
REPORT 1
(1215/52/IM)

POINT DORSET RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to present the submissions received on the draft Point Dorset Reserve Management Plan and an officer response to the issues raised (see Appendix 1). This report recommends that the amended Management Plan (attached as Appendix 2) be adopted.

2 Executive Summary

Twenty eight submissions were received on the draft Point Dorset Management Plan. The majority of these were in strong support for the objectives and policies in the plan, however there were a number of issues where submitters were divided on direction stated in the draft Plan. These included the issues of dogs on or off leash on the beach area, retention of existing exotic or native (but not local) vegetation within the reserve, and cycling in the reserve.

The most significant change recommended is that of the name of the reserve from 'Point Dorset Reserve' to 'Oruaiti Reserve' as requested by the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust.

This paper presents the recommended changes in response to the issues raised in submissions. The Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust as land owner have been closely involved in the development of the plan and support the changes made following submissions.

3 Recommendations

Officers recommend that the Strategy and Policy Committee:

- 1. Receive the information.*
- 2. Agree the changes to the draft Management Plan outlined in Appendix 1 in response to issues raised in submissions*
- 3. Recommend to Council that the management plan as attached in Appendix 2 be adopted as a management plan under Section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977*

Name of the Reserve

4. *Note the land currently covered by the draft Plan is owned by the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust and the Council's role is that of administrating body under the Reserves Act 1977*
5. *Note the Council's Open Space Naming Policy applies only to land owned by the Council*
6. *Agree a name change for the reserve to 'Oruaiti Reserve' and the name of the management plan to Oruaiti Reserve Management Plan*
7. *Recommend to Council that it gazette a name change for the reserve to 'Oruaiti Reserve' under s16(10) of the Reserves Act 1977*

Dog control

8. *Agree to consider the submissions requesting part of the reserve be used as a Dog Exercise Area in the next review of the Council's Dog Control Policy*

Biking in the reserve

9. *Note the Open Space Access Plan states that all tracks are open to walking and cycling unless specifically stated*
10. *Recommend to Council that all tracks in Oruaiti Reserve be closed to cycling except the track between Hector Street and the boardwalk off Ludlam Street under the Open Space Access Plan and that Schedule A and Map 16 of the Open Space Access Plan be amended to record these tracks are closed to cycling*

Coverage of the management plan

11. *Recommend to Council that any private land adjoining the Oruaiti Reserve which is acquired by the Council in the future be vested as Recreation Reserve and be managed in accordance with the Oruaiti Reserve Management Plan.*
12. *Recommend to Council that the Environment Portfolio Leader and Chief Executive Officer be delegated the authority to sign off minor changes to the Plan, resulting from any amendments agreed by the Committee.*

4 Background

The draft Management Plan was developed for the Point Dorset reserve between Seatoun and Breaker Bay to meet the requirements of the Reserves Act 1977. This land is owned by the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust with the Council appointed to control and manage the reserve under the Reserves Act.

The draft Plan was developed based on the objectives of the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust for the site and feedback received on a discussion document released in October 2010. The draft Point Dorset Management Plan was approved for consultation by the Committee in May 2011. Consultation on the draft Plan is required under the Reserves Act 1977 and was publicly notified

on 14 June 2011. Submissions closed on 15 August 2011 and 28 submissions were received (3 of these were received after the closing date but accepted as late submissions). A summary of submissions is included as Appendix 1.

Seven submitters made oral submissions to the Committee on 8th September 2011.

This paper presents all submissions made on the draft Plan and makes recommendation for changes to the text of the document.

5 Discussion

The key issues raised by submitters were around

- Dog walking in the reserve
- Wildlife, particularly penguins
- Pest management
- Removal of existing vegetation
- The range of plants to be used as part of the ecological restoration
- Heritage
- Signage
- Cycling in the reserve
- Acquisition of adjacent private land
- Name change

These are discussed below.

5.1 Dog walking in the reserve

There were two broad groupings on the issue of dogs in the reserve. Submitters were fairly evenly split between those wishing to walk their dogs off lead and those who considered that dogs should be on the lead at all times.

A key issue for dogs in the reserve is the potential for harm to penguins on the beach both at nesting time and during moult season. The proposal in the plan is to restore and enhance the coastal habitats in the reserve to create more habitats that are suitable for penguins and other sea birds. There was some discussion in the submissions around the times when penguins would be on the beach and the areas they currently use. A number of submitters suggested that dogs should be allowed off lead in the reserve during the times when penguins are less likely to be on the beach or on the upper tracks along the ridgeline.

The Dog Policy is the mechanism that controls whether the reserve can be used as a Dog Exercise Area. This policy is explicit that in areas where there is potential conflict between wildlife and dogs, then access for dogs to an area will be restricted.

The Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust (PNBST) considers the greater emphasis for the reserve should be on ecological restoration and would prefer that dogs remain on lead at all times.

Officers considered that a potential compromise could be to allow dogs to exercise off lead on the upper ridgeline tracks between Mantell Street and Ludlam Street. However, the majority of these tracks are currently on private land and if this land is acquired by the Council in the future they would become part of the reserve. At this stage, any decision around the use of the reserve as a Dog Exercise Area would be made through the review of the Dog Policy, anticipated in 2012/13.

Recommendation

- Consider the issue of dogs off lease on the ridgeline tracks as part of the review of the Dog Policy
- Amend the draft plan to reflect the potential for such as review.

5.2 Wildlife

A number of submitters raise the issue of penguins in the reserve around whether penguins inhabit the reserve, the times of the day or season penguins are on the beach or whether they are really an endangered species. Most comments are in connection with the need or otherwise for dog control in the area.

Forest and Bird have a number of penguin nesting boxes in the area. By providing suitable habitat for little blue penguins in natural environments such as Point Dorset, the need for penguins to enter risky urban areas is reduced. Little blue penguins are currently listed as 'at risk - declining', consequently, the Council has an obligation to protect them.

Recommendation

- No changes to the plan are recommended.

5.3 Pest management

Submitters raised the issue of rabbits and other pests on the reserve. Rabbits are a known issue for the area and Greater Wellington are involved in pest management. Given the location of the reserve in a residential area, neither baits nor traps are appropriate and the only method available for rabbit control in this location is likely to be night shooting of the rabbits. This will require appropriate notification of neighbours and other potential users of the reserve.

Two submitters raise the issue of cats in the reserve. Whilst it is acknowledged that cats can be an issue for native wildlife, the majority of the cats in the reserve are likely to be pets from neighbouring residential areas. The Council will undertake an education programme around being 'good neighbours' to the reserve as part of the restoration programme and the issue of cats in the reserve and potential methods (e.g. bell wearing, keeping them in at night) to reduce their impact will be included in the information provided.

Recommendation

- Include cats as a potential pest in 4.2.1.
- Add another bullet point to Policy 4.4.1
 - A proactive rabbit control programme will be carried out to reduce the population and ensure no harmful effects from these pests on existing vegetation and restoration programmes.

5.4 Removal of existing vegetation

A number of submitters raised concerns that the draft plan suggests removal of some existing vegetation, particularly trees such as pohutukawa, ngaio, karaka and karo.

Removal of trees is anticipated in two scenarios, one where they directly affect the ability to restore areas of high ecological significance or where they pose a significant health and safety risk. In the first instance other more suitable local trees will be established prior to any removal of vegetation, in the second instance, any trees, particularly pines, will be subject to a health and safety assessment and will only be removed if they are a hazard.

Pohutukawa, karo and karaka are considered to have reached Wellington only with human intervention and are not included in the list of species. Karo and karaka have the potential to exclude other native local plants that would have grown in this location. Pohutukawa, karo and karaka will be removed in the long term. Potential to replace pohutukawa with northern rata will be explored.

Recommendation

- Include Ngaio and Northern Rata in the list of potential restoration species in Appendix One.

5.5 The range of plants to be used as part of the ecological restoration

Two submitters raised issues around the range of plants included in Appendix One. The Wellington Botanical Society noted that the species listed by John Buchanan (1872) or James Crawford (1872) would be appropriate. These lists were used in compiling the list of species for recommended planting in Appendix One. Species in the list have been selected because they can be propagated and are successful in the re-vegetation process. The intention of the list in Appendix One is not to be an exhaustive list but used as a guide for those locally eco-sourced species to be used for the restoration project.

A number of submitters raised the issue of the harshness of the environment and the need to ensure vegetation cover is retained during the restoration project. This is noted and weed control and planting programmes will be closely linked to ensure the retention of vegetative cover.

One submitter requests that the second bullet point in policy 3.4.1 be modified to “Only locally sourced, low-growing native coastal plants will be planted near the lookout area”. Officers agree with the intent of the submission that landscape planting should be consistent with the ecological restoration objectives of the plan and recommend the wording be change to be consistent

with the policies in section 4: Ecology and refer to eco-source native coastal plants.

Recommendation

- Add an additional note to Appendix One to show the list is not exhaustive and is an indicative guide to the species to be used for restoration of the reserve.
- Amend the second bullet point of Policy 3.4.1 be amended to:
‘Only low-growing eco-sourced native coastal plants will be planted near the look out area’.

