change required
78. yes	Mark Phillips	A. Specifically interested in Akatarawa Forest and Battle Hill B. Considers GWRC has predetermined position on wind farms resulting from commercial contract with RES Ltd		Noted	No change required
79. yes	Kapiti U.S Marines Trust – Allison Webber	A. Support content of network plan B. Consider community engagement and ownership is central to future stewardship of all parks C. Support acknowledgment in plan of QEP history D. Support concept of historic precinct at MacKay's Crossing E. Support printing museum located at QEP F. Support guiding management principle 11 – heritage G. Consider QEP is due for improved signage prior to rugby world cup event H. Developing register of key sites relating to marine history – would like this to be part of interpretative trail I. Support development of commuter cycleway and family friendly cycle network at QEP	Request mention in plan of weaving house at Paekakariki end of QEP	Disagree - other buildings which are lease are not mentioned in the plan	No change required
80. oral	Winstone Aggregates – Kevin Bligh	A. Request to meet with GWRC staff prior to hearing to discuss suggested amendments to plan B. Supports general approach to parks management as identified in network plan Belmont C. Wishes to work with GWRC where opportunities may exist for mutual benefit through partnerships e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • depositing overburden on an area of the park adjacent to the Belmont Quarry to facilitate its development into a mountain bike • track or other recreational facility 	Belmont 1. Request to include provisions for deposit of overburden (cleanfill) into Belmont park on case by case basis should they be appropriate to create opportunities for recreation e.g. mountain-bike tracks 2. Page 9 Part 2.4 Relationship of Greater Wellington parks to the community - request for additional paragraph on benefits of developing	1. Winstone Aggregates have already approached GWRC regarding the possibility of depositing cleanfill in the Dry Creek area. This area is a Recreation Reserve under the Reserves Act. Initial advice from DOC is that the activity would not be appropriate in the area under the current plan. This area's management focus is the enhancement of natural values; it has a well developed Park entrance. 2. Partnerships with the private sector could be appropriate in some parks where there is strong public benefit and the intent of this plan is achieved. The plan	1. No change required 2. No change required

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> exchange or sale of regenerating bush areas adjacent to park within quarry property development of Park land next to Dry Creek through cleanfilling to result in an appearance similar in amenity to Belmont park <p>D. Possible long term opportunity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> rehabilitate parts of Belmont Quarry and Dry Creek cleanfill - may include incorporating parts of these sites into Belmont park to be useable site for creation of all weather access track across Belmont with linkages to mountain bike tracks <p>E. Supports consideration of commercial activities as Restricted Activity - considers it needs to be made clear that overburden disposal(for park enhancement) is quite distinct from Mining activities which are specified as prohibited activity</p>	<p>relationships with both public and private organisations (in addition to tangata whenua and community groups and individuals which have their own commentary already)</p> <p>3. Page 11 - Part 3 Greater Wellington Parks - in addition to farming, forestry and wind farms, other economic opportunities exist e.g. overburden disposal. Request additional sentence to last paragraph page 11 "Other opportunities may exist to generate an economic return from activities within the Park e. g. overburden disposal, add other activities). Such activities are provided for as restricted activities in Part 7 Rules, and will be considered on a case by case basis...."</p> <p>4. Pages 24-26 - Part 4.3 Guiding principles for Parks Management Request for additional principle (19): "Consider partnerships with the private sector where an overall enhancement to park management or park values can be demonstrated" (Opportunities exist around sponsorship, donations, concessions and royalty arrangements, gifting of land etc.) Part 5 General management objectives and policies</p> <p>5. Page 27-28 - 5.1. Indigenous plants and fauna Request additional policy: "To explore opportunities with adjoining land owners for use and development of park land, where a net environmental benefit to the Parks network can be demonstrated."</p> <p>6. Page 30 - Request new method: "Partnerships with the private sector and in particular landowners adjoining the park."</p> <p>7. Pages 32-33 - Land Management – Request new objective: "Economic opportunities for use and development within the Parks are explored through public and private partnerships where a net overall benefit to park values can be demonstrated."</p> <p>8. 5.4.7 Mineral Exploration, prospecting and mining - request clarification that overburden disposal activities and cleanfilling are quite distinct from mining</p> <p>9. Request additional policy (57) "Consider any application for overburden disposal or cleanfilling on a case by case basis and only where it can be demonstrated to provide an overall benefit to Parks management and the values of the wider parks network."</p> <p>10. Pages 41-42 - 5.7 Partnership in Parks Request new objective:</p>	<p>currently does not preclude this, but it is not considered a necessary objective or policy in the plan</p> <p>3. Specific mention of 'overburden' is not considered necessary</p> <p>4. Better placed in the 'partnerships in park' general policy section. Consider Policy 89 could be widened to include partnering with groups. Sponsorship and concessions are already covered in the plan</p> <p>5. Plants and fauna section not an appropriate location for this policy. The current plan does not preclude the opportunity for partnerships with land owners</p> <p>6. Partnership could be included in some form in the methods section</p> <p>7. Difficult to judge net overall benefits, decisions must have regard to the key park characteristics, management focus and underlying legislation on a case by case basis</p> <p>8. Cleanfilling (the deposit of materials) is already distinct from mining (the removal of materials)</p> <p>9. Difficult to judge net overall benefits, decisions must have regard to the key park characteristics, management focus and underlying legislation on a case by case basis</p> <p>10. Partnerships with the private sector could be appropriate in some parks where there is strong public</p>	<p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. Amend Policy 89 to include partnerships with private sectors</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. Review methods section for 5.7 to include partnerships</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p> <p>9. No change required</p> <p>10. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p><i>“Consider partnerships with the private sector which can provide economic returns to maintain and enhance values within the Parks network and result an overall net benefit for values within the Park.”</i></p> <p>11. Request new policy: <i>“To consider private partnerships for use and development within the Parks network where appropriate, and where a net benefit to park values can be demonstrated.”</i></p>	<p>benefit and the intent of this plan is achieved. The plan currently does not preclude this, but it is not considered a necessary objective or policy in the plan</p> <p>11. No change – proposed policy considered too similar to objective</p>	11. No change required
81.	G Martin	<p>A. Specific interest in QEP</p> <p>B. Support Printing Museum being located at MacKay’s Crossing</p> <p>C. Requests removal of pampas grass and other weeds</p> <p>D. Opposes any form of motorised recreation</p> <p>E. Opposes any part of park being taken for expressway road</p> <p>F. Opposes any form of commercial development at QEP</p> <p>G. Considers local community should have powerful voice in way park is used and what is developed at QEP</p>		Note, Operational suggestions will be referred to parks staff	No change required
82. oral	Pauatahanui Futures Society Inc (PFS Inc) and Pauatahanui Residents Association Inc (PRA Inc)	<p>A. Specifically interested in Battle Hill and Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>B. Network plan effectively seeks to re- consult on issues that were determined only six months ago in the operative plan for Battle Hill</p> <p>C. Consider there is a failure to recognise special nature of regional parks in network plan</p> <p>D. Considers plan attempts to "lump" Regional Parks in same category as forestry land and future water collection areas - fails to adequately provide for special nature of Regional Parks including fundamental principles traditionally associated with our parks including free public use and access, preservation, conservation and natural recreation, and the expectation that this is to be held for the public to use in perpetuity</p> <p>E. While commercial use, economic gain, development, lease, licensing and disposal may (in some cases) be permissible considerations for management of Forestry and Water Collection land, they are not suitable for Regional Parks</p> <p>F. Consider regional parks provide important societal functions - areas free of commercial activities and should not be exploited for economic gain where it is inconsistent or incompatible with the primary purpose of Regional Parks.</p> <p>G. Consider not appropriate to protect areas of parks</p>	<p>1. Request for plan to be re-drafted to appropriately distinguish between management considerations relevant to Regional Parks and those for Council’s other lands</p> <p>2. Page 30 - Objective 4 – request to amend to: <i>“Protect the visual quality of landscapes from inappropriate development and use.”</i> (Landscapes and geological values within the park will be protected from inappropriate development and use)</p> <p>3. 5.1.2 Removal of Natural Materials: Page 28 - Policy 10 – request to amend to ensure applications for commercial removal can only occur <i>“..where there will be no more than minor impacts on (a) Species and ecosystems, and (b) Historical/Cultural Values, and (c) Landscape, visual amenity, scenic and natural character/values of the Park, and (d) Recreational/amenity values.”</i></p> <p>4. Policy 11: removal of natural materials - request to delete 11(d) and replace with the values suggested in amended 10 (b)(c) and (d) outlined above</p> <p>5. Page 29 - Policy 20: water – request to add additional clause: <i>“Manage activities in order to avoid, remedy, or mitigate against the adverse effects of activities erosion or sediment run-off where there is a risk of discharge to wetlands or waterways.”</i> (Encouraging effective soil and run-off management is</p>	<p>1. Plan sets out management focus for each park and forest in individual sections and recognizing the underlying legal status of each area</p> <p>2. Not only visual quality of landscapes that need to be protected but also physical attributes</p> <p>3. The ‘commercial purposes’ generally referred to are eco-sourcing seeds and cuttings by nurseries, flax used for weaving and samples for research. Officers consider that the current system gives sufficient scrutiny to each application. If officers are concerned by a request as not being in the public benefit, it would either be denied or require special approvals.</p> <p>5. This is a landuse condition that would be imposed on landuse consents rather than policy in parks network plan</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>5. