
**FEEDBACK ON THE 2003/04 DRAFT WATERFRONT
DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report provides the Subcommittee a summary of the feedback received during consultation on the draft Waterfront Development Plan for 2003/04.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Subcommittee:

1. *Receive the information.*
2. *Recommend that no changes be made to the draft Waterfront Development Plan.*

3. BACKGROUND

Consultation is a valuable tool – it is a chance for the public to have their say and is an effective means of increasing public awareness. However, only those voices that speak up count – it is often the people who have strong views who make submissions, whereas those who are comfortable with what is proposed, or hold no strong view, often do not make their views known. It is important to note that submissions come from a small proportion of the total community and may or may not reflect the general feeling of the community.

The draft Waterfront Development Plan was presented to the Subcommittee 14 April and open for consultation from mid April to 29 May 2003 and late submissions were accepted.

Forty-three submissions were received – a very similar response rate to that of the 2002/03 draft plan. The submissions are summarised by topic in Appendix one.

The plan was advertised through Wellington's community daily newspapers. 2,400 copies of the plan were mailed to residents and organisations on the waterfront mailing list. Copies were also provided to the Council's call centre to mail out on request. The Waterfront Development Plan was also posted on the Council's website for comments, and was available at the Waterfront Project Information Centre.

4. ANALYSIS

Appendix one provides a list of all comments, sorted by topic.

In many areas it has not been possible to gauge a common view because of the wide and diverse range of viewpoints.

Public Engagement

Submitters were varied in their assessment of the success of consultation, ranging from delays that consultation causes through to several submitters commenting that public confidence needed to be developed and maintained.

The Waterfront Development Plan Generally

General support of the Waterfront Development Plan was expressed.

Waterfront-Wide

Buildings

The majority of submitters opposed additional buildings on the waterfront.

Furniture

Comment on the furniture near Te Papa was favourable and a request made for weatherproof furniture on the promenade strip by the lagoon.

Promenade

The range of comments on the Promenade was diverse but common comments were that it should be developed in conjunction with adjacent projects and that a wider promenade should be created from the Railway Station to Oriental Bay.

Parking

Comments on parking were varied but the general view was that parking on the waterfront was inappropriate and that precedence should be given to foot traffic.

Other

There were requests for improved signage in the waterfront area and for more bilingual and interpretive signs.

Finance

The range of comments on financial aspects was diverse with one request for information that offsets Council contributions to development costs and the funding schedule for WWDP.

North Queens Wharf

Half of the respondents on NQW had concerns with the relocation of the Greta Point Tavern and the approval process. One submitter wanted the project to be monitored closely to ensure a minimum of disruption to waterfront users. Grey Power expressed their opposition to the relocation of the tavern on the basis of “further excesses of alcohol in the area”.

The remainder of respondents emphasised the need to keep building heights low to maintain view shafts.

Queens Wharf

A variety of issues were raised regarding the planned development but most welcomed a review of the Queen's Wharf area.

One submitter emphasised the need to carefully manage the construction phase of the hotel to minimise disruption to the public and to commercial activity.

Hotel on Outer-T

The vast majority of submitters who commented on the hotel were against the hotel on the Outer-T on the basis that it would restrict views.

Of those who had alternative suggestions most were strongly in favour of a winter garden and some suggested an ideas competition for the most original and creative use of this space.

Frank Kitts Park

The majority of submitters on this area opposed re-orientation of Frank Kitts Park.

Two submissions made a specific request for the carpark to be made more available to casual users and at weekends.

Concern was expressed by two submitters at the cost of the proposed breakwater. They believed the same benefit could be achieved by floating barges or pontoons.

Taranaki Wharf

The focus of the majority of submissions on Taranaki Wharf was the mound and the footbridge. While the views on retaining the mound were mixed all those who commented on the footbridge questioned the inclusion of an additional footbridge when earlier proposals had been rejected.

Of those who commented on the proposed water features, concerns were raised regarding the possible increase of slime and algal growth in the lagoon area.

Comment was made regarding the unsuitability of the wooden seating with a suggestion that the type of wooden seating along the Petone foreshore sits more comfortably with the natural environment.

Waitangi Park Development

Almost half the submitters believed that the public was not listened to in the choice of design for Waitangi Park and two submitters commented that the current design lacks "heart" and "spirit".

