

Submitter Details

First Name: karen

Last Name: fifield

Organisation: Wellington Zoo

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated

Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

very visitor focussed and also recognises other environmental organisations

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

i think the Botanic Garden is a significant asset for our city and Wellington Zoo looks forward to working more closely with the Garden

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

Otari Wilton's Bush is a national garden of significance. I support more investment and recognition for this national treasure

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

we should be ensuring our existing city assets are well cared for

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

we should be ensuring our existing city assets are well cared for

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

investment in visitor engagement; working with other organisations

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

6. Your additional comments:**Comments**

Attached Documents

| File |
|---|
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

Submitter Details

First Name: Marc

Last Name: Rands

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated
 Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

Excellent proposals

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

Excellent development ideas

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

Excellent development ideas

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose

- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

6. Your additional comments:

Comments

Attached Documents

| File |
|---|
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

Submitter Details

First Name: Simon

Last Name: Cole

Organisation: N/A

On behalf of: Myself

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated
 Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose

- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

I would like to see provision in the plan made for a future potential increase in the size of the Botanic Gardens through their linkage to the Town Belt through the acquisition of currently undeveloped land between Glenmore St and Stellen Park. Such an increase in area could be used to allow the gardens to plant new collections and to allow better walkway linkages to the Northland ridge as well as the Te Ahumairangi Hill section of the Town Belt.

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

6. Your additional comments:

Comments

Attached Documents

| File |
|---|
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

Submitter Details

First Name: David

Last Name: Bain

Organisation: Bain Family Trust no 1

On behalf of: The Trustees (David Bain & John Barton)

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated
 Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

It is vital that Ratepayers do support the Wellington Botanic Garden general direction and policies

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose

- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

The problems for the Botanic Gardens Plan, is the direction that the leadership (the senior management) is being allowed to meander along). It lacks thrust and direction. And foresight. I think that the management people have been in positions for too long. And so lack vitality. There is also low or no strategic thinking going on, and so the Botanic Gardens are out on a limb, and not coordinating with, for example - the cable car, the buses around the periphery of the Gardens, a strong effective contact with the Picnic cafe (currently no such contact), Zealandia , and the Kelburn businesses. Ratepayers will be thinking that the Botanic Gardens is simply not trying to develop aggressive plans for revenue-earning. I am unsure whether these matters are being dealt to. There is no evident thinking about these matters going on. Within the Begonia House there is highly deficient people management and selection criteria for new staff hires. A mentality exists that has European NZers being actively discriminated against in favour of Pacific island peoples, resulting in needless hiring costs and time wastage trying to teach these folk about the job. The senior WCC management needs to get to the bottom of the Begonia House and Tree house ineptitudes, make management changes, and drive a vital, forward thinking leadership. This is not rocket science, nor is it difficult to change or fix. If WCC is to follow the leadership being espoused by its CEO (Not sure if he will be allowed to succeed by the Council.) then the WCC needs to make some pretty big changes quickly.

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

By reading the above critical statements, the gist of what is being argued will be clear.

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

6. Your additional comments:

Comments

Attached Documents

| |
|------|
| File |
|------|

| |
|---|
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |
|---|

Submitter Details

First Name: Sarah and James

Last Name: Soligo

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated
 Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?**2d. Truby King Park?****More Information:** [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?**3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?**

- Yes
- No

Your comments

We are the Owners of two (registered) dogs and live very close to the botanic gardens. We and many other dog owners in Kelburn regularly walk our dogs in the gardens. However, there is no area in Kelburn where dogs can exercise off lead. We submit that the Magpie Lawn area be made available for an hour or two each day for off lead dog exercising. The time could be before 9 am when the area is not otherwise in use or later in the evening. Perhaps a trial period could be started to see if it worked and we suggest a dog poo bag station be put near the lawn.

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments**5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?**

- Yes
- No

Your comments**6. Your additional comments:****Comments****Attached Documents**

| File |
|---|
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

7 May 2014

Here are some initial reactions to the document entitled, *“Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Management Plan”*. The pdf version name is *“draft-plan-final.pdf”*

a) Lack of Vision

- ❖ Page 9 includes a diagram that indicates that a “Vision” is supposed to inform the “Guiding Principles”.
- ❖ Page 15 says, “The vision identifies what we will focus on over the next 10 years.
- ❖ However, a search on “Vision” does not bring up such a section. There is no vision in this document.

b) There is no mention of who the stakeholders are and there is no reference to a visitor survey that would help inform a properly constructed Vision.

As a result, this whole document appears to be the work of self-serving insiders rather than users, rate-payers and visitors. The basis for the non-existent vision and the guiding principles is therefore not substantiated.

c) Education is a focus of the plan and yet there is a complete absence of any serious reference to education in respect of human induced climate change.

The diagram on page 9 recognises that climate change represents a key input to the plan. But is no further reference to educating the public about this, despite the fact that it will have a profound impact of plants.

Peter Metham

Daily visitor to the Botanic Gardens – and one who loves the gardens.

21 Versailles St, Karori.

Submitter Details

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Metham

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated
 Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

6. Your additional comments:

Comments

Attached Documents

| File |
|---|
| Initial reaction to Management Plan - 7 May 2014 |
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

Submission in regard to the Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Management Plan, April 2014

This submission replaces an earlier, "initial reactions" item posted by me on 7 May 2014.

The Vision

The vision stated in the summary - and in part in the draft plan itself at the start of section 2 - is, *"To create and maintain internationally recognised nature-based and cultural visitor attractions that showcase Wellington as an eco city."*

I see a number of problems with this vision.

- a) It says that the main purpose of the garden shall be to **showcase** Wellington, that is to say, to advertise and market Wellington. This may be to the liking of Wellington business people but it is not at all consistent with the purpose of the gardens as described in the various Acts or Plans. Having such a vision creates a slippery slope, whereby the Botanic Gardens is used to encourage consumer spending in Wellington as a whole, perhaps with horridly placed advertisements and other promotional activities. This is not good!
- b) The vision refers to nature-based and cultural visitor attractions. The residents of Wellington have no ongoing interest in a study of our own culture in the gardens and so this statement once again implies a focus on outside visitors and a hope for additional consumer spending. This is wrong.

The summary is correct when it says that, *"people visit the Wellington Botanic Gardens for a range of reasons including viewing plants, walking and exercising, attending events and relaxing and enjoying time with family and friends."*

The Botanic Gardens are a living work of art created and maintained so beautifully by virtue of the love of the curators, gardeners and friends of the park. As long as these people are given the resources to continue their work, the Botanic Gardens will continue to thrive and be the beautiful place that it is. The vision statement needs to reflect this critical concept.



Education

Knowing more about the trees and plants that are maintained within the park greatly adds to the experience. However, it needs to be recognised that given the Internet these days, we can all look up and learn about just any botanic item we choose.

The place to provide an education about a tree or plant is next to the tree or plant itself - not the treehouse! In my experience - and I visit the park daily – very few people bother with the treehouse and no doubt that will continue to be the case. People come to park to see the real deal – not to submerge themselves in printed 2D representations.

I would love to see succinct information about the orchids and begonias and so on, in the hothouse and throughout the park – next to the items themselves.

One thing that would be useful in the treehouse is some convincing information about climate change – something that will ultimately change the gardens - probably for the worse.

Peter Metham
Daily visitor to the Botanic Gardens
pmetham@gmail.com
21 Versailles St, Karori, Wellington
021 101 6085

21 May 2014

Submission in regard to the Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Management Plan, April 2014

This submission replaces an earlier, "initial reactions" item posted by me on 7 May 2014.

The Vision

The vision stated in the summary - and in part in the draft plan itself at the start of section 2 - is, *"To create and maintain internationally recognised nature-based and cultural visitor attractions that showcase Wellington as an eco city."*

I see a number of problems with this vision.

- a) It says that the main purpose of the garden shall be to **showcase** Wellington, that is to say, to advertise and market Wellington. This may be to the liking of Wellington business people but it is not at all consistent with the purpose of the gardens as described in the various Acts or Plans. Having such a vision creates a slippery slope, whereby the Botanic Gardens is used to encourage consumer spending in Wellington as a whole, perhaps with horridly placed advertisements and other promotional activities. This is not good!
- b) The vision refers to nature-based and cultural visitor attractions. The residents of Wellington have no ongoing interest in a study of our own culture in the gardens and so this statement once again implies a focus on outside visitors and a hope for additional consumer spending. This is wrong.

The summary is correct when it says that, *"people visit the Wellington Botanic Gardens for a range of reasons including viewing plants, walking and exercising, attending events and relaxing and enjoying time with family and friends."*

The Botanic Gardens are a living work of art created and maintained so beautifully by virtue of the love of the curators, gardeners and friends of the park. As long as these people are given the resources to continue their work, the Botanic Gardens will continue to thrive and be the beautiful place that it is. The vision statement needs to reflect this critical concept.



Education

Knowing more about the trees and plants that are maintained within the park greatly adds to the experience. However, it needs to be recognised that given the Internet these days, we can all look up and learn about just any botanic item we choose.

The place to provide an education about a tree or plant is next to the tree or plant itself - not the treehouse! In my experience - and I visit the park daily – very few people bother with the treehouse and no doubt that will continue to be the case. People come to park to see the real deal – not to submerge themselves in printed 2D representations.

I would love to see succinct information about the orchids and begonias and so on, in the hothouse and throughout the park – next to the items themselves.

One thing that would be useful in the treehouse is some convincing information about climate change – something that will ultimately change the gardens - probably for the worse.

Peter Metham
Daily visitor to the Botanic Gardens
pmetham@gmail.com
21 Versailles St, Karori, Wellington
021 101 6085

21 May 2014

Submitter Details

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Metham

Organisation: None

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated

Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support

Strongly support

Why?

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

Strongly oppose

Oppose

Neither support nor oppose

Support

Strongly support

Why?

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

Yes

No

Your comments

The vision is very poor. There needs to be proper consultation about the vision, especially with the gardeners and curators.

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

Yes

No

Your comments

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

Yes

No

Your comments

Recognition that it is the head gardener, the curators, gardeners, and friends of the gardens that make them what they are - living works of art that we love to spend time in.

6. Your additional comments:

Comments

Please refer to my written submission - attached.

Attached Documents

| File |
|---|
| Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Management Plan - Submission - Peter Metham |
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Management Plan due 3rd June 2014

Rosamund Averton
12/17 Brougham Street,
Mount Victoria,
Wellington 6011

Mike Oates: Manager of Open Spaces and Recreation Planning,
Wellington City Council,
P.O Box 2199,
Wellington 6011.

[Mike.Oates@wcc.govt.nz]

I make this submission as an individual and wish to be heard but would like to be supplied with hard copies of all submissions made regardless of whether submitters wish to be heard or not. Thank you.

Introduction:

I am a regular visitor to all of Wellingtons "Botanic Gardens".

The one I visit least is Truby King especially since the access from Duncan Terrace has been built over by a neighbour. My other access across Mount Victoria and along the Town Belt from Coromandel Street on the Southern Walkway has become significantly unattractive since the wholesale and unwarranted felling of the unthreatening trees leaving the site unprotected from the elements. I look forward to the replanting with hardy and fast growing trees to provide protection and habitat. The "park" itself should be planted with a mix of plants that are known to survive on the terrain; essentially a return to what was there before the land clearances 20 or so years ago.

The Bot. Gardens are a treasure despite recent "purification" programmes. I delight in the mixed vegetation including some rata in the treetops currently (May 2014) flowering and the birdlife supping on the nectar, nibbling on berries and fruits and fossicking on the ground. The joy of the place is enhanced by the long corridors protected from the elements regardless of the weather. I use the Botanical Gardens as a route either to or from other places such as Karori, Highbury, Tinakori Hill, Otari or sometimes Trelisick Park.

Anderson Park is to me a natural extension of the "Bot" leading either down to the Bolton Street Cemetery or back upward and around to Tokyo Way or Kelburn Park. I pass it by regularly and always delight in the birdlife, these days frequently Kaka, in the remaining tall trees by the posh new accessway from Bowen Street. Hopefully the gums and macrocarpa will be allowed to survive.

The tracks within Bolton Street Cemetery are generally well cared for though some present a challenge being both steep, skittery with ball bearing sized gravel or slick with mud. There are many wee access ways tucked away that are protected from the elements. The top track, since the tree removals, has become unappealing. It was argued that removing some of these ancient specimens was necessary as they damage graves. Leaving well alone preserves the history of the site one of the oldest cemeteries in New Zealand.

I visit Otari at least three times a week from all directions. I regularly tailor routes for people of different inclinations and levels of fitness. Otari has everything from "tidy" gardens to streamside walks and many stepped pathways (eg: Nature and Wild Trails) and the Red, Blue and Yellow to Kohekohe, in the opposite direction Johnston's Hill and Karori Cemetery invite further exploration. There are many sheltered and shady routes, the birdlife is prolific thanks to the fruit, flower bearing vegetation and the fertile ground, perfect for scabbling fauna. This year has seen a proliferation of fungi, some of which I have never seen before. I love Otari for its beauty, its cathedral like peace and for its challenges (eg: hair-raising terrain).

Conclusion:

I generally support the proposals to merge the "parks" into a single management entity whilst preserving their individual characters and would like to see Johnston's Hill, Wright's Hill, Makara Bike "Park", Karori Cemetery and Trellisick "Park" absorbed into a generic Wellington Botanic (sic) Garden with a single large "Parks" of Wellington map. Central Park might also be included once it has been rehabilitated. A separate map for the Northern Regional "Parks" including Huntleigh to Johnsonville Park extending, eventually to via all of the wee "parks" from Newlands to Linden.

Finding our "free" treasures remains problematic, and not only for visitors. Bringing all "Parks" together within a single publication will allow the many to access the information not readily or comprehensively available. Information should be accurate (ie: 22 & 23 buses provide access to Otari via Icard Park which is just a short walk from Churchill Drive and into the most attractive Otari Beech Forest and thence to Otari proper). I would be happy to help with this project.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Rosamund.

Rosamund Averton.

Phone: 3851 495.

NB: Please note I visit my in-box at approximately fortnightly intervals.

Submitter Details

First Name: Rosalind

Last Name: Churchman

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated
 Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

Children's Garden is important to encourage children to participate in gardening as a healthy way to gain physical exercise and value plants. Herb Garden extension is supported to make better use of space. Improving the entrance to Botanic Garden from the Cable Car terminal is important as many visitors arrive near to, or from, the Cable Car.

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

Please refer to responses above.

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

Strongly oppose

- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

Ban dogs from the Botanic Gardens as they are a menace and a hazard. Ban the shuttle bus (used to transport cruise ship passengers) as there is not enough space to accommodate all garden visitors safely. Ban cyclists from the top of the Gardens near the Cable Car and Salamance Road as they are a menace to public safety. Allow the Seminar room in the Tree House to be used as a community centre for Kelburn/Thordon residents as there is no facility currently. Have high quality monthly displays in the Tree House to attract more visitors. These displays should be produced by professionals. Council staff should discuss with the Wellington Sculpture Trust the placement of small sculptures within the Gardens to create a more interesting environment. Reduce the amount of bedding in the Gardens as this is a wasteful process (of time and plants).

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

Put more emphasis on the Gardens' value as 'living art' and where visitors' emotional well being is enhanced as well as their physical well being, as shown by international research.

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

Smoking should be banned in the Gardens as many visitors come to the Gardens for physical health reasons.

6. Your additional comments:

Comments

Attached Documents

File

Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington

MANGEMENT PLAN: SUBMISSION BY FRIENDS OF BOLTON ST MEMORIAL PARK

The Friends of Bolton Street Cemetery¹ was founded in 1977 in response to the damage caused to the cemetery by the motorway, and is therefore one of the oldest heritage groups in Wellington. It is an incorporated society and a registered charity. Its principal aim is to preserve, protect and enhance for the public benefit the three Wellington historic cemeteries grouped around Bolton Street. In particular the Friends assist in protecting and restoring the historic graves, research and maintain the burial records and encourage public interest through a website, guided walks and media liaison. In this work, our most significant partner is the Wellington City Council and the financial support from the Council is greatly appreciated.

The Friends support in general this Plan and regard it as a significant improvement on the 2002 Plan. The Cemetery is somewhat different from the other gardens in this grouping in that its primary importance is the historic memorials it contains. Thus it is equally a museum as much as a garden and in other circumstances might conceivably be placed within the museum sector of the Council's overall structure. However as it is adjacent to the main Botanic Garden and under its general care, the garden grouping makes practical sense, provided that the built heritage is given its due weight in the context of the natural environment. This on the whole is achieved by the draft Plan.

The Plan is not a perfect document. The Friends are disappointed that the consultation promised at an early stage never eventuated and that our input was confined by impossible deadlines. The whole document needs to be professionally proofread and edited as there are many errors – typographical, grammatical and factual. The maps are particularly disappointing and in several cases are unintelligible being rendered from colour into black and white. We assume these inadequacies will be dealt with by Council staff and thus this submission concentrates only on major or policy issues.

Our comments are further confined to Chapter 6 and to the Memorial Park section of Appendix 2. We generally support or have no views on other parts of the Plan including Chapters 2, 3 and 8 which impact on the Memorial Park. A

¹ The name was changed to Friends of the Bolton Street Memorial Park in 1996. A name change back to Friends of Bolton Street Cemetery is underway in anticipation of a change to the area's name.

reference to the historic listing of the cemetery needs to be corrected in 3.4 (page31) as it is not registered under the Historic Places Act 1993.

6.1 Identity and Name. Page 85

Our organisation strongly supports the proposal for a name change for the reasons listed in the Plan and urges the Council to approve this as soon as possible given the impending completion of the national Memorial Park. In anticipation of this approval the Friends are making a parallel name change.

6.2.1 Policies – Landscape Character. Pages 85-86

This is a crucial part of the Plan because of the need to ensure the Memorials are not further damaged by the natural landscape, particularly by the existing and future trees. Several New Zealand historic cemeteries have been over-planted with trees and are now facing the political and financial consequences. While we anticipate continued robust dialogue with Gardens staff on individual tree removals or plantings, the proposed policies contain sufficient safeguards for future development.

The heritage rose collection warrants specific comment. We see this as a significant and meaningful addition to the cemetery's attraction especially for tourists and visitors. Sadly it has been in decline for some years and the number of plants decreased significantly. In 1995 122 species of roses were listed² but the collection declined to about 70 species by 2011. Recently the Botanic Gardens staff have been able to give more attention to it and we are hopeful that the decline has been reversed. The Park is described in Council pamphlets as containing a heritage rose site "of national importance", a claim that might be difficult to sustain at present. We propose that the rather weak policy on the heritage roses be altered to include a firm commitment to upgrade the collection to this level and thus be reworded as follows: "The heritage rose collection shall be managed, extended and developed with the aim of establishing a heritage rose site of national importance with an emphasis on species and varieties available in the Nineteenth Century and early Twentieth Century".

6.2.2 Policies – Graves and Monuments. Page 88

² Weiben "The Scent of a Rose" 1995

We support Policy 1 but suggest it be broadened to include an appropriate reference to the ICOMOS NZ Charter.

In Policy 2 there is a proposal that particular attention be given to “those [graves] that are well-known”. There is no reason given for this distinction nor any explanation as to how this category would be defined. As all should be inspected regularly, and indeed are done so by our organisation, we propose this clause in the Policy be deleted.

Policy 3 proposes that where possible the Council will seek to recover the cost of repairs from the next of kin. While this puts an obligation on the Council and not on our organisation, we feel it useful to mention that this is quite unrealistic. Most of the memorials date back to the Nineteenth Century and are at least 120 years old. Any “next of kin” will be some generations removed and would be difficult to trace or prove. Our preference would be to delete this sentence but if it is retained the concept of next of kin should be replaced by descendants or family and the Council’s responsibilities be further qualified. Similarly thought needs to be given to the last paragraph of this Section where the requirements described seem to be unrealistic for a heritage cemetery.

Policy 4 is unnecessary as the point is already covered adequately by Policy 1. If the Council wishes to retain it the second sentence either needs to be dropped or altered as it contradicts both the ICOMOS NZ Charter and the Guidelines. Both require that repair work be identifiable so that new work can be distinguished from old on close inspection. Our organisation has had considerable debate with Council staff on the interpretation of heritage principles and we believe that the staff involved have misunderstood these and are wasting rate-payers’ money unnecessarily. Conversely Council staff have also not prevented or remedied inappropriate work being undertaken on graves by third parties without a permit or authority.

Policy 5 has our strong support and we hope that it will be drawn to the attention of all staff working in the cemetery.

The whole of page 89 and top half of page 90 of the draft Management Plan down to “1970s” is a direct quotation from the Guidelines (pages 26-28) but is not acknowledged as such, which should be done. We propose this material is removed because it provides an unbalanced level of detail compared to other aspects of the draft Plan, and could become misaligned with any future amendments to the Guidelines during the 10 year span of the Management

Plan. If this material is to be retained, then we propose it be distinctively identified as a selective uplift from the Guidelines, properly acknowledged as part of a report and the author, a well-known conservation architect, acknowledged. There also needs to be some explanation as to why this section has been distinguished out from the rest of the Guidelines.

6.2.3 Policies – Burial Records and New Interments. Pages 90-91

The first policy is unnecessary as it is covered by the second one. However rather than deleting it, it could be added to the second policy as a last sentence. It should be noted also that this policy is contradicted by the first paragraph on page 91, one of the many editing mistakes that need to be addressed.

We support all the remaining policies but stress that there are continuing problems in this area, not so much relating to the policy but to the enforcement. Our organisation has compiled the heritage burial list and has taken the lead in correcting and extending it. We are disappointed that the Council system does not provide a robust and reliable back-up to this work. Lists are inaccurate and are not kept up to date. Consultation with our organisation is poor. Nor is the Council robust in preventing or removing inappropriate new work despite our requests that it do so.

6.2.4 Policies – Heritage Buildings. Page 91

The first policy on the Sexton's cottage requires reconsideration. This is a very important heritage building which has Category I listing with Heritage New Zealand, not Category II as stated in the explanatory paragraph. It is the oldest existing house in Wellington City, centrally located and of attractive appearance. The proposal to continue to use it for short term accommodation and keep it closed to public use is short-sighted although no doubt financially appealing. There is only one other Sexton's cottage in New Zealand that is listed with Heritage New Zealand: this is at the Northern Cemetery in Dunedin. The Southern Heritage Trust, which is devoted to the appreciation and protection of Otago's social, cultural, architectural and industrial heritage, uses this cottage by arrangement with the Dunedin City Council in return for the trust maintaining an information centre and website on the cemetery. The

Wellington Sexton's cottage is even more suitable for such a role, being centrally placed and alongside the Chapel Information Centre. For example, it could be used as a base for those organisations working on heritage issues within the Wellington region and like the Dunedin cottage be opened to the public on an occasional basis in order to assist with heritage, history and genealogical queries. There may be other ideas of interest to the Council that could be explored which would make the cottage and chapel cluster a more attractive tourist destination. We propose the policy be reworded as follows: "the Sexton's Cottage shall be managed according to the conservation plan and the Council should explore ways of increasing its tourist and heritage potential, including opening it up for occasional public use.

6.3.1 Policies – Events and Activities. Page 93

We support these two policies which constrain the type of events in the cemetery but propose the second policy be extended as follows: "No events shall take place on the mass grave or on any other grave, whether marked or unmarked." The reason for spelling out this requirement is that many of the graves are unmarked and what may seem like a lawn is in fact a grass covering of historic graves which should be treated with due respect. In the case of the mass grave, our organisation has been advocating for some time that it be better delineated so that the public knows that under this lawn are buried some 3,500 people. We are disappointed at the lack of progress on this project and that the mass grave therefore remains attractive as a potential play area.

In this section as elsewhere there is mention of the quiet ambience of the cemetery. This is wishful thinking in view of the motorway noise which permeates almost all sections of the cemetery. In the long term the Council should be looking to alleviate this noise, for example by sound absorbing barriers, thus providing a real refuge from the adjacent CBD.

6.4.1 Policies – Partnerships and Community Involvement. Page 93

We support the policy to maintain our close relationship with the Council and Botanic Garden staff. This is an appropriate point at which to note that this relationship is working well despite differences we may have from time to time on policy implementation. Our organisation also maintains a very close

relationship with the Friends of the Mount Street Cemetery so we support the references to this cemetery in the Plan. We agree further and appropriate references should be made to the history of Maori involvement in the area and hope these will be fully documented.

