

---

## **FEEDBACK ON THE OVERSEAS PASSENGER TERMINAL CONCEPT DESIGN PROPOSAL**

---

### **1. Purpose of Report**

To provide the Subcommittee with a summary of the feedback received during consultation on the Overseas Passenger Terminal (OPT) concept design proposal.

### **2. Recommendations**

It is recommended the Subcommittee:

1. *Receive the information*
2. *Note that Council officers have undertaken a programme of public feedback.*
3. *Note that with the exception of the marina berth holders who have a specific issue with one aspect of the redevelopment there are mixed views on the OPT proposal, but general support for the design concept.*
4. *Note that the negotiations with the marina berth holder representatives are in progress and an oral update will be provided to the Subcommittee*
5. *Note that on 8 May the Subcommittee agreed that the proposal met the requirements of the design brief and the Waterfront Framework.*
6. *Note that the financial terms of the proposal have not been considered by and are outside the delegation of the Subcommittee but that WWL advise that negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily.*
7. *Note that the decision to grant a 125 year lease is outside the delegations of the Waterfront Development Subcommittee.*

8. *Agree, subject to any further views raised by oral submitters and subject to the update on berth holder negotiations, to recommend to the Strategy and Policy Committee that the Subcommittee supports the OPT proposal and ask the Strategy and Policy Committee to consider the 125 year lease, including the robustness of the commercial returns.*

### **3. Background**

The Waterfront Framework calls for the OPT to be retained and developed as part of the development of the Waitangi Park Precinct. As with all buildings on the waterfront, the Framework requires that buildings support the surrounding open spaces, both in their design and in their associated uses and activities.

A three stage process from April 2004 to April 2006 was carried out by Wellington Waterfront Ltd (WWL) to select a developer and concept design for the redevelopment of the OPT. In April 2005 Willis Bond & Co (WB) was selected as the preferred developer and invited to exclusively take part in the final stage of this process. Wellington Waterfront Limited was satisfied that the final WB proposal met the requirements of the design brief and the Waterfront Framework and it was presented to the Waterfront Development Subcommittee on 8 May 2006. The Subcommittee agreed that the proposal met the aforementioned requirements and agreed to the undertaking of a public feedback programme, subject to the receipt of satisfactory legal advice in respect of marina car parking. The Chair of the Subcommittee, to whom this responsibility was delegated, has subsequently reported back to Subcommittee members that it was in order for the public feedback programme to proceed.

Accordingly a programme of public feedback was undertaken from Thursday 11 May to Friday 9 June. Late submissions were accepted.

Seventy-two submissions were received by the closing date, and two were received during the week following the deadline. A summary of the submissions is attached as Appendix One to this report and a full copy of each submission is in Report 1.

The plan was advertised through the Dominion Post, the Wellingtonian and the Capital Times and on the Wellington Waterfront website. WWL produced an 'On The Waterfront' Special Edition outlining the proposal along with a submission form, in both hard and soft copy.

Flyers were sent to all Oriental Bay residents and northern end Mount Victoria residents advising of the Public Open Day. Stakeholder presentations were delivered to OPT tenants, marina berth holders, Our Waterfront and the Civic Trust. Presentations were offered to, but not taken up by Oriental Bay and Mount Victoria Residents Associations and Waterfront Watch.

Hard copies of the proposal and the submission form were held at both the Waterfront Information Centre and the Council Offices on Wakefield Street from Thursday 11 May

until present. Copies were also available on request and were provided to the Council's Call Centre to mail out when requested.

### **4. Analysis**

#### **4.1 Summary of Written Submissions**

Appendix One provides a summary of all comments, and the submissions themselves are included in their entirety. Seventy-four submissions were received, of which seventy were made by individuals and four were made by groups. The details below outline the key assertions made by the submitters but it should be noted that not all points made in submissions have been included and that some submissions included multiple points.

#### **4.2 Key assertions from Written Submissions**

Of the submissions received, twenty-five were in favour of the redevelopment of the OPT and the concept design being proposed. The main reason for supporting the proposal was the attraction and activity it would bring to an area considered to be in need of rejuvenation.

Twenty-one submissions were outright opposed to the proposal and there were several reasons that were given for this view. The vast majority of these people were identified as marina berth holders and their reasons for opposing the proposal projected similar themes. Some of these echoed concerns voiced by other submitters who weren't necessarily opposed to the proposal.

Twenty seven submitters were concerned that there would be insufficient parking for the marina users, and the public in general, and that this would be exacerbated by the increased traffic as a result of more tenants and restaurants in the area. Twenty-three submissions said that the increased height of the OPT was excessive for its location and would significantly reduce views as a result. Twenty-three submitters commented on the lack of alternatives, and that feedback was being sought on only one proposed course of action.

Eighteen submitters felt that WWL were responsible for the wharves being in a state of disrepair and that it was their responsibility to make good the wharves, and that this shouldn't necessarily require the OPT to be redeveloped. Sixteen submissions commented that there were already more than enough restaurants in the area. Sixteen submitters felt that the redevelopment should address marina activities and support services to the current marina community.

