

Proposed Natural Resources Plan:

Submitter:

**Trelissick Park Group**

Submitter Number:

**S88**



588

# 1526307

**Darrell Young**

---

**From:** Regional Plan  
**Sent:** Friday, 25 September 2015 9:09 a.m.  
**To:** Records  
**Subject:** FW: Submission from Trelissick Park Group - Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region

**Categories:** Darrell

Wellington Regional Council

24 SEP 2015

**Paul Denton** | Senior Policy Advisor, Environmental Policy  
**GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL**  
*Te Pane Matua Taiao*  
Shed 39, 2 Fryatt Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011

PO Box 11646, Manners St, Wellington 6142  
T: 04 830 4037 | [www.gw.govt.nz](http://www.gw.govt.nz)

**From:** Peter Reimann [<mailto:peter.reimann@paradise.net.nz>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 24 September 2015 9:10 p.m.  
**To:** Regional Plan  
**Subject:** Submission from Trelissick Park Group - Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region

Submitter name: Peter Reimann  
Organisation:: Trelissick Park Group  
Organisation contact name: Peter Reimann  
Address: c/- 51 Heke Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035  
Phone: 04 938 9602  
Email: [peter.reimann@paradise.net.nz](mailto:peter.reimann@paradise.net.nz)  
Date: 25 September 2015

The Trelissick Park Group would like to congratulate Greater Wellington Regional Council on the thorough preparation of this Plan. We support all the measures proposed of interest to us - largely ecosystem health, public access, water discharges, stormwater, earthworks/vegetation clearance and the Kaiwharawhara Stream, tributaries, estuary and adjacent reclamation.

Trelissick Park, in the lower Kaiwharawhara and Korimako Stream valleys, is an integral part of the large catchment stretching from Khandallah to Karori and surrounds down to the harbour (about 20 km<sup>2</sup>). The maintenance and enhancement of the ecological corridors of the catchment from the harbour to the outer green belt are most important. We value the fish and bird movements through our Park, and then through Otari Wilton's Bush and Zealandia, as well as along the Korimako tributary with its source below Mt Kau Kau. Much riparian restoration has been undertaken by the Group since 1991 to enhance these movements. Specific comments are as follows.

### Stormwater

Relevant sections include: O23, O25, O48, R48, R49, R50, R51 and Table 3.4, P31, P32, P33, P73, P74, P75, Schedule N.

Flows - Concerns have long been expressed by the Group about the lack of stormwater control in the catchment. The Kaiwharawhara and Korimako Streams take all stormwater from the large urban catchment area from Karori to Khandallah and surrounds down to the harbour. We have long advocated for zero effect on stormwater runoff from any new developments by such measures as permeable surfaces, soak pits, roof tankage, planting and stormwater detention. More housing on the steep hillsides – together with predicted heavier rainfalls from climate change – have increased the already negative effects of fast flows washing away stream banks as well as on water quality. We note Greater Wellington's (GW's) provisions in P73 "implementing water sensitive urban design in new subdivision and development". The Wellington City Council (WCC) has produced a Water Sensitive Urban Design Guide but is not actually enforcing it, even for its own projects. We would like to see mandatory zero effect on stormwater runoff from any new developments in both this Plan and within WCC plans.

Water Quality – We note aquatic ecosystem health provisions in this Plan. We are concerned about pollutants entering the stormwater system from car washing, paint/cement cleaning and chemicals sloughing off from vehicle use on roads – highlighted by recent adverse publicity. We request that the Kaiwharawhara and Korimako Streams be included in M10 "Water quality investigations and remediation actions".

We support the provisions in M15, concerning Regional and local authority collaboration.

### **Fish Passage**

We note O29 "Use and development provides for the passage of fish and koura, and the passage of indigenous fish and koura is restored", also P35 and M21 on restoring fish passage. There are currently some barriers in the Kaiwharawhara and Korimako stream systems which WCC are investigating and we would like to see GW playing a part in this.

### **Ecosystems and Habitats with Significant Indigenous Biodiversity**

Relevant sections include O35, P40, P41, P42, P43 and Schedules F1 and F4.

We are pleased to see that the Kaiwharawhara Stream, tributaries and estuary are designated as "Ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values". We believe it is vital that this designation is retained.