6.4.2 Implementation Pages 94-95

Of the six points listed in Implementation, we support the five which have already been referred to in Chapter 6. The odd one out is the proposal to “prepare and implement a five year programme of maintenance and restoration work in consultation with the Friends of Bolton Street Memorial Park”. At present our organisation prepares annually for the Council a proposed programme of maintenance and restoration which the Council implements within the annual budget grant. This works well and it would be impossible to prepare a meaningful five year programme as the most urgent repairs are breakages occurring throughout the year because of vandalism, falling trees and even earthquakes. No explanation is given for this proposal nor any indication that the current system needs altering, so we wish to see it deleted.

Appendix 2: Historic outline – Bolton Street Memorial Park. Pages 149-162.

We are extremely fortunate that the cemetery’s turbulent history has been recorded accurately, professionally and in detail by historian Margaret Alington in her book *Unquiet Earth* published in 1978. The outline summarises her account until that date and accurately describes the modern history. We are pleased that we could be involved in much of the drafting of this appendix because of our extensive historical records and some expertise in the subject. There are however a number of errors of an editing nature, including dates, that need to be corrected and the maps are virtually unintelligible.

Our major concern relates to the last minute addition of an extensive extract (pages 156-157) from a book which is described as “Maori experience” and is written by someone who has both Maori and Pakeha ancestors in the cemetery. It is a highly personal narrative, not a factual history and thus, while an interesting read, is an inappropriate insertion into a historical narrative within a Council report. Because of its nature, it does not provide an accurate

account of the history of the Maori graves and misunderstands the policy on reburial of funereal objects. It criticises wrongly the Government implementation of this sensitive subject. Our recommendation is that the entire extract be deleted. If this extract is to remain, it needs to be balanced by some correcting narrative or explanatory footnotes about the history and current position on the Maori graves. Our organisation is able to assist with the provision of relevant material. The extract if kept should also be “boxed” to indicate clearly that it is not the Council’s narrative but the personal opinion of the writer.

Submitter Details

First Name: Priscilla

Last Name: Williams

Organisation: President, Friends of the Bolton Street Memorial Park

On behalf of: Friends of the Bolton Street Memorial Park

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated
 Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose

- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

See details in supporting document

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?**3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?**

- Yes
- No

Your comments**4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?**

- Yes
- No

Your comments

Name change for Bolton Street Memorial Park. See details in supporting document

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

- Yes
- No

Your comments**6. Your additional comments:****Comments****Attached Documents**

| File |
|---|
| MANGEMENT PLAN SUBMISSION |
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

Please click on the link below to view the document

http://submissions.wellington.govt.nz/Consult24Office/Docs/PID_3/3_703_DEEQ0M_MANGEMENT_PLAN_SUBMISSION.docx

Submitter Details

First Name: Linda

Last Name: Caddick

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated
 Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

It is important to have free access to park and bush areas.

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

Concerns are that Otari is mainly a wild bush area, I would not want it to become too structured and park like. I like that there is the botanic garden area at the top but want the rest of it to remain as natural and bush like as possible.

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose

- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

There is an ugly empty section across the road from Otari bush. Can that be taken over by the council and kept tidy, used as a parking area or playground or link to the bush above it. A large portion of it appears to be council access to storm water drains. Because of this, I don't feel this should be privately owned property but council owned and maintained.

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

In the plan it is suggested that the current caretaker's house and garden are renovated. I note that this has already begun.

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

Need for control of parking near Otari bush. Mainly due to school parents but already chaotic at school times. Whether to do with the park or not I feel there needs to be more easily accessible parking for the school and more traffic control to ensure the current dangerous parking does not continue.

6. Your additional comments:

Comments

Attached Documents

| File |
|---|
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

Submission – Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington:

On behalf of Kelburn Normal School. Dated 3rd June 2014

Comments:

Wellington Botanic Garden is right on the door step of Kelburn Normal School (KNS) and offers a great learning environment and recreational area to the students of the school. Already KNS utilises these spaces by utilising Magpie lawn for school picnics, cross country training and other physical education as well as the gardens for their learning opportunities. Many of our children also live in the Kelburn community, with their families making use and supporting the Gardens out of school hours.

Being an urban school with a difficult topography, small footprint and constraints of very few local green spaces KNS would like to offer to be a guardian school to the proposed Children's Garden. With the Gardens located on our doorstep and such an important part of our community we believe we would be well placed to develop this special relationship.

The increased emphasis on environmental education and conservation leadership is a direction our school would like to pursue; what place flora and fauna has in our society, the life cycle of plants, habitats and ecosystems.

Teachers at KNS are willing to workshop ideas to develop resources and ideas to practically apply skills and knowledge within the Botanical Gardens. Some possible foci for the school to explore along with the Botanical gardens staff could be the selection of plants and the reasons for the inclusion in the Children's garden. The children could then explore the practical skills needed to maintain the garden as well as the history and stories that go along with the gardens and plants. While sustainable environmental management and plant diversity could be a main foci it could be expanded into the social science area with the children helping to retell and create stories about the gardens and plants. This material could be used in audio and visual displays appropriate for all age groups.

KNS Board of Trustees would like to promote more partnerships with neighbouring facilities to bring about an enhanced sense of community in Kelburn, improving communication and learning opportunities between all stages of life. We foresee the benefits off fostering links with members of the Kelburn community through the Gardens as way to develop lifelong learning about our environment.

Ongoing, once the Children's garden is developed we would like to be involved in the garden management albeit through a children's gardening club or offering to be guides to visitors. All children from near and far should benefit from the new Children's garden and be involved in its design and ongoing care. KNS does not want to take this away from other schools wanting to participate in the management of it, merely due to our proximity we see this as an opportunity to improve some links already with the Botanic Gardens and Zealandia and to offer something special to the students of KNS. We do see students leave KNS for other schools with superior grounds and facilities, which is not helped by our current position of having to do major earthquake strengthening work and playground maintenance, thereby restricting even more of our outdoor space.

KNS also has a unique area known as the Kelburn gully which in 2008 the NZ Plant Conservation Network presented the school with an award for being a project of national significance. As parents and staff come and go, the involvement in this project has waned. We see the new proposed Botanic Childrens garden as another avenue to help encourage the younger generation and their families to take note of their surroundings and therefore may also have the added benefit of bringing that knowledge back to our own outdoor space.

The Children’s garden has the most obvious links with KNS but we also see other areas such as Magpie Lawn (especially if it had toilets), The Treehouse and planned educational themed gardens between the duck pond and play area all being spaces where KNS could be involved.

We see this as very much a dynamic, two-way relationship and not just one that would benefit the school. A partnership based on the Children’s garden would present an opportunity to develop a long lasting and broader relationship which will benefit the Gardens, the school and its students, and the wider community. In particular, we would hope that the voices and ideas of today’s children could help shape and influence the direction of the Gardens more widely – they have strong ideas and great enthusiasm that we should all value and respect. The voices of our young people are easily overlooked and a partnership with the school would help unlock the great potential that exists amongst our local young people.

We look forward to having the opportunity to expand these ideas further in an oral submission .



Submitter Details

First Name: Sloane

Last Name: Bayley

Organisation: Kelburn Normal School

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated

Onslow-Western

Outside Wellington

Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

The Children's garden will be a real asset locally and for wider communities.

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose

- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

- Yes
- No

Your comments

6. Your additional comments:

Comments

Please see attached document prepared for by Kelburn Normal school (KNS) and community regarding the benefits of Children's garden and the desire to become a partner guardian school on this project.

Attached Documents

| File |
|---|
| Submission WCC Botanic gardens plan - KNS final |
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

Please click on the link below to view the document

[http://submissions.wellington.govt.nz/Consult24Office/Docs/PID_3/3_705_I44AXD_Submission_WCC_Botanic_gardens_plan - KNS final.docx](http://submissions.wellington.govt.nz/Consult24Office/Docs/PID_3/3_705_I44AXD_Submission_WCC_Botanic_gardens_plan_-_KNS_final.docx)

Submitter Details

First Name: John

Last Name: Parker

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated
 Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
 Oppose
 Neither support nor oppose
 Support
 Strongly support

Why?**2d. Truby King Park?****More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)**

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?**3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?**

- Yes
- No

Your comments

The Botanical Gardens are an important off-road thoroughfare for cyclists commuting between Thorndon and the city, and I would like to see a provision for dedicated cycleways through the Gardens to safeguard this important transport link. Due to the high number of pedestrians in this area, a dedicated and marked cycle route through the gardens is essential to mitigate potential conflict, as well as providing a provide a direct, safe cycle route (especially as there are NO on-road cycle facilities that cyclists could use instead).

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

- Yes
- No

Your comments**5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?**

- Yes
- No

Your comments

Cycle routes through the gardens in this important transportation link - see comments in 3 above.

6. Your additional comments:**Comments****Attached Documents**

| File |
|---|
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

OTARI –WILTON’S BUSH TRUST SUBMISSION ON THE BOTANIC GARDENS OF WELLINGTON DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Otari-Wilton’s Bush Trust (OWBT) is pleased to see this draft management plan which brings the four Wellington city botanic gardens together, while recognising the uniqueness of each garden. The multifaceted role of these gardens is well described.
2. We focus in this submission on Otari-Wilton’s Bush, and on some aspects which we think could be strengthened. If we do not comment on something, please take it as an endorsement! For example, we fully support free-of-charge access to all the gardens, the restriction of mountain-biking and dog exercise and off-leash areas, and Council support and promotion of different transport options for visitors. All these will ensure the use and enjoyment of all the Botanic Gardens will continue to grow.
3. Because some of our members – and leaders in the educational activities we provide – are also members of the Wellington Botanical Society, we have seen their draft submission. We are impressed by its combination of strategic approach and deeply-informed and specific thoughts and recommendations. We endorse their submission. Our submission will therefore focus on a few aspects where we feel we have something to add or which we wish to particularly emphasise.
4. In the current era where partnership between WCC and voluntary groups has become increasingly important, we would like to particularly support the Wellington Botanical Society’s recommendation of the establishment of a Scientific Advisory Group. This seems to us to be particularly timely given the progress Otari-Wilton’s Bush has been making toward becoming New Zealand’s National Native Botanic Garden. We need a systematic way to bring knowledge together, in and outside WCC, so that we can work effectively and together make the most of the money available for Otari-Wilton’s Bush. Without such partnerships, it may be difficult to realise this goal: its realisation would do a lot for Wellington’s attraction as a tourist destination, as well as its emphasis on being the country’s knowledge capital. We need to bring the educational and science potential of Otari-Wilton’s Bush together, and the Science Advisory Group would really enable that to occur.
5. We are concerned that a number of the science and education emphases in the 2007 Management Plan for Otari -Wilton’s Bush have been omitted in this draft management plan. If Otari-Wilton’s Bush is to succeed as New Zealand’s National Native Botanic Garden, these emphases are key.
6. We strongly endorse the Wellington Botanical Society’s recommendation that section 5.2.1 is rewritten to give a primary focus on the unique science interpretation and educational opportunities associated with the plant collections

at OWB, and the partnership approach to it. This should start by identifying different ‘student’ groups, and their needs. Existing OWBT and WCC educational programmes meet some of these needs, but not all, as the chart below shows.

| Grouping | Educational activity |
|---|--|
| Primary and intermediate children | Half day holiday programs run by staff |
| School visits by primary and intermediate children | Half day trips using the Nature Trail education package led by teachers and parent helpers. “Peer guided” tours by children from Otari school for visiting school groups. |
| Groups of secondary school children | Curriculum-related activities in the formal garden and on Nature Trail guided by volunteer guides and teachers, e.g. evolution, plant relationships and classification. Transect studies and other activities in the bush and stream to teach research techniques |
| Tertiary students in technical colleges and universities | Both horticulture and more advanced studies (e.g., the basics of NZ native identification, Orchid mycorrhizal symbiosis, kauri growth, decade-long regeneration studies, gecko behaviour). This is where education and research overlap. |
| The general public who wish to extend their knowledge of native flora and its relationships with the fauna. | The monthly Sunday “walks” arranged by the Trust, most recently on ferns. One-off tours by arrangement, e.g., Beginners’ Botany for a Forest and Bird group |
| Tourist-oriented guided tours at OWB and WBG for international and local tourists | Opportunities to soft-sell messages about the need to understand New Zealand flora and fauna if the NZ heritage is to be enjoyed and protected. |
| Conference delegates | Specially arranged tours for conference delegates, e.g, the recent visit by about 140 delegates from the recent International Plant Propagators Group. |

7. Section 5.2.2 identifies the Nature Trail to be ‘the main educational trail’. We think the Treasure Trail could also be used, particularly for those who cannot access the Nature Trail.
8. In relation to Section 5.3.5: Because of our active work in revegetation and then the weed clearance that follows to maintain that success, we are acutely aware of the need for better weed control in OWB. We would urge the Council to more actively manage the forested area utilising the support of the Greater Wellington Regional Council and Department of Conservation as proposed. There is an increasing presence of exotic weeds such as barberry, tradescantia, and selaginella in the peripheral areas of the garden and in the forested area and also a need to provide for a safer habitat for indigenous wildlife, particularly birds, given the success of Zealandia in breeding particular species which are spreading out and seeking new nesting and feeding areas.
9. We also strongly endorse the Wellington Botanical Society’s strategic approach to the forest management, which would weave scientific research through strategically. It makes absolute sense to us to leave untouched (other than weed control etc) the 11 hectares of primary forest, rather than enact a uniform ‘restoration’ policy.
10. In relation to Section 5.4.7: This makes no mention of the area immediately adjacent to Ian Galloway Park (the former landfill tip face). This is listed as being incorporated into Otari Wilton’s Bush in the description and maps of the area in the draft management plan. Its incorporation into the Scenic Reserve was listed in the 2007 Management Plan as listed as an objective in that plan but there is no mention of this having been implemented in the draft plan under consideration. We would like this matter clarified in the proposed Management Plan. This area needs to be incorporated into OWB.
11. We continue to hope that different parts of WCC can work together to achieve access to OWB from the land leased to the Wilton Bowling Club. Their lease was recently renewed without the opportunity taken to achieve something that would make a considerable difference to more people being able to use OWB at the same time. There is plenty of time before the next renewal of the lease to build in changes that would benefit OWB.
12. Section 5.5 *Partnership and community involvement* outlines some of OWBT’s role in working with the WCC team. We would ourselves have put more stress on one of the prime reasons why we were founded, to promote the educational uses of OWB. Our guided tours, for example, are as much about using OWB to share knowledge about indigenous flora and ecosystems as they are “to encourage public interest in the Garden” (p. 83 of the draft Management plan).
13. We see ourselves working in partnership with the WCC staff, and this sense of partnership is becoming increasingly important if the goal of OWBT becoming

New Zealand's National Native Botanical Garden is to be realised. Our desire to see this goal realised is evidenced in such things as:

- our part-funding the Otari Curator's recent study at Kew Gardens, and seed-sourcing trips to parts of New Zealand
- our educational activities, which are currently expanding to support secondary students and teachers, and
- our provision of guided tours to international and national visiting groups (some 600 were hosted in 2013/14).

Our educational activities and guided tours serve several purposes. As well as building knowledge (at different levels) for participants, they also earn some revenue, which we can then put toward supporting the goal of OWBT becoming New Zealand's national native botanical garden. We are delighted that the Cockayne Centre is finally a reality, and pleased to be able to fund the equipment that will allow its use for education and by researchers.

14. We are puzzled by the only implementation action under section 5.5.1 being about the Children's Garden for the (main) Botanic Gardens. We in fact have some concerns that this project could draw money from the other botanic gardens covered by the draft management plan, in particular Otari. We note, for example, that while the Cockayne Centre will allow some more of the educational and research activity that has long been heralded for Otari, we will still need the upgrading of Te Marae o Tane, the interpretation centre, to provide more public access to interpretation material, and to work with groups that are too big to fit into the Cockayne Centre.
15. The implementation action that we would like to see for section 5.5, which is focused on OWB and the trust, would relate to putting an emphasis on working in partnership with the WCC staff to share planning and resourcing educational activities for different groups, so that more systematic approach can be taken. We are really pleased to see the WCC taking a more proactive approach to its own provision of education, and sense that we are now at the point of marked expansion all around, where joint planning and work together would enable all the programmes to benefit.
16. It is the Trust's hope that when finally approved by the Council, the Management Plan can be implemented in its entirety. While we congratulate the Council for the preparation of such a comprehensive plan it is disappointing to note that many of the proposals outlined in the Draft Plan also formed part of the 2007 Management Plan for Otari Wilton's Bush and they have not yet been implemented.

17. We strongly urge that the Council make available the resources necessary for the implementation of this draft plan and retain the facility of separate funding for each garden to enable the work specific to each garden to be undertaken.
18. We wish to speak to our submission. We would also welcome the opportunity to work together with WCC staff on the points and suggestions made here, before the management plan is finalised. That would seem to us the best way forward.

Submitter Details

First Name: Cathy

Last Name: Wylie

Organisation: Otari-Wilton's Bush Trust

Resident or Ratepayer:

Ratepayer Resident Non-resident ratepayer Other

Which Community Board Area is your property in?

Eastern Lambton Northern Not Indicated

Onslow-Western Outside Wellington Southern

Wishes to be heard:

Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Submission

1. Overall, do you support or oppose the general directions and objectives of the draft plan?

More information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2. Do you support or oppose the general direction and policies for:

2a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2b. Otari-Wilton's Bush?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support
- Strongly support

Why?

2c. Bolton Street Memorial Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

- Strongly oppose
- Oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Support

Strongly support

Why?

2d. Truby King Park?

More Information: [Summary Document](#) | [Draft Plan](#)

Strongly oppose

Oppose

Neither support nor oppose

Support

Strongly support

Why?

3. Are there any other major changes you think should be included?

Yes

No

Your comments

4. Are there any actions in the plan you feel should have priority?

Yes

No

Your comments

5. Is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan?

Yes

No

Your comments

6. Your additional comments:

Comments


Attached Documents

| File |
|---|
| OWBT submission on Botanic Gardens management plan |
| Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington |

Please click on the link below to view the document

http://submissions.wellington.govt.nz/Consult24Office/Docs/PID_3/3_707_E6FRJP_OWBT_submission_on_Botanic_Gardens_management_plan.doc

PO Box 10-412
Wellington 6143
New Zealand



Charities Commission Registration CC10518

27 May 2014

SUBMISSION ON DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR WELLINGTON BOTANIC GARDENS

Submitter: Wellington Botanical Society

Contact details: Bev Abbott

40 Pembroke Rd, Northland, Wellington 6012

bevabbott@xtra.co.nz , Phone 475 8468 (H).

We would like to speak to our submission.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Society appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the botanic gardens, particularly Otari-Wilton's Bush (OWB). We hope our suggestions will assist Council to develop a management plan that will inspire and motivate staff, volunteers and decision-makers throughout the next 10 years.

OUR TOP THREE PRIORITIES

2. Our top three implementation priorities are:
 - develop and implement a marketing strategy that positions and promotes Otari-Wilton's Bush as New Zealand's Native Botanic Garden
 - improve visitors' access to the collections at Otari-Wilton's Bush, and develop permanent and changing displays in Te Marae of Tane
 - establish a Scientific Advisory Committee. Commission a scientific report on OWB's forests, including their present structure and composition. Identify priorities for management and research. Implement a monitoring programme to track future changes in these forests.

MAJOR CONCERN

3. We are puzzled by an apparent de-emphasis of scientific perspectives in the draft management plan as evidenced by:
 - the relegation of Cockayne's Guiding Principles for OWB to the historical appendices, particularly the first principle of developing "a flora collection for the plant-classifier and the student of evolution with as many native species and hybrids as could be cultivated at Otari, arranged as far as practicable according to plant families"
 - dropping the previous policy of establishing a Scientific Advisory Committee
 - the dropping of some of the scientific themes for interpretation and education programmes, for example, plant identification and evolution.

STRUCTURE OF SUBMISSION

- 4. The major components in this submission are:
 - Vision page 2
 - The collections page
 - Major facilities page
 - Education and Interpretation page
 - Forest Management page

VISION

- 5. We support the vision. We want to see the gardens become “internationally-recognised, nature-based and cultural visitor attractions that showcase Wellington as an eco-city”.
- 6. Our vision for OWB can be expressed very simply.

“Otari-Wilton’s Bush is recognised nationally and internationally as New Zealand’s Native Botanic Garden”.
- 7. Our vision takes advantage of the botanic gardens ‘brand’ which is well-known internationally. (There are about 3,000 botanic gardens throughout the world.)

Garden tourism

- 8. Wellington’s two collections of native plants, just minutes from the CBD, offer untapped potential for international ‘garden’ tourism. New Zealand’s flora is unique. International visitors at OWB are fascinated by the stories volunteer guides tell about individual plants and the flora. Demand for guided tours from locals and international visitors is growing. See Appendix 1 for more details, and some unsolicited visitor feedback.
- 9. While Wellington has been slow to recognise “garden tourism”, other councils in New Zealand are forging ahead.
 - Hamilton City Council (HCC) recently approved its Management Plan for the Hamilton Gardens. HCC is aiming to increase the average length of visits to from 1-2 hours to 3-4 hours so that more visitors will overnight in Hamilton, delivering increased business for the city’s accommodation providers and restaurants. Under the new management plan, HCC will develop “conceptual gardens” to tap into an emerging international trend.
 - Christchurch Botanic Gardens now has a new \$16 million visitor centre which was opened by the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge in April 2014, completing an initiative that the City Council started well before the earthquakes.
 - Dunedin City won the rights to host the fifth three-yearly Botanic Gardens Congress which brought over 300 delegates from 43 countries to Dunedin in October 2013. (Wellington gained some benefits from this conference because Otari Curator, Rewi Elliott spoke about Otari at the conference and several delegates visited Otari after the conference).

Becoming internationally-recognised

- 10. We support the implementation action which promises to deliver a marketing strategy with a focus on the national profile and role of OWB and WBG. OWB has a clear point of difference from an international perspective (New Zealand’s Native Botanic Garden). We are less sure about the WBG’s point or points of difference that would support international recognition.

11. An effective marketing strategy will identify the audiences that the Council wants to target, and how the products and services currently offered in the gardens should be enhanced to become part of an internationally-recognised visitor attraction.
12. A minor change in wording of the implementation action would remove a perception that Council is planning to use the gardens to market Council messages instead of focussing on enhancing the visitor experience. Our proposed wording is: “develop a marketing strategy for the botanic gardens with a focus on adding value to garden visits by providing more opportunities for visitors to access education and conservation messages”.
13. We don't support the implementation action which proposes developing a recognisable identity or 'branding' for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington. Wellington ratepayers are likely to have very little tolerance for further expenditure by Council on branding initiatives. Is Council confident that the city will benefit from investing tens of thousands of dollars in designing and implementing a new branding on signs, web-sites, brochures, stationery, promotional material, uniforms, and vehicles across all four gardens? We'd prefer to see some of this funding spent on the in-depth visitor research that would deliver a more specific and informative marketing strategy.
14. Ten years have passed since Gisella Carr prepared a report for Council on the marketing of Otari Wilton's Bush. The 2007 Management Plan for OWB included the development of a Marketing Strategy, but that didn't happen. The Society is now looking to the portfolio leaders Councillors Ritchie and Coughlan to identify and resolve whatever issues are impeding the development and implementation of a marketing strategy that will bring more domestic and international visitors to the city and the gardens.

Visitor Research

15. Some data about international and local visitors from the 2010 and 2012 visitor surveys is reported on page 36. The limited nature of this research, its timing, and the simplistic interpretation of the results may be inhibiting the development of products and services for international and specialist visitors. For example, 48% of the 185 respondents interviewed at OWB in 2012 were interviewed before 9am. This may have influenced the finding that: “At OWB, visitors are primarily from Wellington (82%), followed by overseas (9%), and other parts of New Zealand (9%). Before 9am, visitors are likely to be local residents exercising themselves and their dogs, or taking children to Wilton School.
16. A successful marketing strategy depends on in-depth qualitative visitor research with the visitor groups that the City wants to target, e.g., international and regional tour groups, independent international and regional visitors, and plant and heritage specialists. Focus groups with New Zealanders who have visited botanic gardens overseas or in NZ may also deliver valuable insights on particular services, e.g., their views on the different approaches to the labeling and interpretation of plants. In our eyes, a botanic garden without labels is like an art gallery without labels. The labels of the future, with QR codes, may provide a way of connecting visitors with additional web-based information during their visits.

