

## Summary of written submissions, officer advice and deliberations

### Summary of hearing deliberations

- Correction of spelling, grammatical errors and minor amendments as noted
- Additional stakeholders added throughout including predator free groups
- Master planning text moved forward from Plan Appendix 1 and example added
- Additional text and imagery referencing walking, tramping, hunting, horse riding and mountain biking activities. Additional images
- Rearranging text and adding images to reflect pest plan and animal work programme work and the restoration focus of the Plan
- Adding KNE programme boundaries on maps to illustrate their extent
- Minor changes in Definitions

### *Policy section key changes*

- Set riparian setbacks at 15 metres for Battle Hill, 10m for plantation forest and 20m for the Remutaka Rail Trail
- Ensuring farming activity practices protect soil, water and remnant native vegetation as stock grazing is phased out
- Excluding plantation forestry expansion to new areas of park
- Integrating proposed masterplans into the management plan following Reserves Act process
- Prioritising the reduction of pest/introduced animals and plants to support biodiversity and restoration work

### *Action section key changes*

- Investigate an access 'pass' (not 'permit') with horse riders
- Amended action to include possible collaborative working groups for specific topics or recreation activities
- Action added to map ecological corridors connecting to and within parks
- Action amended referencing working with others regarding predator fencing options where cost effective

### *Rule section key changes*

- Backcountry camping – minor changes to Belmont (Allowed), Queen Elizabeth Parks and Baring Head (Managed)
- Fishing – eel and whitebait changed to Prohibited, with an exception for mana whenua customary harvest
- Firewood harvesting – include in Plan, prohibited, with the exception of ranger residences, mana whenua customary uses, art and education purposes
- Remove reference to East Harbour Hunting phasing out by 2025.

## Summary of written submissions and officer advice

## Note:

1. Submissions are ordered below by the structure of the draft plan and their primary topic, noting many submitters discussed a variety of parks and topics.
2. Quoted text from submission is *italicised*. Bold text is proposed changes/ additions.

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
<b>NATURAL HERITAGE</b>				
NA	GW officers and Council hearing deliberations		<p>Suggested changes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 18P – to support ongoing stock grazing activities at Battle Hill and allow flexibility in the width of setbacks</li> <li>- 21P – be consistent with National Environmental Standards</li> <li>- to reflect current PNP and NZ heritage listing for the Rail Trail, Pakuratahi</li> </ul> <p>Noting that set backs are a minimum and draft Plan policies 5P, 11P and 74P support moving beyond minimum standards in parks.</p>	<p>Change from <b>40m</b> minimum setbacks to: 18P Stock exclusion zone for riparian margin to change to <b>15m</b> 21P Plantation forestry <b>a. to change to 10m setback</b> Add <b>f. Remutaka Rail Trail forestry set back minimum 20m</b> 44P add bullet point: '<b>separating motor vehicles from walkers, cyclists and horse riders where ever practicable</b>'. Definition added to Glossary re shared/ multi use trails.</p> <p><b>KNE boundaries added to maps to better show connection to biosecurity/ predator free work. Heading 2.7 changed</b></p> <p>Policies 7P and 10P adding to both '<b>prioritising pest animal reduction, working collaboratively with others</b>'</p> <p>Combined sections 2.3 and 2.7 conservation opportunities and challenges. Added more reference to pest animal management and photos. Some text added from the consultation supporting document, 'Reclothing Papatūānuku'.</p>
#17	Hutt City Council (HCC)	HCC owns parts of Belmont and East Harbour parks. ' <i>HCC supports the vision and direction of the draft Plan</i> '	<p>Comment:</p> <p>HCC input to master planning and land use change to restoration is important to ensure</p>	Accepted

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>'HCC would like to explore opportunities with GWRC to speed up re-establishment of indigenous forests specifically in the eastern side of Belmont Park, and partnering with community groups to improve biodiversity outcomes'</i></p> <p>Supports <i>'Reclothing Papatuanuku in a collaborative way with mana whenua and community groups as set out in the draft Plan'</i>.</p> <p>Land use change supported for a number of benefits including increasing recreation opportunities for Kelson residents, improving biodiversity and the quality and mauri of freshwater, supporting Whaitua work and HCC zero carbon target of 2025. HCC would like to provide input to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Master planning</li> <li>- Speeding up restoration processes</li> <li>- Partnering with community groups</li> <li>- Co-ordinating and collaborating on issues such as pests and weeds</li> </ul> <p>Partnering with community groups to establish trails, picnic spots and <i>'make parks more available to a wider audience to enjoy, and which incentivise residents to participate in wider ecological restoration programmes'</i></p>	<p>connections with trails, other restoration work and operational programme co-ordination</p> <p><i>'Speeding up'</i> land use change and restoration processes will be determined by Council decisions in the LTP process, grazing licence changes, community and other partner / stakeholder led initiatives. It is expected that a range of passive and active restoration options will be explored through master planning processes.</p>	<p><b>HCC to be added as a stakeholder to additional actions for Belmont, East Harbour and Wainuiomata parks including master planning</b></p>
#62	Porirua City Council	<p>Supports key directions. Suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plantation forestry also phased out and that PCC be involved in master planning for Belmont and Battle Hill.</li> <li>- <i>PCC encourages GWRC to address planning and implementation of riparian</i></li> </ul>	<p>Comment: A6 applies to all parks <i>'Incorporate Whaitua Implementation Programme (WIP) priorities and actions into park plans and work programmes'</i>.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>PCC to be added as a stakeholder to additional actions for Belmont and Battle Hill including master planning.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>management on Regional Parks through the PNP as a matter of urgency.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addition to 21P to phase out plantation forestry.</li> <li>- Fast tracking and prioritising riparian planting</li> <li>- 49P suggested change.</li> <li>- A68 suggest TA's included in collaboration groups</li> <li>- Suggests Whitby to Takapu Rd key destination</li> <li>- Identifies land transfer option</li> <li>- A185. Whitby to Takapu Road added to cross-park trails</li> </ul>	<p>21P c. says 'Restore areas with native vegetation when current forestry agreements expire'.</p> <p>Riparian planting can be prioritised as part of master planning processes</p> <p>Consistency with District Plans is intended</p> <p>Post Transmission Gully land transfer discussions are ongoing</p>	<p><b>A9. add 'for areas outside of KNEs, to give effect to the restoration priorities identified through master planning. Prioritising riparian planting'</b> A9 Develop and implement habitat restoration plans.</p> <p><b>A39 add... 'and future' needs</b></p> <p><b>49P add g. excluding plantation forestry. Refer Rules</b></p> <p><b>A68 TA's added in Notes</b></p> <p><b>A72 TA's added</b></p> <p><b>A123, PCC added, 'a ki uta ki tai, mountains to sea approach'</b></p> <p><b>A126, riparian areas added, changed to short - long.</b></p> <p><b>A165, timeframe changed to short</b></p> <p><b>A168,169, riparian areas added</b></p> <p><b>A185 amended to a. Porirua to Hutt Valley, b. Whitby to Takapu Road and map updated</b></p> <p><b>A172, A185, A197 PCC added in Notes</b></p>
#23	James Mikoz, Wellington Recreational Marine Fishers Association	<p><i>There are serious omissions in the Draft Toitu Te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-30 as it fails to mention that all freshwater fish travel in and out of the sea throughout their lives. Nowhere in the Plan has there been any acknowledgement that all native freshwater fish travel into and out of the sea throughout their life cycles.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The draft Plan has numerous references to improving fish passage in streams. The extent of their travels is not detailed.</p> <p>QEP – riparian plantings are ongoing. Significant long term habitat restoration works are proposed. The Plan identifies an action to</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>Interpretation panel in QEP to be updated as part of operational activities</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>QEP. <i>Nothing has been proposed to capture the sediment before it runs off the dirt tracks around the QE2 Park and flows into one of the streams. Currently along the walking and riding tracks are manmade channels directing the sediment off the tracks directly into a stream? There is nothing to stop logs from entering the Whareroa Stream where with every visit it can be seen the logs have moved up and down the stream with every spring tide, severely damaging the stream bank.</i></p> <p>Parangarahu Lakes. <i>Fish at present have no free travel into or out of the lakes and money should be spent in providing a free passage instead of this crazy idea to invest money in designing some magical gate. Nowhere in the Draft of this plan is there any mention that this access to the sea is going to be restored.</i></p> <p>GW/ DOC interpretation panel in QEP needs updating. Fire threat and rubbish concerns.</p>	<p>develop a fire management plan. GW has a take your rubbish home with you policy.</p> <p>Parangarahu Lakes-Refer action A271 for fish passage. Also note that this Plan draws on, but does not replicate the Co-management Plan for the Lakes developed in 2014. Refer action 3.1, page 41 which refers to reviewing and identifying best options for fish passage. The Roopu Tiaki management group determine priority work.</p> <p>Park boundaries stop at mean high water springs. Greater Wellington works with TA's, DOC and others beyond park boundaries.</p>	
#24	A Rocha Aotearoa New Zealand, Pene Burton Bell	<p><i>We don't see enough commitment to establishing eco-corridors as GW has previously promised. If anything there is less focus than in the last plan despite public submissions to this.</i></p> <p><i>Want more eco-corridors; priority fence-off, retirement and revegetation of most ecologically sensitive areas; continue improving KNEs, especially more effort on eliminating fish barriers and collaboration with neighbours downstream; targets for</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Re ecological corridors, the Plan focuses on long term large scale restoration in parks, riparian areas provide the interim 'corridor'</p>	<p>Notes and accepted in part</p> <p><b>Add A Rocha to list of stakeholders for Battle Hill</b></p> <p><b>Add to A8 a. map ecological corridors within and connecting to parks and add to the Plan as an amendment</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>ecological indicator improvements set and publically reported on; no more exotic trees planted; improve weed and pest control; More tree planting, rewet wetlands and especially peatlands. Stream and river corridors should at least match the Fonterra guidelines to its farmers. More corridor width would be preferred. Support A124 broadening stock exclusion zones</i>		
#53	Mark Neeson, Porirua Harbour Trust/Guardians of Pauatahanui Inlet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Particularly support and endorse proposal to phase out most livestock grazing and note this decision supports climate change objectives.</li> <li>- Strongly support restoration to the west of Transmission Gully in Belmont</li> <li>- Note that master planning can be time consuming and may not result in shifts which meet community expectations</li> <li>- Consultation should be targeted and focused</li> <li>- Suggest more generic place plans may be appropriate</li> <li>- Support intention to develop a park environment plan at Battle Hill and minimise downstream effects from forestry harvest</li> <li>- Suggests further resourcing to support implementation of the plan</li> <li>- A177 I endorse the proposal, nevertheless, I request that the term “paper road” be replaced by the more accurate and legally correct term “unformed legal road”.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>64P guides renaming/ naming</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>A177 changed to ‘unformed legal road’ throughout</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
#26 and #88	Pene Burton Bell, Queen Elizabeth Park Restoration Group	<p>Separate to Friends of QEP group but some members in common.</p> <p><i>See Queen Elizabeth Park as the green southern gateway to Kapiti. When Transmission Gully opens, and if plans to extend the parks network through the Wainuiwhenua extension come to pass, it will have increased status. We are generally pleased with the document and with the strategic direction it embodies. ..we totally support the retiring of farmland and the rewetting of peatlands [A10, page 42; A83, page 68; A328, page 162] and riparian planting [A239, page 162]. We would like to see these processes advanced as fast as possible. Land-use choices [A340, page 163] and planting of native forests [A78, A79, page 68] are other levers for addressing the climate emergency.'</i></p> <p><i>We would like to see a greater emphasis on recycling in Regional Parks.</i></p> <p><i>The plan is largely silent on eco-corridors (see however 4P-e on page 38, which refers to 'prioritising ... threatened forest ecosystems and ecological corridor opportunities within and beyond park boundaries'), which are vital for the flourishing of native fauna, who need to be able to move freely between habitats and food sources. Trails...At pinch points these corridors could be riparian-style strips a few metres wide either side of the trail (though we would prefer them to be wider). We strongly urge that eco-corridors</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The draft Plan focuses on overall restoration over a long term. Riparian areas and park boundaries planted with 'green fire breaks' in parks such as QEP and Belmont will be key priorities, with details driven by science and determined through master planning processes.</p> <p>Master planning process are likely to involve extensive iwi partner and community input. The intention is to incorporate them into this statutory management plan as they are developed. This will ensure transparency and accountability through proposed State of the Parks monitoring processes.</p> <p>Recreation suggestions – these are valuable for informing master planning.</p> <p>Greater Wellington is in the process of creating a new website.</p> <p>Fish passage barriers are being assessed across the region.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>As per other submissions, ecological mapping added to <b>A8 a. map ecological corridors within and connecting to parks</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>be included as a priority in the network plan, and followed through into the master plans for the different parks.</i></p> <p><i>We are however uneasy that there is no clear explanation as to how the master plans will be arrived at, or what the finished product will look like. Nor have we seen an explanation of how stakeholders and the public will be involved. ....how the process will be funded, or how the public will be able to assess delivery against the plan. It is critical that master planning is not a purely internal exercise, otherwise the network plan will have been a waste of everyone's time. In our experience, GW has not always been interested in working collaboratively.</i></p> <p>Recreation suggestions.</p> <p><i>One <b>blockage to fish passage</b> that we would like to see fixed promptly is in the section of stream that flows from the Mackays Wetland under Whareroa Road and joins the stream that passes north of the nursery.</i></p> <p>Don't support planting exotic species or poplars on Poplar Avenue. Opposed to community garden plantings. Suggest a review of planting events and success/failure rates. Support some herbicide use, fence removal, nature play. GW website needs improvement.</p>		
#93	Amelia Geary, Forest & Bird	- Agrees with core goals. Strongly support phasing out grazing and suggests better managed and reduced grazing extent at	Comment:	Accepted  <b>F&amp;B added as a stakeholder in A198, A199, A200</b>



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>Battle Hill and more shade trees for stock and regenerative farming. Support the prohibition on unaccompanied domestic animals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests more integration of science, and would like to see all wetlands restored as a priority and more focus on pest control</li> <li>- Suggests that ecological corridors are mapped for all parks, that the plan doesn't give enough emphasis to pest control, clarification on AEE process for annual grazing licence plans and that farming not permitted under RA, only grazing. <i>Grazing for the purposes of keeping the grass down and maintaining views is quite different to the wholesale spraying of herbicides, fertilizers and killing of woody vegetation to maximise profitability from marginal land.</i></li> <li>- Would like to see removal of public access restrictions to grazed areas, within reason. Kaitoke action needs updating to reflect recent LCAF restoration work</li> <li>- QEP would like to see dunes not grazed and restored in addition to wetlands. Oppose spraying of woody weeds and support opening the areas of the park closed to the public for stock grazing</li> </ul> <p>Wainuiomata – would like pig and ungulate control</p>	Pest control policy and work is addressed through other GW plans and the KNE programme.	<p><b>Add to A8 a. map ecological corridors within and connecting to parks</b></p> <p><b>A280 to change to 'Develop restoration plans working with conservation, recreation and other community groups for the grazed areas encompassing A290 recreation trails'.</b></p>
#115	Mike McCombie	<i>I applaud the ambitious proposal to reduce the amount of livestock grazing in Belmont Park in particular, alongside the revegetation and biodiversity conservation goals. I fully</i>	Comment:	Accepted  <b>More reference to Predator Free groups to be added in stakeholder sections</b>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>support the proposed vision, values and goals that are suggested in the document. Capital Kiwi is nearing achievement of its goal to return kiwi to the Wellington peninsula. The possibility for similarly suitable large-scale habitat like the Belmont hills, to provide homes for such taonga, is sincerely exciting.</i></p> <p>- Suggests more emphasis on predator control in the plan</p>	<p>A park-wide predator network proposal is commendable and can be actioned via existing plan directions.</p>	
<p>#56, #126, #207, #259, #266, #277, #374, #380, #381, #104, #118</p>	<p>Shirley Morrison (Onslow Residents Community Association, Jellyspud, Gary, Dom Harris, Richard Davies, Rob Taylor, Kim Beech, Hamish Glen, Ross Murdoch, Merewyn Groom, Graham Bellamy</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity conservation and restoration support</b></p> <p><i>Protect waterways from stock and horses by fencing them and planting riparian vegetation</i></p> <p><i>Use every opportunity possible to promote the preservation of natural habitats through the planting of native species especially where land previously farmed is being converted.</i></p> <p><i>Maintaining and growing our environment and making it accessible and interesting to the youth is the most important thing. If we can connect the youth to the land and environmental issues surrounding it means they will be the future Kaitaki of the land.</i></p> <p><i>...increase the budget for parks to increase pest animal trapping, increased pest plant control and native plant/tree restoration.</i></p> <p><i>In the balance between recreation and preservation/protection of natural</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Plan identifies an action to develop fire management plans</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>2.7.4 Key Native Ecosystems, additional sentence <b>‘Much of the indigenous habitat within parks network is managed under the KNE programme’.</b></p> <p>Outcome 6.22 amend (i) Biodiversity values are improved <b>‘(no net loss of biodiversity, and preferably net gain)’</b>, ecosystem resilience and mauri is strengthened.</p> <p><b>KNE map boundaries to maps for all parks and additional text in 2.7.4 text.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>environments and habitats, recreation must come second.</i></p> <p><i>Be even more upfront about the network effects - for both biodiversity and recreation the activities of Territorial Authorities, central govt and private landowners will have positive and negative spillovers. Faze out and remove forestry activities as soon as possible to take advantage of areas recently cleared that can be regenerated.</i></p> <p><i>We wish to submit in support of the Draft Toitū Te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-30. In particular we would like to endorse the retirement of farmland and restoration of native bush.</i></p> <p>Suggests a range of practical measures to minimise fire threat:</p> <p><i>Native forest resists fire. Park management to prevent ignition events Land clearing burns and machinery remains the source of most wildfires, while the number of wildfires from escaped bonfires, rubbish fires and camp fires is increasing. Land clearing burns and rubbish fires should not be occurring within park boundaries (but such fires may occur as a result of the activities of neighbours). This risk can be managed through the use of park management strategies, and the strategic use of fire breaks to limit fire spread and enable access to quickly extinguish fires which do occur. Where physical fire breaks of clear space may be difficult or undesirable,</i></p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>green breaks consisting of plantings of especially fire resistant species may be preferable.</i></p> <p><i>Park management strategies and green breaks as described above could be effectively used to protect planted areas which they become established.</i></p>		
#384	Bev Abbott, Wellington Botanical Society (BOTSOC)	<p>Suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ..further environmental scanning is required ..conducting a new environmental scan may be beneficial before making further revisions to the draft PNP because of Covid-19 and proposed RMA and NPS changes</li> <li>- further definition around master plans and their relationship to the statutory parks plan. <i>It suggests the blue-prints in master plans can trump policies and actions in the main PNP. We recommend you find a more focused title for this collaborative work. We see it as a subsidiary levels.</i></li> <li>- <i>Council will also need to decide if it wants the results of master planning processes to have the same statutory status as the draft plan which has already been through the public consultation processes required under the Reserves Act, and if so, how this could be achieved. We wonder if the development of master plans for specific parks could be addressed through GWRC's draft Long Term Plan?</i></li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Master plans provide the opportunity for more detailed planning with a focus on land use and spatial elements. The intention is that master plans will be incorporated into the statutory parks plan as amendments as they are developed. However this has not been made explicit in the draft plan. Change suggested to 72P for clarification.</p> <p>Overlap in plan goals is acknowledged</p> <p>The purpose of the Regional Pest Management Plan is to focus on pest animals.</p> <p>Developing monitoring and reporting methodology is an action in the draft plan.</p> <p>The RA allows for exotic plants and gardens in Scenic Reserves and identifies protection of indigenous flora or fauna in Recreation Reserves. 49P allows for taking of specimens. This is addresses in the Rules section of the draft Plan.</p> <p>Parks where grazing activities are undertaken are identified in the plan.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>72P 'and incorporate into the Parks Network Plan through the amendment processes'.</b></p> <p><b>Upper Hutt Forest &amp; Bird added to notes in Kaitoke section</b></p> <p>Page 274, Add to definition of <b>Restoration. 'Restoration can be done by either active or passive means. 'Passive' restoration includes allowing regeneration though seed dispersal from birds and wind and may be supported by pest plant and animal management'.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plan goals overlap. Don't agree with exotic plantings in parks, and suggest we check the RA for 49P.</li> <li>- Would like to see <i>a clear statement recognising the relationship between the control of animal pests and the sequestration of carbon</i> and a sustained focus on pest animal control and that this will facilitate restoration processes.</li> <li>- Suggest that no more trails are built to stop vegetation loss and fragmentation but suggest this may result in more unauthorised track building, displacement of some visitor groups. Suggest gravel isn't used on tracks</li> <li>- Suggest Appendix 5 outline the approach for monitoring and reporting</li> <li>- Suggest adding hyperlinks within the plan to KNE plans</li> <li>- <i>Ensure experienced facilitators, access to specialists in many disciplines, and indicative financial and carbon budgets are available to support master planning, especially when planning restoration and recreation projects.</i></li> <li>- <i>A more coherent PNP could be achieved by moving all the grazing related text from sections 2.3 ('conservation opportunities') and 6.2 ('natural heritage').to section 2.5 (Climate change and sustainability).</i></li> <li>- <i>Create a new appendix with definitions and descriptions about different types of restoration to contribute to sound decision-making and planning for</i></li> </ul>	Suggested restructuring of sections noted. Many issues fall under multiple topics.	