5.6 Heritage

One submitter notes that there was a shooting range for pistols and small arms on Breaker Bay beach at the bottom of the track and an anti submarine MIL loop off Point Dorset not referred to in the draft plan. No records of the shooting range were found in the historical records searched. Map C which lists the main heritage sites on the Point from the Archaeological Assessment carried out by Opus Consultants in March 2011. These represent the sites assessed on the reserve land during the site visit. Opus was not given permission to assess the sites on private land. If the Council acquires the site adjacent to the reserve, an archaeological assessment of the features on private land will be carried out at that time. A note should be added to Map C to reflect the origin of the map. In addition, the existence of the shooting range and anti submarine MIL loop off the Point will be added to the text.

Three submitters made comment around the protection and preservation of the heritage sites. One commented on the current poor condition of the heritage assets and considered the focus of the plan should be on interpretation of the remaining assets and ecological restoration. Others commented on the need to assess the remaining structures, repair and make safe the remaining structures and instigate a monitoring regime. NZHPT noted that vegetation removal around remaining structures should be done on a case by case basis as this may have both positive and negative impacts on the structure. In addition, some removal of vegetation may require an archaeological permit where the site is an archaeological site.

It is intended that the sites will be recorded over time using photo points as part of the monitoring programme. The Council’s heritage specialists will be involved in the restoration programme to provide advice on the preservation or otherwise of the heritage assets. Where required, an archaeological authority from NZHPT will be obtained.

Recommendation

- Add a note to Map C that it is based on the sites assessed as part of the Opus Archaeological assessment in March 2011
- Add the shooting range and MIL loop to the text in section 2.1.2

5.7 Signage and interpretation

Four submitters made comment around way-marking and signage in the reserve. Five submitters raised issues and made suggestions for interpretation around the reserve.

Information panels will be installed at the main entrances to the reserve showing the routes and tracks in the reserve and other interpretation at the heritage sites will be limited. Within the reserve itself, much of the signage will be limited to way finding only. The location and content of all signage will be finalised in a detailed interpretation plan and design of the concept plan includes as Appendix 3 to the draft Plan.

Recommendation

- Consider submissions on signage and interpretation during the development of the detailed design and interpretation plan.

5.8 Cycling in the reserve

Five submitters raise the issue of cycling in the reserve. Three submitters support the restrictions on cycling, although one comments that allowing cycling between Hector and Ludlam Street will only encourage cyclists to use other tracks in the reserve.

The Great Harbour Way Coalition requested that the tracks in the reserve can be used as part of the Great Harbour Way rather than requiring cyclists to use the residential streets through Seatoun. This is not supported; the existing and proposed tracks over the Point and towards the Pass of Branda are unsuitable in places for shared use. The Council is not intending to construct additional tracks dedicated to cyclists in the reserve.

One submitter requests that cyclists are allowed south of Ludlam Street for about 250m to enable cyclists to use the 'coastal route', i.e. bike around the beach which is possible outside high tide. The submitter requested this change as the outline of the reserve land on Map A shows the reserve covering the beach area in some places. Under the Foreshore and Seabed Act, the extent of the legal title ends at mean high water whether the surveyed boundary extends beyond this point or not. As such any part of the beach below mean high water is outside the reserve and cyclists are able to use this part of the beach. Given, this no change to the plan is recommended.

Recommendation

- Retain the current position in the draft Plan to prohibit cycling on tracks other than that between Hector and Ludlam Streets.
- Recommend the Committee resolves to close all other tracks in the reserve to cycling under the Open Space Access Plan.

5.9 Acquisition of adjacent private land

Four submitters support the acquisition of the private land adjacent to the reserve. One submitter commented that the purchase of the private block is critical to the protection of the landform and ecosystem of the existing reserve. The adjacent private land has significant landscape values and mix of

indigenous, exotic and mixed plant communities, it has been used for decades by visitors as if it were part of the reserve. The submitter requests that the Council and the Trust having acquired the land, seek to have it gazetted as Scenic Reserve and Historic Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. The submitter also seeks that a further bullet points is added to 2.4.2 that

“The Council and the Trust enter negotiations with the owner of the land contiguous with the reserve, with the aim of acquiring the land for additional to the reserve”.

The land covered by the draft Point Dorset Management Plan is owned by PNBST and the Council was appointed to control and manage the land as Recreation Reserve under s26 of the Reserves Act. If the Council acquires the adjacent land, at that time it will decide the appropriate reserve classification of the land. If the reserve classification for the new piece of land is either scenic or historic reserve, then the Council does not have delegated authority under the Reserves Act to approve a management plan. As a result, if the Council wished to manage the acquired land under this management plan, and wished to classify the land as scenic or historic, it would need to notify the decision, undertake additional statutory consultation and obtain the approval of the Minister of Conservation for the existing management plan. If any acquired land is classified as recreation reserve, then it may be managed under this management plan and no further statutory processes are required.

Officers agree with the intent of the submission however given the procedural issues, recommend that an alternative solution to that proposed is to add a second bullet point to policy 6.2.3 which states that if the private land is acquired by the Council it will be managed under this management plan and classified as Recreation Reserve.

Recommendation:

- Strengthen Policy 6.2.3 by adding a second bullet point:
 - Any adjacent land acquired by the Council in the future will be managed under this Management Plan as Recreation Reserve.

5.10 Name change

PNBST have requested that the name of the reserve is changed from Point Dorset to Oruaiti Reserve. They consider that, although the site is part of the military base called Fort Dorset, its earlier name was Oruaiti, being the site of Oruaiti Pa. PNBST consider that a name change would give appropriate recognition to the ancient stories of Wellington and add to the richness of the city.

Officers have sought clarification from PNBST as to whether they are seeking a name change to the reserve and the geographic feature of Point Dorset. At present, the Trust is only seeking a name change for the reserve and not the geographic feature

Recommendation:

- Gazette a name change under s16(10) of the Reserves Act 1977 to 'Oruaiti Reserve'.

6 Others

6.1 Consultation and Engagement

This report presents the results of public consultation as required under the Reserves Act 1977. PNBST have been consulted on key issues raised by the submitters.

6.2 Financial Considerations

The initial implementation stage of the management plan is to be funded through the Plimmer Bequest and will start in 2011/12.

6.3 Climate Change Impacts and Considerations

There are no specific climate change impacts relating to the implementation of the management plan

6.4 Long-Term Plan Considerations

Funding for the maintenance of the reserve will be included in the Open Space Asset Management Plan and be considered as part of the processes around the Long Term Plan and relevant Annual Plans.

7. Conclusion

28 submissions were received on the draft Management Plan. The majority were in support of the overall plan, however some submitters raised a number of specific issues that are discussed and addressed in this paper.

Officers recommend the Committee agree the final plan attached as Appendix 3.

Contact Officer: Mike Oates, Manager Open Space and Recreation Planning

Supporting Information

1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome

This project contributes to developing a stronger sense of place:

- *Wellington will value and protect the City's natural heritage*
- *Wellington will be a memorable, beautiful city, celebrating its capital city status, distinctive landforms and landmarks, its heritage, and its high quality buildings and spaces.*

2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact

The project is covered by A004 – Open Space Planning

3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations

The land presently covered by the draft Point Dorset Reserve Management Plan is owned by the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust and Council is the administering body under the Reserves Act 1977.

4) Decision-Making

This is not a significant decision.

5) Consultation

a) General Consultation

Consultation on a discussion document around the future management draft Point Dorset Reserve was carried out in February 2011. This paper summarises the key issues raised by submitters as part of the statutory consultation on the draft Plan developed in response to the earlier consultation

b) Consultation with Maori

Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust has been involved in the development of the plan. They specifically request the change of the name of the reserve to Oruaiti Reserve.

6) Legal Implications

Council's lawyers have been consulted during the development of this report.

7) Consistency with existing policy

This report is generally consistent with Council's existing policy.

