

Appendix 3: North Kumutoto Building and Public Space Development Proposal Consultation Process and Results

North Kumutoto Building and Public Space Development Proposal

Consultation Process and Results



Prepared by Wellington City Council

Updated 20 March 2014

INTRODUCTION

This report summarises the consultation responses to the North Kumutoto Building and Public Space proposal. It describes the public consultation process and how the responses were analysed.

SCOPE OF CONSULTATION

The objective of the consultation process was to get public feedback on a proposed design for a building and public space development in the North Kumutoto precinct, including Site 10. Note that the scope of the consultation did not include the question of whether or not there should be a commercial building on Site 10 as this decision had been made initially in the Waterfront Framework (2001), and reconfirmed in the Framework Review (2011) and North Kumutoto Design Brief (2012). It is noted that most of submissions that were not in favour of the proposed designs took the position that there should be no commercial building in the North Kumutoto precinct and that the area should be developed entirely as public space. These results are discussed in more detail below.

The North Kumutoto consultation was not a Special Consultative Procedure.

The consultation process ran from 21 January 2014 until 28 February 2014.

The public consultation process was led by Wellington City Council (WCC), and facilitated by Wellington Waterfront Limited (WWL) and the WCC Web Design and IT teams. The process comprised the following:

- A detailed information display set up in a shipping container located on Site 8 in North Kumutoto comprising 18 x A2 sized panels showing perspectives, plans and sections together with 2 x A1 sized panels of introductory text and options for Site 8. Feedback forms and a deposit box were also on prominent display. During the consultation period, the container was moved to the South end of the Waterfront, near Te Papa, in order to canvas feedback from the public who primarily use the Taranaki Wharf and Waitangi Park.
- A similar display to that of the container was also set up on the ground floor of WWL Project Information Office in Shed 6 Queens Wharf. This display included a 1:500 architectural model
- A half-page advertorial was placed in the Dominion Post on Tuesday 17 December 2013, followed by another quarter-page advertorial on Tuesday 21 January 2014. A press release and Dominion Post article was featured on Wednesday 22 January 2014, and a smaller 'reminder insertion' was appeared in the Dominion Post on 25 February 2014.
- Information relating to the proposed building and public space development together with an online feedback form were placed on the WWL website together with a link from the WCC website to the WWL website
- Tweets were sent from the Council on 27 January 2014 alerting people via social media to the beginning of the consultation period, and then on 21 February to remind them that the consultation would close in a week.
- Letters were sent to 15 key stakeholders describing the proposed development with an offer to brief them in more detail if requested. Detailed briefing meetings were subsequently held with 10 stakeholder groups: Shed 21, Argosy, Civic Trust, Accessibility

Advisory Group, Chamber of Commerce, Ambitious For Wellington and the NZ Property Council, the Tenths Trust, Land Lease, Brian Galt (owner of the Maritime Building), and the NZ Historic Places Trust.

- Hard copies of the submission forms were made available at the Central Library, and at the Council reception on the ground floor of the Wakefield Street building.

FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

Because Council had agreed previously to pursue a commercial development on Site 10 and a design process had been undertaken in 2013, the questions for this current consultation process do not address the issue of whether or not there should be a building on Site 10. Rather, they were intended to gather feedback on the design proposal for the building and associated development of public space in North Kumutoto. A specific question was also asked about what the public would like to see done on Site 8. The questions were as follows:

- 1 What do you like about the building design?
- 2 How could the design of the building be improved?
- 3 What do you like about the outdoor public space design?
- 4 How could the design of the outdoor public space be improved?
- 5 Do you have any specific ideas about the use of Site 8 and how it should be developed as public space?
- 6 Do you have any other comments?

FEEDBACK SURVEY METHODOLOGY

As noted above, there was an online submission form, and a drop box was set up in the project container to allow respondents to deposit hard copy responses. The web survey form requested that respondents supply their name and address, and respondents were asked to make only one response per person. No multiple responses from a single e-mail address were detected, although a number of related surnames (possibly family members) were noted. Several submissions were signed by two people, but treated as a single submission with both names noted.

Because the North Kumutoto consultation was not a Special Consultative Procedure, submitters were not required to provide their name and contact details.

196 submissions were received: 75 electronic submission forms; 68 hard copy submission forms deposited in the drop box, returned to the reception area at Council or mailed in to WCC; 41 email submission; and 12 letters were received.

