
ORDINARY MEETING
OF
ANNUAL PLAN/LONG-TERM PLAN COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Time: 5:00 pm
Date: Tuesday, 11 May 2021
Venue: Whataitai (16.11)
Level 16, Tahiwī
113 The Terrace
Wellington

MEMBERSHIP

Deputy Mayor Free (Chair)
Councillor Calvert
Councillor Condie
Councillor Day
Councillor Fitzsimons
Councillor Foon
Mayor Andy Foster (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Matthews
Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Pannett
Councillor Paul
Councillor Rush
Councillor Sparrow
Councillor Woolf
Councillor Young

Have your say!

You can make a short presentation to the Councillors at this meeting. Please let us know by noon the working day before the meeting. You can do this either by phoning 04-803-8334, emailing public.participation@wcc.govt.nz or writing to Democracy Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, giving your name, phone number, and the issue you would like to talk about. All Council and committee meetings are livestreamed on our YouTube page. This includes any public participation at the meeting.

AREA OF FOCUS

The Long-term Plan and Annual Plan give effect to the strategic direction and outcomes set by the Strategy and Policy Committee by setting levels of service and budget.

The Committee is responsible for overseeing the development of the draft Annual Plan and Long-term Plan for consultation, determining the scope and approach of any consultation and engagement required, and recommending the final Long-term Plan and Annual Plans to the Council.

To read the full delegations of this Committee, please visit wellington.govt.nz/meetings.

Quorum: 8 members

TABLE OF CONTENTS
11 MAY 2021

Business	Page No.
1. Meeting Conduct	5
1.1 Karakia	5
1.2 Apologies	5
1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations	5
1.4 Confirmation of Minutes	5
1.5 Items not on the Agenda	5
1.6 Public Participation	6
2. General Business	7
2.1 Long-term Plan Forum	7

1. Meeting Conduct

1.1 Karakia

The Chairperson will open the meeting with a karakia.

Whakataka te hau ki te uru, Whakataka te hau ki te tonga. Kia mākinakina ki uta, Kia mātaratara ki tai. E hī ake ana te atākura. He tio, he huka, he hauhū. Tihei Mauri Ora!	Cease oh winds of the west and of the south Let the bracing breezes flow, over the land and the sea. Let the red-tipped dawn come with a sharpened edge, a touch of frost, a promise of a glorious day
---	--

At the appropriate time, the following karakia will be read to close the meeting.

Unuhia, unuhia, unuhia ki te uru tapu nui Kia wātea, kia māmā, te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua I te ara takatū Koia rā e Rongo, whakairia ake ki runga Kia wātea, kia wātea Āe rā, kua wātea!	Draw on, draw on Draw on the supreme sacredness To clear, to free the heart, the body and the spirit of mankind Oh Rongo, above (symbol of peace) Let this all be done in unity
--	--

1.2 Apologies

The Chairperson invites notice from members of apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the meeting, where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

1.4 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting of 11 May 2021 will not be available for confirmation at this meeting, and will instead be confirmed at the next meeting of the Annual Plan/Long-Term Plan Committee.

1.5 Items not on the Agenda

The Chairperson will give notice of items not on the agenda as follows.

Matters Requiring Urgent Attention as Determined by Resolution of the Annual Plan/Long-Term Plan Committee.

The Chairperson shall state to the meeting:

-
1. The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
 2. The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

The item may be allowed onto the agenda by resolution of the Annual Plan/Long-Term Plan Committee.

Minor Matters relating to the General Business of the Annual Plan/Long-Term Plan Committee.

The Chairperson shall state to the meeting that the item will be discussed, but no resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting of the Annual Plan/Long-Term Plan Committee for further discussion.

1.6 Public Participation

A maximum of 60 minutes is set aside for public participation at the commencement of any meeting of the Council or committee that is open to the public. Under Standing Order 31.2 a written, oral or electronic application to address the meeting setting forth the subject, is required to be lodged with the Chief Executive by 12.00 noon of the working day prior to the meeting concerned, and subsequently approved by the Chairperson.

Requests for public participation can be sent by email to public.participation@wcc.govt.nz, by post to Democracy Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, or by phone at 04 803 8334, giving the requester's name, phone number and the issue to be raised.

2. General Business

LONG-TERM PLAN FORUM

Purpose

1. This report asks the Annual Plan/Long-term Plan Committee to recognise the speakers who will be speaking to their submissions regarding the 2021-2031 Long-term Plan.

Recommendations

That the Annual Plan/Long-Term Plan Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Hear the oral submitters and thank them for their submissions.

