

*This document is a suggested draft personal submission to WCC's Spatial Plan Review. It has been compiled by the Johnsonville Community Association (JCA) and is based on the understanding of senior members who have worked to support the Johnsonville community engagement with Wellington City Council over the past decade. This includes the JCA experience in 2012/13 when the WCC imposed the Medium Density Residential Area across the centre of our suburb.*

*That said, this is a guide. You should change any answer and edit any comment that does not reflect your views on the proposed Spatial Plan.*

*The document is designed to be completed by an individual and emailed directly to WCC – either*

- *to be a guide for people to complete their online submission at WCC's website.*
- *updated and emailed as an attached Word document, or*
- *Cut & pasted into the body of an email (fast and easy method).*

*NOTE: submissions close Monday 5 October 5pm, but extensions of up to a week are readily available ON REQUEST from WCC (email to the address below)*

**Complete the segments in Red (\* fields are required)** with your personal details

Where there is a choice of options, please delete all except the one you wish to select.

The email for your submission is: [planningforgrowth@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:planningforgrowth@wcc.govt.nz)

---

## **Individual Submission: *Our City Tomorrow*: Draft Spatial Plan for Wellington City**

**Name (first and last) \*:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email address \*:** \_\_\_\_\_

I would like to receive a copy of my submission by email

- Yes

- No

Postal address: \_\_\_\_\_

Suburb \* *(Please Delete those not appropriate)*

- **Johnsonville** Broadmeadows Churton Park Glenside  
Grenada Village Khandallah Newlands Ohariu  
Paparangi Woodridge
- Other

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

Age range \* *(Please delete those not appropriate)*

- Under 18
- 18 – 24
- 25 – 34
- 35 – 44
- 45 – 54
- 55 – 64
- 65 – 74
- 75 and older

Household \*

-- Please Select *(Please delete those not appropriate)*

- Couple without children
- Household with children living at home
- Household with children who are no longer living at home
- Household of unrelated persons (flatting)
- Other

Preferred method of contact *(Please delete option not appropriate) \**

- Email
- Post (address required)

I would like to sign up to our email newsletter and receive news and updates regarding Planning for Growth *(Please delete those not appropriate)*

- Yes
- No

I am making this submission - *(Please delete those not appropriate) \**

- **as an individual**

- on behalf of an organisation
- 

To what extent do you agree or disagree with what is proposed with intensification in the Central City.

- **Strongly Agree**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with what is proposed with intensification in the Inner Suburbs.

- **Strongly Disagree**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with what is proposed with intensification in the Outer Suburbs.

- **Strongly Disagree**

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? \*

- **Strongly Disagree**

If you disagree, where would you distribute the additional 80,000 people across the city over the next 30 years?

- Wellington is a city living far beyond the capacity of its supporting infrastructure; particularly in “three waters” services. It is wrong to plan to add so much new housing without first rectifying the infrastructure deficit.
- Wellington’s geography means it is physically restrained from such levels of growth without damaging the amenity values and “liveability” that make Wellington such a desirable place to reside. Wellington has traditionally been a seat for workers who commute from nearby satellite cities, and as Wellington reaches capacity, this formula is even more appropriate. We are surrounded by six satellite cities and other rural areas, each with far better capacity for population growth and ability to be serviced by fast, efficient, cheap and sustainable electric train connection to Wellington. Rather than degrading Wellington’s liveability, these satellite population centres should share the population growth sustainably. Otherwise, the proposed level of growth will destroy the quality of life that Wellingtonians value.

- For over a decade, WCC has proceeded with an Urban Development Strategy stating that the distribution of population growth should be:
  - one third central city and inner suburbs, including apartments
  - one third suburban in-fill, and
  - one third “greenfields”.

I support the continuation of that long-standing and fundamentally sound approach. WCC needs to ensure that this pre-existing strategy can work, such as following these recommendations:

- GREENFIELDS: Land currently zoned for residential development has been “landbanked” by developers. WCC should work with the central government to change policies to enable swift greenfields development.
- GREENFIELDS: Rural land close to the city boundary should be considered for rezoning for residential development.
- CENTRAL/INNER CITY: All international best-practice points to more and higher-density residential developments within walking distance of the city. This should be expanded in Wellington to allow the highest possible residential intensity in areas within a 10-minute walking distance of the city’s two biggest employers, Wellington Hospital (Newtown) and Victoria University (Kelburn campus).

---

To what extent do you agree or disagree with how we have balanced protecting special character and providing new housing in the inner suburbs.

