

Pre-Application Meeting Feedback

Meeting Date:	7 th June 2018	SR Number:	384736
Address:	Site 9 – Wellington Waterfront 15 Customhouse Quay, Wellington Central		
Planner:	Elliott Thornton		
Attendees:	<u>Council</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elliott Thornton, Senior Consents Planner • Soon Teck Kong, Manager, Networks Operations • Amanda Mulligan, Senior Heritage Advisor • Robin Simpson (representing TAG as Council's external Urban Design Advisor) • Gerald Blunt, Design Manager 	<u>Applicant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alistair Aburn, Planner, Urban Perspectives • Deyana Popova, Urban Design, Urban Perspectives • Rosaline Luxford, Willis and Bond • Andrew Bishop, Architect • John Hardwick-Smith, Architect 	
Purpose of Meeting:	To discuss a proposal to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construct a new building on the Wellington Waterfront (Site 9) and carry out a commercial activity (retail and office) 		
District Plan:	<p>The site is located in the Central Area.</p> <p>The following District Plan notations apply to the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lambton Harbour Area - Hazard (Ground Shaking) Area - Heritage Building (ref: 333) adjoining - Height Limit is Zero Metres above Mean Sea level - Arterial Road (Waterloo Quay and Customhouse Quay) - Inner Port Noise Affected Area – Central Area - Port Noise Control Line - Appendix 11 – Viewshaft 4 (Whitmore Street) - Appendix 11 – Viewshaft 5 (Waring Taylor Street) <p>Resource consent will be required under the following Rules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rule 13.4.7 – Construction of new building and structures in the Lambton Harbour Area - Rule 30.2.2 – Earthworks that are not compliant with conditions in 30.1.3 (area of earthworks exceeds 250m²) <p>Overall, the proposal will be a Discretionary (Unrestricted) activity under the District Plan.</p>		
<p>It is noted that at the March 2018 meeting no major concerns were raised by Council. At the March 2018 meeting it was suggested that a list of technical and supporting documents should be submitted for consideration prior to lodgement, the applicant should detail servicing of the building and responds to the provisions of the Central Area Urban Design Guide in particular with relation to improving the interface and extent of active façade to Customhouse / Waterloo Quay.</p>			

Several meetings have been held since March 2018 with Council's urban design advisor(s) the Waterfront Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and subsequently the design has been amended.

The applicant provided an overview of key changes post the design presented to Council on March 2018. The key changes include :

- Amendments to the ground floor resulting in a reduced building core;
- Improvements to the lobby providing a thoroughfare between Customhouse Quay and the Waterfront;
- Increased ground floor tenancy frontage to Customhouse Quay; and
- Variations to the façade as a result of thermal modelling in particular increased the extent of solid façade from 1/6 to approximately 1/3 and further details of solid panelling.

The applicant reaffirmed that the intended activity is for commercial (office) purposes along with ground floor retail.

Urban Design:

- Alterations to the façade design and materials will be presented to TAG for further assessment and any comments circulated via Council to the applicant.
- It is requested that as part of the resource consent, sufficient details are provided of façade materials including the outcomes sought by various elements and materials. While it is noted that some flexibility in the final material choice could be carried out during detailed design, it is desirable that examples that achieve the outcomes sought be submitted as part of the resource consent.
- It is requested that façade treatment and materials proposed provide differentiation between Site 9 and Site 10.
- Details of floor heights and overall height must be submitted along with the relationship of these heights to Site 10 and Shed 13. It is suggested that a cross section layout be submitted showing the comparative height of the proposal, Site 10 and Shed 13.
- It has previously been noted and minutes that TAG believes that the proposal is on track to meet the criteria for design excellence (refer to TAG minutes December 2017).

Traffic:

- The proposal should provide a low speed environment along the Waterfront for servicing and reduce potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. Suggested design improvements would include narrowing of the Waterfront laneway, use of kerb and queues to identify that the area is a low speed environment.

The applicant and TAG advised that the laneway design has consent and will not be altered in any significant way by this development. They ascertain that potential laneway conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles had previously been considered. They note that servicing along the Waterfront is predominately carried out during the evening with the exception of daytime courier deliveries. There is a preference throughout the Waterfront to minimise distinctive kerbs or bollards that would separate pedestrians and vehicles although note that there is a slight kerb along the laneway. They also advise that overall servicing of the Waterfront is managed differently to the rest of the CBD and that the use of textural paving, planting, and signage at the entrance to the Waterfront provide sufficient cues to identify the area as a low speed environment. They also note that sculptures proposed within close proximity to Site 9 would also assist in prompting a slower speed environment.

I have since reviewed the previous consent (SR320128) and note that the consent was based on Site 9 being utilised as a car park and potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles along Kumutoto Lane around Site 10.