Background

2. On 4 March 2021 the Annual Plan/Long-term Plan Committee approved the proposed draft consultation document for community consultation using the Special Consultative Procedure (section 83 of Local Government Act 2002).
3. Wellington City Council consulted the community on the city's 10-year plan proposals from 6 April 2021 to 10 May 2021.
4. Submitters who indicated that they wished to speak at oral hearings have been scheduled to speak to elected members during a three-week period in May 2021.
5. The oral submitters for this meeting had indicated that they would prefer to speak at a less formal meeting with more discussion involved. Hence this meeting has been set up as a forum where councillors and the oral submitters have a dialogue about the issues for about an hour.

Discussion

6. Attachment 1 comprises the submissions of confirmed submitters who have indicated they wish to speak to their submissions in this meeting of the Annual Plan/Long-term Plan Committee.

Next Actions

7. Following Long-term Plan oral hearings and forums, elected members will deliberate on the information received from these hearings and all other submissions on 27 May 2021. The committee will recommend the final Long-term Plan document to Council for adoption on 30 June 2021.

Attachments

Attachment 1. [Speakers' Submissions - Forum](#)  

Page 10

**ANNUAL PLAN/LONG-TERM PLAN
COMMITTEE
11 MAY 2021**

Author	Cyrus Frear, Senior Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Stephen McArthur, Chief Strategy & Governance Officer

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Engagement and Consultation

This report provides for a key stage of the consultation process – the opportunity for the public to speak to their written submission.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

There are no Treaty of Waitangi considerations arising from this report. Submitters may speak to matters that have Treaty of Waitangi implications.

Financial implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report. Submitters may speak to matters that have financial implications.

Policy and legislative implications

There are no policy implications arising from this report. Submitters may speak to matters that have policy implications.

Risks / legal

There are no risk or legal implications arising from the oral hearing report. Submitters may speak on matters that have risk or legal implications.

Climate Change impact and considerations

There are no climate change implications arising from this report. Submitters may speak to matters that have climate change implications.

Communications Plan

Not applicable

Health and Safety Impact considered

Participants are able to address the committee either in person or via virtual meeting. Democracy Services staff have offered full assistance to submitters in case of any unfamiliarity with using Zoom.

Tō mātou mahere ngahuru tau

Our 10-year plan

Oral forum submissions for 11 May 2021





Respondent No: 33

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

- Q1. **Full name:** Daniel Spector
- Q2. **Phone number:** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Afternoon
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** None of these options.
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Option 2. Take ownership (Council's preferred option, \$32m investment).
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 4. Accelerated full investment programme (\$226m capital investment, higher debt and rates)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** None of these options.
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Option 1. Demolish and site developed through long-term lease (Council's preferred option).
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 1. Strengthen now by temporarily exceeding debt limit (Council's preferred option, additional 0.79% to rates).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** None of these options.

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

Investment in three waters infrastructure
Te Atakura (climate change)
Sludge and waste minimisation
Te Ngākau funding for future work

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

Wellington Water has a rare ability to evade effective oversight and should be dissolved and reintegrated into the local jurisdictions or some other way in which effective oversight can be created.

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

not answered

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

I somewhat oppose the proposed budget.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

I support increasing spend in the current budget.

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

There is no protection for renters. Landlords are avaricious and will pass on ALL rates and other cost increases directly to renters, thus any increases are a direct attack on Wellington's most economically disadvantaged.



Respondent No: 58

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]

- Q1. **Full name:** David Edmonds
- Q2. **Phone number:** [Redacted]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Afternoon
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Don't know.
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Don't know.
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Don't know.
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Don't know.
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Don't know.
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Don't know.
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Don't know.