It was noted that a number (58 or 30%) of submissions used the identical or similar phrases in their general responses. These wordings align exactly or closely with statements made in a newsletter issued by Waterfront Watch in February 2014, and a 'Kumutoto Submission Reminder' issued by Waterfront Watch on 19 February. While these submissions are all recorded here as legitimate individual responses, the implication is that the respondents were all members of Waterfront Watch and were guided by the wording of the newsletter as the basis for their submission. As such, they are representative of a shared view to the current development proposal.

Overall, responses ranged in length and detail from a single sentence through to a number of submissions that were in the form of detailed letters which addressed the questions in general rather than specific terms, or took the form of additional information appended to the submission form. These have been correlated as best as possible to the consultation questions, but are also available for full analysis by the Council's Technical Advisory Group (TAG).

Each response is individually numbered and the results collated as noted below. Hard copies of the submission have been produced and bound as a reference. In recording submissions, where a person has provided a response that refers to another issue, for example answers on public space under the questions on building design, those responses have been recorded under the question to which they refer. Similarly where a respondent makes a comment twice, it is recorded only once, under the question to which it refers. Responses have been grouped like with like, and these ordered in descending order of frequency of response.

The tabulated response is the compiler’s best assessment of wording to accurately reflect each submission, and group like submissions.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

196 submissions were received during the course of the Consultation Process, which represents a strong uptake compared to other Waterfront consultations. This can be attributed in part to the highly visible presence of the shipping container at strategic locations on the Waterfront, the use of Council’s social media networks to inform people about the process, and Waterfront Watch encouraging its members to provide individual submissions to Council.

Of the 196 submissions, ‘supportive’ and ‘non supportive’ responses were split almost exactly – 97 supportive (49%) and 99 non supportive (51%). No responses were received that could be described as ‘neutral’ or ‘ambivalent’. It must be noted that dividing the results in this way is indicative only, as a large number (44) noted directly that there should be no building on the site, which was not a consideration that was out for consultation this time. Of the other non supportive responses, while not mentioning directly that there should be no building on the site, most took the position that the whole North Kumutoto precinct should be public space and did not address at all the questions about the design of the building.

The following is a summary survey of responses to the consultation questions, along with some general, high-level comments regarding the nature and trends seen in the feedback comments. These, in turn, will be assessed by officers and TAG and reported back to Council on 8 April 2014. The percentages have been presented in two ways – as a percentage of total respondents (% of 196) and as a percentage of respondents who answered that particular question (% of question x). Note that respondents were able to make one or more points against each question so the sum of the percentages for each line will not add up to 100%. Rather, the numbers are indicative of which issues were cited most frequently in the content of each submission.

Question 1a: What do you like about the building design?

(from a total of 97 respondents to the question)	Total	% of 196	% of 97
Attractive Addition to the Waterfront	21	11	22
Modern appearance	19	10	20
Appropriate in scale	20	10	21
Glass/Windows/light/elegant	19	10	20
Appropriate in design	16	8	16
Height increase is appropriate/not an issue	15	8	15
Pedestrian Shelter along the Quays	12	6	12
Good pedestrian through space/promenade	12	6	12
Green roof/green building	10	5	10
Appropriate in use	8	4	8

Visual links through to the harbour	7	4	7
Public access/space at ground floor is good	6	3	6
Compliments nearby buildings	6	3	6
Good link for the Harbour	5	3	5
Place for cafes, restaurants and shops	3	2	3
Good to see progress on the site	3	2	3
Doesn't feel 'closed' to the public	3	2	3
The public plaza	3	2	3
Good for business in Wellington	4	2	4
Seismically resilient	1	1	1
Good location/it has a sense of place	2	1	2
Unobtrusive	2	1	2
Building mass sits well in the urban context	2	1	2
Likes the overhang/cantilever look	2	1	2

General observations:

- A wide range of positive observations were received that complimented the design as being an attractive building to have on the Waterfront and appropriate in scale and use.
- 20% (19) of the supportive responses to the building design made comment on the effectiveness of the glass. It should be noted, however, that 5% (4) of the respondents to Question 2 suggested that softening the glass look in the design should be considered
- Pedestrian access and shelter as design features received positive feedback, with 12 comments noting the provision of shelter and a further 12 supportive references to the extension of the promenade.
- A number of submissions made reference to the 'sense of place' that the building has, and how it compliments nearby buildings.
- 7% (7) of the supportive submissions recognised the provision of visual links through to the harbour.

