



# *A Community Sport Centre for Wellington*

*Submission and engagement responses on preliminary design*

**Absolutely**

**POSITIVELY**

ME HEKE KI PŌNEKE  
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL **Wellington**

This document is Wellington City Council's formal response to those who have made submissions about design aspects – including traffic – of the Indoor Community Sports Centre at Cobham Park, Kilbirnie.

Following a series of public meetings in October, where Council officers and Sinclair Knight Merz presented the preliminary design and the Traffic Impact Assessment, we called for feedback by way of formal submission, about these specific aspects of the Indoor Community Sports Centre.

We received 26 submissions on behalf of individuals and community groups, and added these to the full list of questions and comments raised at the public meetings. The public was given until 14 November to make the written submissions.

The large response has meant it has taken us longer than planned to collate the feedback and for officers from across Wellington City Council to consider and provide detailed responses to that feedback.

In addition to this document, the Council's web page for the Indoor Community Sports Centre (under Projects at [www.Wellington.govt.nz](http://www.Wellington.govt.nz)) will be updated throughout January with:

- the latest version of the Traffic Impact Assessment
- a report into acoustics
- the geotechnical report
- a report on wind effects
- the DTZ opinion on property valuations in the area around Cobham Park.

When further reports into shading and light spill are complete, these will also be added to the website. We expect this will be in early January.

The next step is for the Council to apply for resource consent for the Indoor Community Sports Centre. This process will start in late January. The Council has chosen to voluntarily notify the resource consent. This means that the public will be able to make further, formal, submissions on the environmental effects if they want to as the resource consent process unfolds.

If you want further information at this stage, please contact:

Tim Harrod

Senior Project Manager

– phone 803 8117

– email [tim.harrod@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:tim.harrod@wcc.govt.nz)

