

---

**REPORT 4**  
*(1215/52/04/IM)*

## **FEEDBACK ON THE 2007/08 DRAFT WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

---

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

To provide the Subcommittee with a summary of the feedback received during consultation on the draft Waterfront Development Plan for 2007/08.

### **2. Recommendations**

It is recommended the Subcommittee:

- 1. Receive the information.*
- 2. Recommend to the Strategy and Policy Committee that it approve the draft Waterfront Development Plan subject to any changes as a result of the oral submissions.*
- 3. Approve the 2007/08 programme of work outlined in Appendix Three of this report.*
- 4. Note that there is a joint WWL / WCC / SOS working party that is considering options for relocating the Shed 1 indoor sports activities.*

### **3. Background**

The draft Waterfront Development Plan was presented to the Subcommittee on 25 June 2007 and approved for consultation.

Consultation on the draft Waterfront Development Plan opened on 12 July 2007 and closed at 5pm 10 August 2007. The consultation lasted for 30 calendar days (which is 22 working days). Late submissions were accepted.

The plan was advertised in the Dominion Post, the Wellingtonian 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.

Wellington Waterfront Limited produced an 'On The Waterfront' Special Edition advising of the release, availability and deadlines for submission of the draft Development Plan to 3600 recipients who subscribe to the On The

Waterfront e-newsletter. WWL also included details of the consultation process in its newsletter that went to an additional 1400 addresses. Copies of the consultation document were made available at the Waterfront Project Information Centre on Queens Wharf.

Three hundred and twenty five submissions were received by the closing date, and three hundred and eight were 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 contained in Report 1.

It should be noted that in terms of the contents of the Development Plan, there is no significant change in scope from what has been indicated in earlier plans, but the timing of some projects has changed. 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 Two.

A programme of work for the Waterfront has been derived from the plan – this is presented in Appendix Three.

## **4. Consultation**

### **4.1 Methodology**

This analysis summarises the key issues from submissions made on the draft Waterfront Development Plan 2007/08. The scope of the analysis aims to be broad enough to inform the Subcommittee's decision but sufficiently focused to be accessible and meaningful.

Of the six hundred and thirty three submissions:

- five hundred and eighty eight were made by individuals
- thirty were made by groups
- nine submissions did not indicate whether they were making the submission as an individual or on behalf of a group
- six submissions stated that they were making their submission as both an individual and on behalf of a group.

Submissions were received in three ways:

- online through the council website (49%)
- in hard/paper copies (50%) that were a mixture of formal submission forms, letters and faxes
- emails (1%) sometimes accompanied by attachments.

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. Those sent via emails, faxes and letters, that is, without the submission form, were followed up

to ensure that the submitter was aware of this privacy statement. Submitters that were unhappy about having their contact details made available publicly were required to contact officers by 16 August 2007. Those who did advise the Council before that date have had their details blacked out on the submissions.

A database was established to record and summarise the matters raised through the submissions.

Twenty eight of the submissions were submitted on a petition form. Due to the wording on this petition each person on the form was given their own submission number and each counted as a separate individual submission.

Thirty six submissions didn't state whether or not they would like to make an oral submission. Forty three submissions didn't make any comments at all, that is, they were blank submissions. Although there is no legal requirement for Council to do so, the Council attempted to follow up as many of these as possible within the time available.

The three hundred and eight late submissions received were accepted in the interests of providing the Subcommittee with as full a picture of public sentiment as possible.

The summary below outlines the 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. A large number of submissions, however, chose to comment on the detailed design of projects or on projects that have already been completed or are nearing completion.

Although some of the matters raised in the submissions are not relevant to the Draft waterfront development plan, the high number of submissions is a good indication that our communication methods and tools have worked in asking for feedback and encouraging people to make submissions. It can also be taken as an indication that there are one or two issues that individuals or groups felt passionate about.

## **4.2 Summary of Written Submissions**

### **Waterfront Development**

There were six submissions supporting the 2007/08 draft Waterfront Development Plan and recognising the developments to date. One submission specifically stated that it was opposed to the Council's development plans for the waterfront as a whole.

