

DRAFT 2010/11 WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PLAN SUBMISSIONS

Submission Number	First Name	Last Name	Individual / On behalf of an organisation	Oral Submission	Summary
1	Phillippa	Fletcher	Individual	No	Safety – wharf ladders should be clearly visible at day and night to enable people who fall in to climb out; this is Council’s responsibility
2	Jaimie	Frazer	Individual	No	Kumutoto toilets – need for toilets recognised –proposed ones are an eyesore and a waste of money; would prefer toilets incorporated into existing building. Tensile fabric structure – oppose as no sun to warm area when it’s cold; open air (incl. rain) is a pleasure’ roof would detract from sun, view and whole experience. Waitangi Park buildings – park is wonderful as it is – further building would increase shaded areas unacceptably, and reduce open space. An ice-skating rink is an interesting concept, particularly in Queens Wharf. Not sure why Frank Kitts Park needs to be redeveloped – if it is, there should be no loss of green public open space, ie, no buildings.
3	David	Stevens	Individual	No	Agree with two temporary projects. Council promised a skating rink in Newtown some years ago but nothing eventuated. A temporary rink on Queens Wharf might work and be a catalyst for a permanent one elsewhere? Support police/Dive Squad building – design should be sympathetic to heritage ferry building. Hope that Variation 11 appeal will be successful so that scales of proposed 8,9 + 10 buildings can be re-assessed and reduced.
4	Chris	Brosnahan	Individual	No	Waterfront is inappropriate location for a Chinese garden. Better location would be Haining Street or Courtenay Place due to their connections with the Chinese community. A Chinese garden in Frank Kitts Park would require funding to maintain it. Gardens need shelter from the wind – botanical gardens is a more practical and complementary location
5	Sacha	Gorman	Individual	No	Would like an indoor ice-skating rink with harbour views – it would be popular and attractive for tourists and residents.
6	Shane	Crowe	Individual	No	An iceless skating rink would be cheaper to run and better for the environment.
7	Patrick	Geddes	Individual	No	Supports approach outlined in draft 2010/11 Waterfront Development Plan
8	Mark	Edwards	Individual	No	Long term waterfront development should have leisure as the dominant element and restricted residential / commercial development. Connectivity to city is an issue to address. Cycle access okay on waterfront but cycle access to the waterfront is poor – needs to be addressed, at the same time, reduce Jervis Quay by one lane both ways (especially

					southbound) to allow on road cycle lane and more landscaping. Highway capacity doesn't justify 4 lanes – result is excessive speed and severance of waterfront from city
9	Marguerite	Hely	Individual	No	Don't erect crab-like toilets – they look cheap, nasty and unsuitable – build toilets in keeping with existing buildings Use the money to build bus shelters in Holmbush Road (Khandallah).
10	Sam	Black	Individual	Yes	Wants an ice rink in Courtenay Place.
11	Karen	Serjeantson	Individual	No	Council's approach of drip-feeding buildings for approval is deceitful. People objected to 20 buildings in Variation 17 so why would they support the same total incrementally? All new buildings should be on the non-waterfront side of the quay/road. Waterfront should remain recreational. Council is making decisions for future generations - it will be difficult to remove buildings once they are erected. Council should have foresight of New Plymouth, Chicago and Melbourne who kept waters edge free for green space and recreation. Council doesn't listen to submissions – it does want it wants.
12	Peter	Brooks	Wellington Civic Trust	Yes	Queens Wharf master plan implementation over the next 20 years implies waterfront project completion around 2030 – this should be explained in more detail. Concern that interim use business cases may be commercially confidential and hence exclude the public from the decision-making process. Concerned that inability to find developers for UN Studio and Wardle buildings may result in designs being abandoned and high level of public access may be exchanged for more easily marketed apartment blocks. The Leadership Group was unable to agree on whether or not there should be new buildings on Waitangi Park and significant public debate ensued – if the two competition designs do not proceed the public should again be consulted on a range of options that includes leaving the land as open space, having temporary structures or reserving the site for a future Te Papa expansion.
13	David	Tripp	Individual	No	Waterfront is only feasible cycle route through Wellington but cyclists and pedestrians are forced to share narrow spaces which are unsafe. Measures to keep motor vehicles out make the situation worse. A dedicated, unobstructed cycleway free of cars and pedestrians would make the waterfront safer and promote environmentally friendly and healthy transport – a cyclist user group should be included in the planning.
14	Mrs D and Mr R	Fraser	Individual	No	Totally opposed to new buildings in Waitangi Park or the rest of the waterfront. Dominion Post poll showed that 73% of respondents were opposed to Variation 11.
15	Julian	Gillespie	Individual	No	Objects to any buildings on the waterfront as it should all be retained as public space
16	Vivienne	Bogle	Individual	No	Opposes Variation 11 as it removes public input and control and may affect heritage buildings in the area.
17	Rosamund	Averton	Individual	No	Support recent upgrade of FKP. Don't support any buildings for transition site, or the proposed temporary tensile structure. Decision not to locate Chinese garden here should be reviewed.

