
REPORT 4
(1215/52/IM)

FEEDBACK ON THE 008/09 DRAFT WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1. Purpose of Report

To provide the Strategy and Policy Committee with a summary of the feedback received during consultation on the draft Waterfront Development Plan for 2008/09, and to recommend the adoption of an amended Waterfront development Plan for 2008/09.

2. Executive Summary

- Officers will be presenting a paper to the Strategy and Policy Committee in early October, which will discuss the ten year work programme and various options for implementing the programme in terms of the allocation of responsibilities between Wellington Waterfront Limited and the Council.
- In light of the '*October paper*', the 2008/09 draft Waterfront Development Plan has focussed on the current financial year (as opposed to the normal three year time frame)
- New projects and financial implications are considered to be best discussed within the longer term context of the October paper and the broader LTCCP considerations.
- Key issues raised within submissions have been the Frank Kitts Park redevelopment i.e. timing and affordability and the public consultation process for the future development plans for the Queens Wharf area – the 'Outer T' in particular.
- It is recommended that the timing of two particular projects be amended to enable consideration within the context of the October paper. Namely, the deferral of the planning work for the Frank Kitts Park redevelopment and the Queens Wharf planning exercise. It is otherwise recommended that the Committee approve the draft 2008/09 Waterfront Development Plan

3. Recommendations

Officers recommend that the Committee:

- 1. Receives the information.*
- 2. Approve the draft 2008/09 Waterfront Development Plan subject to any changes required by the Committee.*
- 3. Approve the 2008/09 programme of work outlined in Appendix Four of this report, subject to any changes required by the Committee.*
- 4. Delegate to the Portfolio Leader, Urban Development & Transport, the authority to approve any amendments to the 2008/09 Waterfront Development Plan as required to reflect the changes agreed by the Committee.*
- 5. Note that there is a paper to be presented to the Committee in October 2008 that considers the 10 year work programme for the waterfront and implementation options in terms of the functions of Wellington Waterfront Limited and the Council*

4. Background

Consultation on the draft 2008/09 Waterfront Development Plan opened on 3 July 2008 and closed at 5pm 31 July 2008. The consultation lasted for 28 calendar days (20 working days). Late submissions were accepted.

The plan was advertised in the Dominion Post and on the Council's website. The Council made the draft plan and submission form available at the Council Service centre at 101 Wakefield Street and at Wellington city libraries. Copies were available on request and the information could also be downloaded from the Council's website.

Thirteen submissions were received (one which was received after the deadline). A summary of all the submissions is attached as *Appendix One* to this report and a full copy of all submissions is attached as *Appendix Two*.

It should be noted that in terms of the projects identified within the Development Plan, the only significant change in scope from what has been indicated in earlier plans is the proposed planning exercise for the broader Queens Wharf area. Other than that, the draft 2008/09 Waterfront Development Plan focuses on the timing of the various projects. The Plan continues to implement the Framework and elements of the Plan are consulted on as separate initiatives as well. A copy of the draft Waterfront Development Plan is attached as *Appendix Three*.

It is important to note that a paper will be presented to Strategy and Policy Committee in early October, which will discuss the ten year work programme, various options for implementing the waterfront project and the on-going maintenance of the waterfront generally. As a consequence, the 2008/09 Plan focuses on the current financial year only, with the October paper to inform the longer term work programme and future waterfront development plans.

A programme of work for the Waterfront for the current financial year has been derived from the Waterfront Development Plan – this is presented in Appendix Four. Please note that at this stage, the attached programme of works includes two projects that are recommended to be deferred until the October meeting of the Committee. This is discussed further within section 5.1 of this report.

5. Consultation

5.1 Methodology

This analysis summarises the key issues from submissions made on the draft Waterfront Development Plan 2008/09. The scope of the analysis aims to be broad enough to inform the Committee's decision but sufficiently focused to be accessible and meaningful.

Of the thirteen submissions:

- nine were made by individuals
- four were made by groups

Four submitters made oral presentations to the Strategy and Policy Committee at the 7 August 2008 meeting.

The website and formal submission forms included a privacy statement which outlined that all submissions (including name and contact details) are published and made publicly available to elected members and the public.

