

## **Draft North Kumutoto Design Brief**

### **Summary of consultation and feedback November 2012**



**CONTENTS**

Part 1 – Summary of Consultation ..... 3

    1.1 Background to the consultation ..... 3

    1.2 Consultation scope ..... 3

    1.3 Consultation activities ..... 4

    1.4 Feedback received ..... 5

        Written submissions ..... 5

        Oral submissions ..... 5

        Public forum ..... 6

Part 2 – Feedback received on the Draft Design Brief ..... 7

    2.1 Key overall feedback themes ..... 7

        Key themes from submission feedback include: ..... 7

    2.2 Feedback received on specific questions ..... 8

        Question 1: Increased amount of public space in north Kumutoto ..... 8

        Question 2: Reduced size of potential buildings in the area ..... 11

        Question 3: Balancing needs ..... 14

        Question 4: Funding for public spaces and other improvements ..... 17

        Question 5: Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the draft design brief? ..... 19

    2.3 Oral submissions – summary of key themes ..... 21

Appendix 1 – Table of submitters ..... 25

# **Part 1 – Summary of Consultation**

## **1.1 Background to the consultation**

North Kumutoto is an important part of Wellington's waterfront. It acts as a public gateway to the waterfront from the north. It offers recreation, cultural and employment opportunities. It has strong connections to the central business district and links north to Shed 21, the Railway Station and CentrePort. The area's development aims to enhance these factors. There are wide-ranging community views regarding the development of the area and there has been a long public process debating its development, most recently District Plan Variation 11 and the proposed building and open space development for Site 10.

At its 4 October 2012 meeting, the Strategy and Policy Committee decided to consult on the draft North Kumutoto Design Brief.

The purpose of the design brief is to guide the creation of high quality buildings and spaces in the north Kumutoto area and how these will look. It does this by setting out design principles and parameters.

The brief sits within the wider context of the Waterfront Framework and is consistent with its overarching principles and guiding direction. It is also consistent with the Waterfront Development Plan and the District Plan.

The brief was based on a refresh of the 2002 Queens Wharf Design Brief. Key changes in the brief from previous proposals for the development of north Kumutoto included:

- the development of Site 8 as public open space (rather than a building)
- a much reduced scale of building development on sites 9 and 10 (from 30m to 22m)
- a building setback of at least nine metres on the seaward side of Site 10 to provide for pedestrian movement and servicing
- less bulky buildings – the building on Site 10 is to be read as more than one building, and the building on Site 9 is to step down from north to south
- new buildings are to have strong relationships with heritage buildings, public open spaces and the other buildings in the area
- public consultation will be required on preferred development proposals as well as part of the resource consenting process.

These changes reflect the Environment Court's decision on Variation 11. They also take into account public feedback received over the years on the development of this area, and in particular, concerns regarding the scale of built development and the provision of public open space and access.

## **1.2 Consultation scope**

In agreeing to consult on the draft design brief, the Strategy and Policy Committee set some specific parameters around the consultation scope. In particular the consultation was to seek further feedback on the draft design brief, noting the Waterfront Framework, with key questions focussed on:

- the increased provision of open space, i.e. site 8
- the proposed building envelopes

- the balance of shelter and activity in the area
- the funding relationship i.e. commercial proceeds contribute to the cost of open space and wharf strengthening.

The consultation document therefore highlighted that this consultation focused specifically on the north Kumutoto design brief. It was not about revisiting the principles and provisions of the Waterfront Framework, the Waterfront Development Plan or the District Plan. It also clarified that there will be several more opportunities to provide feedback on the development of the north Kumutoto area, including the opportunity to comment on:

- new building proposals for sites 9 and 10 when these come forward
- the design of public open space – this includes Site 8
- resource consent applications for development proposals for sites 9 and 10.

### 1.3 Consultation activities

Submissions were sought on the draft design brief from 10 October to 5 November 2012.

A number of consultation activities were undertaken as part of the consultation and engagement process to inform and encourage feedback. These included:

1. **Consultation documents and submission form** (printed and online versions) – specifically these included:
  - A consultation document outlining the background to the consultation, the purpose and scope of the design brief, and included a submission form.
  - The draft design brief document.
  - A specific email address was also created for the consultation so people could email questions and submissions ([waterfrontbrief@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:waterfrontbrief@wcc.govt.nz)).
2. **Letters:** letters and emails notifying people of the consultation were sent out to previous submitters on Variation 11 and the Site 10 development proposal. Copies of or links to the consultation material were included with these notifications.
3. **Website and video:** a section on Council's website was dedicated to the consultation. This went live on 10 October and contained:
  - a introductory summary of the consultation
  - a link to (and downloadable copy) of the consultation booklet and design brief
  - a video clip tracking the site's development over time, and showing a 'fly-by' over and through the site from different angles highlighting the open space area of site 8 and the proposed building envelopes for sites 9 and 10
  - links to the Wellington Waterfront Framework
  - online and printable versions of the submission form
  - contact details for further information
  - a link to the waterfront email.
4. **Media information** which included:
  - a media release on the consultation commencing (9 October 2012).
  - a story on Council's Our Wellington page in the Dominion Post on 16 October 2012 (including details of the display at WWL offices and the Public Forum)
  - a media advisory inviting the media to the public forum.

5. **Public information site** - established on the ground floor entrance to the Wellington Waterfront offices with information on the consultation, a screen with the video clip, posters, a map of the north Kumutoto area which people could stick feedback notes to, copies of the submission form and design brief and a submissions box.
6. **Public Forum to discuss the draft brief** – held on 1 November, 5:30-7pm at the Council offices (Committee Room 1). Speakers included Pauline Swann (Waterfront Watch Ltd), Graeme McIndoe (Waterfront Technical Advisory Group) and Andrew MacLeod (WCC – District Plan team).
7. **Waterfront signage** – including posters, directional decals on the pavement (directing people to the WWL office public display) and information boards at the motorhome park and the Harbourside Market.