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
• 1	• Accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When you hold national/regional events, there is only one small local motel on Kilbirnie Crescent, as well as the Brentwood. Will there be more hotels as well as traffic as a result of the ICSC?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only potential development that we know of in the area may be an airport hotel.</li> <li>• If a developer saw an opportunity they could investigate accommodation further if they wished, but there are no applications for this at the moment.</li> </ul>
• 2	• Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the average earnings of people in this region, how can we be expected to pay for this \$40-\$50 million luxury?</li> <li>• People in the \$20-\$30,000 income bracket don't qualify for a benefit. How can we be expected to afford this? How much will our rates increase by?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project responds to the Council's strategic priority to increase our efforts to promote participation in sport and recreation, particularly in youth.</li> <li>• With that in mind, we consulted the Wellington public during the Draft Annual Plan process in 2006 and the majority of respondents said they supported the \$27 million, and then \$40 million project.</li> <li>• The proportion you pay to fund the project is already included in your rates bill, and for those in the low-income bracket a rate relief facility is available.</li> <li>• Please visit <a href="http://www.Wellington.govt.nz">www.Wellington.govt.nz</a> for further information on rates policies.</li> </ul>
• 3	• Airport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the runway being extended and will the runway extension at the airport have an impact on traffic?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes the runway is being extended to meet international requirements for safety run-off. However, the extension will be entirely contained with the airport's fence line.</li> </ul>
• 4	• Alternative sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land behind Rongotai College (Exhibition Grounds) has space for buses and is close to shops, so why can't the centre go there?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> Has council considered the following alternative sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Martin Luckie Park</li> <li>• Macalister Park</li> <li>• area opposite the retail centre at Lyall Bay between Kingsford Smith Street and Cochrane Street/Moa Point Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Is it possible to look at the former Fort Dorset playing field?</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Use Exhibition Ground as it's never going to be sold and is on solid ground not prone to liquefaction.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Buy land from Education Department (Exhibition, from proceeds of sale of Cobham as it's "now" zoned retail, and build a mall suitable for over 50-year-olds who don't like large malls or barn warehouses.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council looked at the Exhibition Grounds as a potential site, but it was not a possibility. The land is owned by the Education Department and was not for sale. It is also zoned Residential and would be very difficult if not impossible to gain resource consent. Other negatives with the site were poor access, and the lack of potential for naming rights sponsorship.</li> <li>• The land area of the playing grounds located on the site previously known as Fort Dorset is under 7000 sq m, therefore cannot accommodate the area required for 12 courts.</li> <li>• Martin Luckie Park and Macalister Park could not be considered because they are situated on the Town Belt.</li> <li>• To be able to do as the last submitter suggests, the Council would need absolute certainty that it could sell the Cobham site. There is no certainty as our processes are designed to provide transparency and seek public opinion. The Council has a robust property disposal process which would need to be followed should the sale of the land at Cobham ever be considered, the process requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public consultation, as the land is subject to Section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002. Any submissions will need to be considered.</li> <li>• Subject to Section 40 of the Public Works Act 1981 with an offer-back requirement. These parties include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government, as it was purchased off them initially.</li> <li>• Part of the site is stopped road and would be required to be offered back to LINZ as previous owner as per the above provision.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Internal business unit and iwi consultation is required.</li> <li>• The land may also be subject to Treaty claim, should it ever be sold.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
• 5	• Annual Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Annual Plan 2007/08 section on Transport Planning and Policy says "... we face challenges such as minimising harm by making the shift from private cars to public transport, walking, cycling and other forms of transport." How will providing the following assist in making this shift?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 325 car parks for private cars</li> <li>• no facilities for public transport</li> <li>• a set of dropped kerbs, a widened traffic island and a short stretch of footpath for pedestrians</li> <li>• an unspecified number of cycle parks for cyclists.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ICSC is located on a major bus route which is expected to encourage the use of public transport.</li> <li>• We will be working with Go Wellington and others to look at ways to promote "modal shift", however it needs to be recognised that this shift will not occur quickly. For related comments see "Parking – Maintaining Suitable Capacity".</li> <li>• The provision of car parks at the centre recognises the reality that many people will use cars to travel to the centre, and seeks to minimise parking impacts on surrounding streets.</li> <li>• The Council's approved Parking Policy implementation plan will also review and assess the impact of activities such as the airport, hospital and ICSC on on-street parking in residential areas.</li> </ul>
• 6	• Construction impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are we considering the construction hours, noise and dust nuisances and how we can reduce these impacts on the residents?</li> <li>• Are we considering the parking issues during construction and how we can reduce these impacts on the residents?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Construction traffic into Tacy Street, concerns over dust and mud.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are about to engage the services of a main contractor in a consultancy capacity to provide technical advice on programme, design, costs, sequencing etc. The issues raised here will form part of those discussions.</li> <li>• The issue on construction hours and other impacts are being addressed in a Construction Management Plan that is enforced through both the Resource Management Act and subsequent consent within the building consent conditions also.</li> <li>• We intend to continue discussions with the community on these issues also to aid our planning.</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Concerned that there will be a lot of construction noise.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Concerned that there will be a lot of construction dust.</i></li> </ul>	
• 7	• Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The consultation process: there is no reference that I could see on the Council website to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>this current consultation</i></li> <li>• <i>the detailed documentation handed out at the meeting.</i></li> <li>• <i>Why is this information not on the website, and how are people who have not attended a meeting supposed to know about what is going on and the opportunity they have to contribute?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please refer to the links at the bottom of the following page:</li> <li>• <a href="http://www.Wellington.govt.nz/projects/new/indoorsports.html">http://www.Wellington.govt.nz/projects/new/indoorsports.html</a></li> </ul>
• 8	• Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>There was consultation for an eight-court centre on Cobham Drive Park: when has the public been consulted over the significantly larger and more expensive 12-court proposal for this site, with its correspondingly greater effects?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation was undertaken in March of 2006 as part of the Council's draft Long Term Council Community Plan.</li> <li>• 15% of all submissions representing many thousands of sports people involved in netball, basketball and volleyball said that we should build 12 courts in lieu of eight.</li> <li>• A 12-court facility will enable a greater number of diverse sports groups and community groups to be able to use the Indoor Community Sports Centre, enhancing the ability to have multiple sports groups using the facility at the same time and meet future growth and demand for indoor sports.</li> <li>• Though not a priority, 12 courts would give Wellington an even greater chance of securing regional, national and international sports tournaments.</li> </ul>
• 9	• Cyclists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>No apparent provision for bicyclists, particularly as there are cycle ways near by. Will provision be made to park bikes?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A large number of cycle stands and ramping for cyclists will be provided. The design team is aware of the city to airport cycleway and hopes many users will arrive by cycle. The design does not hinder the cycleway and will maintain access where possible.</li> <li>• For related comments see "<i>Social Recreational Strategy</i>".</li> </ul>
• 10	• Design – Building Height	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How high is Peter Jackson's wall adjacent the community sport centre?</li> <li>• How high is the centre at its peak?</li> <li>• How high are the eaves on the Kemp Street side?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are two heights to the warehouse complex owned by Peter Jackson at 5.5m and 8.2m. The sports centre varies in height with the undulating eave, but is 8.2m above existing ground on the west, rising to 12m at the NW and SW and to 13.6m above existing ground at the south centre.</li> <li>• The highest point of the building is 15.7m above existing ground level, but this will not be easily seen except at great distance. The apparent height will be to the eaves, which vary from 13.6m in the centre south and north and 8.2m to existing ground on the east and west low points as mentioned.</li> </ul>
• 11	• Design – Cladding/General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Where is the glass, which are the concrete panels and what is the buffer zone?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fins made from concrete are arranged all around the building perimeter with glass between each fin. There are large areas of glass on the main north/south circulation spine and adjacent the entry. This allows light to enter and provides an easier material to place ventilation through.</li> <li>• The buffer zone is formed internally at the south end of the building. It is created by providing two sets of walls of differing materials/density. The first sets of walls are internal walls that separate the sports floor from the café and the administrative areas adjacent the southern ends of the courts. The second walls are the external perimeter walls formed of glass and concrete.</li> </ul>
• 12	• Design – Cladding/Graffiti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Will the external cladding be able to deal with graffiti?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be graffiti-guard treatment to 4m high.</li> </ul>
• 13	• Design – Cladding/Salt spray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Will the external cladding be able to deal with salt spray?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes the concrete cladding and glazing will be suitable for the harsh seaside environment and has been specifically chosen because of its low maintenance requirements and robustness.</li> </ul>
• 14	• Design – Cladding/Windows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Post question-time comments) The use of glass louvres has some problems particularly in windy areas. If you do need to use louvres, can you look at the choice of louvre to make sure they don't hum/flutter in the wind?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will be using either an automated mechanical louvre or automated window sash that will be rated to cope with the harsh conditions and not be noisy.</li> </ul>
• 15	• Design – Configuration/Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have we provided enough changing rooms?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are sufficient changing rooms and amenity spaces.</li> <li>• This issue has been discussed and the design agreed with the sporting codes and by Recreation Wellington (the facility operator).</li> </ul>
• 16	• Design – Configuration/Cafe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Café access: will this be via a separate entrance or will there be internal access also?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be access from the exterior and from inside the reception/foyer area of the complex.</li> </ul>
• 17	• Design –	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Café design: the café should be designed so that it does not</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The café is located at the southern end of the building and nearest the point of entry. It is</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
	Configuration/Café	<i>attract non-stadium users, e.g. no sea views.</i>	designed primarily for sports users. With this in mind, the majority of seating accommodates cubicles for 10-12 people. This allows teams to congregate and socialise in groups before and after matches.
• 18	• Design – Configuration/Courts	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>What is the central spine? Is it a physical separation? Space for bags etc. or congregational space?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The central spine is a series of structures and spaces that divides the building/sports hall in half allowing space equivalent to six netball courts to either half.</li> <li>• This “spine” has space for ablutions, change rooms, circulation and spectator viewing on both the ground floor (court level) and at a mezzanine level above the courts.</li> <li>• Some specific functional spaces are also located within the spine, such as tournament/court management control on the ground floor and a media room on the mezzanine.</li> </ul>
• 19	• Design – Configuration/Entry	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>How possible is it to move the entrance of the facility to the western side closer to the parking structure? This would minimise travel distance from the parking structure and assist in ensuring its use as well as aiding in the entrance being exposed to the southerly.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From a building design point of view we looked at siting the entry on the west but decided the south-east was preferable as it is seen more directly from the arrival street (Kemp Street), offers more room for gathering and is out of the more exposed and prevalent northerly wind that will move down the western side.</li> <li>• From a parking and traffic access perspective, the western access way is as close to the western boundary as possible. The exit from the drop-off area has been located so as to provide as long a kerb-line as possible for the drop-off area. People not using the drop-off will be able to exit from the western access way.</li> </ul>
• 20	• Design – Configuration/Entry	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Construct a glass atrium at the front entrance: Our concern is that people using the facility will mill around the front as they leave or are waiting to board transport. As noise carries, a glass atrium will contain this if it spanned from the stadium to the Kemp Street boundary.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a large atrium within the building. It is not practical or financially viable to enclose people within the trafficable area around the current footpath as there is the need for a drop-off zone for buses and cars across the front of the building.</li> <li>• The entrance to the building and primary route for people walking to car parks is 50m from the residences on the south side of Kemp Street. The angled nature of the concrete fins and building façade will help reflected sound travel on oblique angles and not directly across the road. The acoustic study undertaken by Marshall Day indicates the major change is from vehicles using the centre, not from pedestrian use. Measures such as resealing with a smooth surface are being considered to mitigate the increase in vehicle noise.</li> <li>• For related comments see “<i>Design – Noise Mitigation</i>”.</li> </ul>
• 21	• Design – Configuration/Vehicle Crossings	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Increased vehicle movements and noise due to entrance proximity being close to residence.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The northern kerb-line of Kemp Street is the only feasible location for an entrance to the facility.</li> <li>• The northern boundary is the only boundary not adjacent to residences but is bounded by SH1. SH1 is a limited access road to which access is not permitted.</li> </ul>
• 22	• Design – Floor	• Is the type of flooring being used going to avoid the problems that Kilbirnie Recreation Centre had after five years of use when it required resurfacing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a high-quality sprung timber sports floor which meets the sporting codes’ high standards.</li> <li>• This issue has been discussed and the design agreed with the sporting codes and by Recreation Wellington (the facility operator).</li> </ul>
• 23	• Design – General/Supporting	• Many residents really like the design of the facility and believe it will be a great asset for the city and the community. Commend the designers for all the work they have done to date.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and thanks.</li> </ul>
• 24	• Design – General/Unanswered Questions	• There seems to be many questions you cannot answer yes or no to, we hear many “it’s possible” or “it’s likely” – why? If we can be guaranteed of minimal impact we’d be ok. There seems to be a lot of grey areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have come to you (the community) early in the process to get feedback so there are a few areas which are still not fully worked through. The design has progressed beyond the concept stage to a point where we could engage with the community.</li> <li>• If we had come to the community sooner we wouldn’t have had a design with sufficient integrity to be certain it functioned in the correct way or was achievable within the defined budget. If we had come to the community at the conclusion of the preliminary stage and during detailed design we would be presenting a design almost at its conclusion with little opportunity for your thoughts and ideas to be included. There are a number of areas that we genuinely want your feedback, ideas and comments on as they do assist in our design.</li> </ul>
• 25	• Design – Ground Water Table	• If you consider the Electrolux building, the high tide and rain makes the design of the plant room important; they have problems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the centre has taken into account the issues of sea level and height of the water table. As a result we will not build structures that require deep excavation as this will require significant water protection measures which are not efficient nor cost-effective.</li> <li>• The building’s position on the site has been designed to utilise the natural contour of the site and minimise the amount of excavation or back-filling required.</li> <li>• In using natural ventilation, much of the required plant will be located in the roof space above the mezzanine level.</li> <li>• The types of lifts required for disabled access to the mezzanine floor will require a very shallow</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			depression, unlike the traditional deep lift pits.
• 26	• Design – Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Why use pohutakawa? They drop their leaves all year round and they do not rot down – the gutters will need to be maintained to avoid blocking.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Are the grounds going to have green spaces, not just hard surfaces?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pohutakawa are one of the few native trees that can withstand the difficult coastal conditions as evidenced by their extensive use in similar locations. The existing trees along Kemp Street are being relocated to new locations on the site. The trees will not grow to a height that will affect roof guttering.</li> <li>• The site will be primarily hard surface to the west, with the building and parking covering the greater proportion. However, the landscape has been designed by the same designers as Waitangi Park, with areas of trees and under-planting around the boundary. There is a planted berm to the north and east, and plantings along the flanks of the car park structure. Trees will partially screen the building from Kemp Street, and a running track surrounds the building.</li> </ul>
• 27	• Design – Light Spill and Glare/Mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The airport utilises a directional lighting system for the car parks that doesn't cause a lot of spill or glare. The Council should look at this type of lighting.</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Headlight wash from car entering the car park entrance and the drop-off as proximity being close to residence.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Is the building and car park structure going to have security flood lights? If so, the glare effect for neighbours needs to be considered.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will be using lights that are downward in direction, which are specifically designed to be low glare and that reduce light spill to surrounding areas.</li> <li>• Headlights from cars entering the complex, and those exiting from the drop-off lane which joins Kemp Street near Troy Street, will not affect residences due to the direction of movement as well as the downward exiting nature caused by the exit ramps.</li> <li>• The car park lighting is designed for downward lighting to minimise sideways spill and glare. Lighting levels are to the combined Australia and NZ Standards, and there are associated cameras for security.</li> </ul>
• 28	• Design – Noise/Existing Levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Any testing been done on ambient noise at Troy, Kemp and Cobham intersection during the day and night, if so how far inside the legal levels are these? If outside the legal levels, what are the current reasons for this?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed report by acoustic consultants has tested the ambient noise on and around the site currently. The site is situated within the 65 dBA airport noise contour, meaning there is a high level of existing background noise, including that from the high-volume existing arterial roads. This permitted level is greater than that provided for as an outer residential limit in the district plan.</li> <li>• The building roof and walls are designed to mitigate noise spill from within the centre. Ambient noise from vehicles will be more than the noise from within the centre, and in many times of day is masked by the non-centre background noise. The additional effect has been categorised as minor on Kemp Street and less than minor on east side of Troy Street.</li> <li>• Mitigation measures such as a smooth road surface for Kemp Street are under consideration, along with an anti-squeal concrete surface in the car park.</li> <li>• For related comments see <i>“Design – Cladding/General”</i>.</li> </ul>
• 29	• Design – Noise/Generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Increased noise from car doors slamming and voices due to drop off proximity being close to residence.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>What is the additional noise generated by traffic and people during the day and night?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be some noise from voices and doors, though the bulk of the parking is over 50m away from residences.</li> <li>• For related comments see <i>“Design – Noise/Existing Levels”, “Design – Configuration/Vehicle Crossings”, “Design – Noise/Mitigation”</i> and <i>“Design – Configuration/Entry”</i>.</li> </ul>
• 30	• Design – Noise/Mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Look at noise mitigation measures at the entrance in case people mill around the front doors.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The entrance to the building and primary routes for people walking to car parks is 50m from the residences on the south of Kemp Street. The angle nature of the concrete fins and the building façade will help reflected sounds travel on oblique angles and not directly across the road.</li> <li>• The acoustic report states vehicle movement to be the main source of sound, not from the centre in use.</li> <li>• For related comments see <i>“Design – Noise/Existing Levels”, “Design – Configuration/Vehicle Crossings”, “Design – Noise/Generation”</i> and <i>“Design – Configuration/Entry”</i>.</li> </ul>
• 31	• Design – PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Will there be a PA system?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a court-by-court PA system to communicate with players. The centre's concrete fins (mass and orientation) combined with the buffer zone and the design of the roof will help to mitigate noise.</li> <li>• For related comments see <i>“Design – Cladding/General”</i>.</li> </ul>
• 32	• Design – Rubbish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Will require a lot of rubbish bins, children these days just drop rubbish.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a good comment. Initially the landscape plan has called for rubbish bins at strategic locations. This will be reviewed further for the interior also.</li> </ul>
• 33	• Design – Seismic/Liquefaction and Quakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2006 report to the Council stated that the facility would be available for Civil Defence purposes, so what will happen in a massive earthquake that raises Miramar by two metres, particularly dealing with liquefaction?</li> <li>• Earthquakes in the area will cut off everything.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The centre is designed to deal with liquefaction and some up-thrust events, and it is likely it would be in good condition in the event of an earthquake in the order of magnitude 5. It is not designed to withstand a massive earthquake as it is simply too expensive and impractical to do so on such a large scale. The centre is also not designed as a Civil Defence building, rather it is designed like many community facilities to be a focal point in a natural disaster and be able to</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Concerns about geotechnical design and how the builder will build it to meet the stated liquefaction and earthquake levels.</i></li> </ul>	<p>provide assistance to other efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This design component is one of the factors causing the increase beyond the \$40.3 million identified in the LTCCP.</li> </ul>
• 34	• Design – Sunlight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re sunlight and wind: what’s being done to maximise the sun?</li> <li>• Will the houses/yards on Kemp Street be overshadowed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have located the building and designed the height and eaves in such a way as to minimise the shadowing effect. The effects of the shadowing are being investigated further and this information will be made available on the council website.</li> </ul>
• 35	• Design – Urban Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Post question-time comments) What initiatives could be looked at for residents of Kemp Street as they will be the most affected? Could it be possible to look to “undergrounding” the cables, street lighting or planting improvement as an offset?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of traffic calming measures will help to improve the visual aspect of the street; however other measures are beyond the scope of the project at this stage. Council officers will continue to investigate opportunities as they arise in case initiatives can be incorporated at a future time.</li> </ul>
• 36	• Design – Views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will lose our view of Mount Victoria from Kemp Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views are not protected under the district scheme. This has been a longstanding aspect of development controls in the city as it is very difficult to control the retention of views.</li> </ul>