Three submissions objected to the definition of quality recreational/leisure spaces incorporating corridors, roads, and lanes.

Four submissions emphasised the importance of making the waterfront accessible to everyone. Another submission stated that a re-assessment of

parking requirements should still be guided by the Waterfront Framework, which states that parking should be removed as the waterfront is developed.

Two submissions expressed concern over the scale and clarity of presentations, questioning whether or not the information being presented might be misleading.

### **Public Engagement**

There were six submissions that raised concerns over public engagement stating that the public engagement process was flawed and they felt that there was a loss in public confidence in this process. Reasons given for this included project timing and scope being determined prior to public consultation. One submission felt that the Council places democratic process as a low priority and that the 22 working day consultation period was too limited for the public to adequately comment. Three of these six submitters have requested to make an oral submission.

A number of submissions expressed concern with the infrequency of the Wellington Waterfront Subcommittee meetings. This led onto the opinion that it is TAG who is the authority that make the decisions and give approvals therefore effectively bypassing public input.

### **Finance**

Five submissions commented on the financials relevant to the work and projects proposed in the plan.

One submission felt that public amenity values should not be compromised in any of the proposed developments and especially in the event of any financial downturn. The position taken in the draft plan that a longer period be taken to complete the waterfront rather than compromising quality or placing unnecessary burden on ratepayers was endorsed in one submission. Another submission considered that the financials in the draft plan did not take into account the clear statement of the Waterfront Development Framework which says: "Public Space development does not depend for funding on commercial development".

One submission considered that the financial structure proposed is speculative, as was the funding structure that allowed the expenditure of \$15M before the end of the 07/08 fiscal year.

The assumed revenue from the Hilton Hotel was highlighted as a concern in two submissions.

One submission felt that WWL must act responsibly and therefore immediately stop, not start or commit any money to any projects it can without incurring any penalties.

### **Timing of Projects**

Three submissions touched on this matter. One submission specifically stated that consultation on the development of Sites 8, 9 and 10 should not be undertaken between mid December 2007 and the end of January 2008. To compensate for this period the consultation period should then be extended into February 2008. Two submissions stated that they felt that there had been a delay on projects, particularly due to the debates/negotiating over car parks, meaning that work on Taranaki St Wharf West and Frank Kitts Park will take so much longer. One submitter commented that they would like to see some faster progress on the John Wardle and UN Studio buildings at Waitangi: they felt there was no clear timeline shown in the plan.

There was also an opinion that, due to Wellington Waterfront's stretched financial situation, the proposed breakwater and redevelopment of Frank Kitts Park be delayed rather than seeking further funding from the Council which will add to the pressure on ratepayers. Time should be utilised to engage in wider consultation as to the most suitable location for the Chinese Garden.

### **Indoor Sports Facilities**

Six hundred and four submissions were received that commented on the loss of indoor sports facilities on the waterfront. Of these six hundred and four submissions, forty six were either blank or it was not particularly clear that they were referring to the indoor sport on the waterfront issue. However they arrived as part of a group of three hundred and three submissions that were handed to the Council under the auspices of the "indoor sports" groups and individuals making a submission. Accordingly officers have used their judgement and incorporated these forty six submissions as part of the six hundred and four commenting on the loss of indoor sports facilities.

Four hundred and sixty of these felt that the ground floor of the building on site 10 should be designated for an indoor sports facility. In addition, six submissions requested that an alternative venue be found elsewhere on the waterfront, four submissions requested that Sheds One and Six remain as they are and twenty nine requested that an alternative site within the CBD be found. One hundred and five submissions just commented generally on the loss of the indoor facility and did not specify a preferred location for a potential replacement venue or they were blank (as above).