### 1.4 Feedback received

#### Written submissions

68 submissions were received on the draft design brief by the close off date. A further 3 submissions were received after the consultation close off date but have still been included in this analysis. This brings the total number of submissions received to 71.

#### Number of submissions

Individuals	61
Organisations	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>

Organisations who submitted on the draft brief included:

- NZ Historical Places Trust
- The Architectural Centre
- Land Lease Ltd
- Wellington Employers Chamber of Commerce
- Waterfront Watch Ltd
- Wellington Civic Trust
- Cycle Advocates Network
- Powerco
- Accessibility Advisory Group (WCC)
- Youth Council (WCC).

See **Appendix 1** for a table of submitters.

#### Oral submissions

Oral submissions for north Kumutoto were held on the 7, 8 and 15 of November 2012. These sessions were held prior to meetings of the Strategy & Policy Committee.

18 submitters took the opportunity to make oral presentations on their submissions (see table in Appendix 1). See section 2.3 of this report for a summary of the key themes and issues raised in the oral submissions.

### **Public forum**

A public forum organised by the Council to discuss the draft design brief was held on the evening of 1 November at the Council offices. The Forum was very well attended with approximately 51 people (excluding Council representatives) attending.

Attendees were welcomed by her worship Mayor Celia-Wade Brown. Introductory comments made by Councillor Iona Pannett. Councillor Helene Ritchie was also in attendance. Speakers included Pauline Swann (Waterfront Watch Ltd), Graeme McIndoe (Waterfront Technical Advisory Group) and Andrew MacLeod (WCC – District Plan team). The session was facilitated by Martin Rodgers (WCC).

Key issues raised at the forum have also been included in the analysis of consultation.

### Part 2 – Feedback received on the Draft Design Brief

Overall the feedback received on the draft design brief is consistent with previous consultations on the development of this area. There is still a consistent level of objection by several groups and individuals to buildings on the Waterfront. This ranges from those who believe *some* buildings of a much lower scale may be acceptable to those who believe *no* buildings at all are acceptable. Much of the feedback calling for no building development or for the Waterfront Framework to be revisited does however fall outside the agreed scope of the consultation.

The submissions also reveal a level of support for the draft brief, particularly for site 8 to be developed as open space, for the reduced scale of development on sites 9 and 10, and for the balance between protecting open space and new building development.

#### 2.1 Key overall feedback themes

Key themes from submission feedback include:

- Outdated development vision for north Kumutoto
  - the Waterfront Framework is outdated and should be revisited.
- Use of land in north Kumutoto, particularly site 10
  - there should be no buildings on site 10. It should instead be a permanent campervan park. It could also be an open space that is used as a public gathering area in case of emergency such as earthquakes.
- Buildings on sites 9 and 10 and their use
  - some of the feedback challenges the value of buildings on sites 9 and 10.
  - some suggestions for uses included indoor sports and recreational uses visible from the surroundings, a winter garden, maritime theme park, ice rink etc.
- Views will be obstructed by buildings
  - some of the feedback challenges the value of buildings on the sites and emphasised the perception of buildings as obstructions to views.
- Proportion of built development to open space unbalanced
  - too much emphasis in the brief on built development and not enough on open space.
  - 100% site coverage is excessive and will lead to monolithic buildings.
- Integration of building and open space design
  - some of the feedback calls for building design to follow open space design, and for open space and building design to be more integrated, for e.g. a masterplan approach should be taken.
- New building scale relationship to heritage buildings
  - some of the feedback calls for any new buildings to relate to the existing smaller heritage buildings.
- Funding source for open space and other improvements
  - some of the feedback did not support using commercial development of the area to fund public space improvement and wharf strengthening. This should not be a primary driver.

### 2.2 Feedback received on specific questions

The consultation brochure and submission form (see copy in **Appendix 2**) sought feedback in relation to four key questions, as agreed by the committee. These were:

- the increased provision of open space, i.e. site 8 (Question 1)
- the proposed building envelopes (Question 2a & 2b)
- the balance of shelter and activity in the area (Question 3)
- the funding relationship i.e. commercial proceeds contribute to the cost of open space and wharf strengthening (Question 4).

The submission form also had space for more general comments to be made on the draft brief (Question 5).

#### Question 1: Increased amount of public space in north Kumutoto

***Site 8 is to be developed as public open space rather than being built on. What are your views on this? What activities would you like to see here?***

There was strong support expressed for developing site 8 as open space – 45 or approximately 63% of the submissions received supported this proposal (Note: 25 or 35% of the submissions received did not directly answer or refer to this question).

Many submitters thought that this open space provision should however be a minimum, with some saying the whole area should be reserved as open space (i.e. no buildings at all in the north Kumutoto area), while others commented that the footprints of buildings on sites 9 and 10 should be reduced to provide more space. Several people commented that open space should be incorporated into the development all the sites. It was also noted that site 8 is by far the smallest of the three sites.

Ensuring sun, shelter from the wind and avoiding wind tunnelling effects of buildings, ensuring safety and retaining views were all raised as key issues for consideration for developing open space.

