



Report 10.187  
Date 12 April 2010  
File TP/03/17/09

Committee Wairarapa Corridor Plan Hearings Subcommittee  
Author Tim Henwood – Policy Analyst

## **Process for considering submissions on the draft Wairarapa Corridor Plan**

### **1. Purpose**

To outline the process for handling submissions, both at this meeting and following the consideration of submissions.

### **2. Significance of the decision**

The matters for decision in this report do not trigger the significance policy of the Council or otherwise trigger section 76(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002.

#### **2.1 Public Consultation**

This meeting completes the public consultation phase on the draft Wairarapa Corridor Plan (draft Plan).

The Wairarapa Corridor Plan Hearings Subcommittee must consider both the oral and written submissions it receives at this meeting, and must decide what, if any, changes it wishes to recommend that the Regional Transport Committee make to the draft Plan.

#### **2.2 Principles of consultation**

Six principles of consultation are set out in the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act). One of these principles is that views presented to a local authority should be accepted with an open mind, and should be given due consideration by the local authority, in making a decision.

It is consistent with best practice that members hearing submissions must be present for the duration of the hearing of the oral submissions.

### **3. Submissions received**

Greater Wellington has received 36 submissions on the draft Plan.

### **3.1 Distribution of submissions**

A copy of all the written submissions has been distributed to members of the Subcommittee (under separate cover).

## **4. Comment**

### **4.1 Draft Plan submission process**

#### 4.1.1 Oral presentations

The purpose of this meeting is to hear oral presentations in support of written submissions. At the time of writing, 15 submitters have requested that they be heard on the draft Plan.

Ten minutes have been allocated to each submitter. This allows approximately five minutes for the submitter to present their key points and five minutes for Subcommittee members to ask questions of clarification. Please note that the hearings timetable is, at the time of writing, being confirmed. The final timetable will be provided at the meeting on 23 April 2010.

#### 4.1.2 Written submissions

The Subcommittee must consider all written submissions, regardless of whether or not an oral submission has been made. It is suggested that written submissions are taken as read by the Subcommittee, and that members only discuss those submissions on which they want to make a particular comment or seek officers' response.

#### 4.1.3 Consideration of issues raised in submissions

The principles of consultation, set out in section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002, apply to the submission process. It is important that Subcommittee members retain an open mind in the consideration of submissions. Members must be present for the hearings and deliberations in order to participate in the decision making of the Subcommittee. There will be an opportunity to discuss the issues raised in both written and oral submissions once all submissions have been heard.

### **4.2 Process after consideration of submissions**

The Subcommittee's recommendations on the draft Plan will be considered by the Regional Transport Committee at its meeting on 16 June 2010.

It is proposed that each submitter receives a copy of the report identifying the final changes to the Wairarapa Corridor Plan recommended by the Subcommittee to the Regional Transport Committee, including commentary around the reasons for these recommendations. Under the Local Government Act 2002, reasons must be given for decisions made, including a decision not to take any action.

Submitters will also receive a table setting out personal responses to the key points of their submission.

## 5. Recommendations

*That the Subcommittee:*

1. ***Receives the report;***
2. ***Hears the oral submissions;***
3. ***Agrees to consider all written and oral submissions in the manner set out in section 4 of this report.***

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

**Tim Henwood**  
Policy Analyst

**Francis Ryan**  
Manager  
Democratic Services