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>restoration on large areas of formerly grazed land. Include a table naming parks where grazing is to cease, the hectares to be restored, the main ecosystem types, where the plants will come from, the proposed method of restoration, the estimated 5-year cost, and any end dates that have already been agreed</i>		
#232	Kathryn Hurr	<i>I would like to see an emphasis on both indigenous and introduced plant species to parks, in the right situation. Section 6.2 signals a key shift in terms of broad-scale restoration of grazed areas which will visibly demonstrate good land care practice. I would make two further comments about this. Firstly, grazing helps preserve open spaces which are valued by people for views, vistas and recreation. eg. the views from the Belmont Bunkers would be lost if all grazing is replaced by bush, or the value of carbon-reduction is lost if replaced by petrol-powered mowers / weed-whackers.</i>	Comment:  The draft Plan allows for some grazing areas to continue to maintain open space areas if this is deemed as the most appropriate 'tool'. Open space areas can be maintained by mowing and other means.	No change to Plan  Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses
#238	George Thompson	<b>Prioritising</b>  <i>1) For Belmont Park: A clearer emphasis on the strategic timetable for habitat restoration - eg, that 90% of the Belmont Park be in natural cover within 15 years, and 95% of the Belmont catchment leading to Porirua Harbour.</i>	Comment:  Restoration planning will be undertaken in conjunction with master planning and may be accelerated through Climate Change Action priorities.  21p c. says 'Restore areas with native vegetation when current forestry agreements expire'.	No change to Plan  Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>2) <i>A clear commitment to moving all the pine plantation area in Battle Hill Park to native cover, along with a timetable.</i></p> <p>3) <i>Putting better teeth in the Battle Hill commitment to 'Work to minimise potential downstream effects from forestry harvesting and neighbouring properties such as sediment to Porirua Harbour . The detail of 'Plant buffers with native species' needs to be given - the size of the buffers, and a commitment to starting the buffers by next winter.</i></p> <p><i>There is a need to put a major and clear effort into explicitly and effectively working with Porirua Council and Porirua Harbour stakeholder groups - the need for a joint plan with teeth. The Draft Parks Network Plan had only two mentions of the Harbour. There is no mention of or connection with the Pauatahanui Inlet Action Plan or the Porirua Harbour and Catchment Management Programme .</i></p> <p><i>There needs to be measurable targets for sedimentation and nutrient rates in the streams leading from Regional Parks, eg, leading to a reduction of current levels to 10% of current within 10 years.</i></p>	<p>Whaitua implementation programme work supports sediment reduction and planting of riparian margins</p>	
#243	Julian Thompson	<p><i>'... I feel there should be an urgent timeline to transition away from livestock grazing and stop using top dressing and herbicides to allow natural revegetation to get started. I am concerned that the ambitious vision will</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The draft Plan identifies that grazing activities will be phased out. Master planning will determine restoration priorities.</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p> <p>Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>get bogged down when it comes to actually implementing it.</i></p> <p><i>Long time locals, including myself, have noticed a gradual deterioration of the water quality in the streams entering the forest, and are really concerned with livestock in catchment streams and the chemical spraying on the farm, as well as the annual lack of access due to lambing etc. I see the transition away from livestock farming as a really enlightened move by the council and simply wish to encourage fast action to protect the streams and wetlands in particular. I would also love to see fast implementation of a revegetation corridor lining across the park from East (Pareraho) to west (Pauatahanui or thereabouts) . It also makes sense to do some regular environmental monitoring so that the anecdotal experiences of locals (eg that we are finding it harder and harder to find freshwater crayfish, or native fish species) can be backed up on a more systematic , scientific basis.</i></p> <p><i>Finally I would like to add that you, the council, have some incredibly enthusiastic and active local support in Belmont. We love the park and have visionary ideas for its future along the lines of your proposed PNP. It takes a long time for native plants and animals to take over bare grass hillsides, so for us it will mean a lot if we can actually see real progress start as soon as possible.</i></p>	<p>The current grazing licence in western Belmont Park expires on 31 January 2026</p>	



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
#320	Ben Adams	<p><i>The Pareraho Forest is an amazing pool of local collaboration, with incredible mahi being poured in by some very dedicated participants to weed, plant, pest control and observe and mitigate all other threats to this remarkable stretch of forest that has its own rich history including the NZ wars. I have taken a particular interest in the existence of the threatened Ngahere Gecko on our land, which has been more evident following 2.5yrs of as much rodent control as we can muster. Following a community walkaround in Pareraho with two scientists specialising in lizards, I am really interested in ways that we can better support the park area to provide safe habitats for these incredibly elusive litmus indicators of native biodiversity.</i></p> <p><i>The little community of people who are working at their limit to support the Pareraho forest really need a tail wind of support from the Greater Wellington Council to make that area the incredible habitat for our retreating animals as it has become a sanctuary for our native regenerating flora. Enhanced pest control, lizard monitoring and safe houses, professional weed control programs to target pest plants like Asparagus Fern. And attention towards the sewerage threats that come with houses and farming land uphill/upriver. We really need help to bring the best out of local native area to what it can be for the community, and for the community of threatened lizards who have a tricky toe hold they are clinging to.</i></p> <p><i>Thanks!</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Input to master planning to identify and realise local community aspirations and support work is an important part of plan implementation</p> <p>Refer A72 proposed change re sharing expertise and information to support collaboration and volunteers</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p> <p>Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
#261	Juan Diego Acevedo	<p><i>I strongly support the phasing out of ALL grazing from parks land, the rate payer should not subsidise farming activities. We should be leading natural regeneration and enhancing local biodiversity (1/3 of land in the GWR should be untouched, native bush). The role of GWRC is to focus on conservation and recreation really. A stronger mandate to remove pests (including cats) from parks is required along with more opportunities for local communities to do more volunteering. I would love to see bilingual signage at all parks, showcasing the Te Reo Maori along with clear support for the local iwi to demonstrate the cultural significance of the area.</i></p> <p><i>I also suggest partnering with local artists to create focal points and “experiences” in our parks to encourage recreation.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>A range of actions in the draft Plan support these topics</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p> <p>Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses</p>
#358	Dianne Strugnell	<p><i>I support the visions for the parks as presented by Greater Wellington. I am in support of the notion that medium and large scale renewable energy should be a restricted activity in any of the parks, acknowledging that such projects are likely to have a high conservation and recreation impact for low benefit.</i></p> <p><i>I am in partial support of the intent for Belmont Regional park to have some land use change to native vegetation restoration to support biodiversity, freshwater, recreation experience and help build ecosystem resilience. I know that how this is</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Input to master planning to identify and realise local community aspirations and support work is an important part of plan implementation</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p> <p>Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>managed is intended to be part of further planning but I would urge that there is much more thought given to this including ensuring that this is not a rushed process. In the Te Awarua o Porirua WIP Recommendation 20, GW is encouraged to demonstrate best practice on Council land. There needs to be a very carefully staged and managed "retreat" so that GW does demonstrate best practice!!</i>		
#117	Department of Conservation	<p><i>We look forward to the new insights gained from phasing out most livestock grazing activities to enable a concerted focus on restoring natural values - particularly wetland, freshwater and terrestrial habitat values. We support the policies and objectives relating to natural heritage to protect, restore and/or maintain healthy ecosystems. We particularly support actions to improve fish passage and other ecological connections, and to minimise the impacts on freshwater ecosystems and wetlands.</i></p> <p>Supports other plan goals and objectives. Notes overlap of work and that DOC administers the Waitangirua conservation covenants over sections of Belmont park and is working on transferring hunting permit administration for Parangarahu Lakes to Greater Wellington.</p>	<p>Comment: Collaborative work with DOC is ongoing</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p> <p>Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses</p>
<b>RECREATION EXPERIENCE</b>				
NA	GW officers	<p><b>Proposed new section 2.2.7 Trail related activities</b></p> <p><b>Walking / tramping, dog walking</b></p>	<p>Comment: This suggested new text is to reflect the importance many submitters place on trail-related activities and hunting.</p>	Additional text as proposed

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>Greater Wellington's park network has over 230 kilometres of tracks for walking and 230 kilometres of roads; in total approximately 460 kilometres of road and trail available for recreation activities. Many parks have areas where walking activities are the focus such as much of the Northern Forest in East Harbour, Wainuiomata park and the native bush area of Battle Hill.</p> <p>Greater Wellington's research consistently identifies walking (encompassing dog walking) as the most popular recreation activity in parks (followed by cycling/ mountain biking, jogging/ running and tramping). Feedback to develop the Plan identified a number of opportunities to better support walking / tramping activities including improved signage, information about opportunities, more access and accessible facilities and in some parks, development of new track connections to create easier walks. Key actions in the Plan relate to improving accessibility, signage, more story telling of interesting features and development of 'key destinations' to support walking / tramping experiences. Dog walking areas are not defined in the Plan or on and off-leash areas which are managed on a park by park basis.</p> <p><b>Cycling/ Mountain biking</b></p> <p>The park network offers a variety of cycling and mountain biking opportunities including dedicated mountain bike trails in Belmont and Pakuratahi parks. Across parks there are over 350 kilometres of track and road available for cycling activities.</p> <p>E-bikes have transformed and supported the significant growth in cycling. They help reduce</p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>barriers to participation such as steep, hilly trails. Cross-park routes such as 'Te Ara O Whareroa' through Queen Elizabeth Park sustainably connect communities and are hugely popular. A proposed cycling route through Belmont park from the Waihora Crescent park entry in Waitangirua to Hill Road, Belmont will connect Porirua with the Hutt Valley and support recreation and commuter cycling. The Remutaka Cycle Trail, encompassing the rail trail in Pakuratahi, is part of the NZ Great Rides network and will be further enhanced. The proposed 'Akatarawa Traverse' from the Queen Elizabeth Park Kāpiti coast through Akatarawa forest to the Hutt Valley will be a draw card for the region</p> <p>There are a range of actions in the Plan to support mountain bike network enhancements including a number of new trails and facility improvements such as updating access barriers to make access easier. Appendix One outlines principles for trail development and a 'Track assessment criteria' for consideration of changes including environmental impact assessment process.</p> <p><b>Horse riding</b></p> <p>Horse trail riding in parks is a long standing tradition along with pony club and competitive eventing activities. There are pony clubs in QEP, Battle Hill, Belmont and Kaitoke parks and trail riding opportunities in</p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>Akatarawa, Pakuratahi and Baring Head parks. A number of clubs are based within parks. Horse riders can enjoy a variety of short and long rides through a variety of landscapes with over 160 kilometres of horse riding trails available.</p> <p>Multi-day trail riding is increasingly popular. Long rides are possible through Akatarawa, Belmont and Pakuratahi parks. Facilities for horse riding vary across parks. Actions in this Plan include improving float parking areas, providing more mounting blocks and supporting overnight stays.</p> <p><b>Hunting</b></p> <p>Reducing the impacts of introduced pest animals (also referred to as game animals) such as goats, pigs, and deer on the environment through hunting for recreation purposes can be beneficial in some parks. Deer, tahr, chamois and wild pigs, are legally Wild Animals under the Wild Animal Control Act or Game Animals under the Game Animal Council Act. Collectively with other species such as trout, salmon, ducks, pheasants, quail are considered by hunters to be species of recreation hunting value.</p> <p>Hunting organisations identify that the activity can be a gateway to encourage people to contribute to protection of the habitat through other activities such as predator trapping. Recreational hunting provides an important connection to nature,</p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>known as biophilia, encouraging people to engage with the outdoors and learn backcountry skills.</p> <p>In regional parks the pest/ game species harvested for recreation and food and can provide benefits for broader pest animal control objectives. Hunting activities are managed via permit systems. Public safety is the overarching priority. Safety considerations include public perceptions of safety, proximity to population, recreation trails and activities. Hunting activity areas and periods are defined via the permit system and revised periodically as circumstances change.</p>		
<b>Public access</b>				
#195, #196, #198, #199, #270, #291, #335	Caaaaam, GeoffW, SarafiNZ, Woodsie, Wendy Barry, Ellen Blake	<p><b>Accessible facilities/ barriers to access</b></p> <p><i>The accessibility barriers that are installed in some places are hard to use on bikes. The narrow one is too narrow for a kid seat on a bike. We use the high arch one. Firstly feed the handle bars through one at a time and then you have to tip the bike up to get the kid seat low enough to get through. Do-able but it definitely shouldn't be so hard to get through. Make the accessibility barriers easier to use.</i></p> <p><i>Ensuring everyone has access means removing or changing the barriers at access points. I am unable to get my bike through most barriers with my child seat on the back without a second person to help lift.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Access to and within parks and entry barriers was a key topic of discussion at public drop in sessions during consultation.</p> <p>Objective 6 (mislabelled as 5) on page 49 identifies 'Apply principles of universal design to park facilities and ensure a wide range of accessible recreation opportunities are provided'. A42 is 'Undertake an access audit to identify key issues...'</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Add to <b>Notes: Equestrians, cyclists, other park user groups.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>Loving the new Bike gates, way less chance of injuring myself trying to get the eBike over the stiles etc. Also now able to take an older friend out by hiring an eBike</i></p> <p><i>Regarding making parks more accessible, I often have issues entering parks on my bike with my daughter in her bike seat on the back of my bike. The gates/barriers don't accommodate us both to fit through so I need to get her off my bike, lift my bike over the gate, lift my daughter over the gate then strap her back in her bike seat.</i></p> <p><i>Please consider access for people in wheelchairs. There aren't many options for nature lovers to get into the wilderness yet it's so critical to their wellbeing.</i></p>		
#206	Wellington NZ, Wellington Regional Trails Framework	<p><i>The Wellington Regional Trails Framework recognises that the Wellington Region has the potential to be a world-class trail destination for residents and visitors to explore the region via the strong mix of trail experiences on offer. The vision is Connecting our people with inspiring adventures and by 2025 aims to improve the access, communication and facilities to support the overall trail experience for walkers (including dog walkers), hikers, bikers &amp; horse-riders to a world-class standard and market it as such. Supporting an active community of partners, volunteers, supporters and users to drive success to significantly expand the trail product offer is a goal. Welcoming operators</i></p>	<p>Comment: Implementation of the Wellington Regional Trails Framework is supported via a range of policies and actions in the draft Plan. The development and enhancement of 'key destinations' is a core supportive action.</p>	No change to draft plan



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>that offer packages of accommodation, transport, equipment, events, information and storytelling across a number of activities can boost trail based economic development and employment, and showcase our other regional assets of nature, food, wine and services within easy reach of the capital to domestic and international visitors.</i></p>		
#69, #86, #215, #216, #217, #229, #244, #249, #263, #264, #270, #273, #276, #339	Cameron Evans, Caitlin Carew, A Rocha, Belinda Bennett, Konny Reichert, Mia Bui, Erez, Lynne Jackett, Bill Stephenson, Fiona Beals, Tiffany Nguyen, Parke Englebretsen, John Lucinsky, Leona Wolpert & Jan Keinheins, Jeff Carter	<p><b>Pro improving access</b></p> <p><i>It also doesn't seem appropriate that farming limits recreational access by the community, for example the closing of tracks for lambing for nearly three months of the year, and the dog ban in farmed areas.</i></p> <p><i>We welcome the draft Plan proposals to remove access restrictions to farmed areas of the Park. This will allow year-round access to the skyline Puke Ariki trail and the historic Kilmister track, and recreation with dogs on upper Hill Road.</i></p> <p><i>Want trail connections for walkers and cyclists between all Regional Parks as hinted at in A139</i></p> <p><i>The parks are public recreation land. Improving access, making experiences enjoyable, involving communities and ensuring recreation and conservation go hand in hand should be the focus of the parks plan. I would like to see for example a plan to retire Belmont regional as a farm, a change so that Belmont can be accessed all year round access not closed for lambing, more information about the history and cultural</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Opening the currently closed areas of parks is core to realising public health and recreation benefits and equity of access concerns.</p> <p>Actions to improve access is addressed in range of policies, actions and rules in the draft Plan. In particular refer Rules page 195 for stock grazing not taking priority over public access, and overarching actions associated with Objective 6 (labelled as 5), page 49.</p> <p>Dog walking on or off-lead is determined on a park by park basis</p>	No change to draft plan

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>significance of the area and more conservation, regeneration happening.</i></p> <p><i>I find myself particularly frustrated that I cannot access all of Belmont regional park at the moment due to lambing and that stock can access waterways. There seems there are things that can change quickly, while longer term plans are put in place to either reduce or eliminate farming on the park. '...the general principles of access, recreation, conservation apply to all parks</i></p> <p><i>Parks and ranges should be developed with the perception of making them natural "highways" between suburbs and cities. By that we encourage the people to utilize them more and by that increasing their physical and mental health.</i></p> <p><i>I would like to see dedicated walking tracks, identified wide shared tracks and mountain only tracks. GRWC does need to consider that people with disabilities and families with young children have just as much a right to the outdoors as cyclists.</i></p> <p><i>It would be good to see more tracks allowing dogs on leads...</i></p> <p><i>Lift the ban on dogs (still agree that dog must be on lead at all time on walking trail) and allow vehicle access to the top of Hill Road so young families and others can enjoy the trails, history and views on the ridge-tops.</i></p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>We are just worried that there might be too much car access and it will be dangerous to be walking with our children if there a lot of traffic seeking the outdoors...? We would love to have access into the Belmont Park with our dog.</i></p> <p><i>I support this plan as Wellington region should aim to continue to expand walking and cycling tracks at every opportunity</i></p>		
#188, #221, #245, #258, #330, #370	Amie Lightbourne, Name redacted, Thomas Davies, Mike Duoba, Beth McCraw, Deborah Jane Whittington	<p><b>Against changing access / facilities</b></p> <p><i>I prefer parks to be as natural and as little reminder of humans as possible (too much signage).</i></p> <p><i>From what I can work out, the plan includes the suggestion to make Belmont Regional Park more accessible, including through more access for motor vehicles. I am against that, particularly for the access via Hill Road. Planting trees as climate change measure feel like a cosmetic gesture if at the same time motor vehicles are encouraged (batteries are not environmentally friendly either). Walking, horse riding and pedal biking are environmentally friendly options and should be given preferred consideration.</i></p> <p><i>A rapid phasing out of all motorised activities in favour of less conflicting walking, biking and horse riding. This is the only sensible course of action to reduce emissions and reduce damage to park tracks and environment.</i></p> <p><i>I strongly oppose action A40 to open the park further to vehicles, and in particular to open</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Private motor vehicle access is actively managed in parks and allowed where it is deemed to facilitate use. Vehicle access in some parks is restricted to events and permits.</p> <p>The Hill road access change is identified as an option to explore, which may be as trial. This is an under visited part of the park and the bunkers are an important heritage and landscape feature for Wellington</p>	No change to draft plan

