

Attachment G

Summary of Submissions



PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 81:

Rezoning 320 The Terrace and de-listing the Gordon Wilson Flats

Summary of Submissions

***Disclaimer:** This document provides a summary of the decisions requested by persons making submissions on Wellington City Council's Proposed District Plan Change 81 – Rezoning 320 The Terrace and de-listing the Gordon Wilson Flats. Whilst every possible care has been taken to provide a true and accurate summary, the information contained in this document is not required by the Resource Management Act 1991 to provide a full account of the submissions received. Accordingly, readers wishing to understand the submissions are advised to refer to the full copy of the original submissions, available upon request.*

October 2015

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
1	Anka Kuepper	107 Elizabeth Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter supports the proposed rezoning aspect of the plan change request because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It aligns with her 'Architectural Master's Research' in that a campus expansion down the hillside would open up a direct gateway and new main entrance between the City and the University. • It supports her thesis work. • It would encourage architectural thought across the School of Architecture knowing that the Council does look at and think about design ideas coming out of the education system. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council approve the plan change request in regards to the proposed rezoning.</p>			
2	Anna Ronberg	346 The Terrace, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter's submission is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the demolition of the Gordon Wilson Flats • Supports the proposed rezoning in part if the amendments in the decision requested are made. • Due to recent experience with the University, the submitter has concerns about relying on its goodwill not to construct student accommodation on the site. If student accommodation was constructed on the site, the submitter would be concerned about the University being able to design it to an acceptable standard or even attempt to make it acceptable for local residents. • The plan change request states that the reason for demolishing the Gordon Wilson Flats is that 'the District Plan does not anticipate or provide for a building of this height, bulk, location, design and intensity of residential use'. This reason to demolish a building could just as easily apply to Te Puni Village. Although Te Puni is not in contention here it has set a precedent and with that is a concern for local residents to not allow the University free reign in design and construction when it comes to the proposed rezoning. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From previous experience with the Te Puni Village, the submitter has learnt that the University is more than willing to disregard the concerns of local residents. The University relied on the Institutional Precinct zoning to design an exceptionally tall building that is aesthetically pedestrian and creates noise effects on the neighbouring properties. • The submitter also learnt that the University and its subcontractors do not have sufficient practices and resources to enforce effective management of students living in densely populated buildings. • As a neighbouring property owner, the submitter cannot afford any further devaluation of her property by allowing the University to design buildings without regard for its neighbours concerns. • The submitter has already suffered a loss of quality of life over the last 5 years due to the poorly controlled and densely populated student accommodation at Te Puni Village and as such, cannot risk this to be exacerbated by the plan change request. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>Amend proposed Rule 9.3.2 to exclude student accommodation as a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>Add a new rule to prohibit the construction of student accommodation on the site.</p> <p>That the Council inform and advise all affected persons of the full potential impact of the plan change request.</p>			
3	The Architectural Centre	C/- Christine McCarthy, PO Box 24178, Wellington 6011	-
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the plan change request for the following reasons:</p> <p>Rezoning 320 The Terrace from Inner Residential to Institutional Precinct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently a nationwide shortage of housing and a need to increase social and affordable housing. • A reduction in land available for housing would undermine the Councils strategies and policies for increasing the density of inner city housing in Wellington. • There is a need for 1-2 bedroom accommodation and an oversupply of 3-4 bedroom dwellings in the city. The Gordon Wilson Flats provides 1-2 bedroom accommodation. • The Gordon Wilson Flat can accommodate 300 people and housed 130 people in 2012. It has significant potential to positively contribute to the 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
housing supply.			
De-listing the Gordon Wilson Flats from the Councils District Plan Heritage List			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of a building from the District Plan’s heritage list must be an extremely rare event and due to exceptional circumstances not for the convenience of businesses. • It could set a precedent in that a business could knowingly purchase a building on the District Plans Heritage list in a state of disrepair and get it removed from the list because of repair costs and a mismatch with its preferred development plans. This is exacerbated by the fact that there is a general under appreciation for modernist architecture in New Zealand. Protecting buildings from this era (including getting them listed in District Plans) is also difficult. • The Gordon Wilson Flats are important in the history of the development of modern architecture in New Zealand and social housing in particular. • The Council recently updated its heritage inventory justifying why the Gordon Wilson Flats has been included on the District Plans Heritage list. This suggests that the Council still considers the building’s heritage value to be current. • The removal of the Gordon Wilson Flats from the District Plans Heritage list would appear to reward the inadequate maintenance of a heritage building, creating health and safety risks, and undermining the very reasons for having a list. • The economic arguments are not relevant and could have been foreseen at the time the site was purchased. As such, the University either made the decision to buy the building knowing that it was not an economic proposition or did not carry out its due diligence. It is assumed that the University has the resources to make an informed purchase. • The building had not been used for 2 years prior to the University purchasing the building. The University cannot argue that this was unforeseen. Buying into a situation which inherits the problems of deferred maintenance or the consequences of discontinued use is not a valid reason for de-listing a heritage building. • The University’s strategic plan is not a planning document relevant for considering resource consent applications. • The grounds for stating that a curtain wall would ‘materially affect the heritage significance of the building’ are not apparent. This would depend on the design of the curtain wall (no details for a proposal are given) but also needs to be argued in relation to the values identified in the heritage assessment. • The building is a monolithic block aesthetically capable of accommodating a curtain wall façade. The current curtain wall is timber and it is anticipated that an aluminium curtain wall could be made ‘with the same profile sizes’. An engineered timber solution might be ‘chunkier’ than the current design. • Retention of the existing module proportions (including thickness of elements) is more important than the retention of the original physical fabric, especially given modernist interest in progressive building materials and technologies. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The heritage assessment identified the buildings historical and social significance as considerable and that these values are not affected by minor aesthetic changes to the building nor the replacement of the original building fabric. Identification of the aesthetic and formal qualities of the building elements which have heritage significance is needed to inform the design of a new exterior. 			
<p>Heritage values of the building</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building is a rare typology in New Zealand (monolithic high rise tower block state housing) and is one of the largest public housing projects undertaken in the country. The internal planning (e.g. maisonette) is a rare apartment form in New Zealand social/state housing. This planning is associated with innovative modernist design in Europe such as Le Corbusier’s Unite d’Habitation. As such, it documents international influences in New Zealand social housing. The building is closely connected to important social innovations in New Zealand’s history and is representative of the then Labour Governments last attempt to adopt high rise residential buildings to address housing shortages. The building has a close association with a prominent New Zealander (Gordon Wilson) given that he is the designer of the building and that the building was named after him. The building has important spatial relationships to the McClean Flats (1943-44), is part of a high rise social housing precinct and has landmark values. It has also been recognised as ‘creating a new urban scale’. Due to the buildings high historic and social heritage values, the retention of the buildings residential function has higher heritage worth than the retention of the physical fabric of the façade. 			
<p>Archifact Heritage Assessment</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The heritage assessment is not aligned with the RMA definition of historic heritage. It excludes an evaluation of cultural qualities and includes separate assessments for aesthetic, functional, social and townscape categories. The effect of this is to reduce the overall assessment of heritage because the overall evaluation appears to be an averaging of individual ratings. This means that more categories will dilute the overall rating. The submitter believes that aesthetic, functional and townscape qualities should be included in the evaluation of architectural qualities not as separate categories to be consistent with the RMA definition. Little or no weight has been given to the rarity of the building type in New Zealand under architectural significance. The evaluation of ‘no significance’ for functional significance appears to be incorrect. The heritage significance of the building function relates to its role as part of a significant national housing strategy at a time of high housing need. Similar issues are currently being faced and as such, make its functional significance particularly relevant. The viability of that function is related to an irresponsible attitude to maintenance by 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Housing New Zealand and is not relevant for an assessment of heritage values. Instead this relates to the economic viability of repairs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no weight appears to be given to the buildings national significance in relation to social housing under social significance. • Agree that the heritage of the building is at least 'considerable' in terms of historical significance. • The assessment bases its evaluation of the significance of scientific and technical heritage values on insufficient information and appears to confuse the heritage significance of the buildings technological heritage with current engineering performance. Steps to finding out relevant information do not appear to have been taken. • The assessment is mostly descriptive rather than identifying and arguing the reasons for specific heritage values. <p>Heritage New Zealand's Email</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This email is strangely worded and appears to be insufficient as it does not actually give an opinion on the de-listing or demolition but rather states that Heritage New Zealand's position is to raise no matters. • There is no comment regarding the relevance or value of the Councils Heritage listing. <p>Proposed demolition of the Gordon Wilson Flats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building has significant heritage values. • There is a shortage of inner city affordable housing. • The building is in a state of disrepair due to neglect. • The structural report is not fatal but rather notes incomplete information. It does not appear that archival research has been conducted to ascertain pile type or discussions been had with those who used to work at the Ministry of Works. This could be an important step in understanding the foundation construction. • The argument regarding internal planning appears to be flawed given that the building is in close proximity to the CBD and car use is declining in favour other transport methods. • The submitter finds it difficult to believe the existing plan is inappropriate for staff offices and teaching spaces. The building could be used for staff offices, postgraduate and other research clusters, tutorial teaching and study spaces. Areas of accommodation could also be included. • The building has a beautiful aspect, great roof terrace and real development potential. • It is acknowledged that there are some issues pertaining to circulation and the internal environment but consider that these could be addressed by competent design professionals. • Buying into situation which inherits economic and non-compliance issues is not a reason for de-listing a heritage building. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Maurice Clark letter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This letter focuses exclusively on the weaknesses of the Gordon Wilson Flats and as such, does not provide a balanced evaluation. This letter is to inform a purchase decision and is not relevant to the heritage value of the building. This advice should have been sought when the building was purchased by the University. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request in full.</p>			
4	Avril Miles	344A The Terrace, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter's submission is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the de-listing of the Gordon Wilson Flats from the District Plans Heritage list. Opposes the rezoning of 320 The Terrace from Inner Residential Area to Institutional Precinct. Under the current zoning the public are notified as to any demolition and construction of new buildings. If the land is rezoned to Institutional Precinct the public will lose this right. Victoria University does not have a good track record. An example is the student accommodation above the Boyd Wilson Field, which is an 'eyesore', including the deforestation that went with it. The Gordon Wilson Flats should be upgraded to accommodate people. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request.</p>			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
5	Cara Francesco	3/25 Brentwood Avenue, Mount Eden, Auckland 1024	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the plan change request because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter does not agree that the Gordon Wilson Flats only has moderate heritage significance. • The submitter does not agree that the building should be removed from the Heritage list on the basis of heritage values. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request in full.</p>			
6	Craig Relph	152 Taranaki Street, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the plan change request for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gordon Wilson Flats should not be taken off the Historic Places Trust list. • The building should be left as is and not be redeveloped. • The building and the building fabric are beautiful and of cultural, heritage and architectural significance. • The submitter does not want the development of another noisy house for students. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request.</p> <p>Keep the Gordon Wilson Flats as is.</p> <p>Prevent student accommodation.</p>			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
7	Dorothea and Yves-Louis Sage	13 Waiteata Road, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	-