• 37	• Design – Wind	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re sunlight and wind: what’s being done to minimise the wind?</li> <li>• Will the centre make the wind worse for residents?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Concerned the northerly wind effects will be not be mitigated?</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Concerned the northerly wind effects will be mitigated, afraid the fins may actually cause noise?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wind report and wind tunnel testing has been completed to analyse the building and landscape wind effects. From this trees and screens have been placed to dampen wind speeds in pedestrian areas. Some parts of Kemp Street will have sheltering effects from the building and the area adjacent to the car park area will experience similar wind conditions as currently encountered on the open site.</li> <li>• The fins are made from concrete and will not make noise.</li> <li>• The perforated screens around the car park are specifically design not make noise.</li> </ul>
• 38	• Displaced sport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the sport centre is going to be built on currently open space, what are we doing to find grounds for the displaced sport? Have we thought about using Cog Park?</li> <li>• Some residents drive past Cobham Drive Park on the way to sports fixtures in the north of the city and wouldn’t want to drive further because the park was no longer available. The two open space fields that are being using to build the ICSC are intensively used, how will they be replaced?</li> <li>• Cobham Park is the last open space in the eastern suburbs.</li> <li>• There needs to be a clear and definite plan for their replacement.</li> <li>• Where can children play in public open space?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Cog Park is not big enough for indoor sport.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Council’s commitment to addressing sedentary lifestyles was being addressed with the park space. Now the community sport centre destroys this as it prevents green space sports, flying kites and other active pursuits.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>I am concerned over the loss of provision for outdoor sports.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are exploring opportunities to use under-utilised open space. The redevelopment of Cog Park has created a larger open space area at Evans Bay. However, the main grass area is unsuitable as a sports field because it is not level.</li> <li>• We are working with schools, as there is potential for a partnership whereby the community could gain usage of the school grounds. This will aid in the displaced sports being accommodated.</li> <li>• The Council provides the sports grounds but not the schedule of where and when sport is to be played. It may be worthwhile members of sporting groups discussing scheduling of games in all codes with the respective sporting associations, with a view to better planning for travel to sports grounds throughout the city. The Council would be happy and able to assist in facilitating this work.</li> <li>• There are a large number of sports fields and open space playing areas in the eastern suburbs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Play areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breaker Bay</li> <li>• Cog Park, Evans Bay</li> <li>• Treasure Grove, Hataitai</li> <li>• Waipapa Road, Hataitai</li> <li>• Kilbirnie Park</li> <li>• Lyall Bay</li> <li>• Akaroa Drive, Miramar</li> <li>• Chelsea Street, Miramar</li> <li>• Crawford Green Park, Miramar</li> <li>• Wilberforce Street, Miramar</li> <li>• Miramar North</li> <li>• Seatoun Park</li> <li>• Sinclair Park</li> <li>• Kekerenga Street, Strathmore</li> <li>• Monorgan Park</li> <li>• Nuku Street, Strathmore</li> <li>• Tairoa Street, Strathmore</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Sports fields: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centennial Park</li> <li>• Crawford Green Park</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evans Bay Park</li> <li>● Hataitai Park</li> <li>● Kilbirnie Park</li> <li>● Miramar Park</li> <li>● Polo Ground Park</li> <li>● Seatoun Park</li> <li>● In addition there are also school park areas available.</li> </ul>
● 39	● Draft Annual Plan	● Where do we go to voice our concerns if we are opposed to the ICSC?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Everyone in Wellington was consulted in 2006 on the Draft Annual Plan, and that included whether they wanted the Indoor Community Sport Centre or not. Huge support was received for the proposal.</li> <li>● You are able to make submissions via the resource consent process. For related comments see “Resource Consent”.</li> </ul>
● 40	● Engagement	● Is the Council considering opening this discussion up to the residents of Rongotai Road?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We have made the residents of Rongotai Road aware of the public meeting on the 31 October and they have been invited by letter box drop.</li> </ul>
● 41	● Engagement	● <b>[Submission comment]</b> Will all comments and questions received be circulated to the Mayor and all Councillors?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● As this document is going to be publicly available, this information will be shared with Councillors and the Mayor.</li> </ul>
● 42	● Engagement	● <b>[Submission comment]</b> Why is a period of only 14 days from the public meeting being allowed for this consultation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The public meeting was held to introduce and discuss the design of the sport centre. The site and the need for 12 courts had been consulted on in March of 2006.</li> <li>● As the engagement process was tightly focused on design issues around the site, building and traffic it was felt that two weeks to compile submissions should be sufficient considering we had met with the centre’s neighbours a week prior and with the progressive and residents associations another week prior to that. So in reality, we had been receiving feedback and submissions for two weeks prior to the public meeting.</li> </ul>
● 43	● Engagement – Feedback	● (Post question-time comments) Will opportunity be given for the residents or public to meet again and see what the outcomes of these meetings have been? Can we see the revised designs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The feedback loops hadn’t been defined when we engaged as we felt that the types of questions/responses/feedback we receive will guide us in the best way to do this.</li> <li>● Initial indications are that staged feedback and information will be appropriate, with focus groups potentially being used for specific design queries.</li> </ul>
● 44	● Engagement – Feedback	● When will we get an answer to questions we asked at previous meetings that weren’t answered?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We have been overwhelmed with questions and are answering them as quickly as possible and will provide answers to many of them over the next few weeks.</li> <li>● Some items, however, will require more detailed work and for those we will continue with updates as information comes available.</li> </ul>
● 45	● Finance – Funding/Rates	● Why are we paying a levy on our rates?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● When you talk about a “levy”, we assume you refer to the “targeted rate”.</li> <li>● In March 2006 the Council decided to build the eight-court indoor community sport centre for \$29 million and would pay the debt back over 50 years. After consultation, feedback showed we needed to build 12 courts to accommodate demand and that this would cost \$11 million more. It was agreed by the Council that this additional \$11 million would be paid in a shorter time of 10 years as a “targeted rate”.</li> <li>● This rate equates to approximately 1% of total residential rates – approximately \$17 per year for the average residential property.</li> </ul>
● 46	● Financial – Business Case/Capital Expenditure (Capex)	● <b>[Submission comment]</b> Business case for courts is weak, 12 courts at \$50 million = \$4.5 million per court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● At this time our estimates have shown the cost to design and build our centre are near \$46 million. (\$3.83 million per court) This compares favourably with values of the country’s two most recent examples of similar facilities, those being Porirua’s four courts at \$17 million (\$4.25 million per court) and Tauranga’s proposed nine-court facility at \$40 million (\$4.44 million per court). We still have further value management and value engineering processes to go through that will refine our design and cost.</li> </ul>
● 47	● Financial – Capital Expenditure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What is the total capital expenditure including roading and other associated modifications?</li> <li>● <b>[Submission comment]</b> The \$50 million cost is higher than that as the costs of traffic improvements and economic cost of congestion are factored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Correct, the value identified at \$46 million doesn’t take into account the cost of roading works. The environmental effects, including impacts on the roading network, are minor. However, we do acknowledge that there are in some cases poor existing conditions in the road network and there are existing budgets to rectify this.</li> </ul>
● 48	● Financial – Depreciation	● What is the depreciation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The depreciation expense for the project reflects the proportion of the asset which is “used up” each year over the asset’s life. Depreciation forms part of the net funding requirement for the project and will be funded through general rates. Total depreciation will be equivalent to the total capital cost of the project. Based on the original \$40.4 million capital cost estimate, depreciation</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			will make up approximately \$1.2 million of total operating costs from the year following construction completion (based on a 60-year asset life).
• 49	• Financial – Interest	• What is the total amount of interest to be paid?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The interest component forecast reflects debt servicing costs on the funds borrowed to construct the stadium. As both the targeted rate and depreciation funding pay for debt repayment interest costs reduce over the life of the asset as cumulative targeted rate/depreciation funded component grows. Based on the original \$40.4 million cost estimate, in the first full year following construction interest costs are forecast to be \$2.5 million or a total of approximately \$69 million over the 60-year life of the asset.</li> </ul>
• 50	• Financial – Operational Expenditure (Opex) Cost	• What is the total operational expenditure including specifically the itemised external cleaning cost, internal cleaning cost, administrative costs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council is happy to provide as much information as it has available. Given the project is just beyond concept design stage, the operating costs will continue to be reviewed throughout the design phases and construction. The operational costs were reviewed when the Council made its decision to increase the centre from eight to 12 courts, and this was outlined in the report to the Strategy and Policy Committee on 21 June 2006. The following operational costs were identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The average net operating cost over the life of the asset (50-60 years) is approximately \$2.089 million per annum, which includes interests and depreciation costs. The net cost of the centre's operation is estimated at approximately \$460,000-\$500,000 per year. (Included in the anticipated expenses is \$80,000 for the cost of facility cleaning, both internally and externally). The identified net operating deficit was \$4.420 million in year 4, reducing to \$3.653 million by year 10. These figures included interest, depreciation. These numbers we used to identify the 10-year targeted rate of \$17.50 ex-GST.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For related comments see “Financial – Depreciation”, “Financial – Interest”, “Finance – Funding/Rates”.</li> </ul>
• 51	• General	• If we realise in 2010 it's not working and the situation is a mess, what can we do then, or is it too late?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rigour we are putting into design and the engagement process is to provide the best possible outcome given the project's constraints.</li> </ul>
• 52	• General	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Concern the Mayor is too close and any other public meetings should be by an “independent chairperson”. Concern over the imposed cost.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
• 53	• General – Existing Facilities	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Seems to be no analysis of existing community facilities being used for indoor sport. Notes that there are 40 schools in the vicinity but failed to note that most of these have gymnasiums. Co-ordination of resources and low-cost improvements could make these facilities more widely and intensively used and cost less than \$50 million.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be substantial benefits and cost efficiencies from having a large 12-court facility. Many of the school facilities are operating at capacity and are unable to meet the demand or growth in indoor sports such as netball, basketball and volleyball, or they do not meet the required standard of size for the safe and effective provision of various sports. A cluster of smaller facilities would be disadvantageous for attracting large indoor sports tournaments to Wellington.</li> </ul>
• 54	• General – Impact on Netball	• What will be the impact of Wellington netball on Hataitai Park courts on a winter Saturday?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early indications are that their primary and junior competitions will move to Hataitai Park courts and their senior competition will move to the ICSC.</li> </ul>
• 55	• General – Impact Unreasonable	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The proposal has an unreasonable impact on residents, businesses and schools.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rigour being put into design and the engagement process is to provide the best possible outcome given the project's constraints and to resolve as many issues as possible by providing robust mitigation strategies.</li> </ul>
• 56	• General – Sports Admin Hub	• (Post question-time comments) Will the ICSC become the home of the Saints or the Shakers? It has been done in Palmerston North, is it likely to happen here?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The venue for these games will remain at the TSB Arena; that is its purpose. The centre will not compete with the TSB Arena for activities or events; they should complement each other.</li> </ul>
• 57	• Harbour Quays	• The Harbour Quays proposal was for a regional facility. Will the Cobham centre still be regional?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Harbour Quays site was for a Wellington City community sports facility.</li> <li>• As Greater Wellington Regional Council weren't going to fund the HQ proposal, it was to be 100% funded by the Council. It was never to be a regional facility.</li> </ul>
• 58	• Operation – Café	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it to be a “destination” café?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Propose that the café should discourage non-indoor sport centre users, as it will be a draw card in its own right.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>At 255 seats, should this become a destination in its own right its traffic volumes and parking impacts will significantly magnify these same aspects of the stadium itself.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the café operation will need to remain viable for its operator, its primary function will be to cater for those using the centre for sports. This may result in “sessionalised” operation to cater for peak times of use.</li> <li>• No additional car parks have been included for the café but have been included in the overall requirement of 325 car parks</li> <li>• For related comments see “Design – Configuration/Café”</li> </ul>
• 59	• Operation – Financial/Admission Charge	• Is the facility going to be paid for by users? If not fully paid for, what is the percentage that will be recovered from admissions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has a Revenue and Financing Policy which determines who benefits from various services and facilities and who should pay. For community sport and recreation centres this policy currently reflects 30% of the cost of providing recreation centres being met by users and 70% by ratepayers. The community indoor sports centre will operate in accordance with the relevant</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			Council policy at the time.
• 60	• Operation – Funding Operational Expenditure	• Who's paying for the running of the centre?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are looking to central government funding for some operational costs and will be talking with the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health and SPARC.</li> <li>• We will be looking to find sponsors who can provide either complementary services or financial support. These discussions have started.</li> <li>• There will be a component of user pays as there is at the pools, particularly as the codes indicated they couldn't support the centre with funds for the capital construction cost but would be able to contribute as a user.</li> <li>• Partly funded with your rates as are other essential community services such as libraries.</li> </ul>
• 61	• Operation – Go Wellington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are we working with Stagecoach [Go Wellington] to improve the scheduling for all routes not only those specifically for school drop-off and pick-up?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Bus driver shortage, if buses are late it will affect scheduling.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Go Wellington made a positive submission to the original proposal to establish a community sports centre at Cobham Park. We will work with them to maximise their support and hopefully become a partner in providing transport options for getting to and from the centre. This may include support for transporting schools in what is an off-peak time for buses and reviewing schedules for improved bus availability in servicing the centre.</li> </ul>
• 62	• Operation – Hours/Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are some concerns with noise – is it anticipated that sport will be played beyond 10pm?</li> <li>• Would it be a good idea to have noise monitoring in place at least initially?</li> <li>• Are we designing to minimise court noise getting out?</li> <li>• You say events will finish at 10pm. Will people be able to socialise after 10pm?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We haven't considered in detail the actual extent of programming so we can't confirm start or finish times at this stage. However, we envisage that 10pm is likely to be the time we will operate to.</li> <li>• It is likely that this will become a resource consent requirement and we would meet any conditions placed on the centre. There may be exceptions for one-off events.</li> <li>• We have considered peoples' voices when they leave the centre and we are looking at measures that will minimise this.</li> <li>• Yes we are, we are modelling noise with acoustic engineers Marshall Day and are putting a number of initiatives in place: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• non-symmetrical/reflective internal surfaces</li> <li>• surface treatment to the internal walls to minimise the effects of reflected sound</li> <li>• concrete external walls to keep the sound in</li> <li>• buffer zone between the external walls and internal playing area of the Kemp Street end of the facility (effectively two walls).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
• 63	• Operation – Income	• What is the projected income from admissions/events etc?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council is happy to provide as much information as it has available, given we are just beyond a concept stage in design. Initial operational budgeting models at concept stage estimated total annual revenue of approximately \$580,000.</li> </ul>
• 64	• Operation – Liquor license	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the centre have a liquor licence?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Liquor licence: will this require each function to have its own license and ensuing responsibility to clear up its rubbish?</i></li> <li>• Liquor licence: will this have a set time limit?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Hours of operation: will they be different for regular operation and events and won't these controls make the liquor licence unattractive?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes it is envisaged that the centre will be licensed. This would primarily be for the purposes of supporting programmes and events associated with various sports using the centre. In a function capacity (e.g. tournament or end of season prize giving) and where appropriate we would like to be able to provide the option of alcohol with these activities.</li> <li>• We anticipate similar rules for activities as is in place in other Council buildings with regards to clean up and facility responsibility.</li> <li>• Many sporting clubs and associations do not have a "home" ground, and this facility will be designed so clubs can socialise together. Socialisation is an essential component for users and is a key to the success of this type of facility in becoming part of "community".</li> </ul>
• 65	• Operation – Lost Property	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Presumably the centre will employ people to manage toilets and changing areas for lost property?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The centre will have personnel on site at all times the centre is operational. This will include supervision by staff members and CCTV. A system for collection and identification of lost property will be established.</li> </ul>
• 66	• Operation – Parking/Hours	• Will the car parks be accessible when the facility is not operating?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, car parking outside of operational hours will not be available.</li> </ul>
• 67	• Operation – Scheduling	• It is supposed to be a sports facility. Does it need dining/banquet facilities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The centre is primarily for community sports and will be dominated by such use. However, on the rare occasion the city has the opportunity to host a large event dinner or banquet then the centre will provide a suitable venue that the city currently lacks.</li> </ul>
• 68	• Operation – Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When talking to schools, how many of them said that they would use the centre?</li> <li>• Some believe that schools will not use the facility (as they have their own halls) unless the Council offers something they do not have.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council had discussion with schools during the original consultation round. At this time 64% of schools contacted said they would use the centre.</li> <li>• With the concept now in place, work is being done on programmes that will complement and add</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			to school physical education curriculum and enhance what is already on offer, very similar to the successful programmes run at the Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre. Our current engagement programme with schools will be completed by the middle of 2008.
• 69	• Operation – Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Is the Council going to have this facility monitored by a security firm?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, the facility will incorporate CCTV and alarm systems that will be monitored by the Council's security provider.</li> </ul>
• 70	• Operation - Tournaments and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you know how many tournaments will be coming to the centre?</li> <li>• Do you know how many tournaments will be coming to the centre and do we expect these to be for all the minority sports too?</li> <li>• Will the Council create its own limitation on the number of events to be run at the centre?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do not know the number of tournaments to expect (including those for minority sports) as we will be competing with similar centres in Manawatu, Dunedin, Invercargill and Waitakere City etc.</li> <li>• The number is also something that the Council would like to discuss with the users and the residents in much more detail.</li> </ul>
• 71	• Operation - Tournaments and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This venue is supposed to be purely for Wellington but it will be hosting five or six national events.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We don't yet know the number of tournaments to expect as we will be competing with similar centres in Manawatu, Dunedin, Invercargill and Waitakere City. But tournaments are likely to be hosted at the centre if the city is successful in winning them.</li> <li>• It's important to note that there is sufficient capacity within the court layout to enable community sport to be played while tournaments are under way, in some cases.</li> <li>• Junior sport does benefit from the presence of competitive tournaments in a region. It provides an opportunity to view quality competition and therefore aids in the players' motivation, development and ambition.</li> </ul>
• 72	• Operation - Tournaments and Events/Hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you intending to have concerts into the early hours of the morning?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would be contrary to the objectives of the facility and diminishes its purpose.</li> <li>• However, on the rare occasion the city has the opportunity to host a large event dinner or banquet then the centre will provide a suitable facility that the city lacks.</li> <li>• These activities may require their own consents and would also require an event management plan.</li> <li>• It is likely also that other controls such as resource consent conditions for the building itself would limit such use in the later hours of the evening.</li> </ul>
• 73	• Operation - Tournaments and Events/Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will you manage parking when you factor in other events in the area (e.g. the Indian Cultural Centre)? We note that if the Indian Cultural Centre has an event on, people park on the street because it's quicker.</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Parking for tournaments and events for up to 2500 people for tournaments and finals and 4000 people for unspecified number of one-off events.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Traffic Impact Assessment analysed the parking in a number of different ways. It reviewed the original work done by the Traffic Design Group and found that 325 car parks will be sufficient.</li> <li>• It should be noted also that the Council provides 250 car parks for the Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre (including its café), the Kilbirnie Library, Kilbirnie Bowling Club and Poneke Rugby Club, which attracts some 650,000 visitors and participants a year. The community sport centre will be providing 325 car parks and we are anticipating 400,000 visitors and participants a year.</li> <li>• There is existing parking demand in Kemp Street; we will not increase this demand.</li> <li>• The Council is going to have further discussion with Indian Cultural Centre management and will establish traffic management plans for one-off major events that may clash.</li> </ul>
• 74	• Opposed – General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Opposed.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Opposed (grounds of dropping property values, traffic, loss of green space, site is too small, local schools won't use it).</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Opposed (grounds of increased traffic congestion, events impact causing additional parking, noise and alcohol consumption, reducing property valuations). Petition signed by 15 adjacent land owners.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Residents Association poll of Hataitai Residents 52 replies received, seven supporting.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Points of concern:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>traffic congestion around Moxham Avenue and Ruahine Street causing increase in surrounding network</i></li> <li>• <i>more intensive retail development in Kilbirnie will only increase traffic congestion</i></li> <li>• <i>loss of playing fields</i></li> <li>• <i>increased parking demand</i></li> <li>• <i>not appropriate in a residential area</i></li> <li>• <i>increased cost, increase on rates</i></li> <li>• <i>will become a regional facility.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to sections identified in this feedback document that relate to the topics identified, all concerns have been responded to.</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