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>daylight hour vehicle access to the top car park, Hill Road, Belmont.</i></p> <p><i>The whole point of protecting natural areas is NOT to then litter them with "permanent structures" and picnic tables!</i></p>		
<b>Walking / Mountain biking</b>				
#50	Lyon Edwardson, New Zealand Walking Access Commission   Ara Hiko Aotearoa	<p><i>We endorse the Parks Network plan. We lend our support to the following priorities within it:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Key destination regional trails</i></li> <li>- <i>Developing a diverse network of shared trails</i></li> <li>- <i>connected regional trail network</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Urges GW to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>support access to parks for people without cars</i></li> <li>- <i>improve the provision of wheelchair- and pram-friendly trails, including associated facilities (such as accessible parking and toilets), as this group of users often misses out on outdoor access opportunities</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The Commission recommends the Regional Council continues to protect significant key destination trails by creating enduring access easements. We</i></li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The draft Plan has sought to address issues of inequity of access highlighted by the public and stakeholders in the initial consultation to develop the plan. This includes access for communities near western Belmont Park and Northern QEP. Developing at least one highly accessible trails in each park is a key action.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>A40</b> add bullet point actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Ensure entry barriers easily enable core users to access parks</b></li> <li>- <b>Consult with different user groups in planning and design processes</b></li> <li>- <b>Utilise event opportunities for vehicle access, promoting to people with limited mobility</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Notes column: Horse riders, MTB, walkers/trampers, accessibility groups and others'</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>recommend the Commission to provide support to the Greater Wellington Regional Council to work through the legal and survey requirements to protect key regional assets.</i></p> <p>- <i>The Commission also recommends the Regional Council focus on equity of access, ensuring that all Wellingtonians can access its parks through public and active transport modes, in addition to private motor vehicles, and that people with wheelchairs and/or prams can access local trails in nature with appropriate associated infrastructure.</i></p>		
#75	Ian Goodwin (Forest & Bird Wellington Region Tramping Club)	<p>Support's key directions, park name changes.</p> <p>Disappointed that walking and tramping groups not identified in implementing various actions or master planning or in general.</p> <p>Suggest insufficient information about incompatibility of different activities.</p> <p>Suggest more detailed permissions table.</p> <p>Section 2.2.2 doesn't identify why master planning in some parks and not others.</p> <p>A76 should include consultation with park users/ stakeholders <i>Policies should be expanded to include provision (to the extent possible) and promotion of public transport to parks. A92 and A94 should be expanded to reflect this.</i></p> <p><i>A84: covenanting of native forest areas should be 'in perpetuity'.</i></p> <p>List of minor suggestions</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Shared / multi-use trails are a priority over single uses to make best use of resources and minimise a proliferation of trails.</p> <p>A76 b. monitoring implementation against goals encompassed stakeholders within the Way We Work goal and references in stakeholders in c. but does not outline details.</p> <p>A92 this encompasses promotion of public transport</p> <p>The level of detail suggested cannot be spelled out. There is overarching commentary in each section to identify that place specific rules apply such as track uses.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>More references to be added to walking and tramping clubs throughout including overarching stakeholder tables for all parks.</b></p> <p><b>New section 2.2.7 proposed above</b></p> <p><b>A76 add f. 'encompass mana whenua partner, park stakeholder and public feedback'</b></p> <p><b>A84 changed to 'in perpetuity'</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
#120, #136, #209, #240, #246, #267, #349	Shane Wetzel, Grahcoe, Paule Oliver, Steve Meeres, Alan Smith, Felix Marwick, Blake Sutton	<p><i>A Lot of the parks could cater better by having longer multi use trails is in MTB and walking/tramping.</i></p> <p><i>The plan needs to show opportunities to link up existing parks with walkways, cycleways etc ie in particular, linking QE Park to Battle Hill via the farmland coming surplus as a result of NZTA building the Gully Road.</i></p> <p><i>There needs to be consultation with Walking/Tramping Groups representatives when planning future tracks in all parks.</i></p> <p><i>I particularly support the idea of linking the parks via user friendly MTB / walking trails, for example, Queen Elizabeth Park, Whareroa Farm, Battle Hill, Akatarawa Forest and The Hutt Valley.</i></p> <p><i>GW does not have good track record for pragmatic, real and sustained coo-operation with adjacent councils, always seeming to put its emphasis on "boundary lines on maps" rather than on the practical on-the-ground realities for those actually using those regional parks.</i></p> <p><i>Put some priority on completing the two big regional cycle trail opportunities (i) Akatarawa Traverse linking QEP and Akatarawa RP and (ii) the cycle trail around the coast from Orongorongo River to Eastbourne. In both cases the trails are "pretty much already there" and with some GW effort and positive liaison with adjacent</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Other long distance trails can be explored considering trail assessment processes identified in the draft Plan.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Akatarawa Traverse to be added to <b>Map 4 as a general arrow into Battle Hill</b></p> <p>More reference to walking/ tramping groups added throughout</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>landholders including HCC et al they could be moved from 90% done to 100% done, and marketed to GW's benefit, attracting users and drawing attention to the excellence and worth of the GW Regional parks.</i></p> <p><i>More Mountain Bike and walking trails.</i></p>		
#37	Jeremy Eckley (Upper Hutt Walking and Tramping Club)	<p><i>Congratulates GW in preparing the Draft Parks Network Plan, and for the thorough and detailed approach. Support:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consistent park naming, land use change to restoration, master planning but suggests these should be for all parks that don't have them</li> <li>- Suggests walking and tramping groups be included as key stakeholders</li> <li>- <i>Overall it is felt that insufficient attention is paid to walking/tramping as a specific recreational activity and walking trails protected from use changes</i></li> <li>- Suggest more detailed levels of permission for activities</li> <li>- Suggest that monitor progress on achieving Parks Network Plan goals should include a provision for consultation and feedback from Park users/stakeholder groups.</li> <li>- Do not support trout removal A374 in Wainuiomata</li> <li>- Various suggested changes in the Rules</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The draft Plan generally refers to 'community' groups and introduces a wider AEE process</p> <p>Proposed State of the Park monitoring for plan implementation methodology is yet to be developed but can include Park users/stakeholder groups.</p> <p>The introductory section to the Rules identifies that there are some restrictions in some places and activities. Level of detail suggested is not included in the Plan.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Additional reference to walking/ tramping to be added. Refer new proposed section 2.2.7 above.</b></p> <p><b>A185, walkers added</b></p> <p><b>Rules table correction for 'Motorised Recreation, Category B' accepted</b> (prohibited section missed in error)</p>
#46	Cathy Wylie (Taranua Tramping Club)	<p><i>Generally supportive of the work evident in this draft Toitū Te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-30...concerned that walkers and trampers have sometimes been overlooked in the preparation of this plan, and the</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The plan refers to 'community groups' with the intention of including a range of groups including walking/ tramping clubs.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>More references added to walking / tramping clubs added throughout in Notes and to master planning actions</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>tramping and walking groups which can offer their experience and understanding are not clearly identified as key stakeholders. Our particular interest is ensuring that</i></p> <p><i>a. track development does not occur at the cost of existing tall forest</i></p> <p><i>d. existing tall forest is protected with ongoing trapping and pest control</i></p> <p><i>e. each park has a Master Plan, in which tramping and walking groups are involved as stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>3. We would welcome the opportunity to contribute to the Master Plans for each of the parks, or to discuss these points further.</i></p>	<p>AEE process encompasses new track developments</p> <p>Pest management encompassed in KNE and volunteer programme work</p>	
#78	Danilo Hegg, Federated Mountain Clubs	<p>Supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>reduced grazing and increased reforestation of the Park to meet carbon neutrality goals</i></li> <li>- <i>Strongly supports the action that encourages further land acquisition, protections and recreation links in the Cameron Creek, Gollans Stream and Wainuiomata River catchments. (A261)</i></li> <li>- <i>the rules around stock grazing (pg 195)</i></li> </ul> <p>Suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- an action to negotiate and provide enduring public access to the Park from Riverstone Terraces along Bulls Run Road</li> <li>- Cannon Point and Birchville Dam is recognised as a distinct entity from the wider Akatarawa Forest, and managed in close collaboration with Upper Hutt City Council</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Access to Akatarawa park is restricted for safety reasons during forestry operational hours. It is open to the public after hours and weekends.</p> <p>Not all leases, licences, land exchanges require public notification, some are minor activities or utilities.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>FMC to be added a stakeholder for Belmont and East Harbour</b></p> <p><b>Rules section, page 184 'Backcountry camping' to be changed to 'Allowed' for Belmont and 'Managed' for QEP and Baring Head.</b></p>



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- backcountry camping in Belmont Regional Park become an allowed activity.</li> <li>- change to the point (e) of the list on page 183, to “It involves a <i>lease, licence, easement or land exchange</i>”.</li> </ul> Does not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the concept of the Akatarawa Traverse, development of glamping and concessionaire facilities in Kaitoke (A281).</li> </ul> Wants to be added as a key stakeholder for Belmont, East Harbour		
#79	Owen Cox (Parawai Tramping Club)	<i>Queen Elizabeth Park. Agree with the proposals. We are especially pleased to see comment about enabling public access to currently off-limits parts of the Park. We were puzzled as to why the cycle track south from Eastbourne around the coast past Pencarrow and over Bering Head to the Wainuiomata Coast Road is not marked on the maps.</i> Kaitoke – track suggested for map Akatarawa – does not mention walking/ tramping, misses KCDC in A114. Perkins Land suggestions.	Comment: The legal Pencarrow Coast Road enters the sea. The current road crosses private land. Land owner permission is required for access. The Kaitoke track suggestion is in the adjoining water collection area and outside the park. Walking/ tramping groups added as per other submission notes. Perkins land future uses post TG completion are ongoing. Refer Wainui Whenua related submission (acquisitions).	Accepted <b>KCDC added to A114</b>
#80	Gillian Candler & Philippa Doig	<i>We agree with a renewed focus on conservation, recreation, community and climate change. Walkers and trampers are key stakeholders and should be acknowledged in the plan and consulted. We think more work needs to be done on mitigating conflicts between conservation and recreation by wheeled or motorised vehicles.</i>	Comment: Phone towers are an operational matter	Accepted <b>A131 more reference to be added to walkers / trampers as key stakeholders</b>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>Not all parks need to be highly accessible, some parks offer wilderness experiences, which are spoilt by asphalt, gravel or graded paths.</i></p> <p><i>Accessibility is a great principle, but more visitors means more car parking unless public transport options are available.</i></p> <p>We also question the need for placing more phone towers etc in the forest</p>		
#105	Chris Horne	<p>Supports conservation opportunities, climate change actions,</p> <p><i>It is imperative that GWRC does all it can to restore the “carbon-sink” values of all the plant communities on the lands it manages on the public’s behalf. Thus GWRC must strive, using all methods at its disposal, to eliminate all alien animal species.</i></p> <p>Suggests tracks not trails and prosecuting unauthorised track builders. Asks what master plans are? Suggests no deer repellent on 1080 or more mountain bike or trail bike routes in the Akatarawa park. Doesn’t agree with planting exotics for amenity purposes at Battle Hill. Suggests more pest animal control in Belmont, Kaitoke and East Harbour.</p> <p>Add bus to Belmont maps at Major Drive.</p> <p><i>QEP GWRC should advocate to Kiwi Rail for the construction of a platform at Mackay’s Crossing for trains to use at weekends and for special occasions at the park.</i></p> <p><i>I consider that the among “Restricted activities” should be the construction of more tracks and “trails.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Appendix 1 describes master planning</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>Busses added to maps at Major Drive, Kelson</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
<b>Horse riding</b>				
#12 & #176, #160, #162, #163, #164, #165, #166, #167, #168, #170, #171, #172, #173, #174, #175, #177, #178, #179, #180 #181, #182, #186, #189, #191, #192, #210, #260	Kate Armstrong, Ruth, Kelly, Josien, Richard Schimpf, Ceciel, Rcahel Rolf, CVW, Penelope Haines, Willowsrun, Wilkinson, Lesley Blackmore, Emmajo, Gina, Awells, Julie33, AbbyJ, CGMcC, Khegglun, Sharon Baker, Shelly Warrick, Jacqui, Debbie Dorne, Carolin Beaufort, Chris Manning, Jenni Walsh	Multiple objections to a proposed horse riding pass as per A20, page 46 <i>'Investigate the development of a casual horse riding permit system such as 'parks horse riding pass' to help improve cross-country trail riding experiences for horse riders e.g. Auckland Council's free of charge 12 month pass which enables riders to have streamlined access and receive information updates on temporary closures or biosecurity issues.</i>	Comment:  In the initial consultation to develop the plan many equestrians asked that Greater Wellington streamline and improve access arrangements. The word 'permit' was interpreted by many to mean more control. The intention was actually to make it easier for horse riders as per their request.	Accepted  A20 suggested revision of this action to <b>'Investigate a streamlined access system for horse riders across the park network in liaison with equestrians and TAs'</b>  Proposed new action, Recreation Experience page 50  New action <b>A20 a. 'Across parks improve facilities for horse riders including mounting blocks, hitching rails, float parking areas, and investigate further bridle trails, in particular long distance trails. Notes: equestrians groups, TA's</b>  Belmont section of plan:  Add equestrians in notes column to additional actions.
#57	Ruth Halliday (Kapiti Equestrian Advocacy Group)	Replace the term <i>shared path</i> with <i>multiuse path where appropriate. Multi use includes walking, cycling and horse riding. Shared path excludes horses</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Include horse riding as a permitted activity in all Parks</i></li> <li>- <i>Include equestrian groups in discussions when developing new/existing trails</i></li> <li>- <i>Where camping areas are to be established include paddocks and/or</i></li> </ul>	Comment:  A131b, Battle Hill camping includes action for equestrian camping facilities.  An equestrian / horse rider collaboration group can be established if appropriate to work on improving access across parks.	Accepted in part  Proposed additional actions relating to horse riding as above  Rules section change recommended  Page 190 Rules. <b>Add QEP to 'Managed' camping as item 'i' Fully self-contained limited sites QEP'</b>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>pens for horses so horse riders are also able to undertake this activity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Minimise entry obstacles to parks for horse riders. Currently riders need, keys, fobs or phone numbers to gain entry to different parks. This is cumbersome and difficult to understand. Establish a working group, including riders, to develop one consistent system without the need for any permit system</i></li> <li>- <i>Develop parking areas at all trail heads with signage, hitching rails, mounting blocks, wash down areas and manure bins</i></li> <li>- <i>Develop access and parking points in Belmont Park (as above) with long term planning for access from Pauatahanui</i></li> <li>- <i>Improve trails for horse riders between Parks eg Q E Park to Battle Hill and Battle Hill to Belmont</i></li> <li>- <i>Work with Local Governments to provide consistent signage and messaging throughout the Region</i></li> <li>- <i>Work with Local Governments and Equestrian Groups to develop opportunities for Equestrian Tourism in the Region</i></li> </ul>		<p><b>Action A327 amended to investigate camping options though master planning in QEP, refer QEP section below</b></p> <p>Add <b>Kāpiti Equestrian Advocacy Group</b> to the list of park stakeholders</p> <p>Action amended to include collaboration groups for particular activities or topics</p>
#193, #204, #214, #220, #228 #260	Taylor, Janetf, Rachel Fletcher, Glen McCauley, Cora, Jenni Walsh, Rachel	<i>Horse riding and float parking areas. I would love to see more permitted horse riding areas where dogs are also allowed.</i>	Comment: Draft Plan policies and rules support prioritised public access to and within parks.	Accepted in part  Proposed additional actions relating to horse riding as above

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
#268, #271, #293, #319	Jones, Rachel, Hayley Auld, Sally Mitchell	<p><i>The plan misses an important customer base an community. The community of Horse riders that has traditionally used the parks for recreation. There is a lot of emphasis on enabling Mountain Biking and Walking, but these efforts seem to be at the disadvantage of recreational riders. This community needs to be catered for through the provision of safe, well-formed paths suitable for multiple riders. There is contention on the shared paths, and this practice is a danger to both groups, and leading to tensions between riders and bikers.</i></p> <p><i>'... horse riding in Belmont is primarily a young female activity. A demographic that should be encouraged and supported in their out door sport activities. Sadly in contrast with the mountain bikers, advocacy for the horse riders seems to be hard. I have been on the sidelines of several discussions re horse activities in the region and it always seems to be a battle to ensure they are heard (the other was on the Kapiti Coast and the establishment of their track systems).</i></p> <p><i>Consider the opportunity, both socially and from a tourism perspective if there was a bridleway from Belmont connecting through Transmission Gully and Battle Hill to the Coastal bridleways enabling multi-day treks with camping and overnight opportunities on the way. This accessible from 10 minutes from the city!</i></p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>I would like to stress the need for GWRC to always consider horse access within all Regional Parks and not install 'human' cattle stops or barriers that deny access for horse riders. Small timber gates with long-handled access, spring loaded to ensure they remain shut are suitable for all park users.</i></p> <p><i>I'm a recreational horse rider and am increasingly disappointed with the emphasis on mountain biking with all of these parks to the detriment of horse riding. I would ask that any further development of mountain biking tracks be equal to the expansion of horse riding tracks available in all three of these parks.</i></p>		
#111	Brenda Johnston	<p>Walking and tramping groups left out of stakeholder lists</p> <p>Likes the idea of the Akatarawa and Pakuratahi park enhancements but concerned about pathogens</p> <p>Supports grazing ceasing but concerned restoration won't be fast enough.</p> <p>Should be more effort to control ungulates and weeds</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Noted and addressed in response to other submissions and proposed new text.</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p> <p>Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses</p>
#112	Steven Church	<p>New trail proposals need to consider maintenance requirements and suggests some rationalisation of other tracks.</p> <p>Supports overall directions and phasing out grazing, except Battle Hill for children to see farm animals</p> <p>Suggests regeneration needs to consider view maintenance on hill tops and ridgelines</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>View maintenance is considered</p> <p>Renaming with re reo names is proposed</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p> <p>Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		Suggests park cottages could be rented to return income See traffic pressures in Stratton St at the MTB hub and has reservations about some trail proposals . Would like to see Belmont Trig renamed.		
#116	Allan & Glennis Sheppard	Supports track lookout vegetation maintenance and suggests they should be shown on park maps. Suggests: <i>..that use of weed-eaters is restricted to specific weeds and not used to remove all vegetation. This should also result in a reduction of direct and indirect costs. That the people employed (or their supervisors) have an appreciation of what species are likely to be present and how to avoid them. That the frequency of this level of track clearing be reduced to 2-yearly. ...with the growth of surrounding bush and the closing of the canopy, some of these species will cease to exist in this area and also reduce the need to weed-eat the track.</i> That vehicle access at Pakuratahi Forks, Kaitoke is revised and that the bridge should be replaced. That the Te Marua area is improved to make it more attractive to users Pakurtatahi – suggests additional parking and supports other proposals	Comment: Track maintenance suggestions will be passed on to the track maintenance team. Bridge replacement is planned at Kaitoke along with revision of access/ parking. An action for master planning in Pakuratahi has been added, acknowledging car parking and facility review needs identified by submitters.	No change to draft Plan Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses
<b>Dog walking</b>				

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
#211, #213	Ailsa, Edward Montague	<p><i>It does not miss so much as does not say anything about access for animals as I do not want there to be less access as Wellington has some of the best access for dog walking and this should not change.</i></p> <p><i>Dogs under control and droppings removed. No need for full leashed at all times</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Dog on and off leash areas are defined on a park by park basis.</p> <p>More access, rather than less is proposed in the Plan as per Rules.</p>	No change to draft Plan
#335	Ellen Blake	<p><i>Dogs should be prohibited from many areas, they are a menace to people and wildlife and detract from the outdoor experience.</i></p>	<p>Comment: There are dog free areas within most parks and all of Battle Hill</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p> <p>Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses</p>
<b>Hunting</b>				
#87	Tim Gale (NZ Game Animal Council)	<p><i>Game Animals (deer, tahr, chamois and pigs) are now recognised as valued introduced species in Te Mana o Te Taiao - Aotearoa New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020.</i></p> <p><i>The GAC recommends reference to game animals in the Park Network Plan to compliment the sentiment outlined in Te Mana o Te Taiao - Aotearoa New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020.</i></p> <p><i>The GAC recommends the contribution hunting makes to the integrity of the ecosystem and gains to societal health and wellbeing is considered and detailed in the drafting of the Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The GAC recommends working in partnerships with hunting organisations in the Wellington region to provide coordinated and targeted game animal management in</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The hunting areas in Kaitoke and Wainuiomata are outside the regional parks and in the water collections areas which are managed under a separate management plan.</p> <p>No ballot extensions are proposed for East Harbour at this stage. This is determined operationally. Hunting areas are not proposed to change in Pakuratahi. The areas defined for hunting are for public safety purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>More general reference to the value of hunting and working in partnership added.</b></p> <p><b>East Harbour rule change proposed as below</b></p> <p><b>Table page 215 hunting and bees swapped</b></p>