Some respondents wanted to see Herd Street demolished but the majority were in favour of retaining the building although most were against its use for private apartments and concerns of extra height.

Of those who commented on the proposed wetland the general view was that they are inappropriate in a small urban area and costly to maintain.

The Chinese Garden concept was generally well received.

5. CHANGES INDICATED

Amongst the 42 submitters, there are wide ranging divergent views of the development and proposed development on the waterfront. There are those who support the work, there are those who oppose a range of aspects of the project. There are a number of suggestions about improving aspects of the communication and consultation process. There are a number of detailed suggestions for specific work on the waterfront which can be considered by officers and Wellington Waterfront Ltd.

Given the divergent views, the range of issues touched on in submissions and the specific work proposed in the Waterfront Development Plan, it is recommended that no changes be made to the 2003/04 draft Waterfront Development Plan.

6. CONCLUSION

The consultation process allowed individuals and groups to provide their thoughts and suggestions on the 2003/04 draft Waterfront Development Plan. No changes to the plan are indicated.

Report prepared by: Gerald Blunt, Urban Designer

Supporting information
<p>a) Strategic fit The Waterfront Development Plan would fit with outcomes:</p> <p>1.3 Memorable City – Wellington is a memorable, beautiful city, celebrating its distinctive landmarks, defining features and heritage.</p> <p>9.2 People are encouraged to participate in the decision-making of the city.</p>
<p>b) Annual Plan reference Relates to C378 Wellington Waterfront Project, A312 Lambton Harbour Operations and CX131 Lambton Harbour Development.</p>
<p>c) Annual Plan and Long Term Financial Strategy implications In accord with the 2003/04 LTCCP</p>
<p>d) Treaty of Waitangi implications 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.</p> <p>The Waterfront Development Plan includes a proposal to develop a whare waka – this project is being further explored with the Council’s Treaty partners.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>e) Consultation Public consultation has been undertaken as detailed in the report.</p>
<p>f) Legal implications n/a</p>

Public Engagement

APPENDIX 1

1D Public Engagement

1	Too many delays caused by vocal minorities.
4	People should get 8 minutes regardless of no of participants. Plus another 2 minutes to address other concerns. Public confidence not maintained.
5	Controversies not good example of participatory democracy.
6	Failing to maintain public confidence.
16	The latest literature is to hand but I really feel that it is a waste of time making my feelings known as the powers that be seem to blatantly disregard public input and just go their own merry way and do what they want. Plan D and Plan A comes to mind. Perhaps this is what you are wanting, so you can then say that the public didn't make any suggestions??
18	I would suggest that public confidence will need to be developed before it can be "maintained"! I trust that the engagement with the public will result in actual variations to pre-determinations as has been the practise in the past. Engagement with the public should extend to heeding the messages they send even if the response fails to match the preconceptions and pre-determinations of the interpreters of the poll or competition results. To avoid the appearance of sham and in compliance LGA2k2 a consultation protocol especially for waterfront projects should be developed.
19	The plan mentions that at all stages in the project process, the Subcommittee will engage with the public. Positively Wellington Tourism would hope that when consulting the public, private sector groups such as waterfront attractions, hotels, restaurants and cafes are actively considered.
26	Public confidence principle needs to be the overriding one.
30	Measurement and weighting of public views be applied in transparent way and open to public scrutiny.
34	Concerned about lack of progress and paralysis by analysis. Good development does not happen by public consent - all that happens is that minority interest groups hold sway and the end result is mediocrity. Places such as Woolloomooloo have flourished because the local councils did not seek consensus from local population but allowed experienced developers to get on with it. A WWII general said "an imperfect plan implemented today is better than a perfect plan implemented too late". Please get on with it before I reach retirement age.
39	Consultation appreciated despite WCC's cavalier attitude to public viewpoints they do not like.
41	Meetings - Waterfront Development Subcommittee doesn't appear to read or recall submissions made to them at meetings. Members rarely ask questions. Consultation - in many cases not always a true representation of data is provided. Interactive workshops - used for Chaffers but public input completely ignored and Plan A is almost identical to Variation 17 submission by the same team.
42	Where is proof that Maori have been consulted? Please acknowledge that Tau Iwi have a partnership with Maori. I am a member of Waterfront Watch and they have my proxy.

