

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL AT WELLINGTON CITY I MUA  
NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA WHAKAWĀ MOTUHAKE NGĀMOTU O TE WHANGANUI-  
A-TARA**

**UNDER THE Resource Management Act 1991**

**IN THE MATTER OF the hearing of submissions on the Proposed Wellington  
City Plan**

**HEARING TOPIC Hearing Stream 6- Airport Zone**

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE of Yvonne Weeber**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 My name is Yvonne Weeber I am a resident of Lyall Bay. This is a personal submission.
- 1.2 I have professional qualifications in landscape architecture and urban design however, the majority of this submission is that of a lay person as the areas discussed are out of the area of my expertise.
- 1.3 I support the Guardians of the Bays submission.
- 1.4 I have lived or had a close connection with the Rongotai, Miramar South and Lyall Bay area all my 62 years of life. I went to school at Miramar South School and as a child played with friends in Bridge Street backyards adjacent to the airport runway. I can remember when the first jets arrived at Wellington Airport and their noise and pollution. I have therefore seen Wellington Airport develop and expand in the last 60 years. I have also fortunately seen the planes that fly in and out of the airport become quieter and less polluting.
- 1.5 I am involved in several community groups including being the Chair of Guardians of the Bays, member of the Community Liaison Groups for the Moa Point Sludge Minimisation Facility and the Moa Point Treatment Plant. I am actively involved in Lyall Bay Coast Care, Predator Free Lyall Bay and 4C Climate Change Coastal Community-Hapori Takutai – Huringa Ahuarangi.
- 1.6 I have reviewed the documents supplied for Hearing Stream 5 including:
  - i. Wellington City Councils (WCC) Section 42 Analysis Report prepared by Joe Jefferies for Wellington City Council relating to the Part 3 Area Specific Matters of the Airport Zone;
  - ii. Wellington City Council Appendix A Recommended Amendments to Provisions ( WCC Appendix A) with track with recommended amendments to provisions by the council;
  - iii. Statements of Evidence from WCC experts and rebuttal statements.
  - iv. Relevant submitters material including statements of evidence, submitter statements and rebuttal statements including those from Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL).
- 1.7 I are not opposed to the Airport Zone as a special purpose zone.

- 1.8 I seek clarity of the zone provisions and the mapping of the western Bridge Street boundary in relationship to the Designation WIAL4 (Wellington Airport Main Site Area).
- 1.9 I have used GOTB proposed changes to the WCC Appendix A and any of my changes are seen in *blue italics underlined text*.

## **2. Airport Zone – General**

- 2.1 I support the WCC Section 42A report assessment on definitions and WCC Appendix A as relating to the Airport Zone. I agree the distinction between Airport and Airport Related activities should be maintained in both policy and definition. I agree that there are distinct differences between activity categories in both their effects and necessary operation of Wellington Airport.
- 2.2 The use of repetition of the designation within the Airport Zone will add clarity to the community reading the district plan. This repetition allows for the community to understand the zone better in a way that everyone knows what is happening. I agree with the WCC Section 42A report where Mr Jeffries of “the issue as being more a matter of ensuring that the zone provisions and designations each appropriately perform their respective roles”.
- 2.3 I consider the retention of the Obstacle Limitation Surface definition is important for the community to understand and clarity of the limitations of development around the airport. I consider this should be maintained in the definitions.
- 2.4 The Airport Zone is in the coastal environment and surrounded by sea both the north and south. GOTB considers the Airport Zone should remain within the Coastal Environment Overlay.

## **3. Airport Zone – Introduction**

- 3.1.1 I have no issue with the mapped extent of the Airport Zone. But the Airport Zone does not encompass all WIAL’s designations.
- 3.1.2 The Bridge Street area is presently a street level area of grass considerably lower than the existing runway stip. This land is not proposed for any development in WIAL’s 2040 Masterplan. A new precinct should be made for this area as it could be seen as waste land creating community blight for the next 20 years or until the next Wellington Airport masterplan is developed or designation expanded into this area.

## **4. Airport Zone – Objectives**

### *4.1 AIRPZ-O1: Purpose of the Airport Zone*

- 4.1.1 I disagree that Wellington Airport is nationally significant infrastructure with its constrained site and low passenger volumes. However, the present National Policy Statement on Urban Development appears to give it this status.

### *4.2 AIRPZ-O2: Development of the Airport Zone*

- 4.2.1 I consider the airport zone needs to support the enablement of carbon neutral development through a range of objectives including *AIRPZ-O2: Development of the Airport Zone*.
- 4.2.2 I support the need for a higher standard of design for the large buildings and structures that are adjacent to or visible from the public domain. The community were shocked, and very frustrated by the extremely large grey hanger that was constructed on Tirangi Road. The locals see it as blot on the landscape that adds nothing to the street appeal of Tirangi Road. I do not want this type of large bulky

low quality airport building being constructed directly on public road frontage again and being able to be seen in the wider public domain. The broad lens of ‘public domain’ is important as extremely large bulky buildings can be seen from such a wide area. Reducing the wording to public roads as proposed by WIAL does not go far enough. For schools such as Rongotai College where the Tirangi Road Hanger is clearly visible from. Other areas of the public domain that should be considered in this objective, that have clear views of airport, include Lyall Bay, Evans Bay, the Leonie Gill Cycleway and walkways on Tirangi Road and Strathmore Park.