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>areas of concern to GWRC. Local hunting organisations are in a position to act as facilitators to mobilise their members to undertake hunting where and required.</i></p> <p><i>Throughout the document there is limited reference to hunting. The GAC strongly recommends an increased mention of hunting in sections talking about recreational activities within the park and region.</i></p> <p><i>Page 215. Re-categorise hunting in table to 'High impact and High benefit'. Recreational hunting aligns with all the stated goals of the PNP.</i></p> <p><i>Suggests more overnight access in Kaitoke and Wainuiomata, ballot extensions in East Harbour and hunting area extension in Pakuratahi.</i></p>		
#59, #123, #224, #227, #247, #272, #280, #283, #284, #285, #286, #289, #290, #292, #299, #300, #304, #306, #307, #308, #312, #314, #315, #318, #321,	Simon Morley, Jmb, Brock Beyer, Anthony Coomer, Olivia Nottingham, Les Rob Howey, Peter Ryan, Peter Henderson, Justin McCabe, Phillip Meyer, Pierre Pradervand, Matthew	<p><i>I have the following feedback in regards to GWRC current approach to managing game animals and engaging with the hunting community. It would be nice if some of this could be taken on board, which would foster better local engagement from hunters in our regional parks, which would have social, economic and conservation benefits if undertaken in a managed way.</i></p> <p><i>4. Increased engagement of GWRC pest animal teams with hunting community</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Multiple submissions about hunting</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>Rules, page 196 <del>'To be phased out by 2025'</del> deleted</b></p> <p><b>Refer above proposed new section 2.2.7 encompassing hunting.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
#337, #351, #369	Deiderich , Chris Green, Stefan Botha Wally Potts, Tim Watson, name redacted x2, Nigel Jeffries, Andy Roland, Simon Larsen, Peter Blang, Kovacs, Bryce Shepherd, Ed Trotter, Graeme Blanchard, Theren Williams, Blair Scotland	<p><i>groups in areas where they restrict access or don't allow hunting</i></p> <p><i>5. Overall a better consideration of and allowance of hunting in the region, which would promote individuals to hunt locally rather than leaving the region. This would also promote connection with local whenua and likely lead to further community programmes such as pest control and hut maintenance by hunting groups.</i></p> <p><i>Deer Hunting in the northern forest area of East Harbour region park should in no way be faded out by 2025. This is public land and we have a right to go hunting in there. It really doesn't harm anybody and the hunters pay money to enter the ballot.</i></p> <p><i>We have friends from GWRC pest control who tell us of deer around various Hutt Valley suburbs but are not huntable, so are culled at rate payer expense. Why can't we promote archery in greenbelt areas closer to population which would allow hunting bit massively minimise risk to public.</i></p>		
#282, #294, #297, #345 #76, #82	NZ Deer Stalkers, Wellington Branch, Anton Marsden, NZ Deer Stalkers Association,	<p><i>Wellington Branch of the New Zealand Deerstalkers Association (WB-NZDA) has not been identified as a stakeholder for any of the regional parks in the Parks Network Plan (PNP). Our members are frequent visitors and recreational users of the regional parks. Please amend PNP to identify WB-NZDA as</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Hunting is permitted as a Managed activity in Wainuiomata Recreation Area.</p> <p>The Wainuiomata/ Orongorongo Water Collection Area is managed under its own</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>As above</b></p> <p><b>NZDA Wellington Branch to be added as a stakeholder</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
	Ricky Kernohan, Gordon George (NZDA Hutt Valley Branch), David Shaw	<p><i>important stakeholders of the parks; in particular, Akatarawa Forest, Belmont Regional Park, East Harbour Regional Park, Kaitoke Regional Park, Pakuratahi Forest and Wainuiomata Recreational Area.</i></p> <p><i>The Wellington Branch of the New Zealand Deerstalkers Association should be recognised in the PNP as key partners when it comes to the management of the ungulate (deer, pig and goat) resource across the parks network:</i></p> <p><i>Page 196. The following sentence “Hunting for recreation purposes does not take priority over Greater Wellington’s other pest animal management” needs to be amended to recognise the WB-NZDA as key partners.</i></p> <p><i>Recreational hunting and / or protein gathering has not been identified once in the PNP as an important recreational and cultural value in the PNP, despite it being a very popular recreational activity and aligning with the stated PNP goals. The PNP goes to great lengths to encourage activities such as mountain biking and hiking, but does not encourage recreational hunting despite aligning with all the core values for the parks, Why? Please amend throughout.</i></p> <p><i>Specifically, Page 215 - Recreational Hunting in the table on page 215 needs be re-categorised to ‘High impact and High benefit’. Recreational hunting aligns with all the stated goals of the PNP.</i></p>	management plan and outside the scope of this Plan.	

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>Access and removal of barriers is a core goal of the PNP, however access to recreational hunters is being restricted, and in the case of Wainuiomata and East Harbour completely lost. The WB-NZDA strongly oppose this, it is 100% inconsistent with PNP state goals. Access for recreational hunters should be improved in the following ways: Overnight access should be granted to WB-NZDA members and the wider hunting community across all parks including the water reserve catchments Wainuiomata and Kaitoke.</i></p> <p><i>We strongly oppose recreational hunting being prohibited in East Harbour and Wainuiomata by 2025, please amend accordingly.</i></p> <p><i>The New Zealand Deerstalkers Association Incorporated speaks and advocates on behalf of New Zealand's recreational hunters and note the absence of partnership and consultation with the clubs located in the greater Wellington area. Please update the plan to include NZDA and our local branches as key stakeholders in the hunting aspects of the plan. Deer and hunting have cultural, recreational, and food gathering values that are overlooked in importance. This needs to be rectified in the plan.</i></p>		
#114	Heather Phillips and Donald Love	Concerns about pest animal management including pigs, deer and goats. Identify that the draft plan does not mention <i>wild cattle and how they are managed and the risk the</i>	Comment:	Accepted in part  A98 add <b>'Work towards managing threats to indigenous ecosystem health by supporting the</b>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>pose to adjoining/neighbour landowners – safety wise and/or TB infection potential.</i></p> <p><i>3. No level of pest animal population densities (cattle/pig/deer/goats) that will trigger control measures needed to reduce damage being done to environment and neighbours' properties (both farms and private native bush areas).</i></p> <p><i>4. The methodologies that are to be used to reduce/eradicate pest animals (cattle/deer/pigs/goats) is absent from this plan and the referred to GWRC Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2039.</i></p> <p><i>5. Hunters liberating/releasing pest animals is stated as an offence in the Parks Plan, but there is no direction/plan of action that GWRC will undertake when these offences occur – (can say it is an offence but need action/prosecutions/jail/large fines to follow and this needs to be clear within the plan).</i></p> <p><i>6. Fire management/mitigation states that to return the vegetation of parks to their natural states (ie 'green vegetation' firebreaks) being a form of "fire response plans". How does this mitigate the fire threat? These forests burnt extensively (from Paraparaumu to Hutt Valley via Moonshine and Horokiwi Valleys), when still virgin forests in 1898.</i></p>	<p>The Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2039 provides guidance on these matters of concern</p>	<p><b>KNE programme and associated pest plant and animals programme work'</b></p> <p>Page 76 additional text under Natural Heritage <b>Under the Key Native Ecosystem programme 'much of the park is classed as a KNE'.</b></p> <p><b>References added to Battle Hill graves site on map and in text on page 86.</b></p>
#298, #301, #335 #48		<p><b>Anti-hunting</b> <i>Recreation hunting shouldn't be happening in the parks anymore if you want to</i></p>	<p>Comment: Predator control programme is part of KNE programme work recognising that in some</p>	<p>Accepted in part <b>Public perceptions of safety is one of the key considerations in determining where hunting</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>encourage more walkers and riders. There should be enough DOC land available for alternate use of venue.</i></p> <p><i>Ban hunting and gun carrying except for registered pest people</i></p> <p><i>We request that the phasing out of recreational deer &amp; pig hunting be phased out by 2025.</i></p> <p><i>Specifically I would like to see an additional action to complement A166-A169 Support initiatives to develop a Park-wide predator control network, involving the community and mana whenua, to improve the safety of kiwi and other rare native birds returning to the Park.</i></p>	<p>parks this does not include the whole park. Community lead predator trapping has a significant role in these areas.</p> <p>Action to phase out hunting in Northern Forest by 2025 to be removed as per other submissions.</p>	<p><b>activities are permitted and the duration of ballots. Refer additional text re hunting for recreation purpose above.</b></p> <p><b>A222 allows for review of seasonal hunting activities in consultation with community.</b></p> <p><b>A65 amended to include extra bullet point: ‘Establishing short term or ongoing collaboration groups for particular parks or topics or activities e.g. recreation hunting, horse riding access improvements, trail development and/ or maintenance’</b></p>
<b>Camping/ overnight stays</b>				
#20	Kaumatua Tramping Club	<p><i>On behalf of our Club I would like to strongly commend your team for the detailed and careful work that has been put into this document. It is a superbly crafted work, rich in information and inspiring in its approach.</i></p> <p><i>We are especially delighted with your proposals to develop links and connectivity between currently disconnected parks, and between them and conservation lands.</i></p> <p><i>We also believe that there are opportunities to involve supportive private landowners in helping to connect parcels of park and conservation land, for example to develop a mountain-to-sea experience in East Harbour</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>There are a number of submissions for additional walking/ riding camping or hut stays. Refer submissions for camping/ overnight stays</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Camping rules updated to allow backcountry camping in Belmont and QEP and investigate sites in Akatarawa. Refer above and proposed new action below.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>Park and Baring Head. Our hope would be that GWRC, perhaps in collaboration with the Walking Access Commission, could take a lead in developing these opportunities.</i>		
#364	Eastbourne Scout Group (ESG)	<p><i>The ESG would like to open discussions with the Wellington Regional Council (WRC) in regards to the future of this Hut and its potential use by the Scouting youth of Wellington for years to come.</i></p> <p><i>While ESG would take the primary role of responsibility for the Hut, we would like to encourage other local Scouting Groups to use it to enable more youth to experience the beauty of our Regional Park in a way that is not otherwise so easily obtained.</i></p> <p><i>ESG is keen to understand and incorporate any learnings that WRC has from other similar situations with Scouting Groups and what has worked with the Huts they have access to. We want this to be a situation which benefits our Youth (Cubs 8 to 10 years old and Scouts 10 to 14 year old) by providing them an opportunity to experience the NZ wilderness without the risks associated with back-country outings. We would welcome an opportunity to meet and discuss this with a representative of the WRC.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>This could be investigated.</p> <p>Note, Kāpiti Scout Groups have also asked to be allowed to camp in QEP periodically.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>New action after A222, 'Investigate future uses of the backcountry hut for recreation/conservation purposes. Notes – Eastbourne Scout Group, other community groups.</b></p> <p><b>QEP backcountry camping changed in Rules to 'Managed'</b></p>
#63	James Imlach (NZ Motor Caravan Association Inc.)	<i>The NZMCA's membership is growing at a rapid rate. We urge the Council to be mindful of how camping is evolving and growing in popularity throughout NZ, particularly due to Covid-19, and ensure the 10-year plan accommodates the next generation of kiwi</i>		<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Additional investigation of camping through master planning added, refer QEP section.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>campers. We support the plan where it provides opportunities for all campers and we encourage the council to work with camping groups, including the NZMCA, to ensure the regional parks continue to provide the type camping experiences New Zealanders seek.</i>		
#20	Kaumatua Tramping Club	Support more overnight stay options for longer trails. <i>We believe there is significant opportunity for multi-day walking experiences either using camping/huts on public land and for fostering the use of private accommodation.</i>	Comment: A range of adaptive reuses of park buildings is proposed as grazing activities are phased out, to be explored through master planning processes in liaison with iwi partners, stakeholders and broader community.	No change to draft Plan
<b>Fishing</b>				
#49	Corinne Deans (Wellington Fish and Game Council)	Supports easy public access to parks Concerned about proposal to remove trout from Wainuiomata Reserve without consultation A374. Requests removal of this action Suggest that: - the public are excluded from the 'upper part of the reserve' - trout and native fish interactions not likely to be detrimental, that the upstream fishery is an important population source for the downstream fishery - Hunting- duck shooting is changed to 'game birds' on page 186 - Duck shooting be permitted in QEP - That duck shooting is identified a historic and traditional activity at Parangarahu	Comment: Action 374 to remain as an investigation. F&G NZ are already identified as a stakeholder.  The adjoining Wainuiomata / Orongorongo Water Collection Area is closed to general public access but the Wainuiomata Recreation Area is fully open to the public except ranger residential area and Wellington Water operational buildings.  'Hunting –duck shooting' is more descriptive and change is not required. No change for QEP or Parangarahu Lakes	Accepted in part  <b>F&amp;G NZ to be added as stakeholder in relevant sections of the Plan</b>  <b>Typo noted page 215</b>



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		Lakes and that dogs and boating be permitted		
#67	Ian Hutchings, Cross Country Vehicle Club Wellington	Suggests: - More 4WD access to other parks such as Baring Head, QEP, Wainuiomata and Pakuratahi <i>CCVC submits that the first four areas above should have 4WD recreation activity classified as Managed (instead of Restricted). Whilst there may be theoretical opportunities for 4WD activity in these areas under the Managed classification, every discussion with Officers (which is required/ encouraged) has indicated that even with a costly AEE being prepared and submitted, approval is unlikely.</i>	Comment:  It is acknowledged that motorised recreation access can enable more people to visit parks, particularly those with limited mobility.  Access is periodically available into these parks via the Events programme and is identified as category B and 'Managed' in the draft Plan. The Lakes can be accessed via the HCC managed Pencarrow Coast road. Park tracks are not appropriate for 4WD. AEE for events are not onerous.  Category A motorised recreation has more access to more parks. Long AEE not required for events in category B.	Accepted in part  Page 199. Category B covers events. 'Impacts must be managed via conditions following AEE <b>checklist and other standard events process</b> '
#129, #130	Jay Rowley, Sharon Lapwood	<i>I would like to see further Mountain Bike trail development within the area. The sport has grown massively and Lower Hutt has a large user base, particularly on the western hills. BAMBA have put a lot of time and effort into existing trails within the limited area. Expanding trails to Belmont Trig will compliment the existing network.</i>  <i>GWRC should prioritize building mountain bike tracks as a recognition that increasing interest in mountain biking is bringing more people outdoors.</i>	Comment:  Multiple submissions in support of MTB in Belmont.	Accepted in part  Refer other changes re Akatarawa tracks and proposed map additions
#97	Grant Purdie (NZ Four Wheel Drive Association)	<i>The draft plan took quite some reading, it is impressively comprehensive and complete. There is no doubt that it will successfully serve as a solid foundation for the use and management of Wellington's regional parks.</i>	Comment:  Appendix three provides overall guidance. AEE process will include new templates and forms to facilitate events and low-impact activities.	Accepted in part  <b>NZ Four Wheel Drive Association</b> added to overall Akatarawa stakeholders.

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>Suggest Akatarawa Traverse route is separated from vehicles for walkers and cyclists e.g. parallel route. Concerned about AEE for motorised recreation Category B but suggest that: submit that: <i>The AEE process allow for a short-form option for low-impact, short duration, one-off events.</i> <i>GW provide templates or exemplars for full-form and short-form AEEs.</i> <i>The requirements are clarified for allowing our members to contribute when utilising their 4wd vehicles as part of GW-organised events.</i> <i>The above points be reflected in the Parks Network Plan.</i></p>		
<b>CULTURAL HERITAGE FEATURES AND LANDSCAPE</b>				
#14	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)	<p><i>‘The Draft Plan demonstrates a comprehensive approach to management of the region’s parks’</i> HNZ commend and support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of historic and cultural heritage values, interpretation, AEE process, accidental discovery protocol, work with mana whenua and community groups, development of heritage management plans.</li> </ul> <p><i>‘The policy direction to phase out grazing on most of the park land is commendable’.</i> HNZ would like to be in discussions about restoration works, in particular at Baring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HNZPT should be included in list of key stakeholders, particularly in parks with significant heritage values. Want to be consulted for any development, enhancement or modification of heritage items or areas.</li> <li>• Include HNZ as a potentially interested party regarding disposal of surplus land (52P, pg. 54)</li> <li>• Pg. 150 activity A319 – the whole Remutaka rail area has already been entered on the Heritage NZ List (list number 7511), together with the whole Historic Area and some individual items and features.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>52P c. add HNZPT</b></p> <p><b>A319 change to ‘Liaise with HNZPT, DOC and others on rail trail enhancements and changes’</b></p> <p><b>HNZPT to be added as stakeholder to overarching action for key destinations A45</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>Head where there is <i>'a high concentration of cultural and historic resources'</i>.</p> <p>Specific suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some activities e.g. access improvements and car parking at Baring Head likely require an archaeological authority under the HNZPT Act.</li> <li>• Interested in all and any heritage places and items, not just those on the HNZPT List.</li> <li>• Would appreciate opportunity to be involved in any identified heritage items or destinations, particularly when intention is to enhance and asset or develop interpretation and storytelling</li> <li>• Would like to be involved in drafting and development of conservation management plans for any heritage place or item.</li> </ul>		
#34	Dennis Page, Hutt Valley Tramping Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support restoration works and endorse phasing out stock grazing</li> <li>- Concerned about fire threat and weed management, particularly climbing asparagus fern in Belmont and East Harbour</li> <li>- Would like to see views and hill top vistas maintained</li> <li>- Support Akatarawa Traverse</li> <li>- Would like to see more opportunities for overnight stays in parks, particularly for undertaking conservation work</li> <li>- Support cross valley connection in the Northern Forest but Bait line should be just</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The draft Plan identifies that investigating adaptive re-uses for the five park cottages in Belmont and one in QEP (currently used for grazing licence purposes) will be undertaken via master planning processes. Two park cottages at Baring Head are in the process of restoration for public recreation purposes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Rules for backcountry camping permission changed for Belmont and QEP. Additional action for investigation of backcountry hut in East Harbour Northern Forest added as per other submissions.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>a marked route (its currently an route marked with pink bait markers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support improved trail network connections</li> </ul>		
94	Andrew Fuller, Wellington Astronomical Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports dark sky preservation, in particular at Wainuiomata</li> </ul> <p><i>Whilst lighting has undeniable benefits and a key role in today's modern society, including areas such as parks and reserves, if not controlled and used only when and where required, it becomes a nuisance and pollutant.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I support initiatives that apply guidance from the International Dark Sky Association covering aspects of light colour, shielding of light sources, using lighting only when and where needed. Applying the IDA initiatives can have cost benefits, while also improving the economy and the environment in the Greater Wellington area with minimal outlay.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The dark sky museum proposed at Wainuiomata will significantly enhance people's day time experience of the park as well as night visits.</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p> <p>Suggested are already addressed by the Plan or have been addressed in other submission responses</p>
#60 #145, #156, #260, #268, #305, #310, #357, #370	Brent Cuttance (grazing licence holder Baring Head), Peter Harvey, Jaime, Jenni Walsh, Rachel Jones, Delia Tamsen, Nicola Swain, Jill Kennedy,	<p><b>Do not support land use change/restoration</b></p> <p><i>Sheep and young cattle should be allowed to graze as they complement each other. If wet areas require a higher level of protection then alternative stock water will need to be considered. We do not restrict the public whatsoever on Baring Head all year round. ... Rabbit control is also needed especially on the lower sand country.</i> Fire threat, passive</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The draft Plan allows for grazing activities where there are demonstrable conservation or recreation benefits via AEE process.</p> <p>Refer Plan actions to develop fire management plans which will identify a range of measures to reduce seasonal fire threat. Section 2.3.1 Fire, page 25 identifies that non-flammable native vegetation is a core long term measure to reduce the threat and impact</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
	Deborah Jane Whittington	<p>surveillance from grazing licence holder periodic presence.</p> <p><i>Where we have farmed land in the parks this should be preserved as part of the Kiwi way and allows children to see well run farms and animals in their natural environment...</i></p> <p><i>By grazing and farming the regional parks it maintains the integrity of the park. Greater Wellington should be more concerned with urban waterways and urban pollution</i></p> <p><i>- I am very much opposed to the proposal to stop farming Belmont Regional Park. The farm is extremely well run by the current license holders and should farming cease the park will be overgrown with long grass. Horse riding on the paddocks would be very dangerous as there would undoubtedly be a proliferation of rabbits and the resulting rabbit holes (unseen in the long grass) which would break a horse's leg should they step in one.</i></p>	<p>of fire, with multiple benefits for biodiversity and climate change emissions reduction.</p> <p>The National Environmental Standard for freshwater and other policies require protection of freshwater such as wetlands and streams.</p> <p>Stock grazing activities at Baring Head currently require the restriction of public dog walking in the park.</p>	
#108	Craig Cottrill, Fire and Emergency NZ	<p><i>- We notice that the plan contains some key changes in pastoral land management policies, processes and practices, we submit that Greater Wellington's Senior Rangers contact FENZ's Principal Rural Fire Officer when these changes are in the actually planning process so that the implications on wildfire risk can be assessed and mitigation measures can be implemented to lessen the impacts of these policies, processes and practices. FENZ will most likely suggest that</i></p>	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Proposed fire response plans are expected to be developed in liaison with key stakeholders such as Fire and Emergency NZ</p>	No change to draft Plan