Waterfront Wide

1D Waterfront Wide

3	Accessible	Should be accessible to all people in all weather 365 days. Include covered walkways.
20	Attractions	It is very encouraging to see visitor needs being integrated into the plan as visitors will be a key user of the area. One of the ways of attracting people to the waterfront is by making it a vibrant and a must-see place while in Wellington. Attractions and activities are a key way of achieving this. Positively Wellington Tourism would like to stress that we are more than willing to discuss options with the committee and where potential opportunities may lie. The point we would like to make more than anything is that action on the ground and getting on and doing it is what will now make the biggest difference. This area of Wellington is one of the 'Jewels in the Crown' and it should not be underestimated how important this area is, and will continue to be in attracting visitors.
8	Beauty	A plea for more beauty to be considered an integral aspiration of planners.
2	Buildings	Block views and sun and nowhere for people to go.
5	Buildings	Now more buildings planned than in V17. Creeping privatisation. Developers and architects - professions not noted for understanding importance of space- have disproportionate power.
26	Buildings	Oppose any new buildings or creation of private control on waterfront.
32	Buildings	Cannot approve buildings without consulting regional council.
36	Buildings	Favour few and low buildings.
11	Developments	We think the waterfront development has been fantastic thus far. Keep up the great work.
24	Furniture	The promenade strip by the lagoon would benefit from installation of weatherproof furniture to improve people friendliness of area.
26	Furniture	Commend the simple robust furniture near Te Papa. But make it antiskateboard? If people aren't sitting on it why can't skaters use it?
18	General	Road edges and perspective from the city: I support this upgrade but ask that special attention be given to (a) lighting that actually illuminates, (b) seating with flats backs, not with rubber bolsters, (c) more rubbish bins, (d) more lavatories and (e) clear directional signage.
10	Hazard	Need to discuss hazard risk of area to ensure emergency planning is considered, such as sufficient water.
41	Lighting	Current new lights despite close proximity and numbers do not provide a safe well lit environment.

1D Waterfront Wide

18	Parking	The parking building beneath Frank Kitts park needs to be exploited. Vehicle access ways should be clearly marked by changing the road surfaces at both ends.
21	Parking	Parking on the waterfront should be for the disabled only. I am totally opposed to any plan that may include parking buildings being developed, or raised areas/car parks that obstruct views.
26	Parking	Carparking is inappropriate anywhere on waterfront.
37	Parking	There's a tension between need for access and removal of cars, and need for commercial returns and fact that if consumers cannot physically and affordably access parking on the waterfront they will not use it.
24	Parking and access	Make waterfront more accessible and give foot traffic precedence over vehicles. Many problems would disappear if parking operations were overhauled.
18	Promenade	The promenade needs regular attention to ensure pedestrians are given unhindered access and that surfaces are swiftly cleared of debris.
19	Promenade	A wide promenade should stretch from Lambton Interchange and the Railway Station through to Oriental Bay. The promenade is very narrow in front of Shed 5 and Shed 6 and I would like this addressed.
21	Promenade	I do not believe the promenade should be dealt with in conjunction with adjacent projects but treated as a single project to ensure provision for a wide space for pedestrians and a cyclist's lane. The pedestrian width on the seaward side of Frank Kitts Park is close to an appropriate allocation of space. This would also serve to link discrete areas to form a more interrelated waterfront. The proposed narrow walkway, in front of the proposed Greta Point tavern, north of Queens Wharf, is unsuitable for the above activities.
22	Promenade	Please retain and or create a wide promenade right around the waterfront, from the Railway Station to Oriental Bay. I was most disappointed when it was narrowed at the new bridge and the hole in front of Circa.
37	Promenade	Promenade should be developed in conjunction with adjacent projects.
39	Promenade	Believe this must be treated as one entity.
5	Signage	Want more bilingual signage and interpretive signs.
25	Signage	Many visitors still have little idea how to navigate their way around the waterfront. Recent improvements haven't made much difference. Please identify toilets better, especially the ones by the lagoon.
26	Skateboards	Encourage skateboarding and other non drug forms pf recreation.
24	Toilets	Facilities are too few and far between, and standard is shameful.
21	Views	Apart from the existing buildings, there should be unrestricted views of our fantastic harbour from the Quays, and Cable Street, just as there is from Oriental Parade. Car parking at Frank Kitts Park restricts such views from Jervois Quay and should be removed. Miserly view shafts are not the answer for allowing views from the city.