This proposal does have the potential to increase pedestrian traffic and servicing along the laneway around Site 9. This does not necessarily require modifications to the laneway design, however we will require sufficient details to be submitted with a resource consent

demonstrating how the shared space around Site 9 will be a low speed environment and how potential conflicts will be effectively managed through design.

We will also require details as to how the space between Whitmore Plaza and Site 9 will be utilised and discouraged for the parking of vehicles or deliveries. We note this was a potential site for a future sculpture. This will need to be confirmed as part of the resource consent.

If the open space area is to be amended by the proposal, a comparison of the changes to the open space area should be clearly identified and whether this is to be managed through a new resource consent or a section 127 to consent SR320128 under the Resource Management Act 1991.

Heritage:

- It is noted that the heritage fences post location has altered slightly. No significant concerns are raised at this point.

Wind:

(not present at meeting, however from emailed notes provided prior to meeting)

- Without a wind tunnel test it is impossible to make a genuinely useful prediction
- With the proximity of the outdoor public recreation space defined by this building and the Meridian building it seems there is a strong case requiring detailed wind tunnel examination of the impact on this park / public outdoor space
- Based on Site 10, the building will likely halve the wind in many of the adjacent spaces. Wind currently blows across the site from two wind directions at present, with the building in place, for many points, the wind can only blow from one direction.
- The detailing of the wall, looking at the public spaces immediately adjacent to the building will be the key: at present, without a wind tunnel test, the standard reaction to the design is that the overhangs and colonnade designs risk the channelling of wind and are typically advised against. A wind tunnel would reveal what works and is not in line with the general guidance
- A response to the Design Guidelines for Wind should be carried out and submitted with a resource consent.

Planning:

- It is noted that resource consent is proposed to be lodged in June and that it is anticipated that a decision to request direct referral to the Environment Court will be carried out during or post notification period. Council will undertake to share any submissions that are received with the applicant as soon as practical after being aware of the submission during the notification process.
- No significant concerns have been raised overall during the pre-application meetings. It is noted that the applicant has made significant efforts to provide a design that responds to the matters raised in the pre-application meeting with Council and TAG as well as responding to the surrounding area and provisions of the District Plan. The list of technical documents to accompany the consent appears to include sufficient detail to enable a thorough assessment.
- It should be confirmed that viewshafts in the District Plan are not affected along with providing sufficient views of the building from various points or an animated flythrough of the development.
- The urban design assessment must respond to both the Wellington Waterfront Framework and the Central Urban Design Guide.
- The site is not defined by a cadastral boundary. Where not defined by cadastral boundaries, generally a site includes any external aspects necessary to service the development including access for both pedestrians and vehicles and any external embellishments

associated with the building (eg. landscaping and outdoor dining areas). It is suggested sufficient information be provided to define the extent of the 'site' subject to a resource consent (eg. metes and bounds).

- The extent of earthworks should be confirmed to determine if earthworks rules (particularly in relation to area of earthworks to accommodate the building) is triggered.
- Any changes to the open space area external to the building may require modifications to SR320128 under s127 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Sufficient details must be submitted to show any changes proposed.
- A flowchart of Resource Management Act 1991 timeframes and processes would be helpful particularly where direct referral to the Environment Court is carried out.
- Subject to a detailed assessment, the Council is generally supportive of the proposal.

Next Steps:

- TAG will meet to discuss in further detail the changes to the external façade.
- Lodgement of the resource consent is anticipated during June.

Information to include with the application:

- As per list of technical reports and authors submitted to Council in email dated 30th May 2018.
- Full response to the Central Area District Plan provisions including compliance with Central Area Permitted Standards and the Central Area Objectives and Policies.

Draft Design Excellence Criteria:

Design excellence requires:

- *A coherent and concept driven design, relevant to its context. This will include a thorough site analysis identifying matters of importance to the site and how they influence the design.*
- *A design that enhances:*
 - *The site*
 - *The street (including neighbouring buildings)*
 - *The urban block*
 - *The wider city*
- *A high level of internal and external building functionality and amenity*
- *Three dimensional articulation of building form and building top to reduce the visual impact of the building, mitigate wind effects, and create a strong architectural identity.*
- *Detailing and materials that add visual interest to the façades*
- *A design which goes over and above what would normally be expected to satisfy the Central Area Urban design Guide provisions.*

Senior Consents Planner

Date: 18th June 2018

Please note:

Pre-application meetings are conducted on the basis of information available at the time. Please note that the provision of further information or changes in project scope may impact on the Council's view of your application.

A pre-application meeting is a voluntary meeting organised by the Council to help you through the consent process. Formal decisions cannot be made during or on the basis of the pre-application meeting and any representations made by the Council are not legally binding.

Time spent by the Council's officers in relation to this meeting will be charged to the applicant in accordance with the Council's current fee schedule. An invoice for the meeting and associated costs will be sent in due course.

