
REPORT 3
(1215/52/IM)

FEEDBACK ON THE 2009/10 DRAFT WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1. Purpose of Report

To provide the Strategy and Policy Committee with a summary of the feedback received during consultation on the draft Waterfront Development Plan for 2009/10, and to recommend the adoption of the Plan.

2. Executive Summary

The key features of the 2009/10 draft Waterfront Development Plan that submitters responded to are the three proposed interim measures, the Kumutoto toilet facilities and the Council decision to retain Wellington Waterfront Limited (WWL) as the implementation agency for waterfront projects.

Seventy-three written submissions were received and the Strategy and Policy Committee heard six oral submissions on 5 November. The submissions were strongly supportive of the proposal to retain WWL, with forty-five out of seventy-three submissions saying that WWL should be retained. The temporary Campervan Park received more support than any other aspect of the draft Plan, with fifty submissions supporting it. Officers note that to mitigate against the likely ultimate removal of the Campervan Park from site 10, that Council should actively continue to identify a permanent location.

The Ice skating rink and Temporary tensile fabric structure and Kumutoto toilets were also supported by the majority of submissions however officers have noted some concerns, particularly around the optimal site and the financial viability of the proposals.

Accordingly officers have sought to clarify the process around the progression of these proposals by requesting that WWL develops a business case in support of the Ice skating rink and Temporary tensile fabric structure to demonstrate their financial viability. In addition, officers have requested that WWL reviews the cost and design of the Kumutoto toilet facility, as well as reviewing existing toilet facilities and their signage.

The officers recommend that the Committee approve the 2009/10 Waterfront Development Plan, noting the clarification of the interim uses and Kumutoto toilet project processes.

3. Recommendations

Officers recommend that the Committee:

1. *Receive the information*
2. *Approve the draft 2009/10 Waterfront Development Plan attached as Appendix 3.*
3. *Approve the 2009/10 programme of work attached as Appendix 4 of this report.*
4. *Agree the following in relation to the proposed interim uses and the Kumutoto toilet facility:*
 - (a) *WWL will complete the planning and design work for the temporary Campervan Park prior to starting construction in late 2009 or early 2010.*
 - (b) *WWL will consider the implications of the outcome of the Outer-T Ideas Competition before proceeding with the planning and design work for the Ice skating rink.*
 - (c) *WWL will prepare a business case that demonstrates whether or not the proposed Ice skating rink is financially viable before seeking Council approval to proceed.*
 - (d) *WWL will complete the planning and design work for the Temporary tensile fabric structure and prepare a business case that demonstrates whether or not the project is financially viable before seeking Council approval to proceed.*
 - (e) *WWL will consider the public concern over the Kumutoto toilet proposal's cost with the objective of reducing the costs, considering the design feedback and reviewing the signage and condition of existing facilities before seeking Council approval to proceed.*
5. *Agree to request officers continue to explore a permanent campervan facility in readiness for the closure of the temporary facility.*
6. *Delegate to the Portfolio Leader, Urban Development, the authority to approve any amendments to the 2009/10 Waterfront Development Plan.*
7. *Note that any funding implications will be addressed as part of the 2010/11 Annual Plan.*

4. Background

The draft 2009/10 Waterfront Development Plan continues to implement the Wellington Waterfront Framework. Aside from the interim uses noted below, the only significant change in scope from what has been indicated in earlier plans is the proposed planning exercise for the broader Queens Wharf area. The draft Plan focuses on the timing of the various projects, some of which have changed significantly as a result of Council's 2008 decision to spread the project over 10 years.

The deferral of commercial projects due to the prevailing market conditions created the opportunity to investigate potential interim and temporary uses such as a Campervan Park, a tensile fabric structure and an Ice skating rink. These suggested temporary uses received a significant amount of feedback during the consultation process.

In December 2008, the Council agreed to extend the implementation of the waterfront project over a 10 year work period and to transfer the development and management responsibilities to the Council by July 2010 – subject to a review of market conditions.

At the Strategy and Policy Committee meeting of 3 September 2009, the Council agreed that the Waterfront Project should continue to be managed by Wellington Waterfront Limited, that funding be allocated from 2010/11 onwards to reflect Wellington Waterfront's continuation, and that this decision be reviewed in time for the 2012/22 LTCCP.