While not specifically asked to identify what submitters don't like under this question, 58 general non-supportive comments from 95 submitters were recorded. They are summarised in the following table:

Question 1b: What do you dislike about the building design?

(from a total of 99 respondents to the question)	Total	% of 196	% of 99
no building on the site	44	22	44
dislike the design	26	13	26
will block views of the harbour from the city	15	8	15
disproportionately large building	9	5	9
shades the area	6	3	6
dominates the historic buildings	6	3	6
physical barrier	4	2	4
no heritage connection	4	2	4
is all the glass an earthquake risk?	3	2	3
style clashes with the old brick building	2	1	2

The design does not encapsulate elements of mana whenua and iwi cultural histories	2	1	2
No public benefit	2	1	2
unsuitable for this part of the waterfront	1	1	1
The design is not integrated	1	1	1

General observations:

- Of the 99 non-supportive submissions received, 44% (44) directly referenced that there should be no building on the site. It is noted, however, that Council has already agreed to develop Site 10 with a building so these comments have no context in this current review.
- None of the 26 submissions that 'disliked' the design gave a reason as to why this was the case. There is a strong likelihood, therefore, that these submissions are making an oblique reference to disliking any building on the site.
- Concern about the disruption of views and view shafts as a result of developing North Kumutoto was a strong theme throughout the consultation feedback. 15 submissions noted this in reference to the building on Site 10, including 5 submissions whose overall assessment of the building was positive.

Question 2: How could the design of the building be improved?

(from a total of 85 respondents to the question)	Total	% of 196	% of 85
Concerns about the height	33	17	39
Address potential wind/weather issues/wind tunnel/canyon effect	19	10	22
Make the building 1 or 2 levels only	8	4	9
Less monolithic design/imposing	6	3	7
Make it more in character with the waterfront (e.g. brick, shed-like)/better heritage references	6	3	7
Less glass or soften that look	4	2	5
Incorporate sustainability techniques	4	2	5
Make sure it's not dark and shady, remove overhangs	4	2	5
A few curves, less square angles	3	2	4
No improvement necessary	3	2	4
Base isolation/address seismic issues	3	2	4
Boring design/needs something that makes a statement	2	1	2
Reduce the footprint	2	1	2
More shade which is lost by the glass	2	1	2
Undertake sun studies	2	1	2
Activate ground floor to outside	1	1	1
Overwhelms the police building so slice off the end	1	1	1

A 'wal garden' on the side of the building or support columns	1	1	1
Make sure the northern end is as attractive as the Southern end	1	1	1
Make sure the collonades are well designed	1	1	1
Make the overhang less boxy	1	1	1
The overhang is bad feng shui	1	1	1
Use natural materials in cladding to soften the façade	1	1	1
Make the building warm and inviting	1	1	1
Put it somewhere else	1	1	1
Viewing platform on the green roof	1	1	1
Same height as existing building to create a continuous roof line	1	1	1
Provide a sense of a single space	1	1	1
More public space inside	1	1	1

General observations:

- Concerns about the height (33 submissions) were almost all framed in the context of the recommendations contained in the Environment Court decision, with 8 respondents going on to note that the building should be no more than 1 or 2 storeys high.
- The most frequent suggestion for improvements in the building related to the designers understanding and allowing for the effects of the wind. 22% (19) of the respondents to the question made reference to addressing potential wind and weather issues.
- It is noted that for many of the suggested improvements to the overall design (such as 'to much shade', 'too much glass' or 'too boxy/less square angels'), there were a similar number of contrary, positive statements made to these points in other submissions.
- Feedback included several references to incorporating sustainability techniques (4) and earthquake strengthening 'best practice' (3).

Question 3: What do you like about the outdoor public space design?

(from a total of 66 respondents to the question)	Total	% of 196	% of 66
Nice design	13	7	20
The attention given to the movement of people and vehicles	9	5	14
The sense of openness	6	3	9
It will bring people to the area	5	3	8
Greenery and shade	5	3	8
Major new CBD connection for lunchtime users	4	2	6
Major improvement over the status quo	4	2	6
The separation of cyclists from pedestrians	4	2	6
Another place to enjoy a sunny day in Wellington	3	2	5
Keeps the sight lines down Whitmore Street	3	2	5