There were numerous suggestions made for the use of the open space and activities. These included for example:

- open space for people to just sit and relax, preferably sheltered by planting and trees
- recreational space (sheltered; indoor and outdoor spaces); e.g. ice rink, roller-blading area
- performance space e.g. bands, music, outdoor performances, Fringe Festival-type events
- maritime theme park
- a winter garden
- playground/play areas
- art/exhibition space
- food/beverage vendor(s)
- space for bike/scooter/crocodile bike hire operations
- a small information office / i-site
- caravan/motor home park

Many submitters requested that the open space created be more informal and flexible in regards to its use – a passive recreation space, i.e. a space that is not



overly structured or cluttered with furniture, public art or other structures that block sunshine, views and pedestrian access, or reduce the possible uses of the site. These submitters suggested a grassed open area, with some native planting and landscaping, space for performers including a small moveable stage and market stall space.

Several other submitters highlighted the importance of public space in this area for enhancing the area for promenading, as a safe cycle route, and its role in connecting this part of the waterfront to the north, south and the CBD.

Some specific comments included:

*“We agree with this and would like to see site 8 landscaped with benches and shrubs.” – Submission #28*

*“We agree entirely that site 8 should be developed as public open space, but the provision of open public space here should not automatically lead to the full scale development of buildings on sites 9 and 10. In essence the three areas (sites 8, 9 and 10) should be considered as a whole as they form a gateway to the waterfront.” – Submission #53*

*“Activity that will encourage young people to enjoy the fresh air of proximity to the harbour e.g. ice rink, roller blade area etc.” – Submission #64*

*“Good idea so long as the site planning takes the wind into account and provides some sort of shelter.” – Submission #38*

*“To succeed as an open space, site 8 would need careful design to create shelter from the wind. A simple green space would be under utilised in our windy summers.” – Submission #71*

*“I support public open space providing: 1) an emphasis upon this site as the closest point of contact between the CBD and the harbour, and 2) opportunities for the built edge to embrace its close proximity to the harbour. The built activities on site 9 should be encouraged to have a close synergy with the open space of site 8. And the ground plane should be lowered to encourage access to the harbour where appropriate.” – Submission #39*

*“Empty space so room for people to do big stuff – not too much street furniture clutter. People can roller blade, walk etc.” – Submission #34*

*“Excellent idea – we need more public open space. It would also be an idea to create a cycle lane from Taranaki Street down to the rail along this route.” – Submission #2*

*“People like to promenade. The success of Oriental Bay must have underlined the value of having recreational areas near the city and the harbour where Wellingtonians can gaze, check out the boats, wander and take part in activities that don’t involve very large structures. There will be need for plenty of shelter but large buildings such as those designated for sites 9 and 10 generally create wind tunnels which could well impact on the success of site 8, which I note is by far the smallest of the three sites.” – Submission #13*

*“Site 8 should be a green oasis with creative landscaping of trees and grass which would enable the public to be able to relax and escape from the concrete jungle. It is vital to have a green restful space at the northern end of the waterfront.” – Submission #27*

## APPENDIX 2

*Consultation and feedback summary:  
Draft North Kumutoto Design Brief*

*“Support open space proposal 100%. Lawns, planting, seating and sheltered walkway as per Railway station to Aotea Quay.” – Submission #30*

*“Site 8 is small and should be left as open space. No real activities that could fit without putting some sort of building on the site. Some landscaping should be carried out to blend it in with the Kumutoto Plaza area in front of it by the Kumutoto stream. This should be an early priority.” – Submission #29*

*“We note that while the Environment Court has designated Site 8 as open space, there will still be the need for built structures to ensure the optimal use of this space, including: furniture, and built shelter to protect the public from what is a harsh natural environment (i.e. wind rain and sun/skin cancer).” – Submission #47*

### **Question 2: Reduced size of potential buildings in the area**

***New buildings on Sites 9 and 10 will be on a scale that reduces their impact on the surrounding area. The building development envelopes are now:***

- ***Site 10 (between the Whitmore Street gates and Shed 21) – 4 storeys with the building form reading as more than one building, and with a setback of at least 9m on the seaward side to allow for pedestrian movement and servicing***
- ***Site 9 (south of the Whitmore Street gates alongside Customhouse Quay) – four storeys stepping down to three storeys on the south side.***

***(a) What are your views on this aspect of the design brief?***

***(b) Do you think the reduced scale of the building envelopes is more in keeping with the surrounding area?***

Question 2 on the consultation questionnaire contained two parts – the first part asking for people's views on the reduced scale of potential buildings in the area, and the second seeking comment on whether the reduced scale was more in keeping with the surrounding area.

In terms of the amount of support for the reduced scale of buildings:

- 8 submitters agreed that the reduced scale is more in keeping with the surrounding area.
- 17 submitters thought the reduced scale was positive however they would prefer even smaller buildings/the scale should be reduced further, or that size was only one factor and that things such as style, design and interesting features are important too.
- 13 submitters said that the reduced scale was not in keeping with the surrounding area and that there should be no buildings here at all, or that they need to be much smaller still.
- 5 submitters said they would prefer no buildings but if necessary then they must be small and sympathetic in scale and design to those around them.
- 28 submitters did not directly answer this part of the questionnaire.

The feedback shows a good level of support for the lowered scale of building development, particularly building heights, as put forward in the draft brief. Reasons given in support were that they are much more in keeping with the character of the area and still allow views to and appreciation of the harbour. It was commented that quality not quantity should be a focus for development.

However this support ranged from the 4 storeys outlined in the draft brief being good, to the perspective that the proposals are better than any previous proposals put forward by the Council but that the building scale should be reduced even further. This would support for example, improved relationships with heritage buildings, less impact on views, and reduce wind tunnelling effects and shading.

Suggestions made in relation to further reducing building scale included:

- 3 storeys stepping down to 2 storeys
- 1 storey max across the area
- Site 9 should be no higher than Shed 13 and should include a sympathetic roofline
- The maximum height for site 9 should be 12m

- Site 10 should be set back further from the harbour side to provide a wider pedestrian avenue
- Building height on site 10 should be kept at a similar height to site 9.