Waterfront Development - General

1D Waterfront Development - General

1	Approve - good balance of public space, open space and private development.
13	No difficulty with outline and key areas.
17	Thanks for all the work everyone is putting into our development.
20	We have no major issues with the plan, and see the waterfront as an important asset to Wellington City in the future. We look forward to seeing the final Waterfront Development Plan and development progress throughout 2003/04.
27	Council has good PR, it does great things and makes you feel good about living in this city. Pass on the praise for a well done job.
28	Support the concepts. Please proceed as fast as possible to give Wellingtonians the benefits promised.
29	People are obviously working very hard to produce comprehensive plans for coordinated waterfront development.

Finance

1D Finance

18	<p>This item needs clarifying to ensure that there is a definition of “generated upfront” (sic) does this mean that funding will be provided by a prior asset sale or by a single lease payment, as seems to be the implication of the sale of the “Outer-T” site. In regards to timing surely it would be preferable if that ‘reflected’ market conditions rather than be retrospectively “impacted”! Greater transparency is required of this part of this document. Perhaps a ‘pie-chart’ set against a list of completed tasks/projects balanced against prior “assumptions” along with explanatory notes. A chart that offsets: “Council contributions to Development Costs (Capital)” and the funding schedule for the Wellington Waterfront Development Plan (WWDP) might also be provided.</p>
21	<p>If the necessity for recovering costs relies on revenue from commercial development, then the waterfront framework plan should be scaled down to a level that doesn’t require such investment.</p>
26	<p>Reword principle that income be generated upfront. To ensure environmental impact is considered.</p>
37	<p>Assumption of realistic returns on publicly assessable space at ground floor is a fantasy. Access across Jervois Quay is a barrier. Shoppers will not shop where they can't park closely. If you want commercially leased property you will get a weekend ghetto at NQW which will discourage use.</p>
39	<p>Please keep to budget to minimise impact on ratepayers.</p>

Other

1D Other

17	I do hope Odlins has a face lift before long - preferably as an adjunct to Te Papa to house our nation's art collection et al - retail/cafe beneath.
18	<p>Display - I look forward to a time when representations of projects whether in “words, diagrams, photographs, drawings” or films, videos and other electronic presentations accurately reflect project proposals.</p> <p>Meetings - the monitoring of projects by the subcommittee should required monthly formal briefings which are recorded in writing for presentation in public. It appears that many meetings are held between WWL and WSDC which are treated for LGOIMA as “workshops”. I look forward to the public notification of these get-togethers in compliance with the LGA2k2.</p> <p>OPT - This building once refurbished would make an ideal site for a contemporary art gallery.</p> <p>TAG - The relationship between the WSDC, TAG and WWL needs further definition to ensure that there is no technical capture by TAG. I suggest that the membership of TAG should be changed completely at least every three years to warrant as wide a range of views as possible are being canvassed. WSDC should require evidence that a range of architectural and design practices are being heard and are given weight before proffering advice to the committee. This action would avoid an appearance of preferential treatment being given to one particular group of “design”practitioners.²⁵ WSDC’s delegation of authority to TAG on “minor” matters of detail eg: alterations to buildings, variation to detailed design and temporary use of public space and elements in public space” needs clarifying to maintain consistency and transparency. I am unsure whether “minor” is presently defined as anything not requiring a building permit or whether minor is defined by quantum (ie: dollar value). Clarity is required.</p> <p>BNE – Built & Natural Environment Committee needs to be specifically advertised in the media to ensure those interested in the waterfront can attend and if need be make presentations or submissions that have adequate hearing times. Council officers should be reminded of their obligation to be impartial observers serving the public at these meetings.</p>
23	<p>OPT - We note that WWL plans to “market” the Overseas Passenger Terminal during the current year. The Framework provides no parameters within which this might be proposed. We are concerned that redevelopment of the facility might include increasing the height of the building. This could have a significant impact on harbour views. Waterfront Watch asks that WWL consult the public on the desired future of the terminal before it seeks commercial proposals. We want to avoid past mistakes that have lead to divisions over the vision for the waterfront, and dissatisfaction over public involvement processes. We would like to be able to go forward together in developing plans for this last waterfront feature.</p> <p>TAG - Waterfront Watch would like to see a rotation in the non-councillor membership of both the waterfront Development Subcommittee and the Technical Advisory Group.</p>
26	Challenge assumption that commercial property generates proceeds of highest and best use.
29	Any shops should not compete with central city shops.
30	I have been lead to believe that some of the developers and contractors favoured have connections with Council or Councillors. Concerns about council overriding public expressed wishes.