Don't like the design	3	2	5
The mix of open, public recreation space	3	2	5
It is an integral part of the design	2	1	3
Continuation of existing plaza layout	2	1	3
The strategic limiting of vehicle movement	2	1	3
Access to the water	1	1	2
Open spaces should be for recreation	1	1	2
The consistent approach is appropriate	1	1	2
Habitat for wildlife	1	1	2
Excellent suggestions in the design brief	1	1	2
Don't connect people to the water here -- a working area and therefore not appropriate	1	1	2
Strong balance between public and private good	1	1	2
Get the right building on to Site 10 first	1	1	2
Not enough information	1	1	2
Good opportunities for public art works	1	1	2
It completes the Waterfront	1	1	2
Removes the current carpark eyesore	1	1	2

General observations:

- The supportive responses nearly all align in some way to the general observation that the design shows open, accessible public spaces that maintain views of the harbour and establish another place on the Waterfront for people to sit, pass through or play. The consultation identifies that this is regarded as a highly desirable feature of the public space.
- 9 submissions (14%) identified the positive treatment and attention given to the movement of traffic, bicycles and pedestrians.

Question 4: How could the design of outdoor public space be improved?

(from a total of 70 respondents to the question)	Total	% of 196	% of 70
Better protection from strong winds and rain	15	8	21
more green space/plantings/natural elements	15	8	21
No buildings on the area	11	6	16
Maintain/improve adequate walking and cycling space	10	5	14
No more cafes and restaurants	7	4	10
No vehicle access	4	2	6
maintain multi-use capability	3	2	4
Cafes, bistros, bike rides, trees, bandstands, cycle and skateboard tracks, children's playgrounds, 'retreats', seats (shaded and windproof), Maori and European exhibits about the city's history, markets selling a variety of things.	3	2	4

Could be bigger	3	2	4
Recreation area with a variety of green spaces	2	1	3
No elevated views	2	1	3
Make sure it is 100% accessible to the public	2	1	3
Sensitive signage to mark the heritage and archaeological sites	2	1	3
use locally sourced native plants	1	1	1
Make it a destination	1	1	1
Include a dedicated place for lunchtime sports	1	1	1
No car parking on the waterfront	1	1	1
No hard line between city and sea	1	1	1
Heritage tram to move people along the waterfront	1	1	1
Separate better the modes of transport	1	1	1
There are excellent suggestions in the brief. Use those.	1	1	1
include a 'welcoming and human scale space to greet visitors'	1	1	1
Something that caters to the tourists	1	1	1
Include a fast moving 'travelator'	1	1	1
An 'intriguing' fountain	1	1	1
A café with a slow moving, rotating deck	1	1	1
No improvements necessary	1	1	1
Incorporate a marshland like Waitangi Park	1	1	1
The design is boring	1	1	1
Reduce the building footprint to make more open space	1	1	1
Sounds hell on Site 10	1	1	1
Incorporate a winter garden into the design	1	1	1
Integrate it with the rest of the waterfront	1	1	1
Small buildings to support recreation activities	1	1	1
Incorporate accessibility solutions into the design	1	1	1
Water park/activities included	1	1	1
Maximise sun and open space	1	1	1
Include options for small scale events	1	1	1
Incorporate an urban farm concept	1	1	1
Should have a different feel to other parts of the waterfront	1	1	1
More seating	1	1	1
Needs to be resilient outdoor space	1	1	1
The exterior spaces feel timid	1	1	1
Bike storage (like at the railway station)	1	1	1

General observations:

- Of the responses to this question, the largest number of suggestions were for better protection from adverse weather conditions (15 responses or 21%) and more green space and plantings (15 responses or 21%).

- Another theme to come through strongly (10 submissions or 14%) was the need to maintain and clearly define adequate cycling and pedestrian space.
- A number of suggestions for specific items or activities were received, including: ideas for a sports and recreation area, a moving 'travelator' and 'intriguing' fountain, a marshland area, a winter garden and water park, and a 'café with a slow moving, rotating deck'. Generally, these were one-off ideas and it is noted that while many are very creative and unique, they might be considered impractical in that particular location.
- There were calls for cafes and other amenities, but also similar calls against having any sort of building incorporated as part of the public space.

Question 5: Do you have any specific ideas about the use of Site 8 and how it should be developed as public space?