Some of the reasons people expressed concern at the loss of an indoor sports facility at the Shed One location were:

- Current facility is easily accessible and within walking distance of offices, allowing lunchtime sporting activities to occur;
- Loss of Shed One will present a lack of indoor sports facilities within the inner city;
- See the indoor sports league as a good team building exercise;
- Encourages people to exercise and "push play";

- New Zealand is currently facing an obesity epidemic and exercise helps address this;
- Using the Outer T for a commercial venture conflicts with the push from the Government, the Council and New Zealand society to exercise on a regular basis;
- People playing sport at Shed One adds to the “vibe” of the waterfront and the city; and
- Being able to play sports during the day i.e. lunchtime, attracts workers to Wellington.

### **Berthage Strategy**

Four submissions commented on berthage strategy. 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. One submitter agreed that boating and shipping movements are important however had concern that developments on the waterfront such as the Hilton Hotel would limit access to areas like the Outer T. The use of the waterfront for recreational maritime activities and for commuter boats was supported linking this use with helping to relieve traffic congestion on the Hutt motorway.

### **Kumutoto**

Four hundred and sixty seven submissions were received on this area, including the four hundred and sixty submissions that stated site 10 be designated for an indoor sports facility.

Four 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. Five submissions specifically opposed any development on sites 8, 9 and 10 while two submissions felt that development could occur on these sites but only at ground level. One submission expressed concern over the negative impacts development will have on the heritage buildings within the area e.g. Shed 13.

Two submissions expressed concern over the shared lane behind the Meridian building which appears to be used predominately by vehicles.

One submission hoped that the developed designs will integrate more green elements – trees and grass areas into the public spaces, to soften the hard wind swept edges of buildings and concrete and commented that the promenade from Kumutoto to the Ferry Terminals and Railway Station is a vital part of the Site 10 development concept and the Kumutoto area.

### **Hotel on Outer T**

Twenty nine submissions made reference to the proposed Hilton Hotel on the Outer T, the majority of these related to the impact it will have on the removal of Shed One resulting in a loss of sports facilities. Nine of these submissions were specifically against the hotel, with two concerned about the impacts the development will have on public access and the limitation on berths.

One submission stated that the proposed construction of the Hilton Hotel on the Queens Wharf Outer T is a signal that Wellington's tourism industry is seen as worthy of significant investment.

### **TSB Arena**

Three submissions stated that there was no traffic management plan implemented for this area and were concerned about the impact that the traffic is having on pedestrian safety.

### **Frank Kitts Park and the Chinese Garden**

Fourteen submissions specifically commented on Frank Kitts Park. Eleven of these submissions consider that there is no need to redesign Frank Kitts Park, with the expense being a waste of ratepayers' money. Two submissions specifically stated that the park is satisfactory as it is. Ten of the submissions consider that Frank Kitts Park is not the suitable location for a Chinese Garden and suggest that Waitangi Park is the better location.

Two submissions supported the redesign of Frank Kitts Park however one of these did comment that the location of the Chinese Garden should be one that is "*enclosed, calm, inward focussed, and full of nature*", which they didn't consider Frank Kitts Park to be.

One submission stated that vehicular movement within and surrounding Frank Kitts Park should be minimized with the focus being on pedestrian access.

### **Taranaki Wharf and Lagoon**

Fourteen submissions commented on this area with eight submissions specifically commenting negatively on the necessity and construction of a second bridge from Civic Square to Taranaki Wharf. One submission felt that this area was fine and that the Council should leave this space alone.

Five submissions stated that the existing bridge should be extended to provide greater accessibility, keeping the design compatible and harmonious with the landscape. It was commented that regardless of the design it is important that accessibility is provided for all regardless of their level of mobility. Suggestions were also made on the design of the current Athfield "two fingers" bridge to allow greater views of the sea from Jervois Quay which are presently obscured.

One submission congratulated Wellington Waterfront Ltd on the sensitive redevelopment of the Brewery and St Johns Ambulance heritage buildings.

Three submissions supported the wharewaka/wharenui complex/development.