					<p>OPT - responsibility for wharf maintenance and car parking needs to be clarified during and around redevelopment period.</p> <p>New wharewaka design resource consent should have been publicly notified.</p> <p>Oppose any redevelopment of FKP.</p> <p>Note that no members of Waterfront Watch or public are on the Queens Wharf master plan steering committee.</p> <p>Oppose ice-skating rink anywhere on Queens Wharf but would consider a privately funded one within the Events Centre.</p> <p>Applaud construction of temporary motorhome on site 10.</p> <p>Support service jetty building development for NZ Police and National Maritime Dive Squad – resource consent should be publicly notified.</p> <p>Support the erection of public toilets in principle but opposed to Kumutoto toilets.</p> <p>Car parking is supported as an interim use.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to a regular waterfront mini-bus service, in conjunction with GWRC and NV Bus.</p> <p>Oppose decision for WWL to continue to manage waterfront project.</p> <p>A waterfront reference group comprising public representatives should be involved in decision-making processes.</p> <p>Opposed to any buildings on the waterfront apart from small utility structures.</p> <p>Council should heed messages received from the public during engagement processes.</p> <p>Promenade improvements can be increased to ensure safety for all pedestrians.</p> <p>Visitors arriving by ship need more information on points of interest.</p> <p>Signage needs to be improved, eg, Dockside public access, FKP car parking, Te Papa.</p> <p>Don't support second bridge from City to Sea bridge.</p> <p>Waterfront colour schemes are dismal and unattractive.</p> <p>There should be full and open consultation on the Queens Wharf master planning process.</p> <p>More information, particularly financial, should be given with the draft plan.</p>
18	Lainey	Cowan	Individual	No	<p>Taranaki Street Wharf upgrade needs more detail – will the metre wide safety slip be retained?</p> <p>How will waka get from whare to lagoon?</p> <p>How will 'non-mound' be sorted?</p>
19	John	O'Leary	Individual	No	<p>Oppose erection of temporary tensile fabric structure in Waitangi Park, and of planned UN Studio and Wardle buildings.</p> <p>What is / has been the public input into the Queens Wharf master plan? there must be real and significant public input into plans for this area.</p> <p>What is the planned District Plan variation and what input will the public have?</p> <p>Oppose ice-rink on Outer-T – Events Centre would be better.</p> <p>Oppose Kumutoto toilets – not economical and style not appropriate.</p> <p>Concerned that WWL being retained to manage waterfront project.</p> <p>Concerned at lack of public input into planning of waterfront development – should be an independent waterfront planning group.</p> <p>Oppose large bulky structures on waterfront – buildings should be restrained and appropriate to heritage context and preserving / enhancing harbour views.</p>

					Note recent UMR polling – respondents don't want any more building on the waterfront.
20	Betty	Weeber	Individual	No	Oppose Variation 11 and any more buildings or high rise on the waterfront. Waterfront is for the public not private buildings and it and its views should be accessible to all. Development will create a canyon effect, destroy views and shade public open space. Development is not conducive to rising sea-levels and won't attract tourists. Council is doing too much behind closed doors and not taking any notice of what people want.
21	David	Underwood	Individual	No	Object to high rise buildings on centre city part of waterfront, especially if there is no public hearing for proposal.
22	WD and LM	Grace	Individual	No	Council plans to heap buildings on waterfront is against popular feeling and expert criticism. Won't vote for councillors who support Variation 11. Growing population means that more people will look to waterfront for open space and recreation – Council should plan for the future. Waitangi Park is excellent and the same thing should be done at the other end of the waterfront. The promenade is already congested and increased traffic from proposed buildings will worsen the situation.
23	Pauline and Athol	Swann	Individual	No	Concerned at staff numbers increasing to 12, for motorhome, market and maintenance contractor. Don't agree that tensile fabric structure would provide architectural solution between Te Papa and Waitangi Park. Tensile fabric structure – no side protection from wind and rain and a long way from lunch time sports users; market stall holders already provide their own protection. Don't support Chinese garden in FKP – should be in transition zone as stated in framework. Look forward to more information on Queens Wharf master plan – public can't comment on a plan which isn't available. Don't approve of Kumutoto toilets and think that motorhome facilities could be made available to the public. Suggest landscaping around motorhome. Question costs of temporary ice-rink on Queens Wharf for a facility only open for 3-4 months a year; resolution of practical issues appears costly. Waterfront is not the right location for an ice-skating rink.
24	Grant	Corlieson	Individual	No	Against temporary uses that spend ratepayer money. Tent wouldn't cope with Wellington wind and not justifiable for one day a week. Out-door ice-skating rink prohibitively expensive to run and not energy efficient. Wax rinks don't work. FKP works well and only needs planting / fencing on the road edge; Chinese garden would

