

Before an Independent Commissioner of Wellington City Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a resource consent application for the Future Accommodation Strategy to develop the western portion of the site at 1 Molesworth Street, Wellington

**EVIDENCE OF PETER ALAN COOP ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT IN SUPPORT OF
APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT**

PLANNING

15 May 2023

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Peter Alan Coop. I am a self employed resource management consultant.

1.2 I am authorised by the Applicant, Parliamentary Service, on behalf of His Majesty the King, to give this statement of evidence.

2. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

2.1 My qualifications are a Bachelor of Arts, Diploma of Town Planning, and a Master of Public Policy.

2.2 I have over 40 years' experience in town planning/resource management. This includes 7 years as Wellington City Council's manager of resource consents and 6 years as the Council's manager of strategic planning and policy development. For the last 25 years, I have worked as a resource management consultant for Urban Perspectives Ltd and since 2022 in self-employment.

2.3 My experience has included the preparation of numerous applications for resource consents, applications for private District Plan Changes, submissions on Proposed Plans, and the preparation and presentation of expert evidence at Council, Board of Inquiry and Environment Court hearings.

2.4 For the last 6 years, I have provided resource management advice and assistance to Parliamentary Service in relation to proposed development of the Parliamentary Precinct, the applicable operative statutory provisions, and the Council's Proposed District Plan (**PDP**).

2.5 I prepared the Assessment of Environmental Effects (**AEE**) that was lodged with the application for resource consent that is the subject of this hearing.

3. CODE OF CONDUCT

3.1 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses outlined in the Environment Court's Practice Note (2023) (**Code**) and have complied with it in preparing this evidence. I also agree to follow the Code when presenting evidence to the Independent Hearing Commissioner. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I state that I rely upon the evidence of other expert witnesses. I also confirm that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my opinions.

4. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

4.1 My evidence will cover the following matters:

- (a) Summary of the proposal and the need for it.
- (b) Identify the District Plan provisions that apply to the proposal and the rules under which consent is sought.
- (c) Summarise the positive effects of the proposal.
- (d) Identify the potential adverse effects and how they will be avoided or appropriately mitigated.
- (e) Comment on the Council's report.
- (f) Assess the submissions.
- (g) Policy Assessment.
- (h) Provide a conclusion.

5. SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

5.1 The proposal is set out in the drawings and the design statement prepared by the project architects, Studio Pacific Architecture, provided with the Application. In summary, it proposes the construction of two buildings (**MUS** and **BAL**) and the construction of a landscaped and paved plaza (**LAN**) intended to transform the west half of the Precinct from what is currently predominantly a hard surface car park.

5.2 The need for, and desirability of, the proposal is addressed in sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the AEE, by the statement from the Speaker appended to the AEE, and in the statement of evidence of Mitch Knight.

5.3 In summary, the key outcomes that in my opinion the proposal will deliver include:

- (a) To enhance the vitality, vibrancy, efficiency and effectiveness of Parliament and its Precinct by consolidating and centralising Parliamentary functions on the Precinct and close to Parliament House - MUS.
- (b) To provide robust and self-sufficient accommodation for the National Crisis Management Centre and critical Government operations in the aftermath of a significant natural disaster affecting Wellington - MUS.
- (c) To provide centralized and enhanced security and management of deliveries and services to Parliament - BAL.
- (d) To integrate and transform the rear part of the Precinct with a pedestrian centered plaza and landscaping - LAN.

- (e) To free up space within Parliament House so that a greater appreciation of Parliament, its heritage and its functions can be presented to visitors and dignitaries.
- (f) To provide opportunities to change the physical appearance of the Precinct to better reflect tangata whenua and the Treaty of Waitangi.

6. APPLICABLE DISTRICT PLAN PROVISIONS AND RULES

- 6.1** In section 3.1 of the AEE, the relevant statutory provisions that are applicable to the proposal are identified. Section 3.2 (and drawing on Appendix 7 of the AEE) presents my assessment of the Operative District Plan rules under which consent is required for the proposal, including Discretionary Restricted Rule 13.3.8 for aspects of MUS that do not comply with the building standards, in this case wind speed and transport standards.
- 6.2** My assessment concluded that the bundled activity status is Discretionary Unrestricted.
- 6.3** In preparing my compliance assessment, I assessed that MUS complied with viewshafts standard 13.6.3.3 because MUS does not “intrude” into the margins and base of viewshaft 4A, and does not intrude between the view from the southeast corner of Whitmore and Featherston Streets, and the focal elements of the viewshaft which are “The Beehive” part of the Executive Wing and “The Cenotaph”.
- 6.4** Notwithstanding this, and because the activity status is Discretionary Unrestricted, included in the application drawings is drawing P A6-04 that shows MUS in relation to viewshaft 4A. From this drawing the extent to which MUS will affect the context elements of viewshaft 4A, these being “Tinakori Hill” and “Thorndon Residential Area” can be seen.

6.5 The Eldin Family Trust’s submission is that MUS does intrude into viewshaft 4A because it will change the extent to which the existing context elements behind the focal elements will be able to be seen from the viewpoint, and that this will detract from an appreciation of one of the two focal elements, “The Beehive” part of the Executive Wing.

6.6 The Applicant has since commissioned a registered surveyor (Hudson Moody) to prepare a certified drawing of MUS in relation to viewshaft 4A, and Mr Moody has provided a statement of evidence explaining this process. Mr Moody’s evidence confirms that drawing P A6-04 is an accurate representation of MUS in relation to viewshaft 4A. As noted in paragraph 8.7 below, the urban design experts for the Applicant and the Council consider that the effect of MUS on viewshaft 4A is acceptable.

7. POSITIVE EFFECTS

7.1 The proposal will have significant positive effects, including the following:

- (a) It will enhance the vitality, vibrancy, efficiency and effectiveness of Parliament and its Precinct by consolidating and centralising Parliamentary functions on the Precinct and close to Parliament House.
- (b) It will provide robust and self-sufficient accommodation for the National Crisis Management Centre and critical Government operations in the aftermath of a significant natural disaster affecting Wellington.
- (c) It will provide centralized and enhanced security and management of deliveries and services to Parliament.
- (d) It will integrate and transform the rear part of the Precinct with a pedestrian centered plaza and landscaping.