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>environmental enhancements, in higher risk zones, include low flammability species and that defensible spaces are created around structures and other valuable infrastructure and that access for response assets is maintained along with access too and availability of sufficient water supplies. In some zones we may suggest that grasses are maintained via mowing or grazing to reduce the risk of unintended or other ignitions</i>		
#157, #201	Andrea McDonald, Stace	<i>- Protection for future urban growth. My concern if the bush takes over the grassland the views will become limited. Wants views maintained. Plan should relate to history and what was in the past.</i>	Comment: Maintenance of views is identified in the draft Plan	No change to draft Plan
#231	Charlie Morgan Hopkins	<i>I think that with the current housing environment that future pressure will come on council to surrender and rezone parks lands to be used for urban development, and I think that the current plan does not provide sufficient guidance with either way regardless of the outcome. If the council does hold a position on this matter, I think that could be made more explicit in the final version of the plan to provide more guidance to decision makers.</i>  <i>- I think that on page 184 table 2 row 3 (private vehicle access) that every and all parks should be trigger at least the 'managed' activity status, as a default position and that high value biodiversity parks like Akatarawa should be restricted</i>	Comment: Restoration and recreation are the core focus of the draft Plan. These directions are very clear. Submissions opposing Greater Wellington's proposed disposal of land in Belmont park are referenced in this report.  Private vehicle access (page 184) includes primary park roads open to the public daily. Most other areas of parks are closed to private vehicles or require an access permit.	No change to draft Plan

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>or prohibited. There should be no park in which private vehicle access is 'allowed'. These spaces are taonga and I see so much damage done by motor vehicles. I do believe that have a right to access green space and I want to be inclusive of all persons but do also believe that right does not extend to the use of the parks for motorised access.</i>		
#298	Jemma	<p><i>Encouraging community involvement from all accessibility point including those with a physical and intellectual disability. also making the parks more engaging with art, sculpture trails for families. I think the move for bilingual signage, new park name etc is a fantastic move. Supporting local Iwi and mana whenua visibility in parks is so important. Allowing more businesses to sponsor conservation projects within the parks would be great. with this allowing more of the community and volunteers to contribute toward enhancing the parks</i></p> <p><i>- Phasing out private grazing activities is a great move, opening up 2000Ha of land that us the public are paying for but used for private profit use.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Access improvements are a core direction and the subject of many actions in the draft Plan.</p>	No change to draft Plan
#301	Melody Wehipeihana	<p><i>Love the move toward phasing out of private grazing, the use of Te Reo Maori in signage and a thorough public consultation process before land is sold. Hunting in parks should definitely be culled.</i></p> <p><i>- Great to see more community opportunities for volunteers to pitch in and</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Noted, these are key directions.</p>	No change to draft Plan

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>help enhance the parks too. Some great stuff in here!</i>		
#322	Nicholas Beynon	<p><i>More needs to be done to identify what cultural heritage assets actually exist within GWRC regional parks. To be able to promote and protect heritage assets one must know where they are. Some examples exist within the Kaitoke, Belmont and East Harbour regional parks which are not known enough to be protected. Other sites of importance exist in the East Harbour regional park northern forest such as Tramways, historic tracks over to Wainuiomata and an historic 19th homestead among other sites, these need to be better protected and identified.</i></p> <p><i>Kaitoke regional park has numerous histories relating to the maymorn estates railway from 1913, Bengé family occupation in the 19th century, the Upper Hutt pony club is not aware of the damage they are doing to an archaeological site for example. The sites here need to be better identified. As things have changed since the last heritage survey in 2005. Appendix 4 lists this as "significant heritage site Te Marua" however nothing has been done to protect the site which is used by the Upper Hutt pony club.</i></p> <p><i>59p-60p. Rangers and contractors should be given a guide on what to look for in the event work is being done in an area of high archaeological potential. (Both european and maori archaeology).</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Noted, there are various actions in the plan to support historic and cultural heritage. Thank you for your offer of assistance re Kaitoke park heritage assets.</p>	No change to draft Plan



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>Someone at GWRC is welcome to contact me about my knowledge of heritage resources in the parks and I'm happy to provide information about how to identify and protect these sites.</i></p> <p>-</p>		
<b>Land disposal / acquisition</b>				
#100	Keith Johnston, Wainuwhenua Working Group	<p><b>Acquisition</b></p> <p>The main limitation of the plan is that it does not make any provision for additions to parks or creating new parks. This is a major omission.</p> <p>The central interest of our group is the expansion of the park network to add lands associated with the Transmission Gully motorway that will become surplus after the completion of the project.</p> <p>The Greater Wellington Regional Council needs to commit to realising this opportunity, and others, and spelling out future in a new section to be added to this plan.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>51P and A53 d. 'Regional open space planning priorities and opportunities for the Greater Wellington park network' allow for consideration of acquisitions</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>A 53 d. to be amended to add e.g. strategic additions to the park network</b></p>
#69, #261, #301, #77, Also refer PCC submission #62, #86, #92	Cameron Evans (Belmont Ratepayers Improvement Association), Juan Diego Acevedo, Melody Wehipeihana, Daniel Jones	<p><b>Does not support disposal (Belmont)</b></p> <p><i>We have been alerted to the proposed sale of the house and two hectares of the Park at 300 Hill Road. We, like the Friends of Belmont Regional Park, believe it is important to protect the integrity of the Park. Decisions such as selling part of it should be made very carefully, and we thank the Council for pausing the sale to hear from the community through this consultation. .. community</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Draft Plan policies identify that investigation encompassing public consultation is required before land disposal processes begin. The proposed disposal process in Belmont park is a separate matter for Council consideration.</p>	<p>No change to draft Plan</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
	(Korokoro Environmental Group), Caitlin Carew, Jamie Stewart, Friends of Belmont,	<p><i>groups do have views and ideas that should be considered before a decision is made. We recommend that this matter be deliberated on as part of the master planning process and the decision be made in light of the outcome of that deliberation.</i></p> <p><i>I conversely strongly opposed the sale of ANY rate-payer owned land or assets without a thorough public consultation. It is extremely unlikely that council would be able to buy land back and short term budgetary concerns shouldn't be resolved by the fire sale of assets. Any land that doesn't have a purpose can be easily leased or lended to non-profits or conservation agencies to further biodiversity or cultural purposes.</i></p> <p><i>No sale of public park land without an THOROUGH public consultation.</i></p> <p><i>GWRC should carefully consider how best to use the resources of the Park and not look to sell land or property without very good reason. We were recently concerned to learn about a proposal to sell a property at Hill Road and the land on which it sits. The principle of keeping the Park intact and in public hands means that sale of land and property should only be a last resort, once all other options, including leasing, have been fully explored.</i></p> <p><i>300 Hill Rd Earlier this year I was disappointed to hear the council was proposing to sell off the former shearer's</i></p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>quarters at 300 Hill Rd, along with two hectares of park land. The timing was really inappropriate, given the community had not yet been consulted on the future of the park. The opportunities presented by the house and land need to viewed alongside future uses of the park, so it was right that the proposal was temporarily shelved.</i></p> <p><i>If farming is phased out and recreation, education, and nature restoration are prioritised, this opens up new possibilities for the building, or a new structure in its place. For example, a classroom similar to the Woolshed in Stratton St, a shelter with interpretation panels, a plant nursery and hub for restoration activities, a bike washing / repair facility, or bookable overnight accomodation. The possibilities are endless, and I encourage the council to explore these options with the community.</i></p> <p><i>Waihora Crescent and Hill Road. Overnighting possibilities will be identified and with greater use comes greater opportunity for story-telling and appreciation of the historic heritage.</i></p> <p><i>The Friends request that decisions on the future of former farm houses and surrounding land at Waihora Crescent and Hill Road be made following master planning, a process where the community can collaboratively consider possible adaptive reuses and the values of the reserve land they occupy. This is consistent with A159 and A160, and the All Park Goal of “The Way</i></p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>We Work</i> ". A presumption of protection in perpetuity for reserve land sets a high bar for the process and substance of disposals.		
<b>MANA WHENUA PARTNERSHIPS</b>				
#388	Naomi Salomon, Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Generally supportive of the overall directions Suggests: - Stronger understanding of terms needed; conservation and kaitiakitanga are different - Mana whenua participation in implementation enabling opportunities that contribute to shaping the partnership - Access and storytelling are important as is sustainability - Support light pollution minimisation as is accidental discovery protocol - Different recognition for mana whenua, mata waka and community groups - Master planning at QEP needs to involve Ngati Haumia - Strongly supportive of the master planning process for Belmont park and connection with the Porirua Regeneration Project - Suggest AEE may also require Cultural Values Assessment (CVA)	Comment: Understanding of terms noted. Working in partnership with Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira and Ngati Haumia is ongoing. Improving access to Belmont park, particularly in East Porirua is a Plan priority to support recreation activities, ecosystem services restoration and kaitiakitanga activities, enable the community to realise more benefits from the park and integrate it with residential areas.	Accepted <b>Cultural Values Assessment (CVA) reference to be added to Appendix 2 and other relevant part of the Plan</b>
#223	Lance W Barker	<i>With a multicultural background to the region incorporation of Te Reo Maori signage, names, history placards etc to engage public.</i>	Noted, these are key directions	No change to draft Plan
#375	Name redacted	<i>GWRC should work with mana whenua to restore significant sites</i>	Noted, this is ongoing	No change to draft Plan

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
#379	Barbara McKenzie	<i>The GWRC horrible policy of hybridising the English language is offensive and especially demanding for those whose native language is neither English nor Maori. As far as I'm aware, GWRC has no mandate for this policy. Thought should be given to producing properly bilingual documentation, and treating ALL languages with respect.</i>	Comment:  Submitter has asked to speak to this at Hearing.	No change to draft Plan
<b>MAI TAHI / THE WAY WE WORK</b>				
		Feedback on this goal is reflected in many submissions	Comment:  Significant support for the desire for collaborative working is noted by the number of submitters wishing to be acknowledged as stakeholders in the Plan. The Mahi tahi/ Way we work goal is critical to Plan implementation.	
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE &amp; SUSTAINABILITY</b>				
#85	Karen Yung, Zero Carbon Hutt Network)	<i>We request that Council move further and faster on its Regional Climate Emergency Action Plan to complement the Corporate Carbon Neutrality Action Plan. ...Support the proposal to phase out livestock grazing and change land use to that which benefits nature restoration, recreation and the climate. We urge GWRC to move in this direction without undue delay.</i>  Recommend climate change reflected in the core values section better. Propose additional core value: <i>We proactively initiate and support natural and community-led opportunities that reduce or sequester</i>	Comment:  Accepted with edits to minimise duplication.  Regenerative agriculture practices is only referenced for Battle Hill because grazing activities are progressively ceasing or significantly reducing in other parks. Existing licence agreements create some operational constraints for short term changes in practices.  Renewable energy NPS is considered to provide sufficient enabling direction.	Accepted in part  Additional core value added Page 33 <b>'We support natural and /or community-led opportunities to reduce impacts of climate change and support public learning and engagement'</b> .  <b>References to natural solutions changed to 'natural and/ or community lead' on p 66.</b>  <b>A78 add 'e. and support the community in designing and working on natural and community-led solutions'</b>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>emissions, build resilience, and support public learning and engagement on climate change issues.</i></p> <p><i>Propose that every instance of ‘natural solutions’ to climate change should be replaced with ‘natural or community-led solutions’. Policy should be added to 6.7.1 to make this clear. We suggest: To support the community in designing and actioning natural or community-led solutions to reducing the impacts of climate change, consistent with the vision and values of this Plan. Matching actions in A78 and an extension of A79 would also be needed to enable this policy.</i></p> <p><i>Recommend genuinely sustainable, low carbon, regenerative agricultural practices in any park farming activities. We are concerned that current land use activities in farmed areas of parks are high impact on recreation, ecology, and the climate. We think that stocking rates, reliance of aerial fertiliser and herbicide, and poor protection of native flora and freshwater values within the farm all need close scrutiny.</i></p> <p><i>Policies and actions on truly sustainable land use management appear to be absent in relation to the other parks that currently have grazing and need to be included.</i></p> <p>Support community-led renewable energy generation, ask for additional policy. Request that Belmont master planning is</p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		sped up, that indirect benefits of localised recreation for climate change be better recognised.		
<b>PARK SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS</b>				
<b>AKATARAWA</b>				
#29	Tim Lapwood	<p><i>I am broadly in agreement with the plan and particularly with the six core goals and guiding principles of managing natural values, recreational experiences, heritage and landscape.</i></p> <p><i>There are a number of commercial plantations within the park which are currently being harvested, this has dramatically reduced access to the designated tracks shown on “The Akatarawa Forest Motorised Recreation Tracks 2016’ issued with permits (below).</i></p> <p><i>I would encourage the implementation of all identified “Park Opportunities” in particular the cross park, long distance activities listed and the story telling around historic logging activities.</i></p> <p><i>I would be interested to understand the future status of the Whakatikei Headwater Swamp. The key point I would like the GWRC team to consider is that these areas have been shown to recover quickly from major commercial operations and extended periods of recreational activity and as such present an excellent opportunity to provide a sustainable recreational area, within the forest.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Maintenance of recreation access in plantation forest was a key topic of discussion at the public drop in session. A number of operational changes have been suggested and will be worked through with groups.</p> <p>The draft Plan identifies the forest as the key place for motorised recreation in the region. Further expansion of trails is not deemed appropriate, other than opening some historic logging tramways.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>Ixion Motorcycle Club Inc. to be added to stakeholders</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>One idea worth considering is that permanent marked one-way trails be added to these areas, in particular pine plantations provide the ability to lay out a relatively high-density network of trial bike and mountain bike riding tracks, which are conducive to all weather use.</i></p> <p><i>Supports “key destinations” to utilise authentic attractions which already exist, rather than introduce attractions which do not historically belong to the forest... and are more family friendly. Suggests more access points to the forest and improving Karapoti Gorge track. Prefers ‘forest’ name to ‘park’. Community collaboration groups are a positive step forward.... believe this is the only way that sustainable use of the Regional Parks as both recreational and conservation areas can be achieved.</i></p> <p><i>Suggest that Ixion Motorcycle Club Inc. (Moto Trials) be included in the list of key stakeholders.</i></p>		
#30 (also see QEP section)	Kāpiti Coast District Council	<p>Suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KCDC and Kapiti MTB Club, Coastal Crew and equestrians added as a stakeholder for Akatarawa Traverse</li> <li>- Contradiction between motorised recreation use and conservation of the forest but acknowledge the need for a place for this activity. Suggest improving access controls and GPS on vehicles.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>New track proposals can be considered via the established Track Protocol and the considerations identified in the Plan.</p> <p>The forest an importance place for managed motorised recreation activities and the draft Plan signals this as continuing.</p> <p>Gate access improvements are ongoing.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>KCDC, Kapiti MTB Club, Coastal Crew and equestrians added as a stakeholder as suggested</b></p> <p><b>New or realigned tracks to be considered via existing Track Protocol processes.</b></p>