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

None of these

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

not answered

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

not answered

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

Don't know.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

not answered

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

WCC 2021-2031 Long Term Plan Draft Statement of Service Provisions Feedback provided by David Edmonds [REDACTED] The Urban Development section in the Draft Statement of Service Provisions has the following byline as its introduction: "We aim for a compact, resilient and attractive city" Regretably the attractiveness of much of the more established areas of Wellington, and to some extent the CBD, is marred by the plethora of overhead lines. There is nothing in the section on Urban Development in the Draft Statement of Service Provisions in the 2021-2031 Long Term Plan that addresses this issue and unless it is addressed by the City Council then nothing will happen to reduce the number of overhead lines. They will not go away by magic, and if left solely to the power supply and communication companies they will likely remain in perpetuity. I would like to think that some improvement will occur within a 10 year period. Hence the need to address the issue in this Long Term Plan. I can think of no other city where one of the 'jewels in the crown' has so many unsightly overhead lines. I refer to the Lambton Quay/ Bowen Street intersection that has as its immediate neighbours the Supreme Court, the Cenotaph, the Old Wooden Government Building and Parliament Buildings. In this area there are also many large diameter poles previously required for the trolley bus catenary supports and many 'rustic' timber power poles that detract from the streetscape. Good urban design requires some attention to be provided to the appearance of 'street furniture', such as street lighting support poles. The City Council regrettably appears to ignore this urban design issue unless a significant roading upgrade, such as lower Cuba Street or the Victoria Street Extension, is being undertaken. Compared to most other New Zealand cities and towns the extent of overhead power and communication lines in Wellington City is excessive. While the undergrounding of all overhead lines in Wellington is something that will probably never happen there are opportunities for incremental improvement. Removal of the trolley bus wires did achieve some improvement but, as the Council previously permitted communication lines to be attached to the trolley bus catenary support wires in the CBD, the improvement in the CBD is not as marked as it could have been. Some of the support poles for the trolley bus wires were removed at the time of the removal of the trolley bus wires but many remain. Many of the unsightly large diameter support poles were not removed in the CBD as they supported other lines, namely communication lines or feed to street lighting. There are also many poles that remain that no longer have any function, six of them within a block of the Bowen Street/ Lambton Quay intersection. Could I suggest that the Long Term Plan includes a modest annual budget to progressively underground overhead lines and remove unused support poles in the CBD at least. From time to time the Council upgrades sections on roads or footpaths in the inner suburbs. The opportunity to underground lines at the same time as these upgrades are carried out has, as far as I am aware, never been taken. Could I also suggest that the Long Term Plan has a modest budget allocated for this purpose. Other New Zealand cities have taken a proactive approach to the undergrounding of overhead lines. Auckland City for example appears to have adopted a policy of undergrounding along stretches of main road. There are some main roads in Wellington where this has been done in part, but the overall effect is spoiled by the feed to streetlighting remaining. Two examples are Churchill Drive between Wilton and Crofton Downs and Brooklyn Rd between the CBD and Brooklyn where the streetlighting feed is the only overhead line along the length of the road. Undergrounding of the feed to the streetlighting would also enable many unsightly power poles to be removed. In Victoria, British Columbia, Canada it was decided that a suitable celebration of a momentous event (I think it was the bi-centennial of a some historic event) was marked not by the erection of a monument or the building of a public park but by the undergrounding of overhead lines on one of the main arterial routes in the city. A brilliant idea, which apparently went down very well with the locals.



Respondent No: 83

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- Q1. **Full name:** Jay Hadfield
- Q2. **Phone number:** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Evening
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 3. Accelerated (\$3.3bn investment – higher rates and debt).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Option 2. Take ownership (Council's preferred option, \$32m investment).
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 4. Accelerated full investment programme (\$226m capital investment, higher debt and rates)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Option 3. Fully fund the programme (\$29.9m investment - Council's preferred option).
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Option 1. Demolish and site developed through long-term lease (Council's preferred option).
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 1. Strengthen now by temporarily exceeding debt limit (Council's preferred option, additional 0.79% to rates).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Option 4. Sludge minimisation through alternate funding (Council's preferred option, \$147m to \$208m capital investment funded through a levy, no additional rates increase)

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

Investment in three waters infrastructure
Cycleways

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

The marginal rates increase required to fully fund water infrastructure and cycleways is insignificant in comparison to the benefits that those investments bring. Of particular concern is the growing sentiment amongst young people in our city that Wellington is not keeping up with the work that Auckland is doing. Every new story of burst pipe or cyclist death in Wellington is counterpointed by new cycleways, cycle friendly infrastructure and broader urban improvement projects coming online in Auckland. Wellington must be able to attract and retain young people if it is to continue to be a great place to live. In regards to water infrastructure, more consideration should be given to metering water use, as well as storm water discharge. We should be setting up mechanisms that encourage and reward water saving behaviours, as well as create further incentives for households to retain/detain stormwater. Metering of the network would also enable better monitoring of leaks and patterns of demand. The commonly raised concern of equity in water charges can be mitigated by providing a base level of water usage included in rates with households who exceed that amount charged accordingly. Council could also offer schemes to low income households, providing access to capital to improve/ fix water leaks on their properties, paying the loan back through their water bills (balanced out by lower water use charges). The marginal cost to complete the full cycleway package makes it a no brainer. The value of a network is exponentially related to it's coverage and the current disparate sections should be connected as fast as possible. Where possible, cycleway improvements should be carried out at the same time as kerb renewals, three water network work, and other service improvements (such as the undergrounding of power lines and telecom services). It has been disappointing to see significant work undertaken around the Miramar peninsula to kerbs and roadways where cycleways are planned (such as Broadway). The LGWM programme is causing significant delays to the implementation of much needed bus priority, cycle and pedestrian improvements around our city. Consideration should be given to removing cycling and living streets projects from LGWM and using additional debt or rates increases to fund these critical works which sit well within the Territorial Authorities responsibilities and powers. In summary, the preferred package is an excellent shift away from the approach of previous plans and begins to set out a pathway that prepares Wellington for the next decade. By investing even more heavily in the two most pressing issues facing our city (water and transport), we can ensure that past and future growth is catered for.