Submission

The submitter's support the proposed rezoning aspect of the plan change request depending on:

- The development of the site as there could be impacts on the value of their property including their view.

Decision requested

That any development is mindful of the interests of the long established local residents.

8	Dan Stenton	192C The Terrace, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	No
---	-------------	---	----

Submission

The submitter opposes the plan change request for the following reasons in full:

- Students already create a lot of noise on the Terrace and the proposed rezoning and de-listing will only exacerbate this.
- The University is only interested in generating revenue and does not care about local residents.
- Rule 9.3.2 states that all applications shall be publicly notified. This rule should be upheld.

Decision requested

That the Council decline the plan change request.

Keep the current zoning.

Retain the public notification provision.

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
9	Dartrey and Ann Marie Lamb	36 Buller Street, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	Yes

Submission

The submitter's support the proposed rezoning aspect of the plan change request because:

- They do not want any more student accommodation on the Terrace or in the Te Aro residential areas.
- The Te Puni student accommodation already generates a lot of noise and antisocial behaviour. The proposed rezoning will only exacerbate this as it will allow student accommodation to be built on the site.
- They do not have any confidence in the University's ability or desire to control/manage its students' behaviour because it has not done so in the past.
- They do not want to lose the ability to be publicly notified of all resource consent applications.
- They do not want any more 'night time' noise.
- They do not want an increase in litter, discarded bottles and graffiti as it not only downgrades the suburb but increases costs to the Council as it has to clean up and remove it.

Decision requested

Keep the current zoning.

Retain Rule 9.3.2 whereby all applications are publicly notified.

No student accommodation to be built on 320 The Terrace.

No public access after normal business hours.

The Council to encourage other uses for the abovementioned land.