75	Parking – Maintaining Suitable Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will 325 car parks be sufficient given the number of players attending and the café?</li> <li>• Can the Council look at the number of residents' car parks on Kemp Street and do something to improve this?</li> <li>• Many residents raised the issue of a rental car company utilising the residential streets of Kemp and Tacy to park vehicles, often preventing residents and their visitors from finding a park. Can it be investigated and a solution found?</li> <li>• Combined with limited parking availability, occasionally we have had to get tow trucks to remove blocking cars; won't this centre make things worse?</li> <li>• Will the car parks be free?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Who will police the parking and bus parking, particularly as it's free?</i></li> <li>• Sometimes people have to park on the front of Peter Jackson's property.</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>How will Council ensure that user of the centre does not use Big Save's car parks?</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Concerned that people will park in Kemp Street, walk through the ROW and drop children off at the crèche.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>People are parking on the grass verges on Kemp Street. Maybe plantings would stop this habit.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>At what point will the northern parking be stopped, and what encouragement will be made for centre users to use the car parking building and others not to park in areas used by locals?</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Who will police the parking and bus parking, particularly as it's free? I have had to miss doctor's appointments because Parkwise haven't turned up in time to get cars towed from my driveway.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Resident car parking: The residents of Rongotai Road and Kemp Street should be surveyed if they want residents-only parking outside their houses. This offer should include free parking and the provision of a contact number to have offending vehicles towed.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Traffic Impact Assessment analysed the parking in a number of different ways. It reviewed the original work done by the Traffic Design Group and found that 325 would be sufficient. The 325 car parks are sufficient for peak demand, so parking conditions on Kemp Street at the busiest time will not get worse. In other words our intent is that we do not worsen any existing parking demand in Kemp Street.</li> <li>• To provide some context and comparison, the Council provides 250 car parks for the Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre (including its café), the Kilbirnie Library, Kilbirnie Bowling Club and Poneke Rugby Club, which attracts some 650,000 visitors and participants a year. The community sport centre will be providing 325 car parks and we are anticipating 400,000 visitors and participants a year.</li> <li>• What we intend to do: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look at ways to minimise any potential reduction in car park numbers on the northern side of Kemp Street.</li> <li>• Work with the Indian Cultural Centre: The Council is going to have further discussion with the Indian Cultural Centre management and will establish traffic management plans for one-off major events that may clash, as well as parking issues that may arise.</li> <li>• Incentivise people who are attending the facility to park in the structure. We can do this by providing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• parking that is free</li> <li>• potentially ticketing that ensures only players or spectators and users of the facility are identified (this system could be linked into player registrations, turnstiles etc to enable an incentive scheme to encourage pedestrian, cycle, bus or car pool access).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Disincentivise others who are non-facility users: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a possible initiative is to provide resident parking to one side of the Kemp Street – this will be looked into in more detail</li> <li>• time restricted parking areas on Kemp Street for those who are visiting the residents</li> <li>• permit parking for two-hour-plus stays</li> <li>• work with Parkwise to aid in having illegally parked vehicles removed – we will work with Parkwise to understand the peak times for monitoring and how this could be improved</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Have Parkwise check for long-staying vehicles in the centre's car park structure and have these vehicles, towed, clamped or ticketed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
76	Parking – SH1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People are going to park on SH1.</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>People will stop on SH1 to drop kids off (they won't park there in reference to item 62 from feedback.).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unlikely that people will park on SH1 as parking or stopping on SH1 is not permitted and this would be enforced.</li> </ul>
77	Parking – Tacy Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 120-minute parking on Tacy Street is going to be introduced along with perpendicular parks; this looks to be a good improvement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
78	Pedestrian Access – Delays	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are bottlenecks of traffic created at the pedestrian crossings. Some residents think that this will increase delays by more than 20 seconds.</li> <li>• Sometimes the delays are in excess of 20 minutes trying to proceed through the roundabout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are looking at pedestrian access placed in such a way as to minimise delays to traffic. But to enable better understanding of this we will be conducting a survey sometime between February and May 2008 when these roads return to "normal" flows (not around holiday periods etc.). The main outcome will be to ascertain traffic delays along Rongotai Road.</li> <li>• A preliminary review of Rongotai Road, including assessing intersection capacity, network efficiency and public safety, will be carried out by May/June 2008 also. This may also include appropriate directional signage.</li> <li>• It is important to note that it is not financially feasible or practical to design for the occasional delay caused by trolley bus stoppages and/or breakdowns.</li> </ul>
79	Pedestrian Access – Kemp/Rongotai	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The kids use shortcuts to Kemp Street from Rongotai when hopping off buses. Often they are yelling and fooling around and may not be paying attention to Kemp Street traffic. Could</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The safety barrier for kids is a good initiative and will be installed in February 2008.</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
		<p>some form of barrier be installed to ensure they do not spill out onto the carriageway?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Move the Rongotai Road bus stop forward to in front of the pedestrian crossing. At present when people get off the bus, many walk in front of the bus to cross the road, meaning the bus has to wait and that in turn leads to more congestion.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will make this work part of preliminary review of Rongotai Road to be completed by May/June 2008. We will ensure it includes assessing parking, bus stops and pedestrian crossings.</li> </ul>
• 80	• Pedestrian Access – Miramar/SH1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Miramar foot traffic cannot get across Calabar Road or across SH1 easily or safely.</li> <li>• We need pedestrian access across Cobham Drive.</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Traffic Impact Assessment says "Pedestrians travelling to the site along Cobham Drive from the east (Miramar) will need to cross Troy Street". It is not mentioned here, but the greatest obstacle for pedestrians coming from Miramar is SH1, which has no provision for pedestrians to cross Cobham Drive and Calabar Rd (both busy four-lane 70 km/h roads) east of Evans Bay Parade. How will this significant barrier to pedestrian access to the proposed centre be addressed?</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Crossing from Cobham Drive to Calabar Road needs to be addressed.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce speed limit from 70km/h to 50km/h</li> <li>• Positive steps are taken to ensure pedestrian safety for crossing Cobham Drive and Calabar Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Provide a foot bridge across Cobham Drive: It is stated that many users will commute to the facility on foot or using cycles. However, at present it is very difficult to cross Cobham Drive so a foot bridge to connect the upper floor of the stadium vehicle park across to the Evans Bay foreshore footpath would solve this problem. This bridge would service users from the Miramar peninsula and the city, plus it will be a valuable asset for the local residents to access the waterfront.</i></li> </ul> </li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfortunately a number of these issues are within the control of Transit New Zealand, and will form part of our ongoing discussion as we will need their agreement to any proposal.</li> </ul>
• 81	• Pedestrian Access – Signage Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrians use access across Rongotai Road to Kemp Street – would you consider a sign to notify this?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a good initiative. The pedestrian signs to direct the public will be installed in February 2008.</li> </ul>
• 82	• Pedestrian Access – Tacy Shortcut to Cobham Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you intending to remove the shortcut that the residents of Tacy Street use getting on to Cobham Drive?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Cobham Drive/Kemp Street access by Big Save is improved.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be retained and will need to be remodelled due to the location of the service entry and construction of the berms along the Cobham Drive boundary; therefore it is likely that it will be upgraded in some way.</li> </ul>
• 83	• Pedestrian Access – Kemp Shortcut to Tacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you intending to remove the shortcut that the residents of Tacy Street use when they cut across the park?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design allows for foot traffic entering the car parking area from Tacy Street. Access is still maintained.</li> </ul>
• 84	• Policy – Carbon neutrality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can you justify spending \$50 million and creating 250 extra private car movements in peak times? How is this consistent with the Council's aim of a sustainable, carbon neutral city? Have you considered alternative projects for the \$50 million to improve the sustainability of communities?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the Mayor's carbon-neutral capital vision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the carbon footprint of the proposed centre, including related and consequential activities?</li> <li>• What are the total carbon footprints of each of the other options considered?</li> <li>• What actions will be taken to reduce the carbon footprint to a minimum?</li> <li>• How will the remaining emissions be offset?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Not in keeping with the carbon neutral goal and sustainability due to the additional traffic and destruction of green space.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We consulted with the community and they wanted the community sport centre. We will continue to encourage people to use public transport.</li> <li>• We are working with transport providers to improve services and schedules with the centre in mind, see note 3 above.</li> <li>• A lot of participants will be adults and we hope they take the bus. We need to weigh up all needs; we got overwhelming support for the development of the centre last year.</li> <li>• Also the Ngauranga to Airport study is looking at public transport and will outline strategies to overcome some of the issues.</li> <li>• The Council has just recently passed a Climate Change Action Plan on 5 December, 2007. The Council's aim is to achieve carbon neutrality for our own operations by 2012. This will require a combination of actions that reduce emissions and actions that offset emissions. The Indoor Community Sports Centre (ICSC) will obviously add to the Council's existing emissions profile as it is a new activity. In terms of measuring the emissions profile of the ICSC, we have a rough idea of the energy used to power the building, but we will not have accurate figures until the ICSC has been in operation for a full year.</li> <li>• To reduce energy use (and emissions) from the ICSC, the Council has incorporated sustainable design features such as concrete padding to reduce heat loss in winter and solar hot water</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			<p>heating. The Council will also look for alternative sources of energy use, such as micro wind power, to provide electricity to the ICSC. If the Council gets to a position where it needs to offset emissions, we will first look to use forest sink credits from the Council's reserve land. The Council is also investigating renewable energy projects that may fit the criteria for receiving carbon credits, such as a bio-reactor to treat sewage sludge and hydro-technology used in the sewage treatment plant. Any credits from these projects, would also be used to offset emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The decision to build the ICSC in Kilbirnie does not go against the Council's carbon neutral vision. Becoming carbon neutral does not mean halting all development on new facilities; it means using energy more efficiently, using alternative (less emissions intensive) fuels and conserving energy as much as possible. The ICSC site was chosen because it was the most viable, cost-effective option. The Council is committed to building a sustainable indoor sports centre that has low annual energy use and links to public transport routes.</li> </ul>
• 85	• Policy - Document Production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>What is Wellington City Council's policy on the environmental, economic and sustainable aspects of document production, given that of the documents available at the meeting:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>None was double-sided, which would have reduced the (substantial) volume by half</i></li> <li>• <i>The Feedback and Questions document was in colour on high-quality paper (apparently just for the sake of bullet point symbols and shading), when monochrome printing on ordinary paper would have been substantially cheaper and no less effective?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental considerations are an important part of the Council's purchasing policy. When the Council undertook a whole-of-organisation printer replacement project, the following environmental benefits were realised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fuji Xerox equipment contains up to 97% recyclable or reusable components</li> <li>• all printing devices defaulted to double-siding to reduce paper usage</li> <li>• power savings modes are contained on all devices.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Fuji Xerox printing technology the Council chose to use uses 60-70% less energy per printed page compared to previous technology. It also produces less waste, avoids using organic solvents and enables longer life of machine parts. Fuji Xerox has ISO 14001 environmental certification for all of its New Zealand branch offices and it recently received the Environmental Choice New Zealand accreditation from the New Zealand Government.</li> <li>• The Council's Publication and Design team uses environmental ethics as a key consideration when it out-sources any print services. The Publication and Design team have several initiatives in place aimed at reducing paper waste from the printing process.</li> </ul>
• 86	• Property – Land sale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council had some 5000 sq m of land available at the end of Tacy Street they were going to sell to a developer. What has happened to this? Couldn't this be used as parking?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 5000 sq m of land at the end of Tacy Street will not be sold; we are using all the available site.</li> </ul>
• 87	• Property – Rezoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>"1997. The parking area behind Kilbirnie Shop Bay Court (50 parks) was re-zoned. Only when developer put plans in place, people wanted to know why. People sent in 44 submissions and turn up for hearing on Monday night only to be told it was re-zoned. (Waste of money and people's time). The owner who built the apartments also owns the Bay Court shops. He has since sold his interest in both because Kilbirnie people (still are) were angry with him but it was council's fault not informing the people of change. He had a right to use the re-zoned land. Skate Rink. It was re-built for skate board. Children and Parent wanted it in Miramar (they do not like there children hanging around Kilbirnie Shop) that is why it is not used."</i></li> <li>• <i>Kemp Street Sports ground re-zoned. Residents now only know and are angry with the Council for not informing them.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site received its Suburban Centre zoning in a decision released in 1996. Originally it was intended to be zoned Open Space A, however a submission made during the notification process of the District Plan noted that as the Council had no intention to purchase the property they could not sustain the Open Space zoning of private land. Therefore the zoning of the land was changed to Suburban Centre.</li> </ul>
• 88	• Resource Consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why does the Indoor Community Sport Centre now require resource consent?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Original statements were related to the concept proposal by Stephenson and Turner which was less than 12m in height.</li> <li>• The ICSC is to be located at Cobham Drive Park in Kilbirnie. The area is zoned Suburban Centre. Assessing the development proposal against the rules for Suburban Centre, Discretionary Activities (Restricted) has been triggered by three features. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building Height – The development's maximum building height is almost 16m. The maximum building height is 12m above ground.</li> <li>• The rules states that the "maximum building height is equivalent to three storeys which provides for commercial expansion and flexibility in design at a scale appropriate to Suburban Centres".</li> <li>• A further 50% (i.e. 6m to a maximum of 18m) can be achieved as a discretionary activity (restricted) resource consent. The applicable assessment criteria are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (a) whether additional height will have a material effect upon sunlight access to streets, public space, or residential buildings in Residential Areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (b) whether the wind environment will be materially affected</li> <li>• (c) whether the general form and continuity of development on street frontages will be affected</li> <li>• (d) whether additional height is necessary to facilitate any industrial or manufacturing processes.</li> <li>• The explanation to the rule states: <i>“The permitted building height for Suburban Centres provides reasonably for most development but the Council accepts that in some cases additional height may be necessary or desirable. In the main commercial areas, taller buildings will not be generally be favored close to the boundaries of Residential Areas or Open Space Areas. The Council also accepts that additional height may be required for buildings or structures to facilitate manufacturing or processing. The Council’s aim is to protect any nearby Residential or Open Space Area from effects of additional height”.</i></li> <li>• Parking – The amount of off-street parking proposed by the development is 325 car parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 120 car parks require resource consent for a discretionary activity (restricted) consent. Consideration must be given to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the parking to be provided on the site, and its intended use (whether it is intended for staff or customers)</li> <li>• site access</li> <li>• provisions for servicing</li> <li>• internal traffic circulation</li> <li>• what effects the extra traffic will have on local streets</li> <li>• transportation impact assessments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The assessment criteria is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (a) whether the proposed development will cause congestion or affect the safe and efficient movement of traffic on streets in Suburban Centres or nearby Residential Areas</li> <li>• (b) whether the proposed activity provides high standard facilities for public transport, cycling, pedestrian and vehicular movements or has easy access to those facilities or promotes the use of transport modes other than private vehicles.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The explanation to the rule states that: <i>“Larger developments in Suburban Centres which generate significant vehicular traffic may cause congestion or affect the safe or efficient movement of traffic on the street. The Council requires all developments to be assessed in this light, and appropriate measures taken to remedy problems. In particular the Council is seeking a high standard of public transport, pedestrian and cyclist accessibility”.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Site Access – The development has two single crossings and one double crossing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The condition is that any site has only one 6m-wide vehicle access, except that sites with more than one frontage may have one access on each frontage. An access wider than 6m or a second access on any one frontage (eg. Kemp Street) triggers the need for resource consent for a discretionary activity (restricted).</li> <li>• The assessment criteria are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (a) whether the activities undertaken or proposed on the site will not generate a demand for the required servicing facilities or require compliance with the site access provisions.</li> <li>• (b) the extent to which topography, size or shape of the site, the location of any natural or built features on the site, or other requirements such as easements, rights-of-way or restrictive covenants impose constraints that make compliance impracticable.</li> <li>• (c) whether suitable alternative provisions for parking, servicing or site access can be made.</li> <li>• (d) the extent to which the standards for parking, servicing or site access can be varied without endangering public safety, or the amenities of any shopping street.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
• 89	• Resource Consent	• How do we go about stopping the resource consent if we don't want it? Our concerns will have to be addressed. It will have a big impact and we all pay rates. What's the process for objecting to it? Who do we write to?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council will be choosing the voluntary option of requesting public notification of its resource consent application.</li> <li>• We will not notify during the Christmas period. Once the public notification is made through the usual channels, documentation will be made available that outlines the proposal, the effects and the proposed mitigating measures. There will be contact details and information will be provided</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			on how you can make a submission and on what grounds.
• 90	• Resource Consent	• If the independent commissioners say it's non-notified, then what do we do?	• The Council will be choosing the voluntary option of requesting public notification of its resource consent application.
• 91	• Resource Consent	• How can we trust you, aren't the Council appointing someone to do Council work? • How will we know what's happening?	• The Council will be choosing the voluntary option of requesting public notification of its resource consent application. • Irrespective of the Council's decision to publicly notify, independent commissioners are beyond reproach. Their integrity is in our opinion beyond question, which is why we use them, particularly as the Council has nothing to hide and wants to be totally transparent in these matters. • If you have an issue about any part of the consent process, and in particular the notification, you are within your rights to request a judicial review. • The Council has undertaken to keep you informed as the project develops. • If you have concerns that the Council is not keeping you informed, please contact your ward Councillor as they are your elected representative on the Council.
• 92	• Resource Consent	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Other than the height of 12m, what other effects need to be accessed for the resource consent?</i>	• The effects that can be accessed are identified in the District Plan – Suburban Centre rules.
• 93	• Resource Consent	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>I will be interested in the commissioner's notification decision in respect of "special circumstances" under s.94C(2) – unless the Council requests voluntary notification.</i>	• Sections 93 to 94D of the RMA set out the requirements for notification, non-notification and limited notification. With the exception of controlled activities, the presumption is that an application will be publicly notified in accordance with section 93 unless the criteria for limited notification or non-notification are met.  • It will be the Council's intention to request voluntary public notification of its resource consent application.
• 94	• Safety	• The foot traffic through Kotuku Flats is increasing. It's becoming a public thoroughfare and our safety is being compromised. How will you address this?	• City Housing is developing traffic safety plans for its larger complexes and will be addressing the issue of public thoroughfares as part of that process. A site visit, involving the Council's Traffic Safety Manager, is scheduled for 10 December. The development of a traffic safety plan for the Kotuku complex will take into consideration the potential impact of the ICSC development.  • Walkwise officers are also monitoring this situation as part of their programme in this area.
• 95	• Schools	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Schools will need to provide extra supervision on outings, and this is hard to find and buses are expensive to hire.</i>	• Go Wellington made a positive submission to the original proposal to establish a community sports centre at Cobham Park. We will work with them to maximise their support and hopefully become a partner in providing affordable transport options for getting schools to and from the centre.
• 96	• Social Recreational Strategy	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Strategy and Policy Committee meeting of 21 June 2006, Report 3.3.1, Indoor Community Sports Centre Proposal – Consultation Process says "Rising levels of obesity, diabetes and inactivity is [sic] of major concern in New Zealand and the rest of the world."</i> • <i>Why does this project not help address this concern, by encouraging active modes of transport?</i>  • <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>As one of the stated objectives is to mitigate the rising levels of obesity, diabetes and inactivity, why aren't the pedestrian and cycle routes a priority?</i>	• The Traffic Impact Assessment has focused on a "worst case" assessment of the traffic impacts to ensure that these are acceptable. This resulted in a large number of traffic movements being assessed. As noted in Section 10 of the TIA, there is clearly there is a large opportunity to promote active modes of transport through the rollout of the ICSC. • Refer to Section 10 of the TIA: • Cycle parking will be provided on site and will be designed to ensure security and easy access. The centre is located on a local road which has sufficient width to cater for cyclists and therefore no on-road cycling facilities are considered necessary to provide access. A marked cycle route runs along Kemp Street and links to Rongotai Road in close proximity to the site. This route provides good cycle accessibility to the site from around the city as it runs between the airport and the central city.
• 97	• Social Recreational Strategy	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Strategy and Policy Committee meeting of 21 June 2006, Report 3.3.1, Indoor Community Sports Centre Proposal - Consultation Process says "Rising levels of obesity, diabetes and inactivity is [sic] of major concern in New Zealand and the rest of the world."</i> • <i>This paper checks the project for strategic fit with the Council's Draft Social and Recreation Strategy but not with other relevant strategies such as the Transport Strategy and the Urban Development Strategy. Why not?</i>	• Both of these strategies were adopted by the Council in July 2006 after this report had been completed. • It is noted that the Urban Development Strategy supports development in the Kilbirnie area. Roading improvements will be undertaken in the area close to the proposed indoor community sports centre. • Council officers are also undertaking discussions with Stagecoach to improve public transport to the facility. It is noted that Stagecoach lodged a LTCCP submission in 2006 in support of developing public transport to the indoor community sports centre.
• 98	• Supporting – General	• Many residents support the development of the facility and feel it's needed, particularly for	• Noted