(from a total of 55 respondents to the question)	Total	% of 196	% of 55
Open public space/green park with trees, shelter and rubbish bins	28	14	51
Play/Interactive space	6	3	11
Link it to the waterfront/water more	4	2	7
Multi use space	4	2	7
Something for both young and old	3	2	5
Public Sports facilities	2	1	4
Public art (Te Papa extension)	2	1	4
A maritime nautical theme park	2	1	4
provision of an i-Site on Site 8	2	1	4
Bike/scooter hire facilities	2	1	4
keep it as it is	2	1	4
Don't fill in the current water/stream area	2	1	4
something tat gives a sense of history	2	1	4
No 'private' building on the site	2	1	4
Create exhibition space for storing/presenting heritage things and memorabilia	2	1	4
A kiosk	2	1	4
Maximise the design	1	1	2
No more retail	1	1	2
A building to reflect more European/Maori artistic heritage	1	1	2
An interactive water sculpture	1	1	2
Something creative	1	1	2
Make sure it retains the sun	1	1	2
Restoration of the sea wall	1	1	2
A stage/public performance space	1	1	2
A place for a market	1	1	2
Make the police station easy to access	1	1	2

General observations:

- Overall, the question about Site 8 received the fewest direct responses in the submissions, possibly because people viewed it as part of the larger public space development of North Kumutoto.
- Of the 55 respondents, the clear majority (51%) wanted the area left as open, public space with trees and shelter.
- The second most popular suggestion (6 submissions or 11%) was to incorporate some sort of play or recreation activity into the area.
- Other suggestions for the Site incorporated a range of activities, including the provision of an i-site or kiosk, heritage structures, and a place for the market.

Question 6: Do you have any other comments?

(from a total of 113 respondents to the question)	Total	% of 196	% of 113
Where will the campervans go?/retain the campervan park	16	8	14
Get on with it/A great addition to the Waterfront	14	7	12
No private/commercial office space on this location	11	6	10
Better solution/improve crossing the quay at Bunny and Whitmore streets	11	6	10
Make it a visitors centre/i-site	11	6	10
Maintain the views from all directions	6	3	5
Respect the findings of the Environment Court	4	2	4
The proposed development essentially privatises part of the inner harbour without sustainable rationale	3	2	3
No public retail on this space	3	2	3
Acknowledge the role of mana whenua and iwi interests	3	2	3
Space for leisure, recreation and cultural activities	2	1	2
No car park on Site 9	2	1	2
Enhance the walk from the waterfront to the stadium and cruise boats	2	1	2
The waterfront needs a mix of uses to ensure it is a vibrant area, well designed buildings together with good public spaces has served the area well.	2	1	2
Consider sea level rise/climate change	2	1	2
Don't do it	2	1	2
Give the waterfront reserve status	2	1	2
Consult specifically with Te Ati Awa and Ngati Toa Iwi representatives	2	1	2
Keep and Environmental/sustainability approach	2	1	2
Make sure it is pedestrian/cycle friendly	2	1	2
Promenades	1	1	1
Smaller sites for buildings, more human in scale	1	1	1
People should be able to touch the water	1	1	1
This area still feels disconnected from the harbour	1	1	1
Keep other buildings to recommended heights	1	1	1
Will there be additional parking for people to enable them to access the waterfront?	1	1	1
Designate the Waterfront as a reserve	1	1	1

Concerns that the development will lead to growing inequality in Wellington (via privatisation)	1	1	1
Better building required	1	1	1
The Waterfront precinct must be given a formal specific designation as part of the district plan	1	1	1
The north end of the city needs more green space	1	1	1
The height issue seems to have been addressed in a balanced manner	1	1	1
The city needs quality office space	1	1	1
Does the quay need to be 4 lanes at Site 10?	1	1	1
Needs more character	1	1	1
1 storey building only on Site 9	1	1	1
Will future-proof Wellington	1	1	1
Make it more market friendly	1	1	1
Incorporate Shed 21 and the Ferry building into the Waterfront Heritage precinct	1	1	1

General observations:

- The final question offered respondents the opportunity to comment on a range of topics and issues.
- 12% (14) of the submissions used this question as an opportunity to suggest that the Council 'get on with it'.
- A large number of submissions (16) made reference to the need to relocate the current Motor home park. When added to the 18 responses below aligned with feedback from members of Waterfront Watch, this makes the relocation or retention of the Motor home park one of the most significant issues identified through the consultation process.
- The provision of an i-site or visitors centre also received strong support (11 submissions)
- Although not directly related to the current development proposals, a number of submissions (11) requested attention be given to better pedestrian crossing solutions across the quays at Whitmore and Bunny Streets.

As noted earlier, in collating the responses it was observed that a number of submissions referenced ideas and phrases directly quoted from two documents published by Waterfront Watch. Listed below are number of submissions that were identified as including two or more direct references to Waterfront Watch publications (note should not be interpreted as the total number of Waterfront Watch member submissions).