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggest a number of new tracks – as mapped and an improved MTB track as well as signage improvements</li> <li>- Suggest possible additions to parks via Wainuiwhenua land post Transmission Gully completion</li> <li>- Acknowledging Otaki Lakes in the plan</li> <li>- Strongly support education activities and suggest outdoor classrooms being part of regional parks</li> </ul>	The draft Plan identifies and accommodates consideration of additions and changes to the park network such as Otaki Lakes/ river and other land.	
#84	Murray Dick (Kapi-Mana Motorcycle Club)	<p>A112 supported but not actioned yet</p> <p>A96, minimising effects of forestry operations on park roads. Concerned that tracks have been lost and blocked by logs</p> <p>A95 significant wetlands. Confused at GW approach <i>Significant Wetlands, I do find it slightly hypocritical that an area like Drapers Flat, can be aa pine forest for 30 years, a significant wetland immediately after, while also potentially being flooded by a reservoir sometime in the future!</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Loss of tracks in plantation forest areas has been noted by other submitters.</p> <p>Biodiversity and science officers can provide more information re wetland significance.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p>Refer other submission response re forest tracks and mapping</p>
#98	Andi Cockroft, Akatarawa Recreational Access Committee	The 2016 Plan update created a new map 23 for motorised recreation tracks but plantation forestry area difficult to map. <i>As such, it was agreed for simplicity's sake that many of the shorter tracks would be omitted for the sake of clarity. Unfortunately, when P F Olsen began their operations, it became immediately obvious that their interpretation of the ARAC/GW MoU and Map-23 differed from ARAC's (and indeed GW's) Many of these tracks have been arbitrarily closed by P F Olsen, and in some</i>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Plan maps 3 and 4 do not provide the level of detail stakeholders are saying is required for clarity about the recreation road and track network.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Change A121 (duplicated action to) <b>'Work with all clubs to develop a detailed master map of trails to support ongoing use and safety escape routes in plantation and other areas'</b>.</p> <p>A309, add <b>'Through the events programme, provide periodic access to Mt Climie by vehicle'</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>instances actually supported by GW personnel. This is completely unacceptable to ARAC.</i></p> <p><i>Our most fundamental issue then is the reinstatement of those tracks agreed jointly between ARAC and GW back in 2016. Map-23 could remain as-is, as long as the omitted tracks are listed to confirm ARAC's entitlement to use them.</i></p> <p>Wetlands – concerned about harvesting impacts</p> <p>Heritage – would like to see more conservation planning and preservation of tramways and heritage relics</p> <p>Birchville Dam – concerned about sediment impacts and unfair treatment of recreation group activities</p> <p>Belmont- supports gradual restoration and want to maintain event access</p> <p>Pakuratahi – would like more event access to Mt Climie</p>		
<b>BATTLE HILL</b>				
#11	Gareth Morgan	<p><i>We own "The Morgans", a working farm/forest property situated on Paekakariki Hill Rd that includes an operating 9 hole golf course and has under development walking trails, cycleways, mountain bike tracks, and a sculpture park – all being established within an ecological sanctuary.</i></p> <p><i>What's Our Point?</i></p> <p><i>We submit that there are significant synergies to be achieved from promoting a</i></p>	<p>Seek to integrate walking and cycling trails between their property and Battle Hill</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>A139 refers to developing and enhancing shared trail connections. A131 Key destinations refers to developing forest trails.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Add reference to '<b>The Morgans/ park neighbours</b>' in the notes section for <b>A139, A131</b>.</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>seamless boundary between Battle Hill and The Morgans for recreational users. To that end we'd like to work closely with the Recreational arm of GWRC to make that a reality. By so doing the GWRC can better meet its public good objectives, while we're able to pursue our values of enhancing the ecological value of our property whilst providing a community amenity.</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> <i>We submit that there are significant synergies to be achieved from promoting a seamless boundary between Battle Hill and The Morgans for recreational users. To that end we'd like to work closely with the Recreational arm of GWRC to make that a reality. By so doing the GWRC can better meet its public good objectives, while we're able to pursue our values of enhancing the ecological value of our property whilst providing a community amenity.</i></p>		
#18 Also supports by submission s: #234, #235, #236, #239, #242 #278, #281, #334, #356, #382, #375	Rob Hughes, Mana Cycle Group, Ashley Peters, Shane, Daren Maguire, Steve Meeres, Mike, Jau Hogkiss, Peter Mitchell, Trevor Stanyon, Jason Eason, Robert Lawrence, name redacted	<p>Battle Hill and Akatarawa</p> <p><i>The draft plan is an impressive document, it covers all the interested groups very well and we support it. We are pleased that GWRC included mountain biking at Battle Hill in the draft plan. We look forward to working with the parks people on implementation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Puketiro is perfect venue for a small number of E bike specific tracks</i></li> <li>• <i>In Puketiro Forest, after logging, suggest 1 climbing track, 2 new descents and 1 connector with The Morgan's track into Puketiro Forest</i></li> </ul>	<p>Comments:</p> <p>A131 d broadly covers trail development in the Puketiro Forest and Mana Cycle Group is already identified as a stakeholder.</p> <p>Akatarawa forest has an extensive network of tracks. A117 identifies possible opportunities for opening selected former logging tramways as shared use (non-motorised) heritage trails.</p> <p>Access improvements are noted in A132</p> <p>The Morgan's neighbouring golf course and trail enhancement proposal provides further</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>A106 add 'investigate options for non-motorised users camping with toilet facilities'</b></p> <p><b>Map 4, add general arrow for Akatarawa Traverse route through Battle Hill and connection to 'The Morgan's'</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reschedule action time frames as short (1 to 3 years) so proposed track layout can be flagged straight after harvesting</i></li> <li>• <i>A132 remove gates between homestead and forest and replace with cattle stops</i></li> <li>• <i>Use Battle Hill for access to Akatarawa Forest</i></li> <li>• <i>Trails maintained by Kapi Mana Motorcycle Club can be used for MTB outside events</i></li> <li>• <i>Improve Bush 257 track to a shared road</i></li> <li>• <i>1/A106 set up a mtb / tramper camp site at the Rimu Rd picnic area</i></li> <li>• <i>2/A106 provide a link track around the western side of Wainui to connect Campbell Mills Rd to Battle Hill</i></li> <li>• <i>4/A126 MCG plant native trees – goal is 1 tree per metre of track built, want to do riparian planting of Horokiri Stream and tributaries. Discuss provision of pest control with MCG.</i></li> <li>• <i>Akatarawa trails lack a good trail map and trail markers</i></li> <li>• <i>Battle Hill should be developed as a park entrance to the Akatarawa Forest and have good connections to the trails developed at The Morgan's.</i></li> </ul>	<p>concessionaire opportunities. Refer submission #11.</p> <p>The draft Plan does not differentiate between the types of bicycles people use but recognises the need to remove entry barriers that make access difficult. The Park Bylaws address the definition of a bicycle.</p>	
#55	Tim Coles	<p>Suggests Mount Wainui name is change to it 'original and correct name' Pouawka Mountain. Suggests list of other place name changes and correct of Battle Hill to Battle Hill Knob.</p> <p><i>Amend Reserve Purpose to include 'Historic'.</i></p>	<p>Comment: Names changes can be investigated with mana whenua and are ongoing, refer 64P. A145 can be expanded.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p>32P to be amended. ... <b>except where it may put cultural heritage features at risk of damage.</b></p> <p>A131 timeframe changed to <b>medium</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>Action A131b (p.88) amend ... enhance the educational experience 'and commemoration of the battle.'</i> Change to medium timeframe</p> <p><i>Insert Policy 32a from the GWRC Parks Network Plan July 2011:</i></p> <p><i>'To present and interpret significant heritage values to the community, except where (a.) Cultural heritage features may be at risk from damage or vandalism through increased knowledge or access.'</i></p> <p>Suggested changes for A143 to create a new track to enable public access to the battle site during annual public park closures for lambing.</p> <p><i>For approximately 12 weeks every year visitors to the park are denied access to the battlefield due to lambing and this closure period always covers the anniversary of the battle in August. Next year is the 175th anniversary of The Battle of Horokiri and interested members of the public will be unable to visit the battlefield on the day unless investigation into Action A143 is begun immediately.</i></p> <p><i>For the entire period the Draft Plan was open for submissions access to the battlefield was closed.</i></p> <p>A149 suggests timeframe change and additional of other stakeholders.</p> <p><i>New Action in to Plan in the "Cultural heritage features and landscape values goal" section (p.90) to read:</i></p> <p><i>'Establish a stock exclusion zone on the summit of Battle Hill Knob.'</i></p>	<p>A53 addresses reserve purpose changes but A149 can be amended.</p> <p>A131b. Detail of storytelling will be determined at the time. GW policy is for bilingual signs.</p> <p>Public access closures have been a matter of significant public concern. Page 195 Stock grazing rule a. identifies that: Full public access must be maintained other than in equipment/agrichemical storage areas or short, temporary closures for public safety. Grazing licences must accommodate recreation activities. This change will avoid the need for an additional track for public access.</p> <p>A149. No change due to resourcing, additional parties added to notes.</p> <p>Heritage listing and controlled development zone can be investigated via historic reserve A149 investigation including possible tree removal within battle site.</p> <p>Suggested grave plaque changes could be a local initiative and do not require an action in the draft Plan.</p>	<p>A145 extended to '<b>and other features or places'</b> <b>NZ Geographic Board added to Notes.</b></p> <p>A149, amend to add '<b>and investigate historic reserve status for the battle site'</b>. <b>HNZ, Maori Heritage Council, Archaeologist, historian, others added in Notes.</b> Timeframe changed to <b>Short - medium</b></p> <p>New action A147a '<b>Establish a stock exclusion zone on the summit of Battle Hill'</b></p> <p><b>Map 6, key destination site</b> to be moved to correct location</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>Timeframe: 'Immediate (cattle).' Stock trampling risks ongoing modification of the trench remnant that should be eliminated as soon as possible.</i></p> <p>Suggests action for NZ heritage listing and a controlled development zone. <i>It is disappointing that as recently as 2018-19 ill-conceived works have been undertaken that negatively impact Horokiri Battlefield and right now is the last best chance to restore the integrity of the site with remedial works to reverse these alterations. Horokiri Battlefield is an irreplaceable heritage and cultural feature of much higher value now and in the future than revegetation planting and a fence, so the restrictions of a new controlled development zone should be applied retrospectively. The block of native tree seedlings recently planted above the Bush Reserve should be removed only where they are within the battlefield.</i></p> <p>Map change suggested to correct location of battle site</p> <p>Suggests new action for grave plaque rewording</p>		
#71	Steve Lewis, Kapiti Mountain Bike Club	<p><i>The mountain biking opportunities based around MacKays Crossing are some of the best in the Wellington region. With QE Park and Akatarawa Forest Park run by different areas of GWRC, Whareroa Farm managed by DoC, Campbell's Mill Road managed by KCDC, and a typical ride incorporating some or all of these areas, a commitment from all of these authorities to oversee this recreation</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>There are a range of actions in the draft Plan supporting MTB trails and connections.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Mountain biking clubs to be added to page 75 table of overarching stakeholders for Akatarawa and QEP, and Kapiti MTB Club added to A108, A351</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>resource as one is at the heart of this KMBC submission. With this in mind, what would KMBC like to see from GWRC in the next ten years.</i></p> <p><i>-a recognition by GWRC that the use of the northern area of the Forest by the mountain bike community is an important resource, and to work with KMBC to improve or enhance this resource.</i></p> <p><i>-the connection through the forest, given the regional ride designation in the plan, is further expanded to include the connection from CMR entrance through to Battle Hill. This may well tie in to work going on around Transmission Gully, and these connections will become more popular as more riders of e-bikes use the Forest.</i></p> <p><i>-a commitment by GWRC to work with the other land managers to the north of the Forest to actively promote the combined recreational resources that are available</i></p>		
#385	Mark Sidebotham, Ixion MCC	<p><i>It mostly concerns the Akatarawa Forest where some of our members like to go to appease their biophilia.</i></p> <p><i>This submission is also a call to GWRC to include us in any discussions regarding motorcycle recreation in the area. We consider ourselves to be worthy stakeholders, especially in respect of Akatarawa Forest and would especially like to be put on the list of stakeholders for this park.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Greater Wellington refers to the Land Transport Act definition of a bicycle in Parks Bylaws. This changes periodically but defines the power limits</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Ixion MCC to be added as a stakeholder in Akatarawa park</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>The Akatarawas are a precious resource for us and reduce the temptation to go riding in places we're not allowed. Ixion would like to congratulate GWRC for allowing motorcycling here and our submission is that the status quo suits us very well.</i></p> <p>Ask when e-bikes will be restricted like motorcycles</p>		
<b>BELMONT</b>				
#73	Beth Reille	<p><i>I appreciate that grazing is important as a tool to manage land, but the commercialization of recreation land does not sit comfortably in Belmont. Recreation, and protection of our natural resources, water, flora and fauna must take precedence as per the Act. The failure of commercial farming to change and adapt over the last 10 years means it should be scaled out.</i></p> <p>Park access <i>Legal roads running through the park have been removed from cadastre and illegally locked. Should be put under TA management. GW needs to seriously take this on board as up to now they just look the other way as it suits their farming purposes and to control the publics legal access.</i></p> <p>Horse access improvements required Waterway and wetland monitoring required Does not support aerial spraying</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Judgeford Hill adjoining residential development may provide a significant opportunity to improve northern entry points.</p> <p>Stream and wetland monitoring is not currently undertaken by Greater Wellington's Environmental Science team but it may become part of the programme in future.</p> <p>Locking gates on legal roads will be investigated as an operational matter in liaison with TA's.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Access improvements are key actions in the Plan</b></p> <p><b>Horse riding changes proposed as per other submission response above.</b></p> <p><b>A177 add 'and other unformed legal roads'. The Walking Access Commission has offered support re unformed legal roads and access in their submission #50 above.</b></p>
#77, #336	Daniel Jones (Korokoro Environmental Group)	<p><i>We support the vision and direction of the plan, with its focus on conservation, community and tackling climate change. We strongly support the phased retirement and</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>A187 amended to include investigating a Korokoro valley to Titiro Moana Road track.</b></p>



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>restoration of currently grazed areas of the Park and believe that the carefully planned restoration will not only help the city meet its climate change goals but will increase it's cultural and recreational value.</i></p> <p>Suggest:</p> <p>There needs to be comprehensive monitoring of natural herniate values, that community should be actively involved in restorations, that some open space is retained, bike, foot access is preferable.</p> <p><i>To improve Korokoro residents' walking access to the Park, we would support the creation of a walking track into the Korokoro valley from Titiro Moana Road.</i></p> <p><i>We request to be included as a stakeholder in the proposed master planning for Belmont Regional Park.</i></p>	<p>Korokoro Environmental Group are identified as an overarching park stakeholder on page 97.</p>	
#92, #389	<p>Jamie Stewart, Friends of Belmont Regional Park, and Pareraho Forest Trust, Matt Young</p>	<p><i>The vision underlying the draft plan put forward by Greater Wellington is ambitious and inspiring. The Friends hope this submission reflects our enthusiasm that our wider community grabs this opportunity with both hands, shapes it, and becomes richer and stronger for doing so, in the best sense. As the Friends of Belmont Regional Park we reaffirm our commitment to bringing groups together and fulfilling our role in the future of our local hills, valleys and communities.</i></p> <p><i>As grazing reduces, space also becomes available for communities. It becomes possible to create better walking and cycling trails, encouraging the practice of low-carbon local recreation. The growing pursuit</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>With community involvement, master planning will be a key step in developing shared narratives for the future of the park</p> <p>A196 mana whenua will lead this process.</p> <p>Existing policies address sustainable and local recreation</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>Page 28 additional text 'as do plan proposals for increased access to the parks for local communities providing increased opportunities for low-carbon recreation'.</b></p> <p><b>..to lead the transition to a low-emissions society' added to Objective 20.</b></p> <p><b>Page 23, section 2.3 'and community led pest control initiatives' added</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>of ecological restoration recreation, the active care for our environment, is enabled.</i></p> <p><i>Reforestation can be passive, when grazing is removed. The effectiveness of this has been proven over the last generation as viscerally evidenced by the Remutaka Hill, Eastern Hutt Hills, Makara Peak, Mt Kaukau and any number of other Wellington landmarks. Reforestation can also be active, establishment of pioneering shrublands - or green firebreaks/seed sources, supplementary planting of keystone and missing species and active care for forests to manage weed invasion and encourage diversity. These approaches can (and inevitably do) work together, but they require action, commitment and the overcoming of organisational inertia.</i></p> <p><i>Appropriate scale nurseries can and should be created where the reforestation need exists: Hill Road, Baring Head, QE2 Park, Battle Hill etc.</i></p> <p>Supports key shifts and identifies that narratives matter. Supports farm building repurposing for community groups and overnight possibilities. Concerned about freshwater impacts from storm water and urban waste water.</p> <p>Suggests change to A196 about dual naming, section 2.5.1 and actions A91. Suggest new policy to add recreation to climate change policy. <i>Request change to 2.3 to recognise</i></p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>the opportunity of community led landscape scale pest control initiatives.</i></p> <p><i>The Friends offer to support and facilitate further community group engagement in conversations and decision-making that may need to take place prior to, during and following master planning.</i></p> <p><i>The Trust was recently informed that GWRC intends to delay the retirement and reforestation of the area of Belmont Regional Park west of Transmission Gully, because GWRC was “not ready”. Why not? And what is being done to ensure the climate emergency declaration is more than just words?</i></p>		
#95	Kena Duignan, Wesley Community Action	<p>Support East Porirua in restoration priority one, aspirations for partnerships and collaboration, plans for reforesting and regenerating park environments.</p> <p>We would like to explore how to support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>use our parks infrastructure and resource to uplift communities' aspirations for their environment and also include skills building, education and jobs?</i></li> <li>• <i>extend Belmont Park north into Waitangirua so that the people in that community can also access and support the regional parks?</i></li> <li>• <i>support citizen science opportunities for locals to grow their knowledge and connection with their local environment?</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The community in Porirua East report to us a strong desire for connection to te taiao but that they currently do not have easy access</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The inequity of access to Belmont Park and green spaces was recognised via the preliminary consultation process for the plan.</p> <p>Collaborative, ground-up type master planning process will help facilitate answers to these questions, as will opening the main access to the park at Waihoura Crescent to allow the public to explore and start to envision future states and options. The timing of Ngahere Korowai is a good fit with planned changes for the park.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>A199 amended to include ‘<b>including Ngahere Korowai, a large scale reforestation and protection of the environment around Porirua East</b>’.</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>to high quality, large scale, nature spaces. We are starting to work with a coalition of groups and people who are building momentum around the idea of a ngahere korowai – a large scale reforestation and protection of the environment around Porirua East. We are also sharing in this submission an idea that is forming in Porirua East and would include the western side of Belmont Regional Park. This idea is called the Ngahere Korowai.</i></p> <p><i>The Parks Network draft plan is in line with this idea and would support it well.</i></p> <p><i>The management of the park network is a massive job, that needs more than just Greater Wellington to achieve well. We have many groups, iwi, rūpū, individuals and organisations in the Wellington region who have much to contribute.</i></p> <p><i>We believe that it is not good enough to just manage things as status quo. We have a responsibility to future generations to enhance the world and communities that they will inherit.</i></p>		
#96, #101	Quentin Duthie , Hill Road Community Group, + personal submission	<p><i>I commend Greater Wellington on a draft plan with great vision and a strong set of core values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support actions to improve access into the park, restoration, freshwater quality, more monitoring, State of Parks monitoring, community input to AEE assessments, keeping cattle out of streams, no farm closures, less impacts from spraying etc</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Visitors was replaced as much as possible and can be further checked.</p> <p>Climate change action change as per Hutt Carbon Network submission.</p> <p>Some text changes accepted, others maintained for consistency with other objectives.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>Page 94. ‘and large residential communities surround the park’, ‘and much of the Puke Ariki range of maunga’ added to description</b></p> <p><b>Page 94, Old Belmont Road added</b></p> <p><b>Predator Free Groups – added as Key Stakeholders for all parks</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would like to be able to dog walk in the park</li> <li>- Suggests a range of text changes such as ‘we’ also includes the public – tātou rather than mātou, restoring nature rather than natural heritage, people rather than visitors, recognising the proximity of population to the park, name changes, recognising Old Belmont Road, predator free groups, science led/ guided</li> <li>- <i>Rename the Core values and park characteristics list “Key features and characteristics”, The list here is one of physical features and characteristics</i></li> <li>- <i>Recognise that the Puke Ariki track only enables a traverse when it is not closed for lambing. It’s importance as a regional trail is severely diminished by this restriction</i></li> <li>- Speedy’s Reserve access has a bus</li> <li>- A159 and A160 for master planning are not consistent</li> <li>- <i>A164: Tautoko, add (here or elsewhere) “and collaborate with community groups on citizen science freshwater monitoring and riparian restoration. A166 suggested addition of community groups, A169 add predator control. Suggested stakeholder list amendments</i></li> <li>- <i>Consider creating a basic camping area, or even a tramping hut, high in the park near a taumata</i></li> <li>- Restricted Activities - suggested limited notification to key stakeholder groups</li> </ul>	<p>Draft Policy 22P and grazing Rules now prioritise public access</p> <p>A166 community groups are in the notes, other stakeholder list amendments noted</p> <p>Refer other comments re add camping to page 190 e. for investigation through master planning</p> <p>A177 addresses investigating Old Belmont Rd opportunities</p> <p>Master planning plan references for consistency noted. Details of master planning process are not yet fully determined. However the master plan for Western Belmont park will precede the eastern areas of the park in order to make the most of synergies with adjoin PCC/ Porirua Development opportunities, coincide with the current grazing licence expiring and ensure an appropriate level of focused engagement with the communities of eastern Porirua who have experienced limited access to the park.</p>	<p><b>Core values and park characteristics list renamed ‘Key features and characteristics’ for all parks</b></p> <p><b>P 98 under Restoration add ‘Expanding council and community pest control efforts to improve the healthy and diversity of forest flora and fauna’</b></p> <p><b>Page 99, park entrances with bus stops - Speedy’s Reserve add</b></p> <p><b>A159 and A160 reviewed and revised for consistency. Add text to bullet point 6. “such as food, bike hire/ shuttles and other appropriate concession activities, plant nursery/ restoration project hub, visitor accommodation, artist in residence/ studio’s, ‘remakery’ / sustainability centre, indoor recreation facility’.</b> This will facilitate permissions via PCC District Plan for Open Space Zones.</p> <p><b>A164 add ‘and collaborate with community groups on citizen science freshwater monitoring and riparian restoration’</b></p> <p><b>A169 predator control added</b></p> <p><b>A178 ‘and connectors to Hill Road’ added</b></p> <p><b>Restricted Activities, Page 214 add ‘All significant new Restricted activities and all renewal applications will have limited notification to mana whenua and key stakeholders’.</b></p> <p><b>Backcountry camping Rule section changes as per other submission changes and adaptive re-uses of park cottages explored through master planning.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		- Interested to know how master planning will actually work		
#102	Tim Matthews (Kainga Ora)	<p>Supports key shifts, would like to be added as stakeholder for three parks. Would like to be involved in master planning early in the process.</p> <p><i>Kāinga Ora should be engaged to discuss new features near our land holdings, so that the development potential and amenity of our property is protected and vice versa for the park itself.</i></p> <p><i>Kāinga Ora also supports the Council identifying opportunity to work collaboratively on the master planning for Belmont Regional Park. It should be noted that staff from both organisations have already started this engagement.</i></p> <p>Suggests additional value identification at a park level <i>All values given to certain features, or the regional parks as a whole (e.g. ecological, cultural or heritage values) should be identified through a valuation process to determine their worthiness of protection.</i></p> <p>Suggests master planning is combined and not separated between east and west, bringing forward Waihoura Crescent entry opening and adding more actions to ensure an equitable approach for the Porirua side of the park in key destinations</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Park level values can be defined by/ with community in master planning.</p> <p>Master planning can be combined if resources permit however the eastern Belmont grazing licence expiry in 2025 currently constrains short term land use change</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities added to overarching list of park stakeholders for Belmont, QEP and East Harbour</b></p> <p><b>A170 j. changed to short term</b></p> <p>A170 replace Pareaho Trust in Notes with ‘<b>Park and community groups</b>’</p> <p>J. Add ‘<b>for conservation, recreation and community purposes including concession activities</b>’</p> <p><b>A170 k. added, work with community to develop Ngahere Korowai, a green town belt for Porirua to support connection to te taiao and ecosystem health</b></p>
#325	John Flux	<i>A minor point is the repeated reference to 64 magazines/bunkers. According to the original army plans, and my work for the past 50 years on starlings nesting in 42 of these bunkers, there are only 62: 51 labelled</i>		<p>Accepted:</p> <p><b>Bunker number to be amended to 62</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>1-51, 8 smaller ones in a short row, 1a, 44a, and 44b. There may be confusion because a farm manager about 30 years ago re-numbered the bunkers in white paint, and changed some of the original numbers.</i>		
#332	Paul Neason	<p><i>I like that there is an indication that there will be improved access to the park from the surrounding suburbs. The Major Drive entrance especially is in dire need of some love. It currently is weedy, with little parking and seems to be popular for fly-tipping in the stream, yet is the closest entrance to the park from the city. Could there be specific mention of improvement to the Major Drive entrance in the plan?</i></p> <p><i>I note that the intention is to phase grazing out. While grazing continues, and if any grazing is to remain into the future, it would be great to see more environmentally friendly farming practices such as fencing/planting out the waterways, and avoiding aerial spaying herbicide in the stream catchments. I feel Greater Wellington should be showcasing best farming practice through its farms.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Annual farm plans are required as part of the grazing licence and can include operational changes to support sustainable land management practices in farming methods.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>A178 'and enhance amenity at Major Drive, Kelson' added</b></p>
Referenced in other submissions				
<b>EAST HARBOUR</b>				
#74	Lee Hunter, Tupoki Takarangi Trust 1996	<i>As an overview, the Tupoki Takarangi Trust (TTT) in general supports the draft network plan. Several of the actions impact upon the TTT as a permanent mana whenua</i>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Support noted</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>A250 The Great Harbour Way changed to Te Ara Tupua.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>landowner, and is a separate entity from mana whenua, tangata whenua and iwi. The TTT and its descendants are of Te Atiawa iwi and Ngati Tawhirikura hapu hailing from Te Tatau o Te Po Marae. As such, we are also part of Taranaki Whanui and Te Runanga o Te Atiawa.</i></p> <p><i>For context, you should be aware the TTT is a subset of the before mentioned iwi organisations and integrate with all of these on a regular basis. Identify support for various actions. Identify that The Great Harbour Way should now be superseded by the name of Te Ara Tupua.</i></p>		<p><b>A267 change to TTT from Takurangi Block, add TTT to A255, A273,</b></p>
#27	Terry Webb, MIRO	<p><i>There is a lack of a compelling vision in this document—things are too generic and it lacks a sense of urgency. Lakes block still plagued with sheep, goats, cattle, deer and rabbits.</i></p> <p><i>More emphasis and action on pest management required to support native species recovery. We would like a feasibility study undertaken on the construction of a deer fence, running along the Park boundary from Burdans Gate to the southern end of the Wainuiomata urban area.</i></p> <p><i>MIRO strongly supports item A271 (p. 127) to improve fish passage to and from the Parangarahu Lakes. This has been talked about for many years—we are keen to see some action!</i></p> <p><i>MIRO is very supportive of improving the visibility of Park entrances, especially on the Wainuiomata side—higher use of the Park</i></p>	<p>Noted. Feasibility study proposal not accepted The present focus is to be maintained with ongoing community support.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>A95 add bullet point <b>Improving fish passage throughout the park in line with the New Zealand Fish Passage Guidelines</b></p>