- **Strongly Disagree**

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 the character in these suburbs is important to you? \*

- While I support heritage protection, the “character” of inner suburbs is far less important than ensuring that more people have a chance to find affordable housing. Dramatic increases in the available residential accommodation close to the city centre is critical, where residents can access the vibrant city centre – including its work cultural and sporting opportunities – easily and efficiently, without clogging roads or wasting resources on transport unnecessarily

What amenities would you want to help create a vibrant suburban centre?  
*(please pick your top 5 from the options below) \**

- 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)



What amenities would you want to see around future mass rapid transit stops? *(please pick your top 5 from the options below) \**

- 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)



*\*Click the image to expand the fact sheet or [view the full draft spatial plan here](#)*

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement:

*Our City Tomorrow outlines 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.*

- **Strongly Disagree**

CVID-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? \*



What amenities or facilities were missing or could have been improved? \*



What do you like about Our City Tomorrow: A Draft Spatial Plan for Wellington City?



What would you change or improve?

The consultation process – for such an enormously significant piece of work - has been inadequate. The communication has been poor so most residents still do not know this consultation is happening.

This set of consultation documents is enormous – ordinary people would need 6 months to digest this data and provide an informed response. Key information is only in the online map ... there is no normal document that contains the proposed Spatial Plan changes.

The policies and the maps are inconsistent – i.e., they frequently contradict each other. Key information such as data on the impact of the Spatial Plan on each suburb was released late or is still not available.

The Spatial Plan represents an abandonment of WCC's responsibility to support its targeted level of greenfield residential development. In doing so, WCC appears to have given up trying to curb land speculation (especially in the northern suburbs).

The central and inner city suburbs, where more people aspire to live, will have a lower share of intensification than they should. All the suburbs of

the city should share population growth, with a focus on building affordable housing where it's most needed, and to build the housing types that more people will want to buy.

Is there anything that needs to be considered as we plan for the future that is not provided for in Our City Tomorrow?

The Spatial Plan specifically excludes consideration of adding more land that could be developed for housing. The WCC must consider all options to address this housing crisis and provide affordable housing to our city.

---

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements considering what is proposed for the Inner Suburbs.

*The refined approach to the pre-1930 character areas offers a good balance between protecting special character and providing new housing in these areas.*

- Agree\_– I want less “character” protection, while preserving “heritage”

*The existing pre-1930 character demolition controls should be targeted to sub-areas within the inner suburbs that are substantially intact and consistent.*

- **Agree – But, there should be fewer of them.**

*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**

*There should be a continued emphasis on streetscape character in those areas outside of the proposed sub-areas through the retention of a general character area to ensure that new development respects local streetscape and is well-designed.*

- **Disagree – New development should be encouraged to create a modern form that is primarily efficient and liveable**

*The refined approach to the pre-1930 character areas retains controls on demolition in the right locations and where streetscape character is substantially intact.*

- **Agree**

*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.*

- **Agree - There should be more and larger inner city new developments to cope with growing population.**

---

Thinking about Upper Stebbings Valley, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? [View this section of Our City Tomorrow \(the Draft Spatial Plan\) here](#)

*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, and greener city.*

- **Strongly Agree**



*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.*

- **Strongly Agree**
- 

Thinking about the Lincolnshire Farm Structure Plan, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: [View this section of Our City Tomorrow \(the Draft Spatial Plan\) here](#)

*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).*

- **Strongly - Agree, providing public transport can be improved to service this intensification.**
- 

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.

Do you support the idea of a community planning process for the following areas:

Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula

- **Yes**

Strathmore Park

- **Yes**

If you answered yes, to the two questions above please respond to the following questions:

What should Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula Framework focus on or cover?

- **Affordable housing**

What should the plan for regenerating Strathmore Park focus on or cover?

- **Affordable housing**

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 \(the Draft Spatial Plan\) here](#)

- **Disagree** - WCC is not doing enough to protect our natural environment. Parks around Johnsonville are overrun with noxious weeds, and Johnsonville open spaces are constantly being compromised (e.g. converted into car parks, etc). Our precious open spaces need a higher level of protection from WCC.

Do you think Council should offer assistance to landowners to help them protect their Backyard Tāonga (the natural environment) on their private property?

- **Yes**

If you answered yes to the question above, what types of assistance would help landowners?

**Provide advice on protecting natural biodiversity and combating pests**

- Financial assistance
- Advice and guidance
- Planting
- Weed and pest control

Other (please specify)

---

Are there any final comments you wish to include in your submission?  
If so, please provide your comments below.

The Spatial Plan is missing important information on the future capacity requirements, such as increased capacity for education, recreation and employment. There is no information on where and how building affordable housing will be made possible. This is not a Spatial Plan; it is just a zoning plan.

One notable example of WCC disconnected planning is the Let's Get Wellington Moving plan for a \$2 billion rapid transport line to Wellington South and East which, under the Spatial Plan, are the areas to have the lowest population growth. The WCC has no plan to build Rapid Transport to high growth suburbs such as Karori or Johnsonville.

This plan represents an unsustainable change to the WCC Urban Development Strategy. This plan puts a disproportionate burden of new residential development on Western and especially Northern outer suburbs which are the least "efficient" places for sustainability and a compact city. This plan puts an unsustainable and unfair number of people into Johnsonville when there are better alternative areas for future Wellingtonians to live.