There were also a number of submissions calling for the site coverage maximum of 100% in the draft brief to be reduced, particularly in relation to site 10, in order to provide more open space. These included suggestions to:

- Increase the 9m setback specified for site 10
- Retract the southern end of site 10 (to be more in line with the NZ Post building)
- Set both sites 9 and 10 back from Waterloo Quay.

One submitter specifically commented that it is important to still retain some flexibility in the building envelopes so that outstanding designs which may go over the envelope slightly are not impossible.

Many people in support of reduced building development on north Kumutoto said that the uses within scaled back buildings should be public orientated – for example, community activities, visitors centre, restaurants, kiosks, a temporary ice rink etc – and not office blocks as there is ample office space in the CBD. Council should put more effort into filling the current vacant office space in the CBD rather than building new space on the waterfront.

Several submitters requested that proposed buildings for this area should have to undergo wind tunnel and shading modelling to ensure any new development avoids these adverse effects.

Many submitters said that there should not be any buildings at all in this area as they will block views and limit community and recreational use. These submitters feel strongly that north Kumutoto is a public resource and should be retained as public open space. The visual connection between city and harbour is part of what makes Wellington such an attractive place to live. Many of these submitters expressed concern that Council seems to be extending the CBD onto the waterfront which is totally inappropriate.

Several submitters commented that the design brief is back to front in that it proposes buildings with spaces around them when the first priority should be to define the purpose for which the area is to be developed and then decide whether any building would enhance the area.

In terms of submitters that were opposed to buildings in this area, there was some support for site 10 to remain as space for camper vans as this is an important facility for visitors to Wellington, is accessible, and is close to the ferries and the city. One submitter suggested providing camper van parking at ground level with innovative space like lawns and plants on upper floors.

Another submitter called for this area to become a sculptural park like the Riverside Art Precinct in Brisbane.

Some specific comments included:

*“If sites 9 and 10 are developed as buildings this will further sever the visual link between the CBD and the waterfront. We will be left with mere glimpses between buildings, as we already have due to the Meridian Building, Shell Headquarters, the Events Centre and Te Papa.” – Submission #53*

*Consultation and feedback summary:  
Draft North Kumutoto Design Brief*

*“Proposed buildings on sites 9 and 10 is still out of keeping with the Environment Court’s decision that the waterfront is predominantly a public area, a placed owned by all Wellingtonians. Proposed envelopes will block views and limit community and recreational use. Prefer sites 9 and 10 to be combined with site 8 as public open space, with any structures open to the public and/or supporting public activities in the area.” – Submission #37*

*“I support the proposed brief envelopes and would encourage a reinforced continuation of the promenade 1) by engaging with the harbour board to give the route a meaningful destination and 2) encourage connections with the railway station – both physical (sheltered) and visual as a clear route along the harbour edge.... The scale of buildings seem appropriate though the currently blind facades of heritage (and other) buildings should not be encouraged as a model to be repeated. The use of ground floor car parking should be discouraged.” – Submission #39*

*“These buildings are inappropriate – too high and too large. They will destroy iconic panoramas from Whitmore Street. These views are an important part of Wellington’s beauty. They will create a canyon along Customhouse Quay. They will create shade on the waterfront and wind tunnels between them. They will privatise public land. They should not be built.” – Submission #5*

*“Site 9 could be a recreational area like Frank Kitts to bring some balance to the northern end and Waitangi Park.” – Submission #18*

*“North Kumutoto should be developed as the entrance to the waterfront. Particularly important to those who have just arrived in the city via boat, train etc. The motor home park area for overnight campers is a great asset to retain and would keep gathering some revenue if improved and maintained to a better standard.” – Submission #26*

*“The revised building envelope for site 10 is now better than the original proposal but is still too large for the site. Site 9 should not be built on in the way envisaged – it will severely impact the views across the harbour to Mt Victoria and will extend the canyon effect of large buildings along Waterloo Quay into the Customhouse Quay area.” – Submission #29*

*“I do believe that buildings on sites 9 and 10 should be generally of the scale proposed in the design brief. I note though that buildings in the surrounding area are generally considerably larger (as were the buildings that previously occupied these particular sites e.g. the original Customs House). Significant buildings on sites 9 and 10 are acknowledged as necessary to create activity and vibrancy and to make north Kumutoto a destination rather than simply a thoroughfare as it presently is. Councillors should be positive above this rather than negative and apologetic to the vocal minority who oppose such development.” – Submission #71*

*“I support the North Kumutoto Design Brief. The written part of the Design Brief has been carefully thought through and is in alliance with the aims as stated by the Environment Court in their recent ruling on the proposed Site 10 development proposal... I am fully supportive of two new buildings to be constructed on the North Kumutoto site, and acknowledge that their development is necessary in order to successfully support the activities, and design development of the open space areas that remain. This area is important to the completion of the waterfront promenade...” – Submission #49*

### Question 3: Balancing needs

***We see the need for a balance between public open space and new building development in north Kumutoto. At the moment the area is exposed to the elements and has little shelter available. The brief recognises that buildings can help to provide more sheltered, comfortable, higher quality public spaces that attract people to the area.***

***To what extent do you think the principles outlined in the brief for open spaces and buildings (see sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the brief) reflect the desired balance?***

Twenty eight submitters (or 39% of submitters) who responded to this question commented that the brief's principles do not provide an adequate balance between public open space and new building development. Eight submitters (11%) thought the balance proposed was good, and a further 15 (21%) submitters thought that it was generally good but could be improved in some way. Twenty submitters (28%) did not directly answer this question.