- (e) It will free up space within Parliament House so that a greater appreciation of Parliament, its heritage and its functions can be presented to visitors and dignitaries.
- (f) It will provide opportunities to change the physical appearance of the Precinct to better reflect tangata whenua and the Treaty of Waitangi.
- (g) It will improve the safety and efficiency of the intersection of The Terrace and Bowen Street.
- (h) It will promote the increased use of modes of transport other than by private motor vehicle by reducing on site car parking.
- (i) It will improve safety within this part of the Precinct by increased activity, increased surveillance from within the proposed buildings, better lighting, and the removal of surface car parking.
- (j) It will have positive hydraulic effects, including reduced stormwater discharges into the Council's reticulated system and reduced contaminants entering the system.
- (k) It will result in a better setting of the English Oak heritage tree.
- (l) It will strengthen the positive contribution the Precinct makes to the heritage of Wellington as New Zealand's Capital City by giving greater symbolic weight to the Precinct. This will be physically expressed through the additional Parliamentary buildings that are proposed and by the increased scale of Parliamentary activity on the Precinct.
- (m) It will reduce the need to develop Parliamentary buildings on other development sites within the Precinct such as on the Bowen

Street frontage (the ex-Broadcasting House site that currently contains the sculpture park).

8. EFFECTS ASSESSMENTS AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS OF CONSENT

8.1 The AEE contains the following effects assessments:

- (a) Maori Cultural Effects
- (b) Urban Design Effects
- (c) Heritage Effects
- (d) Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (**CPTED**) Effects
- (e) Relocation of the Heritage Oak Tree Effects
- (f) Geotechnical, Earthworks and Soil Contamination Effects
- (g) Wind Effects
- (h) Transportation Effects
- (i) 3 Waters Effects
- (j) Hazardous Substance Effects
- (k) Noise Effects
- (l) Construction Effects

8.2 Where these assessments identify that adverse effects can and should be avoided or appropriately mitigated, conditions of resource consent are proposed. These are briefly outlined in section 4.3 of the AEE. The Council's report contains a comprehensive set of proposed conditions of consent. I attach as Appendix 1 an updated set of these conditions with minor amendments sought by the Applicant.

Maori Cultural Effects

8.3 I consider the proposal is positive in this respect because of the opportunities it presents to better represent Maori culture within the Precinct. These opportunities are realized particularly in the proposed external design and appearance of MUS and other aspects of the proposal summarized in section 4.2.2 of the AEE. The proposal will complement the

ongoing co-design opportunities across the whole Precinct that are referred to in the evidence of Mr Wills and Mr Davis.

Urban Design Effects

8.4 The AEE contains an assessment of the urban design effects of the proposal by urban design experts McIndoe Urban Ltd, using (as required) the applicable District Plan design guides. Chris McDonald has also provided a statement of evidence that expands on this assessment. Those assessments conclude that the proposal is acceptable when assessed against the guides.

8.5 Drawing on the above assessments, and in relation to the proposed siting, height and mass of MUS and BAL (particularly in relation to Parliament House) I consider the key urban design conclusions are in summary:

- (a) MUS and BAL are sympathetic in siting, massing, and geometry with the existing heritage listed buildings on the Precinct, these being Parliament House, Parliamentary Library, and the Executive Wing.
- (b) The proposed height of MUS is a little over 27m at its southern end and a little under 27m at its northern end. The maximum height standard/threshold for the MUS part of the Precinct is 27m, with the standard/threshold stating that *“any building that is built in accordance with the thresholds will be of a scale that is appropriate for the heritage area in which it is located”*.
- (c) The small encroachment above 27m at the south end of MUS will not have any unacceptable effects.
- (d) MUS and the link bridge to Parliament House will not have unacceptable adverse effects on the public’s ability to appreciate the heritage buildings on the Precinct, including the west façade of Parliament House.

- 8.6** The external design and appearance of the link bridge has since been refined as outlined in the statement of evidence of the project architect, Michael Davis, in a further effort to make the bridge as “visually light” as practicable.
- 8.7** Regarding the effects of MUS on viewshaft 4A, I rely on the expert urban design evidence of Chris McDonald on behalf of the Applicant and Sarah Duffell on behalf of the Council, who consider that the effect of MUS on viewshaft 4A is acceptable.
- 8.8** In addition, the viewshaft standard and rules apply only to the Central Area. The “Thorndon Residential Area” as one of the two context elements is not within the Central Area. Therefore, it is possible that development could occur in the “Thorndon Residential Area” that changes this context element, and there are no viewshaft rules or standards that would be engaged to restrict that from occurring, in terms of protecting viewshafts. This change could in itself change the extent to which the second context element being “Tinakori Hill” can be seen from the viewpoint.
- 8.9** I also consider that in assessing this matter, weight should be given to the very restrictive position of the viewpoint location of viewshaft 4A. The viewpoint location is on the south-east corner of Whitmore St and Featherson St, a location that is very small in area and is only inhabited, in my observation, by pedestrians in transit that are made to wait in this location by the pedestrian crossing lights. This corner is also one of the most inhospitable places in the Central Area to have to wait, it being exposed to high volumes of vehicular traffic, the adverse effects of traffic noise, and is one of the windiest places in the Central Area, based on experience and wind assessments of nearby buildings. In my view, it is therefore not a location where people deliberately wait to appreciate the visual components of viewshaft 4A. There are also other nearby locations from where the Cenotaph and the Beehive portion of the Executive Wing (the

focal elements of viewshaft 4A) can be better appreciated, including along both side of Whitmore Street leading towards Lambton Quay.

- 8.10** Therefore, while I appreciate that viewshaft 4A is protected under the ODP, the reality of the use or appreciation of the viewshaft from that particular location should be taken into account when considering the effect that MUS will have on the context elements, bearing in mind that MUS will be behind the focal elements. Mr McDonald has assessed this in further detail in his statement of evidence.

Heritage Effects

- 8.11** For the AEE the heritage effects were assessed by two heritage experts for the Applicant, Adam Wild and Ian Bowman.

- 8.12** The AEE in section 2.4.1 summarises the Applicant's consultation with Heritage NZ Pouhere Taonga (**HNZPT**). The initial response from HNZPT was, in summary:

- (a) The provision of purpose-built accommodation for Government on the Precinct and adjacent to Parliament House as proposed *"adds to the recognition of the importance of the entire government machine and the place of democracy"* and that the *"ongoing use of the site for MP's, within new buildings, can be seen to reinforce the heritage values of the entire complex"*.
- (b) The proposal does not affect *"the pre-eminent ceremonial spaces in front of Parliament House or the Beehive"*.
- (c) The proposal *"will greatly increase the amenity. Consequently, appreciation of the historic places and area can increase"*.
- (d) MUS is *"carefully placed with its relationship to Parliament House direct and open"*.

- (e) While it would be preferable for MUS to be lower in height than Parliament House, this could be mitigated by its external design and appearance so that it is not *“just another office building”* and that the area between the two buildings is a *“landscaped and mainly pedestrian area”*.