1D Other

40	Why is one generation attempting to complete such a huge project? Unless there's an earthquake this jewel will remain for future generations to shape according to their needs.
41	Opt - this is infinitely better site for a hotel. Activities - would like to see provision for activities such as crocodile bikes and train man.
42	Not what council and Mayor Prendergast (a midwife) is delivering to the people. Is a universal pride in a beautiful city possible under this leadership?? The waterfront project is greed not need. The user pays means can use only if can pay \$\$\$. Dare I say jealousy and anger underpin social development on Wellington policy.

North Queens Wharf

1D North Queens Wharf

4	<p>Potential for interisland ferry to relocate to here</p> <p>Tavern - I do feel a ridiculous amount of time has been taken to remove the Greta Point building from our marine drive. I do know it is going through other procedures, but perhaps the Council should put pressure on them to make up their mind.</p>
18	<p>Tavern - I trust that the management of this project will take into account the conditions of the consent granted and that the monitoring by WWL will ensure that waterfront users are kept informed of potential disruptions.</p>
22	<p>The sweeping, panoramic view of Mt Victoria and the harbour that I get at Whitmore St gates is very special and should be retained as a priority. It is important also to motorists who drive past. Any buildings here should have heights lower than the Sheds, so there is an amphitheatre effect tapering off to zero where the area meets the edge of the promenade.</p>
23	<p>We are not clear as to how WWL proposes that resource consent will be sought for the North Queens Wharf area in relation to the overall design of the area and the specific buildings. We would like to have an opportunity to discuss how this might best be done before decisions are made.</p>
25	<p>Tavern - we note the resource consent has been granted. Grey Power previously opposed this relocation and we are pleased to note it is under appeal. We do not need further excesses of alcohol in the area.</p> <p>The proposal to develop 5 separate sites and to commence marketing is disappointing and against the wishes of the public. We have already submitted about this area.</p>
41	<p>In total agreement about importance of public space. Must be more user friendly than the colonnade - is dreary grey not well lit and no leasing of shop space. Must retain view shafts.</p>

Queens Wharf

1D Queens Wharf

18	I look forward to seeing the exterior of the “Events Centre” being embellished with a trompe l’oeil for which there could be a competition!
23	<p>We welcome the proposed overall review of the Queens Wharf area, covering pedestrian and vehicle access, and the exterior treatment of the buildings. The area is the natural heart of the waterfront, but not all aspects of the current design and uses work well. We would oppose any suggestion that the sails might be removed. A full review of the Queens Wharf area will also be valuable for considering options for the southern leg of the Outer-T.</p> <p>Re-evaluating and confirming that important values of the Queens Wharf area will make an important contribution to the consideration of the resource consent application for the hotel on the outer-T, if it proceeds. Particular attention would need to be paid to managing the impacts of the hotel’s construction phase which have the potential to totally disrupt both the public’s enjoyment and commercial activity in the area for a considerable period.</p>
24	Vehicles park daily on outer-T at back of Dockside. Why is it permissible here, yet a towable offence elsewhere? Radio station vehicles park outside event centre when netball is on with their commercial radio blaring yet Queens Wharf businesses are subject to strict constraints about what they can do on their forecourts. The events centre carpark is subject to continual complaints about the price being exorbitant. It seems their pricing policy may be out of step with Framework principles or encouraging public access.
35	Existing tenants of shed 6 must be retained in any redevelopment as they provide interest and activity in this part of the waterfront.
41	Plans for Events centre and shed 6 for enveloping and height raising a concern.