Submissions on the Draft Point Dorset Reserve Management Plan

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 1 | 1 | Yes | | | Support | |
| 1 | 2 | | No | | See comments below | |
| 1 | 3 | | | When the RC for the subdivision on Fort Dorset site was given, planting of pohutukawas was required to mitigate the effects of housing next to the reserve. More trees are needed to screen housing and those already planted should not be removed. | The resource consent required a range of plantings for the site, however since this time, the Council has learnt more about the ecology of the site and the original species found in Wellington and on the Miramar peninsula. This increased knowledge is reflected in the species list in the draft plan. Ngaio trees will be planted within the pohutukawa, and if the pohutukawa are eventually removed (which is not a short term objective), a screen will remain. | Add Ngaio to species list. |
| 1 | 4 | | | The list of proposed plants does not include trees and natives such as Ngaios, Matagaree and pohutukawas which are naturally growing. | The list of proposed plants includes those originally growing on the land prior to cultivation or intervention / planting in the last 100 years. An objective of the draft plan is to restore the native ecosystem of the Point and these species are consistent with this objective. | |
| 1 | 5 | | | Remove the existing fences in the reserve which was supposed to have been done by the developer of Fort Dorset subdivision | These structures will be removed as part of the restoration work supported by the funding from the Plimmer Bequest | |
| 2 | 1 | Yes | | with the exception of not letting dogs walk off leash | See comments below | |
| 2 | 2 | | Yes | with the exception of not letting dogs walk off leash | See comments below | |
| 2 | 3 | | | Many of the local people use this beach to walk their dogs off leash, particularly in summer when Worsler Bay is severely restricted for dog walking. They are responsible and caring dog owners who respect the local environment, this area should be kept open for local dog walkers. I have never witnessed any issues with dog owners | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. The submissions will be referred to the Dog Policy review scheduled for 2012/13; the plan will note that a potential compromise is to allow dogs off leash on the upper ridgeline tracks and on leash on the beach. | |
| 2 | 4 | | | The rubbish on the beach needs to be addressed. It is very bad in the summer, especially from those partying on the west side of the hole in the rock in the summer. | The location of rubbish bins at the entrances to the reserve will be addressed in the detailed planning for the restoration. Bins will not be placed inside the reserve as vehicular access is required to empty the bins. Officers will monitor beach rubbish as part of ongoing management of the reserve. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 3 | 1 | Yes | | Will see overdue changes and positive management of this space | Support | |
| 3 | 2 | | Yes | | Support | |
| 3 | 3 | | | I believe a full archaeological map and recommended archaeological management is needed. I have doubts about the Opus archaeological survey commissioned by WCC but if it covers engineering failure of structures, that is good e.g. heavy gun emplacement have been smashed down post WWII and it may be possible to tidy these and expose the foundations of guns and in (word not deciphered) | Additional work was commissioned on the structural integrity of the remaining structures and an assessment made of those to be preserved and protected, those too unsafe for the public to enter. This has only been carried out for the structures in the reserve and not on the adjacent private land. | |
| 4 | 1 | Yes | | | Support | |
| 4 | 2 | | Yes | | Support | |
| 4 | 3 | | | I was born in Breakers Bay 76 years ago and have since lived at No's 145 189 186 and currently 194. In all this time I have never seen a penguin on the beach or on the road during daylight hours. Penguins often come ashore during the night, usually in misty or rainy weather. I see no reason for dogs to be on a lead during daylight hours, and they are never taken out for a walk in the dark. | Penguins head out to sea at dawn and return at dusk so are not normally noticed during daylight hours. However when they are nesting and moulting they are vulnerable to predation during daylight hours. Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. | |
| 5 | 1 | Yes | | Good direction | Support | |
| 5 | 2 | | Yes | Good balance of concerns and culture | Support | |
| 5 | 3 | | | More enforcement of dog walking on leash | Enforcement of the Dog Policy is carried out by Animal Control team at the Council. | |
| 6 | 1 | Yes | | The draft plan acknowledges and seeks to protect heritage, ecological and recreational values of Point Dorset | Support | |
| 6 | 2 | | Yes | The draft plan suggests an appropriate mix of preservation and modest development to protect and enhance the Point Dorset Reserve | Support | |
| 6 | 3 | | | I recommend signage and explanatory boards be kept as much as possible to the entrances to the tracks to Point Dorset, on the flat and close to residential sites rather than on the hillside to avoid creating additional targets for tagging and other vandalism. | The main interpretation panels are to be located at the main entrances. A detailed interpretation plan will be developed as part of the implementation of the management plan | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 7 | 1 | | | Great Harbour Way Coalition (GHW) are disappointed that there is no cycle access to the reserve to allow cyclists. We will be enthusiastic supporters of efforts to develop the walking potential of the trails on Pt Dorset and hope you can broaden your vision to include those who will want to bike the GHW without having to ride through the town of Seatoun as currently planned. This is an unspectacular urban route, far from the water's edge and the superb views. | The Council has been working with the Coalition to assist in their endeavours around creating the GHW and is very happy to continue doing so. In Pt Dorset, the draft plan allows for bike access between Hector and Ludlam Street only. | |
| 7 | 2 | | | The vision of GHW is for a shared trail for walkers and cyclists around the whole Wellington harbour, close to the water's edge. We believe a cycle route through the reserve that is safe for all is entirely possible given the will from WCC. It would take some additional track construction and in some tight and narrow places, safe passage for all would involve separate trails for bikers and walkers. Many people will ride the GHW on mountain bikes and these trails would be entirely appropriate for these cyclists. The land is being developed for recreational use for all Wellingtonians and, we hope, increasing numbers of tourists to Wellington wanting to walk or bike the Great Harbour Way. | The tracks over the Point and towards Brandas Pass are unsuitable in places for shared use. The Council is not intending to construct additional tracks dedicated to bikers in the reserve | |
| 8 | 1 | Yes | | The coastal defence facilities at Pt Dorset need to be acknowledged preserve and interpreted. The plan proposes this. | Support | |
| 8 | 2 | | Yes | | Support | |
| 8 | 3 | | | But you need to return to public ownership some vital parts of the ridgeline heritage that is in private ownership. Specifically the Oruaiti pa site, 6 inch coast defence battery site and its associated battery observation post and magazine, and the WWI 12 pounder site need to be brought into the public domain. | WCC has had discussions with the owner of the adjacent private land over its acquisition . These are ongoing | |
| 8 | 4 | | | The interpretation on the ridgeline should include some history of Fort Dorset (now developed for Seatoun School and residential housing). | A comprehensive plan for the interpretation of the site will be developed as part of the implementation of the draft Plan. This will address the issues raised in the submissions | |
| 9 | 1 | Yes | | I really appreciate free, succinct, reliable data like this | Support | |
| 10 | 1 | Yes | | | Support | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|---|
| 10 | 2 | | Yes | The plan clearly sets out grounds and arrangements for co-management and evaluation of the co-management working arrangements. The plan has a clear layout including supporting information and maps. Objectives prioritise recognising, protecting, and interpreting historical assets. Objectives prioritise protecting the natural coastal landscape. Objectives provide for reasonable recreational use. | Support | |
| 10 | 3 | | | Cats are not mentioned in 4.2.1 Pests and Weeds. We recommend inclusion of cats as an additional threat in this section, whether wild or roaming domestic cats. Cats are likely to threaten nesting seabirds and reptiles at the site, particularly with planned restoration initiatives. | Agree | Include mention of cats in 4.2.1 |
| 10 | 4 | | | Bullet point 5 in 4.4.1 could be strengthened to include education about eco-sourcing and appropriate native planting. | Agree | Amend the 5th bullet point in 4.4.1 to read: Work will be done with the neighbouring landowners to provide information on the ecological restoration in the reserve and to stop the spread of garden weeds into the reserve and stop the dumping of garden waste. |
| 10 | 5 | | | The Board does not support any residential development on the site. It is strongly opposed to the scale of development proposed by NZ Defence Department and believes this would considerable harm the character of the area and diminishes its future potential as a natural and historical site. | There is no planned residential development on this site. The submitter may have confused this site with the Defence land at Watts Peninsula | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|---|--|
| 11 | 1 | Yes | | Because they make sense | Support | |
| 11 | 2 | | Yes | The areas deserves to be looked after property | Support | |
| 12 | 1 | Yes | | The paths need tidying up and improving, as it is rudimentary, muddy and exposed in parts | This will be addressed in the implementation of the restoration project | |
| 12 | 2 | | Yes | I think any additional native planting is a good idea. | Support | |
| 12 | 3 | | | It is very rugged area so will not suit pushchairs in parts. | The tracks in the reserve are not fully accessible and given the nature of the terrain, it is unlikely that the upgrade will make them fully accessible. | |
| 12 | 4 | | | I do (not??) support mountain bikes here | Bikes are able to use the track between Ludlam and Hector Streets, and will be excluded in all other areas of the reserve | |
| 12 | 5 | | | Discourage people parking or driving on the beach and beach reserve. | Access to the beach is across private land. As sections are sold and developed, access to the beach will be reduced at the Ludlam Street entrance. | |
| 12 | 6 | | | Put in more rubbish bins. | The location of rubbish bins will be considered as part of the detailed design of the entrance areas. | |
| 12 | 7 | | | Put up MAF signs stating the legal limits for shellfish harvesting (for 9 warmer months of the year there are crowds of larges groups getting huge bags of shellfish in this area) | The Council will work with MAFF to increase the level of monitoring of the site, awareness of the catch limits and installation of signs advising visitors of their responsibilities around the catch limits for shellfish and fish. | |
| 12 | 8 | | | I believe that dogs should be allowed off the lease in the more wild southern parts of the walk. As little blue penguins abound in the whole harbour, south coast and many other coastal areas, I see little sense banning dogs running free here (unless near the beaches that children use e.g. Seatoun or by the swings and slides). If the council wants to ban dogs off the lead, then they would need to it everywhere around the harbour basin to be fair and consistent. | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. The submissions will be referred to the Dog Policy review scheduled for 2012/13; the plan will note that a potential compromise is to allow dogs off leash on the upper ridgeline tracks and on leash on the beach. | |
| 13 | 1 | | | Coastal environment - I support the restoration of the site but am concerned there will be little to indicate the mixed vegetation that grew on this exposed site. Sedges and grasses will protect the sand dunes and provide havens for ground mammals but the result will be monochrome. The area should be beautified with a mix of plants both 'exotic' and local that will survive happily, provide nurture and shelter for fauna and prevent erosion. | As this area has been identified as a Key Native Ecosystem, we will only be planting eco-sourced native plants which is in line with Council policy. However, these will include everything from low growing coastal groundcovers to shrubs and trees. This will indicate the mixed vegetation that would have originally grown on this site. Local native plants will survive better on this exposed coastal site as well as providing the functions of habitat provision and erosion control. | Add an additional note to Appendix One to show the list is not exhaustive and is an indicative guide to the species to be used for restoration of the reserve. |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|--|---|
| 13 | 2 | | | Coastal environment - Leave the existing pohutukawa and karaka on the site | Pohutukawa will only be removed in the long term if they directly affect our ability to restore areas of high ecological significance. If they are removed, we will first establish other more suitable local trees in their place. Karaka have a high invasive potential and are not commonly found on Point Dorset so will be removed where practicable. | |
| 13 | 3 | | | Coastal environment - I support way marking the more fragile routes. | The majority of signage within the reserve will be for way finding. All secondary tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed design process as to whether they should be retained or closed | |