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
10	Denise Stephens	1/326 The Terrace, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter supports the de-listing of the Gordon Wilson Flats and opposes the proposed rezoning for the following reasons:</p> <p>Remove the Gordon Wilson Flats from the District Plans Heritage list</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection to the de-listing of the Gordon Wilson Flats from the Council’s Heritage list. The building is clearly in a state of disrepair and this seems a logical step to enable demolition provided it is well managed. <p>Rezoning 320 The Terrace from Inner Residential Area to Institutional Precinct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the proposed rezoning. The submitter’s property is in close proximity to 320 The Terrace, has the ability to notice any out of the ordinary activity from the site and is visible from the upper floors of the Gordon Wilson Flats. Since the evacuation of the Gordon Wilson Flats there are fewer people in the area at night. As someone who often walks, the submitter feels less safe as a result of the empty site. The advice from the University’s planning consultant regarding the future use of the site is not reassuring as there will be no way of knowing what activities will take place there and what the effects of these activities will be on the surrounding environment (long timeframe but long term resident). The plan change request discusses the economic benefits of the proposal but does not consider its social impact on a residential neighbourhood and the people who live in it. There is value in providing residential accommodation close to the city centre as it will reduce the load on the public transport systems and create a more vibrant central area which is attractive to the wider region and visitors alike. Given that the University has no short term plans for the site there is not a pressing need for the proposed rezoning and de-listing. As such, it could be delayed until there is a more concrete proposal. In doing so, the University could consult with all affected persons to better address their concerns. <p>Amend the Institutional Precinct provisions of the Wellington City District Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the amendments to the Institutional provisions as they do not address concerns regarding the proposal. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the proposed rezoning aspect of the plan change request.</p>			
11	Dennis Walton	1 Rawhiti Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6011	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the proposed rezoning aspect of the plan change request for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will enable Victoria University to build student accommodation without notification. • The University has been unable to manage the noise and nuisance from its existing student accommodation. Any expansion of these facilities will be a further ‘blight’ on the neighbourhood. • The District Plan states the Institutional Precinct Objectives and Policies as being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.2.1.2 ‘Permit the development of Institutional Precincts for their primary purposes and allow the establishment of appropriate related activities where the effects of those activities can be avoided, remedied or mitigated’. 8.2.2 of the district plan states “to achieve this objective the Council will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.2.2.1 Ensure the effects of activities are managed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on other activities within the Institutional Precinct or on properties in nearby residential areas’. <p>The objective goes on to say “the environmental result will be the continuing operation of activities and development within the Institutional Precincts which do not cause any nuisance and be in harmony with adjacent residential areas’ it continues with ‘other mechanisms (Abatement Notices, Enforcement Orders)’ and ‘peace and quiet are particularly important for people’s wellbeing and the District Plan contains specific rules to control noise. Council is particularly concerned to protect residents from the effects of noise. As well as these rules enforcement orders and abatement procedures will be used to control any excessive noise’.</p> • The Council and Victoria University have failed to protect existing residents from excessive noise effects caused by students in residential halls. • The University denies that it has responsibilities for student misbehaviour off campus but at the same time creates rules and regulations that encourage exactly that. • Otago University fines its students for bad behaviour off campus. Victoria University will not even contemplate this suggestion. • The Council has been complicit in letting the University get away with its obligations to neighbouring properties by doing nothing to uphold its 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>own bylaws.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that the University has failed to meet the Council's District Plan objectives in its existing Institutional Precinct the plan change request should not be approved. Ever since the Council disestablished the live in caretaker at Kelburn Park, Weir House students have claimed the park as their own to do as they wish. The lack of action by the University to the problem has shown it is 'unfit' to run any further student halls in residential areas. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>Keep the current zoning.</p> <p>No student accommodation to be built at 320 The Terrace.</p>			
12	Heritage New Zealand	C/- Jillian Kennemore, PO Box 2629, Wellington 6140	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter's submission is neutral as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Gordon Wilson Flats are not on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Korero. However the building does have historic heritage values as concluded in the Archifact report and as demonstrated by its inclusion in the District Plan in the first place. While the Archifact report has refined the submitter's understanding of the buildings heritage values, the submitter does not consider that these values have changed significantly. A key question to be considered through the plan change process is whether it is appropriate to seek protection of the buildings heritage values through the provisions of the District Plan, taking into account all relevant matters of the Resource Management Act 1991. It is noted that the plan change process enables the local community to provide input on these matters including the significance of the building heritage values. The submitter does not oppose the plan change request and has arrived at this conclusion on the basis that the building is not a national heritage listing. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council use Heritage New Zealand's submission to inform its decision on the plan change request.</p>			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
13	Iain Southall	71 Todman Street, Brooklyn 6021	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter supports the plan change request.</p> <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council approve the plan change request.</p>			
14	Anonymous		No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the plan change request because:</p> <ul data-bbox="197 842 2123 911" style="list-style-type: none"> • It will increase antisocial behaviour in a residential area. The University is already having trouble controlling this behaviour in the existing halls of residence. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That no student halls or flats be allowed on the site only teaching units or lecture halls.</p>			
15	Terry and Jenny Cosgrove	145 Dixon Street, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the specific provisions of the plan change request for the following reasons:</p> <ul data-bbox="197 1342 1955 1410" style="list-style-type: none"> • It will increase antisocial behaviour at night. This can lead to stress and permanently affect people's health. • The quiet night time noise environment is at risk of being further diminished by noisy students who go down to the City after 11pm. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will devalue surrounding residences properties as a result of continued drunken behaviour, broken bottles and urination as well as damage to properties and vehicles. • Student accommodation on 320 The Terrace would not be a wise use of this land. • Wellington is well known for good homes near the city boundaries which gives it a lot of character. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>320 The Terrace should be offered for sale as a development for an international hotel or selected up market housing.</p> <p>The University should be allowed to develop student accommodation at the northern end of the Terrace (city end) using empty office building space.</p>			
16	John Blincoe and Wendy Walker	76B Salamanca Road, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter's oppose the proposed rezoning aspect of plan change request because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could potentially allow new student halls to be erected as of right (or nearly as of right) without public notification, subject to only a building consent. • The University has a bad track record with students living in its existing student halls causing unacceptable alcohol fuelled disruption to their local communities. • The University has failed to demonstrate that it is capable or willing to run these establishments harmoniously with its communities. As such, the University cannot be trusted to set up anymore student halls. • The submitter's have a reasonable expectation of peace and quiet at night however Weir House does not allow this. • A practice has arisen of students drinking around the Kelburn Park fountain. This can attract a large number of students which is well above the 30 allowed by the Council for a gathering at the park without a permit. • These gatherings are associated with loud noise and littering in and around the fountain as well as vandalism from time to time which will have cost the Council and its ratepayers thousands of dollars to repair. • The University should accept responsibility for its students. It is simply unacceptable for Weir House to avoid alcohol fuelled disruption within the house after 10pm by shifting the problem to the community by way of curfew. The University must deal with the problems in its own halls. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The University seems to be reluctant to take effective action – at least action that has sufficiently lasting effect in that local residents can proceed with their lives without being continually distracted by a problem not of their making. • Licenced premises have a moral and legal duty to prevent and/or deal with intoxication issues on their premises particularly so they do not spill out onto the streets. The Council takes a very dim view of licensed premises that are deficient in this regard. However the University gets away with operating its student halls as BYO bars where students binge drink before being discharged into the community at 10pm. • The University refers to students responsibilities about noise in its Weir House handbook but does not extend this responsibility to include noise made outside of the student halls that affect the neighbourhood. The University also does not appear to take seriously its own Student Conduct Statute Prohibition on ‘student behaviour that is detrimental to the reputation of the University’. • An informal group of affected neighbours (by Weir House) has been meeting periodically with the University, the Council and Police representatives since 2013. Such meetings are appreciated however concerns have been understated by the responses from the University. • The University is embedding an ugly culture of the 10 o’clock student swill. This culture is incompatible with the University claiming to be a ‘great global civic university’ that values close involvement with the cultural and economic life of its city and region. Such a close involvement necessarily requires a high level of goodwill to exist between the University and local residents but that has been eroded by the student binge drinking culture. • The University and the Council appear to be more interested in the income generated by an increasing residential population than encouraging a neighbourhood that includes considerate, law abiding families and young professionals. • The Council used to have a resident caretaker at Kelburn Park. While he was there students did not hang around the Park but tended to walk straight along Salamanca Road towards the CBD. Since he has left, there has been a marked deterioration in student behaviour. Thus reinstating the caretaker would lead to an improvement in this behaviour. • Local residents have lodged complaints with the Police, the Council and the University over the years. The number of complaints has risen overtime as shown by the number of complaints lodged with various parties since 2011. • The University needs to focus on ensuring a safe and healthy community for local residents who host its student residential activities. The submitter is not sure how the University can credibly claim to be providing ‘pastoral care excellence’ for its resident student community when in respect of alcohol consumption it so clearly fails to provide such care. • Rather than contributing to the City, the University is in danger of tarnishing the City’s reputation by putting the health and safety of residents and its own students at risk, encouraging student ghettos, driving residents out of the inner city residential areas and undermining both heritage and property values. • The Council should be taking a lead on alcohol issues facing New Zealand, especially in light of increased knowledge regarding alcohols long term health impacts as well as other associated effects. • The Council should take action to have parliament return the criteria for liquor ban areas to what they were before 2013. The current criteria

