

# APPENDIX 2:

## Summary of initial submissions

When the Council notified its intention to prepare this plan in November 2001 it produced a discussion document. This was sent to all landowners in the Outer Green Belt area and to all stakeholder organisations, known interested parties, and to anyone else who requested a copy. Fifty nine submissions were received and are summarised below.

Many submissions were structured around the 20 questions in the discussion document which came under six main headings: general concept, landscape and land use, ecology, recreation, significance to Maori and recent history.

### **General concept**

#### *Support for concept (43 comments)*

The majority of the submissions expressed support for the concept. Many of the submitters who did not directly express their support, did so indirectly throughout their submission, or implied that they would support the concept with some modifications.

#### *Support for plan preparation (29 comments)*

The support for the intention to prepare this Plan was similar to the support of the concept. The majority of the submissions stated their support for the Plan, or implied their support without directly stating it. A few submissions suggested modifications or a different approach to the Plan preparation.

### **Landscape and land use**

#### *Placement of utilities (29 comments)*

The majority of comments in relation to utilities were in favour of the Plan limiting utility placement (24). Submitters suggested utility sharing, location away from skyline, using natural colours and designs, putting income back into Outer Green Belt and reference to other legislation. Several utility companies made submissions and were all in support of the Plan providing criteria for utilities. Utility companies stressed that access to existing facilities must be provided for within the Plan, and that some shielding requirements were inappropriate due to reducing utility effectiveness. Five submitters recommended no new utilities to be located on the Outer Green Belt.

#### *Types of structures (21 comments)*

There was some confusion between utilities and structures, and many people commented on utilities in this question. Seven submitters suggested that only structures related to the purpose and principles of the Outer Green Belt are appropriate (i.e. toilets, information boards, signs, picnic spots etc). Five submitters mentioned that the design and colour of structures is important and should be controlled by the Plan.

### **Ecology**

#### *Ridgelines in pasture (30 comments)*

Twenty-four submissions supported some or all of the ridgelines remaining in pasture to maintain views and open space values. There were some questions concerning the management of the pasture, fire risk and effects on biodiversity values. Several people suggested that native grasses should be planted or that studies of historic vegetation should determine ridgeline vegetation. Four submitters suggested that it would be best to re-vegetate ridges, with some suggesting that viewpoints could be maintained in specified areas, or from platforms.

#### *Regeneration process (33 comments)*

Submitters were split on the issue of natural versus active regeneration (seven vs. 12). Some suggested that in priority areas the Council should be active, and in other areas it should be left to nature. Eighteen submitters made comments on the need for more animal and plant pest control. The requirement for fencing was mentioned three times. A suggestion was also made that mapping of re-vegetation priority areas may be useful.

#### *Role of communities and community groups (17 comments)*

Most comments related to the community becoming involved through voluntary activities (12 comments) such as planting, plant and animal pest control, fencing and track building/maintenance. Three submitters suggested that the community should be involved by sharing their ideas on aspirations, values and objectives. One suggestion involved local residents doing their bit by planting natives in their gardens and putting bells on cats. Getting children involved, education and promotion through newspapers and newsletters were also suggested. One other suggestion involved developing a community group to oversee the Outer Green Belt.

#### *Exotic plants and trees (25 comments)*

Ten comments suggested that exotic planting is acceptable in the Outer Green Belt. Most of these comments also suggested that care is required when planting exotics so that they do not become weeds. Seven submitters commented that exotic trees should only be a temporary measure, and should be removed once natives have regenerated. There were also seven comments that were totally against the use of exotics in the Outer Green Belt. One comment suggested that only locally eco-sourced plants should be used.

### **Recreation**

#### *Road access (21 comments)*

Eleven submitters were against any further vehicle access to the Outer Green Belt. Four submitters suggested limited access to strategic viewpoints or for maintenance or management purposes. Five submitters suggested that there should be a lot more access all around the Outer Green Belt to allow as many people as possible access to the Outer Green Belt.

#### *Track usage (16 comments)*

There was a variety of comments in regard to this issue. Eight comments supported track usage by walkers/runners/bikers, and three supported dual (walking and mountain biking) use. Three submitters thought it was most appropriate to separate activities. One person mentioned that steps on tracks were not always appropriate, and another considered that motorised vehicles were not appropriate. One submitter also mentioned they would like to be able to walk the length of the Outer Green Belt.

#### *Track building priorities (38 comments)*

There were several suggestions for specific track priorities, which can be referenced from the main summary. However there was a range of general suggestions including well-maintained tracks, improved signage/markings, loop, link and network improvements. Three people suggested that no new tracks were required.

#### *Responsibility for tracks (20 comments)*

Nearly all submitters who commented on this issue (18) suggested that Wellington City Council should retain the primary role in maintaining tracks, but that community groups/organisations/businesses could be involved with volunteer work supervised by the Council. Four people mentioned the importance of track standards. One submitter suggested that groups/people “adopt a track” and take on its maintenance.

#### *Permitted recreation activities (22 comments)*

All submitters who commented on this issue supported walking and passive activities. Nine submitters supported walking/running and biking. Two submitters suggested that

activities should be limited to non-motorised forms. Three people thought horse riding was acceptable (some mentioned limitation of areas), and one person thought that dog exercising should be permitted. Four people thought that motorbikes and vehicles were acceptable, but realised there may be limitations on the area or timing of the activity.

*Controlled or prohibited recreation activities (28 comments)*

There was a large response to this question. Thirteen submitters said that motorised vehicles should be prohibited, and a further seven suggested some kind of limitation on motorised vehicle access, either to certain areas or at certain times of the year. There were four comments relating to prohibiting horse riding, and two submitters suggested that horse riding should be controlled. A further nine submitters thought that mountain biking should be controlled in some way. Five submitters thought that dog access should be restricted, and three people thought that activities that created noise or environmental damage should be prohibited.

*Commercial recreation (17 comments)*

There were six comments stating that commercial recreation should be prohibited. The remaining comments (11) suggested that commercial recreation should be limited in some way. The suggestions included limiting commercial activity to one off-events, non-motorised activities and activities that do not compromise the Outer Green Belt values. There was also a suggestion that appropriate charges should occur for commercial activities, which could be used within the Outer Green Belt.

*Special needs or areas (19 comments)*

There was a wide variety of comments for this question. Three submitters commented on the need for open space with free access for everybody. There were also three comments on improving the Makara Peak Mountain Bike Park facilities or biking facilities in general. Other suggestions included an orienteering area, native species plantations, and picnic spots. Three submitters suggested that there is currently enough special zoning and no more is required. One submitter suggested Old Coach Road should have its own management plan.

## **Significance for Maori**

*Recognition of Maori history and values (12 comments)*

The majority of submitters (seven) who made comments on this question suggested the use of pamphlets and signage to communicate Maori legends, names, interpretations and values. Other suggestions included complying with the Treaty of Waitangi, more consultation, identification of Maori tracks and research on significant sites.

## **Recent history**

*Historical values (19 comments)*

Nine submitters made comments on the need for signs/information boards or pamphlets to explain and provide interpretation about historic sites. It was also suggested that original names should be used. There were two comments in support of preserving heritage values. Other comments included the need for further consultation with heritage organisations or the public.

## **Land acquisition**

A number of submitters made suggestions about land that could or should be obtained by the Council and added to the Outer Green Belt.

**Please note – a summary of the submissions on the *Draft Outer Green Belt Management Plan* can be viewed by contacting the Council.**