4.2.3 The Airport Zone should construct high quality buildings and structures with a high-quality appearance no matter what scale and location they have. I therefore oppose WIAL’s proposed changes to AIRPZ-O2

#### 4.3 *AIRPZ-O3: Compatibility of other activities*

4.3.1 I accept the changes proposed for AIRPZ-O3 in WCC Appendix A. The operations on the airport do produce conflicts between the airport zone and the surrounding residential neighbourhood.

#### 4.4 *AIRPZ-O4: Adverse effects generated by activities*

4.4.1 The changes proposed in the WCC Section 42A report and WCC Appendix A by Mr Jeffries fundamentally change this objective. I agree with GOTB proposal of adding the effects on the amenity of the surrounding area which is predominately residential.

The Airport’s operational and functional requirements are provided for while ensuring the adverse effects of Airport and Airport related activities on the environment including the effects on the amenity of the surrounding area are avoided, remedied, or mitigated.

~~Adverse effects of activities are avoided, remedied, or mitigated, while recognising:~~

~~1. The need for effects management within the Airport Zone, including effects on the amenity of the surrounding area; and~~

~~2. The need for effects management in adjacent areas outside the Airport Zone, to avoid or limit effects on the efficiency and safety of the Airport.~~

#### 4.5 *AIRPZ-O5: Carbon neutrality-*

4.5.1 I agree with the WCC AIRPZ-O5 use of ‘options’ rather than ‘operations’.

#### 4.6 *AIRPZ-O6: Airport resilience*

4.6.1 I consider that the airports resilience is both through its air and land transport connections. This objective should clearly state the airport zone is an air and land transport hub.

### **5. Airport Zone – Policies**

#### 5.1 *AIRPZ-P1: Airport purposes activities, buildings and structures*

5.1.1 I support the retention of AIRPZ-P1: Airport purposes activities, buildings and structures as proposed by WCC as it maintains a policy and distinction between the definition of Airport and Airport Related Activities.

#### 5.2 *AIRPZ-P2: Airport related activities, buildings and structures*

5.2.1 I support the WCC retention of AIRPZ-P1 and AIRPZ-P2 as separate policies.

### 5.3 *AIRPZ-P3: Non-airport activities*

- 5.3.1 I oppose the removal of number 3 in AIRPZ-P3 as this is about the non-airport activities compromising the carbon neutral outcomes of the Airport.
- 5.3.2 I support the WIAL clause 4 addition of “[Has a significant adverse effect on the economic viability of Kilbirnie or Miramar Centre Zones](#)”. I consider the non-airport activities especially as the Main Site Area and West Side Precinct have an economic impact on Kilbirnie and Miramar. I have seen how the suburban centres of Kilbirnie and Miramar have changed due to the increase retail activities in the West Side Precinct of the airport.
- 5.3.3 I support the remaining *AIRPZ-P3* as set out in WCC Appendix A

### 5.4 *AIRPZ-P4: Airport Character*

- 5.4.1 A large amount of Airport Zoned land on Bridge Street on the western side of the Airport runway is not within the designations of the Main Site Area. This land at present is in grass or occupied by a residential dwellings. At present this is within the ‘Airside Precinct’ and was purchased under the Airport Noise Mitigation Programme.
- 5.4.2 There is no clear development plan for this land as it is not in the Wellington Airport 2040 Masterplan. If the land is to become runway it would require considerable fill and further landform changes.
- 5.4.3 I support GOTB’s proposal of a separate ‘precinct’ being created to enhance the character of Bridge Street.
- 5.4.4 As a writer of the Urban Design Protocol I agree that the reference to the Protocol should be removed from the District Plan. However, the Protocol was not just about mixed use. The seven urban design qualities from the Protocol include: context, character, choice, connections, creativity, custodianship and collaboration. This suggests that this policy should be developed in a more substantial way.

### 5.5 *AIRPZ-P5: Management of effects*

- 5.5.1 I disagree in the deletion of clause 7 in relationship to decarbonization of airport related activities including embedded emissions from construction and activity attracted by the Airport (such as public and private transport).
- 5.5.2 The Bridge Street land and Rongotai Ridge, which is out of the designation, could include considerable construction and release of embedded carbon emissions to bring the land up to civil aviation compliance related to the runway. By removing this clause, you are removing the ability to report on the Bridge Street and Rongotai Ridges development carbon emissions.
- 5.5.3 I consider that duplication of the designation is not a bad thing and allows the community and everyone to see what is happening and required of any development within the Airport Zone.