Promotion

17. We see opportunities for joint marketing initiatives internationally and domestically with other NZ botanic gardens, regional tourism organisations, and private gardens that host specialist tour groups. New Zealand's first appearance at the internationally famous Chelsea Flower Show in 2004 was sponsored by Tourism New Zealand, Air New Zealand and three regional tourism organisations. Winning “gold” at Chelsea on a first appearance stimulated a lot of interest in New Zealand plants, and in the designers and

horticulturalists who put the exhibit together. (See extracts of media clipping in Appendix 2).

18. Potential visitors outside the tourism sector could be reached by offering well-crafted magazine articles to commercial, professional and community-based organisations with interests in botany, horticulture, conservation, gardening, forestry, floristry, and recreation planning.

Green Flag Award

19. Recognition through promotional schemes such as the Green Flag Awards may influence some visitors' perceptions. This scheme makes annual awards to well-managed parks which strive to meet visitors' needs, retain important historic and cultural values, and develop protection of native species and habitats. The Hamilton Gardens received their second consecutive Green Flag award in January 2014. We suggest adding an implementation action to section 3.5: "Submit successful applications for Green Flag Awards for OWB and the WBG by 2017."

Leadership

20. The second component of the vision is Council's wish to showcase Wellington as an eco-city. *Our Living City* identifies leadership as a key pathway to recognition as an eco-city. A strong tradition of leadership was demonstrated at all gardens in earlier times by Leonard Cockayne, Job and Ellen Wilton, James Hector, Walter Brockie, Wellington City Council and others. We hope the final version of the management plan, and its subsequent implementation, will give new energy to that tradition.
21. Plants need more champions. The media, and many members of the public, play very little attention to plant conservation. This point was made in *Threatened Plants of New Zealand*, (de Lange et al 2010).

"Plants have never had the same public profile as animals, especially birds, and although most New Zealanders understand the vulnerability of species such as kiwi and kakapo, they know a lot less about plants"
22. Wellington City is the capital of New Zealand, and it hosts New Zealand's best collection of native plants. As such, the city is ideally placed to become a champion for the country's indigenous flora, not just regionally, but nationally, and potentially internationally.
23. We anticipate a positive response to stories about leadership in plant conservation which are real and current, e.g. the role of the botanical gardens and Berhampore Nursery in supporting in-situ plant conservation by propagating rare and endangered plants for planting back into the wild, Otari's work with seed banks.
24. Council's intention to support capacity-building within the Pacific Island botanic garden community also demonstrates leadership.
25. Sections 3.6.1 and 3.6.3.2 of the OWB Management Plan 2007 outlined a leadership position for OWB staff. We recommend that these ideas are incorporated into Chapter 5.5, and the heading is changed to Leadership, Partnerships and Community Involvement.

THE COLLECTIONS

Management of the collections

26. Plant collections and their documentation are defining components of botanic gardens. Without the collections, there would be very little to distinguish Wellington's botanic gardens from parks, public gardens and reserves in many other New Zealand towns

- and cities. If OWB is to be recognised as New Zealand's Native Botanic Garden, then more attention needs to be given to the management of the collections.
27. The Draft Management Plan defines a collection as a managed group of plants demonstrating a particular theme. A collection can be in one place or dispersed throughout the garden. Collections may be managed for scientific research, conservation, display and education purposes.
 28. We recommend aligning the policy headings with the four purposes of collections as set out in the definition, i.e. scientific research, conservation, etc. Scientific interest is a wider concept than being a resource for scientists in institutions).
 29. We were shocked to find that Cockayne's five guiding principles have been relegated to the historical appendices, and that the future management of the Otari collections will be determined by the 13 general policies in chapter 3. We recommend reinstating Cockayne's guiding principles in section 5.1.
 30. Chapter 5 (OWB) does not contain any long-term goal for the management of the collections. We recommend adding one or more policies to section 5.1 that are consistent with Cockayne's first principle, for example:
 - *"The collections will be developed so that they are representative of as much of the diversity of New Zealand's flora as it is possible to cultivate at Otari."*
 - *"The collections will cater for students, the public and visitors who want to know more about New Zealand's plant families and genera, and their evolution"*.
 31. We think further thought needs to be given to how the plans for the collections are presented in the final Management Plan. The current text lacks coherence.
 32. Statements in chapter 3, (the overarching policies), raised further concerns about the taxonomic collections, for example:

"the collections ... contribute...to the wider landscape and beauty of the garden. This may mean that some collections will need to be dispersed to enhance the wider garden landscape, rather than grouped as one collection".
 33. That philosophy is not new. It has been applied steadily over the last decade or so. The gardens in the collections areas at OWB are beautiful. We believe, however, that there is still a place in a botanic garden for taxonomic collections that are beautiful and of scientific interest.
 34. This issue is important because two implementation actions in the draft plan mention the collections:
 - the taxonomic collections in the lower collections are to be "redeveloped" around the proposed redeveloped pathways.
 - the Phormium (flax) and hebe cultivar collections are to be relocated into the garden around the Cockayne Centre
 35. We suggest that staff test their plans for the redevelopment of the taxonomic collections before implementing them by displaying options in the Information Centre.
 36. We wonder if the extensive deck outside the Cockayne Centre has unnecessarily limited the potential to showcase natives as garden plants. It is likely to limit the diversity of flax and hebe cultivars which can be displayed near the house, unless the intention is to grow some in pots to demonstrate their use on apartment balconies and townhouse patios.

37. As new additions to the collections, we'd like to see at least one, but preferably four species of mistletoe established at Otari with some specimens in the Collections area. Mistletoe provides a rich source of educational stories, about topics such as parasitism, and its relationships with pollinators. Flourishing mistletoes at OWB will be a good indicator of the adequacy of OWB's possum control programmes, and of populations of the right pollinators.
38. A later section recommends planting more beech in the Collections area so that more visitors, especially international tourists, will be able to see all five species.

Access to the collections at OWB

39. Currently little effort is made at OWB to alert visitors to the existence of the collections or to explain their significance. We think improved visitor access to the collections at OWB will contribute to OWB being recognised as THE place to go to see New Zealand's native plants and learn more about them. Access means more than going for a walk in an attractive garden. Our experience is that it is becoming more difficult to find specific plants now that more of the scientific (taxonomic) collections are being displayed in habitat collections (e.g. the alpine garden), or dispersed throughout the collection area to "enhance the wider garden landscape". Fortunately the staff are always willing to help if they are on-site.
40. It was good to read that the Otari collections data base is up-to-date, and that work on completing the WBG data base is underway.
41. The next paragraph sets out our understanding of how visitors are currently able to access the collections.
42. A visitor who wants to know more about the plants in the collections at OWB currently has access to the following services:
 - The OWB website has a list in alphabetical order of the 2,400 vascular plants in the collections – about 28 pages. Our visitor could download this list onto paper or a portable device for use during his/her visit. The list does not help the visitor find the plants as it does not include any location information.
 - On arrival at OWB, our visitor has access to a map at each of the main entry points, but this does not show the locations of specific collections.
 - Our visitor will have difficulty knowing which of the species on the list s/he is seeing because few plants in the collections are labelled, (we've noticed recent improvements), and the list on the website does not indicate if the plant is a large tree, a creeper, a fern or a mat plant.
 - The main OWB brochure provides some assistance to visitors wanting to find particular plants, e.g. a visitor looking for *Coprosma acerosa*, may expect to find it in the Coprosma collection
 - The Treasure Trail and Nature Trail brochures will help our visitor find a small number of plants because the brochure has some sketches, and uses scientific as well as common plant names (in Maori and/or English), e.g. *Asplenium bulbiferum*, hen and chicken's fern.
 - A visitor, wanting to see *Hebe macrantha*, one of the earliest extant hebes to evolve in NZ, faces particular challenges as this plant is not in the hebe collection or in the alpine garden. (It's in the rock garden).

- A visitor wanting to see all 20 New Zealand's conifers, or all 18 species of Carex, would probably need staff assistance.
 - If a visitor wants to see some of the more unusual alpine plants in the Druce or Dench collections, s/he will need to be escorted into the nursery by a staff member.
 - Little assistance is available from the Information Centre as it is staffed by volunteers, and only for limited hours at weekends.
43. We recommend adding a policy and text to section 5.1 about improving access to the collections with a view to enhancing the experience of visitors. Possible wording for the policy is:
- “Access to the collections will be improved”.*
44. The explanatory text could outline possible implementation actions such as:
- Labelling more plants – but always ensuring that unlabelled duplicates are available to protect the collections from theft.
 - Adding more information to the species list on the website, e.g. type of plant, general location
 - Installing more on-site interpretation, with or without QR links to on-line information. (Christchurch Botanic Gardens included QR links on the interpretation installed to celebrate its recent 150th anniversary.)
 - Upgrading the maps at the entrances to provide information about the collections as well as the walks.
 - Developing a brochure about the plants/vegetation types that can be seen on the main pathway which is currently under development through the Cockayne collections
 - Providing read-only access to the BG data base in the Cockayne Centre and/or Te Whare o Tane to enable visitors to identify the location for most of the plants on the website list, (with restricted access to details of species likely to be stolen).
 - Developing displays in Te Whare o Tane about plant groups and their special attributes.
 - Re-instating the policy from the 2007 Management Plan which said: “Staff will endeavour to provide informative and professional guidance to specialist groups where specific knowledge of the scientific and horticultural resources of OWB is required; this includes tertiary groups.”
 - Working towards implementing a system similar to the online “Living Plant Census” system at the Royal Botanic Gardens Melbourne. It can be queried by scientific name or common name. A list of plants in each of the various beds and locations in the Gardens is available. In addition, publicly accessible locations of plants within the Gardens are mapped. The online Plant Census is one of the first of its kind in Australia. This initiative could be included in the planned investigations into alternative technology-based information-delivery systems (section 3.2.6).
 - Garden entrance beacons or a GIS positioning system to activate on-site apps. will be required at some stage.

45. We think implementing some of these services will also be appreciated by regular local users.

Re-design of the collections area

46. Work has been underway since 2010 to form a main path through the collections and secondary paths leading off it. The Landscape Development Plan 2010 describes the intention as being to “refine” the collections so that as people journey along the main path, they will be “immersed and able to experience the different vegetation types” such as a divaricate tunnel, a lancewood forest thicket, and a Phormium “Goliath” walk.
47. The Implementation Plan (section 5.1.1) proposes redeveloping the taxonomic collections below the Cockayne Lookout around the redeveloped pathways. (Asteraceae, Coprosma, Hebe (Veronica), Pittosporum, and Pseudopanax. We strongly support the retention of the taxonomic collections, particularly for their contribution to adult and senior secondary school educational tours. (See also earlier paragraphs about these collections)
48. Please include a map of the intended changes to the Cockayne collections area in the final management plan. A more detailed map showing details of the collections that can be accessed from specific secondary paths would also be helpful.
49. We support the implementation actions for the Forest Collections (page 70). The wide, level paths in this area are appreciated by parties with members requiring mobility assistance. Wide paths also make it easier for casual visitors to pass tour groups.
50. Before deciding to open up the beech collection to more visitors by improving the path, and developing a walking circuit and a lookout (an Implementation Action), we think a more intensive management regime may be required to enhance the health of the trees and their environs. As noted earlier, planting more specimens of each of the five beech species in the main collection area would provide better viewing opportunities for visitors interested in seeing this major forest type.

MAJOR FACILITIES

Cockayne Centre

51. The Implementation Action identifies several purposes for the Cockayne Centre. We strongly support:
- establishing the Cockayne Centre to support education and research.
 - developing the surrounding garden to demonstrate the use of native plants in home gardens.
 - including a botanical library in the Cockayne Centre.
52. We have reservations about making the Cockayne Centre a public space which is available for “small meetings and events”. This would appear to allow bookings of the centre for weddings, family reunions, and corporate functions. These uses may not be compatible with the educational and research functions.
53. We also have reservations about using the Cockayne Centre for traditional interpretation displays. From a visitor perspective, it makes more sense for all in-door interpretation displays to be located in Te Marae o Tane. On-site signs outside the Cockayne Centre could explain how staff chose the species for this “home garden”. We see the Tree House as a better location for most messages aimed at Wellington’s gardeners because the WBG has much higher visitor numbers (1.2 million per annum), and principles of sustainable gardening apply to exotic as well as indigenous plants.

54. Interpretation and education services appropriate for the Cockayne Centre would be aligned with small, seated groups, and research activities. For example:
- an AV system to enable specialist and senior students to see images on a large screen (such as living specimens under microscopes), botanical videos, and botanical information such as on-line herbarium specimens,
 - desks and terminals to provide read-only access for researchers, educators and senior students to OWB's BG collections data base, websites (e.g. Landcare's plant keys, NatureSpace, and the NZ Plant Conservation Network, the Margot Forde seed bank), and OWB monitoring reports.
55. It is unfortunate that wet parkas and muddy boots will have to be accommodated inside the Cockayne Centre because the budget was not sufficient to provide a covered verandah on the deck.

Te Whare o Tane (The Information Centre)

56. The consultant who developed the Draft Landscape Development Plan 2010 (LDP) stated that "the layout of the current building makes it unsuitable for use as an interpretation centre". The LDP also reported that:
- fewer than 10% of visitors visit the Information Centre
 - the displays date from 1999
 - 65% of visitors surveyed requested better displays and information.
57. We think the description on WellingtonNZ.com of this facility as "a modern visitor centre" is an over-statement.
58. Nevertheless, we support the intention to develop Te Whare o Tane as "the main visitor centre at OWB with information and changing displays".
59. An Implementation Action limits the scope of the displays to three topics "the history of Otari, the ecology of New Zealand plants, and the Wilton's Bush forest reserve". What is the rationale for constraining the scope to these topics? Why not give the developer of the Interpretation Strategy more scope to respond to the findings of visitor research, including research with international visitors, or New Zealanders who have experienced new approaches to visitor communications in overseas gardens.
60. We welcome the idea of "changing" displays. Content that gives visitors something to talk about at home, at work or over coffee may result in much higher percentages of regular visitors calling into the building every month or so to see what's new. Topics for the changing displays could be sourced from websites, botanists at Te Papa and VUW, NZ Plant Conservation Network newsletters, Otari staff, volunteers, the Wellington Botanical Society and pupils and teachers at Otari School.
61. Other potential display topics include:
- OWB's contribution to in-situ plant conservation, especially the success stories
 - A featured Plant of the Month which may encourage visitors to seek out the actual plant, particularly if the "clues" about its location provide a fun family activity.
 - A display to encourage photographers to lodge their photos of plants at Otari on Nature Watch NZ in a special "Otari" project, which would increase awareness of OWB among users of NatureWatch.
 - Presenting the story of Wilton's Bush forest and its history from a different perspective to re-engage with people who have been visiting OWB regularly for 10 years or more, (e.g. stories with context, not just facts).

62. We hope that a start on these low-budget suggestions can be made without having to wait for Council to allocate funding for the development of an Interpretation Plan. (A general policy in section 3.2.1 requires every garden to have one). Moreover, we see little point in developing an Interpretation Plan until Council has determined an indicative and realistic budget for its implementation. Many of the interpretation ideas in the Landscape Development Plan 2010 were clearly well beyond the resources likely to be available.

The Wilton Bowling Club

63. The Landscape Development Plan 2010 identified the potential for a new entrance from the site occupied by the Wilton Bowling Club. As was expected, Council renewed the club's lease for another 10-year term in 2012. Draft text on page 70 says "If the land and buildings ever became available then the area should be considered as an addition to OWB."
64. We'd like Council to be more pro-active during the term of the current management plan in exploring opportunities for mutually beneficial use of the club's facilities as a way of meeting some important gaps in the facilities at OWB. Access to the Bowling Club's carpark would provide additional capacity for visitors to Otari (possibly at set times), to reduce congestion in the Wilton Road carpark which is used by visitors and non-visitors, e.g. parents dropping off and picking up children from Wilton School. A larger car park would make life simpler when two or more buses are trying to load and unload visitors at the same time, as happens when the larger cruise ships are in town. More importantly, the club has facilities where the club, or a third party could provide somewhere for visitors to have a cup of coffee and a snack.

Treehouse in Wellington Botanic Gardens

65. We strongly support the proposal to develop the Treehouse as the major visitor centre (for all four gardens) providing changing exhibitions about conservation, environmental issues and gardening, as well as a meeting and community space. A revamped Treehouse has the potential to make a significant contribution to increasing awareness of plants, and Wellington City's contribution to plant conservation.
66. If the security arrangements were sufficiently robust, some of NZ's stunning botanical art works could also be displayed in the Treehouse. These may attract visitors who would not normally visit a botanic garden.

EDUCATION AND INTERPRETATION

67. Section 5.2.1 starts by noting that the plant collections at OWB present unique interpretation and educational opportunities. We agree. The text, however, gives very little detail about these opportunities or their implementation (see section 5.2.2).
68. We are concerned about the significant shift away from the education and interpretation themes in the 2007 Management Plan for OWB. The themes in the 2007 plan included: *"conservation, distinctiveness of New Zealand's plants, plant biogeography, evolution, ecological associations of plants, uses of native plants, botany, horticulture, plant identification, demonstrating the use of native plants in gardens, rongoa Maori and traditional uses of plants."*
69. It is our view that the substance of the 2007 themes should be included in the new Management Plan to provide a framework for initiatives such as the guided tours for Year 13 Biology students on evolutionary processes leading to plant speciation, which were developed by the Otari-Wilton's Bush Trust in 2013.

70. Section 5.2.1 notes that the natural ecosystems (the forests and Kaiwharawhara Stream) are of “special value” because they are “so close to the city”. The interpretation and educational opportunities associated with streams and forests are not unique. They are replicated at other places within and beyond the CBD, including at Zealandia and at the WBG. The latter may be even more accessible for younger educational groups, e.g. 8-11 year olds, and could be combined with a visit to the Children’s Garden.
71. The following table shows the new themes for education and interpretation. The downgrading of the scientific themes at OWB and the expansion of social themes seems to be a consequence of the generic themes.

| Proposed Education and Interpretation Themes | | |
|---|--|---|
| Generic themes Section 3.2.2 | Themes for WBG (Section 4.2) (abbreviated) * | Themes for OWB (section 5.2.1) |
| Plants and people | Plant diversity, its role in sustainable livelihoods and importance to all life on earth | Describing the relationship of all people to the land, their connections to it and how they manage and conserve it. |
| Our cultural and natural heritage | History of gardening and garden design Evolution of a garden (WBG) Use and significance of plants to Maori, including flax collection Stories about historic features, including the observatories | Otari as a place of connection - sites of significance to Maori; historic and contemporary connections between cultures, Roles of Cockayne and Wilton in preservation of bush and development of the plant collections. |
| Plant diversity | Significance and conservation of native forest remnants Characteristics and recognition of different types of plants Scientific and historic interest in the conifer collection and its significance to exotic forestry in NZ Science themes at the observatories | Wilderness stories (natural ecosystems) – ecology and biodiversity both locally as part of Kaiwharawhara catchment, Wellington City and nationally |
| Sustainable living | Cultivation requirements and techniques for plants in Wellington Showcasing sustainable practices to stimulate behavioural change How to live sustainably, including some showcase models (e.g. recycling, composting, green walls, smart energy etc | Plant cultivation stories: the distinctiveness and uniqueness of native plants and their traditional (e.g. rongoa) and horticultural uses. |

72. We urge Council to rewrite section 5.2.1 with a primary focus on the unique interpretation and educational opportunities associated with the plant collections at OWB. This focus would allow for stories about the contributions of the Job and Ellen Wilton, and Leonard Cockayne to the establishment of the collections and the protection of the primary forests.
73. Text in section 3.2 emphasises the importance of clearly identifying which stories to tell, how to tell them, and who to tell them to. We would welcome opportunities to work with Council and the OWB Trust on this re-write.

Nature Trail educational materials

74. We were puzzled by an Implementation Action in section 5.2.2: “Develop to Nature Trail as the main educational trail with interpretive signage, plant labelling of all common trees, and curriculum-based self-guiding material.” There is already an extensive package of well-presented, educational materials about the Nature Trail on Council’s website. It includes self-guiding notes for students to introduce them to the indigenous plants growing at 20 numbered sites. Guide notes for teachers suggest how to prepare for, and manage trips to OWB. It also contains a health and safety risk register. We would encourage Council to interview more teachers and students who have used these materials before investing more funds in revising them. At this stage, we think Council should focus on developing educational materials for use by school groups visiting the Children’s Garden in WBG.
75. Interpretative signage could be designed to diversify the experiences available to children and the public along the Nature Trail, e.g. to introduce non-vascular plants like the giant liverwort in the stream. We don’t see much benefit in merely repeating the information that the children may be carrying. We also see benefit in limiting the signage in the primary forest sections of the Nature Trail so that children can experience Wellington’s original forest without any external intrusions other than the simple steps they are walking on. This may be a unique experience for many of today’s children.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

76. The fragmented structure of the Draft Management Plan makes it very difficult to understand what is proposed for the 90 hectares of forests at OWB and the indigenous forest remnants in the WBG. There are also differences in the management framework for these forests. For example, there are five policies for the forests in the WBG, but only one for the OWB forests. This difference may be attributable to quality of the information that has been available to inform policy development for the management of the WBG indigenous forests, e.g., the report prepared by Forsythe and Blaschke (2008) which was commissioned by the Friends of the Wellington Botanic Gardens.
77. We question the General Objective which requires that all forests are protected and restored. We would argue that “restoration” is not always necessary or desirable, and may not even be possible as climate change advances. (The current intent is to manage the primary and secondary forests as one unit). As one example, we think the remaining 11 hectares of primary forest at OWB should just be “protected” so that the natural ecological processes are allowed to continue. ‘Protection’ allows for the control of weeds, pest animals, and wildfires. Protection guards against harvesting, theft and poaching. “Restoration” is likely to involve adding plants, and/or animals, and/or mulch and/or fertilisers. Leaving light wells open for colonizers may allow new successions to start, whereas filling them with plants to reduce expenditure on weed control may impede natural regeneration processes and change the composition of the communities. We recommend changing the wording of the General Objective to: “Indigenous ecosystems are protected, and some areas of indigenous forest may be restored”.
78. Other changes which may result in a more accessible and consistent planning framework include.
- separating the objectives and policies for the forests from the objectives and policies for cultural heritage.
 - formalizing one or more long-term goals for the forests
 - committing to the control of weedy natives at OWB. The current plan only talks of monitoring their spread. In contrast, the implementation plan for the WBG includes

to “develop and implement a weed control programme that includes current and potential non-local native species”.

- adding a General Policy – to identify areas where natural regeneration processes will be allowed to continue without enhancement or restoration plantings. A policy authorizing the removal of any unauthorized plantings would also be required.
- describing the current make-up of the OWB forests in section 5.3.2. When we look at those forests, we see a mix of forest types; primary forest (11 ha), three planted areas featuring beech, kauri, gymnosperms and some other planted species, and about 80 ha of secondary forests which are regenerating naturally on land that used to be grazed.
- recognising the research and educational value of the secondary forests which show forests at different successional stages of regeneration because grazing ceased at different times
- improving the alignment between the specific policies for WGB and OWB
- ensuring that all key policies are supported by implementation actions. For example, there are three policies for riparian management at OWB but no implementation actions. There are implementation actions to establish monitoring plots in the WBG but not at OWB.
- adding Greater Wellington to section 3.1.5 as a potential source of information about the management of forest ecosystems (they have extensive practical experience in most dimensions of forest management).
- reviewing the need to introduce the term “key native ecosystem” into the management planning framework for the OWB forests. Is this indicative of a gap in the general policies for protection in chapter 3? Should the WGB remnants also be managed as key native ecosystems? What are the implications of using this term, particularly if Greater Wellington is disestablished, or makes further reductions in its funding for pest and weed control at OWBi?
- reviewing the rationale underpinning the policy to establish OWB’s forests as part of the Zealandia halo concept, and clarifying how the policy will be implemented. We think this policy should be replaced by the wording in the 2007 OWB Management Plan, i.e. “provide safe habitat for indigenous flora and wildlife as part of the Kaiwharawhara ecological corridor and catchment”.
- deciding how best to protect the kauri from phytophthora, particularly if the northern kauri forests continue to decline, and human access to them is restricted
- prohibiting the planting of non-native species in the natural or regenerating forest ecosystems. (At one time, Zealandia found it necessary to plant *Banksia integrifolia*, a fast-growing Australian species with weediness tendencies, because the sanctuary’s existing indigenous vegetation was not expected to be able to provide sufficient food in winter for the growing numbers of nectar-feeding birds).
- adding more policy guidance on the processes and criteria for granting approvals for enrichment plantings including that precise records are kept of all interventions. (GPS is not sufficiently accurate for recording enrichment plantings)
- considering allowing the usual ecosourcing policies to be relaxed when setting up the proposed trials for re-establishing podocarps so that seeds can be collected from multiple locations, including places where populations are already surviving stronger winds and higher temperatures. (future-proofing principles for selecting trees for the WBG are based on a 3-5 degree upward temperature shift)

- adding policy guidance on how decisions will be made on proposals to introduce fauna into OWB. As OWB is a living plant museum, our expectation is that any translocations will benefit plants. As an example, introducing bats and geckos with roles in pollination may enhance natural regeneration of some plant species within the gardens and bush areas.

