

SR510418 119 Jervois Quay – Submission Summary

Submission #	Submitter Name	Support/Oppose	Summary	Heard	Decision sought
1	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	<p>Because the proposed building does not front onto Civic Square, it will have virtually no effects on the buildings individually Listed by Heritage New Zealand: Wellington Town Hall (Category 1), the former Wellington Central Library (now the City Gallery; Category 2); and the Wellington Central Library (Category 1).</p> <p>With this in mind the primary concern of HNZPT is that any development on the adjacent parcel should neither crowd the Michael Fowler Centre nor overwhelm it with excessive height. In the view of HNZPT the proposed development appropriately respects the form and location of the Michael Fowler Centre and will be a welcome addition to the urban form in this part of Wellington</p>	N	
2	Darko Petrovic	Support	Support residential and commercial intensification in the central area. Proposal will improve the site and surrounding buildings.	N	Approve proposal as it stands

3	Peter Steven	Support	Love direct path to the waterfront. Appreciate thought given to end of trip and bike parking facilities	N	Allow development to proceed
4	Mike Harris	Oppose	Proposal will cause excessive shading on the submitters apartment due to height and shading. It disrupts the sight plane from the buildings behind toward the water. At least two floors to be used for office space opposed to being the national music centre. It makes our home undesirable and our enjoyment of life will be severely impacted	Y	Oppose proposed height. Confirm intentions of building use in full. Notify all neighbours.
5	Alex Gray	Oppose	Civil Engineer and Project Manager who has experience in diverting/strengthening stormwater culverts. Support WW that the culvert is 100years old and in poor condition and must be replaced or diverted before construction begins. Concern cost will be on the ratepayers. Piles are not wise anywhere near the culvert.	Y	Support WW by requiring the culvert be replaced or diverted before construction starts
6	Andrew Campbell	Oppose	Proposal results in losing much of the sun to the apartments facing the construction and significantly changes the outlook. Owners/occupiers of 132-136 Wakefield St were identified as affected by Council but were not notified. Concerns of dust, vibration, and noise from the construction process. As someone who does night shift	N	Delegate decision making to a commissioner. Seek condition that the contractors engage with Civic Chambers (body corp for 132-136 Wakefield) in developing the CMP, noise and

			this could be detrimental to my sleep and overall wellbeing.		vibration MP, and other plans listed on page 53 of the AEE before submitted for approval.
7	Gabrielle Henderson	Neutral	<p>Proposal results in the loss of sunlight and change the outlook to owners/occupiers at 132-136 Wakefield St. Civic Chambers not notified as required in the notification report.</p> <p>Appears the building will be high quality. In favour of progressing the music centre.</p> <p>Concerns with noise, vibration, and dust from the construction process.</p> <p>Concerns about current access to Michael Fowler Centre and note that the applicant still has to develop a plan with WW for protection of the retention tank/underground stream</p>	Y	<p>Delegate decision making to a commissioner.</p> <p>Seek condition that the contractors engage with Civic Chambers (body corp for 132-136 Wakefield) in developing the CMP, noise and vibration MP, and other plans listed on page 53 of the AEE before submitted for approval.</p>
8	Tui Dewes	Oppose	<p>Groundwater aquifer below the site would require foundations to go very deep. Could give rise to safety issues noting earthquake risk and reclaimed land. This should be explored further.</p> <p>Concerns about streetscape, heritage value, character and safety of the area.</p> <p>Proposal will result in a changed character, and no longer be able to see the sea view changing the nature</p>	Y	<p>Decline the consent.</p> <p>That the proposal abides by the height restriction (27m).</p> <p>That the building be more aesthetically pleasing and in keeping with the area.</p> <p>Preservation of the Pohutukawa including roots.</p>