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>builds a constituency of support for its continued restoration. The issue of improving access to all parts of the Northern Forest requires balance. If the Gollans Stream baitline (item A239, p. 123) was to be improved, better (and alternative) marking of the existing trapping route with minimal clearing is strongly preferred over highly developed tracks with bridges</i>		
#48	Felicity Rashbrooke, East Harbour Environmental Association	<p><i>We believe that the health of the natural environment, not recreation, should be the primary concern of this management plan.</i></p> <p><i>In this context we applaud the phasing out of livestock grazing which has such damaging effects on our natural environment.</i></p> <p><i>In particular we do not support the use of the Pencarrow Coast Rd for tourism.</i></p> <p>Suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maps 11 and 12 need correcting</li> <li>- <i>A hierarchy of tracks and routes and how they should be maintained needs to be incorporated</i></li> <li>- New tracks are kept to a minimum</li> <li>- A greater commitment to <i>noxious plant removal</i></li> <li>- Fire threat monitoring, possibly by drone use</li> <li>- Storytelling is kept to a minimum</li> <li>- Avoiding steps on Ferry Rd Track, A237</li> <li>- Dogs should be on a lead at all times</li> </ul> <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A221 marked route to Wainui coast road and A231</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Pencarrow Coast Road is managed by Hutt City Council and other sections of vehicle track by private land owners.</p> <p>Track maintenance methods are outside the scope of the management plan and determined operationally in liaison with community groups.</p> <p>Dog rules for on or off leash areas are determined on a park by park basis.</p> <p>Greater Wellington does not differentiate rules based on the type of bicycle people ride. E-bikes are managed by in the same manner as other bicycles with a focus on minimal impact user behaviour. The definition of a bicycle is defined in the Land Transport Act and referenced in the Parks Bylaws.</p> <p>Drone use is not permitted over wetlands.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Maps 11 &amp; 12 to be updated</b> (corrections for property boundary, track categories)</p> <p><b>A237, reference to steps to be removed</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phasing out deer and pig hunting in the park by 2025</li> <li>- A241 track circuit at Parangarahu Lakes</li> </ul> Does not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cutting trees to maintain views , changes to A239 Bait Line track</li> <li>- Use of e-bikes at the Lakes</li> </ul>		
#16, #208, #230, #355, #350	F & J Vickers, Maria, Allison Gandy, Rob Lee, Brendan, Rob Lee	<p><b>Northern Forest A237 + A239</b></p> <p>In favour of maintaining harbour views from key vantage points</p> <p>Support A237 <i>We see the merit in creating a loop track by connecting the Korimako Road and Kereru Road tracks at approximately 180m elevation. We are sure many day visitors are frustrated at the current offerings, as being either too easy or too difficult. A route that would take 40 minutes to an hour to complete would be a welcome addition.</i></p> <p>A239 Bait line track. <i>If a cross-valley track was to be established, our concern would be that mountain bike groups might then exert pressure to upgrade this to form a track connecting Eastbourne and Wainuomata.</i></p> <p><i>For me as a resident/tramper and mountain biker, the thing that needs to be changed in the draft is the increased access to the Northern Park on the south side of the Wainuomata Hill Road for mountain biking. As someone who grew up walking Rata ridge once a week as a child and far into my adult life, the access that mountain bikers have</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>A237 – no need to add gravel or steps on tracks above Korimako/Kereru Rd connection or Ferry Rd track</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>A239 – says ‘investigate upgrading’. The track is already established and marked with pink bait line markers. Upgrading could simply include the addition of orange (NZ Standard) route markers.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>A237 accepted remove reference to steps</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>gotten to this area is absolutely DESTROYING the forest. It has gone from a beautiful walk to being horribly eroded and muddy and with a lot of bikers not abiding to the rules set out at the start of the track. ‘.. as much as I love the idea of a route down Gollans stream, this WILL get used by mountain bikers and will damage an even more valuable ecosystem and that damage won't be able to be undone. This comment refers to A239.</i></p> <p><i>Please consider adding a feasibility study for a up and downhill mountain bike track to the north of Point Howard water reservoirs at the end of Howard Road based on the preferred route detailed in the 2015 Kennet Report. This will provide access from the Eastern Bays into the park i.e. the ridge line and Wainui Trail Park. The Point Howard Assn recognizes that the walking trails up to the ridge line in the Northern Forest are not suitable for mountain bikes, a dedicated MTB track may alleviate any potential conflict on these tracks. It also supports the plan's objective to get people out and enjoy the park</i></p>		
#64	Linda Mead	<p>Suggests a hand cut route and provides a map: <i>In East Harbour Regional Park there are few tracks that do not involve a lot of climb. I would like to propose a track that contours and cuts out 80 to 90 m (about half) of the climb... Starting from Muritai Park, this would need to follow the new track for a</i></p>	<p>Comment: This was discussed in detail at a consultation drop in session and deemed to be worthy of investigation.</p> <p>Noted, ongoing work with community groups re track maintenance.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>A237 to be split as investigation options for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ferry rd track</li> <li>b. Moana rd area</li> <li><b>c. Muratai park to McKenzie Rd track</b></li> </ul>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>short distance so that when it starts to follow the contours it is above private property. This could then follow around the hillside to the McKenzie Road track. It would add different options for locals to walk and also add a lower level option for people walking the tour of Eastbourne. I think it would add to the range of tracks available and be popular for walkers and runners.</i></p> <p>Suggests track maintenance standards are amended for different track categories less mowing to protect native species such as orchids.</p>		
#121, #309, #328, #343, #344, #361, #362, #367, #368	Thomas Adams, Anna Lambrechtsen, Ben Wilde, Nick Kennedy, Dan Forster, Brenda Rosser, Gordon Maxwell, Caleb Smith, Dan Sharpe	<p><i>It all seems good. I strongly support <b>A235</b>, Fire break alternative, and think this should be expedited.</i></p> <p><i>The existing alternative 4WD is very slippery when wet and high speed when it is not, causing a potential for significant user conflict and harm.</i></p> <p><i>Request that rather than this being a medium term (4-7 year opportunity) that given this has been under discussion for 3+ years already it be considered for implementation in the short term.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>A235 is 'Fire break alternative. Investigate a shared track for walking and cycling as alternative to the Fire Break Track between Stanley Street, Wainuiomata and the Zigzag Track'.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>A235 change to 'Short-medium' term</b></p>
#241	The Eastbourne Community Board (ECB)	<p><b>Northern Forest</b></p> <p><i>The Eastbourne Community Board (ECB) supports the draft plan in general and GWRC's consultation process.</i></p> <p><i>We suggest the following amendments to the draft plan:</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>ECB already identified as overarching stakeholder on page 117.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>ECB to be added to stakeholders <u>in relevant actions</u></b></p> <p><b><u>A225</u> Spelling of Muritai Road to be corrected</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>Page 119: Add ECB to the list of abbreviations - we note the Wainuiomata Community Board (WCB) is in that list.</i></p> <p><i>Add ECB as a partner/stakeholder to the following actions (green column on the action table). These are areas where ECB is already active, and where ECB can assist GWRC, for example by consulting with residents and encouraging support from residents for working bees, etc:</i></p> <p><i>A203: Raising awareness, A204: Pest plant and animal threat reduction, A209: Dotterel protection, A215: Vehicle parking at Burdens Gate, A217: Trail connections between the three areas of East Harbour, A223: A new lower-level trail in Days Bay, facilities at Butterfly Creek and improvement of the main ridge track, A225: Signage from Muritai Road (note the correct spelling of Muritai), A231: Link tracks at Point Howard, A239: Gollan Stream track - we note that WCB is listed here but see this as being of equal importance and relevance to Eastbourne residents and ECB, A247 and A248: Signage and bike trail at Parangarahu Lakes.</i></p>		<p>A247 – <b>Add Distance markers from Burdens gate to Lake Kohangatera entry gate.</b></p>
#35	Colin Ryder	<p><b>Baring Head</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not support restoration. Suggests heritage values will be lost</li> <li>- Concerned about fire threat</li> <li>- Suggests <i>a more flexible grazing approach</i></li> <li>- Supports proposed footbridge over the river</li> <li>- Supports collaborative working</li> <li>- Other comments re goats, deer, fishing and appendix heritage</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Refer Heritage NZ submission (#14) re Baring Head and restoration and protection of heritage values.</p> <p>Refer plan actions re preparation of fire threat management plan and restoration plan.</p> <p>Annual stock grazing licence operational plans are a subset of licence agreements and guide</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>Refer proposed Rule changes for fishing rules to protect native fish</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
			land care practices, stock numbers, day to day matters.	
#54	Paula Warren, Friends of Baring Head	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>strongly support the emphasis on collaborative processes in the Plan</i></li> <li>- <i>We support the proposals related to fire</i></li> <li>- Bridge for bikes, walkers, more toilets, car parking, a toilet at Fitzroy Bay, nature play, trails,</li> </ul> <p>Do not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- master planning because plans take too long</li> <li>- phasing out grazing around the lighthouse complex to provide a firebreak, maintain <i>nationally important geomorphological features more visible within the park and from Wellington</i>, see lambs and maintain grass in overflow car park area by the bridge</li> <li>- suggest new text to support ongoing stock grazing activities and that leases are utilised</li> <li>- Farm management requires the use of dogs</li> <li>- Suggest passive restoration is not possible because of mouse numbers and rabbits</li> <li>- Would like Map 17, high level restoration priorities removed because it doesn't match the Friends priorities</li> <li>- A211 would like to see collaboration with the Friends to develop the KNE plan, fire threat reduction, reducing grazing pressure and predator control</li> <li>- Suggest rule changes via A213; prohibiting fishing of native fish.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Planting 'green fire breaks and grass mowing by mechanical means are other common methods of seasonal fire threat reduction and used in other parks. The draft Plan allows for grazing activities where there are demonstrated conservation or recreation benefits, e.g. low stock numbers of sheep to mow the grass or support restoration efforts.</p> <p>Heritage plans for the park identify that it is the views from Baring Head that are significant, not of the headland. Refer page 115 HNZ quote.</p> <p>Not accepted re phasing out grazing. This is to meet climate change and habitat restoration objectives. The vision for parks is long term with a 30+ year horizon and native vegetation has been identified as providing the best long term solution to reducing fire threat and supporting healthy ecosystem services.</p> <p>Leases are not utilised for grazing activities because they further limit public access which is not appropriate. The direction of the plan is to enable public access as an overarching priority. Annual stock grazing licence operational plans are a subset of licence agreements and guide land care practices, stock numbers, day to day matters.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p>A272 to be changed to include '<b>Work collaboratively with'.. and new bullet point 'sharing expertise and knowledge'</b></p> <p>FOBH added to all sub actions in A211</p> <p>A213 changes accepted, in part <b>'Improve the health of the Wainuiomata River and its margins by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. investigate removal of barriers to gravel inputs</b></li> <li><b>b. Adding habitat elements such as logs</b></li> <li><b>c. Planting riparian margins</b></li> <li><b>d. Managing pest plants'</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Refer proposed dog Rules additional text above.</b></p> <p><b>P228 error noted for change</b> (Lakes and Gollans Stream moved in heritage schedule)</p> <p><b>A72 add 'and share reference information freely including reports, plans and research on the website'.</b></p> <p>A256, 257 minor changes</p> <p>Refer KNE programme re pest animal work.</p> <p>Park Bylaws address native species removal from parks.</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>- Suggests volunteering related action</p> <p>- Dogs in the park or prohibiting deer and pig hunting</p> <p>Suggest changes to A252, A256, A257, A258, A259, re the lighthouse complex, a road that can accommodate buses and storage space, gate keys for disabled people to drive into the park, wheel chair access close to the coast, visitor number monitoring, track from the lighthouse to the coast. Also suggest a seed bank approach.</p> <p>Suggest marine conservation included (outside park boundaries)</p>	<p>Refer action A5, page 41 which refers to developing a planned approach to phasing out stock grazing.</p> <p>Map 17 is high level and not intended to be interpreted literally in guiding detailed restoration work.</p> <p>A211. Refers to developing a restoration plan with the Friends. KNE plan development is outside the scope of this management plan but does include consultation processes.</p> <p>Park Bylaws address native species removal and unauthorised uses. Volunteer related actions are already addressed in the draft Plan.</p> <p>The Plan is long term. Dog walking is a primary recreation activity and can be accommodated in as grazing activities are phased out in recreation and scenic reserves.</p> <p>A252 reflects existing restoration programme work developed based on heritage and landscape plans. Events are not precluded. Volunteer overnight stays are already accommodated. Other actions changes suggested previously reviewed and are either already in place or not considered appropriate.</p> <p>Land swaps retained as a Restricted activity for a consistent GW approach.</p>	
<b>PAKURATAHI</b>				
#15	NtrailZ Kevin Blair	Outlines trail development proposals	Comment:	Accepted

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		Suggests: Toilets at Plateau Rd car park, Pump track/ gravity fed in the lower MTB area, bike wash station	Trail suggestions covered on map 22.	New action before A307 (or 308a): <b>‘Undertake a master plan to investigate a range of improvements for parking, amenity and facilities in the Tunnel Gully and Incline Road entry areas’</b> . Long term. Notes – mana whenua, park stakeholders.  Amend A307 f Tunnel Gully MTB hub key destination... <b>‘trail head facilities such as toilet, bike wash down and pump track in the vicinity of Plateau Road car park area’</b>
#373	Remutaka Incline Railway Heritage Trust	The Trust asks to be consulted when decisions are made on rail historic heritage assets in the Pakuratahi Forest Park as a stakeholder with rail heritage expertise. Other organisations should also be consulted on the conservation and use of these assets, including Heritage NZ, Rail Heritage Trust of NZ, Friends of Fell, Department of Conservation.		Accepted  <b>Trust to be identified as a stakeholder</b>  <b>Also refer Heritage NZ submission proposed changes</b>
<b>QUEEN ELIZABETH PARK (QEP)</b>				
#47	Ngāti Haumia Ki Paekākāriki	<i>We are writing this submission on behalf of Ngati Haumia Ki Paekakariki for the consideration of the Queen Elizabeths Parks plan.</i> <i>- Vested interest in the Budge house and propose establishment of Marae/Papakainga</i> <i>- Urupa extension and more convenient access.</i>	Comment: Iwi partner Ngāti Haumia Ki Paekākāriki interests and wishes for operational changes noted and will be addressed directly with them. Budge house interests and desire for establishment of Marae/ Papakainga noted. The urupa and adjoining area is Ngāti Toa owned land, classified as Recreation Reserve under the Reserves Act. Refer QEP map.	Accepted  Spelling error corrected. Ongoing discussions with Ngati Houmia about their matters of interest.  Reference added to A363 <b>‘and for the establishment of Marae/ Papakainga, extension of urupa area and other changes to support kaitiakitanga activities’</b> .