8.13 In 2021, there was further consultation with HNZPT, and they requested that various matters should be assessed. In response:

- (a) The heritage assessment reports, specifically from Adam Wild, identify the positive heritage effects of the proposal, as requested by HNZPT.
- (b) The report by Ian Bowman recommends mitigation measures, as requested by HNZPT. These conditions are proposed in the AEE and are included in the proposed conditions in the attached Appendix 1.
- (c) The urban design report assesses the extent to which views of Parliament House, the Executive Wing and the Parliamentary Library are changed by the proposal, as requested by HNZPT.
- (d) As sought by HNZPT, there is ongoing consultation and co-design involvement of tangata whenua in both the proposal and across the whole of the Precinct.
- (e) Consideration has been given to alternatives to MUS, including increasing the separation distance from Parliament House, and construct a third building on the Bowen Street frontage to enable MUS to be reduced in size. These alternatives are not proposed by the Applicant because of practicability and cost reasons.

8.14 My conclusion, drawing on the expert evidence of Mr Wild and Mr Bowman and the above responses from HNZ, is that the proposal is acceptable and positive from a heritage perspective.

CPTED Effects

8.15 The design of the proposal has been informed by the input from CPTED specialist designers, Boffa Miskell Ltd. The CPTED assessment of the proposal appended to the AEE is positive.

8.16 The CPTED assessment identified a number of CPTED aspects that should be further addressed at the detail design stage following the granting of resource consent. An appropriate condition is proposed to this effect to cover the matters identified, including:

- (a) External lighting detail design.
- (b) CCTV monitoring of the area to the north of MUS.
- (c) Window placement in BAL.
- (d) Measures to ensure the safety of people accessing vehicles at night.
- (e) CPTED input into the detail design of the landscape plans, basement ramp and plant within the upper car park.

Relocation of the Heritage Tree

8.17 The District Plan's list of heritage trees includes "Tree #187" which is an "English Oak", located at the rear of Parliament. Its location is currently compromised by being surrounded by car parking and hard surfacing. It is also within the proposed footprint of MUS. The proposal therefore involves the relocation of the tree to a specially designed location within the proposed west courtyard.

8.18 The tree has been assessed by expert arborists on behalf of the Applicant and the Council and there is consensus that:

- (a) The tree is fit for relocation.
- (b) The tree can be relocated in a way that will safeguard its health. Ideally, relocation should avoid the summer months and for this reason, the Applicant is wishing to proceed with relocation as soon as possible.
- (c) The new location is an appropriate and acceptable one for the tree.
- (d) It would be appropriate that root ball preparation and minor pruning take place well prior to relocation. This work has been implemented by the Applicant's arborist with input from the Council's arborist.

8.19 A condition of resource consent is proposed that the relocation is managed in accordance with the recommendations of the Applicant's arborist with input from the Council's arborist.

Geotechnical, Earthworks and Soil Contamination Effects

8.20 These aspects have been investigated and assessed by the Applicant's experts.

8.21 No unusual aspects have been found that distinguish this part of the Precinct from many other development sites in the City Centre. For this reason, it is proposed that the temporary adverse effects of earthworks, including soil that is contaminated, can be avoided or appropriately

mitigated by the Council's standard suite of management plan conditions covering:

- (a) Geotechnical supervision of the excavations.
- (b) Earthworks Management Plan, including Erosion and Sediment Control measures.
- (c) Earthworks and Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- (d) Contaminated Soil Management Plan.
- (e) Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan.

Wind Effects

8.22 Under the District Plan, only proposed buildings that exceed 18.6m are subject to wind speed standard 13.6.3.5. This sets wind speed performance standards for "public spaces", which typically for Central Area proposals is limited to public footpaths.

8.23 MUS exceeds 18.6m by about 10m and therefore the Applicant commissioned wind experts, WSP, to prepare a full wind assessment report for the proposal, including wind tunnel testing. The main findings were:

- (a) The north-south alignment of MUS is a beneficial design feature for minimising the effect of the development on the surrounding wind conditions. MUS presents a relatively small barrier to the prevailing winds, which helps to minimise the downwash wind flows it will generate.
- (b) BAL is sufficiently low in height to have a minimal effect on the surrounding wind speeds.
- (c) It is expected that there will be no significant change in the maximum wind speed that the heritage tree will be exposed to at the relocation site compared to the existing location.

- (d) Existing gust speeds over much of the project area exceed the District Plan's safety threshold of 20m/s.
- (e) The overall frequency that winds equal or exceed the cumulative effect thresholds of the District Plan decrease with the proposal.
- (f) Wind speeds in localised areas can be reduced when screens for example are orientated at right angles across the ground level wind flows. However, for other reasons (i.e. CPTED, maintaining pedestrian access, adverse visual effects etc) they may not be practical.
- (g) Taken overall, wind conditions are improved with the proposed development, but existing unsafe windspeeds are unaffected as well.

8.24 In response to a request by the Council for further assessment, the following were WSP's additional findings:

- (a) The proposed BAL building is sufficiently low to have a minimal effect on the surrounding wind speeds.
- (b) The overall effect of the development on wind gusts is neutral, with increases in speeds to the west of the MUS building (which are more channelled) approximately balanced by decreases elsewhere, including to the east of the MUS building (which becomes more sheltered).
- (c) The maximum gust speed increases from 28m/s to 30 m/s with the development, while the frequency of winds exceeding 2.5m/s and 3.5m/s decreases overall. The safety threshold of 20m/s is exceeded over much of the site, essentially unchanged from the existing situation.

- 8.25** The evidence of Mr Davis is that there are detail design measures that can address pedestrian comfort and safety from wind, while also being acceptable from a CPTED, visual and maintenance perspective. In his evidence he shows some indicative examples of how this might be able to be advanced, and he addresses a “detail design condition of resource consent”.
- 8.26** I am aware from experience that the Council has imposed this type of condition in similar situations where it is desirable that wind speed, CPTED, visual/urban design effects, and practicability/maintenance aspects need to be optimized, and that this can only be practically achieved following the granting of resource consent and that the detail design stage. The condition can also require (amongst other things) that the resulting detail design drawings are required to be certified by the Council’s Compliance Monitoring Officer.
- 8.27** On this basis, I consider that the wind effects of the proposal can and will be appropriately addressed through the Council reporting officer’s proposed condition 74 which includes the wording recommended by the Council’s wind adviser dated 3 May 2023.

Transportation Effects

- 8.28** The transportation effects of the proposal have been assessed by the Applicant’s transportation experts, Aurecon Ltd. Mr Carnell from Aurecon has also provided a statement of evidence in support of this application.
- 8.29** The main findings from that assessment are:
- (a) The safety and efficiency of the intersection of Bowen Street with The Terrace and Museum Street will be enhanced, mainly because of the proposed significant reduction in vehicle movements into and out of Museum Street and reduced conflict with pedestrians.