The above decision subsequently reflected in the draft Plan has received significant feedback during the public consultation, as have the proposed Kumutoto toilet facilities.

A copy of the draft Waterfront Development Plan is attached as *Appendix 3* and a programme of work for the Waterfront for the current financial year, derived from the Waterfront Development Plan is attached as *Appendix 4*.

5. Discussion

5.1 Methodology

Consultation on the draft 2009/10 Waterfront Development Plan opened on 16 September 2009 and closed at 5pm on 13 October 2009. The consultation lasted for 28 calendar days (20 working days). Late submissions were accepted.

The plan was advertised in the Dominion Post and on the Council's website. The Council made the draft plan and submission form available at the Council Service centre at 101 Wakefield Street and at Wellington City Libraries. Copies

were available on request and the information could also be downloaded from the Council's website.

Seventy-three submissions were received (one of which was received after the deadline). A summary of all the submissions is attached as *Appendix 1* to this report and a full copy of all submissions is attached as *Appendix 2*.

The analysis in section 5.2 summarises the key issues from submissions made on the draft Waterfront Development Plan 2009/10. The scope of the analysis aims to be broad enough to inform the Committee's decision but sufficiently focused to be accessible and meaningful.

Of the seventy-three submissions:

- fifty were made by individuals
- twenty-three were made by groups

Six submitters made oral presentations to the Strategy and Policy Committee at the 5 November 2009 meeting.

The website and formal submission forms included a privacy statement which outlined that all submissions (including name and contact details) are published and made publicly available to elected members and the public.

The late submission received was accepted in the interests of providing the Committee with as full a picture of public sentiment as possible.

5.2 Summary of written submissions

The summary below outlines key matters raised by the submitters.

5.2.1 Retention of Wellington Waterfront Limited as implementation agency

The decision by Council to extend the life of WWL as the waterfront implementation agency featured in a large number of the submissions. Forty-five submissions stated that WWL should be retained as an external organisation, with arm's length separation from the Council. The reasons given for this were that the greater focus and freedom from political interference enabled greater speed of delivery of projects. The Company's Board was noted for its commercial strength and the institutional knowledge and skills of a dedicated team were also mentioned.

It was also noted that the natural tension between the Company and the Council served the waterfront project well, with greater transparency and accountability of the Company re-enforced by the Council's checks and balances.

However, eight submissions opposed the retention of WWL, citing the extra operating costs of the Company, the smaller workload than in previous years due to the economic climate and significantly, the fact that in December 2008, the Council agreed to bring the Waterfront Project back into Council.

Officers note that in December 2008, to reflect the smaller anticipated workload of the Company, WWL decreased its operating costs by reducing the number of staff and directors.

5.2.2 Interim Uses

The draft Plan noted the opportunity to investigate potential interim and temporary uses such as a Campervan Park, a tensile fabric structure and an Ice skating rink.

Wellington Campervan Park

The proposed temporary Campervan Park for site 10 in Kumutoto received the strongest support of all the planned projects, with fifty submissions supporting the proposal and just three people opposing it. It was noted that the temporary Campervan Park would meet an unmet demand and help to attract tourists to and retain them in Wellington, and would alleviate the demand on hotels, particularly during the Rugby World Cup.

A lot of submissions fully endorsed the proposal however, a number of submissions suggested alternative sites, such as the Overseas Passenger Terminal (OPT), Te Papa and Waitangi Park – the main reason for this being the better proximity to bars, restaurants and supermarkets. Other key considerations included the need for appropriate landscaping, surveillance and security, ongoing maintenance of the Park and noise control.

A note of caution was sounded by several submitters who supported the Campervan Park in principle and location; this was that it must be made abundantly clear from the outset that the use of site 10 for the Park is an interim measure and that the search for a permanent, alternative site must begin immediately. It was felt that the longer the Campervan Park is situated on site 10, the more likely it is to acquire permanent status or at least become an irreplaceable part of the waterfront, hence the need for an alternative location to be identified well in advance of any future permanent development on site 10.

Of the three submissions opposing the proposal, an increase in vehicular traffic on / around the waterfront was noted as an unwelcome outcome.

A notable submission was that by a resident / owner of a Waterloo Quay apartment which is next to site 10 who voiced strong support for the Park.