For the submitters who thought the brief *does not* provide a good balance, key reasons given included:

- Too heavily weighted towards buildings and not enough on public space.
- Large buildings are not required on these sites – retain campervan park on site 10 with minor landscaping eg. mound along Waterloo Quay side with some grasses and shrubs. Site 9 should be low rise building sympathetic to the sheds – could house an i-site and small businesses.
- Site 9 or 10 could house a winter garden and only low level buildings not exceeding single storey with cafes, recreation hubs etc.
- Open space is more than just designating site 8 as open space.
- This is a notoriously windy area – windflow should be analysed and building work designed to channel wind away from open space.
- Disagree that buildings can help to provide more sheltered, comfortable, higher quality spaces. Trees are much better at providing shelter.
- An inviting gateway to the northern waterfront providing safe, sheltered public space can be achieved without building two 4-storey buildings.
- Totally opposed to multi-storey commercial buildings anywhere on the waterfront.
- Emphasis should be on open space with a minimum number of buildings.
- The waterfront should be developed as an asset of the city proper, not in conflict with CBD goals.
- Balance seems dictated by economic desires rather than public wishes.
- We are building more and more apartments in the city, so there are more people needing spaces to sit and walk and breathe fresh air.

For the submitters who thought the brief's principles *do* provide for an appropriate balance, comments included:

- Reflects needs well and achieves a balance between public open space and commercial development.
- Balance achieved in particular by requiring ground floors to provide public access and shelter from the elements.

For those submitters who thought the balance was *generally good but could be improved*, suggestions for improvements included:

- Ensure that all buildings include sheltered public areas on ground floor e.g. play areas, craft markets, cafes.
- More heritage emphasis is required, particularly recognition of listed buildings and features.
- Site 8 is not big enough for activity and recreational purposes – should also include site 9.
- Could have a maritime heritage theme so if lower buildings are permitted they are for art and history rather than offices, hotels and restaurants.
- Opportunity to actually make this more of a public gateway – form an easy connection with Lambton Interchange (a pedestrian hub for this part of the city) and better connect the Blue Bridge with North Kumutoto.
- Buildings should also be encouraged to provide publicly accessible rooftop space, e.g. bar, cafe, restaurant, overlooking the harbour.
- Open space is great but it can be bleak. Area residents have to be here all the time and could do with shelter around walkways and wind breaks in large open areas.

A couple of submitters also commented on the need for a pedestrian overbridge (similar to the city-to-sea bridge) joining the CBD with north Kumutoto, located somewhere between Frank Kitts Park and the Stadium overbridges.

One submitter made the suggestion that social housing be included as part of the expected mix of functions to be accommodated on the waterfront (suggest a minimum of 20% of any residential development).

Some specific comments included:

*“If buildings are placed on prime locations such as Wellington waterfront it is evitable that spaces are lost for public access, which is often squeezed in to less desirable areas. An innovative, creative and exciting approach would be needed to balance the commercial and public desires.” – Submission #15*

*“The draft design brief is weighted in favour of two very large buildings. The whole area should be re-evaluated starting with a blank open space canvas which happens to have two potential building sites.” – Submission #25*

*“The needs of the public are for views, accessibility, aesthetically pleasing city and seascapes and for recreational opportunities. Buildings create focal blocks and create wind tunnels.” – Submission #27*

*“Need more consideration of links with railway station and cruise ship terminal.” – Submission #34*

*“In my view the over-arching principle for design on the waterfront, including north Kumutoto, is that the waterfront should be people-friendly open space for the enjoyment of all Wellingtonians and visitors. This fits with the vision statement in the design brief. The waterfront should not be treated as an extension of the CBD. Pleased to note the acknowledgement of the importance of the area’s maritime heritage, and the need to maintain and strengthen manifestations of this. Agree with the design brief over improving access from the CBD, that pedestrians should have priority over vehicles on the waterfront, and that there should be access and berthage for water activities such as kayaking, boating and ferries.” - Submission #69*

*“If there have to be buildings their purpose and role in relationship to the development of the whole city should be assessed. The current emphasis on building to obtain rents should be reconsidered.” – Submission #69*

*“The design brief achieves an excellent balance between the need for buildings that will generate activity and vitality on the waterfront, and the need for open spaces. Given the area's orientation to the sun and harbour, its lack of immediate residential populations and the existing scale of the CBD buildings, I believe it would be unwise for Council to further shift the building/open space balance that is proposed in the design brief in order to create public space that would inevitably be less attractive and less frequented than waterfront spaces further south. I do however support a green promenade that extends to the east of shed 22 and along seaward side of site 10 so that pedestrians and cyclists are drawn to and along the waterfront when approaching from the north.” – Submission #28*

*“We agree with the need for buildings to provide a range of uses to support a “safe waterfront and 24-hour activity”. We would also add that development of this part of the waterfront has the potential to support a consistent population on the waterfront during winter, and cold, wet weather, when recreational users of the waterfront are at a minimum.” – Submission #47*



### Question 4: Funding for public spaces and other improvements

***The Council has budgeted on the basis that the development and enhancement of public open space in this area (and other improvements such as wharf strengthening) will be funded from the commercial proceeds of new building development. This approach helps ensure affordability and reduces the impact on Wellington city ratepayers.***

#### ***What are your views on this approach?***

In general the submissions did not support using commercial development to fund public space improvement and wharf strengthening on the waterfront – 31 submitters (44%) were against this approach. The bulk of this objection was from parties who do not want to see any more buildings in north Kumutoto, particularly those that are commercially orientated. Three submitters supported the approach and a further 8 submitters supported it but with some qualifiers.

Many people commented that the Waterfront Framework does not require this approach and that like other green spaces in the city e.g. the Botanic Gardens, Town Belt, Wilton/Otari Bush, Zealandia, development and enhancement should be funded by rates. It was commented that the waterfront is a Wellington city asset therefore this approach is justified. Other comments included that any proposed funding should have the acceptance and approval of the public.