The late submission received was accepted in the interests of providing the Committee with as full a picture of public sentiment as possible.

The summary below outlines key matters raised by the submitters. It is noted that the draft Waterfront Development plan is about the phasing/timing of the projects and the financial spend associated with these projects and their timing.

5.2 Summary of Written Submissions

Waterfront Development generally

Three submitters, Pauline & Athol Swann, Rosamund Averton and Waterfront Watch, specifically state their opposition to any more buildings (other than small buildings) on the waterfront. After congratulating WWL on a number of successful waterfront developments, Ms Averton suggested at her oral submission that the waterfront should be “left as it is now”.

There were two submissions supporting the 2008/09 draft Waterfront Development Plan in general, recognising the developments to date and expressing the view that the waterfront is more attractive and accessible now than it was a few years ago.

Governance

The submission from Pauline and Athol Swann expresses the view that Wellington Waterfront Limited (WWL) should be disbanded and the management role be returned to the Council.

This issue has been raised previously and the Council’s legal advice strongly recommends against the dissolution of WWL due to the potential implications of the Foreshore and Seabed Act i.e. loss of Council ownership of the waterfront.

In terms of the *functions* performed by WWL, this is a matter that will be considered in greater detail within the October paper.

Public Engagement

Submissions have raised concerns over public engagement, stating that the process is flawed and they felt that there is a loss in public confidence in this process. The concern stems from the perception that there is a degree of pre-determination that undermines the value of consultation processes.

Many of the submissions discuss the decision making process and encourage further consideration of the best mechanisms for incorporating public input into waterfront developments. In particular, a common theme through the submissions is the desire to establish clear responsibilities and processes for design competitions for the various waterfront projects. The attachment to the submission from The Wellington Civic Trust discusses this at some length.

Ms Averton suggests the establishment of a “Waterfront Reference Group” to provide input from representatives of the public to balance the “*input provided from developers and TAG*”.

The concerns raised will be considered in the October paper which will discuss the roles and responsibilities of the various entities that have an involvement or interest in the waterfront project.

Finance

One submission commented on the development expenditure and in particular the risk of “extra burden” on ratepayer funding. The assumed (and subsequently not forthcoming) revenue from the Hilton Hotel was highlighted as an example of the need to now consider reducing expenditure. Generally the financial position of the waterfront project and the ability, or otherwise, to fund intended projects is raised as a matter of concern.

The submissions from Pauline & Athol Swann and Waterfront Watch draw attention to the statement of the Waterfront Development Framework which says: “Public Space development does not depend for funding on commercial development”. It is important to note, however, that the Framework explicitly anticipates that the majority of funding for the waterfront project will come from commercial revenue.

The October paper will, among other things, consider the financial implications of development on the waterfront for the longer term. It will be difficult to consider this issue properly in the context of the one year time frame considered under the 2008/09 Waterfront Development Plan, and it is recommended that the Committee consider this further with the benefit of the October paper.

Indoor Sports Facilities

Three submissions (numbered 4, 5 and 6) commented on the provision of indoor sports facilities on the waterfront. The submissions highlight the community benefits of having indoor sports facilities located within close proximity to the central city.

This issue was canvassed extensively during last year’s consultation on the 2007/08 draft Waterfront Development Plan. In response, the issue has been identified in the 2008/09 Plan as a matter to be considered in the long term planning for the waterfront. Whether such facilities require a waterfront location is something that can be considered as part of the wider waterfront project and at a broader Council level in terms of its recreational policies.

Berthage

Submissions commented on berthage, highlighting in particular the need to maintain, or in some cases expand, berthing at Queens Wharf and the Overseas Passenger Terminal. One submission commented that it was important to have a cruise liner berth and that there should be no restriction on the length of the vessels able to use Queens Wharf. Neville Robison’s oral submission, in which he presented his model to the Committee, emphasised the importance that he sees in continuing to provide for boating and shipping movements on the waterfront.