					<p>be better in Illot Park.</p> <p>Re-investigation of Waitangi park buildings from 5 years ago is a wasted effort and a wasted opportunity – paralysis by analysis.</p> <p>The Kumutoto toilets are wasteful – private sector would not approach it like this.</p> <p>Basis of concerns over many of Council proposals is waste of rates resource.</p>
25	Ann	Bain	Association of Blind Persons of NZ – Wellington Branch	Yes	<p>Enjoy recreational facilities and ability to walk along waterfront.</p> <p>Concerned over cyclists and pedestrians having to share space – could be hazardous for blind and vision impaired walkers, children and the elderly.</p> <p>Cycling group courtesy campaign may not be adequate to ensure member's safety.</p> <p>Different textures rather than different colours would be needed for any footpath markings.</p> <p>Consider that this matter is a major safety issue.</p>
26	Peter	Graham	Individual	No	<p>Opposed to Variation 11 – each of the developments proposed for these sites should have its own publicly notified resource consent. Public doesn't want tall buildings so close to the waterfront.</p> <p>FKP is great as it is and the Chinese garden should go on the transition site as originally planned.</p> <p>Shed 6 pedestrian / vehicle separation not addressed in the plan.</p> <p>Kumutoto toilets are a waste of money.</p>
27	David	Wood	Individual	No	Supports proposals.
28	Rachel	Underwood	Individual	No	<p>Objects to more high rise building on city centre part of waterfront which would create a canyon effect.</p> <p>Waterfront is well used by public at present.</p>
29	Pauline	Swann	Waterfront Watch	Yes	<p>Concerned at staff numbers increasing to 12, for motorhome, market and maintenance contractor.</p> <p>Don't agree that tensile fabric structure would provide architectural solution between Te Papa and Waitangi Park.</p> <p>Tensile fabric structure – no side protection from wind and rain and a long way from lunch time sports users; market stall holders already provide their own protection.</p> <p>Don't support Chinese garden in FKP – should be in transition zone as stated in framework.</p> <p>Look forward to more information on Queens Wharf master plan – public can't comment on a plan which isn't available.</p> <p>Don't approve of Kumutoto toilets and think that motorhome facilities could be made available to the public.</p> <p>Suggest landscaping around motorhome.</p> <p>Question costs of temporary ice-rink on Queens Wharf for a facility only open for 3-4 months a year; resolution of practical issues appears costly.</p> <p>Waterfront is not the right location for an ice-skating rink.</p> <p>Not enough green spaces on the waterfront.</p> <p>All roles and structures set up to govern the waterfront must be subject to public scrutiny.</p>
30	Guy	Forrest	Aurecom	No	<p>Believe WWL and WCC have engaged with stakeholders proactively.</p> <p>Support proposed Taranaki Street Wharf and FKP redevelopments.</p> <p>Commend approach to Queens Wharf and Kumutoto, and that Variation 11 is appropriate.</p>

