*Note to Talk Wellington readers!*

*Italic is text added by Urbanerds / Talk Wellington. They’re notes to you our readers / listeners rather than content for a submission. We suggest you delete it once you’ve read it.*

***Italics Bold*** *is text we suggest you use as the basis for your submission.*

*You’re awesome!*

We want to hear your views on Our City Tomorrow (the Draft Spatial Plan).

## Tell us what you think by answering these questions below

You can email this form to: [planningforgrowth@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:planningforgrowth@wcc.govt.nz)

You can also answer these questions online at:

planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz/your-views/consultations/draft-spatial-plan/consultation-form

https://planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz/your-views/consultations/draft-spatial-plan/info-and-privacy-statement#

Make a submission by **Monday 5 October 2020 at 5pm**.

## Privacy statement – what we do with your personal information

View our full privacy statement online: planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz/privacy-statement

All submissions (including names and contact details) are provided in their entirety to Council officers for the purpose of analysing feedback and to inform you of updates and outcomes of the consultation. Feedback and submissions (including names and suburbs but not contact details) may be available to the public at our office and on our website. Exceptions to how we will share your information may occur over the course of the Planning for Growth project in order to comply with statutory process under the Resource Management Act.

All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council. You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. If you’d like to ask for a copy

of your information, or to have it corrected, please contact us at [planningforgrowth@wcc.govt.nz,](mailto:planningforgrowth@wcc.govt.nz) or at Wellington City Council, 113 The Terrace, Wellington NZ 6011.

## View Our City Tomorrow (the Draft Spatial Plan) online

planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz > Draft Spatial Plan > View Draft Spatial Plan

**Mobile and accessible version** planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz > Draft Spatial Plan > Our City Tomorrow: A Draft Spatial Plan for Wellington City (mobile and accessible version)

**Downloadable PDF** planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz > Draft Spatial Plan > Summary of Our City Tomorrow: A Draft Spatial Plan for Wellington City (PDF)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 1 – your details** \*mandatory field | | | | |
| Your name (first and last)\*: | | | | |
| Your email\*: | | | | |
| Postal address\*: | | | | |
| Suburb: | | | | |
| Phone number: | | | | |
| Age range: | Under 18  18–24 | 25–34  35–44 | 45–54  55–64 | 65–74  75 and older |
| Household: | Couple without children  Household with children living at home Household with children who  are no longer living home | | Household of unrelated persons (flatting) Other *(please specify)* | |
| Preferred method of contact: Email Post | | | | |
| You would like to sign up to our email newsletter and receive news and updates regarding Planning for Growth | | | | |
| You are making this submission: as an individual  on behalf of an organisation. Your organisation’s name: | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 2 – compulsory questions** | | | | | | |
|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Not sure |
| 1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with what is proposed with intensification  in the central city?\* (Refer to Central City fact sheet number 02) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with what  is proposed with intensification in the inner suburbs?\*  (Refer to Inner Suburbs fact sheet number 03) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with what  is proposed with intensification in the outer suburbs?\*  (Refer to Outer Suburbs fact sheet number 04) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.We have taken a city-wide view with how we have proposed intensification across the central city, inner suburbs, and outer suburbs. Overall to what extent do you agree or disagree with our approach to this distribution?\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. If you disagree, where would you distribute the additional 80,000 people across the city over the next 30 years?\* | **In 20-minute / 15-minute villages in Porirua, Lower Hutt, Upper Hutt, Kapiti.**  *See 15 minute neighbourhood concepts here: https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2019/9/6/7-rules-for-creating-15-minute-neighborhoods* | | | | | |
