

IN THE MATTER The Resource
Management Act 1991 (“the Act”)

AND

IN THE MATTER of two applications
for a land use consent under section 88 by
IPG CORPORATION LTD to
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL
pertaining to 114 Adelaide Road, Mt Cook

JOINT STATEMENT – APPLICANT and COUNCIL OFFICERS

17th DECEMBER 2021

Joint Statement to the Commissioners

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Joint Witness Statement is written in response to the Commissioners direction in Minute 5 dated 6 December 2021.
- 1.2 The Directions require a Joint Witness Statement, agreed from the conferencing that identifies the issues both agreed and not agreed, accompanied by the expert's reasoning.
- 1.3 The participants met on 30 November in accordance with the directions of the commissioners and discussed alternative design options and explored opportunities to reach consensus on the overall design of the new building and retention of the heritage building facade.
- 1.4 The participants were:
 - On Behalf of WCC
 - Peter Daly
 - Chessa Stevens
 - Sarah Duffell
 - On Behalf of IPG Corporation
 - Dennis Parbu
 - Ian Leary
- 1.5 Following on from this meeting, Council officers provided the applicant with some indicative sketches and explanatory notes of options that might, if all implemented together, get the proposal to a point where it is more likely to be supportable by Council officers. This advice to the applicant is included at Annexure One of this application.
- 1.6 The applicant explored the options with an intent to adopt as much of the officer's recommendations as was possible, taking into account the requirement to achieve a minimum of 45 hotel rooms/units, comply with fire regulations and achieve a structurally viable design.
- 1.7 Following the meeting the applicant has provided an amended proposal, with an accompanying explanation, which was distributed to all parties on the 10th December 2021 with a further amendment to the ground floor, which was distributed on Monday the 13th December 2021. This is included at Annexure Two.
- 1.8 The applicant and the Council met on 15 December to discuss the updated plans.
- 1.9 The joint statement relates to these amended plans.
- 1.10 In preparing this statement, the experts continue to acknowledge the Code of Conduct for expert Witnesses as included in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2014 and continue to agree to comply with it.

2 Discussion Points

- 2.1 The Planner's agree that the main two matters that need to be addressed are the effects on historic heritage, and urban design. Accordingly, the advice of Council's Urban Designer and Heritage Adviser is discussed below.
- 2.2 The Council's Heritage Advisor advised that whilst the amended plans are an improvement to what was previously proposed, the suggestions put forward by Council (Annexure One) were an absolute bottom line to which she could support the proposal. Therefore, Ms Stevens retains her view that the amended proposal will still have significant adverse effects on the heritage values of the building, and has the following primary concerns:
- The significance of the existing building fabric has not been properly assessed nor has a Conservation Plan been prepared to inform decisions relating to the building
 - The height and bulk of the tower in relation to the heritage building, while improved by the proposed design changes, is still dominant and not mitigated by any setback.
 - The proposal does not include full reconstruction of the parapet – this would not just be a beneficial heritage outcome, but would provide some mitigation of the bulk and mass of the tower
 - The proposed setback of the tower from the historic façade is not significant enough and/or does not reflect a minimum one-room-depth retention of the original buildings.
 - The ground floor vehicle access/parking has not been resolved to allow for the footprint of the historic building to be retained and/or to ensure that there is adequate building behind the façade and retention of side elevations
- 2.3 The Council's Urban Design advisor has outlined her position, being cautiously supportive, as follows:
- The exterior design of the new upper part of the proposal is considered to be a better response to the building at the base than the original proposal in terms of differentiation and visual weighting of the various building masses, however details are inconsistent between elevations and plans and this would ideally be subject to final approval if the consent was granted.
 - On the west elevation the inclusion of a lightwell recess is supported in terms of improving internal amenity, however it does not fully address concerns of either Urban Design or submitters about this being a large, blank wall on the boundary. A setback on this elevation above the parapet would still be the preferred urban design outcome,

particularly given the orientation of this façade in respect of adjacent residential properties.

- Reinstatement of the original parapet is not proposed, this would be a preferred outcome particularly in terms of improving the visual weight of the original building.
- On the interior ground floor, the layout is still dominated by vehicles. The design does not nominate a 'front door' at the street edge, it is unclear whether disabled access can be provided, and there is uncertainty around the vehicle entrance in terms of excluding pedestrians or providing safe entry conditions at this point.
- Internally on the upper floors the layout appears to deliver reasonable amenity but is very clumsy with a lot of wasted space. However, it is possible this could be improved without significant alteration to the exterior appearance so is therefore a minor UD concern.