- (b) Pedestrian safety and amenity within the Precinct will be enhanced, mainly because of the removal of the existing significant areas of surface car parking and associated driveways and replacement with a well designed, landscaped and pedestrian centred plaza.
- (c) Commuter car parking reduction as proposed is consistent with the Council's Parking Policy and District Plan policy and is expected to promote the use of more sustainable modes of transport.
- (d) On site parking for cyclists and end of trip facilities are included in the proposal.
- (e) Traffic flows generated by the Precinct are expected to reduce.
- (f) The existing intersection of Ballantrae Place and Bowen Street, and Ballantrae Place itself, has the capacity to accommodate the traffic flows expected to be generated by the proposal. No upgrade is necessary.

8.30 The transportation evidence of Mr Carnell also confirms that Ballantrae Place has the capacity to accommodate the traffic flows expected to be generated by the proposal, both during construction and subsequently. What this means for residential owners and occupiers along Ballantrae Place is that access to and from their residences by car will remain convenient and commensurate with a cul-de-sac that has long served Central Area buildings and activities.

3 Waters Effects

8.31 The 3 Waters effects of the proposal have been assessed by the Applicant's civil engineering experts, Aurecon Ltd. Their findings are:

- (a) There is spare capacity in the Council's reticulated wastewater network to accommodate the flows that will be generated by the proposal.
- (b) Flood risk will be addressed by maintaining overland flow paths and adopting appropriate finished floor levels.
- (c) Rainwater will be harvested from the roofs of the proposed buildings, thus reducing stormwater discharge into the Council's reticulated system.
- (d) The quality of stormwater discharge into the Council's reticulated system will be improved because of a reduction in surface car parking and because of the proposed stormwater treatment.
- (e) Grey water recycling is proposed for the MUS.
- (f) There is adequate water supply to service the proposal.
- (g) Power and communications infrastructure connections are readily available.

8.32 I therefore consider that the 3 Waters effects have been acceptably addressed by the proposal.

Hazardous Substance Facility Effects

8.33 The proposal involved the storage of diesel in tanks within the basement of MUS to fuel emergency generators. The effects of this facility will be

addressed by compliance with the Health and Safety at Work (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2017 and the implementation of the recommendations contained in the reports prepared by the Applicant's hazardous substance facility experts, Engeo Ltd which are appended to the AEE.

Noise Effects

8.34 The noise effects typically generated by Central Area new building proposals are construction noise and fixed plant noise.

8.35 The Applicant is committed to achieving compliance with the applicable District Plan noise emission standards for fixed plant. Included in the AEE is a noise compliance assurance report prepared by the Applicant's noise experts that confirms that compliance is able to be achieved. The Applicant therefore proposes the Council's standard noise compliance assurance conditions of resource consent for this aspect.

8.36 There will be adverse noise and vibration effects during construction. The Council's standard approach to the management of construction noise and vibration for Central Area buildings is to require as a condition of resource consent a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan with the expectation that compliance will, whenever practicable, be achievable with the applicable NZ Standard for construction noise, NZS 6803:1999.

8.37 The evidence of the Applicant's noise expert (Dr Trevathan) further addresses the above noise aspects. In reliance on that expert evidence, and in view of the proposed noise control conditions attached in Appendix 1, I consider that noise effects of the proposal will be adequately managed.

Construction Effects

8.38 As stated above, there will be adverse effects generated by construction activities. The Council's standard approach to the management of

construction for Central Area buildings is to impose the following construction related conditions:

- (a) Construction Management Plan.
- (b) Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan.
- (c) Geotechnical supervision of the excavations.
- (d) Earthworks Management Plan, including Erosion and Sediment Control measures.
- (e) Earthworks and Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- (f) Contaminated Soil Management Plan.

8.39 In my experience, these conditions and controls are effective in mitigating the adverse effects of construction activities, while also enabling works to proceed efficiently. These conditions have been included in the Council's section 42A report, and the Applicant agrees to them.

9. COMMENTS ON THE COUNCIL REPORT

9.1 I have read the Council report on the proposal and agree with its recommendation that resource consent should be granted, subject to appropriate conditions.

9.2 I have read the proposed conditions appended to the officers' report and support them, with minor refinements shown in red on the copy attached to my evidence as Appendix 1. These refinements are consistent with the evidence presented on behalf of the Applicant, and take into account the advice of the various experts.

9.3 The only aspect of the Council report that I do wish to elaborate upon, in case it is a concern of the Commissioner, is the height of MUS and the effects of this height on Parliament House. This matter is raised in paragraph 46 of the Council report.

9.4 Map 32 of the Operative District Plan shows the building height standards for new buildings in the Central Area. However, for new buildings within a heritage area, Rule 13.6.3.1.6 applies. This sets a “*Lower Threshold*”, “*Upper Threshold*” and “*Absolute Maximum Height*” standards. For “*sites west of Museum St*” (i.e the location of MUS) these standards are “*None*”, “*27m*” and “*27m*”. As noted earlier, the proposed height of MUS is a little over 27m at its southern end and a little under 27m at its northern end. The activity status of this exceedance is Discretionary Unrestricted.

9.5 The rule goes on to state that “*any building that is built in accordance with the thresholds will be of a scale that is appropriate for the heritage area in which it is located*” and that “*applications for resource consent for buildings and structures that meet the lower and upper thresholds will be assessed under rule 13.3.4*” which is a Central Area rule, not a Heritage rule.

9.6 The above statutory provisions require that a new 27m high building in the location of MUS “*is appropriate for the heritage area in which it is located*”. That MUS as proposed is appropriate is accepted by the Council’s heritage and urban design advisers and by the Reporting Officer.

10. COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

10.1 Sandra-Lee Monk’s submission seeks that tree 100 shown on drawing P A2-45 is relocated elsewhere on the Precinct. This oak tree is not the listed heritage oak tree (the listed tree is tree 102 on the drawing). The proposal is not to relocate tree 100, in favour of planting native species. Parliamentary Service has discussed the concerns raised in Ms Monk’s submission with her, and I understand that she has indicated that those concerns have now been resolved, and she does not intend to take the submission point any further.

10.2 The submission by HNZPT seeks (amongst other things) that a number of conditions are imposed. These conditions are largely reflected in the conditions proposed in the Council officers’ report. In my view, the

proposed conditions (including those set out in Appendix 1) are an appropriate way to address the matters raised in this submission.