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>with discrete areas or outstanding individual “features” – this provides little or no protection from development of areas/features that are considered less significant - when viewed in isolation fails to recognize the value in large natural open space appreciated by many</p> <p>H. Consider access routes should only be established where they will have low or minimal impact on the environment</p> <p>I. Strongly opposed to GWRC granting leases, third party acquisition or right-of-way caveats over park land</p> <p>J. Strongly opposed to disposal of park land</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>K. Plan does not adequately identify park values - omission of some key landscape areas identified in the 2009 Management Plan specifically the Eastern Hills</p> <p>L. Plan does not protect the values of the park because it allows for commercial activities (specifically wind farm access) inconsistent with other park values</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>M. Agree with primary focus of Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>N. Plan does not protect values of Akatarawa Forest or primary focus of the park - allows for commercial activities (specifically wind energy development) inconsistent with other values identified</p> <p>O. Plan does not sufficiently protect purpose for which the land is held - forestry and future water collection area</p>	<p>vital to maintaining healthy waterways and wetlands and supporting the aquatic ecosystems found there)</p> <p>6. Page 30 - Policy 23: (identification and protection of landscape and geological features) - request additional clauses: (d) Landscape's of high natural character and/or visual amenity value; and (e) Landscapes of high scenic value.</p> <p>7. Request for additional policies after Policy 23: A. “To recognise and take account of the landscape values of each Park in its management, use and development.” B. “When assessing activities and uses consider the adverse effects on landscape and geological values and ensure any adverse effects from development or activities of those values, or cultural values, are avoided remedied or mitigated.” (Many activities have the potential to affect the parks landscapes values. Management decisions on use and development of the park can impact on landscape values and this should be taken into account when considering use or development of the park) C. “To promote the maintenance and enhancement and preservation of the parks amenity and intrinsic values.” (The preservation and enhancement of the parks amenity values should be a key management goal)</p> <p>8. Policy 25: request to amend to: “To manage land use, developments or other activities to ensure that any adverse effects on identified landscape values are avoided remedied or mitigated...This includes (d) Only permitting use and development that is consistent with the values of the park and is not considered inappropriate.”</p> <p>9. Objective 10 – Land management- request to amend to: “Any impacts of public utilities and community infrastructure are minimised. Adverse effects generated by these activities should be avoided, remedied or mitigated.”</p> <p>10. Page 34, Policy 42 - Natural Hazards – request to amend to: “...that poses a risk to health and safety as a result of a natural hazard.” (Only natural hazards should permit the Council to close access off permanently)</p> <p>11. Policies 49, 50 (applications for new network</p>	<p>6. these matters are considered to be adequately covered in policy 23</p> <p>7. Policy 25 covers these points and decision making guidelines in 7.4.7 reference park key characteristics, management focus, relevant policies</p> <p>8. Agree</p> <p>9. Suggest amended wording to: “Any adverse effects generated by public utilities and community infrastructure should be avoided, remedied or mitigated”</p> <p>10. The policy allows scope for limited public access where there is a hazard. This is appropriate whether the hazard is natural or man-made</p> <p>11. Network utilities include national grid</p>	<p>6. No change required</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. Amend policy 25 as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>9. Amend</p> <p>10 No change required</p> <p>11. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>utilities as restricted activities) – request deletion</p> <p>12. Page 36 - Renewable electricity generation - request wind farm development be prohibited on Regional Park land</p> <p>13. Page 38 - Park Infrastructure Design Principles – request to amend clauses f and g to: <i>“f) Avoids displacement of other activities and park users</i> <i>(g) Avoids, remedies or mitigates the visual effects of the development on the landscape”</i> (New park infrastructure should not adversely impact on the park experience, other park values or existing user groups.)</p> <p>14. Page 39 Access – request for new objective: <i>“Provide opportunities for people to use parks to pursue their chosen recreational activities, enjoy and learn from the parks in a sustainable way that is compatible with that parks environmental, landscape, cultural and heritage values.”</i></p> <p>15. Page 39 Access – request for new policies A. <i>To allow free public access to Parks, subject to any necessary restrictions relating to:</i> <i>(1) farming or forestry operations;</i> <i>(ii) protection of the environmental, heritage and tangata whenua values;</i> <i>(iii) Maintenance of public health and safety;</i> <i>(iv) Management purposes, including plantation forestry, pest control and water collection and distribution;</i> <i>(v) Approved special events, leases and licences and concessions”</i> B. <i>“To minimize the impact of any necessary restrictions on public access.”</i></p> <p>16. Page 44 - Land Tenure, acquisition and disposal - Policies 94 & 95 - request to delete both policies and amend Policy 95 to: <i>“To negotiate where appropriate, for the use, the lease, or right of way for recreational activities (non commercial uses) within or adjacent to the park, that do not amount to a disposal of the park in that they, (a) do not constitute exclusive use of the park or part of the park other than for temporary events, ' and (b) do not exclude or substantially interfere with the public's access to and enjoyment of the park (2) The granting of legal rights such as leases, acquisition, right of ways, caveats, or disposal of land within the park for non- recreational</i></p>	<p>infrastructure such as gas and power. Policy provision is needed for such essential services</p> <p>12. This policy covers renewable energy generation (and is not specific to wind developments), the addition would be in conflict with the legislation for the Water Board Act 1972</p> <p>13. (f) New park infrastructure may not be able to avoid displacement of other activities and users, current wording “minimize” is more appropriate. (g) Disagree - not just visual effects but all effects need to be considered</p> <p>14. No change – this is by default how parks are managed and covered in Policy 67 and Guiding Principles</p> <p>15. Current policies and Guiding principles for access are sufficient</p> <p>16. Policy 94 acknowledges that land is held under different legislation – this is the first assessment that is always made when assessing any activity. Note not all recreational activities are non-commercial e.g. commercial events</p>	<p>12. No change required</p> <p>13. No change required</p> <p>14. No change required</p> <p>15. No change required</p> <p>16. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p><i>commercial activities is prohibited</i> (3) Applications for temporary commercial uses (non forestry) such as concerts or filming which meet the following criteria will be considered as a restricted activity on a case by case basis (a) do not exclude or substantially interfere with the public's access to and enjoyment of the park, or (b) do not amount to exclusive use of the park or part of the park, or (c) will not adversely affect the amenity of the park. (4) Where appropriate Council may negotiate for the gifting or purchase of land under private or public ownership adjacent to the park with a view to expanding the boundaries of the park and improving recreational facilities."</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest 17. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>18. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill 19. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22: <i>"To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i></p>	<p>17. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>18. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>19. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steplands</p>	<p>17. No change required</p> <p>18. No change required</p> <p>19. Amend 6.2.4 (c)</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>- <i>European style pastoral character</i> - <i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steeplands</i> - <i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant</i></p> <p>20. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines</p> <p>- Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>21. Request to insert new definition: <u>“Wind Farm Associated Activity/ ancillary wind farm” - includes any activity undertaken to facilitate development, construction, operation and maintenance of the Puketiro wind farm, which will</u> (i) Have a permanent or temporary adverse effect on the integrity of the natural character and environmental/amenity values of the park; or (ii) Affect the public's right to use and enjoy of the park at all times.”</p> <p>22. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>20. The Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act provides for the construction and operation of electrical installations and works for renewable energy on land administered under the Wellington Regional Water Board Act. This includes the Akatarawa and Pakuratahi Forests. The Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south, utilizing existing forestry roads.</p> <p>21. Not necessary to have a definition of every activity</p> <p>22. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park.</p>	<p>20. No change required</p> <p>21. No change required</p> <p>22.No change required</p>
83 oral	Jenny Rowan and Jools Joslin oral	<p>A. Support for integrated plan B. Main interest in Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP) C. Consider critical QEP does not lose its unique identity D. Link to “Open Space Gateway” concept and document developed 5 years ago (provided a copy of this document with submission) Whareroa Farm E. Opportunity for Greater Wellington and DoC to work towards integrated conservation management plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • history of both QEP) and Whareroa intertwined, (Iwi, early European families, US Marine’s camp) • Opportunity to develop access links for non motorised recreation to Whareroa farm and Akatarawa Forest • Opportunity to develop main focal point at Mackay’s Crossing with facilities and activities that cater for all ages 	<p>1. Develop access links for non motorised recreation with Whareroa 2. Develop ecological links with Whareroa</p> <p>3.Request for provision of further development of heritage precinct and associated activities</p> <p>4. Fund a railway platform from the parks budget</p>	<p>1. Agree - discussions with DOC indicated that non motorised links will also be pursued by the DOC. 2. DOC is currently working on a management plan for Whareroa Farm. The policy in this plan (6.7.4 (p)) signals that GWRC will work with DOC to develop recreational and ecological links between the two properties. 3. Submitters were generally supportive of a heritage precinct. Further work is required by officers working with the community on how to develop this concept. 4. The cost of developing a railway platform to the standard required for this site is prohibitive. While the Regional Land Transport Strategy supports more efficient public transport across Wellington region, the Regional Rail Plan does not include a MacKay’s stop in the next 10 years. However, this could be investigated for possible funding in the longer term</p>	<p>1. Include in the ‘projected future changes’ 2. No change required</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for integrated conservation approach for the Whareroa stream (starts in Whareroa and travels through QE Park to the sea) The critical linkage of planting plans to enhance bird corridors <p>Heritage Precinct F. Support proposed heritage precinct and associated visitor attractions – request for provision of further development of these activities</p> <p>Kapiti US Marines Trust G. Trust would like to work with Greater Wellington to develop stronger presence at QEP</p> <p>Whalesong H. Proposal for life sized whale sculpture representing the whale travel between coast and Kapiti Island – consider QEP would be good location</p> <p>I. Proposed visitors centre at QEP Could provide further information/ resources devoted to story telling and education</p> <p>J. Flax House, Tilly Road - Paekakariki Opportunity to highlight indigenous flaxes of the area and enhance park planting programme</p> <p>K. Printing Press Museum Submitter supports proposal to house Printing Press Museum inside proposed Heritage Precinct</p> <p>L. Mackay's Railway Platform Submitter considers platform be funded from Parks budget</p> <p>M. Support for Kapiti Coast District Council submission N. Opposed to taking of northern corner of QEP for proposed expressway development</p>			