Hotel

1D Hotel

1	Support - will add vibrancy and elegance. More people will make area safer. Beneficial to economy. Need progress.
2	No hotel. Will block views and create traffic. Rather have seats and tables.
3	Object no competition was held. Object wholly to hotel. Should be a winter garden. Object to amount of publicity.
5	Would prefer site to be for public activities. Viewed with same despair as event centre. Why not low rise.
6	Wellingtonians will lose connection with harbour.
9	Horrified to read that hotel has approved plans for this stupid hotel. Is last straw.
14	Should no go ahead. Area should remain as open space. Interest generated by boating movements.
15	Opposed to hotel - a blot on a popular open area.
17	The design for the necessary hotel on Outer T, as shown in the local paper, looks fine to me.
19	I do not support the building of a hotel on the Outer-T. It will restrict views as it is higher than Shed 1. It will create extra traffic flows. This land belongs to the public and we should have a building that belongs wholly to the public regardless of their wealth or lack of it. A more appropriate building would be a winter garden or an art gallery.
21	There is nothing new about having a hotel next to the sea. Council should dump this boring idea, along with the mediocre design and really search for alternatives by creating an ideas competition for the most original and creative use of this space.
22	I do not support the proposed hotel on the outer T. It will block views, its not viable as a 5 star hotel, its traffic will interfere with public use of the waterfront, and it is a highly unsuitable use for the prime central site on the waterfront. It should have a building there that can be used by all of the public regardless of how much money they have. I favour a winter garden or similar.
23	We are pleased to note that the plan contemplates what would happen if the hotel proposal does not proceed. We would hope that, as proposed in the Framework, a competition will be held to solicit ideas as widely as possible.
26	Revisit this decision. Any building should be a transparent, public use such as winter garden. Hotel elitist.
29	Have concerns about height and size - may block views.
31	Waterfront Development Plan does not refer to hotel. Am entirely against the proposal. Must keep waterfront open.

1D Hotel

32	No reason why a competition for outer-T shouldn't be successful. There are alternative sites for a hotel. Low light buildings will be costly - detail about foundation.
35	Hope Council will renounce plans. Is inappropriate on a pedestrian promenade.
38	Am in strong opposition to hotel. Hope the council has a rethink. A fountain would be better.
40	A glaring example of crassness and greed.
41	Totally opposed to any hotel on this site. Competition should be held. Public offered no alternatives.
42	A hotel destroys the possibility of having pedestrian promenade free of traffic. Agree with Con Flinkenberg. If a hotel is necessary build one on Chaffers.

Frank Kitts Park

1D Frank Kitts Park

4	<p>Orientation - views should be acknowledged and historical sightlines protected.</p> <p>Breakwater - the calm spot created would be subject to pollutant attraction.</p>
18	<p>I can see no reason to explore the re-orientation of this park. The last time this idea was publicly aired there was consideration being given to the placement of high-rise building along the street edge I doubt that the public rejection of this has lessened in the intervening years!</p>
23	<p>Parking - we would like to see the parking under Frank Kitts Park to be made more available to casual users, including weekends. At present the majority of parks are occupied by permanent, all day parkers.</p> <p>Breakwater - we are concerned at the scale and cost of the proposal being pursued to provide a breakwater outside the park. Could not much of the benefit be achieved using floating barges? Perhaps they could be normally moored elsewhere on the waterfront (providing close access to the water), and moved into position when needed for events.</p>
24	<p>Parking - "No Vehicle Access" sign on Frank Kitts is nonsense as it's continually ignored. Its presence suggests confusion and ambiguity. Vehicles frequently park between playground and event centre, especially during events. The FK carpark offers 88 spaces but is grossly underused at weekends because of restricted access to cardholders. When carpark is opened on weekends it is hugely popular. Public and businesses would benefit if this park was made more accessible.</p> <p>Shelter - Operation of la Felicita by the lagoon would be far less weather dependent if shelter were provided. Sails or pergola might be considered.</p>
35	<p>Implore Waterfront Development Subcommittee to retain current orientation. Works well as it is.</p>
41	<p>Breakwater - ambitious plans for expensive breakwater when all that is needed is a series of pontoons which are flexible and can be used in other parts of the harbour. I'm sure Ian Ferguson's submission would not be as extravagant.</p> <p>Play area - several areas have been broken since Feb and no repairs despite repeated emails. Would be good to see more play equipment on the park.</p> <p>Orientation - current orientation does not appear to be a problem. Public seem to enjoy it as it is. Safety not a problem when there are large gatherings. Arena provides shelter from wind.</p>