(from a total of 58 submissions)	Total	% of 196	% of 58
Should be primarily a place for people to sit, reflect and view the harbour	23	12	40
Maintain panorama views/view shafts	22	11	38
Entrance to the Waterfront/welcome to Wellington	18	9	31
Ignores public feedback/listen to the people of Wellington	17	9	29
Keep the Motorhome park	15	8	26
Better connections for walkers and cyclists	13	7	22
Too much office space/Future demand for open space	13	7	22
Designated as a reserve	12	6	21
Environment court decision	12	6	21
Area provides main open space for central city	9	5	16

Primarily a place for people	8	4	14
Variation 11 references	4	2	7

As noted earlier, these are legitimate submissions and have been recorded as such. However, they are also indicative of a particular group viewpoint in relation to the current proposal under consideration.

CONCLUSION

The Wellington City Council has undertaken a comprehensive consultation process on the current building proposal for Site 10 and associated development of public space in North Kumutoto, on Wellington's waterfront.

196 submissions were received in the form of an online submission form, a hard copy of the submission form, emails and written submissions that did not use the submission form.

Officers have collated the information gathered from the submissions and will use the feedback to address any large and small-scale changes that the public has asked the Council to consider.

The results of the consultation process, along with updated designs for the building on Site 10 will be presented to the Council on 8 April 2014.

List of Submitters

Sub #	Name	Address
1	Grant Corleison	
2	Mike Malone	
3	Luke Troy	
4	Iain Southall	71 Todman Street, Brooklyn
5	Tim Reeves	52 Mandalay Tce, Wellington
6	Simon Meikle	404/ 326 Evans Bay Pde, HAITAITAI
7	Ewan Delany	126 Grafton Road, Roseneath
8	Alex Mitcalfe Wilson	4 Hadfield Tce, Kelburn
9	Ann Louise Mitcalfe	4 Hadfield Tce, Kelburn
10	Richard Norman	1 Stafford Street, Mt Victoria
11	Bea Hamer	4a Pomare Street, Ngaio
12	Dylan Cross	1/19 Onslow Rd, Khandallah
13	Paula Warren	21 Weesley Road, Kelburn
14	Shelagh Cox	5c Mansfield Towers, 1 Grant Rd, Thorndon
15	David and Gillian Ryrie	215 Buckley Road, Southgate
16	Shyam Masalawala	56/72 Tory Street, Te Aro
17	Anne Phillips	15 Burnell Avenue, Thorndon
18	John Rimmer	3a/52 Molesworth Street, Wellington
19	Brian Shillito	20 Burma Road, Khandallah
20	Mike Henderson	75 Fyvie Avenue, Tawa
21	Deryk and Jan McNamara	2 Tai Paku Paku Rd, Karaka Bays
22	Tristan Campbell	36-8 Leeds Street, Te Aro
23	Owen Watson	13 Queen St, Wellington
24	Michael Gibson	
25	Jacque Aldridge	1 Sunshine Avenue, Karori
26	Kara Lipski	2-7 109 Coromandel St, Newtown
27	David Lawrence	27 Imran Tce, Khandallah
28	Hamish Krimp	8B Norna Crescent, Kelburn
29	Margaret Hurst	8 Dorset Way, Wilton
30	Sunny Collings	220, 28 Waterloo Quay, Wellington
31	Jeanette Brunton	97 Calcutta Street, Khandallah
32	Ian Fisher	Adelaide Road, Newtown
33	Pauline and Athol Swann	47 Mairangi Road, Wadestown
34	Brian Speechly	9/B Dekka Street, Khandallah
35	Michelle Fyson and Nick Blake	
36	Carolyn Nimmo	26 Thornycroft Avenue, Epuni
37	Joel Latimer	56 Sar Street, Wellington
38	Gina Fell	11 Lane Place, Palmerston North
39	Mr Phillips	1 The Terrace, Wellington
40	Ngaio Taylor	5 Hewett Way, Ngaio
41	Greg Thomas	38 Hobson Street, Wellington
42	James Cone	150A Tinakori Road, Thorndon
43	John Wootton	Appt 302, 1 Queens Wharf, Wellington