			<p>of the area. People looking towards the city will no longer be able to see the heritage buildings.</p> <p>Exceeds height by 9m. Where incredibly large buildings have been permitted in Wellington elsewhere, they look out of place. Lower storied, less imposing, and more aesthetically appealing building would be preferable.</p> <p>Concerns about roots of Pohutukawa which is a habitat for birdlife. Should take an environmental-forward approach to nature.</p> <p>Increase traffic in an already at times congested area which is possibly dangerous.</p>		
9	Prime Property Group	Oppose	<p>Proposed building is significantly above the maximum height limits permitted (nearly 50% above the max). Height restrictions are in place to ensure development is of a suitable height which respects the surrounding townscape, heritage and built environment. Pre-app identified original height of 36m as being problematic, and the proposed design has increased to 39m.</p> <p>Proposal is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the ODP in relation to heritage area and surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>Significant adverse effects could be resolved by reducing building height. Insufficient alternative designs</p>	Y	<p>The Submitter formally requests that photomontages are prepared to support the Townscape and Visual Assessment. At present, it is not considered the computer generated model views present an accurate depiction of the scale and massing of the proposed development in the existing urban environment.</p> <p>It is firmly requested that a scheme re-design is undertaken to accord with the heights permitted by the Plan.</p>

		<p>or mitigation options have been developed to deliver a solution.</p> <p>Proposal results in the wind speeds exceeding 20m/s at a number of locations, which is identified in Rule 13.6.3.5.3 as being “completely unacceptable for walking”. Unclear how the proposed walking environment connection is acceptable given the wind speeds. Mitigation appears to have been tested, but it is not clear whether the mitigation has been tested to resolve exceedances at every receptor location identified. Reduction of height would reduce wind speeds.</p> <p>Proposal will significantly affect submitters buildings access to daylight and sunlight, resulting in a minimal level of annual probable sunlight hours compared with the existing situation. Reduction of height would improve daylight and sunlight provision.</p> <p>The proposed development is significantly above the permitted activity height of 15 metres for the site, the scale of which is incongruous with the recommendations of the Central Urban Design Guide. Design Guide is at odds with the urban design experts acting for the Applicant and Council. (Existing and proposed views provided by submitter as Appendix 1).</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			The proposed development would result in significant financial impacts to the business' future operations.		
10	Paul Wilson	Oppose	<p>Proposal exceeds absolute maximum height of 27m in the District Plan and this should not be exceeded.</p> <p>The developer should not have the option of "where possible" regarding retaining the existing trees.</p>	N	<p>Require the building maximum height be enforced.</p> <p>Retain all existing trees on an absolute basis.</p>
11	Joseph Pagani	Support	Wellington needs more buildings, whether housing or office space. Developments like this are vital for the city to be vibrant and affordable.	N	Approve with as little red tape as possible.
12	Annette Cook	Oppose	<p>The development will devalue many Wellington Central apartments.</p> <p>Height of the building will adversely affect views of the harbour which was the main reason for buying the apartment.</p>	N	
13	Margaret Mabbett	Oppose	Site should be used in a way that supports the cultural activities around it. Building design needs to address the location, especially height, form and positioning in relation to MFC and Town Hall.	Y	<p>Delegate decision making to a commissioner.</p> <p>Seek a condition that the developers engage with the Civic Chambers body corp in developing CMP, noise and vibration MP</p>