Taranaki Wharf

1D Taranaki Wharf

4	Mound is a significant resource and integral to waterfront. Alternative designers should be approached.
8	Hole interesting but no beauty to concrete lip and steps. Line of lights brutal.
18	<p>Foot bride - I remain perplexed as to the necessity for yet another footbridge from the “City to Sea” and yet more “extensions” additions such as the “caged hedge”; especially knowing that WCC rejected earlier proposals for a very similar development in the recent past on the grounds of cost.</p> <p>Mound - I support the removal of the “mound” and would also support the replacement of the perforated steel panels on the “Two-fingers” bridge with glass panels.</p>
19	The expensive, contrived changes to Taranaki wharf (such as the cut outs exposing the wharf piles, the Odilins timber garden, the metal fence around a group of trees) do not harmonise with the splendour of the panoramic view of the harbour and the hills beyond. By contrast, the chunky wooden seats along the Petone foreshore sit so comfortably with the natural environment.
23	<p>Waterfront Watch has not accepted the proposed construction of a new separate bridge across Jervis Quay at this location, and the associated caged hedge.</p> <p>We have concerns about the proposed water features, particularly about breaking up the area in front of the Odilins building. If it is the intention to use of seawater, we hope that advice will be sought from a marine biologist on the potential of the stirred, shallow pool to stimulate excessive algal growth.</p>
24	Would be benefits to providing shelter over east-west length of promenade by boat sheds and pedestrian link from city to sea bridge to Jervis Quay.
26	Do not remove mound. Green space important.
41	<p>Bridge was previously rejected by council. All that is needed is extension of lagoon board walk to WFAB.</p> <p>Wharfies smoko type planks are unsuitable for sitting on and new backing on seats by cut out are very uncomfortable and not attractive.</p> <p>Extending lagoon another waste of money. No solution for slime when tide is out. Totally opposed to pond next to WFAB and channel. This area is only parking places for rowing club functions.</p>

Waitangi

1D Waitangi Park

1	Resource consents - pity that minority groups have signalled their opposition to RC. Will cost ratepayers more. Protestors should fund delays from own pockets
4	WDS should not have ignored public opinion.
5	The design favoured by public did not get chosen.
7	Hope all Wellingtonians will protest to buildings. Get rid of Herd St too. Fancy leaving such an ugly monster.
12	Chinese community funding Chinese Garden. Who is funding Pacific garden?
17	Although not in complete agreement with the final Chaffers design, I'm pleased a move has been made and there are many good features about the chosen programme.
19	<p>Wetland - I am concerned that the public was not listened to in the choice of design for Chaffers Park. As a biology teacher with an interest in ecology I think the 'wetland' concept is not appropriate for such a small urban area. Wetlands are special natural ecosystems, the area proposed is an artificial swamp. Recently when I walked past the harbour side of the Star Boating Club I noticed a great deal of rubbish in the tidal zone. Given the windy nature of our city and the sometimes less than tidy habits of its citizens I think it is inevitable that rubbish will collect among the swamp plants. How will the Council organise the removal paper, plastic and glass objects and other urban detritus on a daily basis?</p> <p>Herd St - I would like the Council to consider using the Herd St building as a long-term temporary National Art Gallery. Its size and proximity to Te Papa seem great advantages and it is on public land.</p> <p>In choosing design A for Chaffers Park over design D (the public's choice) I feel something very important has been lost. The Megan Wraight design may have all the features that architects and planning professionals approve of but to me it has no 'heart' and evokes none of the emotional response of wanting to be in the park that design D did.</p>
21	Waterfront Development Subcommittee has decided to ignore the democratic choice of design by Wellingtonians and opted for the present design, including the four multi-storeyed buildings. These buildings will block any view of the marina and wider harbour for recreation and leisure users as well as residents on Mt Victoria. The cost of this design will be in excess of that budgeted for and will place an added burden on ratepayers who didn't want the design in the first place. There are issues of safety with the planned children's play and skateboarding facilities being placed next to high traffic density areas. Planned car parking facilities will block the view from Cable Street. I believe the Herd Street building should be knocked down and only refreshment kiosks and one single storeyed building be retained.

