

Report 3 to Strategy and Policy Committee 22 November 2012

Adoption of North Kumutoto Design Brief

Point 1 The subject matter of the consultation had an inherent bias and therefore the Council is not entitled to say it consulted with the public about how North Kumutoto should be developed

p.2 of the Executive Summary: *While a portion of the feedback has fallen outside of **the agreed scope of the consultation** – as it calls for Council to revisit the Waterfront Framework and decisions made in the Waterfront Development Plan -*

see also Officer comments in Appendix 2 re each question: *Note: (25 or 35%) of the submissions received did not directly answer or refer to this question*

My comments: it is not hard to see why some of the feedback fell outside the agreed scope of the consultation – the agreed scope of the consultation included a Council commitment to buildings on Sites 9 and 10. It was consultation about a decision made by the Council about which the public was not consulted.

It is also not hard to see why so many submissions “*did not directly answer or refer to (the) question*”. Submitters felt constrained by the scope of the consultation and had much more to say, particularly about possible buildings. WCC needs to be aware that many submitters, and members of the public who did not submit (because they thought the consultation was a sham) are also committed –and will continue to oppose the development of any buildings which are not 100% owned and used by the public.

5.3 Comments on key issues raised in feedback.

The “biggest” of the key issues clearly related to Buildings on Sites 9 and 10 but the Officer/TAG comment is simply “*This feedback is beyond the stated scope of the consultation*”. Nevertheless the officers and TAG have bullet-pointed some reasons why not having buildings on sites 9 & 10 (or restricting them to very low height) would be a bad thing. The bullet points are generally insubstantial eg people walking along the promenade or in the open space would be exposed to traffic noise, but the last bullet point is probably the most telling “*funding that could have been derived from the development of these sites couldn’t be used for open space improvements*”. Further on we are told: “*the primary reasons for including buildings on the waterfront are: to create sheltered, well-defined public spaces with active edges; and to increase the working and residential population of the waterfront, bringing safety and vitality regardless of weather conditions.*”

My comment: until it is agreed what sort of buildings, if any, might be appropriate for Sites 9 and 10 surely a Design Brief is unnecessary. The Council might be committed to buildings on Sites 9 and 10 but clearly many submitters are not. They were not consulted about the biggest of the key issues identified by the officers from the submissions.

Point 2 The consultation was conducted with unseemly and unnecessary haste, 10 October – 5 November

Nov.1 Public meeting – 40 mins for comment/ questions. No discussion.

Nov.5 Written submissions due

Nov.7,8 and 15 Oral submissions

Nov 16 Report 3 on the WCC website (after Officer and TAG comment)

Nov 22 S&P approval

Nov.29 recommendation to full Council meeting

It is perfectly obvious why.

Final point: abandon the Design Brief at this stage. Take time. Do what you're planning to do with the Cuba Mall – students from the Architecture School to draw up plans

Mary Munro

22.11.12