					Interim uses – car parking is appropriate but consideration needs to be given to longer term if / when the capacity is reduced and it is not supported by a good public transport system. Believe motorhome is a great initiative and that similar facilities could be created temporarily for the duration of RWC2011. Tensile fabric structure and ice-rink could work well; able to help with business case preparation.
31	Kenneth	Simpson	Individual	No	Opposed to 3 new buildings on sites 8-10 – would create canyoning effect and obliterate harbour views. Should be low buildings that are sympathetic to surrounding heritage. Oppose surrounding Waitangi Park with large buildings.
32	Russell	Tregonning	Individual	Yes	The waterfront, particularly as a recreational space is a proven success as it currently stands, without the need for any further development. Increased inner city living in Wellington will increase demand for recreational space. Increased high rises and over-development will also discourage the large numbers of tourists and locals that flock to the waterfront. Low cost and low rise enhancement is all that is needed. Waterfront planning should be absorbed into Council and the LATE (WWL) structure abandoned. Variation 11 is unpopular and the Council should withdraw from its Environment Court appeal – beautification of the quality open space is all that is required on sites 8-10. FKP should be left as it is. Waitangi Park is very popular as it is and the Council should abandon plans for the UN Studio and Wardle buildings. Council should listen to the public and abandon plans for high buildings on the waterfront and give it park status.
33	Margaret	Hurst	Individual	No	Retain empty spaces for activities and events. Don't clutter waterfront with ugly buildings and retain harbour views – some view shafts have been compromised already.
34	Mary	Munro	Individual	No	Council may seek public input but they are not interested in it. The waterfront should primarily be a public space for all people to enjoy. The Queens Wharf steering group should comprise genuine members of the public and chose its own chairperson. The promenade needs to be wide, welcoming and sunny – so minimal buildings as they create shade – with designations to accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and skateboarders. Support parking, berthing strategy and wharf pile maintenance. Oppose feasibility study for Waitangi park buildings – unnecessary and expenditure unjustified. Oppose second bridge on Taranaki Street Wharf. Reconsideration should be given to locating the Chinese garden in Waitangi Park – FKP should be left as it is. Question the Queens Wharf master plan and oppose its incorporation into a District Plan variation. Remain opposed to Variation 11. Opposed to kina and proposed design of public toilets.

					Oppose temporary tensile fabric structure. Oppose ice-skating rink – a wharf is not the place for this. Would support a roller skating rink on site 10. Would like to see WWL disbanded.
35	Paul	Kyne	Individual	Yes	Supports solar powered ice-rink and solar powered active recreation – implemented on the Outer-T, this could create a centre of Wellington. Could also be a transport hub and inner city meeting place for youth.
36	Chris	Fox	Individual	No	Should be more focus on day to day operations such as cleanliness, promotion of events, security and promotion of motorhome. Great Harbour Way needs to be considered carefully – cyclists must be encouraged to slow down or face being diverted through other corridors. The timing of the plan should align better with Council's annual plan.
37	Frances	Lee	Individual	No	Would like full responsibilities for waterfront development to return to Council. There may be opportunities for public comment but what notice is taken of them? Promenades should be wide, sunny (not shaded by buildings) , welcoming and attractive. Berthage strategy and wharf pile maintenance are vital and appropriate. Oppose UN Studio and Wardle buildings for Waitangi Park, and oppose tensile fabric structure until further detail is available. Don't see need for bridge landing in Odilins Plaza. Chinese garden in FKP is totally inappropriate. Planned redesign of FKP unnecessary as public appear completely satisfied with it as it is. Vital that public has early input into Queens Wharf master planning process. Worst fear is that Variation 11 rules will be extended to other parts of the waterfront. Don't believe ice-rink is suitable for Queens Wharf – would reduce public space and be a waste of money. Oppose Variation 11 and support appeals to Environment Court. Oppose Kumutoto toilets. Support temporary motorhome park.
38	Karen	Futter	Individual	No	Berth holder at Chaffers Marina – agreement with WWL provides for at least 70 car parks for berth holder use. Car parks are in designated areas, one of which is site of tensile fabric structure. Oppose any development of this area if transport needs not addressed.
39	Ann	Mitcalfe	Individual	No	Waterfront should be predominantly open space with no new buildings. Specifically don't support buildings on sites 8-10. Don't want to see private ownership of waterfront through 99+ year leases. Non-motorised business and recreation should be a priority for the waterfront. Don't want new buildings on Outer-T once existing buildings expire. OPT redevelopment will increase traffic on waterfront. Growing population will lead to increased demand for existing open spaces. Public toilets with 24 hour access should be built into ground floors of existing buildings. Waterfront should be directly under control of Council. Long term sustainable aspects of waterfront to focus on are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cleaning up harbour verges and water,