### **Kaiwharawhara Estuary Area**

What happens at the estuary can have negative effects upstream - it has its own values which need both protecting and improving. In this context, we are aware that CentrePort may extend its port activities in this area but no details have yet been given to 'interested parties'. We request that GW retains the valued natural resources of this estuary area. The fact that, in the past, authorities approved reclamation plans, the concreting of stream banks and the building of two ugly bridges, does not mean further degradation should be permitted – rather this Plan can support and improve the biodiversity of the area. It is our 'good fortune' that the estuary remains open to the sky although having lost its original appearance and in spite of plans to culvert it. It is the only remaining open estuary within WCC boundaries entering the harbour and as such needs treasuring. We have noted the email from the GW Chairman of 5 August to the Wellington Civic Trust that this Plan "will protect the integrity of the Kaiwharawhara stream and provide an adequate basis for the accommodation of commercial activity by the port" and that for CentrePort's long term plans GW regularly raise with them "the need to ensure that the integrity of the northern end of their operations is a matter of high priority to GW".

We note also that in past years DOC installed some nesting boxes for little blue penguins upstream near Spotlight, but they were swept away during flooding. We would be delighted if they could be encouraged to return.

## **Natural Character**

Relevant sections include P24, P25 and M24.

We support these objectives and policies for the Kaiwharawhara estuary and the public northern beach of the reclamation. Whilst recognising that they are part of an old reclamation plan (thus not the original coastal scene), over the years and with some public input they have been developing their own natural character. With further environmental enhancement, they have the potential to develop into areas with high natural character, particularly in terms of their perceptual (experiential) values and therefore could be considered under these policies.

As general access to the reclaimed land is prohibited by CentrePort, our Group's permitted entry to the area during the annual coastal clean-up is most important, and volunteers thoroughly enjoy the positive ambience of both the northern beach and the estuary provided by the seabirds, the rolling tidal waters meeting the stream outlet, the gentle slopes of the northern beach, the extensive views of the city and the wider harbour and – on a sunny windless day – a general feeling of peacefulness. The question is will this Proposed Natural Resources Plan sufficiently cover protection from inappropriate development for this area as its (perceived) natural character increases over time.

Background. Some GW officers will have been involved in the GW's 1990s exercise for a regional Landscape Plan. Our Group – both on its own but also as a member of the Kaiwharawhara Reclamation Working Group – attended various meetings and made submissions on the Plan outlining the area's attributes for significant landscape status. But in 1998 GW withdrew the proposal and instead intended to produce a set of guidelines for regionally significant landscapes, with Wellington Harbour as one of five areas selected. Again our Group attended relevant workshops. Then in March 2000 we were informed that GW had ceased work on landscape guidelines but would investigate "more practical means of implementing its responsibilities with respect to the region's landscapes". Later in 2000 GW initiated a Lower Kaiwharawhara Stream Project (John Holmes) which was followed by the enhancement of the south side of the estuary with rocks and plantings. Also GW and WCC commissioned a plan for the estuary area by Conrad Pharazyn.

Thus over a period of around 20 years efforts have been made to provide this area with some protection (from inappropriate development) and enhancement - hoping the public could have greater access to its amenities. Hopefully, following this current GW consultation, the Natural Resources Plan will retain its positive provisions for natural character status and provide some finality for protection and enhancement of the estuary and the public northern beach to make them a worthy addition to the sparse public coastal amenities in this part of the harbour.

Also, with DOC managing the public northern beach of the reclamation (which needs proper public access), it would seem appropriate to transfer the title for the estuary and its immediate surrounds, from CentrePort back to GW (where it was originally when Wellington Harbour Board transferred title for the whole area to the ownership of the Regional Council).

## **Public Access to Coastal Marine Area**

Relevant sections include O9, O10, O55, P9, M22.

These sections refer to public access along the coastal marine area. There is the public beach on the northern side of the Kaiwharawhara reclamation (managed by DOC) which needs preserving and improving. In past years this was used and enjoyed by the public for fishing, launching boats and just as a beach – particularly suitable for the young with its shallow water. Access to this public area is now virtually denied by CentrePort and KiwiRail, but could be provided for under this Plan. The estuary itself can be accessed by the public, including those waiting to go on the ferry, enabling them to appreciate (in particular) the bird life at the waters edge and the views across the harbour (although more effort could improve its attractiveness).

## **Definitions**

A definition of “structure” should be added to 2.2 (referred to eg in P138).

We do not wish to speak to this submission.

Regards,

Peter Reimann  
(Chairman, Trelissick Park Group  
[www.trelissickpark.org.nz](http://www.trelissickpark.org.nz))