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

not answered

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

I somewhat support the proposed budget.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

not answered

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

not answered



Respondent No: 89

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

- Q1. **Full name:** Michael Thomas
- Q2. **Phone number:** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Evening
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 2. Enhanced investment (\$2.4bn - the Council's preferred option).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Option 2. Take ownership (Council's preferred option, \$32m investment).
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** None of these options.
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** None of these options.
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Option 1. Demolish and site developed through long-term lease (Council's preferred option).
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 1. Strengthen now by temporarily exceeding debt limit (Council's preferred option, additional 0.79% to rates).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Option 4. Sludge minimisation through alternate funding (Council's preferred option, \$147m to \$208m capital investment funded through a levy, no additional rates increase)

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

Cycleways
Te Atakura (climate change)

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

Cycleway programme is highly inadequate - for example none of the offered options include a Karori to Wellington investment. This is simply unacceptable. For inexplicable reasons you instead suggest a ngaio to karori investment when almost no-one travel or needs this route..! The climate change initiatives look very low returning to me, national climate action is best served by nationwide initiatives such as the ETS and nationwide policy/subsidies etc. There is no need for WCC to spend ratepayers money in small bespoke, low impact programmes and fluff. Concentrate on the big items that are in your control such as cycleways, waste etc.

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

not answered

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

Neutral.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

I support increasing spend in the current budget.

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

Where is the investment to solve the urgent housing crisis? Where is the council investment to open up land for housing? Why are commercial ratepayers facing a higher increase than residential? Residential ratepayers are sitting in hefty capital gains so can easily afford to pay the rates (I am one). If we strangle our businesses with cost - we won't have jobs and a vibrant city anymore.



Respondent No: 107

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]

- Q1. **Full name:** Rhedyn Law
- Q2. **Phone number:** [Redacted]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Evening
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 2. Enhanced investment (\$2.4bn - the Council's preferred option).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Option 2. Take ownership (Council's preferred option, \$32m investment).
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 4. Accelerated full investment programme (\$226m capital investment, higher debt and rates)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Option 3. Fully fund the programme (\$29.9m investment - Council's preferred option).
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Option 1. Demolish and site developed through long-term lease (Council's preferred option).
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 1. Strengthen now by temporarily exceeding debt limit (Council's preferred option, additional 0.79% to rates).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Option 4. Sludge minimisation through alternate funding (Council's preferred option, \$147m to \$208m capital investment funded through a levy, no additional rates increase)

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

Cycleways

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

It is important to invest fully in safe cycling infrastructure for current and future generations to promote mode shift, reduce carbon emissions and support better health outcomes. WCC have spend far to long talking about cycleways and undertaking engagement without actually putting any infrastructure in place. There was a key opportunity to invest in temporary cycleways and trial options during covid shutdown, however council again delayed action and buckled to pressure from a vocal minority. Constituents have said that they want action on climate change, cycling has increased significantly in Wellington in recent years and previous cycleway engagement has shown support for infrastructue. The councils favoured proposal is a half hearted attempt to do as little as possible without doing nothing. It shows a ongoing lack of commitment to emissions reduction, providing transport choice and investing in safety.

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

not answered

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

I somewhat support the proposed budget.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

not answered

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

not answered



Respondent No: 115

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]

- Q1. **Full name:** Ben Colvin
- Q2. **Phone number:** [Redacted]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Evening
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 1. Maintain current funding level (\$2.0bn investment - lower rates and debt).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Don't know.
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 1. Finish started projects (\$29m capital investment, lower debt and rates)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Option 2. Medium investment with savings (\$25.4m investment, lower rates and debt).
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Option 2. Proceed with base build proposal for public purposes (higher debt and rates)
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 2. Council to strengthen Central Library later (complete in 2028 instead of 2025, additional 0.83% rates increase).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Don't know.

