
REPORT 2
(1215/11/IM)

**FEEDBACK ON THE 10 YEAR WATERFRONT
DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

1. Purpose of Report

To provide the Council with a summary of the feedback received during consultation on the 10 year Waterfront Development Plan.

2. Executive Summary

Consultation on the proposed changes to the waterfront project has been undertaken separately to allow the community to specifically consider the waterfront related issues.

The submissions received strongly support the key proposed changes, which were to extend the waterfront project over 10 years and to transfer the implementation functions to the Council (with a review to be undertaken prior to transferring the implementation function).

While many submissions raised project specific concerns, it is considered that these matters are more appropriately addressed via the annual Waterfront Development Plan process. Accordingly, project specific matters have not been considered further for the purposes of this consultation process.

Subject to the outcome of the oral submissions, no changes are recommended by officers to the proposed waterfront project as approved at the 11 December 2008 meeting of Strategy and Policy.

3. Recommendations

Officers recommend that Council:

1. *Receive the information.*
2. *Agree that the proposed amendments to the waterfront project as agreed at the 11 December 2008 meeting of the Strategy and Policy Committee be included in the 2009/19 LTCCP for consultation, subject to any changes as a result of oral submissions.*
3. *Note that specific waterfront projects and funding plans will continue to be publically consulted on, and decided, via the annual Waterfront Development Plan process.*

4. Background

In December 2008, the Council's Strategy and Policy Committee (*the Committee*) were presented with a paper that outlined options for the waterfront's future activities and for bringing waterfront functions within Council – for inclusion in the 2009/10 Long Term Council Community Plan.

The Committee resolved that the Waterfront project should be spread over 10 years and that implementation of the Waterfront Project be undertaken by the Council from 1 July 2010 (with a review to be undertaken prior to transferring the implementation function).

The Committee agreed to consult on this proposal separately prior to being included in the draft LTCCP and requested that officer's report back on submissions in March 2009. While an indicative 10 year work programme was included in the consultation documentation, the focus of the consultation was to seek the public input on the two major changes of extending the project timeframe over 10 years and bringing the implementation function into the Council. This paper reports the public feedback to Council.

5. Discussion

5.1 Methodology

This analysis summarises the key issues from submissions made on the proposed changes to the Waterfront Project.

Of the 17 submissions:

- 14 were made by individuals
- 3 were made by groups

Submissions were received in three ways:

- online through the council website (9)
- in hard/paper copies (5) that were a mixture of formal submission forms, letters and faxes
- emails (3) sometimes accompanied by attachments.

Three submitters have indicated that they wish to make an oral submission to Council in support of their written submission.

The summary below outlines the key matters raised by the submitters.

5.2 10 year work programme

The submissions are overwhelmingly in support of the proposal to extend the project over 10 years, noting in particular the benefits of better phasing development and accounting for the current economic climate.

One submission did, however, express disappointment that a number of projects would be delayed and suggested that the “*Council should continue to press ahead with developing the waterfront*”.

While there are obvious benefits to having the developments occur sooner rather than later, cognisance must be given to the financial challenges created by delayed commercial receipts and the difficulty of the present commercial property market. Extending the project out over the 10 years provides the ability to better phase (both financially and physically) the public space developments with new buildings. Pushing ahead over the next 4 years would create further funding difficulties and would most likely result in discounted returns from the commercial projects (assuming finance and developers could even be found to undertake the project under the current climate). For these reasons, officers continue to recommend extending the project over 10 years.

5.3 *Transfer implementation function*

All submissions support the proposal to transfer the implementation function to the Council at an appropriate time – currently scheduled to occur 1 July 2010.

Some submissions indicated a preference to see this occur immediately, but as advised previously by officers, logistical requirements and the desire to minimise disruption dictate that 1 July 2010 is the earliest that the transfer could practicably occur.

5.4 *Variation 11*

One submission made direct reference to Variation 11 – the proposed amendment to the District Plan regarding the North Kumutoto area. This District Plan variation is subject to a separate and statutory consultation process under the Resource Management Act, which will close on 6 April.

5.5 *Consenting process*

Some submissions raised concerns regarding the proposal to have Wellington Waterfront Limited focus on obtaining resource consents for the proposed commercial and public space developments over the first 2 years. The concerns related to the fact that the 2 year time frame seemed ‘rushed’ and did not properly allow for changes that occur when the projects are actually implemented.

It is agreed that the 2 year time frame is ambitious for the purposes of obtaining consents for all projects. It may be that not all consents are obtained within this period, but it is proposed that the efforts are focussed towards progressing the consent processes as much as possible. The approved project plan is based on the view that the best use of time and resources over the next two years is to gain consents for the projects so that we can move quickly once economic conditions are more favourable for the commercial developments – that will in turn fund the public space projects. This is not about rushing the planning

processes, but is about making the best use of time and resources during a difficult period for commercial development.

5.6 Project specific

Many of the submissions chose to comment on specific projects, that were either supported or opposed or discussed new projects that were not provided for. Examples are opposition to new buildings, encouragement of berthing for Queens Wharf, introduction of a cycle/walk way etc

It should be noted that the consultation was about the project time frame, phasing of the projects and the implementation model associated with these projects and was not intended to discuss the specific projects. It is based on previously approved projects, which will continue to be subject to the annual Waterfront Development Plan process which is reported to the Committee. It is considered that that remains the appropriate forum to consider the details of individual projects.

5.7 LTCCP Implications

Funding for the 10 year waterfront project as proposed has been budgeted for in the draft LTCCP budget, attached as report 4 (Strategy and Policy Committee – Report of meeting of Tuesday 10 March 2009).

6. Conclusion

The consultation process allowed members of the public to provide their thoughts and suggestions on the Committee proposal to extend the waterfront project over 10 years and to transfer the implementation functions to the Council. The submissions strongly support these aspects of the proposal.

Concerns relating to specific projects will be considered annually via the Waterfront Development Plan process. The proposed 10 year work programme is indicative and is based on projects that have been approved by the Committee (and its predecessor the Waterfront Development Sub-Committee).

Accordingly, project specific matters have not been considered further for the purposes of this consultation process.

Consultation on the proposed changes to the waterfront project has been undertaken separately to allow the community to specifically consider the waterfront related issues. Following the Council decision regarding these proposed changes, the waterfront project can then be considered within the wider context of the 2009/19 LTCCP. Subject to the outcome of the oral submissions, no changes are recommended by officers to the proposed waterfront project as approved at the 11 December meeting of Strategy and Policy.

Contact Officer: *Warren Ulusele, Portfolio Manager, Council Controlled Organisations*

Supporting Information

1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations

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

4) Decision-Making

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

5) Consultation

a) General Consultation

Consultation was undertaken on the proposal.

b) Consultation with Maori

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

6) Legal Implications

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

7) Consistency with existing policy

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