		<p>Assessment needs to be reperformed without the assumption that 25-30% will be occupied by the Music Centre.</p> <p>Alternative sites are available for an office building because of Kaikoura earthquake.</p> <p>Site is suitable for green space which the city is looking to establish. These purposes are less likely to conflict with the technical difficulties of the site.</p> <p>Covid has reduced the need for office space.</p> <p>Council is working on an accessibility plan. There should be an analysis of disability and accessibility impacts of the proposal.</p> <p>The west end of the building is architecturally key for the relationship between the proposed buildings and the MFC and Town Hall. The site is a key city crossing from the city to sea bridge. Impacts technical access and audience access to the MFC and Town Hall. Concerns around access for WW to the retention tank.</p> <p>ITA assumes all vehicles delivering to MFC will be on a one-way route, but this is incorrect for oversized vehicles. Adverse effects of proposal include reduction of space for vehicles to exit MFC, conflict between pedestrians and cyclists/scooters, and risks of vehicles</p>	<p>and other plans listed in page 53 of the revised AEE.</p> <p>Civic Chambers should be compensated for any vibration damage.</p> <p>Seeks a condition that any outdoor speakers are not to face Wakefield Street.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>exiting to Wakefield St using the same traffic lane as non-motorist users.</p> <p>The wind effects of the proposal inside the MFC porte cochere appear not to have been studied. This should be done as it could have important effects on accessibility for both MFC and Town Hall patrons. Creating adverse wind conditions that discourage the public from using the area seriously affects the case for the proposal.</p> <p>Further work needs to be done to mitigate wind and the access issues. This additional work needs to involve Venues Wellington and the Council's accessibility panel as well as Wellington Water.</p> <p>Civic Chambers will be directly affected by noise, dust and vibration through the construction period. The construction of the retention tank saw submitter significantly affected, especially by sheet piling.</p> <p>Construction period and long term management of the corridor to the waterfront has significant effects on submitters building, including wind speed, dust, noise, vibration, traffic safety. Damage to submitters building falls on the owners through the body corporate.</p> <p>Council has a conflict of interest as landowner.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

14	Zephaniae Locker-Lampson	Oppose	<p>The building height exceeding maximum allowance has significant impacts on residents.</p> <p>The proposal takes the green space from the Taranaki St end of the building. The site could be used in far better ways such as providing promised green space for Frank Kitts.</p> <p>The site is difficult to build on given reclaimed land, retention tank and culvert.</p> <p>The construction effects of noise, vibration and dirt on Civic Chambers and other affected buildings.</p> <p>There are transport issues around MFC and the building area on Wakefield St.</p> <p>Wind speed issues around the MFC and the new building which sees wind gusts increased due to design.</p> <p>Concerns with transport/access with two construction sites in the area.</p> <p>Noise, vibration and traffic issues from the Town Hall strengthening has affected Wakefield St residents for years. They will have to go through this again with this proposal.</p> <p>The area is a heritage, cultural and civic area. It should be used for something for the people rather than office</p>	Y	<p>I would like council to revisit its approval of this project and reject the site for this use. If the proposal is to go ahead then to lower the height of the building significantly.</p> <p>I would like the developers to engage with Civic Chambers Body Corporate re the construction plan, vibration management plan and construction noise plan before these are approved.</p> <p>A decision on how to address any compensation required for Civic Chambers for any damage to my building through the construction process, whether that be vibration damage or any other damage resulting from the build.</p> <p>A condition regarding noise coming from the completed building whether that be through noise from commercial or retail business etc. We are plagued with noise from bars/restaurants etc so an agreement to no outside speakers.</p>
----	--------------------------	--------	--	---	---

			<p>space. Other sites are more appropriate for a new building without the site difficulties.</p> <p>Proposal will almost guarantee the Amora will never open due to its proposed height.</p> <p>Building design looks the same as many other Willis Bond developments, which means the city lacks diversity in look and form. There are issues at the west end with access, wind speed and parking/accessibility.</p> <p>The view analysis does not consider views from lower points in surrounding buildings, which also lose views.</p> <p>The sun study does not take into account the loss of light (not sunlight) from residents on Wakefield Street. Also affects selling ability and price of apartments.</p> <p>The wind speed analysis shows the wind speed around the building/MFC will increase.</p> <p>WCC has a conflict of interest. It has been reported that WCC is looking to move into the completed site – WCC having approved this use of the site for a building it would like to move into is a conflict of interest and a huge red flag.</p>		
15	Oliver Lineham	Oppose	The proposal is for a nine storey private office building, replacing public open space, in a cultural and heritage	Y	I ask that a condition of the consent be that noisy works be limited to Monday-Friday,