## **6. Airport Zone – Rules**

### 6.1 *AIRPZ-R1: Airport Purposes*

- 6.1.1 I support the changes in the WCC in the Section 42A report and WCC Appendix A Recommended Amendments to Provisions.

6.2 *AIRPZ-R2: Airport related activities*

- 6.2.1 I agree it is appropriate to retain discretion over Airport Related activities in most areas of the Airport Zone.
- 6.2.2 I oppose the permitted activity of all airport related activities within the Terminal Precinct as proposed in the Section 42A report and WCC Appendix A Recommended Amendments to Provisions. This is especially concerning in relationship to the removal of the economic viability issues some 'airport related activities' could have on the Kilbirnie and Miramar suburban centres.
- 6.2.3 For example could a small supermarket be considered an Airport Related Activity that supports the needs of Airport passengers, visitors and employees? Already Wellington Airport has advertised to Wellington to come shopping within its complex with free parking in the weekends.

6.3 *AIRPZ-R3: Non-airport activities*

- 6.3.1 I agree that the golf course activities are better positioned in this rule.
- 6.3.2 I disagree that the notification status is removed in relationship to publicly notifying non-complying activity.

6.4 *AIRPZ-RX Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures and AIRPZ-RX Demolition or removal of buildings and structures*

- 6.4.1 I support the new rules set out in the Section 42A report and WCC Appendix A Recommended Amendments to Provisions. This creates permitted activity rules for the maintenance and repair; and demolition or removal of building and structures within the Airport Zone as set out in the new rules of AIRPZ-RX Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures and AIRPZ-RX Demolition or removal of buildings and structures.

6.5 *AIRPZ-R4: Building and structures*

- 6.5.1 I support the changes to the Permitted and Controlled Activity Status sections of AIRPZ-R4: Building and structures as set out in WCC Appendix A Recommended Amendments to Provisions.
- 6.5.2 I support the including construction effects, including earthworks, noise, hours of operation and traffic within the Controlled Activity status matters of discretion. Construction effects can be a major issue to surrounding residential neighbourhoods to Wellington airport. For example runway maintenance occurs at night and needs to be managed not only in the Airport Zone but in the streets around the airport as vehicles access the airport.
- 6.5.3 I oppose the removal of the Miramar South Precinct integrated management plan as a reference within the District Plan.
- 6.5.4 I oppose the removal in the Discretionary Activity Status of the 'A building or structure is in the East Side Precinct, Landscape Buffer Area but is not a Controlled Activity under AIRPZ R4.2'.

**7. Airport Zone – Standards**

7.1 *AIRPZ-S1: Maximum height and location of buildings and structures (except Miramar South precinct and Rongotai Ridge precinct)*

- 7.1.1 I do not support the deletion of the clause "in the terminal precinct, no closer than 20m to an external site boundary" as requested by WIAL. I agree with the WCC

Section 42A report regarding this being a trigger for a resource consent to ensure the terminal buildings that are visible from the outside of the airport area are able to be assessed for design quality especially for large buildings. The duplication of this designation condition is appropriate and provides council with appropriate enforcement powers.

7.1.2 I oppose the deletion of the matters of discretion on effects on existing vegetation. This is particularly relevant in relationship to the West Side Precinct and existing pohutuakwa on Turangi Road and any remaining vegetation around the airport.

7.2 *AIRPZ-S2: Maximum height and location of buildings and structures (Miramar South precinct and Rongotai Ridge precinct)*

7.2.1 I oppose the removal of the 8,9 and 10 metre building and structure heights in the Miramar South Precinct and the provision of a new 11m building height across this airport precinct. It is extremely unlikely that 11m residential buildings will be built in the Medium Density Residential Zone west of the Miramar South Precinct between Miro Street and Kauri Street. I consider a lower height airport building for the Miramar South Precinct is appropriate as the airport buildings will probably be bulky and utilitarian in design compared to possible future 11m residential buildings in the Medium Density Residential Zone.

7.2.2 I oppose the removal of the Miramar South Precinct integrated management plan as a reference within the District Plan.

7.2.3 I oppose the removal of the assessment criteria on transport, impacts of commercial development, and construction impacts.

7.3 *AIRPZ-S3: Commercial, retail and access restrictions*

7.3.1 I support WIAL's inclusion of constraints of large format retail within the Miramar South Precinct.

7.3.2 I consider there is a need for the airport zone to constrain and limit commercial retail and other activities in the Bridge Street area. This area of land is not in the Airports 2040 Masterplan and therefore is unallocated land with no development function at present.

7.3.3 This is especially important as at this point over half this Bridge Street area is not in the Main Site Area designation. This is why I propose that this area should be limited to open space enhancements with no buildings. At present the development of this area is silent on what should happen to land outside the designations but within the Airport Zone.

7.3.4 I support the GOTB proposal of a open space enhancement area for Bridge Street with the following wording:

[6. Bridge Street Precinct shall be limited to an open space enhancement area with no buildings.](#)

Dated 16 February 2024 Yvonne Weeber