Another common theme in responses to this question was that there should be no rush to develop these areas – it is appropriate to do upgrades in an affordable way, bit by bit, with a long-term plan and goals, rather than privatise public space.

There were some differences of opinion expressed in terms of the quality of the space to be developed in this area. These ranged from low-level development (i.e. fewer bells and whistles) being acceptable, through to high quality space being paramount in order to attract people and to create a desirable space. Several submitters mentioned the same approach could be taken as has been taken to developing the Oruaiti Pa area (e.g. landscaping, sculpture/art, interpretation).

There were a range of suggestions made for alternative funding sources including for example:

- Winter garden
- Weather protected ice rink
- Maritime/nautical theme park
- Low rise development which would provide an attraction to the waterfront (site 9 could be used for this)
- Events
- Campervan park
- Activities for tourists (e.g. water-based, scooter/bike hire etc)
- Pop-up activities – sporting or other.

There was concern expressed that Wellington Waterfront Ltd has too strong a commercial interest in the area to make a decision that is best for the city. There was also concern expressed that Council not over-estimate the return from commercial development.

For those submitters that agreed with the approach, there were some qualifiers including for example:

- Design principles should not be compromised in exchange for funding.

*Consultation and feedback summary:  
Draft North Kumutoto Design Brief*

- Don't overestimate commercial proceeds – returns could be affected by further public sector downsizing and head office movement to Auckland.
- Sequence of development – developing site 8 and 9, and then site 10, would allow natural consolidation and completion of Kumutoto Lane.
- An appropriate commercial arrangement is required to be struck with developers that reflects the inherent value of the waterfront and which represents value for money for ratepayers.

Other comments made in relation to this question included:

- Need to spend money on the basics first before buildings e.g. wharf strengthening.
- Would be happy to see a mix of ratepayer and private investment to avoid lowest common denominator design ethos.

Some specific comments included:

*“The Council’s approach has merit but it should not overestimate the commercial proceeds of new building development.” – Submission #28*

*“Money has to come from somewhere but the waterfront is too precious to sacrifice.” – Submission #3*

*“The waterfront should not be administered by a LATE structure which makes the waterfront put profit before the public will. The Council needs to take control of the waterfront, abolish the waterfront company and make decisions which are democratically robust.” – Submission #5*

*“If the spaces are used for events, then the event promoters should pay rent to the Council. Parks are as essential to a city as sewers and you don’t ask sewers to be profitable. If you want a city that attracts people and revenue, offer then beauty and desirable places.” – Submission #8*

*“The quality of the new urban environment created is paramount and should not be restricted too much by a need to pre-finance such developments.” – Submission #9*

*“Wellington City Council must remember that the waterfront is public space. We do not see office buildings and apartments built on public parks around the city in order to help fund the Parks and Reserves department. The waterfront is no different. Its value (like the Town Belt) is incalculable in attracting people to live in Wellington.” – Submission #13*

*“The costs for maintaining the waterfront should be a council cost just as for the Botanic Gardens etc.” – Submission #29*

*“I support the use of commercial proceeds from new building developments being specifically applied to funding the development of the surrounding public spaces including wharf strengthening. However the reduced scale of buildings now proposed will inevitably reduce the commercial proceeds to Council. It is therefore important that if needed, Council finds funding elsewhere to complete the development of open spaces to the quality the waterfront deserves. In doing so the Council should clearly advise ratepayers that these additional costs have fallen on ratepayers due to the loss of value that has been incurred from restricting the scale of waterfront buildings.” – Submission #71*

*“Dependence on commercial proceeds is likely to put private commercial interests ahead of those of ‘the public’. The waterfront is a cherished asset and should be protected by Council for current and future generations of Wellingtonians.” – Submission #37*

### **Question 5: Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the draft design brief?**

This question attracted a range of comments about the draft brief – key themes commented on included:

- **Further development/use of land** – no more buildings, or much lower scale than proposed. Environment Court decision does not compel the Council to allow maximum height and 100% building coverage. There is no hurry to complete the development of the area – complete the vision when finances allow. Consider area as a whole and integrate planning for open spaces and any buildings. All buildings should be green/sustainable buildings. Need to consider impact of natural hazards on the further development of this area.
- **A city asset** – the waterfront is a vital and strategic part of Wellington's natural environment to be enjoyed by residents and visitors. The waterfront should be treated like other protected reserves in the city e.g. the Botanic Gardens, Town Belt, Otari/Wilton Park. With more people living in the CBD the need for recreational space will only increase over time. Need to provide for future generations.
- **Key design considerations** should include:
  - protection of open space
  - access to sunshine
  - protection from wind
  - protection of public safety
  - accessibility to all members of the public
  - ground floor non-commercial space.
- **Creative and innovative uses** should be a feature of this space. Hold a design competition for ideas on the use of this area. Uses could include for e.g.
  - undercover recreational areas; indoor sports (glazed to allow passersby to see in)
  - an adult playground
  - a large garden area to sit, rest picnic and ponder
  - make Shed 1 into a large glass house that can be used year round and is completely transparent – you could rent out parts of it for events; it could be a winter garden where the weather would be featured at all times of the year and would still be sheltered
  - five star hotel accommodation
  - maritime theme park
  - space for events and activities including cultural facilities
  - centre for civic education.
- **Connections and access** – success depends on strong connections and access to the CBD to ensure mutual benefits for both precincts. Provide for a bridge across Waterloo Quay. More consideration for cyclists in the area. More thought should be given to overseas visitors using this area.
- **Public participation** – active public participation is required at every stage of decision-making. Strong support for the design brief's recognition of this.