84.	Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves Inc – Richard Herbert	<p>A. General support for umbrella approach for all parks in single document</p> <p>B. Request care be taken to conserve those remaining scarce indigenous bush remnants that exist within the regional suburban area and take steps to proactively manage their restoration and survival</p> <p>C. Where there is co-existing farming operations request these should be adequately fenced from the areas to be retired and conserved or regenerated as bush areas</p> <p>D. Support concept of ecological corridors and connections</p> <p>E. Support continued pest animal and pest plant control regional parks</p> <p>Belmont F. Advocate for possum exclusion buffer control zone that would prevent possums from re-invading the remainder of the Wellington City area (after it has been</p>	<p>Belmont 1. Request three additional ecological links be included in “Future” plan for Belmont: (a) from the southern end of Belmont Park, across the Korokoro – Grenada North “transmission block”, across the southern end of the Tawa urban area and across the Arohata Block, to link up with Marshalls Ridge and the Wellington City Council (WCC) Outer Green Belt; (b) from the western side of Belmont Park at the Takapu Road entrance across Mt Roberts and including Wilf Mexted Scenic Reserve, across the northern end of suburban Tawa, to link up with the northern end of the WCC Outer Green Belt and the DOC Porirua Scenic Reserve area; (c) a continuous link along the eastern margin of the Park along the fault-line escarpment from the Wellington city centre along the full length of the Hutt Valley.</p>	<p>Agree to (c) the ecological links along the eastern length of the park could be better recognised in the plan. Other links referred to by the submitter are outside the management of GWRC. Officers are interested in working with community groups (Forest & Bird) as well as Councils and adjacent landowners to improve ecological connectivity.</p> <p>the ecological corridors listed are at a more detailed level than what is considered in the plan. Officers note the support of Forest & Bird for developing ecological corridors within and beyond the parks and are interested in working with Forest & Bird</p>	Amend plan text and maps to reflect ecological links

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		completed eradicated of possums)			
85.	Jonathon and Paul Kennett	<p>A. Support for integrated management plan and balance of environmental, recreational, cultural and economic goals</p> <p>B. Concerned about the lack of targets and outcomes with a timetable attached - if objectives of plan are not to be achieved within any specific timeline, it may be difficult to judge the success of park management</p> <p>C. GWRC should accelerate planting of native species in pasture (e.g. in Queen Elizabeth Park)</p> <p>D. Consider GWRC can lead way in retirement of marginal farmland to make way for permanent carbon sinks</p> <p>E. Request GWRC phase out planting of exotic species in riparian strips e.g. planting of pinus radiata in Akatarawa Forest)</p> <p>G. Surprised to see that none of the native forest southern half of Akatarawa Forest listed as a 'significant indigenous environmental area'</p> <p>H. Support development of sustainable power but consider development of wind farms should be limited to ridgelines dominated by exotic species only</p> <p>I. Consider more use could be made of utilising volunteers to assist in developing tracks – suitable for the general population i.e. “mellow gradients”</p> <p>J. Request for cycle links between Belmont Park and Takapu Track and Whitby</p> <p>K. Support extension of Wainuiomata Recreation Area.</p> <p>L. Request further improvements to walking and cycling access to Wainui water catchment areas as these provide valuable access to adjacent forests and the chance to experience some of the best native forest in the region</p> <p>M. Consider GWRC needs to be more proactive in managing of motor vehicles in Akatarawa Forest (conflict of users) - voluntary code frequently ignored, TREAD code helps mitigate environmental impacts, but not social impacts. Request considering other options e.g. temporal or spatial separation, speed limits, one-way systems, or speed-limiting trail design</p> <p>N. Request for more resources for sustainable track design and management</p> <p>O. Future developments in Akatarawa Forest: request for the development of a few narrow, low-gradient walking and cycling tracks that will give non-motorised users access to the forest without the risk of conflict with motorised users (take advantage of the old, overgrown logging tracks present in the area)</p>	<p>1. Ecosystem Restoration - 4.3 (2), 5.1.1, 5.1.3 and 5.1.4 – request to include goal to eradicate key pest species</p> <p>2. Amend 6.3.4, (n) to include partnerships that help to achieve recreation outcomes</p> <p>3. Belmont future projected changes map: request for cycle links to Takapu Road and Whitby</p> <p>4. 6.1.4 (h) and 6.6.4 (e) – appears to refer to 'foot access' –request for widening to bicycle access</p> <p>5. 6.1.4 (q) – request for support for partnerships with a group that represents non-motorised recreation in the Akatarawa Forest (in addition to ARAC)</p> <p>6. 4.3 (7) (providing a recreational activity) – request to include the opportunity for GWRC providing outdoor recreation activities in <u>partnership</u> with clubs and event organizers</p> <p>7. 6.6.5 (Pakuratahi projected changes) – request to add advocacy of and recognition of the 'Big Coast' route as a multi-day bike ride of national significance</p>	<p>1. Policy 15 already refers to control of pest plans and pest animals. Eradication is a level of service issue and therefore not appropriate in this plan</p> <p>2. Agree</p> <p>3. Will be considered in the evaluation of options for managing the land severed by Transmission Gully route</p> <p>4. Both walking and mountain biking are permitted activities in the parks (and forests). It is appropriate to reflect this in the policies</p> <p>5. Policy does not inhibit partnerships with other groups. Officers are interested to work with the range of user groups within the forest.</p> <p>6. Agree</p> <p>7. There are a number of national events that happen within the parks that are not explicitly mentioned in the plan. These events, including 'The Big Coast' are dealt with through the concessions process.</p> <p>Operational suggestions will be referred on to parks staff</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. Amend 6.3.4 as per submitter's request</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. Amend as per submitter's request</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. Amend 4.3(7) plan as per submitter's comments</p> <p>7. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
86.	Wellington Botanical Society – Bev Abbott oral	<p>A. Only 23 “projected changes” identified for specific parks over the next 10 years - not clear how GWRC selected these 23 projected changes as the best ways of advancing the vision or for the public to examine benefits of these changes</p> <p>B. Section 5.8 - research and monitoring: no mention of -milestones or critical success factors that would identify progress towards the draft plan’s objectives over the next 10 years -any commitment to evaluating the effectiveness of the plan or the effectiveness of GWRC’s management -any commitment to reporting back to the public before the next review on changes in the condition of the network after the Plan becomes operational</p> <p>C. Request for GWRC to improve its understanding of the conceptual difference between planning for a “network” of parks versus planning for the same parks as separate entities</p> <p>D. Request to ensure funding allocations in annual plans enable staff to do monitoring, analytical and consultative work required to ensure that the information is available to inform and support the development of a more strategic Plan in 2015</p> <p>D. Support GWRC’s intention to develop recreational and ecological connections between parks and other public open spaces</p> <p>E. Request ecological corridor to be formalised - Wellington City Council’s Outer Greenbelt across southern Tawa and Grenada North (via Arohata block and former Transmission block) to the Horokiwi Road ridge and then to Belmont Regional Park and the Korokoro Valley bush</p> <p>F. Supportive of six restoration projects in five parks listed in projected changes - among the projected changes, particularly as the list includes coastal dunes and two wetlands – considers “strategic network approach” to identifying priorities for restoration projects in parks would facilitate better informed decision-making</p> <p>G. Akatarawa Forest: do not support 6.1.3(7) - wind energy development on selected ridgelines is not compatible with 6.1.3(3) (the native forest is protected), or with 6.1.4 b protection of landscape and geological features - wind energy development is likely to require the clearance of native forest and the dumping of spoil in gullies</p> <p>Wainuiomata Rec Area</p> <p>H. Request interpretation of forest community along</p>	<p>1. Use Chair’s introduction to explain benefits of incorporating strategic approach to managing GWRC’s parks as a network</p> <p>2. Section 8 - include commitment to review the Plan within five years so that the next plan can be even more strategic as well as including additional parks such as those to be managed under joint governance arrangements</p> <p>3. Include list of priorities for new or enhanced ecological or recreational corridors that include land in GWRC parks</p> <p>4. Section 5.1.1 (4) – request to add generic policy – “<i>using only locally sourced, naturally-occurring indigenous species in restoration projects - Battle Hill (Tararua and Sounds-Wellington ecological districts), QE Park (Foxton Ecological District), and Parangarahu Lakes block, East Harbour (Tararua Ecological District)</i>”</p> <p>5. References in plan: refer to Mitcalfe, B. NZ native plant recommended for restoration and/or amenity purposes in Wellington Regional Parks: a report for Parks and Forests Department, Wellington Regional Council. November 2002.</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>6. Projected changes: request for clarification about the intent, scope, cost and deliverables of “identify any changes as a result of renewable energy and water supply development”</p> <p>7. Request clarification on the nature of the activities for which GWRC is prepared to close the park or parts of the park - events?</p> <p>8. Request addition to 6.2.4 (Battle Hill biodiversity and ecosystems) with “<i>c. Replace the exotic forest on the east side of the park with appropriate, locally-sourced, native species to supplement the regeneration which is occurring naturally within the block</i>”</p> <p>Belmont</p> <p>9. Request to add to Table 4 (protected and managed natural areas): “<i>Remnant, beside farm road/walkway between Boulder Hill and Belmont Rd. Map NZTopo50- P32Paraparaumu, centered on grid reference 6125420. Four species of podocarp, divaricating shrubs, broad-leaved species etc. Severely degraded in the past by pest animals and stock.</i>”</p> <p>Pakuratahi Forest</p> <p>10. Page 71 - 6.6.4 (c): request for amendment: add “indigenous” before the word vegetation in the first bullet point</p> <p>Inserting a new bullet point “<i>when replanting exotic</i></p>	<p>1. Noted, these comments will be referred to the Chairperson</p> <p>2. The Reserves Act requires a management plan to be kept under ‘continuous review’. It is intended that amendments to this Plan will occur before a 10 year period to incorporate changes.