Scientific Advisory Group

79. The Implementation Plan for the 2007 Management Plan for OWB included establishing an advisory group of experts to offer advice on ecological management, including forest health monitoring, enhancement, and wildlife habitat restoration. There is nothing similar in the Draft Management Plan. The policy in section 3.4.8 (Research and Education) shows that that Council intends to rely on partnerships and communication networks involving Council, research organisations and interested community groups for its scientific advice. This contrasts with the emerging trend for some national agencies to employ scientific advisors at a very senior level, e.g., the Prime Minister and the Secretary of Education both have scientific advisors.
80. We recommend adding a policy to section 3.1.5 to establish an advisory group of experts to offer advice and leadership on ecological management. The need is greater at OWB than WBG, but a policy in chapter 3 would cover both gardens.
81. A scientific advisory group could provide scientific advice to Council and garden managers on topics and tasks such as:
- drawing up the terms of reference for one or more research projects that would give similar levels of information about the OWB forests as is available for the WBG forest remnants from the reports prepared by Forsyth and Blaschke
 - providing advice on monitoring programmes, starting with identifying the number, location and distribution of sites for permanent monitoring plots in both gardens
 - identifying research priorities and seeking support from research institutes, e.g. the impact of increasing bird populations on the Kaiwharawhara catchment; the relative effectiveness of natural regeneration and enrichment planting in re-establishing podocarps; unexpected pollinators at OWB
 - supporting bids by regional councils and DOC for biocontrol of weeds, e.g., the two weevils that may reduce the rate of spread of *Berberis darwinii*.
 - advising on the scientific value of the successional stages evident in the regenerating forests at OWB, and developing a nomenclature for their identification.

PLANT SALES

82. A policy in section 8.5.4 refers to continuing to hold promotional open days when practical as a way of making native plants and seeds, and in particular, those of uncommon species available to the public.
83. We suggest that Council develop a policy to guide the selection of plants for sale at Otari's annual Open Day. Components of the policy could include:
- a general description of plants which can be sold, e.g. native species from anywhere in New Zealand that are likely to survive in gardens or on other land in the wider Wellington area, including private wetlands
 - plants which should not be sold, e.g. those known to be weedy in Wellington (*Hoheria populnea*, *Pittosporum crassifolium*, *P. ralphii*, *Pseudopanax lessonii*, karaka), and hybrids or cultivars of native species that pose actual or potential risks to indigenous ecosystems in the city.

REFERENCES AND RECOMMENDED READING

84. The Draft Management Plan (page 191) contained only two references for OWB (two previous management plans). Appendix 3 to this submission contains additional references, many of which come from the Wellington Botanical Society's Journal. Others include papers about research conducted at OWB or the WBG.

HISTORY OF OWB

85. We have updated and corrected the history of the kauri grove at OWB. This is presented in Appendix 4.

CONCLUSION AND FUNDING

86. Under the current Long Term Plan (2012-2022), Council allocated very little funding for developments at the Botanic Gardens.
87. Some Councillors may recall the Society's submission on the Annual Plan (2013/14) when Council decided to develop an integrated management plan for all four gardens. We pointed out the extensive resource that had already been invested developing plans for OWB, and the limited investment in the implementation of those plans.
88. We have identified our top three priorities (see paragraph 2). We urge the Environment Committee to commit funding to their implementation in the first triennium of the next Long Term Plan.

APPENDIX 1: FEEDBACK FROM INTERNATIONAL VISITORS ABOUT TOURS AT OTARI

International visitors who participate in the tours provided by volunteer guides at OWB say the tours are first rate. As a recent example: the following unsolicited praise was received from the Southern World New Zealand following the first visit of the Virtuosa Voyager Club on the Cunard Line's Queen Victoria on 10 March 2014.

"Many thanks to you and your guides for your great organisation & care of our clients yesterday; it is much appreciated. We have received excellent feedback with comments such as – a 'most outstanding & memorable day'; it appears they all enjoyed themselves. Look forward to sending you other groups in the future. I'm quite confident that Virtuoso will select this outing for a number of their groups on visiting cruise ships next year after the fabulous feedback from their guests; fingers crossed"

This group was among about 600 international visitors who participated in these tours in 2013/14. Their enthusiasm has the potential to raise awareness of OWB when they return home. Word-of-mouth recommendations can be very influential.

Many tour groups visit Zealandia and OWB as part of the same tour. These relationships are working well for both parties and leading to new opportunities. ID Tours is sufficiently confident with the combined Zealandia/Otari tour they organise for the Princess Line cruise ships, that they will offer this tour to passengers on the French Compagnie du Ponant's luxury liner L'Austral in January 2015. This will be the first time that Otari guides will provide tours in a foreign language.

Guided tours also work for younger audiences. The following box captures a sample of the comments from a newly-arrived group of Fullbright scholars who visited OWB as part of their induction programme.

"Ah! We needed this great walk! The bush was beautiful, and the tour was informative."

"Wonderfully knowledgeable tour guides, a nice walk, and a great introduction to what we'll be seeing a lot of as we explore the North Island."

"Beautiful place. Great to walk around with the really knowledgeable guides who were able to answer all of our questions."

"The guides at Otari were very knowledgeable and friendly, and the way they divided up the group into smaller groups made our time there more manageable and educational. Plus, since the forests and native species are such a big thing in NZ, it was great to get out and experience some of it."

"I really loved walking around the Bush and learning about the flora there from our guide."

"Our guide was supremely knowledgeable and very enthusiastic about plants and the history of the area. I left the Bush feeling as though I had a better understanding and appreciation of NZ native flora."

"I especially liked seeing the 800 year old Rimu tree - it was amazing to think that the tree was likely a sapling when the Maori people first arrived in New Zealand!"

APPENDIX 2: NEW ZEALAND GARDEN WINS GOLD AT CHELSEA FLOWER SHOW

5:00 AM Wednesday May 26, 2004

LONDON - New Zealand won gold in what has been dubbed the Olympics of gardening at the Chelsea Flower Show yesterday.

Garden sponsor Tourism New Zealand chief executive George Hickton was woken at 7am by a staff member who visited the garden to find an award had been placed at it overnight. Only five golds are awarded by the show's organiser, the Royal Horticultural Society.

"It's fantastic," said Mr Hickton, who had thought the garden would possibly get a minor award or commendation. "We didn't get into it for the awards but this is really icing on the cake." "It's reasonably unprecedented to get a gold first time up," Mr Hickton said. "It's very much been a homegrown job and we won a gold against the enormous competition and investment that some people have put in," he said. "The [cost of the] ones around us ... go upward from £300,000 (\$885,000). One garden was reported to cost £750,000."

Tourism NZ put in \$200,000. Tourism bodies in Taupo, Rotorua and Auckland put in \$100,000, \$30,000 and \$20,000 respectively, with the help of local tourism operators. Air New Zealand has supported the show with flights and staff.

The native bush garden with Maori carvings and a misty hot pool stands out among the more formal and traditional gardens featuring at the 142-year-old event and has proved a favourite with the media.

On Monday the Queen made it the first stop of her tour of a selection of the exhibits. She stayed for about five minutes before moving on to the next garden.

After Royal Horticultural Society members have had the chance to see the gardens, the show will be open to the public for three days. All 157,000 tickets have sold.

About 600 exhibitors are participating in the show, the 82nd to be held at the Royal Hospital grounds. The show features 23 show gardens, eight chic gardens, nine courtyard gardens, four city gardens, eight Sunflower Street gardens and more than 100 floral exhibitions. Exhibits are judged before the show opens, and awarded Gold, Silver-Gilt, Silver and Bronze Medals.

As well as sponsoring the garden, Tourism NZ and Air New Zealand have launched a \$300,000 advertising campaign, which has made an impact, particularly at Sloane Square stations, which are plastered with posters and decorated with live plants.

APPENDIX 3: REFERENCES AND RECOMMENDED READING

We offer the following list of additional references for your consideration.

- Boffa Miskell Ltd. 1998: Interpreting Otari Native Botanical Gardens, Interpretation Strategy. Report prepared for the Wellington City Council.
- Cockayne, L.A. 1932: Scheme for the Development and Arrangement for the Otari Open-Air Native Plant Museum and Other Matters Connected Therewith, Wellington City Council.
- Druce, A.P. 1953: Otari Rock Garden. Wellington Bot. Soc. Bulletin 26.
- Harper, M.A., Harper J.F. 2010: Otari and Taputeranga bioblitzes: diatoms – microscopic algae. Wellington Botanical Society Bulletin 52: 53-63.
- Lewington, R.J. 2009: Paths and Location Names used in the Otari Open-Air Native Plant Museum 1926-1925, Otari Wilton's Bush Trust.
- Lewington, R.J. 2010: More Recent History of Otari Wilton's Bush: Transcript of a 2003 talk by Lindsay Pool. Wellington Botanical Society Bulletin 52: 3-9.
- Lewington, R.J., West C. 2011 History of kauri in Otari-Wilton's Bush, Wellington Botanical Society Bulletin 53.
- Lewington, R.J., West C. 2008: Otari Bioblitz: detailing vascular plants, mosses and liverworts. Wellington Botanical Society Bulletin 51:5-23.
- Martin, Margaret M. 1938: The Otari Open-Air Native Plant Museum. Journal of the NZ Institute of Horticulture, Vol. 8 no. 237-44.
- Mason, R., Sainsbury, G. O. K., Hodgson, E .A. 1941. Mosses and Liverworts of Wiltons Bush, Wellington. Botany Division , DSIR
- Mole, R.H. 1967. Guide List to Plants: The Otari Open-Air Native Plant Museum, Wellington, New Zealand 1967
- Mole, R.H. Guide List to Plants:The Otari Open-Air Native Plant Museum Second edition, Wellington City Council Parks Department.
- Reid, J. S. 1985 Changes Over 50 Years in a Native Forest Quadrant, Wellington Bot. Soc. Bulletin 42: 41-57.
- - (Refers also to his first description in his thesis of 1932-1934)
- Reid, J.S. 1989; Otari Path Names Commemorate Early Botanists. Wellington Bot. Soc. Bulletin 45:48-52
- Reid, J.S. 1989: Bracken fern and Scrub communities in Otari Reserve, re-observed after fifty years. Wellington Bot. Soc. Bulletin 45:100-115.
- Rewi, E. 2013: Making Gardens meaningful: Linking activities to vision at the Botanical Gardens of Wellington A report submitted in part fulfillment of the requirements for the RBG Kew International Diploma in Botanic Garden Management.

- Te Mohoao (Waugh, S., Corkill S., Wylie, C.) 2008: Proposals for Interpretative Services at Otari-Wilton's Bush.
- Thomson, A.D. 1983: The Life and Correspondence of Leonard Cockayne. Botany Division DSIR, Christchurch.

Much of the historic information in the draft management plan derives from *Otari Gardeners Diaries*.

1 January 1933 – 12 August 1946, written by Andy McKay.

26 June 1947 – 31 December 1960, written by Walter Brockie.

29 October 1962 – 31 December 1967, written by Ray Mole.

Records of research activity are generally not published. Much of this research is carried out by students from Victoria University. The following are held in the Curators' Files:

- Marjot, Y.T. Sixty years of change in a forest Reserve: Otari Plant Museum, Wilton, Wellington. M.Sc. Victoria University of Wellington.
- 4 May 2002 Mozzie Hunter Climbs into his Work. Brazilian PhD student doing research.
- 2004 Victoria University, Soil Analysis - Report on results of 2004 lab classes' work at Otari.

Additional references for the Wellington Botanic Garden list

- Buchanan, John. *Notes on the Colonial Botanic Garden, Wellington and its Flora*. 1875. Unpublished.
- Cranshaw, Helen. *Study of the Vegetation in the Seven Native Bush Remnants in the Wellington Botanic Garden*. August 1992.
- Isthmus Group. Draft Landscape Development Plan for the Wellington Botanical Garden. 2000.
- Mitcalfe, B. and Horne. J.C. (2003, revised 2005). *A Botanical Survey of the Indigenous Forest Remnants in Wellington Botanic Garden, Glenmore Street, Wellington*. A report commissioned by the Friends of Wellington Botanic Garden Inc.
- Mitcalfe, B. and Horne. J.C. *Wellington Botanic Garden's Native Forest Areas*. In Friends of Wellington Botanic Garden newsletter March 2014.
- Myers, Shona C. *Native Forest Remnants of Wellington City. A Survey of Five Sites*. Biological Resources Centre, DSIR. June 1985.

APPENDIX 4: UPDATED REPORT ON KAURI GROVE (for page 174)

This will be sent separately.

Submission by

The Friends of the Wellington Botanic Garden
P O Box 28 065
Wellington 6012

Draft Management Plan for the Wellington Botanic Garden

The Friends of the Wellington Botanic Garden supports and commends the draft plan in general terms. It presents a logical and clear vision for the future development and management of the Garden. The Garden is fortunate having dedicated, experienced and knowledgeable staff, and is well placed to move into the next phase of its development.

Funding

One significant issue for us, however, is the ability to implement all aspects of the plan. The main issue controlling this is outside the Garden managements' control, and that is the availability of sufficient funding. This aspect is not specified in the document, although may be implied.

It has been obvious for some time that financial constraints have impacted on the operation of the Garden. The increasing use of volunteer gardeners is one sign. Another was that because of staff shortages, the Butterfly Garden was to be eliminated and to ensure its continuance the Friends have provided financial assistance and voluntary labour in order to retain it.

The last Annual Plan shows net expenditure on the Botanic Garden of \$4,382,000. With the stated 1.2 million visitors, the 'cost' per visitor is \$3.62. This compares with Zealandia, for example, receiving \$700,000 from the Council (2013-14 Annual Report) funding with 88,400 visitors, or \$7.82 per visitor. There needs to be equity in funding. It is also likely that increased funding and development of the Garden will give a greater return in visitor numbers and business return throughout the city, provided its character can be maintained, which needs to be recognised. There needs to be a clear commitment to continued and adequate funding during the 10 year plan life if the plan is to be able to fully implemented.

150 years Anniversary

The Garden was established in October 1868 with the passing of the PUBLIC DOMAINS ACTS EXTENSION ACT 1868 and formal gazetting of the '13 acre reserve' (the Main Garden) with the actual management arrangement with the NZ Institute formalised 13 months later. The Management Plan seems to suggest the establishment was in 1869, but this was the date its management was codified. See attached notes and copy of the establishment Act.

The significance of this is that in four years the Garden will reach its **150th ANNIVERSARY**, something the Garden, the Wellington City Council and the citizens should celebrate. This milestone is worth celebrating, and the Management Plan should outline how this is to be recognised. While it is four years away, there needs to be time to make suitable

arrangements, and the Friends are willing to be involved in this event.

Cable Car precinct

In recent years visitors from cruise ships from overseas have been arriving in increasing numbers, and that trend is likely to continue. The Friends have provided a meet and greet service at the Cable Car entrance for 16 years; over the last 2 years in association with the Wellington City Ambassadors. The Friends provided a shelter for the use of hosts at the Cable Car entrance. The Draft Management Plan provides for the removal of the Bucket tree behind the existing shelter, and there is a planned upgrade of the whole Cable Car precinct. In view of the value of this service expressed by visitors, the replacement of the shelter is important if we are to continue to provide this service. It has been suggested by guides and hosts that a shelter behind the existing map board would be desirable, with the map on the external wall, and preferably with a canopy to provide shelter from sun and rain. It would be appropriate for this or other suitable arrangements to be included in the plan.

We are aware of the difficulties with the ‘bucket tree’ and note its planned removal. It is, however, a garden iconic feature known to many visitors who comment favourably when they see it, and it would be worth retaining if possible for that reason, or a replacement in an appropriate area. If removal is inevitable (Section 4.1.1), the stump could be preserved under a heavy translucent acrylic table cover that would enable visitors to see the age and structure of the former tree. This would provide an educational experience, and a table currently lacking in this high social and recreational value area that is the major entry point to the Garden. Seating could be added or possibly crafted from some of the low lateral branches. A translucent ‘umbrella’ similar to those provided to shelter pedestrians at intersections in the city could be installed over the table, and in wet weather could be used by hosts and guides greeting and directing visitors at the entrance. The installation would contribute to the aim of ‘improving visitor experience.’

Guides

The plan provides emphasis on “**CONNECTING PEOPLE WITH PLANTS AND THE ENVIRONMENT – PLANT COLLECTIONS, EDUCATION AND AWARENESS**”. The Friends, through their volunteer guides and hosts, are well placed to play an important role in this process, especially with the more specific garden orientated aspects. They have been well supported by the Garden management, but the attracting new guides in particular is of increasing concern, and ongoing assistance in this area will be important over the planning period.

In addition to the Main Garden, the Friends have also provided guides for the Truby King Garden when required.

Native bush areas

The Garden has an important area of native forest, of historical significance. It also has many old historic exotic trees. In New Zealand's early history many large estates had significant plantings such as oaks, cedars, redwoods, magnolias etc. With the subdivision of many of these estates, most of the specimen trees have been lost, with people losing many opportunities to experience them. The Garden now provides one of the few places where

such important trees can be seen in all their splendour. We believe it is important that the Garden maintain such collections for future generations, with a widened range of species introduced where possible. An appropriate balance between the indigenous and exotic collections is, we believe, important.

Bird damage

Some trees in the Garden have, over recent years, been damaged by the ravages of the introduced kaka, many of the significant specimens seriously affected, and in some instances have died. With numbers of these birds increasing there is a need to investigate how the damage can be mitigated, and this issue needs to be addressed in the Management Plan if the collections are to be maintained, and the long term development of the Garden achieved.

Begonia House Lilly

One of the features of the Begonia House has been the Victoria Lilly. Unfortunately it has recently died, and finding a replacement should be treated as a matter of urgency as it is a plant that always interests visitors. .

Truby King Garden

The Friends guides run tours at the **Truby King Garden** at Melrose. This is an unappreciated garden. A major issue is the lack of parking, especially for buses, and addressing this matter will be a major factor in securing increased visitation. While allowing parking on the adjoining Town Belt Reserve would generally not be accepted, some encroachment over this area would allow more visitors, and would also facilitate easier access to the Town Belt from this property. The benefits from this would appear to more than mitigate the loss of a small area of the Town Belt, and appears to be a logical resolution.

Children's Teaching Garden

The proposed Children's Teaching Garden is an excellent education and awareness initiative. Energy - both wood and bio fuels - and carbon absorption could be added to the proposed focus on principal plant services (food, fibre, construction and medicine), section 4.2.

Treehouse

Consideration could be given to promoting the renovated Treehouse as a venue for small stand-up social events, with charges set to recover costs and make a contribution to fund-raising for the Garden. (Section 4.2, The Treehouse)

Frank Wilson
President
Friends of the Wellington Botanic Garden

May 2014

NOTES ON ESTABLISHMENT DATE OF GARDEN

From:

THE BOTANIC GARDEN WELLINGTON
A NEW ZEALAND HISTORY 1840-1987
 WINSOME SHEPHERD & WALTER COOK
 Pages 23 to 27


Land Gazetting

“..... Hector had been asked to inspect the site for the Garden in 1867 just at the time when a Crown Grant was being discussed. However with the land for the Botanic Reserve coming under the Public Domains Act,⁽³⁵⁾ it was now considered to be a Crown Domain subject to the provisions of the PUBLIC DOMAINS ACTS EXTENSION ACT 1868” (COPY ATTACHED). “Eleven days after the legislation was passed, the Governor, on 31 October 1868, delegated his authority under the Act to James Hector Esq. M.D. Manager of Geological Survey”.⁽³⁶⁾

Reserve management

“The Premier Mr. Stafford noted "The establishment of a Central Depot for botanical and acclimatisating purposes would form a very useful nucleus where plants and animals could be supplied to all parts of New Zealand and would I think be supported by a **very legitimate application of Colonial funds**".^{<40>} Hector required more help in trying to develop the Garden than that available to him under the Domains Act or through his office at the Geological Survey. To allow for this it was thought a special Parliamentary act was required.” (NOTE: *Hector, as an individual, did not have access to public money to develop the garden, and required an organisation to hold management responsibility – the New Zealand Institute*). “Therefore in 1869 a Bill entitled "An Act to establish and regulate an Institution called the Botanic Garden of Wellington" was presented to Parliament by Mr. Alfred Ludlam”. (November 1869) giving management responsibility to the NZ Institute from that date, some 13 months after the 31 October 1868 establishment of the Botanic Reserve. This later date is widely taken as the establishment date of the Garden, but the Act of 1868 clearly records it was established then, and that Sir James Hector tried to develop the Garden but was limited by the lack of finance.

With the 150th Anniversary of the Garden in 2018, the date 31 October 2018 is clearly the appropriate one to celebrate that event.



A Voice for Heritage

BOTANIC GARDENS DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN: SUBMISSION BY HISTORIC PLACES
WELLINGTON

Historic Places Wellington Incorporated (HPW) was formed in 2011, in affiliation with the national organisation Historic Places Aotearoa Inc., to take over the role of the Wellington Branch Committee of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust which has been disestablished. The principal objects of HPW are to promote the identification, protection and conservation of historic places in the Wellington region for the benefit of those communities and the general public, and to inform, advise and educate the public on the significance of the region's historic places.

All four gardens covered by the plan are either listed as Heritage Areas or contain listed heritage buildings in the Wellington City District Plan. Two of them are on the Register of Heritage New Zealand as historic areas. This submission comments particularly on proposals relating to built heritage.

Chapter 3 General Objectives and Policies. 3.4 Cultural and Natural Heritage p.31

We recommend that Section 3.4 be rewritten to make the key points clearer. The third paragraph should be placed first as it gives the key statement on what constitutes heritage in the gardens context. The present second paragraph should remain as the second, followed by the present fourth. The first paragraph seems redundant. Is the quotation from an authoritative source? If it is retained, it should be referenced; if not it should be omitted.

The fourth paragraph under heading 3.4 inaccurately describes the gardens' heritage status as only three are listed as Heritage Areas in the Wellington City District Plan and only two are registered as historic areas under the Historic Places Act 1993. We suggest this paragraph is checked and corrected.

Section 3.4.1 should be strengthened by rewording the first point as follows:

Historic buildings and sites, and traditional and wahi tapu sites within the gardens will be protected and managed according to recognised conservation principles and policies. Consultation with Heritage New Zealand and mana whenua will be important in implementing this policy.

Chapter 4 Wellington Botanic Garden. 4.3.1 Policies – Historic & Cultural Features p.49

This section lists the three historic features which have been singled out for heritage listing but notes the need also to define other historic features which may not warrant individual listing but in combination tell the story of the garden's development. We support this aim as well as the rather generalised first policy on historic features.

One area that warrants some attention is the attractive grouping of the old stables and mess room below the Tree House. Built in 1914 in the then popular English Arts and Crafts style, they have been described as among the most successful buildings in the gardens.¹

While obviously useful now as store rooms, they should be opened up to the public to a greater degree, so that they provide interpretive comment on the historical development of the early garden, including the use of horses. At the very least there should be some external signage explaining their past use as this would be of interest to visitors.

The Overseer's House above the Rose Garden is the oldest building still extant. It should be kept as clear as possible from foliage so that its unusual architectural feature of the double roof and its deliberately-designed link to the formal garden can be seen more easily.