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating a comprehensive network of affordable public transport to keep the air clean • maintaining views instead of view shafts • keep FKP as it is and improve pedestrian access to and past it • undertake more frequent and effective clearing of wind-blown litter • provide budgets for native planting and maintenance. <p>Support Waterfront Watch submissions.</p>
40	Michael	Taylor	Individual	No	<p>WCC should give Great Harbour Way greater priority – there is a danger that the suitability of the promenade will be compromised by other decisions / developments.</p> <p>Oppose Kumutoto toilets unless funding alternative found so that ratepayers and users don't pay more than \$100k.</p> <p>Facilitating parking of private commuter vehicles is incompatible with WCC climate change strategy.</p> <p>Support motorhome park provided maximum stay is limited.</p> <p>Precise location of ice-rink is critical; also concerned about practicality, energy use and view impacts.</p> <p>Support rearrangement of bollards enabling eastern edge of FKP to be opened up – support further measures to restrict motorised vehicles.</p> <p>Support prioritised route for cyclists.</p> <p>Support bringing car-parking management in-house.</p> <p>Need to ensure OPT construction doesn't interfere with public use of eastern end of promenade.</p>
41	Craig	Palmer	Individual	Yes	<p>There needs to be more constructive and open consultation with the public for each major development.</p> <p>Plan should emphasise city's growing need for recreational space, especially in centre.</p> <p>Concerned that strengthening and redevelopment of Queens Wharf might take 20 years.</p>
42	Barbara	Mitcalfe	Individual	No	<p>Oppose the 3 buildings proposed for sites 8-10.</p> <p>Oppose variation 11 – not democratic – Council should note public rejection of it.</p>
43	J Chris	Horne	Individual	Yes	<p>Support building of wharewaka and Taranaki Street Wharf upgrade.</p> <p>Disappointed that OPT redevelopment will result in shops / businesses being replaced by flats, and a reduction of public access.</p> <p>Kumutoto toilets – not practical.</p> <p>Variation 11 should be withdrawn and replaced by a variation ensuring no blocking of harbour views from the quays.</p> <p>Support Queens Wharf master plan.</p> <p>Market stall holders must be consulted over tensile fabric structure; no opinions on ice-rink yet; support motorhome.</p> <p>Support service jetty building if design sympathetic with ferry terminal.</p> <p>Like FKP as it is apart from its having its back to the harbour.</p> <p>Strongly oppose any buildings in or near Waitangi Park.</p>
44	Alison	Ross Hehir	Individual	No	<p>Support general waterfront development.</p> <p>Waterfront has strong sense of community, and connectedness between city and sea.</p>

					Would hate to see ongoing development and enhancement stop.
45	Mandy	Ross	Individual	No	Waterfront development is not a moment too soon and will help to put Wellington on an international scale. There should be more temporary and transitional installations.
46	Matt	Armitage	Individual	No	The waterfront is a safe and healthy environment for people to relax and enjoy the sun, and encourages alternative means of transport.
47	Anne	McKinnon	Individual	No	Waterfront should retain public open space and there should be no more buildings as these create shade and wind tunnels, obscure views and exclude the public. Existing heritage buildings should be upgraded and used for public purposes. Waterfront should be joined to cbd. FKP and Waitangi park are enjoyed by the public and should not be changed.
48	W Edith	Ryan	Individual	No	Waterfront sites should be redeveloped not developed – City and Sea museum and Wharf office apartments are fine examples of revitalising. FKP is used hugely by the public and will be minimised by a Chinese garden. Kumutoto – no more building; Variation 11 has removed people’s democratic rights. Wharewaka not publicly consulted on; no need for a second bridge. Keep waterfront free of developers and development – all Wellingtonians own it.
49	Ann	Paisley Ryan	Individual	No	Oppose buildings in Waitangi Park. Oppose any more large buildings on the waterfront. In Taranaki Street Wharf - oppose any reduction in size of lagoon, landscaping of the mound and construction of a second bridge. Oppose Chinese garden in FKP. Agree to refurbishment / redevelopment of Sheds 1 and 6 if it doesn’t result in an increase in their size. Difficult to understand how an ice-skating rink could work practicably. Oppose buildings proposed for sites 8-10. Agree with police jetty if small and low lying. Support motorhome. Don’t support toilets. Support temporary tensile structure.
50	Hugh	Barr	Individual	Yes	Remove variation 11 and set a height limit of 3 storeys and public notification for all waterfront consents. Protect sight lines into harbour.
51	BJ and LM	Burrell	Individual	No	Oppose construction of large buildings on sites 8-10 – will restrict views. Don’t move cbd to waterfront – waterfront is needed as open space for all to enjoy. Oppose any large scale buildings on sites 1-4 in Waitangi Park. 10 years ago people protested against the threat of high rises in Variation 17 – today people still don’t want high rises on the waterfront – Council should listen.
52	Malcolm	Sime	Individual	No	All the waterfront looks tremendous. Some turbines would be interesting, educational and practical.
53	Sue	Wild	Individual	No	Congratulations on the following successful enhancements of the waterfront – the cut-outs near Te Papa, the water whirler, the Kumutoto stream outlet and the two bronze human figures.