- 10.3** The submission by the Eldin Family Trust relates to the effect of MUS on viewshaft 4A. My evidence on this is in paragraphs 8.7 to 8.9 above.
- 10.4** The submission by Ben Blinkhorne is in relation to the effects of the proposal on the amenity of Huxley's restaurant and bar located on the ground floor of the adjoining Bowen State Building. The submission is that MUS will unacceptably shade the restaurant and bar, a possible pedestrian connection(s) between Huxley's and the Precinct would adversely affect the layout and sustainability of the restaurant and bar, and there will be unacceptable effects during construction.
- 10.5** The extent of sunlight that Huxley's currently enjoy from the east is amenity borrowed from the Parliamentary Precinct. This "borrowed amenity" is only enjoyed by Huxley's because the adjoining part of the Parliamentary Precinct is not currently built upon. The Central Area building standards do not require any building setbacks from the boundary with Huxley's, they do not require any building recession planes for the purpose of any sunlight access, and they provide for a building height of 27m. There are also no Central Area objectives and policies that provide for any sunlight into restaurant and bars.
- 10.6** The Applicant initially thought that having some direct pedestrian connection from the Precinct to Huxley's would help to generate business for the restaurant and bar, and enhance amenity and convenience. However, it seems clear from the submission that this connection is not preferred by the submitter.
- 10.7** There will be adverse construction effects on adjoining and adjacent activities, such as Huxley's. These will be similar to what is experienced by retail and hospitality tenants who adjoin new building projects elsewhere in the Central Area. As is standard practice, it is proposed that the

temporary adverse effects of construction will be avoided or appropriately mitigated through the suite of construction management plans referred to in paragraph 8.38 above. In my view, these conditions appropriately respond to the concerns raised in the submission. The evidence of Mr Allen refers to the Applicant's ongoing willingness to liaise with the operator of Huxley's for the duration of construction.

- 10.8** The submission by Ewen Robertson is mainly concerned with the capacity of Ballantrae Place to accommodate traffic flows generated by the proposal, and the adverse effects of construction, particularly excessive construction noise. My understanding is that the submitter owns and/or may occupy one of a row of townhouses on the north side of Ballantrae Place. Each of these townhouses has a garage and there is a yellow "no parking" line across the frontage to protect access into and out of the garages.
- 10.9** The evidence of the Applicant's transportation expert is that Ballantrae Place has the capacity to accommodate the traffic flows that will be generated by the proposal both during construction and upon project completion. It follows from this that vehicle access to and from the garages of the townhouses is unlikely to be regularly delayed by vehicle congestion.
- 10.10** I can appreciate that the residents of the townhouses that face onto Ballantrae Place have been exposed to the adverse effects arising from the redevelopment of the Bowen State Campus, particularly as the separation distance of the townhouses from the nearest Bowen State Campus construction noise sources is only 15m. In contrast, the nearest construction noise source for the proposal (BAL) is 50m away with MUS being 90m away from the nearest townhouse. These separation distances will go a long way to acceptably mitigating the adverse construction effects of BAL and MUS on the townhouses.

11. POLICY ASSESSMENT

11.1 Included in the AEE is an assessment of the proposal against the objectives and policies of the Operative and Proposed District Plans that I considered relevant, and an assessment under Part 2 of the RMA.

11.2 I have read the corresponding and comprehensive assessment included in the Council officers' report and concur with it.

11.3 I consider that the proposal has an acceptable level of consistency with the objectives and policies of the Operative and Proposed District Plans that are relevant to the proposal, and that Part 2 of the RMA will be promoted by resource consent being granted with the conditions of consent that are appended to my statement.

12. CONCLUSIONS

12.1 My conclusions are:

- (a) As set out in the evidence of Mr Knight, the existing accommodation for Parliament on the Parliamentary Precinct is inadequate, resulting in adverse effects that are unacceptable to Parliament.
- (b) Shortage of floorspace on the Precinct is limiting the opportunities to promote the operation of Parliament to the visiting public.
- (c) Change to the Parliamentary Precinct and its setting is required to better reflect tangata whenua, mana whenua, and Māori heritage, values and culture.
- (d) The proposal will address these and other important Parliamentary objectives, including to improve the safety and security within the Precinct, provide improved resilience in an

emergency affecting Wellington, and positively transforming the western part of the Precinct.

- (e) The Operative District Plan anticipates and provides for the proposed MUS and BAL buildings on the Precinct as a Discretionary Activity.
- (f) The proposal has been carefully designed to positively contribute to the project objectives, to achieve positive environmental effects, and to avoid or otherwise address adverse effects so that they are acceptable overall.
- (g) The effects of the proposal have been assessed on an unrestricted basis. The positive effects of the proposal are cumulatively significant.
- (h) A comprehensive set of conditions of resource consent are proposed to avoid or mitigate the adverse effects that have been identified.
- (i) The proposal is consistent “in the round” with the relevant objectives and policies of the Operative and Proposed District Plans.
- (j) There are Part 2 RMA matters that will be promoted by the granting of resource consent to the proposal.

- 13.** Resource consent should therefore be granted, subject to the conditions appended to this statement.

Peter Alan Coop

15 May 2023

Appendix 1 – proposed conditions of consent

General:

- (1) Unless otherwise modified by conditions of this consent, the proposal must be in accordance with the information provided with the application Service Request No. 514663 and the following sets of plans within the overall drawing package titled: *“Future Accommodation Strategy (FAS); Architectural Drawings for Resource Consent”*, by Studio Pacific Architecture, dated September 2022:
- ‘A0 - Visualisations’, drawings P A0-01 to P A0-02, ref. 2650
 - ‘A1 - Existing (EXT)’, drawings P A1-01 to P A1-07, ref. 2650
 - ‘A2 - Proposed Landscape (LAN)’, drawings P A2-01 to P A2-45, ref. 2662
 - ‘A4 – Proposed Museum Street Building (MUS)’, drawings P A4-01 to P A4-15, ref. 2652
 - ‘A5 – Proposed Ballantrae Place Building (BAL)’, drawings P A5-00 to P A5-06, ref. 2650
 - ‘A6 – Supporting Information’, drawings P A6-01 to P A6-24, ref. 2650

Earthworks:

Geotechnical Professional:

- (2) The consent holder must engage a Geotechnical Professional for the detailed design and construction phases of the project.

A ‘Geotechnical Professional’ is defined as a Chartered Professional Engineer (‘CPEng’) with specialist geotechnical skills and experience in the design and construction of earthworks and retaining works similar to those proposed and in similar ground conditions.

The name and the contact details of the Geotechnical Professional must be provided to the Council’s Compliance Monitoring Officer, at least 20 working days prior to any work commencing.

- (3) The Geotechnical Professional must monitor the earthworks and advise on the best methods to ensure:
- the stability of the site and surrounding land;
 - the construction of cut faces, fill batters, staging, shoring, and benching as required for stability of the earthworks;
 - the design and construction of the temporary and permanent retaining; and
 - the earthworks methodology is consistent with the recommendations in the geotechnical assessment by Aurecon Ltd. (date 2022-02-16) and to ensure adequate engineering monitoring is undertaken of the earthworks.

The consent holder must follow all the advice of the Geotechnical Professional in a timely manner.