Q16. **Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below** None of these

Q17. **Your comments on the big decisions (optional)**

Skateboarding. almost every single kiwi kid boy or girl learns to ride a skateboard at some stage in there life. Wellington city council continues ban skateboarding in key flat area's of the city with out any plans to grown the Olympic sport. Wellington The capital city of New Zealand has one skatepark in the city center that is extremely out dated and too small to accommodate all skateboarders. Wellington city council HAS to include skateboarding in there 10 year plan. We are not asking for a lot. What we need is a indoor facility that we can skate in the winter months rather than tsb carpark and getting harassed by security guards because its the only place we can skate for 6months of a year. We also need designated skate spots, just like in Europe, just like america, just like Australia and even hate to say it just like Auckland. im talking about when you spend millions of dollars on a new cycle way spend two hundred dollars on coping a few benches /seats (like at aotea square Auckland) so skaters can share the path too. Skateable art. so easy, so..soo easy to apply. built by artists for skateboarders, or better yet built by skaters for skaters, scattered through out the waterfront and public parks or even some some suburbs. Thanks for your time, sorry its really brief. looking forward to having a face to face meeting soon thanks.

Q18. **You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)** not answered

Q19. **Do you support the proposed budget?** I somewhat oppose the proposed budget.

Q20. **You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?** I support keeping the budget the same but with some changes.

Q21. **Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?**

think about skateboarders please.. what we have in wellington is not enough, no where near. you have seen it your self.. skateboarders love this city, we add to culture and the vibrance of this city. with out a plan you are going to kill our sport



Respondent No: 133

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

- Q1. **Full name:** Thomas Kay
- Q2. **Phone number:** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Evening
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 3. Accelerated (\$3.3bn investment – higher rates and debt).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Option 2. Take ownership (Council's preferred option, \$32m investment).
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 4. Accelerated full investment programme (\$226m capital investment, higher debt and rates)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Option 3. Fully fund the programme (\$29.9m investment - Council's preferred option).
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Option 1. Demolish and site developed through long-term lease (Council's preferred option).
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** None of these options.
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Option 4. Sludge minimisation through alternate funding (Council's preferred option, \$147m to \$208m capital investment funded through a levy, no additional rates increase)

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

Investment in three waters infrastructure
Cycleways
Te Atakura (climate change)
Central Library
Sludge and waste minimisation

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

Three Waters: We have a massive problem and it needs to be fixed ASAP. Saving water is critical. I walk past at least 2 leaking water mains every day, and when I report them it takes months to be fixed (presumably because there are bigger problems elsewhere in the city). The Hutt River is a small catchment with fluctuating flows and it very dry in summer - we can't keep putting pressure on it and then just letting the water we take leak away into the stormwater. Cycleways: We have terrible stats for safe cycling and pedestrian safety. We need to invest in these to keep people safe and to minimise carbon emissions. Build the networks and people will use them. Prioritise people and bikes over cars. Climate change: This is a climate crisis. We must act to protect future generations wellbeing, as well as our own. There are many co-benefits to this work - e.g. quieter streets, healthier people, more biodiversity, etc. Central Library: I want to say demolish it and start again (maybe save the Nikau Palms). It isn't that nice of a space to be inside (it can be dark and somewhat confusing and uninviting). Build something new and nice. But maybe strengthening it is a more sustainable option and would save building materials and waste? Sludge and waste minimisation: I'm very supportive of minimising waste to landfill. Other: Housing: we need to build up and not out. We need to build high density housing with apartments designed for families, not just ridiculous studio appartments that aren't good for anything. We also need to address homelessness. And we need to link up developments to sustainable public transport, rather than just having sprawling 'greenfields' reliant on cars. Also, can we please do something about that housing block on the Terrace that is unused?! It's potentially a massive space for may houses to be put in (in an apartment block) - let's do something with it already!! Sexual assault in the central city: we need to make the central city safer. Better designed public transport, education campaigns, working with local businesses, universities, and police, are all vital to improve safety for women and minorities in the central city.

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

not answered

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

Neutral.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

I support increasing spend in the current budget.

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

Please don't extend the airport. We need to reduce our international air travel (and all air travel for that matter). Emissions are too substantial.