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>requires that there be a 'high level of crime or disorder' associated with alcohol consumption which seems so onerous that even the Councils existing liquor ban areas might be in doubt when the relevant bylaws are reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The University has demonstrated by its performance that it is not a sufficiently responsible corporate citizen as to be trusted with the powers it is requesting. Therefore the plan change request should be rejected or modified in the way suggested. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request in respect of the proposed rezoning.</p> <p>That alternatively, proposed Rule 9.3.2 be amended to make it clear that it does not apply to student accommodation</p> <p>That a new rule should be added prohibiting student accommodation on 320 The Terrace.</p>			
17	John Jenner	5/227 The Terrace, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the proposed rezoning aspect of the plan change request because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional student accommodation in the surrounding area would adversely impact existing residents. This is because it would add to the already unsavoury environment which results from inebriated young people such as noise, rubbish, vomit and graffiti. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request in regards to the proposed rezoning.</p>			
18	John Miller	101 Salamanca Rod, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the proposed rezoning aspect of plan request for the following reasons:</p>			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will allow increased anti-social behaviour by university students. The University is already struggling to control this behaviour with the existing student halls. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request in terms of the proposed rezoning or approve it on the condition that it does not allow student halls or flats to be built on the site.</p>			
19	DOCOMOMO New Zealand	C/O Julia Gatley, 27A Rutland Road, Stanley Bay, Auckland 0624	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the de-listing aspect of the plan change request for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Gordon Wilson Flats are a significant historic heritage resource. The Council recognises this by having the building on the District Plans Heritage list. The intent of the District Plan and the Wellington Heritage Policy is to recognise, protect and conserve the City's historic heritage so that the Council can meet its obligations under the RMA and provide for the present and future well-being of its community. The de-listing of the Gordon Wilson Flats will set a precedent whereby other owners feel encouraged to de-list their heritage listed property in order to expedite its demolition. The heritage assessment in the plan change request has not used the Councils criteria and methodology for assessing heritage significance and thus cannot be said to have formed an opinion as to the significance of the building in regards to its heritage listing. The building has high architectural and architectural significance and makes a notable contribution to the urban streetscape of the inner-city. The building has retained a high level of authenticity and is a local landmark. The Gordon Wilson Flats have a significant contextual relationship to other multi-storey apartment buildings as they were built to meet social housing needs by both the Housing New Zealand Corporation and the Council in the latter half of the 20th century. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gordon Wilson Flats are particularly notable for their maisonette style planning and commemorative value as their name memorializes the architect who designed them. • The heritage assessment notes the Gordon Wilson Flats have 'not been attributed Earthquake Prone Status by the Council' however other technical reports contradict this assertion. This contradiction raises questions as to the information available to the Council from which a robust and defensible decision can be made. • The submitter has provided the Council with the Expression of Interest document for the Civic Administration Building in Auckland (1951-66) which was, until recently, under threat of demolition but is now being described as 'an exceptional renewal and adaptive re-use opportunity'. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request to de-list the Gordon Wilson Flats on the grounds that the building fully merits its inclusion in the District Plan as a listed heritage building.</p> <p>That any proposals for the redevelopment of the site proceed on this basis and explore refurbishment and/or adaptive reuse options.</p>			
20	Kenneth and Lynda Bowater	19A Everton Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter's submission is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not object to the Gordon Wilson Flats being removed from the District Plans Heritage list. • Do not object to teaching and research spaces being developed to replace the building. • The antisocial behaviour of university students at Weir House has worsened over the last 5 years with students spilling out of the accommodation at 10pm. This practice has become common on Wednesday, Friday and Saturday nights as well during the day on weekends when the weather allows. A number of complaints have been lodged with the Council about this. • The Kelburn Park group has formally met with the University, Weir House, the Council and the Police on multiple occasions and often exchanged emails around concerning events. However the group are dissatisfied with the University's and the Council's responses to its concerns. • The University and the Council appear to be more concerned with the income generated by an increasing student population than encouraging an attractive and vibrant neighbourhood that includes considerate, law abiding families and young professionals. • Want to raise awareness of their own experience in order to prevent the future use of the site being used for student residential or student 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>union event purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were surprised that the Kelburn Park group members were not notified by the Council of the plan change request. <p>Why the site should never be used for student residential purposes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter's do not have any confidence in the University to manage student behaviour and as such, the site should never be used for student residential purposes. • Recent experience with the University has shown that it has consistently failed to pay due attention to the impact of their operations on local residents. • Once students leave the University's property it transfers the responsibility for monitoring students' antisocial behaviour to the long suffering residents. • Jenny Bentley (Director of Campus Services) has repeatedly stated that the University holds no responsibility for its students once they leave the premises. As such, local residents are expected to call the Councils Noise Control or the Police to log incidents of antisocial behaviour and hopefully get some resolution. • Many of our neighbours will not log complaints because the noise nuisance between each group of students is transient and phoning Noise Control elicits no response. The Council applies a stand down period of 15 minutes before considering sending someone out to investigate which is another inconvenience after being rudely awakened. However it is understood that the 15 minute stand down period for sending out someone to investigate has now been waived. • Experience with landlords (not the University) has been much better. If the landlords are based in New Zealand they generally take steps to ensure their tenants are respectful to the neighbours if a complaint is lodged. <p>More student halls of residence means more fear for our neighbourhood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The University's response to local residents concerns and the escalating antisocial student behaviour has caused local residents stress and anxiety. • Local residents are fearful of confronting students who are behaving badly outside their properties. • Filming or photographing the students has also been unsuccessful as the University suggests that the culprits cannot be proved to be residents of their halls. The submitter's have been advised for their own safety not to intervene or take photos. • Screaming female students have also caused great stress as there have been a number of sexual assaults in the area. The submitter's feel they have to put themselves at risk to investigate such incidents in order to make sure these are not such attacks. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>More student halls of residence means more hazardous littering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mornings following student drinking sessions, residents are faced with cleaning up the alcohol related and takeaway litter left in our streets and walkways or putting up with a degenerated environment. • Weir House and Everton Hall have not responded to resident requests to clean up litter. As a result, school children are required to walk past broken glass and partially consumed bottles of alcohol to get to Clifton Terrace School. <p>More students halls of residence mean Kelburn and Te Aro have become ‘Student Party Central’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three nights a week of drinking is unacceptable. The proposed rezoning would escalate this problem if the Gordon Wilson Flats are replaced by student accommodation. • In the past the submitter’s loved living in this location but are considering selling our property as both the University and the Council appear to have an agenda of turning our neighbourhood into a student ghetto or ‘Student Party Central’. • Concerned how the deteriorating behaviour of students is impacting on their academic performance. Students may fare better academically if they are not in a university run hall of residence environment. • Concerned about what tourists think of the alcohol related litter which is clearly in view of the Cable Car route to Kelburn. <p>Why public access via the site after normal business working hour is unacceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kelburn neighbourhood has extensive experience of the unacceptable noise level of intoxicated students making their way to the CBD at 10pm and then returning in the early hours of the morning. • This would be exacerbated if the proposed rezoning was approved. • The University is not a responsible host, and the submitter does not expect complaints to be dealt with in a way that meets residents’ expectations. • Surrounding properties will likely be devalued as a result of the proposed rezoning. No one will want to buy a house in an area where there are intoxicated and noisy students who keep them regularly awake at night. The Council and the University have remedies available to them to deal with these issues but choose not to invoke them. <p>Other considerations strongly supported concerning the use of the University’s halls of residence and potentially Council Bylaws</p>			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfigure the current stock of halls of residence. The number of university halls of residence is already substantial. The submitter's don't want to see anymore built. The submitter's recommend the University house first year students in the CBD area and more mature students in residential areas like Salamanca Road. • Desist cheap Wednesday drinks. It is recommended that the Council and the University work together to discourage local businesses promoting cheap student drinks on Wednesday nights in the CBD. • Manage the transport of alcohol to the halls of residence. The new supermarket to be built in Cable Car Lane in Lambton Quay will facilitate the purchase and transport of alcohol for students who use the Cable Car to get to the student halls in the area. The Council and the University must give some consideration to how the transport of alcohol in the halls can be better managed. • Liquor bans or managed events on university property. The Kelburn Park Group support a liquor ban in the park but to date has had no support from the Council. The University passes any responsibility onto the Council. Thus the onus for getting any action when needed is yet again pushed onto local residents. If a liquor ban is not possible the University should encourage students to drink moderately in its own indoor areas under responsible supervision with effective noise controls in place. • Remove alcohol related litter discarded in residential areas. To date no effective effort has been made by the University or the Council to remove such litter in the surrounding area. In the absence of a liquor ban, local residents must not have to manage this problem or have to live in a degenerated environment. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request in respect of the proposed rezoning.</p> <p>That alternatively, all applications under Rule 9.3.2 be publicly notified.</p> <p>That the site never be used for student accommodation, student union event purposes or to facilitate public access after normal business working hours.</p>

