

Robert Murray's submission on the Proposed District Plan

Walkability for Wellington must allow for both topography and weather rather than being just a matter of time. I could walk from my home to either Kilbirnie or Newtown in 15 minutes but because of the steep hill on return I would never do so.

If democracy is government, of the people, by the people, for the people I understand there is conflict between of and by, due to the people being diverse and never of one mind, but, for the people should be relatively simple – provide a solid framework for them to inhabit and then, if there is a surplus, perhaps Council can address more esoteric concerns – or it could reduce its demands on the residents. The question then becomes which people are you governing for: should it really be the people you want to come and live here, or the tourists you want to cram in; or should you be ruling for the people who are already living here? The other aspect of democracy that seems to be missing here is majority rule – which from Council's perspective should mean providing for the majority. I would suggest that the majority of users of the eastern suburbs need a more efficient way to access the rest of the country more than they needed a second convention centre or a restored duplicate town hall. After all the ratepayers built the Michael Fowler Centre as a replacement town hall and convention centre. And, if Council maintains public transport is a viable option they may need to figure out where they're going to get bus drivers from. On that topic, if Council is making cycle lanes to promote safe cycling why aren't they making motorcycling lanes given that there are more motorcyclists and motorcycling is proportionally twice as dangerous as cycling – perhaps motorcycles could use cycle lanes, after all in the city they don't travel any faster than electric bicycles. Does this District Plan provide improved access to or from the eastern suburbs – Not that I could find. And: what I really don't understand: Council through Let's Get Wellington Moving is trying to reduce the number of private vehicles in the CBD – so they create bus and bike lanes that reduce the number of car parks available; then they go out and spend 13 million on replacement car parks so they don't lose the revenue from the parking. Regardless of my disapproval of the whole LGWM idea, this just makes no sense at all!

The booklet “Understanding Our District Plan” states the District Plan is a rule book managing stuff with the aim of meeting the needs of current and future generations: I would suggest that this rule book does not bother with the needs of the current generations and that the number of objectors here reinforces that. Another problem with this District Plan is that as a rule book it seems to depend on Council staff to provide the final interpretation on whether a guideline/rule is being complied with: as well as increasing costs and delays and putting a lot of extra work on front line staff this also risks personal bias or influence. You're opening the door to corruption. Grow or die has been a mantra of business and politics for a couple of generations now but it has no basis in the natural world of growing things. Plants and animals have a fixed size they attain at maturity which they maintain for the rest of their lives. Humans also reach a fixed size early in life then (hopefully) grow in wisdom knowledge and maturity. People that are too big are seen as flawed and have difficulty

functioning and cities that are too big are seen as diseased and non functional. Plans that are too big are seen as over complicated and verbose. Uncontrolled growth is the definition of cancer. This plan does not try and control growth – it tries to fit growth into a body that is too small.

Growth is also a prime factor in climate change which this city and Council is both opposed to and unable to cope with. Trying to fit more and more people into Wellington city is only going to create slums and poor living for the people the Council is tasked with improving the lifestyles of. So, if you're planning to control growth in Wellington surely the main role of Council, and this plan, is to establish an infrastructure that can cope with the current level of population and can accommodate expansion as required. This differs from the current proposed plan which seeks to encourage growth in specific defined areas where apparently the infrastructure is already inadequate. I will point out that this approach has failed previously: a 1960's plan put all the high rises in Te Aro flat, and the overseas terminal was redundant before it was finished. People make choices: if the Council tries to influence these choices they may find the result is not what they expect. What about climate change and managed retreat: this plan doesn't seem to limit construction to 2 metres above high tide mark nor to discourage use of infrastructure below this guideline. I will be saddened to lose the road around the bays but that's inevitable – although it looks like Council may have to construct a tunnel to Shelly Bay.

I do apologise if I have interpreted this plan incorrectly: but as a fluent English speaker I attribute this to the plan being overly complicated, deeply dependent on a technological framework which is not explained – and I maintain should never have been used for public consultation – and full of irrelevancies.

Let me cite an example: my own property in Hornsey Rd. Melrose. When I enter this in the plan I discover the property is zoned medium density residential – which means that I can build 3 three storey houses on it. What the plan doesn't mention is that this is a 500m² triangular section on a steep site: I had difficulty building a single house on it. What else does this plan tell me. That I have a height control plane of 11 metres – great for building a pyramid although it might be a bit lop sided. Also that I'm near or in the Mt Albert Ridge and the Town Belt and the Airport Obstacle Limitation Surfaces zones. Whatever the hell all that means! I will point out that my aunt, who lives on the flat in Seatoun also lives in the Airport obstacle zone despite the fact there is a 100 metre hill between her and the airport: I only have a fifty metre hill directly behind me. I'm starting to think this plan was made, like the original plans for Wellington were, from a great distance on a flat map with no regard for topography or natural features. Maybe it was done by an AI – still in development. Perhaps the property report will be more illuminating. Unfortunately not - but there are some more maps which show that there is a bit of a flooding risk down the road a bit, there are no specific controls, no precincts, no historical or cultural values but: I do live right next to a DP overlay (marked by vertical lines) which is not identified in the legend although it might be the coastal zone. A bit of a failing for a legal document. Regarding failings as a legal document, and I apologise again if this is not the appropriate hearing but during my attempted browsing of this document it seemed that the maps for coastal inundation showed greater flooding for the medium scenario

than for the high scenario – perhaps its a technical thing.

Seems like the proposed District plan doesn't apply much to my property.

A further check on my aunt's and mother's properties showed a similar lack of information – apart from the fact that there's a cultural tree outside my aunt's. But, they, living on flat land in the Eastern suburbs will probably end up surrounded by 6 storey apartment blocks, and all those extra people will be forming a traffic jam of ebikes to get to and from work each day.