| 5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with  how we have balanced protecting special character and providing new housing in the inner suburbs?\* (Refer to Character Areas fact sheet number 05)  *It’s OK. Protection is enough for now; the devil will be in the detail of the District Plan changes* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.We want to make sure we keep what is special about the character of the inner suburbs  as we provide new houses in these areas.  What about character in these suburbs is important to you?\*  (Refer to Character Areas fact sheet number 05)  *This is a bit of a trick framing. The first sentence implies lots of important stuff is at threat. This is pretty debatable. A lot of what we hear is at threat isn’t actually going to be (everything in DP will be challenged hard by pro-heritage groups, so the real fight for Wellington will be ensuring that these things don’t hamstring good intensification.)*  *The actual question is in yellow. Answer this one without being distracted by the framing statement.*  *It’s Freetext so you can write what you like, and crucially \*\* the question is open to* ***what’s not in these suburbs currently****, that you’d like to see.*  ***Say “I want” or “i value,*** *and then go nuts – you could consider things that (we think) are nice, like…*   * ***walkability / bikeability / wheelability to the city but not being right in it Healthy Streets streets (we haven't got heaps! https://healthystreets.com/home/about/)*** * ***Sun*** * ***Backyards and green space - including pocket parks / town belt*** * ***Maori history manifested*** * ***Natural history manifested - streams, scarps etc*** * ***Birds coming back*** * ***Mix of people around you - ages, life stages, lifestyles, ethnicities, abilities, socioeconomic status etc*** * ***Small / friendly shops / hospitality businesses*** * ***being able to recognise faces and feel connected and supported*** | | | | | | |
| 7. What amenities would you want to help create a vibrant suburban centre?\*  Please pick your top 5 from the options below.  *Pick whatever you like in your top 5.*  *It’s odd to ask about infrastructure; this isn’t an amenity, it’s an essential service.*  *We’ve assumed it is provided to a decent standard.* | | | | | | |
| Proximity to parks and open space Access to public transport Public/shared spaces  Commercial activity *(retail, cafes, local businesses)*  Employment opportunities  Community spaces or ‘hubs’ that provide  for a variety of functions *(working, study, etc)* | Infrastructure *(stormwater, water supply, wastewater)*  Social services and community facilities Medical facilities/centres  Access to cycleways/routes Walkability within the centre  Easy walking distance to the centre Other *(please specify)* | | | | | |
| 8.What amenities would you want to see around future mass rapid transit stops?\*  Please pick your top 5 from the options below.  *Here we’ve suggested some common essential ingredients for decent TOD. More are here re placemaking*  [*http://www.tod.org/placemaking/principles.html*](http://www.tod.org/placemaking/principles.html) | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Public shared spaces**  Landscaped spaces/plantings Parks and playgrounds  Shops and businesses  **Cafes and restaurants**  **New housing** | **Community facilities *(libraries, community spaces, social services, etc)***  Child care  Medical facilities/centres  **Bicycle parking**  Other *(please specify)* |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Not sure |
| 9.To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?\*:  Our City Tomorrowoutlines a 'blueprint' for how we can grow and develop that aligns with the five goals for Wellington to be compact, resilient, inclusive and connected, vibrant and prosperous, and greener.  (Refer to Our City Tomorrow fact sheet number 01)  *It’s fine, it needs more clear vision though - specific reductions in carbon footprint, specific improvements in economic diversity, in housing supply, in liveability indices – you can mention these below.*  *So yeah, Agree or Strongly Agree.* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. COVID-19 has had a significant impact on our lives and on our city. We acknowledge that since March this year people may have experienced their local suburb or neighborhood in a different way. | | | | | | |
| What spaces, amenities, or facilities did you find most beneficial during the different levels in your local neighbourhood/suburb?\*  *Answer these two questions yourself – they’re quite personal.  Think about what nourishes the different aspects of your whole person: your body, your social self, your intellectual self…* | | | | | | |
| What amenities or facilities were missing or could have been improved?\*  *We personally missed* ***safe, family-friendly streets including good footpaths and safe cycling / scooting space***  *– this is a good time to give WCC a shove to* ***integrate******local transport planning and walkability/wheelability with landuse planning****!* | | | | | | |