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
21	Kenneth Davis	Suite B, Alison Building, 3 Devon Lane, Devonport, Auckland 0624	Yes

Submission

The submitter supports the plan change request in part and opposes the plan change request in part as follows:

- Does not support the removal of the Gordon Wilson Flats, they are a very important piece of modern architecture and are significant to New Zealand's mid-20th century social and political history. Consequently the submitter believes there is no reason or justification to de-list the heritage status of the building particularly as nothing has changed to affect the buildings original heritage status.
- Supports the proposed rezoning and proposed provisions provided the Gordon Wilson Flats are retained, adaptively reused and creatively integrated into the University campus through the innovative redevelopment of the building and its adjacent land including Housing New Zealand's Mclean Flats site.
- Undertook the original research on F. Gordon Wilson through my Bachelor of Architecture sub thesis/research report '*A Liberal State of Mind – The Architectural Work of F Gordon Wilson 1936-1959 – A Cultural Analysis*'. This sub thesis/research report has formed much of the basis of subsequent research and writing on F. Gordon Wilson and his contribution to architectural modernism and the development of State Housing in New Zealand. As such, I have a special interest in the building.
- F. Gordon Wilson was the first Principal Architect of the Department of Housing Construction from 1936 until his death in 1959 as Government Architect. The Gordon Wilson Flats building were named after him.