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
		<p>youth, and as such are prepared to pay for it within their rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The kids' programmes are vital and it appears that they will not cause any delays or impacts on the traffic as they clearly are non-peak, starting from 9am and running through to around 3pm.</li> <li>• If the Council tried to take amenities away, we would all be up in arms. With any development for the city's benefit come negative effects; however the benefits far outweigh these effects.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 99</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic – Calabar Road Roundabout</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Miramar side of the “big” roundabout often sees traffic built up all the way along the runway. Residents' observations have suggested that this is the caused by the give way signs and the right-hand turns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During site observations undertaken during the afternoon and Saturday peak hours, queue lengths on Cobham Drive East were very small, rarely extending more than a few vehicles.</li> <li>• The Cobham Drive roundabout has been modelled in Paramics. This modelling indicates that in the afternoon and Saturday peaks, there is no significant queuing expected on this approach, even with the additional ICSC traffic.</li> <li>• During the morning peak, the peak traffic direction towards the central city and hence there are additional vehicles on the Cobham Drive East approach. Queue lengths are longer in the morning peak. However, the morning peak is not a time when large numbers of vehicles are expected to be accessing the ISCS. During the morning and early afternoon the facilities are expected to be used largely by schools which will access the site by bus. Therefore, the impact on the queue lengths at the roundabout is likely to be negligible during this period.</li> <li>• Disruption caused by incidents (accidents or buses breaking down etc) are not common events and can not be designed for economically.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic – Cobham Drive Roundabout</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit had planned the development of a slip lane for city-bound traffic Miramar side; is our work actually going to see this being done? Also isn't this simply doing work already planned and how is that going to improve things?</li> <li>• Two lanes is a great idea but the problem is you can't get on to the roundabout as you have to continually give way to traffic on your right, so you can't get from Troy Street onto Cobham Drive. Have you considered putting traffic lights there as it's the give way which is the problem?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Southbound traffic from the city has three lanes entering the Troy roundabout.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Three lanes at Troy roundabout, dedicated right to Miramar.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Cobham roundabout, reference to traffic and lane markings, make these physical islands to separate the traffic.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>I am concerned over the traffic effects on Cobham Drive and Troy Streets, some suggestions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>extra lane around Cobham roundabout</i></li> <li>• <i>three lanes entering the roundabout from the city</i></li> <li>• <i>enhanced traffic islands to allow Fire Service access to the roundabout and an immediate right turn from eastbound side of Troy to westbound side of Troy.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Concerns are mainly around traffic, extra slip lanes around Cobham roundabout and Troy would help as would a right turn into Kemp Street to discourage traffic from Evans Bay Parade.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Addition of a right-hand lane for turning traffic onto Cobham roundabout is essential. Can the Council contribute financially to ensure Transit action?</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Increase Troy Street to three lanes and modify roundabout. On Troy Street adjacent to the site heading north, this should be increased to three lanes. One lane to turn left to head towards the city and two to turn right towards Miramar. The street and roundabout configuration would be the same as the other roundabout on Cobham Drive</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are working with Transit to get this lane completed – we do expect that it will be constructed. Note that the slip lane was initially intended to be constructed as part of Transit's minor safety improvements programme. It was therefore intended to improve safety, not to reduce congestion.</li> <li>• A meeting is programmed with Transit for 16 December to update progress.</li> <li>• When people turn right from Cobham Drive onto Troy Street it creates a break in the traffic for people to exit. The use of traffic lights would not be efficient; they would mean extra stopping time, but we will investigate a signalised intersection further.</li> <li>• The roundabout improvements proposed will allow right turns on the Troy Street approach, allowing two vehicles on to the roundabout each time there is a gap in the circulating traffic. This will improve the situation and reduce delays over the existing situation on this approach.</li> <li>• The traffic modelling undertaken confirms that the queuing on the Troy Street approach will be reduced below existing levels even with the ISCS traffic and confirms that the roundabout will operate efficiently. On this basis, signalisation of the roundabout is not required.</li> <li>• Southbound (eastbound) traffic from the city only has two lanes on the Cobham Drive West approach to the Cobham Drive/Troy Street roundabout.</li> <li>• It would not be appropriate to make traffic lane markings into traffic islands because of the swept path of large vehicles.</li> <li>• An extra circulating lane is proposed. The traffic modelling confirms that three lanes are not required on the Troy Street approach. The central island widening will be designed to ensure that a third lane can be retrofitted with little disruption if required in the future.</li> <li>• A right turn from Troy Street into Kemp Street and modified islands for emergency vehicles is now included in the mitigation measures proposed.</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
		<i>when you leave the cutting heading towards the city.</i>	
• 101	• Traffic – Drop Off/Right Turn Out	• How does a person go right from the drop-off?	• Vehicles will exit the sports centre turning left out of the site into Kemp Street. They will then turn left on to Troy Street and make a U-turn using the roundabout. Vehicles will then be able to travel south on Troy Street.
• 102	• Traffic – Emergency Vehicles	• Emergency vehicles need access during peak traffic times.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The centre’s operation will have a noticeable effect on afternoon/evening peak but the effect won’t be as marked at other times. With the mitigations proposed, and further work around some of those identified opportunities from the engagement rounds, the likely impact on the network will be minor.</li> <li>• In general, the queue on Troy Street will be reduced as a result of the proposed improvements to the Cobham Drive roundabout making it easier for fire appliances to exit the Kilbirnie Fire Station. Discussions held with station staff and have identified that additional hatch or “keep clear” markings would be desirable in the proposed new right-turn lane into Kemp Street. The swept path of a truck has been used to confirm the location of the markings and to ensure they are wide enough. This will encourage drivers to leave a gap or to move when an appliance needs access. Egress from the station could be improved further by installing emergency traffic signals on the northbound approach to the Kemp Street intersection. This is being discussed with the Fire Service.</li> <li>• In the wider area, travel times for emergency services will remain relatively constant. The travel time information in the Section 6 of the Traffic Impact Assessment notes the forecast changes in travel times for the afternoon and Saturday peaks on routes around the sports centre. This shows that there will be some reductions on Kemp and Troy streets, and minor increases (in the order of 19 seconds) on the Cobham Drive approaches.</li> <li>• During the morning peak and off-peak period, the ISCS is not expected to have any impact on travel times for emergency vehicles because there will not be large numbers of vehicles accessing the site.</li> </ul>
• 103	• Traffic – General/Queuing	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Traffic queuing occurs in the morning and the late afternoon early evening.</i>	• For related comments see “Traffic – Emergency Vehicles”
• 104	• Traffic – General/Better Solutions Needed	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Generally concerned that alternative solutions need to be sought as all the current answers seem insufficient.</i>	• The rigour being put into design and the engagement process is to provide the best possible outcome given the projects constraints and to resolve as many issues as possible by providing sound mitigation strategies.
• 105	• Traffic – General/Congestion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On Saturday and Sunday mornings, as well as early evenings, there will be a huge increase in traffic.</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Huge congestion will detrimentally affect taxi drivers and emergency services, so don’t build it. But if you have to, what about the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>don’t provide car parking, rather improve bus services</i></li> <li>• <i>enhance cycle and pedestrian ways.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>An additional facility will only worsen the current traffic “grid lock”.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Increased vehicle movements.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will investigate our scheduling of netball games to minimise the weekend winter traffic peaks and aid in smoothing them out.</li> <li>• Section 4 of the Traffic Impact Assessment indicates that the ICSC will generate 216 vehicle movements into and out of the centre during the PM peak hour and 287 during the Saturday peak hour. The report details the development of this traffic generation and an assessment of the impacts. This is a large number of additional vehicle movements, however the analysis has shown that the effects will be no more than minor.</li> <li>• The analysis was undertaken assuming that all games would begin and end on the hour. Discussions are under way with Wellington Netball to consider scheduling of games to reduce the peak demand on the hour. This means that the assessment undertaken is a worst case and the effects are still no more than minor.</li> <li>• The Saturday peak hour was chosen for the assessment during the weekend because traffic volumes are generally higher on a Saturday than a Sunday and is considered to be a worst case.</li> <li>• Car parking is seen as a very important issue for local residents. Wellington City Council requested that sufficient car parking be provided on site to cater for the forecast demands so that parking will not proliferate onto the surrounding roads.</li> </ul>
• 106	• Traffic – Kemp/Left Turn In	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is Troy Street narrowed to one lane? This prevents Kemp Street residents from having a free turn left when coming down Rongotai Road when the want to turn into Kemp as they have to join the queue.</li> <li>• Kemp and Troy streets merge poorly.</li> </ul>	• For related comments see “Traffic – Rongotai Road” section.
• 107	• Traffic – Kemp/One way from each end.	• (Post question-time comments) Have we considered closing off Kemp Street adjacent to the end of the pedestrian way (from Rongotai Road to Kemp Street) and make Kemp Street two dead ends?	• Kemp Street could be divided in the manner suggested. This would mean that no through movements could take place. This would result in wide-scale rerouting on to other roads and make it more difficult for local residents to access different parts of the network. There would need