Chapter 5 Otari-Wilton's Bush 5.3.1 Policies – Cultural and Natural Heritage p.73

The only significant built heritage relating to this area is the privately owned Wilton Farmhouse and Outbuildings that already have appropriate protection. We have no problems with the changes proposed for this garden including adaptation of the Curator's house.

Chapter 6 Bolton Street Memorial Park.

This chapter contains considerable material of historic interest reflecting the importance of the cemetery as a heritage site. **Section 1** [sic] proposes a name change. We support strongly this proposal to revert to the previous name of Bolton Street Cemetery as this describes the Park's function and its previous history.

6.2.4 Policies – Heritage Buildings p 91

The first policy on the Sexton's cottage is inadequate in view of the importance of this building which has recently been reregistered by Heritage New Zealand as Category I. It is disappointing that the Council feels its use as short term accommodation is a desirable use for this unusual and centrally located heritage cottage. We notice that the only other registered sexton's cottage, the one in Dunedin's Northern Cemetery, is in public use, thanks to an arrangement between the Dunedin City Council and the Southern Heritage Trust, an organisation with similar aims to our own. The Wellington Sexton's cottage could emulate the Dunedin example by using it as a base for heritage work, especially for the many voluntary organisations in the city. We should like the policy to drop the reference to short-term accommodation and to be more imaginative about future use. A possible rewording of this policy could be: "the Sexton's Cottage shall be managed according to the conservation plan and the Council should look at other ways of using the cottage particularly ones that would open it up more to the public and enhance heritage work in the city".

¹ *The Botanic Garden Wellington* by Shepherd and Cook, 1988.

Chapter 7 Truby King Park. 7.1 The Garden, 7.2 The House and Mausoleum p.99f

The historic character of the garden, the house and the mausoleum are well described in this chapter. So are the difficulties of finding a use for this property which will preserve the important elements. We support the policies proposed which provide a cautious and pragmatic way forward. One key part is the review of the conservation plan to ensure that adaptation of the house does not involve significant heritage loss (policy 4 in 7.2.1). We assume that such a review will give priority to the views of the conservation architect and other heritage experts.

The adjacent property which houses the old Karitane Maternity Hospital is now in private hands. It is an integral part of the Truby King Park grouping, as shown by Heritage New Zealand's listing, and - as the Draft Plan states - its gardens are part of the Park landscape. However it appears to have no particular protection under the Council's heritage listing, the gardens are overgrown and the building is closed, unused and red-stickered. This spectacular site and historically important building, as well as the Truby King designed garden requires some special attention by the Council.

Appendix 2 Historic Outlines – Otari-Wilton's Bush

The Otari-Wilton's Bush section needs editing and some statements need checking. In particular:

- There are uncompleted cross-references throughout
- Footnotes are inconsistent and in some cases incomplete
- There are several references to a Witton family. This may be a mistake, but if not there should be some explanation of the similarity to the Wilton name.

Botanic Gardens Management Plan

Robert Stephens

Thank you for the opportunity for commenting upon the Draft Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington. It is useful to have forward thinking about these four parks, and their future development. In general I am supportive of the draft, especially the emphasis given to environmental education and conservation leadership as well as the plans to showcase Wellington as an eco-city. However, many of the details of how the management plan will be implemented and operated are missing. These issues need clarification, or further work to be done on the proposal before it can be fully accepted.

The main issue is one of management and governance, and these need to be explained in the final document. However:

- Given that each Park has its own distinctive features and objectives, any Management Plan must take these separate features and objectives into consideration.
- The actual governance structure does not seem to be identified in the document: what organisational structure will be providing an oversight of the whole plan so that the development of the parks can occur in an integrated fashion? Presumably this is to be the Parks and Gardens section of WCC.
- If the Parks and Gardens section of WCC does provide this oversight, where will be the actual management be located, and with what responsibilities.
- Will each garden have its own manager, or management board, and what degree of autonomy and freedom will they have to operate at the overall park level, and individual aspects of each park;
- Or are all four gardens to be governed by the same body, with the manager of each park having limited autonomy?

Until this management and governance structure is clearly shown, it is hard to determine the outcome for the proposed management plan. This structure is especially important as each park has its own 'networks' such as the Friends of the Botanic Garden and the Truby King Park Trust etc. Decisions need to be made as to their role vis-a-vis the new management structure, in addition to taking account of their separate roles in achieving these objectives.

The Management Plan should also:

- Be linked into plans for development of the overall Town Belt, and outer Town Belt.
- Management of the four gardens should include recreational values as well as the environmental education and conservation leadership roles.

- The marketing strategy should indicate that these parks are not just created in isolation, but form part of a much bigger area for the environment. Correctly the document specifically mentions Zealandia, but not the Town Belt. The Zoo has quite a different purpose, and should be managed separately..
- However, the marketing strategy could go much further, indicating how, for example, Truby King Park links into the Town Belt, and Otari links with Johnsons Hill, Karori Cemetery and Trelisick Park.
- For each of the Gardens there is limited car parking – how to provide additional parking, or good public transport access is required in the final document - this is the kind of detail that a management plan needs to consider.
- The strategy emphasises ‘education and conservation messages’, which is excellent, but again conflicts can easily enter into achieving this goal. The Botanic Gardens have several roles – providing the normal flora displays, keeping the historic pine trees, and retaining the native bush area around the Pukatea Stream. The conservation aspect implies increasing emphasis on New Zealand, especially Wellington Region, species: an aspect I fully endorse. This would entail the removal of some non-native species that are effectively labelled as pest weeds – for example agopanthus, and wilding pines - with those being replaced by Wellington-sourced native plants.
- As Truby King is very underdeveloped at present, emphasis should be placed on native, Wellington-based plants as the park is developed. This development of native plants can then be extended into the surrounding Town Belt as the ageing pine trees are removed (or are blown down).
- The partnering with external funders is a good aim, but this external funding must accord with the conservation and education criteria, rather than their own specific agenda.
- The proposed ‘system of rules’ approach needs to be clearly explained – the plan is silent on what would be covered in this system of rules. The rules may well reduce the autonomy of the separate management of each park, and limit the manager’s ability to continue their own different focus. The Management Plan needs to specify who establishes those rules, stating what the rules are, and how they are going to be developed, along with a consultation process for the development of those rules.
- What organisation is going to have the role of implementing and monitoring those rules?

I have seen reference to a recent study that shows that parks need to multi-purpose if they are to be of maximum value in achieving all the objectives of a park, rather than each park having a single focus. For example, rather than just providing sports fields, for example (Anderson Park), there should be related facilities for children – so that parents etc. can bring children along to games - (the children’s playground in the Botanical Gardens is quite a distance from the sports field), and

a place to walk (the path behind the Dell). In other words, a more holistic approach in terms of objectives and values need to be taken in terms of each Park.

The objectives of the four Parks could thus be widened to incorporate recreational (and health) values, as well as show-casing the Parks for international and out-of-town New Zealand visitors. Most people go to the gardens, especially the Botanic and Otari, for recreation purposes, including events such as Shakespeare in the Dell, or the free concerts at the Rotunda. In many ways the planned management structure should be seen as mechanism to achieve that recreational purpose, with the recreational experience being best enhanced through the development of native flora (and fauna through the increased eradication of pests and thus the overflow of bird life from Zealandia) as well as these specific events.

Most people stay on the main paths – the circular walk in Otari or the trip to the duck-pond in the Botanic Gardens. The proposed management structure is silent on the methods to use to expand the objectives of the environment education and conservation experience, as well as the objective of the recreational experience, through encouragement of use of the less well-known paths.

In terms of Otari-Wilton's Bush, the basic objectives and proposals are good. However the car parking is limited, and public transport is limited for access to Otari and Truby King, especially if the gardens are to have greater usage. The link with Zealandia is sensible, but equally the links to Johnson's Hill, the Skyline and Trelisick Park are of equal value to provide these botanic and fauna corridors. I would like to see the area of Otari be expanded to include at least Johnson's Hill to ensure that development.

Truby King Park is hardly known to Wellingtonians, and there are no signs that point to it at present. The area is underdeveloped, and its development should be undertaken on the basis of native plants. The area should be gradually extended north so that more of the Town Belt has the specific objective of environmental education. As a query, is the Truby King house suitable for conferences?

In summary, the main issue for the Management Plan is the actual governance structure, and how that will take account of the different objectives and functions of the four gardens.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to make a submission.

Bob Stephens
Senior Research Associate
Institute of Governance and Public Policy
Victoria University of Wellington.

Draft Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington

April 2014

Submission from Rachel Brown, 6 Easdale Street Wellington 6012

Email: rsb@xtra.co.nz

I am making a submission as an individual. I do not want to make an oral submission.

I have noted the five questions provided for submissions on the draft Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington but the question that interests me most are the questions around "is there anything you feel has not been adequately covered by this plan" and 'are there any other major changes you think should be included". Also my main focus is the Wellington Botanical Garden (including Anderson Park)

1. My comments relate solely to the Wellington Botanical Garden (including Anderson Park).
2. The plan related to the Wellington Botanical Garden (including Anderson Park) seems to not include commuters and purposeful walkers. As so much effort by the Wellington City Council is being put into cyclists, evidenced by the intention to spend more than a million dollars on a cycle way between the city and Island Bay, I am unclear why pedestrians are not having such similar amounts of money spent on them. I can think of a number of places where money such as a million dollars would be commuting to work by walking a shorter route.
3. In section 4.2 Education Awareness of this plan (page 46) the sustainable living section relates omits walking as a way of living sustainably.
4. In the first section on page 41 the geography of the botanic garden is described without highlighting that the botanic garden has excellent paths for providing direct walking paths from nearby suburbs (particularly Northland and Kelburn) to the Parliament end of town or Thorndon up to the university. There is some acknowledgement on page 49 of the plan that a green link has been created when it notes that '[o]n its eastern side, redevelopment of the roadway with a pedestrian route combined with structural planting has created a green link between the Botanic Garden and Bolton Street Memorial Park'. This area is now pleasanter to walk along. However actually I regret the loss of the ability to walk diagonally across Anderson Park which was taken away some years ago now!

5. On page 57 the plan notes that ‘a network of tracks shall be provided to enable visitors to experience and use the gardens – taking them through the collections and heritage features’. This is under the heading ‘Policies – circulation, orientation and way finding signage’. The use of the word “visitor” seems to mean the person who has deliberately come to the gardens for a wander around the garden for the length of time that they have for their leisure and does not cater for the person walking with a purpose to get to where they want to get to in the shortest possible time and the Botanic Gardens offer the paths. Tighter definitions of who the users of the gardens are needed eg visitor, commuting walker etc. Even the visitor could be broken down more for example visitor with under 5s, visitor in a wheelchair, etc
6. AS part of section 4.4.2 no mention of improving walking for commuters is made. For example the very worn grass path up the hill past the Henry Moore sculpture shows the path wanted by walkers/commuters to go up to the university, and it is not the tarmacked path where the art steps Body to Soul is but is actually the shortest way up the hill.
7. I live in Easdale Street and have done for more than 40 years. Whenever I am in my street gardening or unpacking the car etc etc I am most interested in the number of people who come down the street sort of purposefully as they see the Seddon memorial and so assume they will get to the gardens but they don’t. They get half way down, they look ahead and see no way of getting to it! Neither is there any signage to tell them how to get to the gardens.
8. Two things could be done to remove this disappointment.
 - a) First a sign/plaque be put into the footpath at the end of Easdale Street highlighting that walkers need to go up to Kinross Street to get through to Anderson Park. I do ask people who come down the street and find disappointment to talk to the council to improve the signage at the beginning of Easdale Street.
 - b) The second is a much more radical proposal and would require money which if this management plan considered purposeful walkers/commuting walkers is that land is purchased from both 12 and 13 Easdale for a set of stairs up to the Seddon memorial thus providing a shortcut through to Anderson Park. Think how many minutes would be saved over a year by the regular commuters who currently need to walk along Kinross Street. If required to allay nearby residents in Easdale Street concerns, gates could be installed that are locked top and bottom between 8 pm and 7 am.
9. Currently a very few minutes are trying to be saved by building the Basin Flyover yet a set of stairs between the end of Easdale Street and the Seddon memorial would save minutes too.

10. I am interested that this draft management plan is not canvassing the environment particularly the residential area around the Botanic Gardens such as making new paths that meet the needs of walkers, parking restrictions in the area both for residents and for “visitors” to the gardens, placement of bus stops.
11. When it comes to bus stops – a most useful bus stop for people in the Bolton Street area was the stop half way along Bowen Street beside the newly renovated steps that came up to the cricket pavilion– and putting this bus stop back would be great especially now the steps have been repaired.
12. In the plan page 58 mentions local walkers and runners who ‘complete circular routes’, but not commuters or purposeful walkers going through the Botanical Gardens.
13. The plan also does not take into account working with NZTA to reduce the motorway noise when in the Bolton Street Cemetery. In Auckland NZTA has installed Perspex looking noise bafflement as the motorway comes out of the new tunnel heading to the bridge. Wellington City Council should also push for such noise reduction strategies for the Wellington motorway.
14. I do agree that the name of the cemetery should return to Bolton Street Cemetery.
15. I want to conclude by reinforcing that the botanical gardens are a great asset to Wellington.

J Chris Horne
28 Kaihuia Street
Wellington 6012
Ph: 04 475-7025; Fax: 04 475-7253
E-mail: jchorne@paradise.net.nz

Barbara Mitcalfe
15 Boundary Road
Wellington 6012
Ph/Fax: 04 475-7149
E-mail: bmitcalfe@clear.net.nz

2 June 2014

Botanic Gardens Plan
Parks and Gardens (REPL01)
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
WELLINGTON 6140

SUBMISSION: Botanic Gardens of Wellington draft management plan – April 2014

To whom it may concern

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the document.

We would like to speak in support of this submission, and may wish to add comments at the hearing.

As contractors in 2002-2003 to the Friends of Wellington Botanic Garden, we made a botanical survey of the five ecologically significant, historically important, native forest areas in the Botanic Garden. Our report was completed in 2003, and revised in 2005. It is referred to in footnote 17 on page 55 of the draft management plan. If requested, the Friends may grant permission for the report to be cited in the “References and Recommended Reading” section of the final plan.

In this submission, we follow the system of headings and numbering used in the document.

4.2 *Education and Awareness*

Plants and people

We support the theme.

Recommendations:

- ✧ The proposed Children's Garden includes plantings of foods such as kōkihi / NZ spinach.
- ✧ The proposed Children's Garden includes a crawl-through, “micro-trail”, such as at Shanks' Bush, Papatowai, The Catlins. The site, owned by the Papatowai Heritage Trust, is protected by a QEII National Trust Open Space Covenant. Ilona Keenan suggested the idea to Fergus Sutherland, who implemented it. For further information, Google ParksVictoria.

Our cultural and natural heritage

We support the third bullet point.

Recommendations:

- ✧ Plants of use and significance to Māori include food sources such as kōkihi / NZ spinach, rongoā purposes such as koromiko, fibre sources such as the flaxes and cabbage tree, construction materials such as tree fern trunks, rimu and tōtara.

Plant diversity

We support the first two bullet points in this theme, provided that indigenous plant species are included in the information.

Sustainable living

We support the first bullet point

4.2.1 Policies – Education programmes and events

We support the two policies. In the case of the second bullet point, we recommend that guided tours of the native forest areas be developed and promoted, to publicise their ecological, heritage and cultural significance, their close proximity to the CBD, the problems faced by native forest areas in an urban setting, and the management of pest animals and ecological weeds.

4.2.2 Implementation

We support the theme and four actions.

4.3 Cultural and Natural Heritage

4.3.2 Policies – Tree Framework / Replanting Programme

We welcome the statement in the second bullet point that “ ... future planting shall be situated away from the edges of the native forest remnants ...”, and support the reasons given.

We support the third bullet point, with the proviso that species with known weed potential, such as the non-Wellington native trees, pūriri, and puka / *Meryta sinclairii*, are not planted.

In the paragraph on page 51 beginning “The skyline of the Wellington Botanic Garden ... “ we recommend that the establishment of “ ... tall native forest

species within the forest remnants ... “ be left to the increasing numbers of native birds visiting, and resident in, the garden, and the wind, bringing in seed from indigenous forest areas elsewhere in the city. This will allow Nature to restore the native forest areas over the coming decades. This process must be aided by sustained, intensive control of pest animals, pest plants and other ecological weeds.

In the paragraph on page 51 beginning “The pines are an important part of the Garden's character ... “, we welcome the statement “ ... other groups will be removed when they present a safety risk.” We believe that the 15 – 20 tall conifers on Druid Hill may eventually present a safety risk, because of their position, . i.e. exposed to northwesterly and southerly gales, coupled with their great height.

In the paragraph on page 52 beginning “The planting programme began in 2001 ... “ we do not support “ ... new plantings of pines on the lower slopes of Druid Hill”. The reason for this is that such plantings would eventually hide from view the existing native plant communities on and near the summit of Druid Hill, the natural regeneration of indigenous species already occurring there, and the plantings of indigenous species that we propose.

In the paragraph on page 52 beginning “Apart from aging ... “, we welcome the targetting for removal of the non-Wellington natives, pōhutukawa, karaka and *Pittosporum ralphii*, and urge Council to add to this list *Hoheria populnea*, a non-Wellington lacebark which is widespread throughout the native forest areas.

4.3.3 Policies – Native Forest Remnants

First bullet point – we support this policy. It will require funding every year for sustained and intensive control of pest animals, pest plants and other ecological weeds. This must include removal of adventive plant species along the edges of paths and tracks, many of which are dominated by weeds, as well as from the interior of the native forest areas.

Second bullet point – we accept this policy.

Third bullet point – we support this policy, provided that the only plantings are on the margins of the native forest areas, to buffer them against the damaging effects of gales. We do not support plantings within the native forest areas. This will allow birds and the wind, assisted by intensive pest control, to restore the native forest areas over the coming decades.

Fourth bullet point – we support , assuming that it refers only to exotic plant species.

Fifth bullet point – we support this policy.

Regarding the penultimate paragraph on page 53, we note that mature trees of hīnau (2), northern rātā (1), and several pukatea and rewarewa exist in the

native forest areas today.

Page 55.

We strongly support the statements in the first two paragraphs.

We agree with the matters identified by Blaschke and Rutherford, subject to our recommendation that planting be restricted to the margins of native forest areas, to buffer them from the effects of gales.

4.3.4 Implementation

Theme - Action

Native Forest Remnants

We do not support the restoration of sparse or absent species, because this would interfere with the process of natural restoration.

Second bullet point – we support this action.

Third bullet point – we do not support this action, because this would interfere with the process of natural restoration..

Fourth bullet point – we support this action.

Fifth bullet point – we strongly support this action.

Proposal for ensuring the continuation of kānuka forest in the Garden

Today, *Kunzea ericoides* / kānuka are very uncommon in Wellington city, except in the Botanic Garden, where several individual kānuka are well over 100 years old, stately, precious relics of our indigenous, Wellington, ecological heritage. Kānuka are a long-lived species, with an expected life-span of over 100 years, so although these are thriving, it is possible some may be declining.

Kānuka forest is an officially recognised NZ forest type, which once covered much of Kelburn, including the present Botanic Garden area. A well-known painting by C.D. Barraud in 1873 shows this. Some large, emergent kānuka and areas of younger, closed-canopy kānuka shrubland are still present in several parts of the Garden,.

The following text is from the interpretation panel on Camellia Path:

“Kānuka – the colonist

Kānuka is a colonising plant, one of the first species to start growing on burnt or cleared soil. Kānuka is often followed by broad-leaved species e.g., māhoe, pseudopanax, then late podocarps (native conifers). Kānuka acts as a nursery plant, providing shade and shelter for seedlings as well as conditioning and stabilising the soil. It also provides a habitat for birds that then bring in and spread seeds. This helps to colonise the area.”

A substantial area of kānuka forest in the Botanic Garden was cut down in 1960 to make room for enlarging the Camellia Garden. Similarly, what are

now the Pinetum, Salamanca Road Lawn, and other Garden sites which were previously under kānuka forest, have been cleared. However, descendants of the kānuka treeland that covered what is now Salamanca Road Lawn, are not giving up. On the Lawn there is a mini-forest of hundreds of tough little kānuka survivors, no higher than 3 cm, with sturdy roots because they are regularly mown.

In view of the ecological and historical significance of kānuka / *Kunzea ericoides* forest in Wellington, we ask whether management has a strategy for its continuation in the Botanic Garden. We are concerned at the documented, progressive destruction of kānuka forest in the Garden, as cited above.

Kānuka readily colonises relatively bare, dry, exposed sites such as Druid Hill's western face and the summit, at present under pines and being taken over by weeds and a few native species. Far better surely, to have it colonised by an indigenous species once common here in Kelburn

Replacement vegetation will be needed when the historic Druid Hill pines succumb to old age, severe gales and / or chainsaws. In preparation for this, we ask whether management has considered sowing kānuka seed or transplanting beneath them, kānuka seedlings collected from e.g. Salamanca Road Lawn, to hasten Druid Hill's reversion to its previous kānuka-dominant vegetation. (Shepherd and Cook. 1988). The Listening & Viewing Device should of course remain clear of any such re-vegetation, to enhance its ambience. A copse of kānuka could grow up there to become an appropriate, indigenous, long-lived, plant community, requiring no or low maintenance. It would be a form of appropriate, ecological utu for the substantial, earlier losses of kānuka forest cleared from other parts of the Garden.

4.4 Recreation and Use

We recommend that bicycle access into and though the Botanic Garden be restricted to the trial route between the Cable Car terminus and Salamanca Road.

4.4.2 Policies – Circulation, Orientation and Way-finding Signage

Recommendations:

The Botanic Garden's five areas of native forest, less than a kilometre from the CBD, be highlighted in the brochure, by naming them on it, and the interpreted walks through them, e.g., Waipiro Bush Walk, Pukatea Bush Walk, etc.

The brochure be amended by naming and numbering, in the "Tracks" index, the following tracks in the native forest areas, and indicating them on the map by their numbers: Cork Oak Path, Scrub Path, Ruru Path, Fern Hill Path, Hīnau Path, Rangiora Path, Aka Path, Epuni Path, and any other paths not

named and numbered. This information is essential for encouraging visitors to explore these ecologically significant, heritage, native forest areas.

To encourage visitors to appreciate the native forest areas, the missing, or illegible names of paths be replaced, and unnamed paths be given names, those names to be indicated on the brochure, as listed above.

Miscellaneous

We recommend that a feasibility study be done into daylighting Pipitea Stream from the southern boundary of the garden as far as the gate opposite Orangi Kaupapa Road.

To go at end of submission:

References and Recommended Reading

We recommend that this section includes:

- ✦ Gabites, Isobel. (1993). *Wellington's Living Cloak – A Guide to the Natural Plant Communities*. Wellington Botanical Society. Victoria University Press.
- ✦ Wellington Regional Council, QEII National Trust, NZ Biological Resources Centre. (1984). *Biological Resources of the Wellington Region*. Area 12h in Schedule A refers to Wellington Botanic Garden.
- ✦ Park, Geoff. (1999). *An Inventory of the Surviving Traces of the Primary Forest of Wellington City. Compiled for Wellington City Council. Geoff Park Landscape Ecology and History*. Sites O406.8, O406.9 and O406.10 refer to Wellington Botanic Garden.

Yours sincerely

Barbara Mitcalfe and Chris Horne

SUBMISSION ON MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE BOTANIC GARDENS OF WELLINGTON

by Mr Nick Perrin
 45 Norwich St
 Wilton
 Wellington 6012
 Phone 04 472 3767
 Mobile 027 478 0193

I am making a submission as an individual, but it support of the submission by Friends of Bolton Street Memorial Park (inc) of which I am a past president and current committee member of more than 10 years standing. Margaret Alington and I compiled the computerised burial list for Bolton Street, with checking and research assistance from many members of FOBSMP over several years.

I do not wish to make an oral presentation to the City Councillors but would do so if requested. If my comments are made public I plan to refuse any further comment to the media, as I have gone into this at length already (see below).

My comments relate entirely to that part of Appendix 2 covering the Maori history (page 132) and “Maori experience of the motorway disinterments” (pages 156 and 157).

In summary, I am saddened by the claimed negative Maori experience espoused by Rachel Buchanan in her book, which is quoted at length on pages 156 and 157 of the Plan, and I object to its inclusion in the Plan because I feel some facts and things I told her have been misrepresented and misinterpreted. I would prefer to see a different commentary written, or at least have the quotation edited to remove any reference to me personally.