54	Ronald Alan	Henry	Individual	No	Variation 11 will deny current and future citizens views of the waterfront from the city. Developments should be small scale, sympathetic to heritage and retain view shafts. Hope that Variation 11 will be abandoned and no similar proposals raised again.
55	Sue	Wild	National Society of Watercolour Artists	No	Watercolour artists love to paint on the waterfront – there is shelter, interesting view shafts and cafes to nearby to meet and share work.
56	I B	Owen	Individual	Yes	Plan destroys connectedness between harbour and city. Wellingtonians oppose buildings that destroy the waterfront – why doesn't Council listen?
57	Andrew	Morrison	Chaffers Marina Ltd and Chaffers Marina Holdings Ltd	Yes	proposed construction of temporary tensile structure represents a breach of the contract between WWL and CML and CMHL in relation to the provision of car parking spaces.
58	Alexia	Pickering	Individual	Yes	Public space around wharewaka should be accessible to all users. The proposed bridge landing from the City to Sea Bridge is a building under the Buildings Act and must be accessible to all. FKP is multi-functional, providing for people with restricted mobility – unlike Waitangi Park. Chinese garden should be placed somewhere more appropriate such as the Botanical Gardens – a poll should be conducted among the Chinese community to see if they agree with the demolition of FKP with all its current uses.
59	Di	Buchan	Individual	No	Ice-skating rink supported if cost neutral and doesn't interfere with other activities outside winter months. Supports tent as interim measure for transition zone. Support feasibility studies of Waitangi Park buildings but must be economically feasible, with attractive urban design and community use of surrounding space. Appalled that Kumutoto toilet was approved.
60	David	Perks	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support business cases being prepared for interim uses – would need to be convinced around ice-rink numbers. Concerned that development of single service jetty may impact negatively on more substantial future changes. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
61	Doug	Buchanan	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Unsure of interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies. Support WWL; more buildings desirable from shelter perspective.
62	Guy	Cleverly	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Disagree with ice-skating rink. Believe overall strategy for city market is required – Waitangi Park is windy and limited – review of location should be considered.

					Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
63	Jeannie	Warnock	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies. Support WWL – they are responsible for the most successful waterfront development in NZ. Need to better link the cbd to the waterfront.
64	Margarete	Mcgrath	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
65	Richard	Findlay	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies. Have reservations about campervan solution.
66	Malcolm	Watson	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies. WWL has achieved an attractive waterfront and proposed work will capitalise on this. Concerned around integration of cyclists and pedestrians mainly because of cyclists using high speeds.
67	Andy	Bogacki	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses but ice-skating rink should be at Waitangi Park near car parking and other activities. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies. Endorse framework and its pro-active implementation by WWL.
68	Julian	Smith	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
69	Dean	Riddell	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
70	Grant	Watkins	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
71	Andrew	Brockway	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan.

					Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
72	Barbara	Bercic	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies. Waterfront continues to set national standards for innovation, creativity and excellence. Would like a child specific feature in the future – something creative and exciting – not an off the shelf playground.
73	John	Milford	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
74	Drew	Herriott	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
75	Peter	Scholes	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
76	Vaughan	Wilson	Individual	No	Support Queens Wharf master plan. Support interim uses. Support development of service jetty for NZ Police. Support Waitangi Park buildings feasibility studies.
77	Alistair	Smith	Cycle Aware Wellington	Yes	Concerned that no recognition of the Great Harbour Way (GHW) in the draft plan. Concerned that development may lead to further constriction of route and lack of connection with other parts of GHW. Events can be better managed to reduce bottlenecks. Motorhome park could be extended to include cafes, bike stores, bike rentals, etc. in conjunction with the GHW. Cruise the Waterfront courtesy campaign very successful. problem of cyclists travelling too fast addressed by providing cycle lanes along the Quays, as well as Cable and Wakefield Streets.