

---

## **FEEDBACK ON THE 2006/07 DRAFT WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

---

### **1. Purpose of Report**

To provide the Subcommittee with a summary of the feedback received during consultation on the draft Waterfront Development Plan for 2006/07.

### **2. Recommendations**

It is recommended the Subcommittee:

- 1. Receive the information*
- 2. Recommend to the Strategy and Policy Committee that it approve the draft Waterfront Development Plan subject to any changes as a result of the oral submissions.*
- 3. Approve the 2006/07 programme of work outlined in Appendix Three of this report.*

### **3. Background**

The draft Waterfront Development Plan was presented to the Subcommittee on 8 May 2006 and was made available for consultation from Thursday 11 May to Friday 9 June. Late submissions were accepted.

Thirty-four submissions were received by the closing date, and three submissions were received during the week following the deadline. A summary of the submissions is attached as Appendix One to this report and a full copy of the submission is in Report 1.

The plan was advertised through the Dominion Post, the Wellingtonian and the Capital Times and on the Council's website. The Council made the draft policy and submission form available at the Council reception desk at 101 Wakefield Street and at Wellington city libraries. Copies were also available on request and were provided to the Council's Call Centre to mail out when requested and the information could also be downloaded from the Council's website.

Wellington Waterfront Limited produced an 'On The Waterfront' Special Edition advising of the release, availability and deadlines for submission of the draft Development Plan to 763 recipients who subscribe to the On The Waterfront e-newsletter. Hard copies of the Draft Plan were also made available by WWL alongside print offs of submission forms at OPT Public Open Day, Saturday 13 June (attended by approximately 200 people) and in the WWL Information Centre and offices from Monday 15 May to present.

It should be noted that in terms of the contents of the Development Plan, there is no significant change in scope from what has been indicated in earlier plans, but the timing of some projects has changed. The Plan continues to implement the Framework and elements of the Plan are consulted on as separate initiatives as well. A copy of the draft Waterfront Development Plan is attached as Appendix Two.

A programme of work for the Waterfront has been derived from the plan – this is presented in Appendix Three.

## **4. Analysis**

### **4.1 Summary of Written Submissions**

Appendix Two provides a summary of all comments, and the submissions themselves are included in their entirety in Report 1. Thirty-seven submissions were received, of which thirty-three were made by individuals and four were made by groups. The details below outline the key assertions made by the submitters but it should be noted that not all points made in submissions have been included.

#### **Waterfront Development**

There were nine submissions supporting the 2006/07 draft Waterfront Development Plan, though two of these felt that the process was taking too long. Six submissions said that there should be no further construction on the waterfront and that there should be more parks and open spaces. Two submissions said that it was important to ensure easy pedestrian access to the whole of the waterfront.

Two submissions considered that waterfront development needed to consist of a good mixture of commercial, residential and public activity and that the necessary public expenditure should be partially funded by commercial development. Two submissions expressed a concern that ground floor public space was being converted to commercial offices, in contrast to the aims of the framework. Further to this, one submitter questioned where all the proposed ground floor activity was going to come from, and that vacancies were a cost to ratepayers.

Two submissions expressed concern over the scale and clarity of presentations, questioning whether or not the information being presented might be misleading.

### **Public Engagement**

There were four submissions claiming that the public engagement process was flawed. Reasons given for this included project timing and scope being determined prior to public consultation and that insufficient public presentations are made in advance of consultation. Two submissions also claimed that correspondences from the public to the Waterfront Development Subcommittee were not acknowledged and there was nothing to indicate that they were even considered and that the Subcommittee meet too infrequently to stay connected with the public.

### **Finance**

Two submissions mentioned a lack of financial analysis to substantiate the developments being proposed.

### **Queens Wharf**

Four submissions expressed concerns over the early stages of development of Site 7. They felt that the development was too big, didn't fit with its surroundings and blocked views of the sea and Sheds 11 and 13. Five submissions specifically opposed any development on Sites 8, 9 and 10 because of the further restriction of views and the necessary long term leases, effectively privatising public land that this would entail.

Two submissions stated that the open space associated with Shed 21 was of poor quality and that the heritage retention of the building was low.