44	Mrs Norman	24 Oaklands Road, Bristol
45	Anna Sheffield	PO Box 11591 Manners Street, Wellington
46	Catherine Keating	P2/99 Dixon Street, Wellington
47	Brian Brown	16 Rewa Road, Haitaitai
48	Linda Barton	16 Rewa Road, Haitaitai
49	Joan McLay	2957 Kalakava Avenue #216, Wellington
50	Sophia Hardie	12 Benge Crescent, Naenae
51	Rachel Hughes	11 Fettes Crescent, Seatoun
52	Jacqueline Haydn	14 Ranfurly Tce, Mt Cook
53	John Galloway	26A Rajkot Terrace, Broadmeadows
54	Tony Hurst	8 Dorset Way, Wilton
55	Matthew Underwood	PO Box 12360, Wellington
56	Lorraine and David Grace	3/17 Lower Street, Karori
57	George Preddy	39 Anne Street, Wadestown
58	Dean Stanley	324 Queens Drive, Lyall Bay
59	Paul Wavish	21 Bank Road, Northland
60	Josh Haddon	
61	Peter Bennett	7 Rutland Way, Wadestown
62	Martin Shelton	1 Upland Road, Kelburn
63	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Roseneath
64	Janet Tremewan	7 Paparata Street, Wellington
65	Lavo	
66	Warren Dickinson	101 Beauchamp Street, Karori
67	Coral Aitchison	
68	Gayle Cullwick	46a Grafton Road, Roseneath
69	Robert Stephens	32 Glen Road, Kelburn
70	David Forster	49 Bidwill Street, Mt Cook
71	Alice Beasley	37 Hay Street, Oriental Bay
72	David Underwood	
73	Rachel Underwood	14 Rimu Road, Wellington
74	Waterfront Watch	PO Box 19045, Wellington
75	Jill Burdett	49 Milne Terrace, Island Bay
76	Catherine Underwood	22 Taft Street, Brooklyn
77	Patricia and Neil Fraser	
78	David Barber	106 Warwick Street, Wilton
79	Ralph Wilkinson	9 Dover Street, Island Bay
80	Philippa Boardman	64 Quebec Street, Kingston
81	Janice Fraser	4/23 Reading Street, Karori
82	Peter Henderson	78 Homebush Road, Khandallah
83	Mary Munro	1 Orari Street, Ngail
84	Fisher	Karori
85	Julia Burgess	27 William Street, Haitaitai
86	Stephen Fogarty	14c Upton Tce, Thorndon
87	Sue Watt	91 Marjoribanks Street, Mt Victoria
88	Jonanna Newman	
89	Russell Tregonning	
90	Wellington Civic Trust -- Alan Smith	PO Box 10183 Wellington

91	Alana Bowman	PO Box 24332 Wellington
92	Audrey Cook	
93	NZHPT -- Alison Dangerfield	PO Box 2629 Wellington
94	Wellington City Youth Council -- Jack Marshall	
95	Patrick McCombs	9/91 Austin St, Mt Victoria
96	Karen Wallace	1291 Akatarawa Road RD2, Akatarawa
97	Frances Lee	24 Orari Street, Wellington
98	Chris Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay
99	Jocelyn Brooks	3/91 Austin Street, Mt Victoria
100	Lynne Roborgh	93 Tio Tio Road, Seatoun
101	David Lee	PO Box 19091, Wellington
102	Patricial Norton and Ian Frater	130 Owen Street, Newtown
103	Wellington Sculpture Trust	PO Box 195, Wellington
104	Robyn Procter	4 Moana Rd, Plimmerton
105	Lyn Garrett	96 Fraser Ave, Johnsonville
106	Lydia Hamer	499 Riverside Dr, Fairfield
107	Pamela Tregonning	5 Anne Street, Wadestown
108	Brian Burrell	38 Marewa Road, HAITAITAI
109	Anne Ryan	67 Para Street, Miramar
110	Ralph Jorgensen	405 Makara Road, Makara
111	Ron England	8/16a Lyndhurst Rd, Tawa
112	Victor Davie	4 Claremont Grove, Mt Victoria
113	Ruby Woodward	9 Breaker Bay Rd, Wellington
114	Silvia McIntyre	18 Harewood Grove, Pinehaven
115	Mary Wooton	302/1 Queens Wharf
116	Ann Hannah	2/159 Hobart Street, Mirimar
117	Yvonne Mewton	11/6064 Courtney Place
118	Greenstone Design -- G Souter-Brown	5a Leyton St, Wadestown
119	Matthew Sew Hoy	155 Glenmore Street, Wellington
120	Ms Anna	
121	Anne Heyns	7b 5 Kent Terrace, Wellington
122	Gill Rodger	96 The Terrace, Wellington
123	Paul McCardle	1a Sunrise Blvd, Tawa
124	Diane Varey	2/50 Dornett Street, Nelson
125	Carl Howarth	8/33 Hania Street, Mt Victoria
126	Malin Mosin	5 Queen Street, Mt Victoria
127	Tracy Price	9 Mulberry Street, Maungaraki
128	Vicky Mabin	8 Crofton Road, Ngaio
129	Theresa Keogh	11a Severn Street, Island Bay
130	David Carter	317 Charteris Bay Road, Lyttelton
131	Alice Phillips	73/43 Mulgrave Street, Thorndon
132	Paul Feenstra	12 Murphy Street, Thorndon
133	Mary Nixon	35 Clyde Street, Island Bay
134	David Nisbet	35 Clyde Street, Island Bay
135	Alan Whiting	15 Orchard Street, Wadestown
136	Jacob Treder	249 Tinakori Road