Ice skating rink

Thirty-eight submissions supported the Ice skating rink proposal while eight submissions opposed them. A number of supporting submissions cited the rink as a focal point to draw activity to an under-used site though there were some uncertainties over the site which is very exposed during winter; possible alternate sites suggested were Shed 1 (Outer-T), Te Papa, Waitangi Park and site 10.

A common theme from both the supporting and opposing submissions was the cost of the proposed rink, and any associated infrastructural requirements. It was quite strongly felt that the rink should be cost neutral, and that the Council having to subsidise the rink would not be appropriate in the current economic climate.

Other key considerations raised by submitters were the need for the rink to be accessible, available for multi-use and not to encourage cars to the waterfront. In addition, some submitters stated that this proposal should not be progressed until the outcome of the Outer-T ideas competition is known. WWL has already put this project on hold, pending the outcome of the competition.

Temporary tensile fabric structure

Thirty-eight submissions supported this proposed interim use while six submissions were opposed to it. The support for the proposal was largely due to its potential for multi-uses for a range of groups and providing protection from wet weather. Key considerations noted by submitters were the strength, permeability and maintenance requirements of the structure. Some submitters who were supportive in principle did note concerns over the cost of the structure and any associated infrastructural requirements, as well as questioning whether or not Waitangi Park was the best location; some submissions restated that the currently proposed site should be used for the proposed Chinese Garden, as originally planned.

The submitters opposing the proposal raised concerns over the potential cost of the structure, the consequent loss in car parking revenues and the possibility of the structure detracting from Te Papa.

5.2.3 Kumutoto toilet facility

This proposal attracted a lot of attention from submitters, with thirty-six supporting and nine opposing the proposal. Many felt that it was an excellent design that had the potential to become an iconic piece of Wellington artwork, and that any additional expenditure required in its development would be offset by its architectural and PR value.

However, some submitters felt that the estimated \$400k cost was not an appropriate use of ratepayers' funds while others felt that the design should be more sympathetic to and better integrated with the surrounding architecture. Some submitters felt that a more appropriate use of funds was to upgrade some of the existing facilities and improve the signage of others.

As previously noted, the above issues attracted the greatest number of (mainly supportive) submissions by far. A number of other themes and ideas, some well supported and others perhaps only mentioned by one or two submitters are included below for the Committee's consideration.

5.2.4 Promenades

One submitter requested that the Waterfront Development Plan address the deficiencies in the promenades, the most popular part of the waterfront and an integral part of the Great Harbour Way. Several submitters noted that safe, attractive promenades with minimal vehicle traffic were needed to encourage people to connect with the water.

A number of submitters commented on the current state of repair of the promenades and how narrow sections of promenade created problems for the large volumes of pedestrians, cyclists and other non-motorised traffic and how greater consideration should be given to encouraging and facilitating walking and cycling on the waterfront.

5.2.5 Wharewaka

Several submitters commented that they were looking forward to seeing this project finally coming to fruition whilst others considered that the significant design changes required a new resource consent.

5.2.6 Climate Change

A number of submissions commented on the need to consider the traffic impacts of all developments, and the consequent carbon emission levels.

One submitter noted that the harbour will be one of the very few points of entry giving access to the outer world when a disaster strikes and emergency measures for the health and safety of citizens must be paramount.

Several submitters noted that improved public transport would help to keep cars away from the waterfront and one submitter suggested a mini-bus service to travel along the entire coastline.

5.2.7 Wharf Pile Maintenance

A number of submitters commented that this was one of the biggest, if not the biggest priority for the waterfront and that it should have a much higher priority than either commercial redevelopments or interim uses. One submission noted that the cost to the ratepayers of essential wharf repairs could be reduced considerably by commercial proceeds from private developments.

5.2.8 Frank Kitts Park

The redevelopment is supported by several submitters though others note that the Chinese Garden should be in Waitangi Park, as originally stated, whilst others feel that there is nothing wrong with the Park and that it works well as it is. One submitter commented that the redevelopment should only start once all the targeted funding (Council and the Wellington Chinese Garden Society) funding was in place.

5.2.9 Other submission points

A small number of submitters supported little or no further waterfront development, stating that the waterfront should be predominantly open space.