| 13 | 4 | | | Coastal views and landscape - the grassed lookout area should be enhanced by building a replica stone crescent shaped viewing area. It is important that any seating fits into the space and is not obtrusive. Interpretation panels commemorating the pas should be discreet and set into the stone framework. | The concept plan provides for few additional structures in the reserve in keeping with other submitters comments to retain the 'rugged' and unmodified appearance of the reserve | |
| 13 | 5 | | | Recreation - I agree the site needs both locational and directional signage. Tracks could be given a number for easy map reference. | A detailed interpretation and signage plan will be developed as part of the detailed planning for the restoration project | |
| 13 | 6 | | | Recreation - I do not support a shared path around the site as part of the Great Harbour Way but would support a coastline route being marked to Owhiro Bay going south and to Cobham Drive going north. | The draft plan allows for bike access between Hector and Ludlam Street. The tracks over the Point and towards the Pass of Branda are unsuitable in places for shared use. The Council is not intending to construct additional tracks dedicated to bikers in the reserve | |
| 13 | 7 | | | Recreation - I support the proposal to prevent cyclists using all or any of the routes at Fort Dorset. | As noted above, the tracks will be closed to cyclists except for the track between Hector and Ludlam Street. | Except for the track between Hector and Ludlam streets, close all other tracks in the reserve to cycling under the Open Space Access Plan |
| 13 | 8 | | | Recreation -I am equivocal about the erection of another Pou about 50 metres from the present one - this would diminish the significance of the one by the junction close by. Perhaps the existing Pou could be moved. The Pou could be located just past the other carpark site on Breaker Bay as waka approached the area from the south through the heads. | The layout of the entrance areas will be considered during the detailed design stage. This submission will be considered at that stage | |
| 13 | 9 | | | Recreation - The concrete blocks close by the Pou should be identified as the remnants of the military use of the site. | A comprehensive plan for the interpretation of the site will be developed as part of the implementation of the draft Plan. This will address the issues raised in the submissions | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 13 | 10 | | | Plaques should be placed on each of the various gun emplacements including that hidden in a stand of trees along the ridgeline towards Breaker Bay Road - Branda Pass. | A comprehensive plan for the interpretation of the site will be developed as part of the implementation of the draft Plan. This will address the issues raised in the submissions | |
| 13 | 11 | | | Waymarkers should be placed by each intersection of the tracks. | The majority of signage within the reserve will be for way finding. All secondary tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed design process as to whether they should be retained or closed | |
| 13 | 12 | | | All tracks need upgrading. I support the proposal to upgrade the formal steep access route from the Pass of Branda by constructing steps with a handrail. | All tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed planning around the restoration project. These steps are unlikely to meet the gradient requiring a handrail. This is consistent with the opinion expressed by submitters to have minimal impact on the reserve as part of the restoration project | |
| 13 | 13 | | | The formal steep access route from the Pass of Branda would be an ideal spot for a sign showing the link from the peninsula to Fort Dorset. | Noted, the location of way finding and interpretation signage will be considered as part of the detailed planning around the restoration of the reserve | |
| 13 | 14 | | | The old paths on private or school land should be retained; they provide useful links and are relatively protected from southerlies. | These tracks are currently on private land and outside the reserve boundary | |
| 13 | 15 | | | Consideration should be given to the retention to the under track that leads to the beach track access route. | All tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed planning around the restoration project. Secondary tracks will be assessed as to whether they should be retained or closed | |
| 13 | 16 | | | There appears to be a paper road between the houses leading from Mantell Street to the ridgeline - if so, it should be given a directional sign. | This access is over private land | |
| 13 | 17 | | | There are many trails that lead down and around the site. They offer pleasant alternatives to the very rough 'formal trails. | All tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed planning around the restoration project. Secondary tracks will be assessed as to whether they should be retained or closed | |
| 13 | 18 | | | The coastline track could easily and discreetly be upgraded with the installation of boardwalk around the 'Pinnacle' rocks. | This submission is not supported as it is inconsistent with the general opinion expressed by submitters to have minimal impact on the existing rugged terrain. | |
| 13 | 19 | | | A discreet plaque that explains the geological story could be installed on the gun emplacement. | The main interpretation panels are to be located at the main entrances. A detailed interpretation plan will be developed as part of the implementation of the management plan and this will consider the level of interpretation within the reserve. Generally plaques on heritage items are not supported as they impact on the integrity of the heritage structure. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|--|--|
| 13 | 20 | | | Rubbish bins should be placed so that dog walkers have somewhere to place 'dog poo'. A bin is needed near the popular beach site just below the main dune climb from the beach to the ridgeline. | The location of rubbish bins will be considered during the detailed design of the site entrances. The track for the main dune climb will be closed as part of the restoration works. | |
| 13 | 21 | | | Note there are at least three access points from the beach from this recreation area plus a steep cliff for human mountain goats to climb. | All tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed planning around the restoration project. Secondary tracks will be assessed as to whether they should be retained or closed | |
| 13 | 22 | | | A standard water tap for topping up drink bottles should be installed by the lavatory in Churchill Park and each of its 'installations' should be described as such things now are around Parking Buildings. | Churchill Park is outside the reserve boundary. This submission will be considered by the relevant asset manager. | |
| 13 | 23 | | | WCC should ask NZTA for; a directional sign showing the route to the Seatoun Tunnel from Churchill Park along the Parade and then left, the present signage is visible only when one is driving from the Parade to Ferry St. | This is an operational signage matter and has been referred to the relevant project manager | |
| 13 | 24 | | | A directional sign showing the route from Ferry - Forres - Inglis Street to Brandas pass, this useful route is not signposted and nor is there any indication that there is a coastal road going back to Owhiro Bay etc. | This is an operational signage matter and has been referred to the relevant project manager | |
| 14 | 1 | Yes | | Point Dorset has been underutilised and under developed for years so I fully support the plan | Support | |
| 14 | 2 | | Yes | <p>I don't support over vigorous clearing of pines, pohutukawa, karo and gorse. Interplant with desired natives, not clearing hillside leaving it exposed and erosion prone. Manage out the large old pines - leave them until they fall naturally. Any dangerous ones should be removed. Pohutukawa and karo need to be accepted as acclimatised natives which it would be pointless to remove as this is a fight that can never be won.</p> <p>Pines, karo, pohutukawa: limb up the pines and plant rata.</p> | Pohutukawa will only be removed in the long term if they directly affect our ability to restore areas of high ecological significance. However, if they are removed, we will first establish other more suitable local trees (such as northern rata and ngaio) in their place. The pines on public land will be managed for health and safety risk in the short term, as opposed to being removed. But they can't be allowed to fall naturally in areas of tracks and high public use. Karo grow particularly well in Wellington, and due to this, they exclude many of the native local plants that once would have grown in this location. They are very invasive and eventually form a monoculture where only karo will grow. In this context they are more damaging than gorse and pines and have the potential to significantly lower our local biodiversity. However they will also only be removed in small areas in the short term, where they directly affect our ability to restore the local environment. | Add Northern Rata to the list of plants in Appendix 1. |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|--|---|
| 14 | 4 | | | Rabbit damage to taupata on Breaker Bay - urgent pest control needed, this should be a high priority. | The Wellington City Pest Management Plan 2004 states that "Greater Wellington will undertake control of rabbits on riverbanks, esplanades and similar public commons. Wellington City Council as landowner is responsible for maintaining rabbit numbers at or below level 5 of the Modified McLean Scale as specified in the RPMS. Level 5 of the Modified McLean scale is, "Sign very frequent with faecal heaps less than 5m apart in pockets. Rabbits spreading." However, given the level of replanting and revegetation to be undertaken on the reserve, active pest animal management can be anticipated to precede the restoration and be ongoing to reduce the level of animal pests on the site. | Add to 4.4.1 control rabbit population to ensure no harmful effects on existing vegetation and restoration programmes. |
| 14 | 5 | | | Dog access should be work out in a compromise way. Dogs off leash on Breaker Bay side and on lease from the point back to the Steeple rocks and Seatoun Beach. This would encompass current practice by many dog owners. The penguin nesting sites are mainly up steep banks meaning less desirable places for dogs to go and the opens space of the beach would allow a good exercise area and owners supervision. | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. The submissions will be referred to the Dog Policy review scheduled for 2012/13; The plan will note that a potential compromise is to allow dogs off leash on the upper ridgeline tracks and on leash on the beach. | Add another paragraph at the end of section 5.2.3: Consideration will be given at the next review of the Dog Policy to allow dogs off lead on the upper ridgeline tracks if this land is acquired by the Council in the future. |
| 14 | 6 | | | I suggest that strategies to buy the private land adjacent to the reserve are looked into as this land would add a significant extra area to the reserve | WCC has had discussions with the owner of the adjacent private land with a view to purchasing this land. These are ongoing | |
| 14 | 7 | | | If the private adjacent land is not managed similarly to the reserve area, there will always be a reservoir of pest plants and animals ready to decolonise clear areas | The Council will work with neighbouring landowners to manage pests and weeds which may recolonise the reserve. | |
| 15 | 1 | Yes | | Preservation of the natural environment is particularly important here as this piece of land is the only place between Sinclair Head and Pencarrow which does not have a road between the sea and the adjacent vegetation. This aspect I prize above all else. | Support | |
| 15 | 2 | | Yes | Formalising of the walkways, particularly at the Seatoun end where it basically loses its way! | All tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed planning around the restoration project. Secondary tracks will be assessed as to whether they should be retained or closed | |
| 15 | 3 | | | I would not like to see any structures (not even seating!) at the lookout - Seating serves no purpose except intrusion to say 'we are doing improvements!' | The general opinion expressed in submissions has been to retain the current character of the reserve. This is underpinning any planning around the detailed landscape plans for these areas | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 15 | 4 | | | I was very pleased with the breadth of study that the plan demonstrated | Support | |
| 15 | 5 | | | I have been particularly concerned about a clump of pingao (just north of the Beach Battery). This clump has been struggling to survive and I believe is one of the few naturally occurring (as opposed to planted) clumps on the Miramar Peninsula. I have been recording its decline for the last 5 years and would like to see it preserved. | We are aware of this clump of pingao and will do everything possible to ensure its continuing survival. We also believe it is naturally occurring, and is only one of two such populations we can guarantee for all of the Wellington Coast. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 16 | 1 | No | | Support much but disagree with some specifics - There should be a dog off-leash area - I note that it was excluded from consideration in the original Dog Policy as it was Defence land - it was about to become off-leash a year ago after public consultation or so when at the last minute this was changed due to the Trust. Let's hope the 12/13 review gets it right. | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. The submissions will be referred to the Dog Policy review scheduled for 2012/13; the plan will note that a potential compromise is to allow dogs off leash on the upper ridgeline tracks and on leash on the beach. | |
| 16 | 2 | | | I don't support mountain bikes between Hector St and Ludlam St - a distance of 300m and of no use to bikers - will only encourage them to go to out of bound areas. | Bikes can use the beach if they wish to continue as the reserve ends at mean high water | |