</p> <p>3. Priorities are not currently listed in the plan. These would be determined through operational plans and given effect through the LTCCP and annual plan process</p> <p>4. An eco-sourcing policy in the general policy section should cover submitters concerns</p> <p>5. Agree</p> <p>6. Too detailed for this plan</p> <p>7. Agree</p> <p>8. This is covered in the general policy. Policy 38, where forestry is no longer considered appropriate, reversion is the default option</p> <p>9. Officers will investigate this location to see if it should be included in the Table</p> <p>10. Agree</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. No changes required</p> <p>4. Include eco sourcing policy in Part 5 of the plan</p> <p>5. Include report in the References as requested by submitter</p> <p>6. No change required</p> <p>7. Include examples in 6.1.4(n) as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>8. No change required</p> <p>9. Investigate area for possible inclusion in Table 4</p> <p>10. Amend 6.6.4 (c) as per submitter’s request</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>the track in the valley of Sledge Track Creek be considered - either in form of plant labels or numbered posts beside some plants, and a brochure describing the native plants or plant community at that site</p> <p>Possum-free zone I. Proposal for Wellington to become possum-exclusion zone by establishing virtual possum-proof barrier by means of intensive baiting/trapping throughout zone - Porirua Harbour, via Belmont Regional Park, to Wellington Harbour</p>	<p><i>forest blocks, leave a buffer strip of not less than 20 m either side of wetlands, and permanent or ephemeral water courses, and encourage the regeneration of appropriate naturally-occurring indigenous species in those buffer strips.</i></p> <p>Queen Elizabeth Park 11. Page 77 6.7.4 k: request Poplar Ave be secondary entrance (so that park visitors can see the ecologically significant Poplar Ave wetland and the re-vegetation in its catchment) Management guiding principles 12. Note these are different to those in network strategy – request reference in network plan to guiding principles identified in network strategy which are about quality, sustainability, teamwork and transparency – maintain guiding principles in network plan in the form of objectives (these are duplicated) Relationship between rules and guiding principles for management 13. Request GWRC look at relationship between some rules in Section 7 for activities in the parks and the “guiding principles for management” – there are many inconsistencies Monitoring – 5.8 14. Request to change 5.8 heading from section 8 from “Monitoring and Review” to “Reporting and Reviewing”</p> <p>15. Request to reinforce the importance of an integrated approach to monitoring ecosystem health 16. Request strengthening this section to make absolutely clear top priority for monitoring activity throughout the park network is the ecological health of the significant ecosystems identified in section 6 as minimum. This is essential, not only to assess the effectiveness of the PNP, but to assess the strengths and weaknesses of GWRC’s intention to identify and implement monitoring programmes through annual planning process Reporting 17. Request to identify channels GWRC will use to report progress on the PNP and the frequency of reporting 18. Request to identify small number of specific milestones associated with the projected changes for individual parks that GWRC will report on five and/or</p>	<p>11. The focus is currently on developing and promoting the Raumati South (Rainbow Court) entrance.</p> <p>12. The principles in the Draft Parks Network Strategy were reviewed and changes inserted into the current plan. Further review of how the principles and objectives fit together could be useful.</p> <p>13. In finalizing the draft plan these aspects will be considered</p> <p>14. Section 8 should be focused on monitoring the effectiveness of the Plan. This needs some minor editing to improve clarity. Section 5.8 is more appropriately dealt with in operational planning, and does not relate strongly to the purpose of this section. It is recommended that this be merged into Section 8</p> <p>15. Consider the current provisions satisfactory</p> <p>16. A policy for ecological health monitoring should be included within the monitoring section</p> <p>17. Reporting occurs 6 weekly in managers report, as well as annually. It is intended that reporting on plan implementation will become part of the Annual Report for Parks 18. These will be determined through the LTCCP process, and current work on levels of service and activity plans will inform this</p>	<p>11. No change required</p> <p>12. Review principles and objectives to ensure consistency and reduce duplication</p> <p>13. Review plan for potential inconsistencies</p> <p>14. Merge 5.8 into Section 8 and focus on monitoring plan effectiveness</p> <p>15. No changes required</p> <p>16. Include policy for ecological health monitoring</p> <p>17. Reference frequency of plan monitoring in Part 8</p> <p>18. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>ten years after the plan has been approved</p> <p>New park partnerships</p> <p>19. Request transferring policy “To ensure that any new partnerships contribute to advocacy, restoration or education outcomes for X Park” to section 5.7 Partnerships in Parks to reduce repetition</p> <p>20. Request GWRC consider potential benefits of developing new partnerships to advance recreational and heritage objectives</p> <p>Definitions/Glossary</p> <p>21. Request to include comprehensive glossary of all terms (not just bylaws glossary) – including definitions for: liaise with, work with, support, undertake in association with, promote, encourage, support, assess, monitor, ensure, enable, allow, maintain, manage, develop, give primacy to</p> <p>22. Request definitions for park-users: e.g. “primary entrance” and “secondary entrance” to clarify what facilities and services visitors can expect to find at these locations, (e.g. display map, car parks, toilet, potable water)</p> <p>Document structure</p> <p>23. Insert Part 7 (Rules for use and development of parks) between parts 5 and 6 (because the rules apply to all parks)</p> <p>24. Improve alignment between order of 18 “guiding principles for management” in section 4.3 and the nine headings in section 5 under which the 20 general management objectives and 97 policies clustered</p> <p>25. Start general principles 6 and 13 (page 25) with an active verb, i.e. <u>mitigate</u> effects of climate change and <u>base</u> relationships with ...</p> <p>26. Combine two sections on history of the parks and present these in the appendix</p> <p>27. Present summary of the “Projected Changes” in one section</p>	<p>19. Agree – could state this as a general policy rather than under each park section. Recreation should be included in the list</p> <p>20. This is implicit in Policy discussed in 19 above</p> <p>21. Technical terms and te reo are the focus of the glossary</p> <p>22. Agree - explanation is needed to clarify the primary and secondary entrances</p> <p>23. Retain current layout which is broadly: Description, Policy, Rules (standard layout for planning documents)</p> <p>24. Disagree</p> <p>25. Wording of objectives and policies needs review for consistency</p> <p>26. Disagree - the Park description is both historical and present and an integral part of the plan for understanding a park’s values</p> <p>27. Disagree – but should include maps and text for each park together</p>	<p>19. Amend as per officers comments</p> <p>20. No change required</p> <p>21. No change required</p> <p>22. Define meanings of entrance types</p> <p>23. No change required</p> <p>24. No change required</p> <p>25. Review grammar of objectives and policies</p> <p>26. No change required</p> <p>27. Review location of ‘projected changes’ maps</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
87. oral	Chris Horne	<p>A. Support for integrated plan</p> <p>B. Page 13: Motorised recreation What measures can Greater Wellington take to stop the unauthorised opening of old logging roads, and other tracks, by trail bikers, quad, and 4WD-vehicle users? Motorised vehicles devastate forest tracks, so it is essential that no more routes be opened in the park, if the park's ecosystems, and future value as a water resource, are to be protected.</p> <p>C. Akatarawa, Belmont, Battle Hill, East Harbour, Kaitoke, Pakuratahi, , Wainuiomata Rec area – requests confirmation if there are enough 20 m x 20 m vegetation monitoring plots to provide statistically reliable information on trends in ecosystem condition</p> <p>D. Page 47: Akatarawa management focus: oppose 6.1.3 (7) – wind energy development of selected ridgelines, because it is incompatible with 6.1.3 (1) and (2), and on page 48, with 6.1.4. a and b.</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>E. Page 53: Support for 6.2.4 e, and explanation that turbine blades should not enter park's airspace</p> <p>Belmont</p> <p>F. Recommend removal of pines at Korokoro Forks with slopes to regenerate in native species, many of which are now in the understorey</p> <p>Kaitoke</p> <p>G. Supports low-level track between Pakuratahi Forks and Te Marua - combining this with Ridge Track would make interesting, long, round trip, particularly appealing because there is no bus service along SH2 past Waterworks Road</p> <p>H. Request for walkway easement over private land to facilitate tramps from Kaitoke to Akatarawa Road</p> <p>Queen Elizabeth Park</p> <p>I. Supports proposed marked route for walkers, rather than a cycleway, over the rolling dunelands from Poplar Avenue to Inland Track</p> <p>Pakuratahi Forest</p> <p>J. Page 19, para 3: Requests all telecommunications operators to co-locate their facilities on one tower, to avoid a clutter of towers</p> <p>Wainuiomata Recreation Area</p> <p>K. Page 20, para 8: request if Lower Dam be included in recreation area from 2012, that no cars or other private motor vehicles be permitted past the present gate, except cars used by people going on guide walks starting from the Treatment Plant</p>	<p>Plan layout</p> <p>1. Request moving each park's description, now in Part 3, to immediately before each park's "Park-specific management and policies", in Part 6, followed by the map of the park</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>2. Page 12, para 3: delete Orongorongo –there is no "Orongorongo Range"</p> <p>3. Page 13, para 4: indicates construction of a wind farm, involving destruction of native forest, and earthworks, would be incompatible with "Protecting and sustaining the water resource ..."</p> <p>4. Page 49, para n: request confirmation of what the applicants likely to be applying for when closing Akatarawa forest</p> <p>5. Akatarawa forest maps: Request for Drapers Flat wetland, and Martins River wetland be shown on both maps, even though these are unofficial names, not shown on topographic maps.</p> <p>Battle Hill Farm Forest Park</p> <p>6. Page 14, para 2: Request to add: <i>"that the park's value for indigenous biodiversity and recreation would be improved if pine forest on eastern slopes were to be replaced, when mature, with indigenous vegetation, such as that existing in places in the plantation, supplemented by planting with appropriate, eco-sourced native plants"</i></p> <p>Belmont Regional Park</p> <p>7. Page 57: Request new paragraph (f): <i>"Manage the placing of ewes, from the start of lambing, into paddocks not traversed by any walkways, so that walkways are open year-round."</i></p> <p>8. Page 58: Request to add Takapu Road to i, because it is a secondary park entrance</p> <p>9. Table 4 (Belmont protected and managed areas): request to add bush alongside walkway/farm track between Boulder Hill and Belmont Road (contains four species of podocarp, plus tree ferns, divaricating shrubs)</p> <p>East Harbour Regional Park</p> <p>10. Page 16: para 5 use the name Orua poua nui with Baring Head</p> <p>11. Page 63: Visitor services, h – add Moana Road to the list of Days Bay entrances</p> <p>12. Use the names: Whiorau with Lowry Bay, and Oruamotoro with Days Bay</p>	<p>1. Disagree - but should include maps and text for each park together</p> <p>2. Agree</p> <p>3. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding.</p> <p>4. This will be considered on a case by case basis</p> <p>5. Agree – Drapers Flat wetland missing from map</p> <p>6. This is currently covered by Policy 38. Where a decision is made not to replant the default is to revert to indigenous vegetation</p> <p>7. Access needs to be reviewed around lambing to maximise access opportunities. The sustainable farm plan for Belmont will give consideration to access. This submission will be referred to operation staff.</p> <p>8. Agree</p> <p>9. Currently being investigated by officers as a result of the submission</p> <p>10. Disagree – this will be considered where there is an amendment to the plan to include Baring Head</p> <p>11. Seek further information on entrances from rangers and amend 6.4.4 (h) if required</p> <p>12. Disagree – current names sufficient in the plan</p>	<p>1. Review location of 'projected changes' maps</p> <p>2. Amend as per submitter's comments</p> <p>3. No changes required</p> <p>4. No change required</p> <p>5. Revise Map 3 and Akatarawa Maps</p> <p>6. No change required</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. Include Takapu Road as a secondary entrance</p> <p>9. Include additional bush in Table 4 if considered appropriate</p> <p>10. No change required</p> <p>11. Review 6.4.4 (h) and amend if required</p> <p>12. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>13. Maps: Lees Grove Track is incorrectly located, repeating the error in the park brochure</p> <p>14. Page 71 – 6.6.4 (c): requests additional point: <i>“when exotic forests are replanted, require the setting aside of not less than 20-metre-wide strips, along the length of both sides of all permanent and ephemeral watercourses, and around the boundaries of all wetlands, these strips to be for the establishment of native plant communities, by natural regeneration, assisted by planting with appropriate, ecosourced, native plants..”</i></p> <p>15. Pakuratahi Forest Maps: requests Colliers Track be named and shown on map.</p> <p>16. Page 81 – 6.8.5 (projected changes): request additional bullet point – <i>interpretation panels, or plant name signs, or numbered posts and a brochure, be provided for a nature walk along the track in the valley of Sledge Track Creek</i></p>	<p>13. Note, seek further information from rangers</p> <p>14. This is already covered under general policy, although it does not extend to ephemeral watercourses</p> <p>15. Note, will check with operational staff if this is a track that GWRC maintains</p> <p>16. This level of detail is not considered to be appropriate for a policy document</p>	<p>13. Review East Harbour park map and amend if necessary</p> <p>14. No change required</p> <p>15. Review Pakuratahi map and include track if necessary</p> <p>16. No change required</p>
88. Oral	Peter Rendall – Omnibus Society NZ (Inc)	A. Specifically interested in Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP) B. Supports proposed base for heritage organisations	Page 78 - 6.7.5 QEP (projected changes) – request for plan to develop more detail as to what may be permitted (more detail around projected changes)	It is important that changes suggested on the maps are detailed in the text. Where more information can be provided this will be included	Review level of detail in text to ensure consistency between the parks
89. Oral	Mike Fuller and Gavin Bradley – Whale Song	A. Considers plan provides right emphasis on conservation, heritage management and recreation B. Have specific interest in Queen Elizabeth Park (QEP) C. Support proposed heritage precinct D. Whalesong - proposal for life sized whale sculpture representing the whale travel between coast and Kapiti Island	That plan does not preclude opportunity for Whale Song to be developed in QEP	This proposal would be considered under the restricted activities category (Rules 7.4). This section sets out a process to submit an application. The proposal is not consistent with the recreation reserve status of the land and the key park characteristics	No change required
90.	Department of Conservation – Claudia Hill	A. Support for integrated management plan and balance between recreation, heritage management and conservation B. Supportive of maps C. Requires Minister of Conservation sign-off for plan under Reserves Act 1977	<p>1. Page 6 - Part 2.2: relevant legislation and policies: request to add Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983</p> <p>2. Page 6 – Part 2.2: request to add Fire Protection Plan for GWRC Parks and Forests</p> <p>3. Page 7 – Part 2.3: relationship of GWRC parks to other public lands: request to replace reference to DoC with <i>“backcountry drive in” with “urban fringe”</i></p> <p>4. Page 34 Natural hazards policies: request to add <i>“To prevent and manage fires to preserve historic flora and fauna values and minimize risk to life and property”</i></p> <p>5. Page 55 6.3.1 Legal status: Title held Wellington Regional Council – note the two areas totaling 80 hectares under covenant are not QEII covenants – they were derived from the time when the property was sold to Landcorp. Request change of words to “between Minister of Conservation and the land owner”</p>	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. Agree</p> <p>3. Agree</p> <p>4. Agree</p> <p>5. Agree – will liaise with DOC over correct land description</p>	<p>1. Include reference in 2.2</p> <p>2. Include reference in 2.2</p> <p>3. Reword 2.3 as requested by the submitter</p> <p>4. Amend page 34 as requested by the submitter</p> <p>5. Amend 5.4.2 land description for Belmont</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			6. Page 89 Part 7.3 Managed activities: Fire – note that GWRC has a Fire Protection plan in place for dealing with all fires in GWRC parks and forests	6. Agree – could include explanation to policy	6. Include explanation about Fire Protection plans
91.	Paul Blaschke	A. Consider GWRC needs to focus more on integrated catchment management – thinking about all the catchment, how one part of the catchment affects another and that people in the catchment also influence ecosystems e.g. with DoC – Kaitoke and Hutt Water Collection area, Wainuiomata Catchment Area and Recreation Area; with Hutt City and Porirua City over integrated management of Belmont and adjacent TA reserves	1. Page 9 paragraph 1: request for GWRC to continue work with agencies (including other GWRC divisions) to use an integrated catchment management approach where possible 2. Page 11 paragraph 2: request to add <i>“parks also contribute to healthy soils, ecosystems and ecosystem services”</i> 3. Page 24 section 4.3 principle 3: request to add farming and forestry will be undertaken where they <i>“contribute to integrated catchment management...”</i> 4. Page 25 principle 5: request to add <i>“and within catchments”</i> after between natural areas 5. Page 25 principle 6: request to add <i>“and ecosystem services enhanced”</i> after effects of climate change are mitigated 6. Page 27 section 5.1 objective 3: request to add <i>“and within catchments”</i> after between natural areas 7. Page 29 section 5.1.5 water policies: request for policy 20-22 to specifically mention DRINKING water standards being met (especially Akatarawa forest and Kaitoke) 8. Page 11 section 3.1: note that recreation does not occur in headings as to why parks are valuable – this is inconsistent with the primary purpose of most parks being recreational reserves. Note recreation is more than a social benefit 9. Page 24 section 4.3 principle 1: consider misleading to describe all forested areas as remnant areas – amend 10. Page 30 section 5.2 methods – request to not include pest plant and animal control, and include input into resource consent processes 11. Page 34 section 5.4.1 – request to not include pest control	1. Agree 2. Agree 3. Agree 4. Agree 5. Current wording sufficient 6. Agree 7. This is not relevant to the plan 8. Recreation is an activity not a benefit. However the heading should refer to healthy lifestyle and wellbeing 9. Agree 10. Agree 11. Reference appears erroneous. No appropriate to include pest control in this section	1. No changes necessary 2. Amend page 11 as requested by the submitter 3. Amend Principle 3 as requested by the submitter 4. Amend Principle 5 as requested by the submitter 5. No change required 6. Amend Objective 3 as requested by the submitter 7. No change required 8. Amend Section 7.1 9. Amend Principle 1 as per submitter’s comments 10. Amend 5.2 as per submitter’s comments 11. No change required
92. oral	Akatarawa Recreational Access Committee (ARAC) – Damon Gruenwald	Akatarawa forest A. Designated Tracks in Akatarawa Forest - current management plan designates certain specified tracks for use by off-road recreational vehicles in Akatarawa Forest - draft plan follows the same approach. ARAC has concerns over the basis for changing from the previous “zones” approach, formally endorsed and signed off by both ARAC and GWRC, to designated tracks approach B. ARAC Requests process developed through	Akatarawa forest Page 12 - Section 3.2 Park Description 1. Consider motorised recreation paragraphs are prescriptive rather than descriptive (impose regulation and inconsistent with other park descriptions)- request location elsewhere in plan 2. Request footnote in Akatarawa park description refers to legislation e.g. Akatarawa being a gazetted motorised recreational area	1. Agree 2. Officers cannot find any gazetted area. Request for evidence from submitter during oral hearing	1. Review wording to be descriptive 2. Review description to focus on current activities rather than groups and permit systems.

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>consultation whereby ARAC and GWRC negotiate and reach agreement on changes to activities within each zone, including additions and deletions, when agreed circumstances warrant</p> <p>Puketiro Wind farm B. Philosophically ARAC supports concepts renewable energy sources, including generation of electricity from wind. A mitigation plan prepared by RES has not been incorporated into draft network plan</p> <p>C. ARAC consider potential to prevent access from plantation forestry in Puketiro Forest to remainder of the Akatarawa Forest - effectively restrict recreation to some 70% of areas currently available.</p> <p>Whakatikei Dam D. ARAC has concerns that potential exclusion area around dam would mean the closure of significant number of tracks that widely regarded as high value for recreation purposes</p> <p>Heritage Sites E. Consider there are a number of features in that have heritage values e.g. old logging tram routes and other relics from early logging of the Forest, Valley View Woolshed (recently demolished by GWRC), the Cookhouse on Deadwood Ridge, Karapoti Schoolhouse, the single-men's quarters at Karapoti Mill, the mill baches at Karapoti Gorge (also all demolished over the years) and the Craig bach which is the only remaining heritage feature of Dude Ranch - while these are not registered with Historic Places Trust, they are regarded by ARAC and others as having intrinsic value for their historic connotations.</p> <p>F. ARAC would like to jointly compile with GWRC an inventory of known sites and features with heritage and/or archaeological values in Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>G. Page 47 Section 6.1.3 (Akatarawa management focus) - ARAC specifically supports items 4, 5 and 6.</p> <p>H. Page 48 Section 6.1.4 (Akatarawa specific policies) - ARAC specifically supports items h, i, j, k, l, m, n, q and r.</p>	<p>3. Request deletion from "Motorised Recreation" section on page 13 last four sentences commencing "The motorised recreation user code..." Insert footnote referring to the legal status of the trail-riding routes in the Akatarawa Forest.</p> <p>Motorised Recreation in Parks 4. Page 83, Table 9 - motorised recreation shown as managed activity for Akatarawa Forest and prohibited activity for all other parks. Part 7 motorised recreation is described as restricted activity for those other parks - ensure consistency (ARAC request restricted activity not prohibited for all parks except Akatarawa (managed))</p> <p>Motorised recreation map 5. Request for zones approach adopted in the management plan at the time is reinstated and incorporated into the 2010 plan setting out parameters of each zone and the activities that are permitted on the tracks in each zone.