Several submitters opposed any changes that resulted in the reduction of public involvement, submissions and participation on what is built on the waterfront. A number of submissions noted that they were opposed to private or commercial developments that benefitted a minority, on waterfront land held by the Council on behalf of the people of Wellington.

Two people were in favour of the proposed bridge by the old Odlin's building to improve the traffic flow and therefore reduce carbon emissions.

One submission suggested retaining Shed 1 and fitting it out as the Maritime Annex of the City and Sea Museum using Bond Store exhibits plus most of the objects currently stored in Ngauranga.

Several submitters voiced support for the Kina sculpture.

The importance of the role of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was noted by several submitters, and the need for TAG to review all proposals and monitor all construction on the waterfront to ensure continued high standards of waterfront design quality.

5.3 Oral submissions

The submissions covered a range of issues, much of which has already been addressed via the written submissions however there were two points which officers consider warrant further discussion.

Concern was raised over the process for the proposed redevelopment of Frank Kitts Park, and specifically the dual aspects of the Chinese Garden and the remainder of the Council funded redevelopment. The draft Plan states that the two stages of redevelopment should happen at the same time, and that this should not be until all the sponsorship funding for the Chinese Garden has been raised, currently estimated to be in 2015/16.

However, the current 2009/10 work programme plans for WWL to apply for resource consent in the 2009/10 year. The oral submissions noted that due to the not inconsiderable costs of the resource consent process, this process should not be started until such time as there is greater comfort over the ability of the

Wellington Chinese Garden Society (WCGS) to achieve the targeted sponsorship funding.

WWL advise that the WCGS require the certainty of an approved resource consent in order to secure the funding.

5.4 LTCCP Implications

The funding requirements for the Waterfront in the 2009/19 LTCCP were developed based on the approach approved by SPC in the December 2008 paper "Options for Waterfront Project".

The proposed Waterfront Development Plan can be accommodated within the funding provided in the LTCCP in 2009/10 and budget that has been carried forward from 2008/09 for wharf piling repairs now expected to be performed in 2009/10. For subsequent years, however the funding required, both rates and borrowings, will need to be adjusted to reflect WWL continuing as project manager, to provide for approved interim projects and to reflect the impacts of the deferral of commercial proceeds and the subsequent impacts on operating revenue and expenditure.

Officers propose that the necessary changes are made for 2010/11 onwards during the 2010/11 Annual Plan process.

6. Analysis of submissions

The table below gives a high level summary of the key areas of feedback addressed by submitters in their responses:

Proposal	For	Against	Silent
Retention of WWL as implementation agency	45	8	20
Wellington Campervan Park	50	3	20
Ice skating rink	38	8	27
Temporary tensile fabric structure	38	6	29
Kumutoto toilet facility	36	9	28

6.1 Officers Responses to Submissions

While some submissions opposed some or all aspects of the 2009/10 Waterfront Development Plan, the vast majority of submissions were very supporting, especially of the interim proposals, the Kumutoto toilets and the decision to retain WWL as the implementation agency.

Accordingly officers recommend that the Council approves the 2009/10 Waterfront Development Plan however officers have sought to clarify the process for the implementation of projects during the 2009/10 year, particularly with respect to the items noted above which received a significant number of responses during the public consultation.

All of the comments discussed below have been incorporated into the report recommendations for the Committee to consider.

6.1.1 Campervan Park

Officers recommend that as part of the Plan, Council approves the planning and design for the proposed temporary Campervan Park, as this facility has long been considered to be an important addition to Wellington's tourism infrastructure, as noted by the weight of submissions supporting it.

However, officers note the following in relation to the temporary Campervan Park:

- Council officers should continue to explore a permanent campervan facility in readiness for the closure of the temporary one. This is because the Campervan Park is temporary and removing it from site 10 in around three years time will be seen by Wellingtonians as a drop in service level and therefore is likely to put significant pressure on the Council to deliver a replacement, particularly given that the temporary park will potentially be replaced by a building/hotel.

6.1.2 Ice skating rink

With regard to the Ice skating rink, officers note the uncertainty over the suitability of the proposed location and the concern over the proposal's ability to be financially sustainable that were cited in a number of submissions.