TAG DESIGN REVIEW RECORD

Date 27 June 2018
Subject TAG Review – Site 9 Façade Design Development

The following notes are from the urban design pre-application meeting held 9.30am, 26 June 2018 at Shed 6. They have been prepared by Graeme McIndoe, and reviewed and approved by all TAG members.

Present:

David McGuinness	Willis Bond
John Hardwick-Smith	Athfield Architects
Andre Bishop	Athfield Architects
Alistair Aburn	Urban Perspectives
Deyana Popova	Urban Perspectives
Elliott Thornton	WCC Senior Consent Planner
Sarah Duffell	WCC Urban Designer
Chris McDonald	TAG
Robin Simpson	TAG
Stuart Gardyne	TAG
Graeme McIndoe	TAG (Chairman)

1. The meeting was held to discuss the applicant's response to the TAG Design Review Memo of 20 June 2018.
2. TAG noted that since early iterations up to and including the current, there has been general improvement and refinement of various aspects of the building planning and design. TAG also confirmed that the issue for discussion for this meeting (as noted on 20 June) is composition and detailing of the main west and west facades, plus addressing information on proposed facade materials.
3. Athfield Architects (JH-S and AB) presented a package of drawings dated 26 June 2018 which describe recent façade development including the Willis Bond/Athfield Architects design response to the 20 June TAG memo.

Applicant's drivers for façade change

4. JH-S described drivers to recent design changes including:
 - a. feedback from services engineer on need for more solar mitigation and hence a reduced proportion of glazing;
 - b. Intention to achieve aesthetic contrast between eastern and western sides; and
 - c. Logic of increased 'density' of solid on the east as being part of the intended abstract reference to a series of stacked containers, complementing the abstract 'gantry' of the Site 10 building.

These drivers and the proposed design response (as tabled in this 26 June meeting and discussed in more detail below) are accepted as appropriate.

East façade composition

5. The latest east facade configuration maintains the previously described higher proportion of solid (one third), but describes a greater degree of irregularity relative to the version reviewed on 20 June.

- a. TAG considers that this latest composition successfully addresses concerns about the previous 'chequerboard' approach, and the increased intensity of 'solid' relative to glazing is an improvement on earlier versions.
- b. It offers a level of aesthetic sophistication that successfully makes abstract reference to the concept of stacked containers with irregularity in our view better representing the variation of container aesthetic while strongly expressing the container module at floor levels.

West façade composition

6. The approach of this façade facing the CBD being aesthetically 'slippery' and reflective is supported. The scenario of one panel of glazing per floor (with concealed spandrel and ceiling void pans behind) is strongly preferred over the alternative also presented of three glazed panels over 2 floors.
7. There was discussion around the glazing treatment with reference to the different treatments used on levels 1 and 2, and 3 and 4 of the Site 10 building. TAG preference is for use of the approach seen on levels 3 and 4 of the Site 10 building.
8. Detail at the top of the ground floor wall was discussed given the need to provide for seismic movement, and that movement potentially impacting on the top of the brick wall (and glazing) at ground. AB identified two approaches being replacement of the top brick panel with a full width, horizontal sacrificial panel, or partial panels in the location of the base isolators. TAG considers that this can be satisfactorily resolved with either compositional approach, subject to design investigation.

Resolution of diagonal bracing

9. Athfield Architects described the slot between the western and eastern building forms which receives the diagonal bracing, which resolves TAG's 20 June concern in this regard.

Confirmation of materials and detail

10. The challenge of having sufficient information on materials and detail to allow consent assessment and give certainty on quality and the need to allow for flexibility for design development was discussed and accepted.
11. General intentions including metal and ceramic panels, various glazing types and aluminium for slab edges were discussed and are in principle appropriate, with this subject to approval of final choice of materials and related detailing.
12. The means of describing materials and detail for consent while allowing for appropriate flexibility is to be addressed by RMA planners.

Design excellence

13. TAG confirms that the latest iteration of the scheme as presented today displays design excellence, contingent on satisfactory resolution of materials and detail to be consistent with the intentions described. This is due to a combination of attributes including:
 - a. the quality of the proposed building form;
 - b. positive response at ground to a challenging four-fronted site;

- c. provision of base-isolated accommodation;
- d. positive relationship to waterfront spaces and city streets;
- e. recognition of the character of both the waterfront and CBD environment;
- f. integration of considered and subtle reference to other buildings; and
- g. sophisticated façade composition, assuming the changes discussed today are implemented.

14. TAG notes that there are various ways to achieve design excellence, with these relating to quality of response to context. In this waterfront context, in TAG's view excellence will be achieved by a building that relates positively to the context of other buildings and spaces, completing and contributing to the public realm in a refined and accomplished way, and that is the approach seen with this proposal.

END