| 16 | 3 | | | Wildlife and seabirds aspects are overstated. I dive all of Wgtn South Coast and there are many areas where there aren't humans. Wildlife flourishes there. Pt Dorset reserve should be for humans - wildlife has many kms of uninhabited coastline on the South Coast they can enjoy. | We believe Point Dorset can provide important coastal habitat for wildlife and seabirds and also be a reserve for humans. The two aren't mutually exclusive. | |
| 16 | 4 | | | There needs to be specifics on: 1 tracks to be closed. | All tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed planning around the restoration project. Secondary tracks will be assessed as to whether they should be retained or closed | |
| 16 | 5 | | | There needs to be specifics on: 2 Dunes to be protected. | The track to be closed through the dune is marked on the landscape concept plan in Appendix 3 and the dune planting on Map E. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|---|--|
| 16 | 6 | | | There needs to be specifics on: 3 Where the reserve/private land line is exactly. | The boundary between the public and private land is unlikely to be marked specifically in the restoration project , however all works will be carried out on the reserve land. The Council will work with the owners of the adjacent private land to ensure the areas for public access are clearly marked. | |
| 16 | 7 | | | I suspect the ratio of dog walkers is far higher than you report - I'm on those hills every other day and the vast majority of people have a dog with them. | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. The submissions will be referred to the Dog Policy review scheduled for 2012/13, the plan will note that a potential compromise is to allow dogs off leash on the upper ridgeline tracks and on leash on the beach. | |
| 16 | 8 | | | Some corrections and missing features: 1 There was a Defence shooting range for pistols and small arms on Breaker Bay beach at the bottom of the track - I used it - it is still visible. | This is noted and text will be added to reflect this. Map C includes all structures surveyed by Opus as part of the Archaeological assessment, this will be noted on the map. | Add text to note additional heritage features in section 2.1.2; Add note to Map C that all features identified were those surveyed in Opus archaeological assessment 2011 |
| 16 | 9 | | | Some corrections and missing features: 2 There was an anti submarine MIL loop off Point Dorset. | This is noted and text will be added to reflect this however the loop is outside the boundaries of the reserve | Add text to note additional heritage features |
| 16 | 10 | | | We used to have penguins under our house in Seatoun - time for them to nest elsewhere - they are not endangered. And since when did they nest on Breaker Bay? What proof do you have? | By providing suitable habitat for little blue penguins in natural environments such as Point Dorset, we reduce the need for them to enter risky urban areas. Little blue penguins are currently listed as 'at risk - declining' so are a species we have an obligation to protect. Places for Penguins, a Forest & Bird initiative, has records of penguins nesting at Breaker Bay and they have been seen on the beach during moulting season. | |
| 17 | 1 | Yes | | I feel you have taken on board the publics concern to keep the look and feel of the area as rugged and natural as it already is, but with some improvements in access and native plants | Support | |
| 17 | 2 | | Yes | With the exception of the decision around dog access. | See comments below | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| 17 | 3 | | | I believe the area should be used for off lead dog walking. Dog walkers are heavy users of the tracks and tend to use the tracks before business hours and before other users are out and about. On this basis there is no reason, why you couldn't impose time restrictions like you do for dog accessible beaches i.e. dogs can only be off lead before 9am and after 7pm in the daylight saving months | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. Setting separate times during the day for dogs on or off lead can be confusing for the public and difficult to manage. | |
| 17 | 4 | | | While I agree there should be protections in place for penguins and other shore birds this can be done without a blanket on lead policy. The area could be on lead during penguin breeding season. Signage could be erected at access points and the area policed during this time. I do not believe that would cost more from a policing perspective as the animal management people are constantly policing the area already. | The Dog Control Policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Control Policy 2009. | |
| 18 | 1 | Yes | | We would like the Council and the Trust to start taking steps to acquire the adjacent private land in order to protect its values. This is consistent with policy 6.2.3 Reserve Acquisitions and would increase the size of the reserve. This substantial area of land, with significant landscape values and its mix of indigenous, exotic and mixed plant communities used for decades by visitors as it were part of the reserve should become part of the reserve. The fact that historic sites including Oruaiti Pa and parts of Fort Dorset are on private land gives rise to our recommendation to purchase the site. | WCC has had discussions with the owner of the adjacent private land over its acquisition . These are ongoing | |
| 18 | 2 | | Yes | Support Objectives 2.3, 3.3, 4.3, 5.3, 6.1. Support Policies 2.4, 3.4, 4.4, 5.4, 6.2 | Support | |
| 18 | 3 | | | 2.4.2 Protecting Heritage: We recommend adding a further bullet point - that Council and the Trust enter negotiations with the owner of the land contiguous with the reserve, with the aim of acquiring the land for additional to the reserve | A more appropriate location for this policy is in 6.2.3 | Strengthen Policy 6.2.3 by adding a second bullet point: "Any adjacent land acquired by the Council in the future will be managed under this Management Plan as Recreation Reserve" |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|---|---|
| 18 | 4 | | | Amend Policy 3.4.1 second bullet point to "Only <i>locally source</i> , low-growing <i>native</i> coastal plants will be planted near the lookout area" | Agree, but amend the wording to be consistent with the wording in the ecology section of the draft plan | Amend the second bullet point of Policy 3.4.1 be amended to: 'Only low-growing eco-sourced native coastal plants will be planted near the lookout area'. |
| 18 | 5 | | | 4.2.1 We compliment WCC on the coverage given to the serious weediness of the site, including the contiguous private block. | Thanks | |
| 18 | 6 | | | Weed infestations, coupled with the presence of rabbits and other pest animals, indicate the level of effort required by WCC, the Trust and the local community to restore the site to a functioning indigenous ecosystem. | A partnership approach to restoring the reserve is required. The Plimmer Bequest funding will enable this to occur. | |
| 18 | 7 | | | 4.4.1 Pests and weeds, we recommend that bullet point 3 and 4 be amended so that pohutukawa and conifers will be removed.' We believe that their removal is essential 'to enable restoration'. | Pohutukawa and conifers will be removed in the long term when they directly affect our ability to restore areas of high ecological significance. However they have value to a number of submitters so this will be a gradual process, and will be replaced with more suitable local native trees. | |
| 18 | 8 | | | We consider the full implementation of policy 6.2.3 Reserve acquisitions i.e. the purchase of the private block to be critical to the protection of the landform and ecosystem of the existing reserve. | WCC has had discussions with the owner of the adjacent private land over its acquisition . These are ongoing | |
| 18 | 9 | | | We recommend that the Council and the Trust having acquired the land, seek to have it gazetted as Scenic Reserve and Historic Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. | The current reserve is vested as Recreation Reserve. If WCC acquired in the future, any decision around reserve status would be made at this time | |
| 18 | 10 | | | We welcome the stance indicated in 6.2.6 Encroachments. | Support | |
| 18 | 11 | | | We recommend in 6.2.7 Utilities and Infrastructure that any new above-ground facilities be co-located on existing structure, thus avoiding the construction of new towers. | Any new above ground utility structure is likely to require a resource consent on the land zoned Conservation site or Open Space B in the District Plan. Mitigation of the effects of any proposed utility structure will be considered through this process and through landowner consent process. | |
| 18 | 12 | | | Section 7: Implementation. We welcome the decision by WCC to spend up to \$400k from the Plimmer Bequest on the point Dorset/ Breaker Bay restoration project. | Support | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|---|
| 18 | 13 | | | Appendix One: Species recommended for planting on Pt Dorset (page 27). Species listed by John Buchanan (1872) or James Crawford (1872) would be appropriate. | Past species lists have been used in compiling the list of species for recommended planting. These have to be species which can be propagated and are successful in the revegetation process, hence the list not being exhaustive. | Include a note on Appendix 1 that the list of plants is not exhaustive. |
| 19 | 1 | Yes | | | Support | |
| 19 | 2 | | No | Most is unobjectionable; however I strongly disagree with the proposed treatment of attractive native tree species karo and pohutukawa as weeds needing to be removed (P15). This categorisation is misguided and without scientific basis and removal would be unjustified. | Pohutukawa and conifers will be removed in the long term when they directly affect our ability to restore areas of high ecological significance. However they have value to a number of submitters so this will be a gradual process, and will be replaced with more suitable local native trees. | |
| 19 | 3 | | | JT Salmon (1980) described Karo as 'one of the most notable NZ scented plants' and said 'it has spreading the wild as far south as Wellington' (the photo in his book on p144 is beachside at karaka Bay Wgtn) There is no way of knowing what the 'natural' ranges are today of these plants (climates fluctuate and today are warming) other than what we can all see - they are tough and currently thrive at this latitude. This is good news as they are a beautiful part of the landscape. To group them with alien gorse and pine, and waste money chopping them down here, or anywhere else in the Wellington region is botanical folly. Please don't do this. | We are aware of the natural ranges of plants through historical plant lists and the analysis of fossil seed records. Climates are fluctuating but karo have not spread this far south without human intervention, this fact is now widely accepted. Karo grow particularly well in Wellington, and due to this, they exclude many of the native local plants that once would have grown in this location. They are very invasive and eventually form a monoculture where only karo will grow. In this context they are more damaging than gorse and pines and have the potential to significantly lower our local biodiversity. However they will only be removed in small areas in the short term, where they directly affect our ability to restore the local environment. | |
| 20 | 1 | | | We have found <i>Senecio Sterquilinus</i> (listed as a range restricted relict plant) on the cliff around the corner coming from Breaker Bay. Between the carpark and Pt Dorset are various degrees of hybrids between the native <i>Senecio lautus</i> and the relict <i>S sterquilinus</i> . We believe it is important given the range restricted occurrence of <i>S sterquilinus</i> to make sure it is not accidentally mixed up with the introduced <i>Senecio Skirrhodon</i> | When weed control is conducted, all staff and contractors will be advised of the native populations of <i>Senecio</i> and all care will be taken. | |
| 20 | 2 | | | Several plants are mentioned for weeding. We think it would be beneficial to include <i>Senecio skirrhodon</i> , <i>S. elegans</i> and <i>Gaucium Flavum</i> but be careful to protect the native <i>senecio</i> throughout the weeding process. | When weed control is conducted, all staff and contractors will be advised of the native populations of <i>Senecio</i> and all care will be taken. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|---|
| 20 | 3 | | | The Draft Plan mentions the survey work of Buchanan 1872 and were wondering whether there is any more recent survey work. In 4.4.3 it is mentioned to include the Pt Dorset in citywide monitoring plans - we would like to emphasise the importance of detailed monitoring of the current status of the biodiversity before commencing restoration if that has not been done yet | There was a botanical survey done by the Wellington Botanical Society earlier this year, but we have no other records of survey work. There will also be a weed survey before work commences. Photo points will be used to monitor the restoration planting and baseline photos will be taken. | |
| 20 | 4 | | | <i>D.australe</i> is mentioned for duneland plantings - this is a plant of rocky areas and should therefore be planted carefully to avoid loss of costly plantings. | Within the duneland area there are rocky outcrops suitable for <i>Dysphyma australe</i> . A comprehensive planting plan will be put together prior to planting to ensure appropriate species selection and location. | |
| 20 | 5 | | | When implementing the goal of increasing numbers of native animals in the targeted areas, it is important to maintain the vegetation cover during the restoration process and control rats and mustelids. | Agree - weed control and planting programmes will be closely linked to ensure the retention of vegetative cover. | |