Kumutoto

Some submissions were concerned about the design and height of the Meridian building which led onto concerns around the bulk and height of any future buildings within the area. These submissions specifically opposed any development on sites 8, 9 and 10. One submission expressed concern over the negative impacts development will have on the heritage buildings within the area e.g. Sheds 11 and 13.

Frank Kitts Park and the Chinese Garden

Five submissions specifically commented on Frank Kitts Park. All of these submissions consider that, presently, there is no need to redesign Frank Kitts Park, suggesting that it is satisfactory as it is. The submissions then follow on to raise the question as to whether it is appropriate to incur the costs of re-developing the park as a priority over other projects.

Some of the submissions consider that Frank Kitts Park is not a suitable location for a Chinese Garden and suggest that Waitangi Park is the better and preferred location.

The submission from the Wellington Sculpture Trust argues against the relocation of the Tanya Ashken sculpture *Albatross*. The Trust suggests that the relationship between the sculpture and the lagoon environment and the positive contribution that it makes to the City's sense of place will be lost if relocated. The Trust cites the Council's Public Arts Policy as something to be considered in deciding whether to relocate the sculpture.

In light of the concerns regarding the Frank Kitts Park redevelopment, it has been suggested that the Chinese Garden may be able to proceed independently of the broader park re-development. It is considered that this option should be investigated further to enable the planning work to continue for the Chinese Garden. The Council has made a commitment to the Chinese Garden Society and the Mayor of Beijing, and it is therefore essential that the work on this project continues.

Taranaki Wharf and Lagoon

Two submissions commented on this area with eight submissions specifically commenting negatively on the need to construct a second bridge from Civic Square to Taranaki Wharf. One submission felt that this area was fine and should be left alone.

In terms of specific projects, some submissions have questioned the materiality of amendments to the approved¹ Taranaki Street Wharf buildings. The concern is that the changes may significant enough to be warrant re-evaluation and

¹ Resource consents were granted in 2005 for a wharenuī, wharewaka and public space development

possibly a new resource consent. WWL have been, and will continue to monitor this issue in their overview role with these projects.

Waitangi Park and Herd Street Area

The submissions do not raise any issues that relate specifically to the Waitangi Park and Herd Street area.

Overseas Passenger Terminal

Two submissions commented on the Overseas Passenger Terminal (OPT). One submission felt that the public spaces in and around this building should complement its proximity to the wharf. The two submissions were against the proposed use of this site, design and lease.

It should be noted that the resource consent for the redevelopment of OPT has been granted by Greater Wellington Regional Council but is currently awaiting the outcome of the Environment Court appeal lodged by Waterfront Watch. If the appeal is unable to be resolved by mediation and goes to hearing it could be that a decision will not be made by the Court until early 2009. Therefore, any further discussion (if required) regarding this (previously approved) project should be deferred pending the outcome of the Environment Court process.

Other

Other points for the Subcommittee to note were:

- Better signage, seating, lighting and rubbish bins should be provided along the waterfront
- Pedestrian flow is encouraged through the design of the waterfront to allow use by pedestrian and cyclists
- More public toilets required along the waterfront
- Avoiding conflict with vehicular traffic, in particular the work to improve the Hunter Street access.

6. Changes Indicated

6.1 *Written Submissions*

Strong views exist for some individuals and organisations in relation to the redevelopment of Frank Kitts Park. The design consultation for Frank Kitts Park noted the objections of some submitters, however decided that a redevelopment of the park was still appropriate. The physical redevelopment of the park is not intended until the 2009/10 financial year, although the current Plan anticipates the detailed design and resource consent work to be completed within 2008/09.

As commented previously the draft Waterfront Development plan is about the phasing/timing of the projects and the financial spend associated with these

projects. The difficulty is the risk of pre-determining a work programme that may not align with the ten year work programme. For example, the issues raised in submissions regarding the timing of the Franks Kitts Park redevelopment can be expected to be debated in October. This provides validity to the question of whether the detailed design and planning work should be done before the project is confirmed. Likewise, the planning exercise for the Queens Wharf area – a strong theme within this year's submissions – as it will be difficult to identify appropriate timing for the planning exercise without first confirming the intended timing of implementing the project within the ten year work programme. Accordingly it is recommended that the decision on the timing of this work be deferred until the October meeting of the Committee.