### **Hotel on Outer T**

Eleven submissions said that there should not be a hotel of any kind on the waterfront, reasons for this included traffic issues and restricted access to public land. One submitter said that any other city in the world would welcome having a Hilton Hotel built in its harbour whilst other suggested locations for a 5-star hotel were Site 9/10 and the top eight floors of the Post Office building.

### **Frank Kitts Park**

Eleven submissions opposed any changes in Frank Kitts Park which is considered to be 'full and well used' and some of the activities that might be displaced (as a result of the proposed relocation of the Chinese Gardens) could not easily be held at Waitangi Park. Four of these submissions also suggested that the Chinese Community have been treated poorly over the entire affair and further delays may jeopardise their enthusiasm and financial support. Two submissions supported the relocation of the Chinese Gardens to Frank Kitts Park.

One submission noted that the location of the Chinese Garden was originally approved as being part of Waitangi Park so that if it is changing it should be part of a separate, specific consultation.

### **Taranaki Wharf**

Two submissions opposed the construction of a second bridge from Civic Square to Taranaki Wharf.

## **Waitangi Park**

Two submitters praised the development of Waitangi Park though one of these questioned the estimated cost of \$23 million. Three submitters opposed there being buildings of any kind in the transition areas within Waitangi Park.

## **Other**

Other points for the Subcommittee to note were:

- Council advertising should be placed in supermarkets to increase the audience and response numbers
- Waterfront framework principles need updating to make allowances for future climate changes and to be more sustainable
- Part of the waterfront should be set aside for a campervan park to encourage visitors to spend more time in the city

## **5. Changes Indicated**

### ***5.1 Written Submissions***

From the summary of key points, it can be seen that whilst there is reasonable support for the development plan from the submissions received, there are strong views on two particular issues, namely the proposed Hilton on the Outer-T and the proposed redesign of Frank Kitts Park. It should be noted that the Hilton proposal has already been approved by Council and the project is subject to the resource consent process. In addition, the redesign of Frank Kitts Park to incorporate the Chinese Garden does not represent a significant change to the framework, it is simply a location change which has been requested by the Chinese Community.

However, as there were only 36 submissions it is not possible to establish that there is a widely held view of any of the issues raised. There are a range of views that touch on both aspects of project development and on communication and consultation.

Opportunities to comment on specific proposals are also provided throughout the implementation of projects. The Outer-T resource consent process has included public submissions and the design brief for Frank Kitts Park will be the subject of a separate consultation process

Accordingly it is recommended that no changes be made to the 2006/07 draft Waterfront Development Plan as a result of written submissions received.

### ***5.2 Oral Submissions***

On the Submission form for the draft Development Plan, members of the public were asked if they would like to make an oral submission. Sixteen people requested the opportunity to make an oral submission, and the names of the submitters, and the times at which they have been invited to speak have been previously detailed in Report 1.

As noted above, based on the written submissions no changes to the draft Development Plan are recommended. However, members of the Subcommittee will listen to the oral submissions and make any changes to the plan that they consider necessary as a result.

## **6. Conclusion**

The consultation process allowed individuals and groups to provide their thoughts and suggestions on the 2006/07 draft Waterfront Development Plan. No changes to the plan are currently indicated, subject to the outcome of the oral submissions.

*Report prepared by: Ian Clements, Portfolio Manager, Council Controlled Organisations*

## Supporting Information

### **1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome**

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

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

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

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

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

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

*C378 Wellington Waterfront Project*

*A312 Wellington Waterfront Operations*

*CX131 Wellington Waterfront Development.*

*In accord with the 2006/07 LTCCP.*

### **3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations**

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

### **4) Decision-Making**

*This is not a significant decision. The report deals with a strategic asset, but does not propose any changes to the development plan*

### **5) Consultation**

#### **a) General Consultation**

*Consultation will be undertaken on the draft development plan. All affected parties will be included, and any feedback will be reported to the Subcommittee.*

#### **b) Consultation with Maori**

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

### **6) Legal Implications**

*There are no implications from this report.*

### **7) Consistency with existing policy**

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

**Summary of Submissions on draft Waterfront Development  
Plan**

## Appendix 2