Comment on Maori History section (pages 132-135)

On page 143 there is a quotation attributed to Neville Gilmore in 2004, but the quote is obviously a personal account by someone in the earliest days of European settlement. The original reference to the real author and date of this quote should be given, and not present it as a quote from Neville Gilmore (he obviously included it as a quote in his 2004 report to the Wellington Tenth Trust.).

The quote referred to above is used to support the statement (page 133, 2nd paragraph) that “*the land set aside as a cemetery in the 1840 plan was probably already used by Maori from both Pa for burials and for the earlier traditional processes for dealing with the dead*”. But from the topographic evidence in the account, I suggest the area of early urupa and atamira is further to the south of the allocated cemetery land, on the basis of historical maps and the William Mein Smith surveys which established the location of all the pre-1840 streams in the city area.

Kumototo Pa was about where Woodward Street meets The Terrace. The Kumutoto Stream runs from Kelburn and parallel to and west of The Terrace and took a right-angle turn at the Terrace to run down what is now Woodward St. The Pa was on the north side of this bend, and probably covered all or part of the former site of the Wellington Club on the west side of The Terrace opposite Woodward St.

The Waipiro Stream starts in the Dell of the Botanic gardens, and the only part that is still a visible stream is from below the Meteorological Office to the back of the lawn

behind the Begonia House. It ran down the former Sydney St via Anderson Park, through the centre of Parliament buildings to discharge into the harbour at Lambton Quay near the Cenotaph.

The Tutaenui Stream seems to have run in the gully to the north of Bolton Street, and this gully runs through the southern part of Bolton Street Cemetery with its source in the Morva Williams bequest, then crossed where the motorway now runs to the gully now containing graves and the mass (“memorial”) grave of those disinterred for the motorway.

I suggest that after crossing these two streams, the un-named writer quoted by Gilmore asked why they did not go to Kumutoto Pa via “the top Te Iwamata ngakinga”. I am uncertain of the location of Te Iwamata ngakinga, but from the description, and the fact that it was “up” means the urupa and atamira was somewhere along the north end of The Terrace at the top of the old sea cliff behind Lambton Quay. I think the quoted passage means they travelled southwards along the foot of the sea cliff and took a steep ascent (where Woodward St is now) to gain access to the Pa, rather than the likely easier route where the seacliff was lower, but which would have meant they would pass through the area of the urupa and atamira.

I have to say that while I would personally welcome a suggestion that Maori already treated this area as tapu, I can’t see that this piece of evidence supports that. I am open to correction or additional information that might be forthcoming. I have been personally interested in the pre-colonial as well as the colonial history of Wellington for many years, mainly in connection with genealogy and Bolton Street Cemetery in particular.

Comment on “Maori experience of the motorway disinterments”

This section is almost entirely based on a quotation from Rachel Buchanan, which she wrote after consultation with me, and a meeting I had with her and her father at Bolton Street. I feel the discussions I had with them and various “facts” relating to the finding of a greenstone mere in one of the graves have been misrepresented, and I find the passage is personally insulting to me as well as insulting to Department of Maori Affairs, Wellington City Council and Ministry of works for suggesting that “...re-bury this treasure, thus hiding , yet again, the evidence that Maori pioneers and leaders are buried in this historic site too” was a deliberate and considered act of racially motivated concealment.

In fact, the reburial of the greenstone mere was entirely within the rules established for the disinterments. Margaret Alington in “Unquiet Earth” said “*A member of the Maori community was asked about the fifteen Maori graves involved. He replied that these should be treated in the same way as the pakeha graves.*” (Margaret Alington, page 169). The policy was that “...all remains, including valuables, would be re-interred” *ibid*, page 169. The reason for the secrecy of the discovery of the greenstone mere was likely to be prevent attempts to rob the mass grave (as actually happened in September 1970, but nothing appears to have been stolen). To argue that this was to “hide evidence” as Rachel Buchanan claims is a false accusation which I resent. I would have told her so if she had asked me, and I would have boycotted her book launch if I had read it before it was published.

It should be noted that a number of other valuables, besides the mere, were found (gold rings, a red ruby, etc), and all were re-interred with the human remains they had been buried with. To do otherwise would be grave robbery, and I believe that if any

person was buried with valuables, those who buried them intended these personal items to accompany the deceased for all time, and I believe that applies to Maori as much as to the Europeans, Chinese and Jews we have in Bolton Street.

I resent the mention of my name from her book being reproduced in the quotation on page 156 unless I can counter that and several of her other claims from her book that are quoted here which I believe are false.

On page 156 the Buchanan quote includes the sentence “*Despite the best intentions of the Friends group, Maori remain excluded from this memorial place*”. I strongly dispute this. If she put “feel” instead of “remain”, I would accept that, but Maori are NOT excluded. I regret that they feel that way, and would hope we can build bridges to overcome the Maori feeling of exclusion. But the claims Rachel Buchanan makes are divisive rather than helpful in my opinion.

The fact is that we have about 8500 burials in Bolton St, and of those, probably less than 100 are Maori (in 2008 I compiled a list of apparent Maori burial records, which totalled 80. If anyone wants this list, contact me by email or through www.boltoncemetery.org.nz). Rachel Buchanan suggests that since we have only one Maori on our self-guided tour pamphlet, that we are remiss. Since the pamphlet is a much-priced down version of my full guided tour notes (which includes at least 4 Maori and a lot of other Maori connections), and we did not select on a racial basis, I am sorry there is only one on that pamphlet, but the facts remain that Maori are only about 1% of the recorded burials in Bolton Street, and there is very little biographical detail available in the media from even the most important chiefs that we know are buried there. I would welcome engagement with Maori to tell us more about these people.

There is a problem also with very poor, inaccurate or missing records of Maori (as Rachel Buchanan found when looking for her ancestor, but why she never asked me to research him, I fail to understand, since I am the person most familiar with the records and their foibles). However, the poor records do not apply only to Maori – they apply to very large numbers of burials in general. Poor record keeping, inaccurate spelling and likely destruction of records were rife, and a very large minority of recorded burials have no recorded location and no extant headstone (bordering on half, actually). Personally, I blame the Church of England for the fact that my great-great-grandfather is one of the lost at Bolton Street – Rachel does not have that feeling alone, I have to say.

Rachel Buchanan is absolutely right in saying that Bolton Street is a resting place primarily for white pioneers and white early settlers because probably only slightly more than 1% don't fit that description. But that does not mean we actively try to conceal the presence of Maori as she suggests. In fact, in my guided tours I always try to emphasise Maori burials and connections (such as the fact that James Edward Fitzgerald was way ahead of his time in advocating Maori representation in Parliament). Even when I show the grave of the Gillespies killed by Maori in 1846 I mention that they were killed after (inadvertently) desecrating a burial ground and burning apparently unused huts belonging to Maori, not understanding the itinerant nature of Maori occupation for gardening purposes.

To support my claims of being personally inclusive of Maori matters in Bolton Street, I submit this story. - What I feel is probably the most important event in the first contact between Maori and NZ Co settlers in Wellington relates to cemetery

occupants Te Rira Porutu and Thomas Wilmore McKenzie. I feel the implications of this have been largely overlooked by historians – TW McKenzie and another boy, Edwin Ticehurst, went ashore immediately after their ship arrived in Wellington, and sought shelter in a house under construction by Te Rira Porutu and his iwi for another settler. This being a gross breach of tapu, Porutu was going to kill the boys with his greenstone mere, but they were saved by his daughter-in-law who threw her cloak over them. I ask what would have happened had the boys been killed? Probably armed action against Maori by the settlers, in which case the settlers may well have been wiped out – and all because of a cultural clash. The settlers had no knowledge of the concept of tapu on a house under construction, and Porutu had no conception that anyone would not understand the concept of tapu. I believe things could have been very different if there had been a different outcome to this event. The fact that McKenzie became a life-long friend of Porutu after this, and the cloak and mere were on his casket at his funeral is a fact that I always try to stress, and the mere and cloak are now important taonga at Te Papa.

I would welcome engagement by Maori, and I would be very keen to compile any biographical material anyone would care to let me have. (It is a stated aim of FOBSMP to compile biographies of as many of the occupants of Bolton St Cemetery as we can, and this most definitely includes Maori).



HAVE YOUR SAY ON THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE BOTANIC GARDENS OF WELLINGTON

Have your say

You can comment on the draft plan by completing a submission form or writing down your comments and sending them to us by:

- Visiting our website: Wellington.govt.nz/have-your-say
- Email: botanicgardenplan@wcc.govt.nz
- Post: FREEPOST, Botanic Gardens Plan, Parks and Gardens (REPL01), Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington 6140
- Fax: 04 801 3155

You may also make an oral submission to Councillors in support of your written submission. To do this please let us know and provide your contact details.

What happens next?

1. You can drop into the Treehouse Visitor Centre between 2–4pm on Sunday 4 May to speak with Council officers and the Botanic Garden manager to discuss the plan.
2. Comments on the draft plan are due by 3 June 2014.
3. Submissions will be analysed. Oral submissions will be held in early August 2014. Amendments to the plan could be made based on submissions.
4. The final Botanic Gardens Management Plan will go to the Council for approval in September 2014.

SUBMISSION FORM QUESTIONS

| ENTER YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS | |
|--|--------------------------|
| * Mandatory fields | |
| Mr / Mrs / Ms / Miss / Dr <i>(Please circle which applies)</i> | |
| First name* FIONA | Last name* BARR |
| Street address* 50 ST MARY STREET | |
| Suburb THURSDON | City WELLINGTON |
| Phone/mobile | Email fibarr@hotmail.com |

| MAKING A SUBMISSION | |
|---|--|
| I am making a submission | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As an individual <input type="checkbox"/> On behalf of an organisation |
| Name of organisation | |
| I would like to make an oral submission to the City Councillors. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| If yes, provide a phone number above so that a submission time can be arranged. | |

COMMENTS ARE DUE BY 5PM, TUESDAY 3 JUNE 2014

Privacy statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are published and made available to elected members of the Council and the public. Personal information supplied will be used for administration and reporting back to elected members of the Council and the public as part of the consultation process. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington. Submitters have the right to access and correct personal information.

1. OVERALL, DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE GENERAL DIRECTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DRAFT PLAN? (please circle)

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
| Why? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

2. DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE GENERAL DIRECTION AND POLICIES FOR: (please circle)

a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
| Why? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

b. Otari-Wilton's Bush

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
| Why? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

c. Bolton Street Memorial Park

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
| Why? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

d. Truby King Park

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|

Why?

3. ARE THERE ANY OTHER MAJOR CHANGES YOU THINK SHOULD BE INCLUDED? (please circle)

| | |
|------------|----|
| Yes | No |
|------------|----|

Your comments

A small off-lead area for dogs in the Botanic Gardens. ^{To:} ① Cater for large number of dog owners in this area. ② Reduce the number of dogs off-lead elsewhere in the gardens. ③ Encourage new visitors to the gardens. ④ Increase revenue for Picnic ⑤ Somewhere for parents to take dogs while children in playground. ⑥ Good use of dog registration money

4. ARE THERE ANY ACTIONS IN THE PLAN YOU FEEL SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY? (please circle)

| | |
|-----|-----------|
| Yes | No |
|-----|-----------|

Your comments

5. IS THERE ANYTHING YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY COVERED BY THIS PLAN? (please circle)

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

Your comments

Off-lead dog area.
This only needs to be small and could be a section already partly fenced. I do see there are plans for the small grassed area behind the herb garden but something of that size would suffice

continue

6. YOUR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: (please attach additional pages if you need to)

The plan seems to have been given a great deal of consideration. It is great how you have considered the community, the environment and also future-proofing

1st fold here - fasten here once folded

Thank you for your comments.

PLEASE RETURN THIS SUBMISSION FORM BY 3 JUNE 2014

2nd fold here

Free Post Authority Number 2199

Absolutely
POSITIVELY
ME HĒKE RI PŌHĒKE
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL Wellington
PO Box 2199, Wellington, New Zealand



FREEPOST
Botanic Gardens Plan,
Parks and Gardens (REPL01)
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140



Cycle Aware Wellington

www.caw.org.nz
 info@caw.org.nz
 (04) 934 8315 or 021 036 4443
<https://twitter.com/CycleAwareWgtn>
 post office box: 27 120 Wellington

Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Management Plan – Cycle Aware Wellington submission

We would like to make an oral submission. Please contact andy.gow@gmail.com

Cycle Aware Wellington is a voluntary, not-for-profit organisation aimed at improving conditions for existing cyclists and encouraging more people to bike more often. We advocate for cyclists who use their bikes for recreation and transport. Since 1994, we have worked constructively with local and central government, NZTA, businesses, and the community on a wide variety of cycle projects. We represent around 600 members and supporters.

Key points of our submission

- We ask you to reconsider the ban on cycling in the Botanic Gardens.
- We consider that an increase in cycling provision in the Botanic Gardens is compatible with the other aims of the plan if implemented well.
- We would like the plan to acknowledge and consider the role of commuters in the Botanic Gardens.
- We present possibilities for further cycling routes in the Gardens.
- We encourage publishing of information on arriving at the Gardens by bike, and support the installation of cycle parking at the Garden entrances
- We support the remainder of the plan with regard to Otari-Wilton's bush, Truby King Park, and Bolton Street Memorial Park.

We ask you to reconsider the ban on cycling, and allow consideration of new cycling provisions.

The plan outlines that cycling is currently banned in the Botanic Gardens (p30) apart from the designated route between Upland Road and Salamanca Road. We believe this situation should be reconsidered, and this section on page 30 be changed:

“In accordance with Council’s Open Space Access plan 2008, all walkways and tracks in the gardens are closed to mountain biking/cycling...” (p30)

The Open Space Access plan of 2008 merely mentions the current ban on cycling in the Gardens in Schedule A (p20) but does not elaborate on that. The intent, vision, and principles of that same plan would support an increase of cycling provision into the Botanic Gardens. We recommend that the wording on page 30 of the plan is changed to reflect this.

“The gardens are places where bikes are not suitable because of intensity and range of public use and the potential conflict between bikers and walkers...” (p30)

This is no more true than of many public places – for example, busy city roads, many parts of the green belt, or Wellington’s waterfront. Some of the highest intensity locations in the world (eg, Amsterdam, New York), and their parks, successfully merge cycling with other forms of recreation.

The key is to carefully consider how a cycling provision is made, and to minimise conflict between cyclists, walkers and other users. We are willing to provide further support and advice in this regard.

We recommend that the plan be changed to allow the possibility of considering new cycle routes, and any requirements that would need to be met for a route to be successful.

Cycling is compatible with the other aims of the plan

We believe introducing more cycling provision into the Gardens would benefit other plan objectives, for example:

- Getting everyone active and healthy (from the Open Space and Recreation Framework, p11)
- Contributing to Wellington's outstanding quality of life (p11)
- Showcasing Wellington as an eco city (p12)
- Healthy Gardens, Healthy People - Getting people active more often through use of the gardens for physical activity (p23)
- Providing quality visitor facilities and services (p26)
- Enabling access and enjoyment for all (p26)
- Encouraging and catering for casual use of the Gardens (p26)
- Wellington’s aim to be an Eco City (p36)
- Encouraging visitation by active modes of transport (p56).

The Botanic Gardens are a commuter thoroughfare

The Botanic Gardens are currently a widely used pedestrian commuting route, providing access from both sides of Kelburn down to the Thorndon and Te Aro areas of Wellington. The plan currently provides no acknowledgement of this, though it does mention the same role for the Bolton Street Memorial Park. **We believe the plan should:**

- Acknowledge the use of the Botanic Gardens for foot commuters (and limited cycle commuters).
- Consider how the the Gardens should be managed with regard to this user group.

- Consider how to manage and accommodate increases in commuter use, and any increase in cycle provision for commuting. Lighting at night and security are two key issues, and there is a benefit to security with more traffic on walking and cycling routes. We are happy to provide further consultation and advice.

The Town Belt Plan provides some examples of how all this might be implemented in the Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Management Plan.

The cycling opportunity

We believe the Botanic Gardens provide a unique opportunity for several cycle commuting routes in addition to the foot commuting opportunities already present:

- Upland Road to Salamanca Road – enables cycle access from Kelburn to Thorndon whilst avoiding the very busy parts of Kelburn (eg, Glasgow Street, Kelburn Parade). We recommend that the existing shared trial be upgraded to a segregated cycleway, to avoid conflicts between pedestrians and other users. (We would be interested to know more about how this route has worked so far too).
- Mariri Road and Glen Road to lower Glenmore Street – such a route would allow cycle commuters to enjoy the gardens and avoid the Upland Road / Glenmore Street roundabout and congested roads.
- Alongside Glenmore Street from the entrance opposite Collins Terrace to the end of the park, potentially uphill only.

We would recommend that further expansion of cycling in the Gardens be preferentially on segregated routes, so that walkers are not put in conflict. This would eliminate cyclists posing a hazard to walkers, and provide a more enjoyable walking and cycling experience, consistent with visitor goals outlined in the plan. This principle of separating modes of different speeds works well in many locations worldwide.

We recommend that the plan be changed to allow the possibility of new cycle provisions in the Gardens, and guidelines for how they would be implemented.

Visiting by cycle and cycle parking

Section 4.4.1 mentions providing more information about visiting the gardens by active transport (p56). We support this. In particular information on the the WCC web page for the gardens is important ([currently there is no information on arriving by bike](#)).

We would also support the installation of more bike parking facilities at each of the entrances to the park. If done well and publicised in visitor information, this will help relieve the congestion described on page 57 of the plan, and encourage more visitation. Cyclists will be more encouraged to visit the gardens if they know their bike is safe.

We recommend the plan specifically lists adding cycling to the visitor information. We also recommend an increase in the cycle parking facilities at the park entrances.

We support the plan for the other gardens

We support the remainder of the plan with regard to Otari-Wilton's bush, Truby King Park, and Bolton Street Memorial Park.

Nā mātou noa, nā Cycle Aware Wellington
3 June, 2014

Submission on the Draft Management Plan for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington

Dr Margaret E. Gordon
41 Ngaio Road
Kelburn
Wellington 6012
New Zealand
Phone/Fax: +64 4 475-9925

I am making this submission as an individual.
I would like to make an oral submission to the City Councillors.

Overall, I support the general directions and objectives of the draft plan, and its general direction and policies for the four parks mentioned, so in this submission I wish to focus on a few specific issues detailed below. All of these relate to the Wellington Botanical Gardens in Kelburn.

A. Enhancement of the experience of visitors (including tourists), to the Wellington Botanic Gardens in Kelburn.

1. Tree house access.

It would be ideal if some way could be found to fund staffing of the Tree House information centre on weekends, since for many visitors these are the days when they can most easily visit the gardens.

2. Fair parking charges near the cable-car entrance

I note that on p.29 of the draft plan, section 3.3.5 presents the objective to "support and promote the different transport options available to get to the Botanic Gardens, including car, bus, walking, cycling and cable car options". It would greatly help families and the less physically able to visit the gardens from their upper level if parking at the top of the cable car was more reasonably priced, especially at weekends, when pricing and parking conditions here should at least be comparable with what pertains at the Rose Garden. Buses to and from the part of Kelburn near the cable-car entrance are not very frequent at weekends, and one-off cable car fares, even with a family concession, can be expensive. In my submission on public transport in Wellington I have made more comprehensive complaints and suggestions about the anomalously high price of parking at the top of the cable car, especially to park and ride and could elaborate orally on this issue at my oral presentation. Meanwhile I again maintain that it seems inappropriate to delegate the parking charges to Tournament Parking on a site that is part of the original town belt, and is part of the Wellington Botanic Garden as is indicated on the map on Page 124 of the Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Plan. I request that Council re-possesses this car park and administers it in the interests of serving locals and

visitors, without creating a car-park that is unduly taken over by all-day university parking.

3. Path maintenance

Path maintenance is mentioned in the Draft Plan as needing to be appropriate to the size and use of the path. I would like to argue that the wide path from the Glen to the lawn near the duck pond is a popular extension to the gentle walking experience of the main path through the more formal part of the gardens, that is the flower-bed zone that connects with the main gate at Glenmore Street. The upper path to the Glen entrance provides a change of scene from the walk past formal beds to a native bush walk, while maintaining the same gentle slope and wide path character. The upper path is even wider than in the formal area at just over 3 metres wide. I often see mothers with baby buggies walking up this path from the formal gardens.

Currently, however, the poor standard of the chip seal detracts from the experience of using the upper path, as the surface is uneven and does tend to shake the baby buggies somewhat. In addition, although this path is also part of a popular walking route from Kelburn to Thorndon, well patronized by people walking to and from work, it is very unpleasant to walk on compared with the lower path. The loose chips were never swept off the upper path after it was poorly sealed quite some years ago, and in quite extensive areas the chips remain on the hard seal, where they are extremely uncomfortable to walk on in all but thick-soled shoes. Even then they can still cause skidding, because the loose chips act like ball bearings under-foot, especially where the surface is also uneven. Gravel is sensible on an unsealed road, where it can be trodden into the soft substrate, but is nasty on a hard sealed surface. If the chips are swept away, however, the sealing job will be seen even more clearly to be inferior, with many bumps, and places where the seal is cracked, missing, or too thin to last much longer. I would like to nominate this path for resealing in asphalt as soon as possible, to smooth its contour as is the case on the lower path, and make a sound, comfortable and safe surface for baby buggies, wheelchairs, mobility scooters, and of course pedestrians. Such an upgrade would support the objective stated in the Draft Plan section 3.3.5 (Page 26) to “extend opportunities for people with disabilities and limited mobility, use pushchairs and wheelchairs to enjoy as much of the Gardens as practicable”.

2. Cycling in the Wellington Botanic Gardens in Kelburn - a request for a further shared path trial.

1. The case for cycling between the Glen entrance and the main Glenmore entrance.

I notice that the trial of the permitted cycling route from Upland Road to Salamanca Road is being continued, and judge from this that pedestrian and cyclist path sharing here has been a successful experiment. This is heartening since the cycling route intersects a busy pedestrian route close to the cable car lookout just where the cycle route detours to dodge a flight of steps. There are many visitors

around this intersection, walking from the cable car and lookout area into the Gardens to spend time there or go to the Carter Observatory or to walk down to Salamanca Road. Last Sunday I observed several groups of cyclists weaving their way carefully through visitor foot traffic at this intersection with no problems arising. It is good to see common sense and obedience to cycling rules prevailing in the gardens.

On the strength of this success I would like to nominate for trial sharing the wide low-gradient path from the Glen entrance to the main gate at Glenmore Street, via the outer lower path that runs along the Glenmore Street boundary of the northern formal section of the gardens, leading to the main gate. This is a wide route of uniformly gentle slope, popular with those who go to work in the northern CBD by active means and also with visitors of mixed physical ability or with encumbrances such as buggies, as mentioned in my earlier comments about path maintenance. I would like to see cyclists between Thorndon and the suburbs of Karori, Northland or Kelburn given a quieter, less polluted route to and from work or study than is provided by Glenmore Street at busy times. This path is also part of a less steep option as a route to the CBD than is provided by the currently permitted Upland Road to Salamanca Road cycling route through the gardens. The latter leads only to steep options for getting from the top of Salamanca Road to town, whereas the path to the main gate that I am arguing for presents the option to go on down Bowen Street, as well as to proceed to Bolton Street (via the one-way cycle approved path to Kinross Street).

I believe that such a trial of shared use of the Glen to Glenmore path by cyclists and pedestrians would be straightforward and inexpensive to set up. If the cycling had the same low speed limit as on the presently permitted route (or even lower), cycling could be restricted to the side of the path closer to Glenmore Street for the entire length of this route, downhill cyclist being instructed to give way to uphill cyclists. With cyclists confined to this side, there would be only one major intersection on the cycling side, namely the one near the duck pond where two paths enter, one via steps from Magpie Lawn, and the other from the Western Gate. There could be warning signs here, with cyclists and pedestrians alerted to this intersection and cyclists reminded to give way to pedestrians entering or leaving, or even to stop to check the coast is clear. There is one further path entry from the left just a few yards from the Glen entrance, but this is a low-traffic path so close to the entrance that a short bike-wheeling segment could be introduced if this was felt necessary. The path uphill from the duck pond area is at least 3 metres wide throughout, and the lower path is of generous width in relation to its foot traffic relative to the more popular central path, except perhaps at tulip time. If the green line path marking was adopted for this route, cyclists could be asked to cycle ON the green line. This would save on the cost of lane colouring of the sort found at some intersections in the CBD to let cyclists to the front of traffic, and the green line method could lend itself to on-path alerts to the intersection.