Vehicular traffic around Shed 6 was commented upon stating that it had significant impacts on the pedestrian promenade experience. It was considered with increased pedestrian movements in this area, public transport to waterfront locations must be improved to alleviate traffic congestion and to reduce the need for at-grade parking

### **Waitangi Park and Herd Street Area**

Two submitters praised the development and completion of Waitangi Park to date however did comment that any further buildings in this area will need to be very carefully designed so as not to close off views and sun from the park or to increase the amount of at-grade parking. Three submissions opposed any building development on sites 1,2 and 3.

Two submissions were concerned that further development off Herd Street will create major traffic problems at the Herd Street/Oriental Parade intersection. These submissions felt that there was inadequate parking and poor access both to and from the developments of Waitangi Park, the Marina and Herd St.

One submitter considered that amendments to Waitangi Park would be an appropriate way of alleviating the potential parking and traffic problems, whilst another would like to see the provision of a Sunday market in the design of Site 4.

### **OPT**

Four submissions commented on the OPT. One submission felt that the public spaces in and around this building should complement its proximity to the wharf. Two submissions were against the proposed use of this site, design and lease. One would like to see this space used as a market place. One submitter specifically commented on the depth of the piles and design of the wharf/berths and the impacts this could have on berthage.

One submission stated that Chaffers Marina berth holders and the marine industry require vehicular access to transport large and heavy equipment. However many weekend sailing crew currently using OPT car parks are only carrying personal gear and therefore do not require vehicular parking.

It was acknowledged that apartment dwellers, utility vehicles and the disabled will all have vehicular requirements and finding a balanced solution should be a priority. It was recommended that Wellington Waterfront Ltd consider adopting a permit system to ensure that parking spaces are kept available for those that need them.

### **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.

## **5. Changes Indicated**

### **5.1 Written Submissions**

The vast majority of submissions (six hundred and four) related to the loss of indoor sports facilities due to the redevelopment of the Outer-T (Shed 1). Many of these submissions (four hundred and sixty) related to the design of Site 10, specifically that it should incorporate an indoor sports centre on the ground floor. A working party consisting of representatives from WWL, the Council and Save Our Sport (SOS) has been established for some time to identify solutions for relocating the indoor sports activity in the central city. It was reactivated when the decision was taken to develop the new indoor sports stadium in Cobham Drive. It meets regularly and is currently considering a number of options for indoor sports, one of which is Site 10. This working party will also liaise with the commercial operator that leases Sheds 1 and 6 to understand his plans.

Strong views continue to exist for some individuals and organisations in relation to the Hilton and the redevelopment of Frank Kitts Park. The Hilton proposal has already been approved by Council and is awaiting the decision of the Environment Court to determine whether it will go ahead. 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 still some time away due to the deferral of the funding in the business plan. While the funding of Frank Kitts Park has been deferred, design and planning for the park will continue as previously planned.

As commented previously the draft Waterfront Development plan is about the phasing/timing of the projects and the financial spend associated with these projects. Although a large number of submissions commented on the loss of sports facilities on the waterfront they did not address or request changes to the matters within the draft development plan.

Accordingly it is recommended that no changes be made to the 2007/08 draft Waterfront Development Plan as a result of written submissions received.

### **5.2 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. Eleven 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 detailed in Report 1.

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

## **6. Conclusion**

The consultation process allowed individuals and groups to provide their thoughts and suggestions on the 2007/08 draft Waterfront Development Plan. No changes to the plan are currently indicated, subject to the outcome of the oral submissions. However the ongoing efforts of the working party on options for shed 1/6 sporting activities is noted, particularly in light of the number of submissions highlighting this issue during the consultation.

*Report prepared by:*

*Kate Neilson, Project Manager, Council Controlled Organisations*

*Sarah Polaschek, Portfolio Manager, Council Controlled Organisations*

## **Supporting Information**

### **1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome**

*The Waterfront Development Plan would contribute 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**

*Consultation has been undertaken on the draft development plan. All affected parties were included, and feedback will be reported to the Subcommittee.*

#### **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.*