| 21 | 1 | | | The Wgtn Branch of Forest & Bird support the general directions of the plan and proposed policies and changes. Natural Wellington (an F&B document) identifies Pt Dorset as a site being regionally representative of coastal vegetation. We are pleased it now has reserve status and the Council has a plan and funds for its restoration. The Wgtn Branch of F&B would welcome the opportunity to be actively involved in the restoration of Pt Dorset in partnership with WCC | Support | |
| 21 | 2 | | | The site assessment has shown the extent of weed contamination and reinforces our view that greater emphasis and resources needs to be applied by WCC to weed reduction across the whole of Wgtn. The removal of pohutukawa may be controversial, however we support its removal due to it being beyond its natural range in Wgtn, its potential to hybridise with northern rata and its propensity to become a coastal weed. F&B suggests that Northern rata be planted in place of pohutukawa that are to be removed from Point Dorset | Agreed that northern rata will be suitable in some areas. | Add Northern Rata to the list of plants in Appendix 1 |
| 21 | 3 | | | In regards to mammalian pests, F&B Places for Penguins project is willing to provide volunteers to help control mammalian pests through trapping as an extension to the current trapping programme at Tarakena Bay. | thanks | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 21 | 4 | | | F&B supports the objectives and proposed direction of the ecological restoration of Pt Dorset. We are willing to support the restoration of the area through consultation of planting priorities and outcomes as well as potentially providing volunteers. We would expect the ecological measure for assessing the effectiveness of the programme to be published and be accessible to the public. | Monitoring of the reserve will be carried out as part of the city wide monitoring programme | |
| 21 | 5 | | | F&B support better signage in regards to marking tracks | The majority of signage within the reserve will be for way finding. All secondary tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed design process as to whether they should be retained or closed | |
| 21 | 6 | | | F&B support better signage in regards to limits on catch or harvests from the rocks of the point. | The Council will work with MAFF to increase the level of monitoring of the site, awareness of the catch limits and installation of signs advising visitors of their responsibilities around the catch limits for shellfish and fish. | |
| 21 | 7 | | | Dog control is important to our Places for Penguins project that currently has nesting boxes in the area. We recognise the importance of the area for dog walking however the area should remain an on leash area to ensure dogs are under control at all times to reduce the risk to little blue penguins and other wildlife. Anecdotal and observational evidence suggests that the current on leash designation for dogs at Pt Dorset is frequently not adhered to by dog walkers. Signage for the area should also include a reminder for dog walkers to keep their dogs on a leash at all times and the reasoning behind this. | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. Consideration will be given to providing explanation for the policy position on dogs on lead during the development of the interpretation plan for the site. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|---|--|
| 22 | 1 | | | (A)1.1 Purpose of this plan (page 1): This needs strengthening. To say the objectives and policies only “give guidance” leaves too much room for actual actions to deviate from the Plan after it has been finalised and so is beyond the normal public consultation process. The objectives and policies generally are worded broadly (e.g. “where appropriate”) and avoid too much detail, so that they provide enough flexibility without being downgraded to guidance. I agree that the Plan provides a clear framework, with a lot of background research having been well documented. I ask that “give guidance for the” be replaced by “explain the intended”. | Agree | Amend the second paragraph of 1.1 to read: The objectives and policies in this plan explain the intended methods for the protection, management , development, operation and public use of Point Dorset Reserve' |
| 22 | 2 | | | (B) 1.4 Vision (page 3): I support the Vision. | Support | |
| 22 | 3 | | | (C) 1.8 Co-management (page 4): This co-management seems to be a sensible approach. However, I do ask that the Plan explicitly require WCC make the annual report available to the public. It would be unreasonable if it were available to only “Wellington City Council and Taranaki Whānui”. I know the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act might be able to be used to gain access but, like other reports, it should automatically be made public (e.g. via the WCC website). | The annual report on the management of the reserve will be made available to the public on request. | |
| 22 | 4 | | | (D)2.3 & 2.4 Objectives and Policies (for culture and heritage) (page 10 onwards): I note from my own observation, and statements in the plan (e.g. “Most of the remaining military structures from Fort Dorset are in poor condition; they have become overgrown with vegetation and also have graffiti. Some are unsafe.”), that much of the physical heritage value has been destroyed or significantly damaged. | An archaeological assessment was carried out by Opus Consultants in March 2011 on all sites within the reserve. Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust own the reserve land with the Council as the administering body under the Reserves Act. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|---|---|
| 22 | 5 | | | As a result of the loss of heritage values, I believe the Plan should put less emphasis on “keep, maintain, repair and strengthen” these and more on interpretation and recognition. There are other, better examples of “European fortifications” in Wellington. Physical work in the Plan would generally be better used to protect, enhance and restore landscape, ecological, and recreation features, with interpretation including any necessary further research and recording, being the main emphasis for such heritage values. | The plan addresses the key issues for the site and the recognition of the history of the site is an integral part of this. | |
| 22 | 6 | | | (E) 3.x Landscape (page 12 onwards): I strongly support this section. Protecting the natural character and views (3.2.1 and 3.2.2) is essential for the Reserve's value. My own visits to the area are to enjoy those views and the “wild rugged”, comparatively natural coast. I strongly oppose structures in the lookout area. I ask the Plan explicitly state as an additional policy that a consent application, or proposal to change the District Plan, to allow any additional structure or extension of the built environment that would impact on the Reserve's views or landscape character would be incompatible with the Plan's vision and objectives and would be opposed. The Plan should not appear neutral as the wording here does. Although outside the scope of this Plan I note that the location of the telecommunications tower suggests the District Plan itself needs strengthening | The majority of the site is zoned Open Space B and Conservation site. As such any new utility structures are likely to require resource consent. The detailed policies around utility structures is outlined in section 6.2.7 | Amend the cross reference in 3rd bullet point of 3.4.2 to 6.2.7 |
| 22 | 7 | | | (F) 4.x Ecology (page 14 onwards): I strongly support this section, including its objectives and policies. I trust that the sort of monitoring specified in 4.4.3 will also be applied to monitor the results of all actions taken within section 4.4.x I note that WCC here recognises that Pohutukawa is an introduced species, effectively a pest, and urge that it make no new plantings of Pohutukawa anywhere in the city. | Monitoring of the reserve will be undertaken as part of the city wide monitoring programme. There will be no new planting of Pohutukawas in the reserve. The Council selects trees in other areas of the city based on those most suitable for the specific environment. This may mean that Pohutukawas are planted in other parts of the city. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 22 | 8 | | | (G)4.2.4 Human Impact (page 18); 5.2.3 Dogs (page 22); 5.4.1 Policies (page 23): I strongly support requiring any dog in the Reserve to be on-lead and under control. I note a recent trend to circumvent the on-lead requirement through the use of “dog reels”, which allow dogs to roam ten metres and more from their nominal controller. I ask that the Plan, and, when reviewed, more generally the Dog (Control) Policy, ensure that use of such reels, or any other type of “lead” longer than two metres, be classified as “off-lead”. Any change to the Dog (Control) Policy should not be allowed to weaken this Plan and so not override any restriction placed on the Reserve by the Plan. | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. The submissions will be referred to the Dog Policy review scheduled for 2012/13, the plan will note that a potential compromise is to allow dogs off leash on the upper ridgeline tracks and on leash on the beach. | |
| 22 | 9 | | | (H)5. Recreation and Access (page 20 onwards): I agree that access and track conditions have serious problems which detract from the enjoyment of the Reserve. I support the closure of informal or short-cut tracks that go through areas of high ecological value. | All tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed planning around the restoration project. Secondary tracks will be assessed as to whether they should be retained or closed | |
| 22 | 10 | | | (I) Map F (page 21): It appears that the Ludlam and Hector Street entrances have been transposed in this map. | Names of streets transposed | Correct labelling of streets on map F |
| 22 | 11 | | | (J) 5.4.1 Policies (page 23): I ask that the Plan include provision of tide timetable and guidance displayed near the Breaker Bay and Ludlam Street entrances. This will assist those walking (or cycling see (K)) the “coastal route” (i.e. round the coast at beach level) as use of that route depends on the tide. | A detailed interpretation and signage plan will be developed as part of the implementation of the management plan. The inclusion of tide timetables in the signage at the main entrance points is unlikely unless these are included in any signage provided by MAF around fishing and shellfish gathering quotas. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 22 | 12 | | | (K) 5.4.1 Policies - The reserve is closed to the following activities: (page 23): I agree that the current tracks on the hill and high ground are unsuitable for mountain biking. However, it is possible at the right state of the tide to cycle round, with the some “portages”, on the “coastal route”. While the beach is mainly outside the Reserve and so presumably not affected by the Plan, at the northern end it appears to be within the Reserve and the use of the track south of Ludlam Street entrance (for around 250m) also provides good access, without, I believe, compromising natural values or creating conflict between users. I therefore ask that allowing mountain biking from Hector to Ludlam Street entrances be extended south to the beach at that point just north of where the “dunelands” are on the slopes and on the beach where that is in the Reserve. Note that the beach on the seaward side of the “dunelands” provides safe (with no damage to the dunes) and easier (for the traveller than on the slopes) passage. There it also appears to be outside the Reserve. | The boundary of the reserve is at mean high water and as such the use of the beach below this point by cyclists is not prevented under the management plan. The extension of the cyclist access to the tracks south of Ludlam Street is not supported. | |
| 22 | 13 | | | (L) 6.1 Administration (page 24): I ask that “and public consultation” be added after “appropriate recreational activities”. | The Objective of the Plan is to manage the reserve appropriately. Consultation on the management policies is being undertaken through this process. Any expenditure associated with the improvement of the reserve other than the \$400k from the Plimmer Bequest will be consulted on through the relevant Draft Annual Plan and Long term plan as appropriate. Any physical works on the site are likely to require resource consent under the District Plan and would be consulted on through this process also. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|---|--|
| 22 | 14 | | | (M)6.2 Policies (page 24): I am concerned that this section seems to introduce into the Plan a whole set of new, many permissive, conditions (allowing closure, exclusive use, utilities, approving legal access for utility companies etc) which may limit the appropriate management of the reserve. It seems to do so without any specific justification. Indeed no evidence is offered as to whether some of the policies can actually apply. As examples: there is no list of the existing encroachments "all of which" are to be removed; there is no list of the existing legal motor vehicle accesses by utility companies which the Plan here allows. I ask that "are likely to" be replaced by "may" in 6.2.10. This is public land, set aside for the people and nature, not for profit, and if there is any chance that a commercial activity might affect the public's enjoyment of the reserve that activity must not be allowed. | The administration of the reserve must be consistent with all the objectives and policies outlined in the document. The policies outlined in section 6 do not override other policies. The submitter raises specific issues of encroachments - there are no known encroachments; access by utility companies - most utility companies have rights under other legislation to access land to maintain their infrastructure, this plan cannot fetter this right. Agree the requested modification to 6.2.10. | Replace "are likely to" with "may" in 6.2.10 |
| 23 | 1 | Yes | | Because information (historical) is a good way to enhance the Pt Dorset experience and pests have become a problem. Basic track maintenance has been slack. | Support | |
| 23 | 2 | | Yes | | Support | |