**Section 3 – non-compulsory questions**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What do you like about Our City Tomorrow: A Draft Spatial Plan for Wellington City?  ***It’s a necessary but not sufficient step for a city that’s more liveable and affordable***  ***It’s tied to the city outcomes and engagements, and insofar as it goes, it’s a generally sensible way to distribute growth*** | | | | | | |
| 2. What would you change or improve?  ***Integrate it with transport planning. It’s not a spatial plan at the moment, nor really a fully-fledged landuse plan, it’s a housing plan.***  ***Integration of access (not transport, but access) with landuse is what a grownup city needs and Wellington deserves.***  ***A good starting point is Auckland’s Access for Everyone and the City Centre Masterplan.***  ***Inclusionary zoning or some other carefully-applied set of policy tools for affordability, coupled with good partnerships.*** | | | | | | |
| 3. Is there anything that needs to be considered as we plan for the future that is not provided for in Our City Tomorrow?  *We’ve put a whole slew of things here we think are important to follow through on, so pick and choose or just add ‘em all!*  ***Proper spatial planning that enables good mixing of uses and ensures good social-capital infrastructure like venues, urban marae, community centres and so on are provided for well in each urban heart and not forced out (e.g. noise restrictions / carparking requirements / places of worship / other spurious restrictions).***  ***A good design guide that enshrines good-quality urban environments (both indoors and out) and healthy approaches to local identity and character that celebrate identity fit for a multicultural city in a constitutionally bicultural nation, in the 21st century and beyond. A strong Aotearoa feel for our streets and public realm. Vitally, identity and character provisions must not be Trojan horses for protecting aspects of the status quo that don’t deserve protection.***  ***Transparent decision processes for ways different qualities of a development can be traded off: public realm, green space, biodiversity improvements, water sensitivity,***  ***A signoff and approvals process that clears the way for those developers and architects who “get it”, to have a progressively easier ride through the processes***  ***A street design and retrofitting approach that ensures public realm between the buildings becomes better, as the buildings themselves do. It should, for example, enable council and developers to easily create localised street improvements in a comprehensive development approach. This means coming hand in glove with new developments, so that (e.g.) an apartment block can prioritise bike and scooter storage knowing that improvements to surrounding streets will be prioritised so its residents will be able to safely and comfortably navigate them carfree.***  ***For greenfields in particular, having streetscapes built right from the outset as Healthy Streets is a non-negotiable.***  ***For brownfields and in general, Council should learn from Tauranga’s Infrastructure Development Code, articulating the Roads and Streets Framework and the Healthy Streets Approach. The Parking Policy and its implementation, logistics and deliveries policy, and transport planning and investment in general should be in lockstep with the approach of good density done well, enabling whole areas to improve.***  ***Enforced universal accessibility requirements – for the public realm and for buildings. Put into our Code and design standards***  ***Special provision for pocket parks and other miniature, localised, people-centred public realm space – including as popups, and enabling quicker temporary conversion of carparking spaces and other low-value street landuses as trials. This should include equivalents of the Auckland Design Office.***  ***A business support (Development Response) group in partnership with a series of BIDs, to engage, inform and support businesses through the disruption associated with major developments, building change and street change***  ***New partnerships for funding good developments, especially the infrastructure components, such that the burden of upgraded or new infrastructure is shared fairly and underground infrastructure (including water-sensitive building development) ceases to be a handbrake on good intensification***  ***New investment models so that insurance doesn’t price apartments out of the city*** | | | | | | |
| 4.To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements considering what is proposed for the inner suburbs:  *It’s OK.*  *The debates are hot but with a cool, objective eye, these provisions are a decent start.*  *They’ve already been heavily fought over behind closed doors, and will be heavily fought in court, where hopefully the financial privilege of property-owning, status-quo-prioritising folks doesn’t skew the pitch and the outcome too much.*  *So Agree or Neutral is good for all of these.* | | | | | | |
|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Not sure |
| 4.1 The refined approach to the pre-1930 character areas offers a good balance between protecting special character and providing new housing in these areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.2 The existing pre-1930 character demolition controls should be targeted to sub-areas within the inner suburbs that are substantially intact and consistent. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.3 The pre-1930 character demolition controls should be removed in areas that are no longer substantially intact and consistent or where character has been compromised. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Not sure |
| 4.4 There should be a continued emphasis on streetscape character in those areas outside of the proposed sub-areas through retention of a general character area to ensure that new development respects the local streetscape and is well-designed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.5 The refined approach to the pre-1930 character areas retains controls on demolition in the right locations where streetscape character is substantially intact. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.6 There is a good mix of housing types and heights that is suitable for the area given the city’s projected population growth and the need for more housing choice. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Thinking about Upper Stebbings Valley, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?  View this section of Our City Tomorrow (the Draft Spatial Plan):  planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz > Draft Spatial Plan > View Draft Spatial Plan > Opportunity Sites  *This section is sticky. WCC are pushing ahead with greenfield, cos developers love it and it’s very familiar to Kiwis.*  *But some of these are good moves, some very bad.* | | | | | | |
|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Not sure |