</p> <p>Puketiro Wind farm 6. Include reference to mitigation plan prepared by RES in plan.</p> <p>7. Make provision in plan for topping up track network, to replace any tracks lost through Wind Farm development or similar</p> <p>Dam sites 8. Request in plan to allow off-road motorised recreation to take place in catchment area for Whakatikei Dam (and any other relevant catchment areas) and include suitable provisions for managing recreation in order to minimise the potential for water contamination in future dam site areas e.g. Whakatikei</p> <p>Access 9. Request for provision for off-road recreation vehicles to be used by ARAC members to undertake voluntary activities such in Battle Hill, Belmont, Kaitoke and East Harbour with additional permit conditions as appropriate</p> <p>Orange Hut 10. Page 48 - one brief mention of Orange Hut – request to expand this to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orange Hut available for overnight stays • Status, use and management of Orange Hut to be detailed in a Memorandum of Understanding to be agreed between GWRC and ARAC, • Designated ARAC representatives have right of access through the forest to the Orange Hut for purpose of management and maintenance - normal permit should be applied for 	<p>3. Refer to point 1 above</p> <p>4. Revise table 9 and 7.4.3 and 7.5 to show motorised recreation as a managed activity in Akatarawa Forest and a prohibited activity in other areas, with some allowances (refer to submission 21 for more detail)</p> <p>5. Using zoning for mapping motorised recreation activity areas has been discussed with councilors and ARAC. This approach was initially adopted in the late 1990's but as problems arose the Council approved moving to mapping by route (as per other activities). Officers advise against using a zoning system.</p> <p>6. Specific reference to any mitigation plan is not necessary in this document</p> <p>7. This issue can be considered as part of any wind farm development proposal. Officers are working to develop a process for evaluating track use and when tracks should be opened and closed.</p> <p>8. To adopt this decision would preempt for further work which need to be completed on the effects of motorised recreation on water quality.</p> <p>9. Refer to 4 above, this would not be exclusive to ARAC</p> <p>10. Orange Hut is an emergency shelter. This status was conditional on the granting of a building consent for the Hut.</p> <p>Currently GWRC is working with ARAC on a memorandum of understanding regarding the Orange Hut which will include details on access arrangements</p>	<p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. Revise Table 9, 7,4,3 and 7,5</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. No change required</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p> <p>9. See point 4 above</p> <p>10. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>11. Page 4 - Section 1.4 - Belmont: add visits by tourists and other sightseers, including transport for those with reduced mobility.</p> <p>12. Page 19 - Section 3.2 - Queen Elizabeth Park: amend to “eastern length of park”, not “western...”</p> <p>13. Pages 27 - 45 - Part 5: Note number of inconsistencies and contradictions between various policies in Part 5 – request for process to be followed.</p> <p>14. Page 35 Section 5.4.3 Climate change, Methods: Add the construction and maintenance of stormwater channels to avoid or minimise erosion and contamination of water catchment with sediment.</p> <p>15. Page 36 - Policy 51 Utilities: Request for re-wording to: “...for the construction and operation of utilities...”</p> <p>16. Page 36 - Policy 52 Utilities: Request to include wording along the lines of “...and public consultation if the proposed utility is of significant scale or has visual or environmental impact.”</p> <p>17. Page 36 - Policy 54 (renewable energy generation): Request to include a requirement for public consultation as part of this policy.</p> <p>18. Page 41 Policy 84 (use and development): Request to include a description of the process</p> <p>19. Page 44 - Section 5.8 Park user satisfaction in the table – recommendation that website hits cannot be a measure of user satisfaction</p> <p>20. Page 47 Section 6.1.2 - request for third bullet point under “People” to reference to more than 4wd events - “...including 4wd, motorcycle and quad-bike events.”</p> <p>21. Page 48 - Visitor services Section 6.1.4 (h)- second bullet: request to include pest management</p> <p>22. Page 49 - Section 6.1.4 Partnership in the parks: request for additional clause: <i>“(s) GWRC officers and elected representatives will undertake periodic site visits into each park with members of the relevant “Friends” group.”</i></p> <p>23. Page 49 Section 6.1.3 - Table 2 (significant environmental areas and features): Not all of the areas in the table are identified in Map 3</p> <p>24. Page 83, Table 9: Activities rule: Request to change Motorised Recreation to show “Restricted” instead of “Prohibited” for all parks except the Akatarawa Forest, which should remain as “Managed”</p> <p>25. Page 83 - Table 9: Add an activity “Education”.</p>	<p>11. This section is a summary only and request is too detailed</p> <p>12. Noted, inaccuracy in the plan</p> <p>13. Revise to avoid any inconsistency</p> <p>14. Too detailed, not a necessary addition</p> <p>15. Operations over time will be dealt with through a lease agreement rather than the plan</p> <p>16. New utilities would be considered as restricted activities under the plan which contains provisions around public consultation</p> <p>17. As per comment above, this is covered by 7.4.4 (f) - Restricted activity public notification policy</p> <p>18. Agree – there is some ambiguity by referring to process</p> <p>19. Agree</p> <p>20. Agree</p> <p>21. Agree</p> <p>22. Too detailed</p> <p>23. Agree, table and maps do not match</p> <p>24. Disagree – motorised recreation should read prohibited , with exception for one-off events (Refer to submission 21)</p> <p>25. Disagree - do not consider “education” as an activity</p>	<p>11. No change required</p> <p>12. Amend 3.2 as requested by submitter</p> <p>13. Review policies to ensure consistency</p> <p>14. No change required</p> <p>15. No change required</p> <p>16. No change required</p> <p>17. No change required</p> <p>18. Re-write policy 84 to avoid ambiguity</p> <p>19. Remove reference in 5.8</p> <p>20 Amend 6.1.2 as requested by submitter</p> <p>21. Amend 6.1.4 as requested by submitter</p> <p>22. No change required</p> <p>23. Amend 6.1.3 as requested by submitter</p> <p>24. Amend Table 9 to insert footnote that concession approval may be given for one off events</p> <p>25. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>Request “Education” be added, both to the table and in the detailed requirements. (This would make it clear which parks offer educational experiences or resources and the parameters around those)</p> <p>26. Page 84 - Table 9: Firearms are shown as prohibited across the board, yet clause 7.5.2 (e) on page 94 says that firearms are allowed where a permit has been issued. This is inconsistent.</p> <p>27. Page 87 Section 7.3.2 - Clause e: Request to Delete the word “only” at the end of the sentence</p> <p>28. Page 88 Section 7.3.13 – Request re-wording to: “Motorised recreation will be managed only in specified zones in accordance with the <i>Motorised Recreational User Code and Management Guidelines 1997</i> document.”</p> <p>29. Page 88 - Section 7.3.14 – requests to read “...in all parks...” instead of “...in the Akatarawa Forest...”</p> <p>30. Utilities - Section 5.4.5 covers the existence of utilities in parks and their associated operation and maintenance - some individual parks mention utilities, while others don't. e.g. main gas transmission line which passes through both Battle Hill and Belmont, yet is mentioned only in relation to Belmont – ensure consistency</p>	<p>in its own right</p> <p>26. Agree – need clarification around firearms which would be approved for use through a hunting permit. Bylaws do not prohibit firearms</p> <p>27. Agree – amend as requested by submitter – make it clear about motorised recreation in other areas as per points 4 and 25 of this submission</p> <p>28. Disagree – refer to point 5 above.</p> <p>29. Suggest removing in ‘Akatarawa Forest’ but not inserting ‘.in all parks’ as this would be inconsistent with the other policy changes</p> <p>30. Agree – ensure consistency – refer to submissions 5 and 6 (Transpower and PowerCo)</p>	<p>26. Amend Table 9 to show firearms as a restricted activity</p> <p>27. Amend as per submitter’s comments</p> <p>28. No change required</p> <p>29. Remove words ‘in the Akatarawa Forest’ from Section 7.3.14</p> <p>30. Review Section 5.4.5 to ensure consistency</p>
93. oral	Steve and Pauline Murphy	<p>A. Support balance between conservation, heritage management and recreation in plan Akatarawa forest</p> <p>B. Concerns over motorbikes straying outside designated area</p> <p>C. Support management focus clauses 1 and 2 and agree with secondary focus in clauses 3,4,5 and 6</p> <p>D. Against wind energy development on selected ridgelines (contrary to guiding principles for management)</p>	<p>1. Confirm activity status of trout fishing</p> <p>2. 6.1.3 (7) - request to be deleted</p>	<p>1. Trout fishing is dealt with by Ministry of Fisheries and Fish and Game. GWRC can only restrict access to sites. There are no restrictions on access to trout fishing (not withstanding park closures and operating hours)</p> <p>2. The Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act provides for the construction and operation of electrical installations and works for renewable energy on land administered under the Wellington Regional Water Board Act. This includes the Akatarawa and Pakuratahi Forests. In December 2006 Council approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and extended this area in 2008.</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. No change required</p>
94. oral	Cross Country Vehicle Club – Grant Purdie	<p>Puketiro Wind</p> <p>A. Concerned risks of prolonged unavailability of tracks during construction, and permanent loss of tracks once completed</p> <p>Whakatikei Dam</p> <p>B. Concerned over risk of catchment area being defined around proposed Whakatikei dam that would prevent motorised recreation on significant number of existing tracks</p>	<p>Motorised recreation map - tracks</p> <p>1. Request for zoned approach to map of motorised recreation tracks in Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>Puketiro Wind farm</p> <p>2. Request for mitigation measures and conditions to be included in plan relating to proposed Puketiro wind farm that conditions along these lines are</p>	<p>1. Using zoning for mapping motorised recreation activity areas has been discussed with councilors and ARAC. This approach was initially adopted in the late 1990’s but as problems arose the Council approved moving to mapping by route (as per other activities). Officers advise against using a zoning system.</p> <p>2. Specific reference to any mitigation plan is not necessary in this document</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