Consequently, officers note the following in relation to the Ice skating rink:

- WWL should await the outcome of the Outer-T Ideas Competition before proceeding with the planning and design work for the Ice skating rink
- WWL should prepare a business case to include further site and analysis and to also demonstrate the financial viability of the proposed Ice skating rink and present this to Council for approval before starting construction

6.1.3 Temporary tensile fabric structure

The Temporary tensile fabric structure concerned a number of submitters, specifically in relation to the uncertainties around the optimal site and the financial sustainability of the proposal.

Officers note that WWL should complete the planning and design work for the Temporary tensile fabric structure and prepare a business case to confirm its financial viability before reporting back to Council to seek approval to proceed.

6.1.4 Kumutoto toilets

The Kumutoto toilets received a large number of submissions therefore officers consider that WWL should consider the submitter's feedback on the proposal and review the current scope of the project. The areas of review include trying to integrate the design with the surrounding architecture, exploring the possibility of reducing the cost, and review the signage and the condition of existing facilities.

6.1.5 Wharewaka

Officers note that the latest wharewaka complex design has been lodged with Council planners and WWL will await their decision on whether the new design fits into the existing resource consent conditions.

6.1.5 Financial implications

Officers note that the December 2008 Council decision to spread the waterfront development over a 10-year period was largely in response to the economic downturn, and the fact that the Waterfront Framework states that, as far as possible, commercial proceeds should be used to fund public space expenditure.

As noted earlier in this report, this deferral of commercial proceeds created the opportunity for WWL to consider temporary uses for some of the likely development sites however there is no funding available for either the Ice skating rink or the Temporary tensile fabric structure in the currently approved 2009/10 budget, or in the out years.

Accordingly the financial viability of these projects needs to be clearly demonstrated to justify their implementation in the current economic climate.

7. Conclusion

The consultation process allowed individuals and groups to provide their thoughts and suggestions on the 2009/10 draft Waterfront Development Plan.

In addition, the processes by which Council might approve the suggested interim uses and the Kumutoto toilet facility should be confirmed as follows:

- WWL will complete the planning and design work for the temporary Campervan Park prior to starting construction in late 2009 or early 2010. Officers further recommend that the Council continues to explore a permanent campervan facility in readiness for the closure of the temporary one
- WWL should complete the planning and design work for the both the Ice skating rink and the Temporary tensile fabric structure and prepare a business case to confirm their financial viability before reporting back to Council to seek approval to proceed with construction
- WWL will consider the public concern over the Kumutoto toilet proposal's cost with the objective of reducing the costs, considering the design feedback and reviewing the signage and condition of existing facilities

The Waterfront Development Plan will be amended to reflect any changes agreed to by the Committee.

Contact Officer:

Ian Clements, Portfolio Manager, Council Controlled Organisations

Supporting Information

1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome

The Waterfront Development Plan would contribute to the following Council outcomes:

More Liveable – Wellington will be a great place to be, offering a variety of places to live, work and play within a high quality environment.

Stronger sense of place – Wellington will have a strong local identity that celebrates and protects its sense of place, capital-city status, distinctive landform and landmarks, defining features, history, heritage buildings, places and spaces.

More Eventful – Wellington will maximise the economic value from promoting and hosting high-profile events.

More Prosperous – Wellington’s urban form, and flexible approach to land use planning in the central city, will contribute to economic growth and prosperity.

2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact

C378 Wellington Waterfront Project; A312 Wellington Waterfront Operations; CX131 Wellington Waterfront Development.

3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations

Maori have had a long connection with the harbour and waterfront that continues today. There are several sites of significance for iwi around the waterfront including Waitangi Lagoon and Te Aro Pa.

4) Decision-Making

This is not a significant decision. The decision has been assessed under the decision-making framework of the LGA as appropriate following the consideration of section 79 LGA 2002. It is noted that the decision does not give rise to any inconsistent decisions, and is consistent with the Waterfront Framework.

5) Consultation

a) General Consultation

Consultation was undertaken on the proposal.

b) Consultation with Maori

Representatives from Council’s mana whenua Treaty partners – Wellington Tenth Trust and Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira were involved in the development of the Wellington Waterfront Framework that underpins the Waterfront Development Plan.

6) Legal Implications

The LGA decision-making framework has been considered in this paper.

7) Consistency with existing policy

This report is consistent with existing WCC policy on waterfront development.