| 23 | 3 | | | Dogs are in my opinion the leading cause of penguin mortality - I have found 5 bitten and dead penguins in the 5 years I have lived here. I believe dogs run around the point without their owners. | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. The submissions will be referred to the Dog Policy review scheduled for 2012/13, the plan will note that a potential compromise is to allow dogs off leash on the upper ridgeline tracks and on leash on the beach. | |
| 23 | 4 | | | Also I like that your changes are minimal. I hope the artist has to lug those oamaru stones up there - they are rubbish. | All changes made during the restoration project will be consistent with the retaining the rugged feel of the reserve | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|---|
| 23 | 5 | | | No mention of rabbits (unless predator trap line includes these ringbarking breeding little destroyers). At present most of the mature taupata have less than an inch of bark unnibbled. Much has already died, in part. Magpies also rule the point and Seatoun. Have you made people aware of this pest? | The Wellington City Pest Management Plan 2004 states that "Greater Wellington will undertake control of rabbits on riverbanks, esplanades and similar public commons. Wellington City Council as landowner is responsible for maintaining rabbit numbers at or below level 5 of the Modified McLean Scale as specified in the RPMS. Level 5 of the Modified McLean scale is, "Sign very frequent with faecal heaps less than 5m apart in pockets. Rabbits spreading." However, given the level of replanting and revegetation to be undertaken on the reserve, active pest animal management can be anticipated to precede the restoration and be ongoing to reduce the level of animal pests on the site. Greater Wellington manages magpie control and the supply of magpie traps. | Add another bullet point to 4.4.1: A proactive rabbit control programme will be carried out to reduce the population and ensure no harmful effects from these pests on existing vegetation and restoration programmes. |
| 23 | 6 | | | The signage about limits (seafood) need to be huge and indestructible and in many languages. More fisheries officers needed and an education programme in churches and schools about catch limits. | The Council will work with MAFF to increase the level of monitoring of the site, awareness of the catch limits and installation of signs advising visitors of their responsibilities around the catch limits for shellfish and fish. | |
| 23 | 7 | | | No plants should be removed until others have become established. The wind here is intense! Removing pohutukawa is counter productive. Ratas should be planted amongst them and will eventually take over. The pines should be 'limbed up' to remove dangerous limbs and fire risk. But to pull tem down will cause massive erosion. Big trees will enable hawks to nest after the magpies are gone. . | Pohutukawa will only be removed in the long term if they directly affect our ability to restore areas of high ecological significance. However, if they are removed, we will first establish other more suitable local trees (such as northern rata and ngaio) in their place. <i>The pines on public land will be assessed for health and safety risk in the short term. They will only be removed if deemed to be a danger to the general public.</i> | |
| 23 | 8 | | | Cats? No policy? | Identify cats as a pest in 4.2.1 | Include mention of cats in 4.2.1 |
| 24 | 1 | | | The private land surrounding the Seatoun School and to the south east should be purchased as the first opportunity to ensure that it remains part of the Pt Dorset Reserve | WCC has had discussions with the owner of the adjacent private land with a view to purchasing this land. These are ongoing | |
| 24 | 2 | | | While it is valuable to have only native plants and trees growing on the reserve, removing pohutukawas because the never came south of Taupo is going too far. Plants and trees should be removed in stages so that there is always a good cover of foliage over the hill track as there is at present | Pohutukawa will only be removed in the long term if they directly affect our ability to restore areas of high ecological significance. However, if they are removed, we will first establish other more suitable local trees (such as northern rata and ngaio) in their place. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 24 | 3 | | | The points of historical interest should remain with a little tidying up and some information on their history. A Pa that no longer exists should have its position shown and something of its history stated. The gun emplacements should all remain with their history stated | The objective of the Culture and heritage section of the plan is to 'recognise, protect and interpret the historical and cultural feature of Point Dorset Recreation Reserve.' Recognition of the pa site and gun emplacements on private land will be subject to negotiation with the private landowner. | |
| 24 | 4 | | | The path from the beach facing Eastbourne to the Pass of Branda need to keep its back country feel and not be made into a park walking track or bicycle track. At present it has this wonderful affect of coming form the urban world straight into the rural back country world. | All tracks will be assessed as part of the detailed planning around the restoration project. Any changes to tracks and areas will be minimal to be consistent with the opinion expressed by submitters to have minimal impact on the reserve as part of the restoration project | |
| 24 | 5 | | | There is a case for dogs being on leads around the coast but they should be allowed free over the hill from the coast to the Pass of Branda. No little blue penguins and they might clean up the rabbits. | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. The submissions will be referred to the Dog Policy review scheduled for 2012/13, the plan will note that a potential compromise is to allow dogs off leash on the upper ridgeline tracks and on leash on the beach. | |
| 25 | 1 | Yes | | | Support | |
| 25 | 2 | | yes | | Support | |
| 25 | 3 | | | We note that in appendix 3 'Landscape Concept Plan' there is a proposal to close the track which runs along the boundary between the school and the reserve which looks to be on land which is privately owned. The school uses this track regularly for cross country and other activities. We wonder whether it would be possible to retain this track and potentially improve it? | Any works on this land carried out by WCC would be subject to WCC acquiring the land for public use. At present the land is privately owned and any use of the track by the school is subject to the approval of the private landowner | |
| 25 | 4 | | | Also the school currently access the coast via a pathway and gate on the northeast boundary of the school. We would really like to see this access retained or some alternative provided. From the maps provided it would appear that our current access crosses private land? | This access used by the school directly accesses private land. The Council is not in negotiation to purchase this property and it may be sold in the future. The school may wish to approach the owner of the land to formalise their access over this privately held land. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|---|
| 26 | 1 | | | We believe part of the management plan and its process must be consideration for the name change to Oruaiti Reserve rather than the current Point Dorset. The reason we are seeking this name change is because although the site of the former military base was called Fort Dorset, the earlier name for the area was Oruaiti. The name change does not require the consent of DOC or the Geographic Board and can be undertaken by the Council. | Rename the reserve Oruaiti Reserve in recognition of the importance to the iwi of the site. | Gazette a name change for the reserve to 'Oruaiti Reserve'. |
| 27 | 1 | | | HPT is generally supportive of the objectives and policies for the reserve in the draft Plan | Support | |
| 27 | 2 | | | The heritage values present at Point Dorset are significant and need to be given equal weighting, attention and respect as those associated with the reserves current recreational use. | The plan reflects the priority placed on the heritage aspects of the reserve | |
| 27 | 3 | | | HPT is supportive of the proposed interpretation around the site that will help inform users of the special values of the site. | The main interpretation panels are to be located at the main entrances. A detailed interpretation plan will be developed as part of the implementation of the management plan and this will consider the level of interpretation within the reserve. | |
| 27 | 4 | | | HPT supports the weight given to the heritage values of the site in the draft Management Plan | Agree | |
| 27 | 5 | | | HPT is supportive of the intention to provide a detailed framework of the management of this important place through the draft plan and landscape plan | Support | |
| 27 | 6 | | | Fort Dorset has a number of significant archaeological site and a rich Maori history. Any works should be informed by an up to date archaeological assessment, iwi consultation and may require archaeological authority. This should cover the whole area including the pa site, associated sites and the coastal defence battery site. | An archaeological assessment was carried out by Opus Consultants in March 2011 on all sites within the reserve. Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust own the reserve land with the Council as administrator under the Reserves Act. As such, PNBST have been closely involved in the development of the plan. | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 27 | 7 | | | Whilst supportive of landscape planting, care needs to be taken to selected appropriate plants to install around archaeological sites. Sites need to be managed carefully so that vegetation does not damage the sensitive archaeological deposits and protects heritage features. If planting is required, HPT recommends natives with short root bases and grass in and around archaeological site. Regular maintenance and monitoring of the site needs to occur to ensure no weed species or trees take root. Planting can benefit archaeological sites as they can restrict public access to sites and prevent unintentional damage by people. | Noted and will be addressed in the development of the detailed planting plan for the sites | |
| 27 | 8 | | | Particular care needs to be taken if trees are removed as removal of trees deep root systems can disturb archaeological deposits. In some cases, archaeological authority is required to remove a tree. | Agreed | |
| 27 | 9 | | | HPT is supportive the area maintains its sweeping ocean views to and from the surrounding landscape. Any works including the planting and track building should ensure that important views to and from the site are maintained. | Planting on the ridgeline areas will be for amenity and landscape plantings. There is no intention in the draft plan to plant larger trees species which would impact on the views from the lookout and nearby tracks | |
| 27 | 10 | | | Although WWI and WWII military installations are not protected under the Historic Places Act, their significance and values are high. HPT has an interest in their retention and management. HPT is supportive of Council's intention to repair and make safe these structures. Council should also implement a monitoring plan for the site to ensure their on going survival. | Photo points will be used to monitor the heritage sites and any change in condition recorded in this way | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 27 | 11 | | | Policy 2.4.1 states that vegetation currently around the remaining structure will be maintained to protect the historic features. While HPT is mostly supportive of this policy, this needs to be considered on a case-by-case basis and the best outcome from the protection of the structure can sometimes be the removal of the vegetation. Large trees in particular can pose a threat to archaeological sites. This is also true of military installations. Some vegetation can damage the structures and needs to be monitored and managed appropriately. | Ivy and other invasive plants around the structures will be removed and monitored. However some of the sites are currently on private land and are outside the boundaries of the reserve. | |
| 28 | 1 | | | I am concerned that pest control methods will use poison. This is a dog walking area and poison is deadly for dogs also. It is inappropriate to use poison in this area. | Appropriate pest control methods will be used in the area and staff are very aware of the proximity of residential areas and potential for harm to pets through the use of poison | |
| 28 | 2 | | | I reiterate my position that Point Dorset should be an off lead dog exercise area. | Dog access is set through the Dog Policy and is developed under a separate statutory process. This policy states that "Where the likelihood of conflict exists between dogs and wildlife, access for dogs to public places will be restricted." The position adopted in this plan is consistent with the Council's Dog Policy 2009. The submissions will be referred to the Dog Policy review scheduled for 2012/13, the plan will note that a potential compromise is to allow dogs off leash on the upper ridgeline tracks and on leash on the beach. | |
| 29 | 1 | | | PG 20, Note that revegetation is unlikely to benefit wildlife (birds and lizards), unless pest control is undertaken. Note that year-round rat control would be needed to stop declines of lizards. | Noted, this will be included in the planning of the revegetation and pest control programmes | |
| 29 | 2 | | | Pg20 "As well as spinifex and pingao, sand tussock (<i>Poa billardiae</i>), silver tussock (<i>Poa cita</i>), ice plant (<i>Dysphyma australe</i>) and sand coprosma (<i>Coprosma acerosa</i>) will be among the species used." Other species such as <i>Pimelia</i> should be planted for the <i>Notoreas</i> "Wellington" moth which is endemic to this coast line. Other coastal invertebrates should be considered in the planting plan. | Noted, this will be included in the planning of the restoration programme. The list of plants included in Appendix One is to provide guidance but does not represent an exhaustive list of plants to be used in the revegetation of the site | |