		<p>Heritage C. Request GWRC and CCVC jointly compile an inventory of known sites and features with heritage and/or archaeological values</p>	<p>3. Request for provision in plan of “topping up” the track network to compensate for permanent loss of off-road recreational tracks Whakatikei proposed dam 4. Request for provision in plan to allow motorised recreation in catchment area in places where the water treatment system is considered an appropriate measure to ensure there is no adverse effects Motorised Recreation Access 5. Part 7 - request for motorised recreation to be changed from “Prohibited” to “Restricted for all parks except the Akatarawa Forest which should remain as “Managed” Orange Hut 6. Currently there is just one brief mention of the Orange Hut, on page 48. Request for Orange to be formally recognised plan stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • freely available for overnight • managed by ARAC in collaboration with GWRC • Memorandum of Understanding will be put in place regarding this (including appropriate access by ARAC members for management and maintenance purposes) <p>7. Page 4 - Section 1.4 - Belmont: add visits by tourists and other sightseers, including transport for those with reduced mobility. 8. Page 19 - Section 3.2 - Queen Elizabeth Park: amend to “eastern length of park”, not “western...” 9. Pages 27 - 45 - Part 5: Prioritization of policies Note number of inconsistencies and contradictions between various policies in Part 5 – request for process to be followed. 10. Page 35 Section 5.4.3 Climate change, Methods: Add the construction and maintenance of stormwater channels to avoid or minimise erosion and contamination of water catchment with sediment. 11. Page 36 - Policy 51 Utilities: Request for re-wording to: “...for the construction and operation of utilities...” 12. Page 36 - Policy 52 Utilities: Request to include wording along the lines of “...and public consultation if the proposed utility is of significant scale or has visual or environmental impact.” 13. Page 36 - Policy 54 (renewable energy generation): Request to include a requirement for</p>	<p>3. Officers recognise that this is the main area for motorised recreation. Officers are working to develop a process for evaluating track use, and determining when tracks should be opened and closed. 4. To adopt this decision would preempt for further work which need to be completed on the effects of motorised recreation on water quality. 5. Disagree – motorised recreation should read prohibited with exceptions to one-off events (refer previous submission and submission 21) 6. Orange Hut is an emergency shelter. This status was conditional on granting of a building consent for the Hut. Currently GWRC is working with ARAC on a memorandum of understanding regarding the Orange Hut which will include details on access arrangements 7. This section is a summary only and request is too detailed 8. Note, inaccuracy in the plan 9. Policies are not prioritized. Evaluation of any proposals will involve a balance between the various objectives and policies of the plan 10. Too detailed 11. Operations over time will be dealt through a lease agreement rather than the plan 12. New utilities would be considered as restricted activities under the plan which contains provisions around public consultation 13. As per comment above, this is covered by 7.4.4 (f) - Restricted activity public notification policy</p>	<p>3.No change required 4. No change required 5. Amend Table 9 to insert footnote that concession approval may be given for one off events 6. No change required 7. No change required 8. Amend as per submitter’s comments 9. No change required 10. No change required 11. No change required 12. No change required 13. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>public consultation as part of this policy.</p> <p>14. Page 41 Policy 84 (use and development): Request to include a description of the process</p> <p>15. Page 44 - Section 5.8 Park user satisfaction in the table – recommendation that website hits cannot be a measure of user satisfaction</p> <p>16. Page 47 Section 6.1.2 - request for third bullet point under “People” to reference to more than 4wd events - “...including 4wd, motorcycle and quad-bike events.”</p> <p>17. Page 48 - Visitor services Section 6.1.4 (h)- second bullet: request to include pest management</p> <p>18. Page 49 - Section 6.1.4 Partnership in the parks: request for additional clause: <i>“(s) GWRC officers and elected representatives will undertake periodic site visits into each park with members of the relevant “Friends” group.”</i></p> <p>19. Page 49 Section 6.1.3 - Table 2 (significant environmental areas and features): Not all of the areas in the table are identified in Map 3</p> <p>20. Page 83, Table 9: Activities rule: Request to change Motorised Recreation to show “Restricted” instead of “Prohibited” for all parks except the Akatarawa Forest, which should remain as “Managed”</p> <p>21. Page 83 - Table 9: Add an activity “Education”. Request “Education” be added, both to the table and in the detailed requirements. (This would make it clear which parks offer educational experiences or resources and the parameters around those)</p> <p>22. Page 84 - Table 9: Firearms are shown as prohibited across the board, yet clause 7.5.2 (e) on page 94 says that firearms are allowed where a permit has been issued. This is inconsistent.</p> <p>23. Page 87 Section 7.3.2 - Clause e: Request to Delete the word “only” at the end of the sentence</p> <p>24. Page 88, Section 7.3.13 – Request re-wording to: “Motorised recreation will be managed only in specified zones in accordance with the <i>Motorised Recreational User Code and Management Guidelines 1997</i> document.”</p> <p>25. Page 88 - Section 7.3.14 – request to read “...in all parks...” instead of “...in the Akatarawa Forest...”</p> <p>26. Utilities - Section 5.4.5 covers the existence of utilities in parks and their associated operation and maintenance - some individual parks mention utilities, while others don't. e.g. main gas transmission line</p>	<p>14. Agree – there is some ambiguity by referring to the process in a policy. This is more appropriately described in 4.1</p> <p>15. Agree</p> <p>16. Agree</p> <p>17. Agree</p> <p>18. Too detailed, not a necessary addition</p> <p>19. Agree, table and maps do not match</p> <p>20. Disagree – motorised recreation should read prohibited with exceptions for one-off events</p> <p>21. Disagree - do not consider “education” as an activity in its own right</p> <p>22. Agree – need clarification around firearms which would be approved for use through a hunting permit. Bylaws do not prohibit firearms</p> <p>23. Agree – amend as requested by submitter – make it clear about motorised recreation in other areas as per points 4 and 25 of this submission</p> <p>24. Disagree – see point 5 above.</p> <p>25. Suggest removing in ‘Akatarawa Forest’ but not inserting ‘...in all parks’ as this would be inconsistent with the other policy changes</p> <p>26. Agree – ensure consistency – refer to submissions 5 and 6 (Transpower and PowerCo)</p>	<p>14. Delete policy 84 and insert reference to process 4.1</p> <p>15. Remove as per submitter's comments</p> <p>16 Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>17. Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>18. No change required</p> <p>19. Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>20. Amend Table 9 to insert footnote to motorised recreation to include concessions for one-off events</p> <p>21. No change required</p> <p>22. Amend Table 9 to show firearms as a restricted activity</p> <p>23. Amend as per submitter's comments</p> <p>24. No change required</p> <p>25. Remove words ‘in the Akatarawa Forest’ from Section 7.3.14</p> <p>26. Review Section 5.4.5 to ensure consistency</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			which passes through both Battle Hill and Belmont, yet is mentioned only in relation to Belmont – ensure consistency		
95. oral	Korokoro Environmental Group – Vanessa Browne	<p>A. Supportive of plan and complimentary on contents and concise and clear manner in which written</p> <p>B. Consider specific implementation strategies will need to be prepared in a number of areas to achieve objectives and policies</p> <p>C. Unclear on time period of plan and frequency of review</p> <p>D. Supportive of creation of riparian bush corridor to connect the bush of the Korokoro Valley, over the ridge of the Belmont Hills to the bush in the Cannons Creek Valley</p> <p>E. Would appreciate the opportunity to show GWRC Officers and Elected Members key points and values of Korokoro Valley</p> <p>F. Request for GWRC to pay particular attention to the ecology of the area around Oakleigh Street entrance to Belmont - concerned about effects of nearby residential development and increased pressure of people on original forest</p> <p>G. Request to tidy up Cornish Street entrance to Belmont Regional Park (BRP) - including pile of rubble and weeds</p> <p>H. Request for provision of picnic areas, adequate parking and toilets at Cornish Street entrance</p> <p>I. Request for GWRC to investigate options for 'bush to beach' access way between Cornish Street entrance to BRP and the Petone foreshore</p> <p>J. Request to better understand how GWRC proposes to work alongside community groups</p>	<p>Belmont</p> <p>1. Request more emphasis on heritage, including the early Maori routes through Belmont Regional Park</p> <p>2. Request for more detail on how GWRC proposes to implement the objectives and policies - in particular, how regenerating bush will be protected and supported</p> <p>3. Request for more protection in Korokoro catchment of areas of regenerating bush and contiguous with park e.g. on private land on the south side of the Korokoro Valley</p> <p>4. Page 59 - Table 4: request for recognition of regenerating nikau palms e.g. track from Oakleigh Street to the Dam and just south of Baked Beans bend</p> <p>5. Request for clear statement prohibiting construction of a road through Korokoro Valley part of BRP – “if GWRC can prohibit a wind farm in the park, couldn't they also prohibit a road to prevent adverse effects on this unique corridor?”</p> <p>6. Page 24, 4.3.1 – request to add regenerating into the list of important ecological areas that will be protected and managed</p> <p>7. Page 27, 5.1 – request to amend Objective 3 to read ‘enhance <u>and create</u> ecological connections’</p> <p>8. Page 29, 5.1.5 – request to add “<i>GWRC will actively seek to enhance aquatic systems where high existing potential exists (e.g. Korokoro Stream)</i>”</p> <p>9. Page 30, Methods – request to change to “the following methods <u>will</u> be employed.” AND add ‘<i>continuing to support local groups who work to achieve the objectives of the Plan</i>’</p> <p>10. Page 38, Methods – request to add any revenue generated within a Park will be used to further enhance the values of that park</p> <p>11. Page 40, Policy 75, e – request to add “<i>through gifting, sponsorship or personal commitment of time and energy.</i>”</p> <p>12. Page 56, 6.3.3 (3) – request to remove word ‘remnants’</p> <p>13. Page 57, 6.3.3 (5) – request to provide an objective or definition for a ‘sustainable farm management plan’</p> <p>14. Page 57 (6.3.4 (d)) – request to Change wording in first bullet to ‘dam or weir’</p> <p>15. Page 57, 6.3.4 (d) – request to add Maori heritage alongside cultural heritage</p> <p>16. Page 58, 6.3.4 (h) – request that links through Newlands also be considered as being practical</p>	<p>1. Iwi will be consulted to establish whether reference is warranted</p> <p>2. Current level of detail in plan is considered sufficient A diagram showing how this plan links to operational plans would be useful</p> <p>3. GWRC can only advocate for protection</p> <p>4. Agree</p> <p>5. While the submitters concerns are noted, the current proposal for the Petone-Grenada route will skirt around Belmont Regional Park and will not go through it</p> <p>6. Unnecessary change, this is a list of examples only</p> <p>7. Disagree. Enhancing ecological connections is about linking areas together</p> <p>8. Wording does not accurately reflect GWRC intent</p> <p>9. These methods are examples only</p> <p>10. Not appropriate place to reference this as it's not a method but a principle or objective</p> <p>11. Agree</p> <p>12. Agree</p> <p>13. Agree – further explanation about sustainable farm plans would be useful</p> <p>14. Agree, should include the word ‘weir’</p> <p>15. Requires iwi input</p> <p>16. This section of the plan includes current entrances not proposed entrances</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. Include a diagram showing how this plan is effected through operational plans</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. Include detail on nikau palms in table 4</p> <p>5. No change required</p> <p>6. No change required</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p> <p>9. No change required</p> <p>10. No change required</p> <p>11. Amend methods as suggested by submitter</p> <p>12. Amend 6.3.3 as suggested by submitter</p> <p>13. Include explanation of Sustainable Farm Plans</p> <p>14. Amend 6.3.4 as per officers comment</p> <p>15. Consult with iwi over additions suggested by submitter</p> <p>16. No change required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>17. Page 58, 6.3.4 (k) – request to add the following ‘improving the habitat of fish’ and ‘acquiring private land which would add to the values of the park’</p> <p>- request to add additional clause to improve ecological habitat of Korokoro Stream</p> <p>18. Page 58, 6.3.4 (m) – request to add ‘Korokoro Environmental Group</p>	<p>17. Agree to first addition only</p> <p>18. Agree</p>	<p>17. Include ‘improving the habitat of fish’ to 6.3.4(k)</p> <p>18. Amend 6.3.4 as requested by submitter</p>