*Consultation and feedback summary:  
Draft North Kumutoto Design Brief*

Some specific comments included:

*“We are delighted in the campervan site in the North Kumutoto area is proving so successful. Is there anyway of retaining it in some form or other in this area or finding another site with similar advantages?” – Submission #28*

*“Think that a centre for civic education should be located on the ground floor of a building at North Kumutoto. Such a facility would be of enormous social and economic benefits to Wellington. The Waterfront Framework has endured over many electoral cycles and can therefore be considered to fairly reflect the wishes of all citizens for the development of the waterfront. It envisages that people will live, work and play on the waterfront, and that the addition of buildings will be a legitimate part of its development.” – Submission #71*

*“Strongly support public consultation being required on preferred development proposals as well as part of the resource consenting process.” – Submission #69*

### **2.3 Oral submissions – summary of key themes**

Eighteen submitters presented their submissions orally to the committee. Submitters were heard on the 7, 8 and 15 November (see table in **Appendix 2**).

Key themes and issues raised in the oral submissions included:

#### **Approach to any further development/use of the land**

Most oral submitters opposed the level of development for the remainder of the north Kumutoto as proposed by the draft design brief. Many called for the Council to rethink its approach to the development of remainder of this important waterfront area. Other comments made included:

- The Framework does envisage buildings but the Framework is quite old and needs to be revisited.
- North Kumutoto is the only undeveloped bit of the waterfront left – therefore makes it an extremely important area.
- Don't let buildings drive open space or vice versa – an integrated approach is needed which addresses buildings and open space in a coherent, unified manner, rather than the piece-meal approach that may eventuate from the brief. A master plan approach could deliver this.
- The need for buildings in this area should be informed by a comprehensive open space needs assessment.

#### **Value of the waterfront as open space**

Many oral submitters highlighted the fact that Wellington has a fantastic harbour setting, capital city status and is compact and well designed. Comments were then made that keeping this part of the waterfront as open space supports the continuation of this. Other comments made included:

- The Kumutoto area and its wider setting is of high historic significance and has important social, architectural, technical and archaeological values.
- The central city's residential population is growing and will continue to grow - a further 9000 people are expected to live in Wellington by 2030, hence the need for this as public open space.

#### **Site 8**

There was wide agreement that site 8 is best developed as open space. However several submitters commented that this is the only specific provision for dedicated open space in the North Kumutoto precinct and this is not adequate.

#### **Sites 9 and 10**

Most oral submitters were generally in opposition to buildings on sites 9 and 10, particularly of the scale envisaged by the draft design brief. No buildings, or buildings of much smaller scale that are for public uses, would reflect the public space values of this important waterfront area.

Other comments made included:

- The proposition of a very large building is flawed – the site 10 footprint is far too large; the Environment Court decision said it should be adjusted so that the form reads as more than one building.
- Do not think that the Environment Court decision indicated buildings were essential on sites 9 and 10.

- The southern end of site 10 needs to be retracted northwards to align with an axis no further south than a line along the south west face of the NZ Post building.
- The 9m setback for site 10 should be increased.
- The reduced height on site 9 is a positive step but it is important that any building on site 9 continues to provide relativity to shed 13.
- If the footprint of site 9 was pulled back from Balance Street at the north end then this building could go ahead.
- Low scale building development of these sites could include an i-site – would be of huge value to visitors and tourists.
- Appalled at the image of the buildings which will introduce a canyon like effect.

### **Balancing needs**

Several submitters commented that the design brief's proposition that "buildings can help to provide more sheltered, comfortable, higher quality public spaces that attract people to the area" overlooks the fact that shelter, comfort and high quality public spaces can be designed in the absence of buildings. Many felt that the brief still places too much emphasis on built form and active building edges as the defining factors in the design of open spaces. It was felt that it is more appropriate for built form to respond to the design of open spaces, rather than open spaces just being the "left over bits after buildings".

Many oral submitters, including Waterfront Watch, emphasised the importance of retaining views in this area. It was felt that 4 storied buildings on sites 9 and 10 would result in the loss of views across to Mt Victoria and the Monastery. Glimpses of the harbour and hills framed by buildings are not an adequate solution. There was support for the statement (made at the public forum) that "view shafts are what you have left after you've destroyed the view". There are important and long standing views to the area and through to the harbour. The views enable appreciation of the area and its features from many different parts of the waterfront and the city.

It was also felt that the area's importance for visitors and tourists would be lost if developed with buildings. It was suggested that they would prefer a recreation area with a variety of green spaces, shelter, seats, artisans' workshops and access to the hiring of cycles, scooters, crocodile bikes etc to continue on to Te Papa and Oriental Bay.

### **Accessibility**

- Great to see accessibility considerations are included in the design brief. Would like to learn from mistakes made in the past regarding accessibility and move forward. Everyone should be able to access and use the waterfront.
- Would like to see reference to universal design and accessibility in the brief's new building principles.
- The AAG would like to be able to engage more with the TAG group in regards to both design proposals and design details.

### **Funding for public spaces and improvements**

Most oral submitters who commented on this issue did not agree that using commercial development to fund the development and enhancement of public space and wharf maintenance was a good approach for Council to take. It was felt that this is a short-term approach and while it may help alleviate rates burden, once waterfront

resources are gone they cannot be recreated. More sustainable funding models which look longer term are required. Many submitters commented that it would be appropriate to use general rates to fund improvements, as is the case for other Council reserves and parks.

### **Heritage**

While there was support from oral submitters for the brief's recognition of the area's heritage values and significance of the area, many felt it does not go far enough and/or fully reflect the Environment Court decision on Variation 11. The NZHPT in particular requested that the brief more fully reflect and emphasize the heritage values of the area, including reference to all the heritage items in the area (e.g. the former Eastbourne Ferry Terminal, harbour Board Iron Gates and Railings), and reflect the mediation agreement for Site 10 and the Eastbourne Ferry Terminal (former) between WCC and NZHPT.