Respondent No: 135

Login: Jessica Allison-Batt

[Redacted]



[Redacted]

- | | |
|--|---|
| Q1. Full name: | Jessica Allison-Batt |
| Q2. Phone number: | [Redacted] |
| Q3. Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation? | Individual |
| Q4. What organisation are you submitting on behalf of? | not answered |
| Q5. Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum? | Yes |
| Q6. If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer? | Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters) |
| Q7. Oral forum time | Evening |
| Q8. Oral hearing time | not answered |
| Q9. Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision) | Option 3. Accelerated (\$3.3bn investment – higher rates and debt). |
| Q10. Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision) | Option 1. No change (no change in investment, rates or debt). |
| Q11. Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision) | Option 3: High investment programme (\$120m capital investment - Council's preferred option) |
| Q12. Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision) | Option 3. Fully fund the programme (\$29.9m investment - Council's preferred option). |
| Q13. Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision) | Option 1. Demolish and site developed through long-term lease (Council's preferred option). |
| Q14. Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision) | None of these options. |
| Q15. Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision) | Option 4. Sludge minimisation through alternate funding (Council's preferred option, \$147m to \$208m capital investment funded through a levy, no additional rates increase) |

Q16. **Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below**

Central Library

Q17. **Your comments on the big decisions (optional)**

The Council has not provided a substantial programme or funding for critical housing infrastructure in its long term plan. This is a serious issue for Wellington which is dealing with a crisis. I am a young professional who grew up in Wellington, I have a substantial deposit and two good salaries between my partner and I and I cannot afford to live in the city. Asking prices for a modest home are now well in excess of \$1 million, and apartments which are designed to maximise short term rental return are too small, poorly lit and poorly designed to accommodate someone wanting to start a family. A 2 bedroom new build apartment off the plans costs 720k for 65 sqm. 3 bedroom apartments are a rare development, and those that are developed cost 1.45 million- outside the city new developments in Upper Hutt and Paraparaumu now cost approx 1 million as well. Meanwhile there are people far worse off than me living in the streets or in damp cold and mouldy accommodation with their children. I am booked to go to Christchurch in June to look at buying there, and finding new employment- I know of a number of people who have already made this decision. Leaving Wellington is hugely disappointing for me. However for Wellington city, the mass exodus of young professionals, and essential workers forced out by the high cost of living will have a substantial impact. The Council must act now to build essential affordable accommodation for the most vulnerable, and ensure high quality builds at high density in the city. This includes taking on debt above the Council's self imposed cap to invest now in the future generations that will call Wellington home. It also means putting the needs of young Wellingtonians above 'nice to have,' projects that the council cannot afford, including restoring the heritage library. Instead the council should demolish the library and build a new structure at half the cost- that 30 million saving could support at least some investment in much needed housing.

Q18. **You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)**

not answered

Q19. **Do you support the proposed budget?**

I strongly oppose the proposed budget.

Q20. **You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?**

I support increasing spend in the current budget.

Q21. **Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?**

Think about the young people living in this city that want to have choices and an opportunity if they work hard to buy a modest home, or liveable apartment and start a family, rather than investing in high cost 'nice to have,' projects that are far less critical to the everyday basic needs of residents. If you have to invest in these types of 'nice to have,' projects then massively increase your debt to fund those basic and essential housing needs.



Respondent No: 187

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- Q1. **Full name:** Janet Margaret Russell
- Q2. **Phone number:** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Morning
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 3. Accelerated (\$3.3bn investment – higher rates and debt).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Option 2. Take ownership (Council's preferred option, \$32m investment).
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 1. Finish started projects (\$29m capital investment, lower debt and rates)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Option 3. Fully fund the programme (\$29.9m investment - Council's preferred option).
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Option 1. Demolish and site developed through long-term lease (Council's preferred option).
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 2. Council to strengthen Central Library later (complete in 2028 instead of 2025, additional 0.83% rates increase).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Option 4. Sludge minimisation through alternate funding (Council's preferred option, \$147m to \$208m capital investment funded through a levy, no additional rates increase)

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

Investment in three waters infrastructure
Wastewater laterals
Sludge and waste minimisation

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

Whatever the future plans are for Wellington City and Region, be they in housing, transport or Climate change, they will be costly wastes of funds unless the Council begins by replacing the ageing and inadequate piping systems that carry our fresh and contaminated waters to and from our dwellings. Wether we like the disruption or not, the Council needs to begin replacing pipework at one end of the city and just keep going until all is more than adequate for a growing population. While the roads are being dug up, anyway, a new 'light rail' public transport system could be installed, along with any telecommunications 'wiring' as each piping length is completed, thus ending the constant digging up of road surfaces. Every one knows that unless foundations are good, building anything is a waste of money and a modern city's foundation is it's water and energy supplies.