96. oral	Te Runanga O Toa Rangatira Inc. - Jennie Smeaton		<p>All references to Ngati Toa</p> <p>1. When referencing to Ngati Toa request to change to Ngati Toa Rangatira</p> <p>2. Page 9 Tangata Whenua – request removal of paragraphs 2 and 3</p> <p>3. Page 11- Parks values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 2 – request reference to <i>Maori and Non Maori</i> rather than <i>Maori and Pakeha</i> • Request removal of para 2 from ‘Care of these places’ <p>4. Page 12 - 3.2 Park Descriptions Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira require additional time to provide comment on the traditional uses of these sites to confirm if they are as outlined in the current draft report</p> <p>5. Page 14 - Battle Hill park description Historic account under this section is flawed and request is re-written. Request for paragraph 4 to be removed with a statement added acknowledging our offer of a Statutory Acknowledgement</p> <p>6. Page 19 - Queen Elizabeth Park, park description Request for removal of Paragraphs 3 and 4 or re-written. Request for Paragraph 8 to be re-written</p>	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. Agree</p> <p>3. Agree</p> <p>4. These were included in the plan based on previous advice. Note submitters concerns and amend when advice is provided</p> <p>5.-6. Officers have met with the submitter and discussed the changes. Agree that these are appropriate</p>	<p>1.-3. Amend as requested by submitter</p> <p>4. No change required</p> <p>5.-6. Amend as requested by submitter</p>
97. oral	Jock and Lyn Simpson	<p>A. Consider right balance between conservation, recreation and heritage management</p> <p>B. Specifically interested in Akatarawa Forest and Battle Hill</p> <p>C. Support vision and guiding management principles of network plan (4.2-4.3)</p> <p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>D. Plan does not protect values as it promotes commercial activities (wind energy development) inconsistent with guiding principles of management</p> <p>Battle Hill</p> <p>E. Concerned about omission of key landscape areas identified in 2009 management plan – Eastern Hills</p> <p>G. Plan does not protect and conflicts with values identified for Battle Hill</p>	<p>Akatarawa Forest</p> <p>1. 6.1.3 (7) Wind energy development on selected ridgelines - disagree with secondary focus. Request 6.1.3 (7) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; and 6.1.3 (3) ensuring native forest vegetation is protected; and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park’s key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>2. 6.1.4 (f) To allow for the development of the GWRC approved wind farm development adjacent to Battle Hill Farm Forest Park and associated utility infrastructure - disagree with allowing wind farm development in the Park. Request 6.1.4 (f) be deleted (allowing for wind energy development on selected ridgelines is inconsistent with the primary focus 6.1.3 (1) for Akatarawa Forest of future water collection; with 6.1.3 (3) that ensures the native forest vegetation</p>	<p>1. -2. In making land available for development the Council is required by the Wellington Regional Council (Water Board Functions) Act to be satisfied that development will not impede the use of the land for future water collection. Information has been provided that satisfies that requirement in general terms and specific information will be provided by the Developer for approval prior to wind farm development proceeding</p>	<p>1.-2. No changes required</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>is protected and 6.1.4 (b) that protects the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development)</p> <p>Battle Hill 3. 6.2.4 Landscape & geological features – note plan omits key landscape features identified in 2009 Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan including the Eastern Hills. Request 6.2.4 (c) be replaced with wording from the Battle Hill Farm Forest Park Management Plan adopted in November 2009, Policy 2.22: <i>“To protect the park's key landscape features and values from inappropriate use and development. Key landscape features include:</i> - <i>European style pastoral character</i> - <i>The combination of unbroken pasturised river flat to forested steeplands</i> - <i>The eastern hills</i> - <i>Patchwork of mature specimen trees and native vegetation</i> - <i>Native bush remnant”</i></p> <p>4. 6.2.4 (e) Prohibit the construction of wind turbines - Request this be extended to include prohibition of all activities associated with wind farms including access through the park, blade flyover and the building of any associated utility infrastructure</p> <p>5. Map 4 - Battle Hill Forest Farm Park projected future changes April 2010. Possible wind farm road- request that any and all references to a wind farm road are deleted from Map 4</p>	<p>3. There should be recognition of the backdrop of the pastoral landscape and forested steeplands</p> <p>4. In September 2008 Council resolved that there will be no wind turbines in Battle Hill Farm Forest Park. Blade fly-over was permitted, as was road access from Paekakariki Hill Road and along the eastern ridge together with power and communications cables in the roadway and power connection to the TransPower network in Transmission Gully. Access through the Park from Paekakariki Hill Road is no longer required and RES has agreed there will be no turbine blade fly-over 5. Council has approved making part of the Akatarawa Forest available for wind farm development, and this includes an access road from the south through existing forestry roads at the rear of Battle Hill Farm Forestry Park</p>	<p>3. Amend 6.2.4(c)</p> <p>4.-5. No change required</p>
98. oral	Friends of Belmont Regional Park - Peter Matcham	<p>A. Thank GWRC staff for giving opportunities to be involved in the plan's development</p> <p>B. Supports the concept of a single document</p> <p>C. Prefers the term 'Landscape services' over 'Ecosystem services'</p> <p>D. Supports the majority of principles in the plan (with some changes as noted)</p> <p>E. Encouraged by the ongoing commitment to engage with and support community groups such as the Friends</p>	<p>1. Request for operational plans to be included as an appendix</p> <p>2. Request stronger emphasis on GWRC parks providing 'mix of conservation and recreational opportunities'</p> <p>3. Landscape management should be the primary purpose of farming and forestry within the parks</p> <p>4. Lower dam in Belmont is a concrete gravity dam, not weir as stated (Offer R. E, 1997)</p> <p>5. Review diagram on page 23</p>	<p>1. Including the operational plans within this document is inappropriate. This plan provides a framework for their development</p> <p>2. This is already indicated in the guiding principles</p> <p>3. Disagree, farming and forestry contributes to a range of outcomes (educational, economic, historic), including the management of landscapes</p> <p>4. Agree</p> <p>5. Diagram should be reviewed in light of this</p>	<p>1. No change required</p> <p>2. No change required</p> <p>3. No change required</p> <p>4. Amend as appropriate</p> <p>5. Review and amend diagram</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			<p>Guiding principles for management</p> <p>6. Principle 2: Disagrees with the use of ‘restore’</p> <p>7. Principle 4: Widen to include visual amenity</p> <p>8. Principle 5: Should not be a principle</p> <p>9. Principle 6: The text conflicts</p> <p>10. Principle 15: Should be under ‘recreation’ rather than ‘community’</p> <p>11. Principle 17: Reword to ‘Decisions on the future of GWRC’s park network are based on up to date quality information’</p> <p>General management objectives and policies</p> <p>12. Concern that the objectives are the same as principles. Outlines a way to structure links between principles, objectives and policies</p> <p>13. Policy 17(e) and 19(a), reword to read “<i>the most effective and efficient techniques available that are consistent with the park’s primary purpose</i>”</p> <p>14. Section 5.2 – include consideration of skylines</p> <p>15. Section 5.4.1 The primary purpose of parks is recreation, and farming and forestry should be subservient to this. Support 5.4.1(e) Guidance on harvesting of tress should be given.</p> <p>16. Section 5.4.5 Request that means of access and size of equipment for maintenance is restricted</p> <p>17. Section 6.3.1 Area at Stratton Street is currently not gazetted under the Reserves Act.</p> <p>18. Section 6.3.3. Request that the protection of the geological landscape of the boulder block fields should be a prime management focus</p> <p>19. Request that sustainable farm plans are subservient to the principles, objectives and policies set out in this draft document.</p> <p>20. Section 6.3.4 (b) should read “...features and values listed below...”</p> <p>21. Section 6.3.4 (d) Cultural heritage sites should be given better protection and preservation</p> <p>22. Section 6.3.4 (i) Correction needed on park entrance, should read <i>Normandale Road (Normandale)</i></p> <p>23. Section 6.3.5 Bullet point 3, requires correction, recommend two bullet points</p>	<p>submission and others</p> <p>6. This does not mean ‘restore’ to as it was before, but to a ‘healthy functioning state’ which is already stated in the text</p> <p>7. Current text sufficient</p> <p>8. Disagree, supported by majority of submissions</p> <p>9. Disagree, minimizing greenhouse gas emissions can be achieved on modified ecosystems (e.g. reducing stock numbers on farmland)</p> <p>10. Current placing appropriate</p> <p>11. Agree</p> <p>12. This point was raised by other submitters, needs review</p> <p>13. Change considered unnecessary from submitters</p> <p>14. Disagree, this is difficult to define unless specific viewing points are specified</p> <p>15. Agree with submitters concerns, where this applies to recreation reserves (Belmont and Queen Elizabeth). The management focus of each park assist with defining how farming will be used within the park. Disagree that guidance on tree harvesting should be included (this is not a procedures document)</p> <p>16. Disagree, this is too detailed for the plan</p> <p>17. Noted</p> <p>18. Agree - The landform contributes to the landscape values. It is the landform that requires protection</p> <p>19. As farm plans are contained within the management plan, they cannot be inconsistent with the plan</p> <p>20. Agree with grammar change</p> <p>21. Covered under general policy</p> <p>22. Agree</p> <p>23. Agree – wording missing, requires clarification</p>	<p>on page 23</p> <p>6. No change required</p> <p>7. No change required</p> <p>8. No change required</p> <p>9. No change required</p> <p>10. No change required</p> <p>11. Reword as requested by submitter</p> <p>12. Review objectives and principles to avoid duplication</p> <p>13. No change required</p> <p>14. No change required</p> <p>15. No change required</p> <p>16. No change required</p> <p>17. No change required</p> <p>18. Amend as per submitter’s request</p> <p>19. No change required</p> <p>20. Amend as per submitter’s request</p> <p>21. No change required</p> <p>22. Amend as per submitter’s request</p> <p>23. Amend as per officers comment</p>

Greater Wellington draft Parks Network Plan – Summary and analysis of submissions received, June-July 2010

Submission number	Name	General submission	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer comment	Officers recommendation
			24. Section 6.3.5 Bullet point 4, reword to say “Work with community groups to enhance access to and enjoyment of the park”	24. Disagree – submitters point is covered under general policy, this statement is specific to the focus for Belmont Regional Park	24. No change required