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			to be considerable consultation with the local community and is outside of the project at this time.
• 108	• Traffic – Kemp/Right Turn In	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Allow right-hand turn into Kemp Street in conjunction with lights at the Tully Street and Cobham Drive intersection.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>(From Cobham turning right into Troy) Reducing Troy Street to one lane is not supported and short-sighted.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Fire Station Access: Consideration should be given to lights on Cobham Drive/Troy Street to halt traffic when the fire engines need to exit the building. As the road design has vehicles turning right from Troy Street into Kemp Street first passing in front of the fire station; with the increase in traffic going to Kemp St, this may mean a queue of vehicles blocking the station. Hence fire station lights further back on Cobham will stop further vehicles joining the queue and give it a change to clear.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A right turn into Kemp Street from Troy Street has been included in the proposed mitigation measures.</li> <li>• It is not proposed to reduce Troy Street to one lane.</li> <li>• For related comments see “Traffic – Rongotai Road” section.</li> </ul>
• 109	• Traffic – Kemp/Tacy Round About	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrians often cross adjacent to the Resene Paint Shop at the intersection of Tacy and Kemp Streets, and traffic moves very quickly at this point. Can anything be done to improve this for pedestrian safety?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Improved roundabout/island at Kemp Street and Tacy Street intersection, help Tacy Street units to cross the road unrestricted.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Tacy and Kemp streets intersection is dangerous with poor sight lines and pedestrians are at risk. Will not improve with buses and service vehicles entering the centre.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Kemp/Tacy roundabout would be good for pedestrian safety.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further work is required on a proposal to install traffic calming at the intersection of Tacy Street and Kemp Street. Public engagement/consultation is planned for 2008/09.</li> <li>• Section 6 of the Traffic Impact Assessment details the forecast travel time impacts.</li> </ul>
• 110	• Traffic – Ngauranga/Airport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regards to improvements to the network that extends to Hataitai, particularly Moxham, this will require Transit input.</li> <li>• When will the Ngauranga to Airport Study be released?</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>What is being done about the bigger problem, the Basin Reserve and Hataitai Tunnel?</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>SH1 solutions to Goa/Ruahine, maybe we should also look at another pedestrian bridge, restricted right hand turns, left lane merges for the Badminton Hall and Hataitai Park. The signals appear to be a quick fix.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Miramar to city concern: As vehicles travelling from the city down Cobham Drive turning right to go to Troy Street have right of way over vehicles coming from the Miramar peninsula, you may find that congestion on Cobham Drive in front of the airport becomes a serious concern. Of course this is linked into the City to Ngauranga transport study which has yet to be released.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The second stage of consultation on the Ngauranga-Airport Transport Study is being undertaken between 6 December 2007 and 22 February 2008.</li> <li>• A number of possible solutions are being released for public consultation, including changes to the Basin Reserve and possible duplication of the Mt Victoria tunnel.</li> <li>• The study is expected to be completed by mid 2008.</li> <li>• Further traffic assessment will be carried out on SH1 as part of the Ngauranga to Airport study.</li> <li>• It is worthy to note that there is currently an ongoing discussion with Transit NZ on the management and proposed improvements to State Highway 1 which include some immediate actions such as the proposal to install traffic signals at Ruahine Street/Goa Street intersection to improve pedestrian linkages and traffic movements.</li> </ul>
• 111	• Traffic – Other Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have we considered the various retail developments’ impacts on traffic, not just their present extent but what it’s supposed to be when it’s all finished?</li> <li>• Several attendees thought that the Council had already assessed the retail complexes’ impact in the completed studies.</li> <li>• A growing amount of people are using Queens Drive and Childers Terrace to avoid the traffic lights in Kilbirnie. Since the retail centre opened in Lyall Bay, traffic has tripled. The ICSC traffic will put extra pressure on these streets.</li> <li>• The proposed local crèche is intended to cater to about 80 kids. Has that been included in the model and assessment?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of the new retail development currently under construction on Tacy Street were obtained. The development has approximately 3040 sq m of retail floor space. We have been advised that the key tenant will be a large furniture retailer and the site will have approximately 80 car parks. Using this information an evening peak hour trip generation of two trips per 100m2 (two-way trips per hour) was developed.</li> <li>• The previous use of the site was mechanical garages and storage and had an assumed traffic generation of one trip per 100 sq m.</li> <li>• On this basis the net increase in traffic from the development site is in the order of 30 vehicles in the peak hour. In reality, vehicles using the development would route in a number of ways including via the Kemp Street / Evans Bay Parade intersection and Tacy Street / Rongotai Road intersection. A worst-case assessment was undertaken, assuming that all vehicles would route past the ICSC on Kemp Street and exit onto Troy Street. This analysis identified that there would</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			<p>be very minimal impact on the operation of the network, with delay and queue lengths remaining very similar to those forecast with only the ICSC in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crèche data is still being accessed by SKM, but effects initially appear to have no/minor impact on Kemp Street.</li> </ul>
• 112	• Traffic – Rongotai Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would it be possible to return the roads to the previous condition?</li> <li>• Rongotai Road has performed poorly with massive delays since it was reduced from four down to two lanes.</li> </ul> <p>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Return Rongotai Road to four lanes.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review of Rongotai Road will start early next year and will be led by the Council's Road and Traffic Manager. Preliminary findings will be due in May/June 2008, the study will allow us to ascertain if the four-lane option for Rongotai Road is beneficial (safety, intersection capacity and network efficiency) to proceed in conjunction with ICSC.</li> </ul>
• 113	• Traffic – Rongotai Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queue length is grossly underestimated; sometimes the build-up is all the way back to Pak'n'Save.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A traffic survey will be conducted at some stage between January and June of next year to capture the normal traffic patterns. This will analyse the traffic flow and safety of the whole stretch of the approach to the ICSC along Rongotai Road. This will cover the length of road from the Mahora Street intersection to the ICSC. The appropriate actions will be investigated once the results from the surveys are obtained.</li> </ul>
• 114	• Traffic – Rongotai/Salek Intersection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The traffic on Rongotai Road has been much worse since Salek Street intersection was modified.</li> <li>• Would it be possible to return the intersections to the previous condition?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review of Rongotai Road will start early next year and will be lead by the Council's Road and Traffic Manager. Preliminary findings will be due in May/June 2008, the study will allow us to ascertain if the four-lane option for Rongotai Road is beneficial (safety, intersection capacity and network efficiency) to proceed in conjunction with ICSC.</li> </ul>
• 115	• Traffic – Tacy/Heavy Vehicle Turns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parts of Tacy Street are currently used by Placemakers and probably the new businesses as a turn around area for heavy vehicles and b-trains.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parallel parks adjacent to the netball courts in Tacy Street are to be converted to perpendicular parks with work programmed to start in January of 2008.</li> <li>• These parks are going to be P120 and additional spaces will meet the increasing parking demand from residents, visitors, customers to businesses and workers in the area</li> <li>• We will be trying to have some discussion with our neighbours who use heavy vehicles and talk about our ability to be able to provide a safe place for large vehicles to turn fully, providing that they are able to assist in maintaining the surface that their vehicles turn on.</li> </ul>
• 116	• Traffic – Tacy/Motu Kiarangi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The netball courts at Kemp Street currently cause huge congestion. Is the Council looking at having these matches relocated?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is ongoing discussion with Wellington Netball Centre with a view to having the Motu Kairangi competition shifted to Hataitai.</li> </ul>
• 117	• Traffic - Tournaments and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a number of sports competing for use of the centre at the same times. Will the centre liaise with other codes when it comes to events to ensure there won't be more traffic delays?</li> <li>• When travelling from the eastern suburbs to the city the delays will be huge when events are on.</li> </ul> <p>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Conflicts when events are scheduled with the ICC and Jackson studio's activities will cause big traffic headaches.</i></p> <p>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Conflicts when events are scheduled with the Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre may cause huge issues?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council will try to spread events out over the calendar to minimise the possibility of clashes. We look closely at scheduling tours and events to ensure scheduling is aligned to minimise traffic. If there is a one-off big event we will put an event management plan in place to manage the traffic impact on that day.</li> <li>• We haven't planned for more than one or two significant events per year (with a maximum attendance of 4,000 people). Usage for community sports will decrease if we focus on events and that's not the purpose of the centre.</li> <li>• We have actively engaged with the ICC to begin working through mutual issues and potential solutions.</li> </ul>
• 118	• Traffic - Tournaments and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you know how many tournaments will be coming to the centre and how many buses do we expect and wouldn't that worsen the traffic coming to the centre?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do not know the number of tournaments to expect as we will be competing with similar centres in Manawatu, Dunedin, Invercargill and Waitakere City.</li> <li>• As note in Section 3.2 of the Traffic Impact Assessment, any large spectator events and banquets that the centre could potentially accommodate are considered to be rare special events and have not been considered in assessing the likely traffic impacts. Catering for these events will be managed through special event plans produced by the Council and are likely to take place outside peak traffic periods and will involve transportation by coach.</li> <li>• It is possible that special resource consent conditions are imposed that require a specific Traffic Management Plan be produced for any major event outside the normal day to day operation of the facility.</li> </ul>
• 119	• Traffic – U Turn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As you are intending to increase bus access to the centre, how are you expecting the buses to utilise the proposed U-turn? How many buses are you expecting?</li> <li>• Residents going towards Miramar and Seatoun trying to turn across the traffic during the day near the fire station find this difficult now: what will be done to improve this?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The improved U-turn facility, marked "No Stopping" zones and two lanes for the right turn around the roundabout should improve congestion and help to free up the approach. However, we intend to do more work on the U-turn.</li> <li>• A right turn facility is now proposed which will make it possible for buses to access Kemp Street from Troy Street more easily.</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The proposed main traffic entry via Troy using the U-turn will make it unsafe for pedestrians.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The proposed main traffic entry via Troy using the U-turn will generate unsafe practises.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Troy Street U-turn needs further study, difficult for large vehicles like buses.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic turning right from Troy Street towards Miramar will now be able to turn right from both lanes.</li> <li>• Bus count numbers are being re-assessed against likely scenarios.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 120</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic calming</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is being proposed to stop Kemp being used as a shortcut, because so much traffic comes down there now? What are the proposed calming measures?</li> <li>• The design will need to consider heavy vehicles like buses and trucks to reduce noise as their access will need to remain.</li> <li>• Kemp Street is used as a main drag for people coming from the city, not Cobham Drive.</li> <li>• The position of the first calming measures needs to be thought about carefully as traffic enters Kemp Street from Rongotai Road/Troy Street end at sometimes high speed.</li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Measures need to allow for buses and heavy vehicles.</i></li> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Would like to see chicanes as humps do still get approached at speed. Would push heavy vehicles down to Rongotai Road, which is an advantage also.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will be looking at traffic calming measures to discourage the use of Kemp Street and push people back onto the main routes (see note 12 above). To encourage the use of the primary roads (Cobham Drive – Troy Street) improvements are being made to the Cobham Drive roundabout and the right turn access to Kemp Street from Troy Street.</li> <li>• Calming measures, we are looking at ways to slow down the traffic in Kemp Street, because if it's narrower/slower people will be less likely to use the road. If it's 30km/h maximum people will choose not to use it. This was shown by Aotea Quay – it is used less now because people know the bypass is faster.</li> <li>• The proposed measures we are looking into are speed humps, chicanes and narrowing as possible measures and we'll need to consider the acoustic issues associated with that.</li> <li>• It is in this area in particular that we want to have resident participation and feedback.</li> <li>• Traffic calming measures have been proposed to discourage the use of Kemp Street (Evans Bay Parade end) and Tacy Street for access to the ICSC. Instead drivers should be encouraged to use the primary road network (Cobham Drive -Troy Street) for access. Travel time surveys were undertaken during the peak hours on the following routes between the Wellington Road/Kilbirnie Road intersection and the ICSC in both directions to assess the relative attractiveness of the routes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evans Bay Parade – Kemp Street – ICSC Entrance</li> <li>• Cobham Drive – Troy Street – Kemp Street – ICSC Entrance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Average travel times for vehicles using the route along Evans Bay Parade-Kemp Street route were very similar to travel times for vehicles using the Cobham Drive-Troy Street route in both directions. The largest variation was 60 seconds in the afternoon peak in favour of the Evans Bay Parade route. Traffic calming measures would need to slow vehicles on Kemp Street to increase the travel time and make the Cobham Drive Troy Street route more attractive.</li> <li>• A number of measures, including road humps, one-way roads, chicanes, road narrowing, textured surfacing and pavement markings, were identified through the public engagement and have been considered.</li> <li>• Kemp Street and Tacy Street provide access to commercial uses such as the Placemakers and the Brentwood Hotel. Heavy vehicles accessing these sites currently use the Evans Bay Parade end of Kemp Street and Tacy Street, but in general do not require access to the Troy Street end of Kemp Street. Measures which would prohibit movement of heavy vehicles (or make movements very difficult) such as road narrowing, road humps and chicanes at the Evans Bay Parade end of Kemp Street or on Tacy Street are therefore not appropriate. One-way systems would also provide a barrier to easy access to residences or businesses. Pavement markings are costly to implement and are generally inefficient.</li> <li>• Road humps are a traffic management measure commonly used in Wellington City and provide an appropriate solution. On this basis, the traffic management scheme as shown in the Traffic Impact Assessment using road humps on Kemp Street between Tacy Street intersection and the entrance to the ICSC is considered the most appropriate. This means that large vehicles needing to access the commercial uses on Kemp and Tacy streets would be largely unaffected by the proposed measures.</li> <li>• Directional signage is intended to reinforce the Cobham Drive route as the preferred route. Directional signage is proposed at the Evans Bay Parade/Cobham Drive intersection, the Rongotai Road/Tacy Street intersection, the Troy Street/Kemp Street intersection, and the approaches to the Cobham Drive/Troy Street roundabout.</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road humps spaced at less than 80m intervals will reduce the 85 percentile speed of traffic to approximately 30 km/h on Kemp Street. Over the approximately 275m between Tacy Street and the ICSC access, this will increase travel times by approximately 50 seconds. This combined with the deterrence or annoyance factor will mean that a large proportion of vehicles will use the Cobham Drive route. The proposed introduction of a right turn movement from Troy Street to Kemp Street (as opposed to the existing U-turn) will reinforce this, as will the proposed directional signage.</li> <li>• The road humps have been located so that the majority of heavy vehicles will not use them. This will mitigate any potential noise issues with larger vehicles. The road humps will have a “Watts” profile which will reduce the noise impacts compared to steep profiled “judder bars”. The close spacing of the humps will mean that there will be little benefit in accelerating and breaking hard between the humps, and vehicles will be encouraged to travel at a constant speed, thus reducing the potential for noise problems further.</li> </ul>
• 121	• Traffic Impact Assessment	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Traffic Impact Assessment says "...a zebra crossing facility is provided across Troy Street." The crossing is across Rongotai Rd, near the Troy Street intersection.</i>	• Noted. However, it is drawn and has been assessed in its current location, irrespective of the wording.
• 122	• Traffic Impact Assessment	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Traffic Impact Assessment says "... it is desirable to have these pedestrians cross at the existing zebra crossing" [involving a significant detour]. Desirable from whose point of view? (Clearly not from pedestrians', because otherwise it will not be "more likely that they will attempt to cross near the Kemp Street intersection".)</i>	• It is desirable from a safety perspective for pedestrians to cross a road at a formalised pedestrian crossing facility.
• 123	• Traffic Impact Assessment	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>With the Traffic Impact Assessment's lack of knowledge of facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and its preference for non-sustainable over sustainable transport modes, what confidence does the Council have in its validity with respect to sustainable modes?</i>	• The Traffic Impact Assessments focus is not on pedestrians or cyclists and does take into account public transport. Given its function with regards to motor vehicles the report is accurate and with some minor additions of information, complete.
• 124	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Count Data	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Traffic count from note 14.06: "Why is it that traffic count data seems to be available for all streets in Wellington except those in Kilbirnie?"</i>	• The Council is undertaking counting on these roads at the moment.
• 125	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Count Data	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Why was the childcare centre information not included in the assessment as it was provided as they were required to submit a "publicly notified" resource consent?</i>	• The traffic counting will measure the additional traffic created by the crèche as it will be in operation at the time of the count.
• 126	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Generation/Data Gathering	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Disappointed that the Traffic Impact Assessment only measured traffic affects on one day, expectations were that this should be done over a longer period.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is standard practice to collect traffic data on a typical day because of the large costs associated with data collection.</li> <li>• The choice to undertake an industry standard sample was done to aid in prudent management of the project funds.</li> </ul>
• 127	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Generation/Parking	• Can you please identify the section in the report where we evaluate and confirm the parking numbers?	• This issue is addressed in Section 9 of the Traffic Impact Assessment report.
• 128	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Generation/Parking	• Parents of children participating at the centre may drop kids off but more are likely to stay and watch – we need to take this into account.	• This is taken into account in the parking and traffic movement assumptions.
• 129	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Generation/Parking	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Concerned that the car parking numbers are incorrect where it comes to spectators and officials at matches.</i>	• This issue is addressed in Section 9 of the TIA report.
• 130	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Generation/Traffic	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The traffic impact assessment indicates in the order of 250 vehicle movements in either direction per hour at peak, 216 on the weekend and 287 on Saturday specifically. Notably the weekend peaks are likely to only be during the winter months. Specific scheduling for netball, as indicated above, is likely to assist with peak reductions. Is this an estimate or actual, if actual how does this compare to the previous assessment?</i>	• An assessment of the demands expected for the proposed use is detailed in Section 4 of the TIA
• 131	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Modal Shift	• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Traffic Impact Assessment says "Figure 2-1 below shows the location of the site in relation to the surrounding road network." Why are there not similar maps showing its relationship to the walking, cycling and public transport networks?</i>	• The information regarding pedestrian and cycle ways is available to us, however the traffic impact assessment is more focussed towards motor vehicles. The project team reviewed the need to provide this information but thought that it would add little value to this project and was wasteful expenditure.