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

not answered

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

I somewhat support the proposed budget.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

not answered

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

When raising the cost of Rates, please consider the incomes of ratepayers, especially those whose property/rating values have increased beyond what they can afford. People having to leave their family home of 20-40 years just because of rising cost of rates is not what a caring community is about.



Respondent No: 277

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]

- Q1. **Full name:** Saffi Naik
- Q2. **Phone number:** [Redacted]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Evening
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 2. Enhanced investment (\$2.4bn - the Council's preferred option).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Don't know.
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 3: High investment programme (\$120m capital investment - Council's preferred option)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Option 3. Fully fund the programme (\$29.9m investment - Council's preferred option).
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Option 1. Demolish and site developed through long-term lease (Council's preferred option).
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 1. Strengthen now by temporarily exceeding debt limit (Council's preferred option, additional 0.79% to rates).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Option 4. Sludge minimisation through alternate funding (Council's preferred option, \$147m to \$208m capital investment funded through a levy, no additional rates increase)

Q16. **Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below**

Te Atakura (climate change)

Q17. **Your comments on the big decisions (optional)**

More Type 2 chargers should be installed in central Wellington and either be free of charge until RUC costs for EVs are introduced or subsidised by 50% to offer EV users incentive to take their EVs into the city for shopping, entertainment etc. These chargers should be positioned at community centers, shopping centers and other places of interest in Wellington e.g libraries, sports grounds, Oriental Bay and supermarkets. Council should help fund type 2 charges for supermarkets in the city to attract shoppers. A perfect spot would be in the parking lot at 133 Tory Street which includes The Warehouse, Noel Leeming and Common Sense organics. Auckland city currently provides free EV charging for a limited time frame to encourage EV uptake.

Q18. **You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)**

not answered

Q19. **Do you support the proposed budget?**

Neutral.

Q20. **You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?**

I support increasing spend in the current budget.

Q21. **Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?**

Provide more infrastructure to suburban shopping centers to attract new business and not have shops and businesses concentrated in and around the CBD. This will help ease traffic congestion



Respondent No: 285

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

- Q1. **Full name:** Simon Louisson
- Q2. **Phone number:** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Morning
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 3. Accelerated (\$3.3bn investment – higher rates and debt).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** None of these options.
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 4. Accelerated full investment programme (\$226m capital investment, higher debt and rates)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Option 3. Fully fund the programme (\$29.9m investment - Council's preferred option).
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Option 2. Proceed with base build proposal for public purposes (higher debt and rates)
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 1. Strengthen now by temporarily exceeding debt limit (Council's preferred option, additional 0.79% to rates).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Option 3. Sludge minimisation through Council funding (\$147m to \$208m capital investment, above debt limit, and higher rates)

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

None of these

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

I would like to see WCC adopt a policy on Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. I have attached a file suggesting why and how it should be done.

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/bd117a73ff3fcb5c4a000334115839315935f0d9/original/1619742976/1acc84617f70e19f47d89abfa0092cb9_Submission_to_WC_C_LTP_-_Low_Traffic_Neighbourhoods_30-4-21_by_Simon_Louisson.docx?1619742976

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

Neutral.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

I support increasing spend in the current budget.

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

I want our library back. I want our Civic Square back. I want our pipes fixed. I don't care what it takes. I don't want a convention centre.



Respondent No: 314

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- Q1. **Full name:** Alexander John Litherland
- Q2. **Phone number:** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Evening
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 2. Enhanced investment (\$2.4bn - the Council's preferred option).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Option 2. Take ownership (Council's preferred option, \$32m investment).
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 4. Accelerated full investment programme (\$226m capital investment, higher debt and rates)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Option 3. Fully fund the programme (\$29.9m investment - Council's preferred option).
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Don't know.
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 1. Strengthen now by temporarily exceeding debt limit (Council's preferred option, additional 0.79% to rates).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Don't know.