| Submitter No | Point | Support overall direction | Support policies | Submitter Comment | WCC response | Recommended change to draft Plan |
|--------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 29 | 3 | | | <p>"Shrubland" section on Pg 20. Note that rank grass will be providing the majority of habitat for lizards and removal of this for replanting will have negative impacts on the lizard populations if done on a large scale. There needs to be careful planning of spraying and replantings to ensure suitable dense ground cover is available for impacted lizard to move to (especially after spraying) during the replanting process. Lizards need suitable cover to move away from dying/sprayed grass habitat. Divaricating species (such as Meuhlenbeckia spp) is very dense low growing - suitable because it provides some protection from predators (esp large bodied predators such as cats.)</p> | <p>Noted, this will be included in the planning of the revegetation programmes</p> | |

Appendix 2

Amended draft Management Plan

Appendix 3

Submitters to the draft Management Plan

| Submitter number | Submitter name |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1 | John Malthus |
| 2 | Gary Hewson |
| 3 | Kevin Jones |
| 4 | Stuart Young |
| 5 | Joyce Mackay |
| 6 | Helen Moody |
| 7 | Great Harbour Way Coalition |
| 8 | Defence of NZ Study Group |
| 9 | Yamary Yamary |
| 10 | Wellington Hawke's Bay Conservation Board |
| 11 | Donald Mallinder |
| 12 | Sally Talbot |
| 13 | Rosamund Averton |
| 14 | Curtis Nixon |
| 15 | Bruce Staples |
| 16 | Richard Cassidy |
| 17 | Deb Hurdle |
| 18 | Wellington Botanical Society |
| 19 | Geoffrey Read |
| 20 | Susanne Krejcek |
| 21 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc - Wellington Branch |
| 22 | Michael Taylor Markus |
| 23 | McIntyre |
| 24 | RF Will |
| 25 | Seatoun School |
| 26 | Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust |
| 27 | New Zealand Historic Places Trust |
| 28 | Katey Kestin |