2.4 Overall, in the opinion of Council officers, on the outside the design exhibits some improvement in terms of drawing a better conclusion for an addition to a heritage building. On the inside though, there remain concerns about functionality, access and legibility.

2.5 The applicant's planner notes that the engagement between WCC's Heritage Advisor and Urban Designer were helpful in providing some opportunities to improve the design outcome, the Applicant must still achieve a design which enables a viable proposal to be developed.

3 Planning Context

3.1 The planners agree with the following points:

- That overall, there is general urban design support from both the applicant's advisor and Council officers (noting the comments of the Council's urban designer above)
- The Council's heritage advisor while accepting that the amended proposal is an improvement, they still do not support the proposal.
- That the amended plans fall within the scope of the original application.
- Any changes to the ground floor layout, provision of entries, and minor cladding changes can be managed through consent conditions.
- More fundamental changes to building bulk, particularly any which increase height or building bulk cannot be addressed by conditions.

3.2 Based on the above the Council Planner is of the opinion that whilst the proposed amendments have made positive steps towards resolving some of the issues, these have not been resolved enough to change his recommendation from that of the 42A report. In particular, it is noted:

- Based on the advice provided by Ms Stevens, the heritage effects will be significant, which in a large part caused by the height of the addition in relation to the existing heritage listed tramway hotel frontages.

- In the feedback provided to the applicant (as detailed above), Council officers provided what was considered the 'bottom line' to obtain support for the proposal. This advice provided suggestions that could achieve the same number of residential units, whilst improving the setback from the parapet edge, particularly along Adelaide Road.
- Irrespective of the Urban Design and Heritage matters discussed above, I am still in a position where I cannot make a recommendation based on the shading or wind effects of the proposal, for the reasons as outlined in my S42A report.

3.3 For these reasons, the Council planner retains their recommendation that the consent should be refused. However, if the Commissioners are of a view that consent should be granted, it is my recommendation that the updated iteration of plans are approved, and that amendments to the ground floor layout are required by consent conditions.

3.4 The applicant's planner views are set out in evidence and remain unchanged overall but agrees that the current design, is a better outcome which has been facilitated by the officer's assistance in the recent meetings.

3.5 The applicant's planner notes that conditional WCC urban design support is now obtained and that WCC heritage advisor acknowledges an improvement, whilst still not providing support for the proposal. The applicant's planner reiterates the fact that it was the applicant's intent to adopt as many heritage recommendations as possible, but there are viability issues that prevent full adoption of the recommendations.

4 Conditions

4.1 In respect to paragraph 3.3 above, the planners discussed and agreed on the wording of a condition. The following condition is jointly proposed (amended in underline) as satisfying the requirement to address urban design issues if the Commissioners were to approve the proposal.

Townscape/Design:

7. Prior to the commencement of construction, the following final details must be provided to Councils CMO for certification:

a) Plans that demonstrate:

- i. That the design is altered to provide an exterior entrance to the hotel that celebrates the building's heritage and streetscape significance.
- ii. That the corner entrance to the building is removed, and the original window is reinstated.
- iii. The setback of the new building from the heritage facade is implemented on the elevations and floor plans for the proposed new building addition and appropriately illustrated on the submitted plans.
- iv. That the ground floor design is able to provide compliant accessible entry. – Note: The Urban Design Team's preference is that an exterior entry faces Drummond Street. If this is not proposed, the consent holder should demonstrate why this is not achievable.

- v. That the exterior façade of the new building is altered to provide more three-dimensional relief on the façade by variation in depth of window placement, and interest in the finish of window reveals.
 - vi. That the north-east corner of the building is altered to respond to the angled corner of the original building below, on a reduced scale.
- b) That the applicant supplies a full schedule of colours and materials for the exterior of the development, noting the following:
- i. The colour scheme for the original hotel part of the development must also be endorsed by the Heritage Team
 - ii. The colour scheme of the new part of the building should complement the chosen colours for the heritage building
 - iii. The palette of materials must not visually overwhelm the heritage building by being overly detailed or detract from it by being overly bland
 - iv. The south-facing wall should take into account the billboard placement and orientation (if approved) and should introduce an understanding of scale

Notes:

- The CMO will consult with the urban designer in relation to this condition.

SIGNED:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Peter Daly', written in a cursive style.

Peter Daly

On behalf of Wellington City Council

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Ian Leary', written in a cursive style.

Ian Leary

On behalf of IPG Corporation

Dated: 17th December 2021