Heritage Status of the Gordon Wilson Flats

- The Gordon Wilson Flats is one of only 7 high rise multi-unit state funded social housing developments which was a social and building programme initiated by the first Labour Government from the mid 1930's.
- The building is also important as it is only one of two post WW2 social housing blocks in New Zealand with two level maisonette planning, rectilinear form and articulated facades influenced by Le Corbusier's Unite d'Habitation innovative 1950's apartment buildings in Marseilles.
- The Gordon Wilson Flats are an important example of modernist social housing and represents an important part of New Zealand's social and political history. The building was also designed by F. Gordon Wilson, a significant New Zealand architect, and was named after him.
- These points of significance are all acknowledged by various heritage assessments of the building including Archifacts report for Victoria University on the building and Wellington City Councils '*Heritage Inventory – 1995: 'Gordon Wilson Flats*'.'
- While a heritage buildings value can vary between experts, all regard the building as being of heritage importance and the Council has valued

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>the heritage of the building to be significant enough to merit listing on the Heritage register of the District Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is likely that over time the buildings heritage value will increase as society comes to recognise the importance of this example of architectural modernism. • Society undervalues the cultural products of its immediate preceding generation. It often prematurely destroys recent built culture before it can come to understand its cultural value or its place in history. • Our society will ensure resources are made available to protect those things deemed to be important such as contemporary buildings and heritage structures. An example is the historic value of New Zealand’s colonial, Victorian and Edwardian architecture which only became recognised from the 1970’s. In certain suburbs, the workers cottages and Victorian villas are now strictly protected and also provide some of the highest residential property values in the country. • It is only in the last 20 years that the heritage importance of mid-century architectural modernism as exemplified by the Gordon Wilson Flats started to be recognised and embraced by mainstream culture. As such, New Zealand modernist social housing may become a major cultural tourism attraction both internationally and nationally in the next 20 years as the value of this style of architecture becomes fully acknowledged. • The destruction of important cultural product such as the Gordon Wilson Flats is ‘cultural vandalism’. To allow the demolition of this building would be short sighted and fool hardy from not only a heritage point of view but also in relation to economics and sustainability especially as I believe the building could be adaptively reused as student housing. <p>Adaptive Reuse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building could be adaptively reused for student accommodation in the form of large 5 bedroom flats. The building could be converted relatively easily that would increase total bed numbers by 15% from 162 to 187 beds in typically a 5 building student flat arrangement. These changes provide 25 additional beds and the extra commercial value could be undertaken without changing the footprint of the building and only require 900mm wide penetrations through the short transverse north/south structural concrete shear walls at each floor level. These changes are structurally feasible and would likely be undertaken during any wider seismic upgrade of the building. <p>Site and Building Potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed rezoning is potentially a great opportunity as it opens up a new gateway from the Terrace to the Kelburn campus and provides more land for development. Currently there is no direct access from the Terrace directly to the campus. • The balance of the site could be developed as university teaching or student residential accommodation. <p>Victoria University Wellington Heritage and Green Building Advocacy</p>			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The University has a very strong record as a heritage and green building advocate. It has shown commitment to heritage retention and adaptive reuse in retaining and seismically upgrading its heritage and non-heritage building stock. • The University has been successful in retaining and reusing heritage and other older buildings in creative and positive ways with resultant high quality architectural and urban design outcomes. • I believe that an equally high quality architectural and urban design outcome is possible with the Gordon Wilson Flats and the integrated development of adjacent land. • At a sustainability level the demolition of the building presents a negative outcome as it is a waste of existing building resources and the buildings inherent embodied energy. It is also a waste of viable and valuable housing resource especially as there is demand for 2 bedroom inner city housing stock. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request in regards to the de-listing of the Gordon Wilson Flats.</p> <p>That the plan change request be approved on the condition that the Gordon Wilson Flats are retained, adaptively reused and creatively integrated into the University Campus through the innovative redevelopment of the building and its adjacent land including Housing New Zealand’s Mclean Flats site.</p>			
22	Ken Mitchell	9/324 The Terrace, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter’s submission is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the removal of the Gordon Wilson Flats from the District Plans Heritage list. • Does not object to the proposed rezoning on the condition that the University’s existing design height parameter of 10m for buildings and facilities on the Terrace is adhered to. • Does not object to the demolition of the Gordon Wilson Flats but insists that a plan for the removal of the asbestos interior is made publicly available to local residents and the Council for approval. The plan should include current best practice mitigation techniques for its safe removal and that the actual removal should be monitored by an independent external agency who reports to the local residents and the Council. The plan must also include procedures for demolition and asbestos removal relating to wind strength and it should only occur in the winter months to minimise any adverse effects and asbestos threats on local residents. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not object to the University's plans for landscaping the site once the Gordon Wilson Flats are removed on the condition that the Council ensures the University implement the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constructs a permanent fence/wall between 320 The Terrace and the back of Units 9, 10, 11 and 12 at 324 The Terrace. This is to ensure the safety and security of existing residential properties and to ensure property value retention. - That Victoria University provides a 24/7 security monitoring presence (such as currently provided in other parts of the campus). <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council approve the plan change request subject to the above comments.</p>			
23	Kevin Melville	139 Waterloo Road, Hutt Central, Lower Hutt 5010	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter supports the plan change request.</p> <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council approve the plan change request.</p>			
24	Living Streets Aotearoa	C/- Paula Warren, PO Box 25/424 Panama Street, Wellington 6146	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter's submission is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see a formal 24 hour pedestrian accessway included in the District Plan that connects the Terrace to the University along Waiteata Road. Currently there is limited pedestrian access to the Kelburn campus. • Would like to see the bush area at the rear of the Gordon Wilson Flats preserved as far as possible to maintain the amenity of this area. • Would like to see a pedestrian crossing included in the District Plan from Dixon Street across the Terrace to the bush area. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Rule 9.3.2 should allow public notification given that 320 The Terrace is a significant inner city site and is visible from many parts of the central city. • Building heights should not exceed the current limits. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>Does not state, seeks amendments as above.</p>			
25	MANA Newtown	C/- Josh Hutcheson, 2/5 10 Adelaide Road, Berhampmore, Wellington 6021	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the plan change request for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for housing in Wellington. • The Gordon Wilson Flats accommodated over 150 people. Housing New Zealand has not added to its stock to replace these flats so the housing crisis in Wellington must be worsening. The declaration of Special Housing Areas by the Council must support this. • The site has residential character and given that the Council wishes to have people living close to the city centre it would be wrong to change the District Plan to convert this area of inner city land into university use. • If the University does not want to fix the building to accommodate students it should sell it to someone who will. Rental income from the flats will pay for the cost of repairing the building in a few years. • If the University wishes to expand it should use commercial buildings. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>Keep the current zoning.</p>			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
26	Dr Ben Schrader Michael Kelly Chris Cochran	C/- Dr Ben Schrader, 41 Northland Road, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes

Submission

The submitter's oppose the plan change request because:

- The Gordon Wilson Flats are on the District Plans Heritage list for very good reasons.
- The building has great historic and architectural significance. As such, its protection and conservation should be strongly supported by the Council.
- The use of a plan change to demolish a listed heritage building is completely inappropriate. Demolition of a listed heritage item is a full discretionary activity and should be assessed through the normal resource consent process. The merits of the proposal can be decided via such an application.
- A precedent may be set in that an institution other than the Council can successfully pursue a private plan change of this nature. The Council should determine what is on the District Plans Heritage list via its usual public processes and manage plan changes when appropriate as it has always done.
- The Gordon Wilson Flats do not need to be demolished and the zoning does not need to be changed. The building can be repaired and restored and used as student accommodation. The University should be setting a better example in its use and care of heritage buildings, even ones that it takes over or inherits.

The Heritage Significance of the Gordon Wilson Flats

- The building was designed in the head office of the Ministry of Works and construction supervised by the Wellington District Office.
- The original plans were at least in part the work of Ernst Plischke, the Austrian-born émigré who worked for the Ministry of Works under chief architect Gordon Wilson. Plischke was, together with Wilson and a handful of others, one of the most important Modernist architects in New Zealand history. A design by Plischke, dated to 1942, shows a building that in idiom and scale was very like the one eventually designed. It confirms how the design ideas he was promoting had already been absorbed by the Government's own architects.
- These plans, signed by Gordon Wilson, were not completed until August 1954, and the building itself was not finished until 1959, but the flats still broke new ground. They were uncompromisingly Modernist in style and closely followed the kind of apartment construction that was

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
			<p>becoming common in Western European countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure introduced maisonette-style flats to New Zealand, a type that Le Corbusier’s famous Habité d’Habitation in Marseilles (1947-55) pioneered. This building and the related Upper Grey Street Flats are the only examples of maisonette social housing flats in New Zealand. Although the building was one of the biggest in the city, its impact on the environment was cleverly reduced by its construction against - and beneath - Kelburn hill. • In 1961, in a review of the building, the Journal of the NZIA noted that the system of piling was not known to have been used before in New Zealand. It involved ‘placing reinforcement and dry concrete aggregate’ in a pre-bored cavity, and then ‘grouting with a fluid mixture of cement and sand.’ The system proved to be not only economic, but also ‘ensured a better key with the sloping rock beds’. • The building’s technological value is enhanced by the fact that it included equipment to measure seismic movements, not a common practice at the time. • The extent of the government’s commitment to mass social housing was fully evident in this building which was large, low-cost apartments in inner-city areas. The building was intended to provide accommodation for pensioners, single people, childless couples and others who wanted to live close to city workplaces and amenities. The accommodation provided was generous and comprised 75 maisonette style apartments, most with two double bedrooms, and 12 bedsitting-room flats. • The high-rise slab block of flats is a significant townscape feature and dominates the southern end of The Terrace. It also maintains high authenticity in its design, materials and setting. • Together with the adjacent McLean State Flats, and the nearby Dixon Street Flats, the building is part of an important collection of buildings of a similar design and purpose located in the same part of central Wellington. • Wellington is the home of some of the most important buildings in the history of the provision of mass social housing in New Zealand, including the Centennial Flats on Adelaide Road (1940). There is no comparable collection of state-built flats like it in the Country. • The Gordon Wilson Flats was the last large multi-storey state housing complex built in Wellington. It foreshadowed the embrace of city-based social housing provision in the 1960s by the Council, which went on to build many more large apartment buildings. (The recent excellent renovation of Newtown Park Flats surely shows the redevelopment potential of this structure.) • The building has historic significance for its association with one of New Zealand’s most celebrated Modernist architects, Gordon Wilson, who died while it was being constructed. The building was fittingly named after him. The connection with the Ministry of Works, the government’s builders for over 110 years, is also historically significant. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request.</p>

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
27	Nicola and Norbert Koptisch	236 The Terrace, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	Yes

Submission

The submitter's oppose the proposed rezoning and amendments to the Institutional Precinct provisions for the following reasons:

No more student accommodation

- The University will be allowed to build more student accommodation without any public notification. This will only increase the current widespread antisocial student behaviour that residents have to put up with.
- The antisocial behaviour has worsened over the last 10 years and now ear plugs have to be worn every Friday and Saturday night to block out the noise from students (e.g. screaming and yelling, fights and damage to private property).
- The submitter's have recently joined the Kelburn residents group to obtain support from other residents experiencing similar problems.

Noise nuisance from the Student Union building

- Resource consent was granted in 2005 to allow external parties to hire the Student Union building for their own events.
- The Council only monitors some student and public events at this building before leaving it up to local residents to contact the noise control officers when the noise is very loud.
- Often the buildings resource consent is breached as some events go beyond midnight and the noise is over and above the allowed decibel limit.
- Many calls have been logged only to find the noise control officers not turn up or turned up after the shut down time has been breached.

Pre-loading in the Student Accommodation halls

- The student halls have a 10pm curfew for alcohol consumption leaving the residents to face the consequences of drunken students walking to and from bars in the CBD.