Construction Management Plan:

- (4) At least 10 working days prior to any work commencing on the site a Construction Management Plan (‘CMP’) developed by the consent holder must be submitted to the Council’s Compliance Monitoring Officer for certification in relation to any temporary works and earthworks to ensure there is not uncontrolled instability or collapse affecting any neighbouring properties, buildings, or infrastructure.

- (5) The CMP must be consistent with the finding and recommendations of the geotechnical assessment by Aurecon Ltd. (date 2022-02-16) and must include, but is not limited to, the following:
- Details of the staging of work including hold points for engineering inspections and an illustrated plan showing the proposed staging and earthworks.
 - Measures to limit the exposure of unretained earthworks at any one time including maximum cut heights of earthworks before the support is put in place.
 - Any runoff controls required to minimise the risk of instability.
 - Roles and responsibilities of key site personnel.
 - A contact (mobile) telephone number(s) for the on-site manager, where contact can be made 24 hours a day / 7 days a week.

- (6) The CMP must be reviewed by the CPEng prior to being submitted to the Council, to ensure that the methodology is in accordance with the geotechnical assessment, by Aurecon Ltd. (date 2022-02-16).

The review must be provided to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer when the final CMP is filed for certification.

- (7) Work must not commence on the site until the CMP is certified by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer. The earthworks and retaining work must be carried out in accordance with the certified CMP.

Note: Any amendments to the CMP (once work starts) must be approved by the CPEng and certified by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer.

- (8) To mitigate adverse visual amenity effects during construction, the consent holder must install creative or interpretive material on any construction hoardings that will be visible from a public place. [This may be limited to elements on the hoarding, or to a portion of the hoarding only, rather than in entirety.](#)

Note: The Council has launched a pilot 'Creative Hoardings' programme, which has been designed to enliven building sites and celebrate creativity across the city. Creative hoardings present opportunities for artists and property developers to contribute to the revitalisation of the city and the consent holder is encouraged to use this programme during the construction phase. Local artists, Gabby O'Connor, Ariki Brightwell, Ruth Thomas-Edmond and Telly Tuita have been commissioned to design artworks for hoarding. Their work can be downloaded from the Creative Hoardings Library on the Council's website, printed and installed on hoarding. For more information contact the City Arts and Events Team (arts@wcc.govt.nz) or visit the Council's website: <https://wellington.govt.nz/arts-and-culture/arts/creative-hoardings>

Erosion and Sediment Control Plan:

- (9) An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan ('ESCP') must be developed by the consent holder and submitted to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer for certification, at least 10 working days prior to any work commencing on site.

The purpose of the ESCP is to identify the erosion and sediment control measures that will be implemented on site during construction activities and how these will comply with the *Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Land Disturbing Activities in the Wellington Region* (February 2021).

The ESCP must include, but is not limited to, the following:

Erosion and Sedimentation Controls:

- An illustrated plan that records the key features of the ESCP (including the approved earthworks plan).
- A description of the broad approaches to be used to prevent erosion, and minimise problems with dust and water-borne sediment.
- Measures to limit the area of earthworks exposed to the weather at any one time (sources of dust and sediment).
- Stabilisation of the site entrance(s) to minimise the tracking of earth by vehicles onto the adjoining roads.
- Detail of the use of diversion bunds/cut-off drains, as required, to minimise stormwater entering the site and discharging onto earthworks areas where it can pick up sediment and not discharged on to sloping ground.
- The type and location of silt fences to control water-borne sediment.
- Methods for protecting stormwater sumps from the infiltration of water-borne sediment.
- Stabilisation of soil or other material that is stockpiled on the site or transported to, or from, the site, to prevent dust nuisance or erosion by rain and stormwater (creating water-borne sediment).

Dust Suppression:

- Limiting the vehicle speed on site to 10 kilometres an hour.
- Assessing weather and ground conditions (dryness and wind) before undertaking potentially dusty activities.
- Ceasing all dust generating activities if site dust is observed blowing beyond the site boundary.
- Stabilising exposed areas that are not being worked on, using mulch, hydroseeded grass, chemical stabilisers or other similar controls.

Management of Controls:

- The methods for managing and monitoring the ESCP controls.
- Nomination of a site person responsible for the implementation and administration of the ESCP.

The ESCP must be reviewed by the suitably qualified engineering professional prior to being submitted to Council, to ensure that the methodology is in accordance the *Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Land Disturbing Activities in the Wellington Region* (February 2021). The review must be provided to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer when the final ESCP is filed for certification.

- (10) No work may commence on site until the ESCP is certified by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer. The earthworks and associated work must be carried out in accordance with the certified ESCP.
- (11) Any amendments to the ESCP once work starts must be certified by the suitably qualified engineering professional and certified by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer.
- (12) The erosion, dust and sediment control measures put in place must not be removed until the site is remediated to the satisfaction of the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer. 'Remediated' means the ground surface of the areas of earthworks have been

stabilised (no longer producing dust or water-borne sediment), and any problems with erosion, dust or sediment that occur during the work have been remedied.

Note: If necessary, the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer may require changes to the implementation of the ESCP, to address any problem that occurs during the work or before the ground surface is stabilised.

- (13) A copy of the certified ESCP must be held on site throughout the duration of the earthworks and must be made available on request.

Producer Statements:

- (14) A copy of the producer statement 'PS4 – Construction Review' and its accompanying documents for structures/buildings required for the stabilisation of earthworks and, prepared for the associated building consent process, must be provided to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer within one month of the structures/buildings being completed.

Grassing of Earthworks:

- (15) All exposed areas of earthworks, unless otherwise built on and/or stabilised, are to be grassed or re-vegetated within 1 month of completing each stage of the earthworks, to a level of establishment satisfactory to Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer.

The Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer may agree to a longer period than 1 month, if appropriate, and will certify it in writing.

- (16) If construction works at the site cease for a period of greater than 2 months, the exposed areas of earthworks must then be stabilised to reach a level of establishment satisfactory to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer.

General Earthworks Conditions:

- (17) Run-off must be controlled to prevent muddy water flowing, or earth slipping, onto neighbouring properties or the legal road. Sediment, earth or debris must not fall or collect on land beyond the site or enter the Council's stormwater system. Any material that falls on land beyond the site during work or transport must be cleaned up immediately (with the landowner's permission on land that isn't public road). The material must not be swept or washed into street channels or stormwater inlets, or dumped on the side of the road.

Note: As a minimum, 100 mm clarity is required to allow water to be discharged offsite. If clarity is less than 100mm then the water is considered to be muddy and must be captured and treated on site.