		<p>area, far outside the scope envisaged by the District Plan.</p> <p>The owners of 132-136 Wakefield/25 Cuba St were not originally notified of the proposal. The body corporate was not notified although an owner of an affected property. Occupiers have not been notified to date. Unclear if owners/occupiers of other addresses listed in the NDR have been notified.</p> <p>Council has obstructed and frustrated the public's ability to submit on this application through extending the notification date only to those that were not originally notified.</p> <p>Council has a direct financial interest in this application as lessor of the land in question. For avoidance of doubt, I am not exercising my RMA s 100A right to request an independent commissioner. Rather, the council should exercise its own discretion and meet the cost of addressing its own conflict of interest.</p> <p>Proposal is a poor use of public space and further diminishes public space in the central area.</p> <p>The height of the building is far beyond the 15m envisioned by the District Plan. The justification for this height is unconvincing and has significant negative impacts on outlook and character of the Civic Centre Heritage Area.</p>	<p>and not "out-of-hours" as this is when the impact is on the greatest number of people.</p> <p>I ask that a condition of the consent include that any outdoor loudspeakers installed must point away from Wakefield and Cuba Streets to reduce effects on residents.</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>The building is substantially taller than the neighbouring buildings of Lower Cuba Street to its south. The building will dwarf the Michael Fowler Centre. The School of Music is limited to two floors for administrative purposes.</p> <p>The outlook towards the harbour from Civic Chambers will be reduced by half.</p> <p>It is unacceptable that noisy construction can occur from 7.30am to 6pm Monday to Saturday and on Sundays by agreement.</p>		
16	Sharon Ellis	Oppose	<p>Completing the strengthening on the two vacant buildings short distance away from the application site is more sensible than allowing a new building.</p> <p>The proposal is for a large dominating building that is not in keeping with the scale of its neighbours. It pays no aesthetic attention to MFCs distinctive architecture.</p> <p>The proposal affects access to the Michael Fowler Centre for trucks, which are required for major musical events.</p>	Y	At least make it smaller and don't say that it is part of the music school centre until the university expresses a commitment to it.

			<p>The use of the site will change. It was used for community purposes but will now be used for an unnecessary office building.</p> <p>The building goes well above the maximum height of 27m. There is no special reason for this.</p> <p>Green spaces in the cities of the world are valued more than big block buildings.</p>		
17	Margaret Thompson	Oppose	<p>The appropriateness of past decisions, the objectives, lease and cost benefits need to be examined and reviewed by Council before the project is implemented. This is in the ratepayers' interest.</p> <p>The application pays minimal attention to the design as viewed from the South and Cuba Street Heritage Area. In relation to Policy 12.2.2.2 the applicants assessment states the site is not in a residential area although there are six storey apartments buildings on both corners of Cuba/Wakefield opposite the MFC and also buildings in Wakefield and Cuba Street.</p> <p>The building is 15m higher than what is allowed under the current District Plan. The notification report shows the building at the lower level. The proposal has potential for significant impact on shading and possibly wind effects. The proposed height is inappropriate from all sightline directions. The Lantern should</p>	Y	

		<p>complement and enhance this exciting and historic cityscape but instead it dominates the drawings.</p> <p>The height of the 'lantern' part of the building should at a minimum conform with the District Plan, but I propose that it should align or be lower than the height of the MFC and Town Hall.</p> <p>I think the building design should be set back all along the Wakefield frontage and have an attractive presentation for pedestrians the whole way.</p> <p>The only heritage matter considered in the proposal is the Civic Centre Heritage Area and issues discussed are predominantly sightlines. The Cuba Street Heritage Area is close by, and heritage issues are more inclusive than just sightlines.</p> <p>The design takes no account of the current numbers of people who use the space, while the limited objective of maximum commercial development potentially suppresses what already exists.</p> <p>Objective 12.2.1 and 2, 12.2.6.1 to 5 of the District Plan and the inner city intensification policy of the Government (NPS-UD) are relevant and should be addressed by the planner and applicant.</p> <p>The landscape concept needs to be better integrated with the building plan, particularly in relation to the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>south side. Loss of significant tree and garden space on the south side of the building.</p> <p>The traffic impact needs further detailed study.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--