

**APPENDIX 2**

**RECORD OF PRE-APPLICATION MEETING**

## Pre-Application Meeting Feedback

<b>Date:</b>	03 March 2016	<b>SR Number:</b>	351835
<b>Address:</b>	29 Jervois Quay, Wellington (AKA Frank Kitts Park)	<b>File Reference:</b>	1909364
<b>Planner:</b>	Claire Moore		
<b>Attendees:</b>	<u>Council</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Angela McArthur (Landscape Architect)</li> <li>• Bec Ramsay (Reserves Planner)</li> </ul>	<u>Applicant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alistair Aburn</li> <li>• Michael Faherty</li> <li>• John Hardwick Smith</li> <li>• Jaden from Athfield Architects</li> <li>• Blair</li> </ul>	
<b>Distribution:</b>	Attendees		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Modification of Frank Kitts Park including the introduction of a Chinese garden and lantern cafe		
<b>Relevant District Plan documents:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operative District Plan</li> </ul> <p>Although not a District Plan document, the Waterfront Framework is an important guide for the expectation of applications in the waterfront area.</p>		
<b>District Plan area and notations:</b>	<p>The site is located within the Central Area.</p> <p>The following District Plan notations apply to the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lambton Harbour Area (LHA)</li> <li>- Hazard (ground shaking) Area</li> <li>- Sunlight Protection Area (Appendix 7, Frank Kitts Park)</li> <li>- View Shafts 10 and 11</li> </ul>		
<b>Resource consent required for:</b>	<u>District Plan:</u> <b>13.4.5 (DU)</b> - Modification of existing open space in the LHA <b>13.4.7 (DU)</b> - Construction of buildings and structures in the LHA that do not meet permitted requirements of 13.3.5. <b>30.2.2 (DR)</b> - The area will exceed 250m <sup>2</sup>		
<b>Comments and feedback:</b>	<p>The following are comments either in relation to matters discussed at the meeting, or made after the meeting:</p> <p><u>Bec Ramsay (Reserves):</u></p> <p>Ms Ramsay emphasised that Parks are keen to see the introduction of a few skateboard friendly spaces/surfaces as this group is a legitimate user of the waterfront and it is best to cater to them rather than try to deter them. This could be done simply through ensuring some of the furniture is “skate-able”.</p> <p>Furthermore, with regards to the resource consent process, Ms Ramsay questioned whether a maintenance condition could be included to capture the need for the detailed thinking still to be done around detailed design for planting - appropriate space, soil build up, irrigation, plant species choice etc. It would also include both short (establishment period) and long term maintenance and management plans for the landscaping. There has already been some discussion around this between Parks and City Shapers as the project progresses.</p> <p><u>Angela McArthur (Landscape Architect):</u></p>		



	<p>Overall, Ms McArthur considers the proposal to be of a high standard. Ms McArthur has made the following comments which should be reflected through information provided with the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planting and ground preparation specifications that will ensure good plant establishment and ease of maintenance and the maintenance period.</li> <li>• Details about Tree management of existing specimens to be retained around the site and those to be relocated.</li> <li>• Ensure proposed species within the Chinese garden areas are robust enough to tolerate site conditions.</li> </ul> <p><u>General Planning:</u></p> <p><i>Viewshafts:</i> I stressed in the meeting that the policy surrounding viewshafts in the central area does not necessarily seek to ensure nothing impinges on the viewshaft, rather, the policy talks about protect and enhance. This gives room for the improvement of a viewshaft, and relying on the comments of TAG and their original assessment in 2008 of this same (or very similar) project, the proposal seems to enhance the viewshaft by removing clutter that is scattered throughout the shaft and instead condensing the infringement.</p> <p>Furthermore, the earthworks and levelling of the park to increase access to the waterfront and promenade will also enhance the visual connection of the city to the waterfront and this will contribute to a sense of greater openness.</p> <p><i>Wall of Remembrance:</i> The location of this wall allows the open lawn area to be level with the promenade and opens up the views from the city to the waterfront as discussed above. I noted that as a matter of respect, the applicant should discuss the location of plaques and the wall with the relevant groups.</p> <p><i>Notification:</i> Despite what was discussed through the pre-application meeting of buildings being the trigger for Policy 12.2.8.8, I have since read through the Waterfront Framework which sets a clear expectation for full notification for applications that are in the waterfront and which do not have explicit non-notification through the District Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, after speaking to Gerald Blunt from City Shapers, it is clear that City Shapers have informed the public through consultation last year that the application will be publically notified, and thus, the application should be made to Council on this basis.</p>
<p><b>Next steps/Action points:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss the wall of plaques with the relevant groups.</li> <li>• Get a TAG review regarding the new wall of plaques and an addendum to their viewshaft analysis from 2008 which notes the changes that have been made since this analysis.</li> <li>• Prepare viewshaft analysis' imaging- this should show the current and proposed view from the points detailed in Appendix 11 for viewshafts 10 and 11.</li> <li>• 3D images along Jervois Quay will assist the understanding of how the redevelopment will appear and work.</li> <li>• CEPTED analysis of the redevelopment design- the design guide for design against crime may be a useful reference point.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of earthworks and an earthworks management plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Pre-application process:</b>	<p>For your information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pre-application process is confidential.</li> <li>• All time spent on this process by Council officers will be charged at a rate of \$155/hour, with invoicing on a monthly basis or when the resource consent application is lodged. If you would like an update of time spent on the pre-application please contact me.</li> </ul>

**Claire Moore**  
Consents Planner

Date: 14 March 2016

**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.**