Waterfront Watch also supports more recognition of the area's heritage saying that the old waterfront buildings in the Kumutoto area have high architectural values and interest. The collection is important as a representative group that illustrates the development and use of the historic working waterfront.

Other submitters also emphasised the need for any development to relate to the heritage of the area. Specific suggestions included ensuring the building height, design and roofline of any building on site 9 is sympathetic to Sheds 11 and 13; reducing the size and footprint of any building on site 10 to provide a strong relationship with Shed 21 and the Ferry Terminal building.

### **Public notification of proposed development**

As with the feedback received in written submissions, there was very strong support from oral submitters for the move within the design brief to require public consultation and notification of any development proposals within the north Kumutoto area.

### **Waterfront examples from elsewhere**

Several submitters commented that WCC should look to other cities as examples of good waterfront management and development. Examples provided included:

- Waterfront Centre in Washington DC – helps communicate the importance of waterfront renovation projects and aims to enhance its urban landscape by maintaining its originality and authenticity.
- Panama city – a 2km stretch of waterfront adjacent to the CBD has been developed as a recreational promenade.
- Vancouver city – often lauded as the world's most live able city. Even big cities like New York don't have buildings right on their waterfront.

### **Other comments**

- Council should go back to a blank canvas in this area – start with open space design and perhaps then consider the design of low-level buildings. People should be consulted and there should be lengthy consideration of any design brief.
- Has Council not learned from Variation 17 and the amount of public response? Consultation not litigation please. If design brief goes ahead it will no doubt result in more appeals to the Environment Court.

## APPENDIX 2

*Consultation and feedback summary:  
Draft North Kumutoto Design Brief*

- Site 10 uses at present are returning an economic return for Council so there's no rush to do anything.
- CBD suffering economically (office movement to Auckland and earthquake prone buildings issues) – more buildings here will undermine the CBD further.
- Sun access to public space in critical otherwise they will be cold, shaded and unused spaces.
- There is no recognition in the brief of the other statutory plans or regulations guiding the development of the area (e.g. regional coastal plan).



### Appendix 1 – Table of submitters

#### Written submissions

Submission No.	First Name	Last Name	Organisation/ Individual	Organisation Name
001	Chris	Greenwood	Individual	
002	Kara	Lipski	Individual	
003	Sunny Catherine	Collings	Individual	
004	Judith	Doyle	Individual	
005	Russell	Tregonning	Individual	
006	Sandra	Jackson	Individual	
007	Suzanne	Holden	Individual	
008	Anne	Weinbrenner	Individual	
009	Patrick	Geddes	Individual	
010	Anne	Holmstead	Individual	
011	Ian	Breeze	Individual	
012	Bernard	O'Shaughnessy	Individual	
013	Janet	Coburn	Individual	
014	Barbara	Fowler	Individual	
015	Simon	Gray	Individual	
016	Patrick	Morgan	Organisation	CAN – Cycling Advocates Network
017	Anne	Neill	Organisation	NZHPT
018	Jenny	Hanna	Individual	
019	Grant	Lyon	Individual	
020	Mike	Henderson	Individual	
021	Rosamund	Averton	Individual	
022	John	Galloway	Individual	
023	Benjamin	Speedy	Individual	
024	David	Ryrie	Individual	
025	Mary	Munro	Individual	
026	Philippa	Boardman	Individual	
027	Frances	Williamson	Individual	
028	David and Anke	Atkins	not answered	
029	David	Stevens	Individual	
030	Pam	Fuller	Individual	
031	Niels	Gedge	Individual	
032	Frances	Lee	Individual	
033	Michael	Gibson	Individual	
034	Georgina	Preston	Individual	
035	Anthony	Cranston	Individual	
036	Shirley	Hampton	Individual	
037	Julia	Burgess	Individual	
038	George	Slim	Individual	
039	James	Fenton	Individual	
040	Estelle	Cook	Individual	
041	Bill	Viggers	Individual	
042	Jason	Strawbridge	Organisation	WCC's Accessibility Advisory Group
043	Kathryn	Lacey	Organisation	Powerco

## APPENDIX 2

Submission No.	First Name	Last Name	Organisation/ Individual	Organisation Name
044	Jeremy	Harding	Organisation	Wellington Employers' Chamber of Commerce
045	Alana	Bowman	Individual	
046	Jack	Marshall	Organisation	Wellington City Youth Council's
047	Christine	McCarthy	Organisation	The Architectural Centre
048	Janice	Schone	Individual	
049	Guy	Marriage	Individual	
050	Con	Anastasiou	Organisation	Land Lease Limited
051	Pauline and Athol	Swann	Individual	
052	J Chris Horne & Anthony and Fiona	Barbara Mitcalfe	Individual	
053	Fiona	Sturrock	Individual	
054	Pauline	Swann		Waterfront Watch Inc
055	Catherine	Underwood	Individual	
056	Craig	Palmer	Individual	
057	Arthur Wynyard	Beasley	did not answer	
058	David	Lee	Individual	
059	Wendy	Poste	Individual	
060	Anne	Ryan	Individual	
061	Frank	Boardman	Individual	
062	Patricia	Norton	Individual	
063	Janet	Tremewan	Individual	
064	Fay	McIntyre	Individual	
065	Brian	Burrell	Individual	
066	Rosemarie	Bowers	Individual	
067	Andrew	Roupe var der Voort	Individual	
068	Alan	Smith	Organisation	Wellington Civic Trust
069	Sue	Watt	Individual	
070	Victor	Davie	Individual	
071	Philip	Crampton	Individual	