#### **4.3 Other**

Seven submitters were concerned that there would be a decrease in public access to the OPT as a result of the proposed development. Seven submitters felt that the granting of a 125 year lease was effectively privatising publicly owned land, to which they were opposed. A further three submissions felt that the redevelopment should benefit the whole public, and not just the developers, investors and tenants.

Five submissions considered that there were other more appropriate uses for the OPT including being the location of the proposed marine centre or music school. Five submitters felt that there should be greater retention of maritime themes in all or at least some aspects of the design.

A range of points raised by no more than one or two submitters have been included below for the Subcommittee to note:

- Consideration should be given to a percentage of the apartments being set aside for people on lower incomes.
- Some submissions were concerned that the scale and impression of buildings depicted in models, photos and plans may be deceptive.
- It should be noted that though there was significant concern regarding the height of the proposed building, there were very few submissions opposed to the actual design of the OPT.
- There should be less car parking and the waterfront should be pedestrian friendly.
- It is important to ensure that all the proposed ground floor activity materialises and that high occupancy levels are maintained.
- Some consideration should be given to climate changes and the use of sustainable resources in the development of the waterfront.
- Development should ensure that there are sufficient public facilities and amenities on the OPT.
- Redevelopment should consider retention of heritage wherever possible.

## 5. Changes Indicated

### 5.1 *Written Submissions*

From the summary of key points for written submissions, it can be seen that the numbers of submissions for and against the proposal were quite similar, twenty-five versus twenty-one respectively. However, the single largest issue within the submissions was that of car parking, over which concern was raised by twenty-seven submitters, a large number of whom are marina berth holders. WWL are taking steps to address this issue and have set up a working group to meet with representatives of the marina berth holders in order to try to reach agreement.

Importantly there were few negative comments over the actual proposed design of the building, and of the twenty-five submissions supporting the proposal, the majority commented on the design in a very positive fashion.

Based on the written submissions received it is not possible to establish that there is a widely held view on any of the issues raised. Further to this, an approximately equal number of submitters supported the proposal as opposed it. Therefore on balance, Council Officers recommend that the Subcommittee supports the OPT design proposal.

### **5.2 Oral Submissions**

#### **5.3**

On the Submission form for the OPT design proposal, members of the public were asked if they would like to make an oral submission. Sixteen people requested the opportunity to make an oral submission, and the names of the submitters, and the times at which they have been invited to speak have been previously detailed in Report 1.

As noted above, based on the written submissions no changes to the OPT design proposal are recommended. However, members of the Subcommittee will listen to the oral submissions and make any changes to the proposal that they consider necessary as a result.

## **6. Conclusion**

The consultation process allowed individuals and groups to provide their thoughts and suggestions on the OPT design proposal. Subject to no further issues arising from the oral submissions and subject to satisfactory resolution of the car parking issue, Council Officers recommend that the Subcommittee support the OPT proposal as it meets the requirements of the design brief and the Waterfront Framework.

*Report prepared by: Ian Clements, Portfolio Manager, Council Controlled Organisations*

<b>Supporting Information</b>
<p><b>1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome</b>  <i>The Waterfront Development Plan would contribute to the following Council outcomes:</i>  <i>More Liveable – Wellington will be a great place to be, offering a variety of places to live, work and play within a high quality environment.</i>  <i>Stronger sense of place – Wellington will have a strong local identity that celebrates and protects its sense of place, capital-city status, distinctive landform and landmarks, defining features, history, heritage buildings, places and spaces.</i>  <i>More Eventful – Wellington will maximise the economic value from promoting and hosting high-profile events.</i>  <i>More Prosperous – Wellington’s urban form, and flexible approach to land use planning in the central city, will contribute to economic growth and prosperity.</i></p>
<p><b>2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact</b>  <i>C378 Wellington Waterfront Project.</i>  <i>A312 Wellington Waterfront Operations.</i>  <i>CX131 Wellington Waterfront Development.</i>  <i>In accord with the 2006/07 LTCCP.</i></p>
<p><b>3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations</b>  <i>Maori have had a long connection with the harbour and waterfront that continues today. There are several sites of significance for iwi around the waterfront including Waitangi Lagoon and Te Aro Pa.</i></p>
<p><b>4) Decision-Making</b>  <i>This is not a significant decision.</i></p>
<p><b>5) Consultation</b>  <b>a) General Consultation</b>  <i>Consultation will be undertaken on the draft development plan. All affected parties will be included, and any feedback will be reported to the Subcommittee.</i></p> <p><b>b) Consultation with Maori</b>  <i>Representatives from Council’s mana whenua Treaty partners – Wellington Tenth Trust and Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira were involved in the development of the Wellington Waterfront Framework that underpins the Waterfront Development Plan.</i></p>
<p><b>6) Legal Implications</b>  <i>There are no implications from this report.</i></p>
<p><b>7) Consistency with existing policy</b>  <i>This report is consistent with existing WCC policy on waterfront development.</i></p>