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
**SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do note that as part of the work being conducted on climate change and carbon neutrality, cycle and pedestrian plans are to be completed for June 2008.</li> </ul>
• 132	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Modal Shift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Traffic Impact Assessment says "Another zebra crossing or signalised crossing in this location would not be appropriate because vehicles queuing back from the crossing could block back and interfere with the operation of the roundabout. Vehicles exit the Troy Street near Cobham Drive roundabout at relatively high speeds and pedestrians should be encouraged to cross as far south as possible..." Why are pedestrian safety, accessibility and convenience being made subservient to operation of the roundabout and to maintaining the speed of fast-moving traffic on an urban (50 km/h) street?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety of all road users has been considered. SH1 is a strategic arterial road with a speed limit of 70km/h.</li> <li>Please note also that the regulation of speed on SH1 is under the control of Transit New Zealand.</li> </ul>
• 133	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Modal Shift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Traffic Impact Assessment says "Cyclists will be able to dismount and use the same facility".</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Why is the attractiveness of cycling being eroded by suggesting that they cease being cyclists at this point?</i></li> <li><i>The Council cycle route to the airport goes within metres of the proposed site, providing a good access route for cyclists. Why is it not mentioned?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experienced cyclists will be able to use the general traffic facilities. This comment was related to younger and less confident cyclists.</li> <li>Refer to Section 10 of the Traffic Impact Assessment.</li> </ul>
• 134	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Modal Shift/Buses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Traffic Impact Assessment says "Should sufficient demand for use of the site be experienced, there may be opportunities to reroute [bus] services past the site. The opening of the ICSC provides the opportunity to promote the use of sustainable transport options". Why is consideration of sustainable options not happening until the proposed centre opens, while full provision for all potential demand for non-sustainable transport options is being made now?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report was written prior to the Council's discussions with Stagecoach [Go Wellington]. This will be done, for related comments see "Operation – Go Wellington"</li> </ul>
• 135	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Modal Shift/Buses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Traffic Impact Assessment says "Bus route 11 follows Rongotai Road and Troy Street". Routes 2, 18 (Mon-Fri), 24 (Mon-Fri), 43 and 44 also follow Rongotai Rd and Troy St, with the 91 a block further away on Coutts Street, between them providing a service of 15 buses an hour in each direction during the day on weekdays, also serving Upper Hutt, Lower Hutt, Khandallah, Ngaio, Karori (Mon-Fri), Kelburn (Mon-Fri), Hataitai, Newtown, Kilbirnie, Maupuia (Mon-Fri), Oriental Parade (Mon-Fri), the airport and Miramar. Why are these bus services not mentioned?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These routes were not included in the Traffic Impact Assessment revision 4. The routes have now been included in Section 10 of the updated TIA which will be updated and available on the website by 21 December.</li> <li>However, the additional information has no impact on the conclusions.</li> </ul>
• 136	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Modal Shift/Buses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>The Traffic Impact Assessment says "Route 30 runs via Cobham Drive ... A stop is provided on the eastern side of the Troy Street Cobham Drive roundabout" the stop in question is a couple of hundred metres east of the roundabout, and it is not served by route 30 (nor is any other stop within a kilometre of the proposed centre, nor any stop on the pedestrian-accessible side of SH1).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council's Roading and Traffic team is currently in discussions with Transit. One aspect of the discussion is related to pedestrian safety.</li> </ul>
• 137	• Traffic Impact Assessment – Peaks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report section 6.1.1 doesn't identify when the peaks that were assessed actually occurred.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 4.5 of the TIA includes the dates and times that the surveys were undertaken.</li> </ul>
• 138	• Transport Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Given the Council's Transport Strategy July 2006, which says "Improving health outcomes will mean: promoting walking and cycling and reduced dependence on motor vehicles for short trips through the travel demand management programme". How has the travel demand management programme been applied to this project?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incentives will be put in place to encourage users of the indoor community sports centre to walk and cycle to the facility. Initiatives such as bike racks will also be provided at the facility.</li> <li>The Council will look to manage its programme to aid better management of travel demand.</li> </ul>
• 139	• Transport Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>Given the Council's Transport Strategy July 2006, which says "Things to do: Develop public transport systems as the main means for the movement of people along the Urban Development Strategy growth spine".</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>According to the map in the Urban Development Strategy, Cobham Drive is on the growth spine. How does a project that has a maximum of 6% of its users coming by public transport fit with the development of public transport as the main means for the movement of people?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For related comments see "Social Recreational Strategy"</li> </ul>
• 140	• Transport Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>"Improvements to the "Transport Corridor" City to Airport is also desirable to begin to address the increasing traffic flows and delays. Attention is needed at Wellington Road, Basin Reserve, the "Bypass" and the seven traffic-lighted intersections between Mt Victoria Tunnel exit and motorway north to determine acceptable short- and medium-term solutions. Options of grade separation for north/south vs. east/west flows in the city must be used some time in the future and planning should begin to identify the next strategic project.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For related comments see "Operation – Go Wellington, Traffic – Rongotai/Salek Intersection, Traffic – Kemp/Right Turn In, Traffic – Kemp/Tacy Roundabout, Traffic – Ngauranga/Airport, Traffic – Rongotai Road, Traffic – Rongotai/Salek Intersection and Traffic – Tacy/Heavy Vehicle Turns."</li> </ul>