137	Jenny Lewis	70 Cecil Road, Wadestown
138	Donald Woodward	95 Breaker Bay Road, Breaker Bay
139	David Stevens	63 Rangoon St, Khandallah
140	Chris Murray	8 Dyer St, Epuni
141	David Wallace	26 Jefferson St, Brooklyn
142	Robert Cameron	Lvl 25, 125 The Terrace, Wellington
143	Matt Farrar	30 Queen St, Mt Victoria
144	Curtis O'Connor	8 North Tce, Kelburn
145	Andrew Field	42 Austin Street, Mt Victoria
146	Matt McGuinness	27 The Parade, Island Bay
147	Adam Guile	40 Northland Road, Northland
148	Gerard Andrews	91 Pinehaven Road, Silverstream
149	Steven Becker	63 Brussels Street, Mirimar
150	Wendell Phillips	Vipond Road Whangaparoa
151	Mr Master	
152	Ralph Goodwin	26 Golf Road, Heretaunga
153	Max Brown	
154	Nicholas Reeve	15 Inglis Street, Seatoun
155	Matthew St Amand	9 Rydal Place, Island Bay
156	Anne McKinnon	46B Simla Crescent, Khandallah
157	Mark Hargreaves	26 Wade Street, Wadestown
158	Matthew Whimp	24 Fancourt Street, Karori
159	Edith Ryan	46B Simla Crescent, Khandallah
160	David Atkins	9A/20 Oriental Terrace, Oriental Bay
161	Maria van der Meel	2/20 Trent Street, Island Bay
162	Elaine Hampton	52 Porritt Ave, Mt Victoria
163	Frances Robinson	15 Talavera Tce, Wellington
164	DNZ -- Andrew Hay	P O Box 2879, Wellington
165	Tim Park	2/9 Hawker Street, Mt Victoria
166	Phil Royal	36 Forres Street, Seatoun
167	Janice Schone	354 The Esplanade, Island Bay
168	Roger Twose	
169	David Zwartz	54 Central Terrace, Kelburn
170	Carol Hardie	6 Dunmail Way, Newlands
171	Duncan Garvie	40 Palliser Road, Roseneath
172	Rosemarie Bowers	PO Box 11024, Wellington
173	Paul O'Regan	81a Awa Road, Karaka Bay
174	Fran Parkin	319/28 Waterloo Quay, Wellington
175	Margaret Shepherd	68 Hector Street, Seatoun
176	Leslie Tarpley	14 Cheshire Street, Wilton
177	Sandy Morrison	
178	Chamber of Commerce	
179	Sunita Singh	
180	Anne Weinbrenner	
181	Margaret Gordon	
182	Guy Marriage	
183	Chris Horne and Barbara Mitcalfe	

184	Architectural Centre	
185	Ken New and Ruth Pemberton	
186	Maddy Wallace	
187	Frances and Bryden Williamson	55 Jubilee Road, Khandallah
188	CentrePort -- Nick Wareham	
189	Paul Wilson	120 Glenmore Street, Wellington
190	K. Smith	12a Rotherham Tce, Mirimar
191	David Flynn	27 Waipapa Road, Haitaitai
192	Janet Pascoe	36 Chelmsford Street, Ngaio
193	Teremoana Sparks	13a Palm Grove, Belmont
194	Fiona Falconer	1 Heke Street, Ngaio
195	Charles Dawson	24 Spencer Street, Crofton Downs
196	Ross Thornton	20 Linu Road, Newlands