~~(18) Dust created by earthworks, transport and construction activities must be controlled to minimise nuisance and hazard. The controls must be implemented for the duration of the site works and continue until the site stops producing dust.~~

Contaminated Land:

- ~~(19)~~(18) Additional soil quality sampling must be completed to supplement the Ballantrae Place DSI completed by Aurecon in 2021. The additional soil quality sampling must be completed under the guidance of a suitably qualified and experienced practitioner ('SQEP'). The additional soil quality sampling must be carried

out in accordance with the *Ministry for the Environment's (MfE) Contaminated Land Guidelines No.5 (CLMG 5), June 2021 and the New Zealand Guidelines for Managing and Assessing Asbestos in Soil (Building Research Advisory Council New Zealand, 2017)*.

~~(20)~~(19) _____ A report summarising the additional soil quality sampling must be prepared by a SQEP in general accordance with *MfE Contaminated Land Guideline No. 1 (CLMG 1), June 2021*. The additional soil sampling report must be submitted to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer for certification prior to earthworks commencing.

~~(21)~~(20) _____ If the additional soil quality sampling confirms a risk to human health for the proposed land use, a remediation action plan ('RAP') must be prepared by a SQEP.

~~(22)~~(21) _____ A Contaminated Land Management Plan ('CLMP') for the proposed development must be completed by a SQEP and submitted and certified by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer prior to earthworks being undertaken at the site. The CLMP must include the following:

- Date and version control.
- A summary of soil sampling results including the further soil sampling undertaken as part of the additional soil quality sampling.
- A summary of the proposed redevelopment works.
- Roles and responsibilities and contact details for the parties involved, including the SQEP.
- Health and safety and environmental management procedures for implementation during the works including but not limited to:
 - Personal protection and monitoring.
 - On site soil management practices including stockpile management and stormwater and sediment controls.
 - Off site soil transport and disposal.
- Asbestos in soil removal procedures in accordance with the approved code of practice *Management and Removal of Asbestos*, November 2016 and Building Research Association of New Zealand, November 2017. New Zealand Guidelines for Assessing and Managing Asbestos in Soil (BRANZ Guidelines).
- Contingency measures in the event of accidental/unexpected discovery including the discovery of asbestos and asbestos related controls.

~~(23)~~(22) _____ Soil disturbance works must be undertaken in accordance with the certified RAP and CLMP.

~~(24)~~(23) _____ If unexpected soil conditions, such as staining, odorous material or evidence of potential asbestos containing materials are encountered during the soil disturbance works, work in that area must cease and the Council notified. Any unexpected contamination and contingency measures must be overseen and assessed by a SQEP.

~~(25)~~(24) _____ All soil material with contaminant concentrations above background concentrations that requires removal from the site must be disposed of at a licensed facility that holds a consent to accept the relevant level of contamination.

~~(26)~~(25) _____ If remedial works are required, a Site Validation Report must be prepared in general accordance with *MfE CLMG No. 1* and must be provided to the Council within 3 months of completion of the soil disturbance activities. The Site Validation Report must include the following:

- The location and dimensions of the excavations carried out, including a relevant site plan.
- Records of any unexpected contamination encountered during the works.
- Soil validation results, if applicable (i.e. if remediation is carried out or unexpected contamination is encountered).
- Copies of the disposal dockets for the material removed from the site and any clean fill imported onto the site.
- Specify the requirements for ongoing monitoring and management (if required).
- The report should outline the site's suitability for the intended use.

Hazardous Substances:

~~(27)~~(26) The proposed tanks containing hazardous substances must be designed, installed and certified in accordance with the recommendations as listed in the HSNO Report by ENGE0 Ltd dated 17 September 2021, with the exception of the following points:

- (a) The 4 x 7216 Litre fuel tanks SVR 7000 Fuel-Chief Super Vault tanks situated in the Museum Street building are to supply fuel to the generators in the same building. As a result, the appropriate Regulation 17.63 (3) (b) for the Museum Street building holding fuel must be looked at as per requirements that fall under fuel supply 'in that building' (17.63 Subclause 4 under HSW (HS) Regs 2017) and 'in another building' (17.63 Subclause 6 under HSW (HS) Regs 2017) if the same SV4 fuel tanks are to supply fuel to the generators housed in the Parliament building.
- (b) As a consequence of (a) above, the separation distances in section 4.4 of the HSNO Report will need to be reviewed.
- (c) Prior to the installation of the hazardous substances, an addendum to the HSNO Report must be provided to the Council that includes:
 - A review of the SV3 11000 diesel fuel tank (11,400 Litres).
 - A review of hazardous classifications required for the wastewater tanks situated in the Museum Street building and appropriate controls associated to the overall design that have been verified and deemed sufficient.

Transport:

Construction Traffic Plan:

~~(28)~~(27) The consent holder must submit a Construction Traffic Plan ('CTP') to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer at least 10 working days before any works commence on the site.

~~(29)~~(28) The CTP must be certified by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Traffic and Vehicle Access Team before any work begins.

~~(30)~~(29) The CTP must include methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse construction traffic effects during the works. The CTP must include, but not be limited to, the following matters:

- Timing of specific work phases.
- Key activities and anticipated traffic levels for each work phase.

- Expected frequency of vehicle movements specific to the construction phase, with details of the proposed hours and days of week. Vehicle movements into and out of the site should be restricted during peak traffic times (7-9am and 4-6pm weekdays).
- Locations of where construction related vehicles will park, wait, turn and carry out loading and unloading of materials.
- Locations where construction materials would be stored.
- Arrangements for temporary traffic management, including pedestrians, car-parking and servicing.
- Temporary pedestrian safety measures, including directional signage where applicable.
- Details of how servicing and access to adjacent site activities will be provided for, specific to each development phase.
- Methods for the public to contact the site manager for complaints. There should be a 1m² sign facing the public footpath at all points of entry to the site with the site manager's contact details.
- [Construction traffic noise.](#)

~~(31)~~(30) _____ The consent holder must carry out the work in accordance with the certified CTP.

Notes:

- The CTP does not constitute an approved Traffic Management Plan ('TMP') for any of the works. This approval must be gained separately. The TMP must reflect each different stage of the project including vehicle movements in and out of the site.
- A Corridor Access Request ('CAR') must be approved before construction activities within the road corridor starts. This is for mitigating public safety risks associated with the proposed earthworks and construction activities. The application needs to be made through: <https://www.submitica.com/>
- A Road Usage Licence ('RUL') is necessary if any temporary structures or sole use of space (scaffolding, hoarding, loading zones, tower crane positioning, gantry etc.) are needed on road reserve during any stage of the development and construction. Please note additional fees can occur and will apply when occupying legal road reserve for private use. A quote will be sent to you for acceptance if this applies.