**INDOOR COMMUNITY SPORT CENTRE**  
*SUBMISSION AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSES ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN*

Reference No.	Subject	Submission Question or Comment	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 141</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Valuation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>[Submission comment]</b> <i>We are concerned that property values may drop?</i></li> <li>• “Forget traffic”, some residents believe that property values will fall once the centre is built. Is the Council going to do anything to compensate for loss?</li> <li>• What about the number of cars moving back and forth at peak times? This will also cause significant disruption to residents, so will we be compensated for loss or offered soundproofing?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excerpt from “Draft” report by DTZ;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Conclusion:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Based on the information detailed in our report, we find that in “isolation” the erection of the proposed sports stadium could potentially impact slightly on the value of the residential properties opposite, though is more likely to impact in a higher-priced residential market.</i></li> <li>• <i>However, given the existing development in this area, the style of housing and the over-riding fact that due to its zoning the land could be developed for commercial use, we conclude that there is no substantive evidence to support reduction in the “market value” of the residential properties on the southern side of Kemp Street.”</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• At this time there is no evidence to support property values declining because of proximity to these types of facilities.</li> <li>• No soundproofing will be offered at this stage as noise emissions will be controlled as required by the Resource Management Act.</li> <li>• Note also that Cobham Drive Park has a District Plan zoning of Suburban Centre, and Council purchasing this land has avoided many development issues.</li> </ul>