

File: 13.09

26 February 2015

Kumutoto Sites 8&10
Resource Consent Application
Section 92 Response, Architecture

In response to the Wellington City Council Section 92 request for further information with respect to the Kumutoto Sites 8 & 10 application submitted, I include further information below in relation to item 29:

29 *The architectural Design Report identifies the consideration of historic heritage items and their setting has informed design and materials of the proposed new building. Please clarify/ explain to what extent and provide an assessment of how the new building contributes to the historic heritage value of individual items and the area as a whole.*

This response should be read in conjunction with the Kumutoto Site 10 Architectural report by Athfield Architects Ltd, and the Assessment of environmental effects on heritage by Adam Wilde.

Page 6 of the Architectural report outlines aspects of historic context ('patterns' and 'elements') that have been acknowledged in the proposal, and Page 18 outlines how these aspects have influenced the design.

Although the proposal is contemporary in character and use, its design is responsive to, and contributes to historic heritage on several levels:

1 General historic maritime activity and movements:

- The expressed gantry reflects and reinforces the sense of the historic working port activity, and the sense of elevated structures over water typical to historic port edge buildings and infrastructure.
- The configuration of the building along the edge of the Quays opening out to the waterfront promenade reflects and reinforces the historic condition of buildings fronting the harbour and supporting water edge mixed use activity along the strip of land defined by the sea wall.
- The Harbour wharf link recalls the configuration and activities of rail linkages between the Quays and the wharves, provides a pedestrian route, and frames a view between the quays and the wharves to celebrate these historical lines of movement/ activity.

105 AMRITSAR STREET
WELLINGTON 6035
PO BOX 3364
WELLINGTON 6140
NEW ZEALAND
TEL 64 4 499 1727
FAX 64 4 499 1960

69 CAMBRIDGE TERRACE
CHRISTCHURCH 8013
PO BOX 3724
CHRISTCHURCH 8140
NEW ZEALAND
TEL 64 3 377 2007
FAX 64 3 377 2009

2 The historic harbour edge, the wharves, and the Quays:

- The configuration, alignment and scale of the building recalls and reinforces the historical built edge between the Quays and the waterfront, and reflects the location of the historical sea wall and the strip of working 'promenade' edge between sea wall and building.
- The diagonal harbour wharf link, and other diagonal components of the building, is set out by the location and geometries of the historic wharves.
- The extent of the southern end of the gantry, and the portico are informed the alignments of the Whitmore street Corridor, as well as the extents of the former Customs House Building that was previously centred on this corridor.

These aspects in 1 and 2 above combine to 'seat' this contemporary proposal into its broader historical context, and to contribute to the historic values of the area by reflecting, interpreting, and reinforcing a sense of the historical activities and spatial relationships that have defined the area over its constantly developing history.

3 Shed 21, and Sheds 11 and 13.

The diagrams and elevations on Pages 6 and 18 demonstrate how the proposal, although clearly different in architectural character, responds directly to the scale, modulation, and massing of Shed 21:

- The height of proposal is approximately aligned with Shed 21,
- The elevation of the building is articulated as 3 horizontal 'bands' (visually combining levels 1 and 2, then 3 and 4) corresponding to the articulation of Shed 21,
- The modulation of the building works to a similar structural rhythm as Shed 21
- Although the length of the proposal is longer than Shed 21, this apparent length is broken down by the change in modulation that occurs either side of the Harbour link, effectively breaking the mass into components not dissimilar length to Shed 21 and other Quay side sheds. In addition the large format cladding components on the west elevation of the proposal are reminiscent of the large overlay sliding doors on Shed 21 and other Quayside buildings.
- The Ground level modulation of the proposed building with the retail units, structural grid, cross wharf component interprets the modulation of historical quayside loading doors/ openings of Shed 21 and Sheds 13 and 11.
- The quayside colonnade, and the fine grain tenancies opening towards Woolstore plaza and the east side of the proposal extend the pattern of use that is now occurring in the redeveloped Shed 21 'Wool store' building. While these are not historic conditions/ associations, they have become established within the current/ recent history of the Wool store, and its adjacent Quayside and waterfront, and are critical to its sustained use, access and relevance on this part of the waterfront.

4 The Former Eastbourne Ferry Building.

While this proposal is clearly larger in scale than The Former Eastbourne Ferry Building, the proposal responds to its form and setting by stepping back in both its East and South Elevation, reducing its scale and intensifying its articulation (the columns, the stepping upper levels, the portico ceiling) at its closest proximity.

The Ferry building is respected and highlighted by this proposal by the manner in which the Portico frames the Ferry Building and its frontage (particularly as viewed from the Whitmore Gates approach), and in a sense raising its profile in relation to the Whitmore Gates and the Harbour wharf. (refer Architectural design report cover page image, figures 26, 29, 36).

These aspects in particularly 3 above, contribute to the value of these historical elements by recreating relationships that these elements historically had with neighbouring waterfront buildings, extending patterns of their scale, modulation, rhythm, and form, and contributing to their combined presence as a collection of related waterfront structures. In the case of The Former Eastbourne Ferry Building, while on one hand the proposal 'avoids' by stepping back, it also 'highlights', by framing the building, enhancing appreciation, and contributing to its setting at this critical junction on the waterfront.