The proposed shared route would present no more potential conflict with pedestrians than the busy part of the already approved shared route from Upland

Road to Salamanca Road, but if Council feels unable to support the trial for two-way cycling, I would ask it to consider permitting cycling at least in the uphill direction. Cyclists on push bikes are at their most vulnerable on a main road when cycling slowly uphill, and riders of battery assisted bicycles have considerable weight to push if they have to dismount to negotiate a long uphill discontinuity to a cycle route.

Ideally I would also like to see sharing with cyclists on the pedestrian path to the Western gate, which would give some cycling Northland residents a greater portion of their trip to and from work off the main road. Again, sharing for cycling uphill only would be the fallback option.

The proposal for a further shared path is the main thrust of this part of my submission, and is what I would particularly like to have a chance to speak about to Council Members.

2. A request for fair treatment of cyclist employees of the gardens.

I would also like to see any current or future cycling employees of the Botanic Gardens given the same courtesy as employees who arrive at work by car. The latter are permitted to use the access road within the gardens to get to their car-park, but this road is specified as being for employees' CARS and service vehicles, which implies exclusion of cycles. Permission to use the access road should clearly apply also to all cycles, powered or not and would require just a very small change to the relevant signage to "service and employees' "vehicles, including cycles".

3. Two signage issues for cyclists using the currently permitted path.

Two things about the current signage for cyclists in the Botanical Gardens at Kelburn strike me as unclear.

Firstly, the cycling entry point at the cable car end of Upland Road has signs on either side of the entrance which give conflicting instructions to cyclists, one saying that bicycles must be wheeled, and the other asking cyclists to follow the green line and not exceed 10 km per hour. Local cyclists will have sorted this out, but it might confuse visitors.

Secondly, the instructions on the cycling-permitted path are that cyclists should follow the green line. This is on the left for cyclists entering at the opposite ends, Upland and Salamanca, and to achieve this the line crosses the road about halfway along the path. Are cyclists supposed to switch sides of the path at this crossover point, or is the green line simply an indication of the route to be followed, where the normal rule to keep left still applies?





TRUBY KING PARK SUBMISSION

Comments and additions to the WCC Summary Document

- **Completing reconstruction of the landscape features particularly the walls and archways around the house.**
 - The pergola built over the pillars on the Eastern Driveway
 - Ships Lanterns on eastern deck.
- **Replacing the large pine tree framework with a framework of smaller trees and open up the views over Evans Bay.**
 - Noting that this would re-instate the historic views of the Truby Kings days at the House.
 - The pine trees to the East of the property are outside of the official Rhododendron dell area. This is ideally suited to be replaced with fruit trees as community orchard space.
- **Increasing use of edible plant and tree species to emphasise the holistic nature of the garden.**
 - The garden was also famous herb garden with many medicinal plants.
 - Many existing areas could be orchard and or herb gardens.
- **Find a long-term sustainable use for the house that enables public access on either a regular or managed basis.**
 - The TBK Trust goal:
 - Is to see daily use of the house with education workshops, training meetings, exercise and dance classes, musical soiree's.
 - That the house be included as one of Wellingtons Community Houses and listed accordingly. Officially "Melrose Community Centre"
 - As a Community recognized house, it also can become a disaster shelter a resilient hub in the local community, a local noahs ark.
 - The house is in an ideally isolated location to be an autonomous example providing its own water, electricity and having onsite black and grey water solutions provided and surrounded by orchards.
 - That other community facilities gear up to perform the same role.

- That the house's historic rooms are open for a period on every weekend.
 - Opening the living rooms and dining rooms with display of some memorabilia and or the Library.
 - That the large hall area (previously bedrooms/currently office space) be used available for functions. This requires doubling the car parking capacity.
 - To propose additional car parking area to the north of the house in the Town belt land. This will serve the Mountain bike club, give access to Southern walk way walkers and free up the Truby King car park for those holding events at the house.
- Problem with past popularity: The main problem has been that the house has not complied with the full rules for achieving the status of public venue.
- The key limiting item, now, is wheel chair access to the house. This has meant that the advertising for the house as a venue has been limited.
- The other limiting factor to the professional venue status is completing the separation between the custodian residential area and the public areas. As a minimum this requires a separate bathroom within the custodian flat.
- In order to promote the house as a public venue, the TBK Trust would like to proceed with application to DoBH for full dispensation for this, allowing the house to be proudly open to the public as a venue.
- Once the dispensation is granted the TBK Trust believes that with proper promotion the house will become more popular with at least most days being either visited or used by the public.
- Current situation:
 - The house is open on an appointment basis 7 days per week. This is managed by the current custodian volunteer.
 - The house is open also on a casual basis 7 days per week when the custodian is present at the house. There have been many spontaneous house tours giving to Southern walkway walkers.
 - Dozens of walkers enjoy the gardens and front porch during the summer months.
 - Currently 1 annual open day and in addition to this, around 6 groups a year book house and garden tours separate to the annual open days.
 - 3 to 4 Musical soiree's per year open to friends of the TBK Trust, a number of Weddings in the House and Gardens, at least one film company a year uses the house as a set,, a theatre group hires the house fortnightly
- **Develop a schedule of regular open days and guided tours for the house and garden.**
 - A good goal and welcomed by the TBK trust.
 - These should be advertised as RSVP to ensure adequate numbers.
- **Develop a partnership with the Truby King Park Trust and the local community to increase use and visitation as a local community space.**
 - The TBK Trust fully embraces the house as a community space and would like the house to be officially called Truby King House and Garden: Melrose Community Centre. Or simply "Truby King House and Garden: Community House"





3 June 2014

File ref: 33002-085

FREEPOST
Botanic Gardens Plan
Parks & Garden (REPL01)
Wellington City Council
P O Box 2199
Wellington 6140

Attention: Joana Gillanders

By email: joanna.gillanders@wcc.govt.nz

Dear Joanna

HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND'S SUBMISSION BOTANIC GARDENS OF WELLINGTON DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan. These comments are further to the feedback we provided in our letter dated 12 July 2013 in relation to earlier discussion documents.

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage New Zealand) is an autonomous Crown Entity with statutory responsibility under the new Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 for the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of New Zealand's historical and cultural heritage. This act also confirms Heritage New Zealand as New Zealand's lead historic heritage agency.

Heritage New Zealand's main interest in the management of the Botanic Gardens of Wellington is in relation to historic and cultural heritage. All four reserves are rich in historic significance given that they are associated with the early use and development of Wellington.

General Support for the Draft Management Plan

Heritage New Zealand acknowledges the effort that the Council has put into preparing a thorough and well-considered review and consolidation of the management plans for the four botanic gardens of Wellington (i.e. Wellington Botanic Garden, Otari-Wilton Bush, Bolton Street Memorial Park and Truby King Park). ²⁷

Heritage New Zealand considers that the draft plan provides good identification of heritage values associated with each garden and recognition of the contribution that heritage can make to the visitor experience. Furthermore, Heritage New Zealand considers that the general provisions applying to all four gardens will be a good base from which heritage values can be appropriately considered in the future maintenance, use and development of the gardens.

Heritage New Zealand endorses the commitment expressed in various sections of the plan to ongoing consultation with interested parties. Wellington City is very fortunate that the local support groups for each of the gardens include people with valuable experience, ideas and expertise regarding the issues and practicalities of managing the gardens.

Heritage New Zealand notes that separate chapters are used to provide detailed provisions and considerations that are particular to each garden, with appendices providing further information about their history and features; this is considered to be a good structure for the plan.

Heritage New Zealand is aware that some inaccuracies have been identified by Historic Places Wellington and the Friends of the Bolton Street Memorial Park, particularly in the appendices; the Council is encouraged to make appropriate corrections before finalising the plan.

Specific Comments on the Draft Management Plan

1. Name Change: New Zealand Historic Places Trust to Heritage New Zealand

Heritage New Zealand, formerly the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, reminds the Council of its new name in accordance with the recent passing of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, which came into force on 20 May 2014.

There are a number of references to the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and the Historic Places Act 1993 in the draft management plan. Accordingly, we seek that all of these references be updated to Heritage New Zealand and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 respectively.

Another area where amendments are necessary is when referring to items and areas that were previously known as being 'registered' under the Historic Places Act 1993 or being on 'the Register'. Under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, 'the Register' is now the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero (or 'the List'). Rather than saying a place is 'registered', Heritage New Zealand prefers to say that an item is 'on the New Zealand Heritage List' e.g. as an historic area or Category 1 historic place (depending on the situation).

As a result, the following changes are sought under Section 1.4 Legislative Context for the Botanic Gardens of Wellington (p.13). Additional wording is underlined, and the words to be deleted are struck through:

²⁷

Historic Places Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 1993 2014

The ~~Historic Places~~ Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 1993 2014 establishes ~~the New Zealand Historic Places Trust~~ Heritage New Zealand as being, which is responsible for administering the functions of heritage protection in New Zealand.

The legislation ~~is to~~ promotes the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of the historic and cultural heritage of New Zealand.

The Act also ~~sets out provision~~ provides for registering the entering of places of interest on a national register the New Zealand Heritage List/ Rārangī Kōrero (the List) and an authority process in relation to archaeological sites.

We have attempted to identify below as many situations as possible requiring related wording changes.

2. General Management Framework – Overall Vision & Guiding Principles (Section 3 of the Plan)

Heritage New Zealand supports the recognition of the cultural values of the four gardens, in the overall vision, as well as their nature-based values.

Of the eight guiding principles that will support the overall vision, Heritage New Zealand is particularly supportive of the following principles:

- Sharing our knowledge – Heritage New Zealand agrees that the gardens provide an opportunity to share information and knowledge about the Maori and European heritage of Wellington.
- Protection and interpreting our heritage – Heritage New Zealand supports the commitment to recognising, protecting and preserving heritage features for future generations.

3. General Objectives and Policies – Education and Awareness (Section 3.2 of the Plan)

Heritage New Zealand supports the objectives and policies to provide learning experiences within the gardens. It is pleasing to note that the significance of the gardens and their role in connecting the Maori and colonial history of Wellington has been identified as one of the themes to be emphasised.

The interpretation ideas mentioned in this section of the plan indicate that the Council is well aware of the many ways in which interpretive information can be provided, including modern mobile and web-based tools. Heritage New Zealand would be happy to provide information and ideas in this respect, based on its experience around the country.

4. General Objectives and Policies - Recreation and Visitor Use (Section 3.3 of the Plan)

Heritage New Zealand supports the commitment expressed in Section 3.3.4 of the plan to minimising the construction of new facilities and, when they are considered necessary, ensuring that they are visually integrated within the heritage character of a garden setting.

5. General Objectives and Policies – Cultural and Natural Heritage (Section 3.4 of the Plan)

Heritage New Zealand fully supports the two stated objectives for cultural heritage:

- Significant historical and cultural features and values of the gardens are identified, managed and protected.

- Appreciation of the cultural heritage of the gardens is enhanced through research and interpretation.

Heritage New Zealand also endorses the policies outlined in Section 3.4.1, particularly:

- The commitment to consulting with Heritage New Zealand, mana whenua and other directly affected groups or individuals in managing historic and traditional sites within the gardens.
- The commitment to protecting and managing the gardens in a manner reflecting their value and significance.
- The specific recognition of the potential for encountering archaeological sites, including the relevant statutory requirements. Heritage New Zealand also supports the acknowledgment provided in Policy 3.4.2 of the need to conduct archaeological surveys for garden change proposals, where appropriate.

Correction – Heritage New Zealand points out that the following paragraph needs to be corrected as the Truby King Park is not scheduled as a heritage area in the District Plan. Also, the Bolton Street Memorial Park is not on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero as an historic area:

Wellington Botanic Garden, Otari-Wilton's Bush and Bolton Street Memorial Park ~~All of the Gardens~~ are listed as Heritage Areas in the Wellington City District Plan with Wellington Botanic Garden, ~~Bolton Street Memorial Park~~ and Truby King Park also registered entered on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero as historic areas under the Historic Places Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 1993 2014.

...

In accordance with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 and two correct two mistakes, the following changes are sought on p. 31 of the draft plan:

3.4.1 Policies – Recognition and protection

- *Consultation with ~~the Heritage New Zealand Historic Places Trust~~ and mana whenua will be an important part of managing historic and traditional sites ...*
- *Where possible, proposed works will avoid recorded archaeological sites. Where avoidance of recorded sites is not possible, authority shall be sought from ~~the Heritage New Zealand Historic Places Trust~~ before An archaeological authority shall be applied for from ~~the Heritage New Zealand Historic Places Trust~~ in accordance with the Historic Places Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act (1993) 2014.*

General Objectives and Policies – Partnerships and Community Involvement (Section 3.6 of the Plan)

Heritage New Zealand is particularly supportive of the stated commitment to involving mana whenua and community groups.

Heritage New Zealand especially appreciates the work that each of the existing Friends groups do for their gardens, particularly in hosting visitors and their involvement in repairs and maintenance. Through this work, the members have developed considerable skills and experience to inform management of the gardens, at both strategic and day-to-day levels.

7. Wellington Botanic Gardens, including Anderson Park (Section 4 of the Plan)

Heritage New Zealand supports the recognition given to the cultural and historic significance of these gardens and the policies aimed at protecting and maintaining the associated features.

The idea under Section 4.3.4 of carrying out an assessment of the garden's heritage values is supported. Heritage New Zealand confirms that it would be happy to provide input on such a project.

In accordance with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, the following changes are sought:

Page 49:

4.3.1 Policies – Historic and Cultural Features

- *All historic and cultural features shall be protected and maintained to a high standard. Advice from suitably qualified historians, artisans, and ~~the~~ Heritage New Zealand Historic Places Trust shall be sought on issues relating to the conservation of specific features.*

Page 50:

Wellington Botanic Garden is listed as a Heritage Area in the District Plan and three features are listed specifically as Heritage Buildings or Objects. These are:

...

- *The overseer's house, 1876, (also classified as a Category 4/2 historic place on the New Zealand Heritage List /Rārangī Kōrero ~~by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust~~ under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014).*

The Garden is also on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangī Kōrero ~~registered by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust~~ as historic area.

27 *Pages 55-56:*

4.3.4 Implementation

Historic and Cultural Features – Complete an assessment of the Wellington Botanic Garden's heritage value... Assistance from local historians and ~~the~~ Heritage New Zealand Historic Places Trust shall be sought in preparing the list.

8. Otari-Wilton's Bush

Heritage New Zealand supports the recognition given to the cultural and historic significance of these gardens and the policies aimed at protecting and maintaining the associated features.

9. Bolton Street Memorial Park

Heritage New Zealand supports the recognition given to the cultural and historic significance of this site and the policies aimed at protecting and maintaining the associated features.

Proposed name change – Heritage New Zealand agrees with the proposal to change the name of this park back to the Bolton Street Cemetery, for the reasons outline in the draft plan. Heritage New Zealand notes that this name change is supported by Friends of Bolton Street Memorial Park (which is to change its name accordingly).

Graves and Monuments – Heritage New Zealand considers that the historic graves are a particularly important feature of this park. It is therefore pleasing to note that the plan refers to established guidance (such as the ICOMOS Charter and maintenance and repair guidelines that have been specifically prepared for this park). The Friends of Bolton Street Memorial Park have considerable experience in overseeing repairs to the graves and have a good sense of practicalities and costs. Accordingly, Heritage New Zealand encourages the Council to seek input from this group on relevant repair and maintenance issues.

A particular issue for historic cemeteries is the damage that root growth and falling branches can inflict on gravestones as trees get larger and age over time. Accordingly, Heritage New Zealand particularly supports the policy under Section 6.2.2 to manage vegetation so that graves and monuments are protected from damage and to maintain adequate visibility and physical access.

Sexton's Cottage – Heritage New Zealand supports the policy under Section 6.2.4 that the Sexton's Cottage be managed in accordance with the conservation plan; this includes any change in use and any associated physical changes. Heritage New Zealand points out that this building has recently been moved from Category 2 to a Category 1 on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero. Accordingly, we seek the following amendments:

Page 91:

The Sexton's Cottage, dating from 1857, is ~~registered as a Category II Historic Building with the Historic Places Trust~~ is entered on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero as a Category 1 historic place and is listed as a heritage item under the District Plan.

Correction – As noted above, Heritage New Zealand points out the Bolton Street Memorial Park is not on ~~the~~ the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero as a historic area. Accordingly, the statement on page 31 (Section 3.4 Cultural and Heritage) that it is needs to be corrected.

Also, in accordance with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, the following changes are sought:

Page 91:

6.2.4 Policies – Heritage Buildings

...

- *Heritage New Zealand ~~The Historic Places Trust~~ shall be consulted about any proposed alterations to the structure of the Memorial Chapel, to ensure that the replicated architectural integrity of the building is retained.*

10. Truby King Park (Section 7 of the Plan)

Heritage New Zealand supports the recognition given to the cultural and historic significance of these gardens and the policies aimed at protecting and maintaining the associated features.

In accordance with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, the following changes are sought:

Page 96:

The landscape context of the three buildings and their original roles and relationship remains today and provide a unique historic precinct that has been entered on the New Zealand Heritage List /Rāranqi Kōrero ~~registered by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust as the Truby King Historic Area.~~

Page 103:

7.2.1 Policies – Future use and management

...

- *Provide physical access to the house consistent with NZHPF Heritage New Zealand guidelines....*

Page 104 (3rd para):

There is a need Heritage New Zealand ~~Historic Places Trust~~ guidelines recommend ...

Correction – Heritage New Zealand confirms that the Truby King Park is on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rāranqi Kōrero as a historic area. However, as noted above, it is not scheduled as a heritage area in the District Plan; the statement on page 31 (Section 3.4 Cultural and Heritage) that it is needs to be corrected accordingly.

11. Rules for Use and Development (Section 8)

Heritage New Zealand generally supports the proposed rules and notes that cultural and historic values are provided for in the objective for this section of the plan.

It is ~~noted~~ that the list of Allowed Activities is quite limited and, as a result, activities that are not specifically ‘allowed’ (or ‘prohibited’) require specific approval against the relevant provisions of the plan. Heritage New Zealand supports this approach.

In relation to heritage buildings and objects, Heritage New Zealand notes that specific approval will be required for any changes proposed by the holder of leases, licences, encroachments etc. In these situations, Heritage New Zealand is satisfied that the provisions of the plan will provide suitable guidance for the consideration of heritage effects.

Application of rules to Council-led developments within the gardens - It is not clear how (or if) the rules of this section apply to the Council itself when it is proposing changes to built heritage within the gardens. While the rules of the District Plan will apply to heritage items and areas scheduled in the District Plan, not all changes require a resource consent. For example, most internal alterations are permitted as of right under the District Plan for individually scheduled buildings or other buildings within a scheduled heritage area. Also, as noted above, the Truby King Garden is not a scheduled heritage area in the District Plan; while the house and mausoleum are individually scheduled, there are other structures that are of heritage value. Heritage New Zealand assumes that the heritage considerations in the management plan would apply to decision making on work carried out by Council in all four gardens. However, Heritage New Zealand seeks that this be clarified within the rule section.

In accordance with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, the following changes are sought:

Page 111:

8.4.3 Note that other approvals from Wellington City Council and other organisations may be required for some activities including:

...

Archaeological authority (from ~~the~~ Heritage New Zealand Historic Places Trust)

Page 115:

...

- Recorded archaeological sites are avoided and where required an Archaeological Authority is obtained from ~~the Historic Places Trust~~ Heritage New Zealand.*

We are happy to discuss our comments further if this would be of assistance.

Yours sincerely



Ann Neill
General Manager
Central Region
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Address for Service:

Jillian Kennemore
Heritage Advisor – Planning
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
P O Box 2629
Wellington 6140
Phone: 04- 494 8325
Email: jkennemore@heritage.org.nz

Submission on Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Management Plan

Paula Warren
Pwarren58@yahoo.co.nz
 2/1 Wesley Road
 Kelburn
 Wellington 6012
 4713118

I would like to be heard in support of my submission.

About the submitter

I am a botanist/ecologist. While I now work as a policy analyst for the Department of Conservation, I continue to do liverwort parataxonomy activities outside work, including involvement in the Otari Bioblitz.

I was New Zealand's chief technical delegate to the Convention on Biological Diversity for about 6 years, the focal point for the Clearing House Mechanism and the Global Taxonomy Initiative, and a member of the SBSTTA bureau for one term. As such I had a strong involvement in the development of international guidance on plant conservation. In my work I have been involved in amending and administering the Reserves Act.

I am a member of the Friends of the Wellington Botanic Gardens, the Friends of the Bolton St Cemetary, and the Friends of Otari-Wilton's Bush. I run the restoration project along the motorway edge from the Bolton St Cemetary to the Cable Car.

I am a member of the WCC Environmental Reference Group, and of the stormwater advisory group.

Objectives for Otari

I do not consider that the proposed objectives in the document appropriately recognise Otari's role as a plant museum a place for science as well as public enjoyment.

To be scientifically useful, the Otari plant collection needs to be managed in a particular way that would not be signalled by the objective. I would like to see the document contain a very clear objective for the museum, added after the general objectives:

In the case of Otari, to be a living museum of the natural flora of New Zealand, with the collection being as complete as possible and representative of the range of the flora, with each plant having a known provenance, and with the collection being organised and managed to enhance its use for scientific and science education purposes.

The cultural heritage section on p64 should also mention the cultural significance of the Otari Plant museum and Cockayne's role in it. (see page 73).

In the themes section on page 65, add to the first theme "... and providing a basis for scientific study of New Zealand's flora.

The plan (page 66?) should include a clear objective for what proportion of the flora should be covered in the collection (including the bits located elsewhere). I would suggest:

"The complete museum collection (located in the Otari gardens and in satellite locations) should be as comprehensive as possible. All families should be represented, and the long term aim should be to have representative species of all genera. The collection should

contain all plants that are considered to be unusual parts of the flora, and be able to be used to demonstrate all key characteristics of the NZ flora.”

One of the themes for the collections that should be recognised in the discussion on p68 should be connections between the NZ flora and other floras. NZ has some oddities which presumably arise due to our isolation – only one Euphorbiacean species for example.

But it is also important to show the affinities – something that could be done in the satellite collections. Key southern hemisphere genera/families (e.g. southern beech, restionaceae, auracariaceae, treeferns) should be interpreted in the Wellington gardens, with full collections of the NZ members included. The satellite collections could also highlight some of the structural changes in our flora. For example I took a Colombian, Harvard trained ecologist through Otari, and he found it hard to believe that our divaricating coprosma spp were rubiacean, because they don't look it. Equally, the woody members of normally herbaceous groups like Violacea/mahoe could be highlighted in satellite collections that can have a mix of native and exotic species.

My preference would be for the cultivar collections to be removed from the museum and placed in satellite collections.

Science and science education

For the Kelburn Garden, I also believe that there should be a clear science and science education role. This should be referred to in the general objectives, by adding a new bullet:

- *Facilitate scientific study and science education*

The wording in 3.1.1 implies that there is a problem with organising plants taxonomically. I can agree with the intent behind the statement – to have a wider range of interpretation approaches. Nevertheless, I would like to see more taxonomic emphasis in management of the collections. That doesn't have to be by putting plants into taxonomic groupings, although it is perhaps ironic that one recent development – the pinetum – is in fact a taxonomic focus. An alternative that should be explored in this digital age is to have mapping of where plants are, so a visitor wanting to explore a particular taxonomic group can find the plants.

So I would like to see the material under 3.1.1 re-worded as “...interpretation and education. While the scientific study objective of the gardens should be retained, and in the case of Otari remain a driving objective, there is a need to also use the collection to raise awareness and provoke behaviour change. This can be achieved by telling stories about plants and biodiversity in ways that will engage the casual visitor. If collections are re-organised to better meet that purpose, other tools can be used to maintain the value of the collections for research and people wishing to explore taxonomy. We discuss...”

But taxonomy is not something we should be afraid of building into broader interpretation. The reason that taxonomy is at the base of every biological science is because humans don't even see things unless they can put things in boxes and give them names. Even amateur gardeners use taxonomy – they cannot effectively communicate with each other or garden centres or find information if they don't know that this is a rose and that is a geranium. “Red flower with nice smell” doesn't get you very far.