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

Cycleways

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

1. Support Option 4 to build a fully-connected network by 2031 2. Prioritise children before seawalls: useful cycleways rather than recreational ones 3. Double the Cycling Minor Works Budget to \$2 million per year 4. Create a new dedicated funding category to deliver rapid changes to the urban environment 5. Ring-fence cycling funding Please see Cycle Wellington's recommendations for further detail: <https://cycwell.wordpress.com/2021/04/30/planning-for-the-long-term-submission-guide/?fbclid=IwAR1HtS2yv-lmtXEMk1ysZ1qvDJYNJ9MNbiTzuFgFAGX-ljRzGD1EvYVg8v0>

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

not answered

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

Don't know.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

not answered

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

not answered



Respondent No: 338

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- Q1. **Full name:** James Clarke
- Q2. **Phone number:** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Are you making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?** Individual
- Q4. **What organisation are you submitting on behalf of?** not answered
- Q5. **Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an Oral Hearing or Forum?** Yes
- Q6. **If yes - we are offering two ways of speaking to Councillors about your submission. Please select which option(s) you would prefer?** Oral forum (informal, 60min facilitated table discussion with 2 to 3 Councillors and other submitters)
- Q7. **Oral forum time** Morning
- Q8. **Oral hearing time** not answered
- Q9. **Which of these options do you prefer? (3 waters decision)** Option 3. Accelerated (\$3.3bn investment – higher rates and debt).
- Q10. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Wastewater laterals decision)** Option 2. Take ownership (Council's preferred option, \$32m investment).
- Q11. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Cycleways decision)** Option 4. Accelerated full investment programme (\$226m capital investment, higher debt and rates)
- Q12. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Te Atakura Funding decision)** Option 3. Fully fund the programme (\$29.9m investment - Council's preferred option).
- Q13. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Civic Precinct decision)** Don't know.
- Q14. **Which of these options do you prefer? (Central Library decision)** Option 1. Strengthen now by temporarily exceeding debt limit (Council's preferred option, additional 0.79% to rates).
- Q15. **Which of these options do you prefer?(Sewage sludge and waste decision)** Option 4. Sludge minimisation through alternate funding (Council's preferred option, \$147m to \$208m capital investment funded through a levy, no additional rates increase)

Q16. Do you have any comments you would like to provide on why you selected your preferred options to any of these big decisions, or why you don't support any of the options we proposed? Please indicate what decision you are commenting on by selecting from the list of item(s) below

Investment in three waters infrastructure
Cycleways
Te Atakura (climate change)

Q17. Your comments on the big decisions (optional)

Te Atakura: I strongly support full funding of this plan. WCC has declared a climate emergency, yet seems to regard and present action as an optional consideration - this is not good enough. With a very small number of individual exceptions, Council as a whole has provided weak leadership on this important issue and looks feeble and out of touch. I support managed retreat with significantly reduced operational and capital spending by WCC in at-risk areas, starting immediately.

3 Waters: I strongly support full investment now to make up for many years of inadequate spending. This will support greater housing density in the city, reducing housing unaffordability and limiting sprawl. At the same time, WCC should invest in reducing demand such as through water metering and increased levies.

Finance: I strongly support raising the debt limit given low global interest rates, as well as increasing rates, in order to invest in the city's resilience, density and carbon reduction. I support increasing these beyond the proposed budget in the LTP - this seems unambitious and the consultation document omits to mention the under-investment of recent years. Increases now will protect younger generations already facing significant housing costs and poor city amenities due to inadequate Council spending over recent years. WCC should not spend money on the airport extension or associated seawall - WIAL can fund this itself and Council has higher priorities.

Cycleways: I strongly support the accelerated option. I find it ridiculous that this is still an issue as the programme has already been widely consulted on in various ways for years. Given the climate, pollution, amenity and congestion issues this programme is a no-brainer and other cities in NZ and around the world have made much more progress. This means taking space from private vehicles (including parking, also already consulted on) and giving it to cycles/scooters without taking space from pedestrians. Cycleways should be separated wherever possible and physically separated from cars. Speed limits and priority for cars should be reduced, which will improve safety and amenity, as well as reducing road maintenance costs. Ultimately it will be much cheaper for the city and its residents to use more active and public transport. Auckland and Christchurch are both making significant progress and Wellington is losing its appeal of being easy to get around. All Wellingtonians should have access to safe public and active travel options.

Q18. You can attach any other document supporting your submission here. (Please ensure that the information is on the 10-year Plan)

not answered

Q19. Do you support the proposed budget?

I strongly support the proposed budget.

Q20. You stated that you were neutral / did not support the proposed budget. Do you support increasing or decreasing spend?

not answered

Q21. Do you have any comments you would like to provide about the big decisions, fees and user charges changes, other future issues or any other general feedback on our 10-year plan and budget?

I worry that the Council is constrained by weak leadership and is therefore unable to make the bold moves needed to address the challenges we face as a city. NIMBYs and nay-sayers cannot be allowed to hold us back. Other cities are moving past us in terms of investment in housing, public transport, active transport and infrastructure to support a dense and vibrant city. I hope the Council is able to move ahead with conviction.