1D Waitangi Park

22	<p>Choice - I am concerned that the public preferences were ignored in the choice of design for Chaffers park. Their first choice (a Weta workshop collaboration) didn't even go to stage 2. At stage 2 the public choice as shown by an A.C. Neilson survey was Option D. The public was assured that features of these two rejected designs would be carried over to the final design but this has not happened.</p> <p>Buildings - A key feature of these 2 public choices was no new buildings. Instead I see as many new multi- storey buildings as proposed in the much-hated Variation 17. I want only small one-storey buildings for the purpose of supporting recreation on the park. I particularly don't want buildings for residential or office use.</p> <p>Wetland - The proposed wetlands are inappropriate and a great mistake in a small urban area. They are much too small to be a viable ecological community therefore pointless as an ecological example of a wetland. They use up a large area that could otherwise be used for more interactive recreation. They will be difficult and expensive to build and maintain.</p> <p>Skatepark - The skateboard area is too small – use the better design from Option D.</p> <p>Something very important has also been lost in the spirit of the park. The 2 public choices mentioned above had many interesting and inviting things to do right through the park, based on research done by consulting the public first off. Those who chose the Megan Wraight design preferred the 'experts' choices to those of the public, and put form before function. The main sweep of the park in the proposed design now looks bleak and featureless and uninviting. Another example, as Geoffrey Palmer said so well, that "experts should be on tap, not on top".</p>
23	<p>Resource consent - we do not support the proposal that planning approval for a park be sought separately from the proposed building sites. The area should be treated as a whole. The proposed scheme has been designed and costed as single proposition, and needs to be considered as such. Resource consent should be sought over the entire area, not 70%.1.3 The development plan should be amended to include the intended process for seeking resource consents for the proposed buildings in the transition zone and near the Herd Street building. As agreed when the Council adopted Variation 22 to its District Plan, each building should be subject to a separate application.</p> <p>Chinese Garden - we would like clarification of the statement that the timing of developments in the transition is dependent on funding for the Chinese garden. What would be the intention if the construction of the garden is delayed? Would it still be the intention of the Council to build the single story carpark with public open space on the roof?</p> <p>The Plan needs to be amended to set out how WWL would respond if it is denied resource consent for the proposed buildings on Chaffers Park.</p>
25	<p>Buildings - proposal to continue with scheme A is a blatant example of Council and WWL imposing its intention to allow private development on Chaffers. Chaffers should not have privately owned buildings on it. The public does not want buildings. All the buildings will be subject to private development despite public opposition.</p> <p>Wetland - the expensive water channels are unnecessary.</p> <p>All that is needed is an unencumbered, inexpensive park with adjoining activities. Maybe a stage.</p> <p>The statement that Megan Wraight won the design competition is incorrect since the public chose another design. Accordingly this plan was not chosen by the public but was selected by council despite public choice for another design.</p>

1D Waitangi Park

26	<p>Herd St - revisit decision to have this in private apartments.</p> <p>Buildings - revisit decision.</p>
27	<p>Herd St - please remove this barn.</p> <p>Love boulders, hope there will be event to welcome them. Like market, hope there will be EFTPOS and rubbish facilities there. Please include safe water feature in Chinese garden. Other detail and suggestions for Waitangi development.</p>
32	<p>Herd St - would like to see top storey removed (illustrations provided). Concerns raised about construction.</p>
33	<p>Points of concern detailed about Chinese garden - adjacent buildings, size, carpark.</p>
35	<p>If North Queens Wharf provides revenue for Chaffers, then no reason to have buildings on the park.</p> <p>Design boring and monochromatic. Hope colourful features added.</p>
41	<p>Seating and lighting are not of standard expected. Need variety of seat including conventional styles with backs.</p> <p>Wetland - does the cost include the visits of consultants from Australia?</p> <p>Buildings - grave concerns for proposed buildings, especially in transition zone. Majority of submissions show that no building should be put there - landscape instead. Most museums in the world are in park like settings not surrounded by commercial buildings.</p> <p>Herd St - concerned to see 3 penthouses but brochure talked about public walk up to sculpture garden. Is extra height allowed under Framework?</p>