As with museums, we shouldn't dumb down the interpretation to the point where people cannot move on from there to a more detailed interest. Scientific names should be on all labels, and key taxonomic information also included. For example I was disappointed on a recent visit to the pinetum to find that all the new plants were the same species, and there was no information on the

pine family at all. Not even on what are the basics for identification – needle number for example. We need to be using places like that to give people a start into understanding taxonomy. In fact, I can't think of any other reason for taking a large area of expensive city land and putting pines on it.

I have also been disappointed by the gradual loss of what used to be a lovely restio collection. They are a fascinating southern hemisphere family, don't take up much room, and are generally pretty easy to grow. But we could provide that somewhere else if space is an issue – as I discuss below, stormwater gardens could be used to hold bits of the collections, and would suit restionacean plants very well (in fact that's mostly what WCC uses).

I strongly support the holding of reference libraries, but I would also like to see the gardens have places that researchers or people wishing to explore plants in more detail can go. For example the Treehouse could have a small "laboratory" with microscopes and other basic equipment, and staff could be available to approve the taking of small samples by people wishing to use those facilities. This should be available for people wishing to look at fine details for art purposes, not just for "real" science.

Ideally there would be an all-year bioblitz happening, with retired scientists working in the gardens, and the type of work they do visible to the public – cf the popularity of the zoo's hospital area. At our last national bryophyte workshop in Ohakune, we hosted a school group. One small child in the group was so fascinated by the microscopes that he stayed and watched me identify things instead of going out and collecting with the rest of the class. Most people never get to look down a microscope and see the details of plants, and for many people that will be the trigger for a love affair with plants (and an appreciation of non-vascular plants and fungi) that other forms of exposure won't achieve.

I would be quite happy to lend my microscopes and related equipment to such a facility (provided I could use them when I am working on liverworts).

On page 67, the discussion on use of the house at Otari should include "research". Otari really should have a "scientist in residence" programme based there. Equivalent addition on page 72, with "scientists in residence" added to "intern/staff accommodation".

Weeds

One of the issues we discussed in the international debate on plant conservation and botanic gardens was the role of botanic gardens in introducing weeds. Wellington's gardens have some serious weeds – sometimes as weeds and sometimes in the collections.

Our conclusion in the international discussions was that botanic gardens need to:

1. Be more responsible about which plants they promote to gardeners.
2. Provide public education about weeds.
3. Get rid of species that are environmental weeds (or expected to naturalise) unless they have a strong role in the garden and aren't easily replaced.
4. Where they keep problem plants, take some responsibility for preventing spread from those plants (e.g. removing seedheads before they are spread by birds).

I would like to see this approach reflected in the document by:

- Adding a new bullet to the 3.2 objectives second bullet sub-bullets: "environmental weeds"
- Adding "including environmental weeds" after "sustainable living" in 3.2.2 Policy – Education and Awareness Themes on p22.

- In the section on sustainable living at the top of p23, add “Also help people understand environmental weeds and restoration practices.”
- Adding a new theme in 4.2: “What makes some plants become environmental weeds and how can they be controlled in restoration work.”

Volunteers as visitors

I believe that a good way to get people to connect to a place is to get them to do things to improve that place. And a lot of people like to have some reason to go to the place, or like to make their visit of benefit to the place. The Friends groups are one avenue for that, but there can also be other opportunities provided. For example neighbours who regularly walk in the gardens could be encouraged to remove tradescantia and deposit it in tradescantia bins.

I would therefore like to see added to the recreation objectives a new bullet “Encouraging volunteer contributions to the gardens.” Policies for that would be:

Opportunities will be provided to allow people to contribute to the management or development of the gardens as volunteers, through

- events managed by Friends organisations
- being open to proposals from individuals to make specific contributions (e.g. creation of artworks, research, etc)
- encouraging regular visitors to contribute to ongoing programmes (e.g. eradication of problem weeds).

Friends groups

I am surprised at the lack of a clear policy in section 4.5 about the role of the Friends of the Wellington Botanic Gardens. It states their roles, but does not say whether those are the roles that are wanted or how the relationship should be managed or how much is wanted from the Friends and whether the organisation needs to change to deliver what is wanted.

I think the table in 5.5.1 belongs with the other garden. Again, the Otari section doesn't say what is wanted in terms of the relationship with the Friends group.

Transport corridors

The Wellington garden in particular is a major commuter route. I was amazed recently to see a WCC statement that it was fine to close the gardens for the Festival event because “the gardens are always closed at night”. News to me, who often walks through them to get from home to other places, including after 7.30pm. And closing a garden at night is a bit of a dumb idea anyway. Why shouldn't people be able to go and enjoy the glow-worms, or take their kids on a walk by torchlight through the bush.

The closure for the Power Plant was entirely appropriate, but badly managed, and highlighted the importance of the gardens as a pedestrian transport route. I had my mother staying, and so after evening events we would take the Cable Car up and walk back down to Wesley Road. Mostly we managed to get through the Power Plant queues without major problems, but a security guard tried very hard one evening to stop us and a neighbour walking home. The importance of that transport corridor should have been recognised and provided for – either by having commuters exit the Cable Car on the gardens side and able to pass through a fenced off route to the path below the lookout.

The management plan should be actively encouraging use of the gardens as walking routes, with interpretation being designed to encourage those people to start noticing what they are walking through. This is a captive audience that should be targeted, including by encouraging them to use different routes for their walk on different days.

There is also a need to look at how the gardens connect to the walking routes around them – improved road crossings for example, or route signage, or short-cuts to streets (e.g. in the case of Truby King) – so that more people doing transport walks will detour slightly to add the gardens into their journey, or choose to walk through the gardens to a different bus stop.

On page 60, add a new bullet in the table under circulation... to read

- Encourage use of the botanic gardens as a pedestrian transport route, and develop interpretation to encourage users of those routes to notice the plants they are walking amongst.

Reading the Otari section on page 79 you would think everyone drove there. They shouldn't. But when you go there by bus, it isn't immediately obvious as to where to get off the bus and where to go from the bus stop – something that is recognised as an issue on page 81. There needs to be a section in 5.4.2 that says something like:

Access by public transport will be encouraged, including through support for provision of bus facilities at the gardens (bus shelters, RTI screens), and active promotion of the use of the bus service. Use of the Bush and gardens as part of a longer commuter journey will also be encouraged.

The Bolton St Cemetery section recognises this as a commuting route, but there is no mention of the potential for interpretation to be targeted at those users. Why not, for example, a frequently changed small interpretation panel by the overbridge, highlighting a different feature each time. For example what about one that focuses on death rate of children as a result of poor sanitation/infectious disease, or a showcase of particular people who are interred. The Friends newsletter often has articles that could be used as a basis for this. Also a chance to alert people to volunteer work days.

In 7.2.1 add a new policy

- Improve pedestrian connections to the garden from neighbouring streets and town belt paths.

In 7.3.1 change the first para after the bullets to read:

“The Park needs to offer opportunities to local residents who use it as their local park, to visitors who are attracted by the values of the site, and to visitors who are incorporating the park into a longer walk (including along the southern walkway). All visitors should be encouraged to experience...”

At the top of page 106, change bullet 2 by adding “Access by walking or public transport will be encouraged, including through improved information, walking links and signage.”

At the bottom of that section, change “prevents the building of pedestrian access ways” to “makes building pedestrian access ways more difficult and expensive”. We can build them on cliffs, it just costs a bit more.

Add an implementation section on 107:

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Visitation and access | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance pedestrian links to the park, and look at ways to encourage use of the park as a feature on longer walking routes. • Examine ways to encourage increased |
|------------------------------|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| | use of public transport to access the park, including by signage and targeting of supergold card holders. |
|--|---|

The remnants as a source for restoration elsewhere

The section on natural heritage needs to recognise the importance of the two bush remnants (Bot Gardens remnant and Wilton's Bush) as sources for propagules (including seeds, fungi, and litter containing invertebrates) to allow nearby projects to achieve more complete restoration.

That could be provided through a new bullet under 3.4.7:

- The natural remnants within the gardens will be available for use as sources of propagules for nearby restoration projects. That would include allowing appropriate seed collection, and removal of small amounts of leaf litter to translocate soil organisms into re-vegetated areas.

Extending the gardens out into the city

I would like to see the concept of plant interpretation/education extended out from the botanic gardens into other parts of the city.

I have in the past suggested that my Tokyo Lane project should include some patches of interpreted plantings – for example a small group of typical coastal plants, or perhaps a taxonomic group such as Muehlenbeckia, or a distinctive plant form such as divaricating shrubs. The Lane is well used for commuting and lunchtime walks/runs, and it would be good to have those people targeted.

A similar approach could be taken when designing new stormwater gardens in the central city, or in major landscaping projects such as the intended Basic re-development work or Memorial Park work.

There is also potential to place interpretation of plants in other locations, with the reader encouraged to visit the gardens to see the plants in the flesh. The railway station, buses, Te Papa, the library, etc could all be used. We used to have poetry in buses. Why not have each bus showcasing a different interesting plant, including a little note on where the plant can be seen.

I would like to see that reflected in the management plan through:

1. Adding to the Plant Collections section a new paragraph under 3.1.1 to read "Collections will be gradually extended beyond the geographic limits of the gardens, by providing interpreted plantings in other public places in the central city, town centres and other places where there a wider audience can be reached."
2. Add new material under 3.2.2 to read "There will also be consideration of how to target audiences who are not visiting the garden, through placing of parts of the collection in other public places, and providing interpretation of aspects of the gardens in other locations."
3. On p66, first para under "Range and scope of collections" add "In addition, other locations could be used to hold parts of the collection and make it more accessible to a wider audience. Possibilities that will be explored include the gardens around Te Papa and the waterfront area."
4. Add a new section in the table in 5.1.1, covering the development of satellite collections in other locations to allow a larger collection, allow the use of mixed native/exotic collections to interpret themes, and to increase the range of people who see the collection.

War and victory garden

What on earth is a war and victory garden? If you really want something with a war theme, what about showcasing the florals of places that were invaded by both sides and suffered severe environmental damage as a result, like Gallipoli.

Bucket tree

If by the bucket tree you mean the macrocarpa next to the Cable Car lookout, don't you dare to take it away. It is one of the few places that teens seem to really appreciate, and more frequently used than a lot of the formal seating areas.

Section 4.3.3 last bullet on page 52

This should be amended to read "...damage buildings, and the material cannot be moved into an adjacent part of the remnant. The first thing that should be done with dead branch material and logs is to put it into the bush to add more habitat for things like liverworts.

Monitoring of health of remnants

The policies in 4.3.3 should include a policy to develop and implement a monitoring plan for the remnant.

Wilton's Bush revegetation

It is not clear in the document as to what the intended extent of the restored Wilton's Bush will be. It would be good to see a goal to extend the forest out over all the adjacent council-controlled land at the very least.

Kaiwharawhara stream

The Bioblitz sampling didn't just find vertebrates, but also exciting invertebrates and algae. It is important that documents like this recognise more than just trees and vertebrates.

Prohibited activities

The end of Wesley Road is constantly subject to illegal parking. Often just on the yellow lines, but far too often on the grass. The council needs to either enforce the no vehicles rule on the grass, or put a parking space in. I would prefer the enforcement approach.

HAVE YOUR SAY ON THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE BOTANIC GARDENS OF WELLINGTON



Have your say

You can comment on the draft plan by completing a submission form or writing down your comments and sending them to us by:

- Visiting our website: Wellington.govt.nz/have-your-say
- Email: botanicgardenplan@wcc.govt.nz
- Post: FREEPOST, Botanic Gardens Plan, Parks and Gardens (REPL01), Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington 6140
- Fax: 04 801 3155

You may also make an oral submission to Councillors in support of your written submission. To do this please let us know and provide your contact details.

What happens next?

1. You can drop into the Treehouse Visitor Centre between 2–4pm on Sunday 4 May to speak with Council officers and the Botanic Garden manager to discuss the plan.
2. Comments on the draft plan are due by 3 June 2014.
3. Submissions will be analysed. Oral submissions will be held in early August 2014. Amendments to the plan could be made based on submissions.
4. The final Botanic Gardens Management Plan will go to the Council for approval in September 2014.

SUBMISSION FORM QUESTIONS

ENTER YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS

* Mandatory fields

Mr / Mrs / Ms / Miss / Dr (Please circle which applies)

First name* Tony Last name* FISHER

Street address* 155 Wilton Road

Suburb WILTON City WELLINGTON

Phone/mobile 04) 475 3015 Email tonyfisher19@gmail.com

MAKING A SUBMISSION

I am making a submission As an individual On behalf of an organisation

Name of organisation _____

I would like to make an oral submission to the City Councillors. Yes No

If yes, provide a phone number above so that a submission time can be arranged.

COMMENTS ARE DUE BY 5PM, TUESDAY 3 JUNE 2014

Privacy statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are published and made available to elected members of the Council and the public. Personal information supplied will be used for administration and reporting back to elected members of the Council and the public as part of the consultation process. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington. Submitters have the right to access and correct personal information.

1. OVERALL, DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE GENERAL DIRECTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DRAFT PLAN? (please circle)

Strongly oppose Oppose Neither support nor oppose Support Strongly support

Why? The options to have these opportunities in the Wellington City area are too precious to let go.

2. DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE GENERAL DIRECTION AND POLICIES FOR: (please circle)

a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)

Strongly oppose Oppose Neither support nor oppose Support Strongly support

Why? as above

b. Otari-Wilton's Bush

Strongly oppose Oppose Neither support nor oppose Support Strongly support

Why? The option of having this piece of bush, available to all free of admission, and with such easy to access + so extremely close to the city, with its excellent bus route is a great amenity for locals + visitors alike. However it could do with greater promotion of its possibilities. I generally like the "balance" between plant information (which could perhaps be spread a little wider) but not over-cluttering areas with too much information — Continue to page 4

c. Bolton Street Memorial Park

Strongly oppose Oppose Neither support nor oppose Support Strongly support

Why?

d. Truby King Park

Strongly oppose Oppose Neither support nor oppose Support Strongly support

Why? *No nothing about this area.*

3. ARE THERE ANY OTHER MAJOR CHANGES YOU THINK SHOULD BE INCLUDED? (please circle)

Yes

No - *other than my comments on page 4.*

Your comments

4. ARE THERE ANY ACTIONS IN THE PLAN YOU FEEL SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY? (please circle)

Yes

No - *continue on as at present.*

Your comments

5. IS THERE ANYTHING YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY COVERED BY THIS PLAN? (please circle)

Yes

No

Your comments

6. YOUR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: (please attach additional pages if you need to)

I would see a great option for the WCC to acquire the property at 153 Wilton Road which is currently vacant & also has the easement for the WCC water reticulation scheme — this section could be used at the roadway side to increase parking options if thought fit, or to perhaps use some of it for a bus stop option opposite the main entrance. It also has the possibility to connect through the steep gully at its rear up to the WCC reserve behind which fronts on to upper Gloucester Street to virtually add all this into the Otari Bush area.

1st fold here — fasten here once folded

Thank you for your comments.

PLEASE RETURN THIS SUBMISSION FORM BY 3 JUNE 2014

2nd fold here

Free Post Authority Number 2199



FREEPOST
Botanic Gardens Plan,
Parks and Gardens (REPL01)
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140

HAVE YOUR SAY ON THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE BOTANIC GARDENS OF WELLINGTON



Have your say

You can comment on the draft plan by completing a submission form or writing down your comments and sending them to us by:

- Visiting our website:
Wellington.govt.nz/have-your-say
- Email: botanicgardenplan@wcc.govt.nz
- Post: FREEPOST, Botanic Gardens Plan, Parks and Gardens (REPL01), Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington 6140
- Fax: 04 801 3155

You may also make an oral submission to Councillors in support of your written submission. To do this please let us know and provide your contact details.

What happens next?

1. You can drop into the Treehouse Visitor Centre between 2–4pm on Sunday 4 May to speak with Council officers and the Botanic Garden manager to discuss the plan.
2. Comments on the draft plan are due by 3 June 2014.
3. Submissions will be analysed. Oral submissions will be held in early August 2014. Amendments to the plan could be made based on submissions.
4. The final Botanic Gardens Management Plan will go to the Council for approval in September 2014.

SUBMISSION FORM QUESTIONS

| ENTER YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| * Mandatory fields | |
| Mr / Mrs / Ms / Miss / Dr (Please circle which applies) | |
| First name* IAN | Last name* STOCKWELL |
| Street address* 2 PAISLEY TERRACE | |
| Suburb KARORI | City WELLINGTON |
| Phone/mobile 476-3630 | Email |

| MAKING A SUBMISSION | |
|---|--|
| I am making a submission | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As an individual <input type="checkbox"/> On behalf of an organisation |
| Name of organisation | |
| I would like to make an oral submission to the City Councillors. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes * <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| If yes, provide a phone number above so that a submission time can be arranged. | |

COMMENTS ARE DUE BY 5PM, TUESDAY 3 JUNE 2014

Privacy statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are published and made available to elected members of the Council and the public. Personal information supplied will be used for administration and reporting back to elected members of the Council and the public as part of the consultation process. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington. Submitters have the right to access and correct personal information.

*** PLEASE NOTE I AM OVERSEAS 22 JUNE to 14 AUGUST**

1. OVERALL, DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE GENERAL DIRECTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DRAFT PLAN? (please circle)

Strongly oppose Oppose Neither support nor oppose Support Strongly support

Why? I support this. Consistency should hopefully be the result of these general directions and objectives and get away from the disconnected approach to date.

2. DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE GENERAL DIRECTION AND POLICIES FOR: (please circle)

a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)

Strongly oppose Oppose Neither support nor oppose Support Strongly support

Why?

b. Otari-Wilton's Bush

Strongly oppose Oppose Neither support nor oppose Support Strongly support

Why? The uniqueness of Otari Wilton Bush, as the only public garden focused on native plants needs to be continually highlighted as it is not well known.

The Otari Wilton Bush nursery needs to be adequately resourced in terms of infrastructure; the educational/research aspect as mentioned is strongly supported - the Cockayne Centre will be an essential component of this.

The boundary with Ian Galloway Park needs to be clearly defined on all documentation (legal)

c. Bolton Street Memorial Park

Strongly oppose Oppose Neither support nor oppose Support Strongly support

Why?

d. Truby King Park

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|------------------|
| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
| Why? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

3. ARE THERE ANY OTHER MAJOR CHANGES YOU THINK SHOULD BE INCLUDED? (please circle)

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Your comments *Consideration should be given to including Karori Cemetery with the other listed entities under the Botanic Gardens of Wellington Draft Management Plan. Karori Cemetery occupies a key geographical area adjacent to Olavi Wilton Bush in terms of ~~flora~~ ^{and fauna} and the 'green corridor' with Zealandia. The Cemetery already has substantial areas of native trees & many native birds. This needs to be managed & researched under the ^{Botanic Gardens} Management Plan.*

4. ARE THERE ANY ACTIONS IN THE PLAN YOU FEEL SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY? (please circle)

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|

Your comments

5. IS THERE ANYTHING YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY COVERED BY THIS PLAN? (please circle)

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|

Your comments

6. YOUR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: (please attach additional pages if you need to)

The Council needs to have a more vibrant and visible communications programme to encourage the public to remove weeds from their properties. This especially applies to all of the suburbs where the entities in the Botanic Gardens Management Plan are located plus the Karori Cemetery. Flyers could, as one suggestion, be included in Council communications such as rates payment, leased land & highlighted in online communications. There also needs to be a more active weed control policy in Karori Cemetery given the potential for weeds to spread into Otari Willton Bush.

1st fold here - fasten here once folded

Thank you for your comments.

PLEASE RETURN THIS SUBMISSION FORM BY 3 JUNE 2014

2nd fold here

Free Post Authority Number 2199

Absolutely
POSITIVELY
ME HEKE KI PŌNEKE
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL **Wellington**
PO Box 2199, Wellington, New Zealand

CARRIED BY NEW ZEALAND POST 410-09 30 MAY 14

Free  >>>> GOT A QUESTION? VISIT WWW.NZPOST.CO.NZ/HELP <<<<

FREEPOST
Botanic Gardens Plan,
Parks and Gardens (REPL01)
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140

HAVE YOUR SAY ON THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE BOTANIC GARDENS OF WELLINGTON



Have your say

You can comment on the draft plan by completing a submission form or writing down your comments and sending them to us by:

- Visiting our website: Wellington.govt.nz/have-your-say
- Email: botanicgardenplan@wcc.govt.nz
- Post: FREEPOST, Botanic Gardens Plan, Parks and Gardens (REPL01), Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington 6140
- Fax: 04 801 3155

You may also make an oral submission to Councillors in support of your written submission. To do this please let us know and provide your contact details.

What happens next?

1. You can drop into the Treehouse Visitor Centre between 2–4pm on Sunday 4 May to speak with Council officers and the Botanic Garden manager to discuss the plan.
2. Comments on the draft plan are due by 3 June 2014.
3. Submissions will be analysed. Oral submissions will be held in early August 2014. Amendments to the plan could be made based on submissions.
4. The final Botanic Gardens Management Plan will go to the Council for approval in September 2014.

SUBMISSION FORM QUESTIONS

| ENTER YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS | |
|---|---|
| * Mandatory fields | |
| Mr / Mrs / Ms / Miss / Dr (Please circle which applies) | |
| First name* <i>John</i> | Last name* <i>Meeds</i> |
| Street address* <i>20 Ngaho Road, The Glen</i> | |
| Suburb <i>Kelburn</i> | City <i>Wellington</i> |
| Phone/mobile <i>021 648 198</i> | Email <i>john.meeds@paradise.net.nz</i> |

| MAKING A SUBMISSION | |
|---|--|
| I am making a submission | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As an individual <input type="checkbox"/> On behalf of an organisation |
| Name of organisation | |
| I would like to make an oral submission to the City Councillors. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| If yes, provide a phone number above so that a submission time can be arranged. | |

COMMENTS ARE DUE BY 5PM, TUESDAY 3 JUNE 2014

Privacy statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are published and made available to elected members of the Council and the public. Personal information supplied will be used for administration and reporting back to elected members of the Council and the public as part of the consultation process. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington. Submitters have the right to access and correct personal information.

1. OVERALL, DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE GENERAL DIRECTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DRAFT PLAN? (please circle)

| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|------------------|
| Why? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

2. DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE GENERAL DIRECTION AND POLICIES FOR: (please circle)

a. Wellington Botanic Garden (including Anderson Park)

| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|------------------|
| Why? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

b. Otari-Wilton's Bush

| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|------------------|
| Why? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

c. Bolton Street Memorial Park

| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|------------------|
| Why? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

d. Truby King Park

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|------------------|
| Strongly oppose | Oppose | Neither support nor oppose | Support | Strongly support |
|-----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|------------------|

Why? My wife and I are immediate neighbours of the Botanic Gardens. However, we have a particular interest in Truby King Park, which is a fabulous site but in urgent need of restoration. See over.

3. ARE THERE ANY OTHER MAJOR CHANGES YOU THINK SHOULD BE INCLUDED? (please circle)

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

Your comments

4. ARE THERE ANY ACTIONS IN THE PLAN YOU FEEL SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY? (please circle)

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

Your comments

5. IS THERE ANYTHING YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY COVERED BY THIS PLAN? (please circle)

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

Your comments

6. YOUR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: (please attach additional pages if you need to)

Truly King Park

We support the proposals, but feel they should be 'addressed urgently, and that sufficient funding be allocated' to enable restoration work to be undertaken over the next 12 months. We are interested in supporting the Truly King Park Trust.

1st fold here - fasten here once folded

Thank you for your comments.

PLEASE RETURN THIS SUBMISSION FORM BY 3 JUNE 2014

2nd fold here

Free Post Authority Number 2199

**Absolutely
POSITIVELY**
ME HEKE KI PŌNEKE
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL **Wellington**
PO Box 2199, Wellington, New Zealand

CARRIED BY NEW ZEALAND POST 610-13

>>> GOT A QUESTION? VISIT WWW.NZPOST.CO.NZ/HELP <<<<



30 MAY 14

FREEPOST

Botanic Gardens Plan,
Parks and Gardens (REPL01)
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140