While acknowledging the benefits of considering the project within a ten year time frame, it is essential that the 2008/09 Waterfront Development Plan sets out a work programme that makes the best use of the abilities and resources made available by WWL. It is also necessary to ensure that momentum is maintained for the current projects and the opportunity is taken to investigate infrastructure projects that will support future development plans.

For this reason it is recommended that the draft Waterfront Development Plan be approved by the Committee with the following changes –

- a. That the detailed design and planning of Frank Kitts Park redevelopment be deferred pending the decision to be made at the October meeting of the Strategy and Policy Committee. Amend the work plan to require further investigation of progressing the Chinese Garden project independently (of the Frank Kitts Park re-development) and to undertake the necessary detailed design and planning work to lodge the resource consent application. The amended wording would be (new wording in bold) –

*The Subcommittee approved the design brief for the redesign of the park in December 2006. The design competition has been held and a design chosen in December 2007. Further planning work regarding the resource consent **for the Chinese Garden** is currently being undertaken and it is planned to lodge the resource consent in 08/09.*

- b. That the timing of the broader Queens Wharf Precinct planning exercise be confirmed at the October meeting of Strategy and Policy Committee. The amended wording would be (deleted wording with strike through) –

The Environment Court declined the resource consent for the Hilton Hotel. WWL will call for ideas to determine what to do on the Outer T. This will be incorporated into a broader Queens Wharf Precinct planning exercise ~~that will take place in 08/09~~. Improvements to Hunter Street traffic control will be implemented.

These amendments, if agreed, will be reflected in an amended programme of works for the 2008/09 Waterfront Development Plan. If, at the October

meeting, the Committee decide to bring these projects back into the 2008/09 work programme, the Waterfront Development Plan can be revised at that time.

6.2 Oral Submissions

On the Submission form for the draft Development Plan, members of the public were asked if they would like to make an oral submission. Four submitters took this opportunity. Generally, the oral submissions emphasised particular issues that are raised within the written submissions, as opposed to raising new issues. The Queens Wharf model presented by Mr Robinson was an exception.

7. Conclusion

The consultation process allowed individuals and groups to provide their thoughts and suggestions on the 2008/09 draft Waterfront Development Plan. In response to the submissions and in light of the October paper two changes to the Development Plan are recommended, being the deferral of the Frank Kitts Park design and planning work and any decisions regarding Queens Wharf planning exercise. The recommended changes:

- Defer the detailed design and planning work for Frank Kitts Park until the Committee has confirmed that the timing of the project under the ten year work programme
- Defer the design competition/planning exercise for the broader Queens Wharf area until the committee has confirmed the timing of the project under the ten year work programme

The Waterfront Development Plan will be amended to reflect any changes agreed to by the Committee.

Report prepared by:

Warren Ulusele, Portfolio Manager, Council Controlled Organisations

Contact Officer: Warren Ulusele, Portfolio Manager

Supporting Information

1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome

The Waterfront Development Plan contributes to the following Council outcomes:

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.

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.

More Eventful – Wellington will maximise the economic value from promoting and hosting high-profile events.

More Prosperous – Wellington's urban form, and flexible approach to land use planning in the central city, will contribute to economic growth and prosperity.

2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact

C378 Wellington Waterfront Project

A312 Wellington Waterfront Operations

CX131 Wellington Waterfront Development.

In accord with the 2006/07 LTCCP.

3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations

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.

4) Decision-Making

This is not a significant decision. The report deals with a strategic asset, but does not propose any changes to the development plan.

5) Consultation

a) General Consultation

Public consultation has been undertaken on the draft development plan. All affected parties were included, and feedback will be reported to the Committee.

b) Consultation with Maori

Representatives from Council's mana whenua Treaty partners – Wellington Tenth's Trust and Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira were involved in the development of the Wellington Waterfront Framework that underpins the Waterfront Development Plan.

6) Legal Implications

There are no implications from this report.

7) Consistency with existing policy

This report is consistent with existing WCC policy on waterfront development.

Appendix One

Appendix Two

Appendix Three

Appendix Four