

**Before A Hearing Panel of Wellington City Council**

**Under the** Resource Management Act 1991

**In the matter** of the Wellington City Proposed District Plan

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DAVID ALEXANDER WILLS ON BEHALF OF  
PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE AND ITS SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED DISTRICT  
PLAN**

**Hearing Stream 3**

**11 May 2023**

---

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

**1.1** My full name is David Alexander Wills and I am the Manager Buildings Project Management Office for Parliamentary Service.

**1.2** The Parliamentary Precinct has national and local significance, and it is important that it can function well and serve the needs of the New Zealand government into the future. Since its establishment in 1865, the Parliamentary Precinct has been progressively developed with a variety of buildings, structures, and landscape necessary to serve the democratic needs of the people of New Zealand. As these needs have evolved and changed, the buildings, structures, and grounds within the Precinct have had to be adapted, altered, added to, and in some cases demolished, so that Precinct can continue to be fit for its Parliamentary purpose.

**1.3** It is therefore important that the district plan provisions that apply to the Precinct are appropriate and enable the Precinct to be used for its intended purpose in the future. Further explanation on this is set out in Parliamentary Service's primary submission, and I do not intend to repeat that here.

**1.4** In terms of this hearing stream, and given the Heritage value associated with the Precinct, Parliamentary Service made a submission on the Historic Heritage chapter of the notified PDP. Mr Coop has provided a statement of evidence in relation to its submission on that chapter, and will speak to that submission today.

**1.5** In preparing for this hearing, another matter in this Hearing Stream has come to our attention that Parliamentary Service has an interest in and wishes to support.

**1.6** Parliamentary Service has now had the opportunity to review the submissions on the Viewshafts chapter, and in particular the submission by the Eldin Family Trust on that chapter (submitter #287). The Parliamentary Precinct appears in several of the viewshafts notified in the PDP, and we

have a particular interest in ensuring that the viewshaft provisions appropriately protect the Parliamentary Precinct.

**1.7** Parliamentary Service wishes to record its support for the Eldin Family Trust's submission in respect of viewshafts 1 and 4 of the notified PDP, and the retention of viewshaft 3 from the ODP. This support is qualified by a request that the PDP expressly recognises the need for the efficient, effective and safe-functioning of the Parliamentary Precinct in the event that consent is sought for buildings on the Parliamentary Precinct that trigger the viewshaft provisions. This recognition could be by way of an assessment criterion requiring regard to be had to the above matter, similar to that which Parliamentary Service has sought in the historic heritage chapter. This is because of the importance of having a well-functioning Parliamentary Precinct that can accommodate future changes as well as the present built environment.

**1.8** Parliamentary Service also supports the matter raised in the Trust's legal submissions from paragraphs 28 to 49 in relation to some of the recommendations made in the section 42A viewshaft report, in particular HS3-VIEW-Rec4 and HS3-VIEW-Rec9. Parliamentary Service agrees with the Trust that those recommendations would represent a significant departure from the way that the viewshaft provisions operate in the Operative District Plan, and would result in (likely) unintended consequences. Parliamentary Service supports either of the two approaches proposed by the Trust to remedy this inconsistency, again subject to the qualifier that the PDP recognises the value in having other Parliamentary buildings as part of the context for the Beehive.

**David Alexander Wills**

11 May 2023