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allocate a set of keys specifically for Ngati Haumia Ki Paekakariki to access all gated areas of the Park</li> <li>- Sign posting for Wainui Pa</li> <li>- Restoration of the original wetlands and Wainui stream to enhance the natural habitat for growth. I.e. York Town Lagoon</li> <li>- Haumia specific Tohu he maumahara</li> <li>- Weir to be improved to promote the breeding and migration of fish and fresh water life.</li> </ul> <p>Usage of the building, currently being utilised by the Paekakariki Surf Club.</p>	<p>Wetland restoration, freshwater and fish passage improvement works are signalled in the draft Plan.</p> <p>The current Paekākāriki Surf Club building is to be removed in future and a new building constructed inland. It will offer some shared use. Use of other park buildings can be investigated.</p>	
#109	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	<p>Supports a range of proposals and suggests a number of recommendations.</p> <p><i>The Trust does not support the use of the Park for large community events such as music festivals, as these events will negatively impact the surrounding ecosystems. Events that will have negligible impact to the environment such as community mass planting and sports days is a better use of this ecologically diverse space. The Trust supports events and recreational activities that will allow those from all economic backgrounds to participate.</i></p> <p>Support story telling but want to be involved, would like walkways moved away from the coast, support wetland restoration and ceasing grazing activities.</p> <p><i>The Trust believes that it is inappropriate to utilise recreation reserve land for farming that commercially benefits a very small</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Riparian set backs will become less important as work progresses towards phasing out stock grazing across the entire park.</p> <p>Events are managed via a permit system which includes risk and impact assessment and management. Event proposals considered inappropriate are not approved.</p> <p>The draft Plan contains policy supporting phasing out stock grazing on a pragmatic, paddock by paddock, basis to avoid the need for further public capital investment in stock fencing infrastructure. It also identifies policy to meet and exceed regional and national standards. Wide riparian margins can be established where appropriate.</p> <p>Key dates for ceasing stock grazing activities across the park have not yet been determined by Council.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p>Working in partnership with mana whenua is a core part of master planning and ongoing park management. Atiawa ki Whakarongotai's Kaitiakitanga Plan will be an important guiding document.</p> <p>Stock grazing is identified for phasing out with the focus shifting to restoration and recreation activities across the park.</p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>portion of the community but generates adverse effects for the entire community. The Trust asks that the Plan does not attempt to please all parties and instead focuses on phasing out grazing to restore the environment back to its natural state.</i></p> <p><i>The Trust would like the Plan take one step further in committing to phasing out all grazing within 50m of the Whareroa Stream so that these other restorative actions can be maintained into the future. Suggest Kaitiakitanga Plan will support management of the park and give effect to the plan and seeks involvement in restoration planning and science knowledge sharing</i></p>		
#2	Juanita Crossland	Would like motorhome campers to be able to stay overnight at QEP utilising existing toilet facilities	Self-contained motorhome camping in QEP Camping at approved sites is identified as a 'managed' activity in the draft Plan.	Accepted. <b>'Investigate self-contained camping options' to be added to A327 master planning.</b>
#19	Kāpiti Coast Biodiversity Project	Predator proof fencing for lizards is being investigated by the group for QEP.	The final Park Network Plan can reference the potential construction of such fences within regional parks.	Accepted <b>New <u>A1</u> a 'work with others to develop cost effective, predator proof fencing or other intensive predator control options in appropriate locations to support native species biodiversity recovery'</b>
#30	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Support national park city proposal. Suggest: - strongly support wetland restoration and native forest - native vegetation in preference to exotic - suggest dune restoration should be a higher priority than identified	Comment: Master planning will consider the detail of many proposals in the draft Plan.	Accepted <b>KCDC to be added as a stakeholder in master planning.</b>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- oppose horse riding permit</li> <li>- coastal track should be maintained</li> <li>- support bike skills track, links to other parks and other cycling/ trail proposals</li> <li>- support master plan and ask to be identified as a stakeholder</li> <li>- support Raumati end of park enhancements</li> <li>- suggest some consideration be given to motorhome stays in the park</li> <li>- strongly support equestrian uses and facility improvements</li> <li>- would like to see dedicated bridle trail in the park</li> </ul>		
#44	Gary Simpson, Te Araroa Wellington Trust	<p><i>Our interest is specifically Queen Elizabeth Park as Te Araroa travels through the park. Our concern is that reference to Te Araroa is made only on the map on page 169 of the plan. There is no narrative description of Te Araroa in the plan nor does it feature in the list of activities and amenities that are available within the park.</i></p>		<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Additional reference to Te Araroa to be added on pages 159</b></p>
#52	John Andrews	<p><i>This submission is made intentionally without any reference to any guidelines, pre-formatting or other submission requests. It is a long term vision that may take longer than ten years to unfold. The broad areas of recommendation are highlighted in bold script and cover the following topical areas:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Appreciation and acknowledgement of achievements and changes to date</i></li> <li>- <i>A deeper and more integrated theme for QERP</i></li> <li>- <i>Species Management – Flora, Fauna, and Avifauna</i></li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>There is scope for more storytelling in the park particularly as wetland and terrestrial restoration activities advance</p> <p>Dual naming is proposed for the park, not name change.</p> <p>Storytelling suggestions can be further utilised via master planning and other processes</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>Rule change proposed re white baiting.</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Cultural and Social Heritage</i></li> <li>- <i>Education and Recreational Development</i></li> </ul> <p>Suggests that GW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Consider the concept of TimePaths, or windows in time, using storyboards, static displays, dinosaur models, educational structures or a children’s prehistoric adventure playground</i> and further historic heritage story telling such as whaling and family stories and taniwha/ Maori mythological creatures/ storytelling</li> <li>- <i>Ban the practice of whitebaiting</i></li> <li>- <i>Re-wets the former wetlands and regularly water tests streams</i></li> <li>- <i>Continues bee concessionaires</i></li> <li>- <i>Retains QEP name</i></li> </ul>		
#81	Kat Thorstrand Mitchell and Wayne Mitchell	<p><i>There is no doubt that this plan is a dramatic and welcome shift in thinking at a time when transformational change is necessary. The policies and actions are important.</i></p> <p><i>The concern we have is that whilst many of these policies and actions are important and in some cases critical, there is no commitment to completing these actions nor are the timeframes anything more than indicative.</i></p> <p><i>Sections 6.2 and 6.7 are key, give thorough coverage, scientific, all the reasons to rewet peat. However there are a few more points that are not specifically mentioned that we believe raise the nature of related actions to critical status. RAMSAR wetland references.</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Reducing emissions is a priority of GWRC and the LCAF will allow park-wide restoration works to commence in the short term and be ongoing.</p> <p>Refer Grazing licence rules and public access priority, page 195.</p> <p>A range of trail opportunities will be considered in master planning. The northern area will require significant focus to facilitate public use and enjoyment and consider options for pony club relocation to drier ground (as per their previous request)</p> <p>Refer A81 re regenerative agriculture practices for Battle Hill</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>A328 modified to add ‘rewet peatland to stop further degradation and undertake riparian planting throughout the park</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>No peatland should be grazed.</i></p> <p><i>GWRC gained approval in September to restore 73 hectares of peatland in Queen Elizabeth Park. The proposal took 4 months to prepare and gain approval, also by the way demonstrating that for wetland plans there is a shortened process available. The scientific justification was clear and well written. However the proposal made no mention of the remaining peatland, which is estimated at 85 hectares. The justification contained in the proposal applies equally to the remaining 85 hectares.</i></p> <p><i>The submission made no mention of the Reserves Act which governs the Park.</i></p> <p>Climate Change</p> <p>Climate change indicators are getting worse. Our plans need to raise the criticality of mitigation actions. GWRC is no stranger to the climate change arguments. <i>This is urgent. For every year that the peatland remains drained, it emits CO2 and it will take another 15 years for the CO2 produced to be reabsorbed. So if GWRC continue to graze this land for another 3 years, it will take 45 years for the lost carbon to be reversed.</i></p> <p><i>Rewetting of peatlands is a much higher priority and more aligned with the Reserves Act than grazing. Action A328 should be modified to allow or propose that interim rewetting is encouraged where possible to stop further degradation. For any remaining</i></p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>non-peat area that may be grazed, the PNP should state that; Extensive riparian planting should be undertaken before grazing commences.</i></p> <p><i>Limited Access. The current farming license, ending October 31, effectively severely restricts free public access to 60% of the Queen Elizabeth Park. The current implementation of this is such that access is in effect not possible without considerable effort and pre-planning. The requirement should be that recreation should take precedence. Access needs to be free and unrestricted unless temporary notices are placed to control access for limited periods.</i></p>		
#83, #106	Russell Bell, + Friends of Queen Elizabeth Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asks that GW manage QEP in accordance with the Reserves Act, putting conservation and recreation first</li> <li>Doesn't support spraying, heavy grazing, Supports more focus on ecological corridors and suggests mapping required as per current Plan.</li> <li>Requests x 26 to</li> <li>- Focus on recreation over grazing, public access over closures, speedy peatland restoration and re-wetting before weed spraying, excluding key areas from grazing in discussion with the Friends, riparian planting before grazing, protection of the spring in the <i>Stables lease area</i> from grazing, grazing not farming, consideration of recreation proposals in master planning, cattle</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Planning for restoration work via the LCAF and master planning should be able to address many of the requests identified. Other issues raised can be addresses operationally or via other planning processes such as concession licence renewal processes. AEE requirements have been added in the Rules of the draft Plan.</p> <p>Ecological corridors. Biodiversity advice is to adopt a holistic approach to park-wide restoration, maintaining areas of open space where appropriate for recreation or landscape value. Whilst corridors are a priority, particularly riparian areas, the overall approach in the plan is park-wide restoration work.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p><b>Add to A8 a. map ecological corridors within and connecting to parks</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>exclusion from horse grazing area, loss of public access is minimised, monitoring is undertaken, contracts are scrutinised and honour RA, riparian strips are honoured and scientific advice sought, grazing effluent barriers investigated, sand blow outs revegetated, all wetlands protected from grazing, beehives treated like grazing and removed or kept small, fish barriers addressed, that rangers don't shoot grey ducks or pukeko, restoration priorities focus on peat, sand bottom wetlands then waterways, public input sought for resource consents, master planning undertaken by planning group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Request 3 That the land available for a grazing licence is not decided upon until all recreational and conservation (including climate change opportunities) are removed and that this is preceded by an opportunity to see the land that the public have had no access to for 10 years.</i></li> <li>- <i>Request 9 That the ecological corridors described by the Friends of QEP be added to the PNP and implemented forthwith. This was agreed to 10 years ago and are shown in the current PNP but GWRC Parks has not progressed this.</i></li> <li>- <i>Concessions should be divided into two types. Those that provide recreation such as pony clubs and those that don't such as bee hives. In fact bee hives are essentially farming and seem to be</i></li> </ul>	<p>Rules relating to grazing identify the requirement to prioritise public access. Bee hives are identified as a restricted activity requiring AEE in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Bees are now identified as a Restricted Activity with AEE required. They</p>	

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>driven by a desire of GWRC to make money.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Those that provide recreation should essentially be helped to set up. But the potential for adverse effects to the park should be assessed</i></li> </ul>		
#70	Henry Brittain, Wellington Tramway Museum	<p>Suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of fire response plans is prioritised</li> <li>- Improved signage in McKays Crossing entry area is developed in liaison with stakeholders</li> <li>- Akatarawa Traverse identified as long term. Suggest earlier.</li> </ul> <p>Disappointed that a possible train station at McKays is 'dismissed' as a remote possibility P165, A349.</p> <p><i>WTM looks forward to being a positive participant in the planned Master Planning exercise noted on p.44 and elsewhere in the PNP; but it is essential that this really does take in the diversity of ideas and views which will be expressed. Experience shows that it is all too easy for these well-intentioned strategies to turn into top-down exercises with "community reference groups" becoming little more than tokenistic fig-leaves. The guiding principle should be reinforced as set out on p.27: "supporting, recognising and rewarding the efforts of volunteers ... is critical to GW's success".</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Routes already exist for Akatarawa Traverse so it can be changed to short –medium term, particularly with significant community group support for implementation (evidenced in other submissions). Map 4 shows the route to the coast.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>A100c to be changed to short –medium term</b></p>
#103	Bruce Henderson (KCDC)	Supports plan directions. Suggests a more all-ecompassing approach to including horse riding as a permitted activity on all parks	Comment:	Accepted



Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
	Cycleways, Walkways, Bridleways Advisory Group)	<p>where practical, including equestrian groups in discussions when developing new/existing trails</p> <p><i>Where camping areas are to be established, include paddocks and/or pens for horses so horse riders are also able to undertake this activity</i></p> <p><i>Minimise entry obstacles to parks for horse riders. Currently riders need keys, fobs and phone numbers to gain entry to different parks. This is cumbersome and difficult to understand.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, establish a working group, including riders to develop one consistent system without the need for any permit system</i></p> <p><i>Develop parking areas with, signage, hitching rails, mounting blocks, wash down areas and manure bins at all trail heads where topography and space permits</i></p> <p><i>Develop access points in Belmont Park (as above) with long term planning for access from the Pauatahanui side (Bradey or Belmont Roads).</i></p>	Changes are per other equestrian related submissions	<p>Managed camping via permit application identified for QEP and Belmont in Rule changes</p> <p>Page 77. Add <b>Kāpiti Equestrian Advocacy Group</b> to the list of park stakeholders</p>
<b>WAINUIOMATA</b>				
#262, #52	Mike Jackett	<p><i>There is no obvious reason why the area to the left of Reservoir road between the gates and the lower dam is shown on the map as being excluded from the WRA. This is potentially an area for walking track extension. I support highlighting the dark sky activities within the park. Dark Skies are becoming an increasingly rare commodity</i></p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>This area is part of the Wainuiomata Water Collection area, not the park but a boundary change could be investigated with Wellington Water.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p><b>To be investigated operationally</b></p>

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><i>internationally and it is most appropriate we should treasure what we have at WRA.</i> Supports other actions</p> <p><i>Support your itemised points A389, A391 and A392 (perhaps the astronomy display could also include the full range of nature as highlighted within the park (trees, birds, insects, fungi etc)</i></p> <p>Suggests GW needs to use higher resolution aerial maps.</p>		
<b>RULES FOR USE AND DEVELOPMENT</b>				
	GW officers	<p>Suggested changes:</p> <p>Page 186 pig hunting Northern Forest = <b>Managed activity</b></p> <p>Page 185, Rule 33. Fishing – eel, whitebait. Change to <b>Prohibited</b> (red shading) all parks. Note: <i><b>*except mana whenua customary harvest activities by permit.</b></i></p> <p>Page 185, No 35. Forestry Commercial change to <b>Prohibited</b> for Belmont, Baring Head, Parangarahu Lakes, QEP</p> <p>Page 190 Camping at Approved sites. Add <b>h. Akatarawa additional sites investigated to support Akatarawa Traverse</b></p> <p>Page 191 Dog Walking add to:</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Suggested changes to correct omissions/ minor errors and ensure consistency with Parks, Forests and Reserves Bylaws 2016</p> <p>Grazing added to Akatarawa because there is a small paddock at Karapoti Road end.</p>	Changes as proposed

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p>f. change to <b>'On a seasonal or periodic basis e.g. breeding season for birds, to facilitate restoration activities'</b></p> <p>J. <b>'where toxins and traps are used intensively for pest management purposes'</b></p> <p>k. <b>'where grazing activities present significant hazards e.g. toxins, agrichemicals. Also refer Stock grazing'</b>.</p> <p>Page 194. Replace all current text with: <b>'To protect these vulnerable species, fishing whitebait and eel is not permitted except mana whenua customary activities by permit. Refer Natural Resource Harvesting'</b></p> <p>Page 194 the text amendment <b>'All public recreation access is prohibited during forestry operational hours, in areas that are actively being harvested and along park roads and truck routes.</b></p> <p>Page 195 Stock Grazing. Change Akatarawa to <b>"Restricted"</b>. Point d. remove <del>'Greater Wellington carbon neutrality policies, carbon accounting, offsetting'</del> retain other text</p> <p>Page 196 Hunting, Pigs (ungulates) <b>add East Harbour, Northern Forest</b> to 'Managed' and change to same category in #46, Page 186.</p> <p>Page 196 Hunting (all other) – add <b>'and hunting pigs with firearms'</b>.</p> <p>Page 197 Park management purposes. Add <b>'f. Fallen firewood for park ranger residence or park accommodation heating only. No removal from the park except for mana</b></p>		

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<p><b>whenua customary purposes, public art, sculpture or education purposes. Public harvesting not permitted’.</b></p> <p>Page 199 ‘Motorised recreation’ – add <b>‘Prohibited’</b> row and move Parangarahu Lakes and QEP into this category to be consistent with Table 2. Add – <b>‘Motorised recreation not permitted to protect fragile wetland and dune systems’</b></p> <p>Page 199. Natural Resource Harvesting. Add <b>‘Note: Permit not required for harvesting from pa harakeke and other sites specifically planted and managed by mana whenua and mata waka for their customary purposes.’</b></p> <p>Appendix added to reference Whaitua programme core value statements</p>		
<b>APPENDICES</b>				
#55	Tim Coles	<p>Appendix 4. Heritage and landscapes of significance schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- move Gollans Stream to correct section</li> <li>- Suggested new text from PCC District Plan P219 as reinforcement</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Minor corrections identified through consultation process</p> <p>PCC District Plan text not added. This would require too much if other TA plan references are included for consistency. Other actions in the plan should address concerns about threats to the Battle Hill battle site.</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p>New text in introduction to schedule: <b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 - 42(1): ‘Unless an authority is granted under section 48, 56(1)(b), or 62 in respect of an archaeological site, no person may modify or destroy, or cause to be modified or destroyed, the whole or any part of that site if that person knows, or ought reasonably to have suspected, that the site is an archaeological site.’</b></p>
<b>OTHER</b>				
<b>WAIRARAPA</b>				

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
#1	Max Stevens	<p>Would like the GW owned Hiwinui forest block 10 minutes south of Martinborough to be accessible for public recreation activities , similar to existing parks with plantation forest and over time, restored in native vegetation.</p> <p><i>We believe that the Wairarapa deserves more commitment to regional parks from GWRC, and that such commitment is in the overall strategic, environmental, economic, biodiversity and community/recreational best interests of both GWRC and the Wairarapa District. We submit that the Hiwinui Block, in concert with the Aorangi Forest Park, could be an amazing recreational asset for our region, and that this concept deserves well-resourced and dedicated attention from the Greater Wellington Regional Council, with a plan and time frame to achieve phases of public involvement and access. We further submit that it is an imperative that we utilise our public assets to the best advantage of the community as a whole.</i></p>	<p>Comment: The plan accommodates land managed under both the LGA and Reserves Act, and is designed to accommodate additional parks as chapters with a consistent policy approach. Refer Policy 51P, Actions A52 and A53 and Outcomes 6.4.2 B. and 6.6.2 A. This can be investigated through strategic planning processes and resourcing identified through LTP and Annual Plan processes.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>New action proposed (page 56):</p> <p><b>A53 e. 'Investigate opportunities for public access to GW owned land for recreation and conservation purposes in the Wairarapa. Notes: Iwi, DOC, TA's, community groups'</b></p>
#132, #265, #335	Joe Howells, Jack Sheppard, Ellen Blake	<p><i>The Wairarapa area deserves more attention in the Regional Parks strategy</i></p> <p><i>There are opportunities to create one or more Regional Parks in the Wairarapa - in particular the Hiwinui Forest .... becoming a Regional Park and being eventually allowed to revert to Native Bush should be included in Regional Parks planning by GWRC.</i></p> <p><i>Wairarapa Moana is supertrophied and is the jewel in the crown of the Greater</i></p>	As per submission #1	Accepted as per as per submission #1

Submission number	Name	Submission summary	Officer comment Noted / not accepted	Officer recommendations No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>Wellington Region. Please help protect this sacred space.</i>		
#134	Stevens	<p><i>The Wairarapa consists of what, two thirds of the land mass of GWRC, population of 45,000 and growing. The playground of many Wellingtonians but lacking in Regional Parks.</i></p> <p><i>Hiwinui Block is relatively close to Martinborough currently public access is prohibited, in the past management allowed access. The Hiwinui Block could easily provide an opportunity for the GWRC to firstly explore the possible inclusion of the block into the Regional Parks Plan. In the first instance access doesn't necessarily mean funding public facilities, there are many examples of public access into forestry blocks without providing a lot of infrastructure. Access would be closed during forestry operations. The recreational benefits are many and would not require significant funding if the level of expectation was pitched correctly and explained.</i></p> <p><i>The Aorangi Trust, chaired by Clive Paton is doing a great job in the preservation of flora and fauna. There are areas of the Hiwinui block that are not planted in pine that could be enhanced to improve native regrowth and water quality. Thank you.</i></p>	As per submission #1	Accepted as per submission #1
#147	David Boone, GW officer, Land Management team	<i>Identification of the long term aspirations for Regional Parks in the Eastern two-thirds of our Region. Is there any intent to look into opportunities for Wairarapa Parks, or will are</i>	Refer response submission #1	No change to the draft Plan

**Attachment 1**

<b>Submission number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Officer comment</b> Noted / not accepted	<b>Officer recommendations</b> No change to Plan Accepted in part or full – change identified
		<i>Regional Parks continue to serve one-third of our Region?</i>		