| 5.1 Developing the area between Churton Park and Tawa to create a new neighbourhood supports our goals of making Wellington a compact, resilient, vibrant and prosperous, inclusive and connected, greener city.  *Disagree or Strongly Disagree.*  *Should be a moratorium on greenfield in hilly areas draining into Porirua harbour until they can prove a featherlight water footprint and far less sediment per block than is normal.* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2 Connecting a future community in Upper Stebbings and Glenside with Takapu train station and the shops and services in Tawa will support public transport usage and access to economic opportunities.  *We interpret “connecting” as “build a road between”.*  *On that basis, answer is Disagree or Strongly Disagree for similar reasons to the above there’s far too little intensification around Takapu rail station already, which breaches the National Policy Statement on Urban Development’s requirements to intensify within the walking catchments of mass transit hubs. Flag some of the greenfield bit and intensify around Takapu instead!?* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.Thinking about the Lincolnshire Farm Structure Plan, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?  View this section of Our City Tomorrow (the Draft Spatial Plan):  planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz > Draft Spatial Plan > View Draft Spatial Plan > Opportunity Sites | | | | | | |
|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Not sure |
| 6.1 The Lincolnshire Farm Structure Plan should be reviewed to allow for a mix of housing types and to accommodate more dense housing options (such as townhouses and low rise apartments can be built in this area).  *Yes. This is a good move and frankly it’s a shocker that this wasn’t planned for in the first place. See our post on nearby* [*greenfield subdivision Stebbings Valley*](https://talkwellington.org.nz/2018/option-adoption-stebbings-valley-residential-development/) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. We also want to understand the public appetite for community planning processes in specific areas, such as:  **Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula**  This framework could cover matters such as how to maximise the benefits of living, working and visiting the area, investment in social and affordable housing aligned with public transport and greenspace, and how to ensure better connections to the City particularly with the future mass rapid transit route.  **Strathmore Park**  This could be to develop a plan for regenerating this suburb, which could include developing new modern or upgraded state housing with better public transport connections to the rest of the City, along with a range of other initiatives that could benefit the wider area including the neighborhood center. | | | | | | |
| 8. Do you support with the idea of **a community planning process** for the following areas?   * + 1. **Te Motu /Miramar Peninsula**   **☒ Yes** ☐ No ☐ Not sure   * + 1. **Strathmore Park**   **☒ Yes** ☐ No ☐ Not sure  *Community planning processes are a good thing, def support this!* | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9. If you answered yes, to the two questions above please respond to the following questions:  *Disclaimer: we’re not well connected to either Strathmore Park or Te Motu Kairangi, so these are some failsafes to include in any neighbourhood enhancement initiative.*  *Please add other stuff as you wish.* | | | | | | |
| 9.1.1 What should the **Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula Framework** focus on or cover?  ***Strong, authentic participatory planning***   * Emphasising meaningful public participation in decisions that affect them. When you experience it it’s a whole new word and you go “whoa, “consultation” is so superficial!” (<https://civicplan.ca/what-is-participatory-planning/>)   ***15-minute neighbourhoods***   * Explainer [here](https://www.c40knowledgehub.org/s/article/How-to-build-back-better-with-a-15-minute-city?language=en_US). And our post on 15-minute cities [here](https://talkwellington.org.nz/2020/the-15-minute-city/) * It’s basically: a neighbourhood where you can get \*everything\* you need for a decent life within a 15-minute walk, bike, wheelchair, scoot, or public transport trip (or combination of the above).   ***Urban sustainability***   * Integrating people into the environment (Pest Free Motu Kairangi is a great community-building initiative) | | | | | | |
| 9.1.2 What should the **plan for regenerating Strathmore Park** focus on or cover?  ***Strong, authentic participatory planning***  ***It’s particularly important here. as there are lots of people who don’t normally get heard in planning processes. Bring the conversation to people, with trusted local messengers, don’t expect them to come to the conversation.***  ***15-minute neighbourhoods***  ***Sustainable transport, public realm and people-friendly streets should all develop in lockstep with intensification in Strathmore Park as people have lower-paid jobs and more transport poverty and the city needs to bring them up.*** | | | | | | |
|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Not sure |
| 10. Overall do you agree with our proposed approach to protecting our natural environment and investment in our parks and open spaces?  View this section of Our City Tomorrow (the Draft Spatial Plan):  planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz >  Draft Spatial Plan > View Draft Spatial Plan  > Natural & Open Space  *This is solid* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Do you think Council should offer assistance to landowners to help them protect their Backyard Tāonga (the natural environment) on their private property?  Yes No Not sure  **YES**  ***This is a vital complement to regulatory controls (rules about what you can and can’t cut down on your property) as it helps people feel that their rights to do what they like with their property aren’t being just hit by the Big Rules Stick. It’s a good return on investment (see Hutt Valley’s*** [***fund and in-kind support***](http://www.huttcity.govt.nz/Your-Council/News-and-notices/media-releases/grant-scheme-to-support-indigenous-habitats-on-private-land-kicks-off/) ***for landowners protecting indigenous biodiversity on their land.)*** | | | | | | |
| 12. If you answered yes, to the question above what types of assistance would help landowners?  ***All of these***  ***Also development relaxations for really good initiatives – e.g. making a super biodiversity corridor in a comprehensive development as well as a parklet should allow you to do other stuff like add another storey.*** | | | | | | |
| Financial assistance Advice and guidance | Planting  Weed and pest control | | | Other *(please specify)* | | |
| 13. Are there any final comments you wish to include in your submission? If so, please provide your comments below.  ***There needs to be a really clear vision for the life we want to offer people in Wellington.***  ***Leadership is needed for this, meaning specific reductions in carbon footprint, specific improvements in economic diversity, in housing supply, in liveability indices.***  ***There should be an overall kaupapa of density done well in 15 minute neighbourhoods with easy walking or biking access to all the stuff you need to live like jobs, shops, schools, doctors and public transport within a quarter of an hour.***  ***I want to live in a city where most kids can and do bike to school!***  ***The street network needs to be developed in lockstep with what’s “between the streets”. Enough with the disjointed planning and investment.*** | | | | | | |
| 14. Have you provided an attached document? Yes **No** | | | | | | |
| *THAT’S IT! THERE’S SOME WEIRD FORMATTING HAPPENING BELOW BUT THAT’S ALL THE QUESTIONS DONE.* | | | | | | |