Infringement of the quiet residential zones

- The University is free to commit a nuisance and impinge on the rights of the Kelburn and Terrace residents. Many of the houses in these areas were in existence long before the student union and student accommodation halls were built.
- The submitter's currently have a permanent loss of 'quality of life' as a result of anti-social activities. The submitter's have a right to a quiet noise

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>environment given that they are living in a residential zoned area. Anxiety, stress and sleep deprivation are the consequences suffered from these activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the residents move out of the Kelburn and Terrace neighbourhood these areas could turn into a student ghetto and a 'no-go zone'. As such, many of the houses could be at risk of deterioration and devaluation. Tourism may also be affected. <p>Accountability for the nuisance caused</p> <p>For Victoria University to be fully accountable they need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge reality as to the widespread problems. Residents are now turning to radio talkback shows and newspapers to voice their concerns Take responsibility for its problems. If the University denies its students are causing anti-social behaviour it needs to prove the students are not from the University. Find solutions. Solutions are difficult to find and implement if you do not accept the problem. Make it happen. If the problem is left to fester, the University risks resident/s taking legal action. Look at the University's contribution to the community. Its profit is being made at the expense of the problems caused to the Kelburn and Terrace neighbourhood. Look at the residents' contributions to the wider community. Local residents use their own time and resources to beautify the area through house renovations and continual maintenance of gardens and paths. <p>Develop a framework for Nuisance Responsibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply a nuisance framework to the Institutional Precinct Zone The Council is ultimately responsible for the anti-social behaviour and has to ensure the residents have a quiet night environment. The Council will need to prove to the residents how the quiet night environment will be achieved and how the anti-social activities will be prevented. Provide data to resident groups that are being collected by Wellington Hospital in relation to emergency admissions for intoxicated students. Use available smart technology in monitoring anti-social behaviour. <p>Student Union Events</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All planned events at the Student Union building are monitored to comply with resource consent. Provide adequate communication to the residents for all events at the building such as a schedule of the planned events with a management 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>plan sent to nearby residents.</p> <p>Host Responsibility to prevent anti-social behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervise all the drinking in the student accommodation halls to prevent 'pre-loading' and leaving the halls disorderly and intoxicated. • Provide food with any alcoholic beverages being consumed. • Instant payment fines to be issued to students caught 'pre-loading'. • Arrange transport to and from bars. • Students caught 'pre-loading' are banned from leaving the halls. • Consider a complete alcohol ban and eviction for continual non-compliance. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>Keep the current zoning.</p> <p>That all applications are publicly notified.</p> <p>No student accommodation to be built on the site.</p> <p>No public access after normal business working hours.</p> <p>That the Council and the University consider other uses of the land such as infill residential housing.</p> <p>That the site be subdivided and sold on the market for new residential houses to be built.</p>			
28	Patricia Gruschow	321A The Terrace, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the plan change request in its entirety.</p>			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Decision requested</p> <p>Keep the current zoning.</p> <p>Notify local residents of all demolition and construction plans.</p>			
29	Paul Lee	53 Mulgrave Street, Thorndon, Wellington 6011	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter's submission is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned as to how the plan change request will deal with site access, parking and loading in terms of provisions on the new university site. • Concerned about how pedestrian access and the increasing vehicular pressure on surrounding Mount Street, McKenzie Terrace and Waiteata Road will be dealt with. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That pedestrian and traffic management designs/plans are incorporated into the proposal and that these designs/plans include the wider accessibility issues that are increasing as the university expands into the surrounding neighbourhood.</p>			
30	Roland Sapsford	23 Eponi Street, Aro Valley, Wellington 6021	Yes
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter supports the plan change request in part and opposes the plan change request in part for the following reasons:</p> <p>De-listing the Gordon Wilson Flats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given that the proposal is about demolishing the Gordon Wilson Flats it should be dealt with under the heritage provisions of the District Plan. • Delisting the building implies it lacks heritage merit when in fact the building has considerable heritage merit. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building is capable of restoration and redevelopment in a manner consistent with its heritage values. <p>Rezoning 320 The Terrace</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed rezoning will reduce the ability for the public to participate in the resource consent process and the Councils ability to control the use of the land. This is inappropriate for such a large significant site especially when there are no defined plans for its use. • The proposed rezoning provides the University with the ability to do almost anything it wants. This is at odds with the importance of the site to the city and the potential impacts on local residents. • The proposed rezoning is premature. Specific proposals for landscaping in the interim could be dealt with under the existing District Plan provisions. A more considered review may lead to some aspects of the site being classed as open space or reserve land for example. <p>Amendments to the Institutional Precinct provisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of the site suggests that Councils discretion should remain unrestricted or at least be extended to encompass more possible effects of development. • A more appropriate course of action would be to seek public input and when there was a reasonable degree of support for a proposal then present it to Council for consideration. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request in respect of de-listing the Gordon Wilson Flats and the proposed rezoning. However if the plan change request is approved in these respects, amendments should be made to the Institutional Precinct provisions to provide for more comprehensive control on development and a higher degree of public input.</p>			
31	Sarah Wilcox	15 St Michaels Crescent, Kelburn, Wellington 6021	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the plan change request due to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing number of drunk and noisy students around the city. More student accommodation in the area would only add to this problem. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Decision requested</p> <p>That the Council decline the plan change request.</p>			
32	William Aitken	PO Box 36, Paekakariki 5381	No
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter opposes the plan change request because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would adversely affect his property. • There is already regular damage to the submitter's property by students going up and down the Dixon Street steps intoxicated on Wednesday and Thursday nights. • The noise disturbs the submitter's sleep and that of the submitter's tenants. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>That new student accommodation be established at the CBD end of the Terrace so that students do not disturb residents at night.</p>			
33	Fernhill Body Corporate	C/- Geraldine Ryan, 3/324 The Terrace, Te Aro, Wellington 6011	-
<p>Submission</p> <p>The submitter's submission is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not oppose the removal of the Gordon Wilson Flats from the Heritage list. • Do note that measures arising from the draft demolition management plan include consultation with Housing New Zealand and Wellington Electricity but none with the neighbours on the southern boundary of the site. 			

Submission No.	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Clause 3.4 of Appendix 2, the submitter's object to the insertion of clause 9.3.2 which states that applications will not be publicly notified or limited notified. As affected persons the submitter's require that applications will be publicly notified and that 324 the Terrace will be fully consulted on any proposed designs. • Under Appendix 4, Item 1, the submitter's object to the proposed permitted height of buildings and structures however the submitter's would agree to building heights beyond a 15m yard space to the southern boundary adjoining 324 the Terrace being limited to 30AMSL. • Under Appendix 4, Item 4, Yard – Section 2.2.1, proposed permitted activity condition 9.1.1.1.3, the submitter's seek to ensure that a 15m yard be the accepted distance along the boundaries to the adjoining residential areas to the south side of the site to protect our residents sunlight plane. • The submitter's request that noise levels applicable to the site be the same as that for the Inner Residential Area. <p>Decision requested</p> <p>Does not state, seeks amendments as above.</p>			