Driveway Construction and Street Level Matching Plans:

~~(32)~~(31) _____ Driveway Construction and Street Level Matching Plans showing how the proposed new buildings will match the existing public road (Ballantrae Place) and private road (Museum Street) must be submitted to the Compliance Monitoring Officer for certification (in consultation with the Transport Team) before construction starts. This plan must:

- Indicate how building entrances, floor levels and other street-dependent aspects have been designed to match the existing footpath and/or road levels.
- Include full construction details of any changes needed to the existing turning area at the end of Ballantrae Place and for the construction of the proposed adjacent two vehicle parking bay.
- Show the location and levels of the vehicle and pedestrian entrances and any other sections of the building that require access to nearby sections of existing footpath and/or road carriageway.

- Show existing levels of the top of the adjacent street kerb and/or back of footpath levels near vehicle and pedestrian access areas.
- Show details of any proposed street layout and level changes.
- Show details of any new features proposed in public road land or other changes to the existing public road layout.
- Show construction details for the turning area at the end of Ballantrae Place
- Show confirmation that all areas needing to be trafficable will be provided with suitable pavements. Details of the pavement design must be provided for certification.

Noise and Vibration:

Construction Noise:

~~(33)~~(32) The consent holder must ensure that construction activities are measured, assessed, managed and controlled in accordance with the requirements of managed and controlled so that the noise received at any residential or commercial site does not exceed the limits set out in Table 2 and Table 3 of 'NZS6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction' Noise, ~~when measured and assessed in accordance with that Standard.~~

Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan ('CNVMP'):

~~(34)~~(33) The consent holder must ensure that not less than 20 working days prior to commencing any construction activities authorised by this consent, the consent holder must submit to Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer a draft Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan ('CNVMP') for certification.

The Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan must include but not be limited to:

- Background and purpose of Construction Noise Management Plan
- Objectives of Construction Noise Management Plan
- Description of the project (nature and scale)
- Description of the site, designated areas and construction work areas
- Description and location of noise sensitive sites (commercial and residential)
- Construction and vibration levels
- Noise and vibration sources
- Project period(s), sequencing and staging
- Performance noise and vibration standards
- Hours of operations (all activity types and activity area)
- Physical noise and vibration mitigation measures in line with section 16 of the RMA
- Managerial noise and vibration mitigation measures in line with section 16 of the RMA
- Community consultation and communication procedures
- Consultation and communication procedures with Council regarding noise complaints
- Contact details of the person in charge of noise management
- Construction noise and vibration monitoring and reporting
- Non-compliance contingency planning and monitoring
- Methods to review the CNVMP with respect to changes in the program

~~(35)~~(34) The consent holder must not undertake any activities authorised by this consent until the draft CNVMP has been signed off by the Council's Compliance Monitoring

Officer as final and is denoted by Council as being 'approved for use' as the final CNVMP.

~~(36)~~(35)_____ The consent holder must at all times ensure the on-site activities are carried out in accordance with the final 'for use' CNVMP.

Boundary Noise Emissions (as received in adjacent Central Area sites):

~~(37)~~(36) The consent holder must ensure noise emission levels (excluding fixed plant noise other than generators) when measured at or within the boundary of any fee simple site, other than the site from which the noise is emitted, must not exceed the following:

At all times: 60 dBA $L_{Aeq(15 \text{ min})}$

At all times: 85 dBA L_{AFmax}

Note: Measurements must be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 “Acoustics – Measurement of environmental sound” and NZS 6802:2008 “Acoustics - Environmental Noise”.

Boundary Noise Emissions (as received in adjacent Inner Residential Area sites):

~~(38)~~(37) The consent holder must ensure noise emission levels (excluding fixed plant noise other than generators) when measured at or within the boundary of any fee simple site, other than the site from which the noise is emitted, must not exceed the following:

Monday to Saturday, 7am to 7pm: 55 dB $L_{Aeq(15 \text{ min})}$

Monday to Saturday, 7pm to 10pm: 50 dB $L_{Aeq(15 \text{ min})}$

At all other times: 40 dB $L_{Aeq(15 \text{ min})}$

All days, 10pm to 7am: 70 dB L_{AFmax}

Note: Measurements must be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 “Acoustics – Measurement of environmental sound” and NZS 6802:2008 “Acoustics - Environmental Noise”.

Fixed Plant Boundary Noise Emissions (as received in adjacent Central Area sites):

~~(39)~~(38) The consent holder must ensure all fixed plant and equipment including heating, cooling and ventilation plant must be located, designed and operated so that noise emission levels, when measured at or within the land parcel, other than the building or site from which the noise is emitted, do not exceed the following limits:

At all times: 55 dBA $L_{Aeq(15 \text{ min})}$

At all times: 70 dBA L_{AFmax}

Note: Measurements must be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 “Acoustics – Measurement of environmental sound” and NZS 6802:2008 “Acoustics - Environmental Noise”.

Fixed Plant Certification:

~~(40)~~(39) The consent holder must ensure that noise emission levels emanating from all fixed plant and equipment must be monitored at the commissioning stage (prior to occupation) by a qualified and experienced acoustic expert suitable to the Council. Written certification in the form of an acoustic measurement and compliance commissioning report must be provided to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer and Acoustic Engineer for certification. The certificate must certify that commutative worse case fixed plant noise emissions comply with the noise limits set out in **condition (39)** above.

Fixed Speaker:

~~(41) The consent holder must ensure that noise emission levels emanating from any electronic sound systems associated with the commercial operations of the site do not exceed 75 dB L_{Aeq} when measured over any 2-minute period. In any event, measurements must be made no closer than 0.6 metres from any part of a loudspeaker and at a height no greater than 1.8 metres (representative of the head of a passer-by).~~

Three-Waters Servicing and Flooding:

Minimum Flood Levels:

~~(42)~~(40) Any building constructed on the site must have a minimum ground floor level of 12.25m RL (Wellington 1953 Datum).

Location of Secondary Overland Flow Path:

~~(43)~~(41) A suitably qualified engineer must demonstrate that any overland stormwater flow paths which may flow through the development site are redirected away from any new or existing building.

Engineering Standards:

~~(44)~~(42) The consent holder must comply with the requirements of the Wellington City Council Code of Practice for Land Development, unless otherwise modified by condition(s) of the consent. These are the engineering standards for mitigating adverse effects on the environment from earthworks, traffic (roading and vehicle access), wastewater and stormwater drainage, water supply and utility structures.

~~(45)~~(43) Construction must not start until the following engineering plans in relation to water supply, stormwater or wastewater drainage, being accepted in writing by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Wellington Water Land Development Team:

- Engineering plans
- Specifications

Notes:

- The design and construction documentation needs to include a copy of the Safety in Design documentation generated in response to the legal requirements under the Health and Safety at Work Act (2015) section 39.
- Scheme and other indicative layout plans that were submitted as part of the application will be used by Council for information purposes only. These plans will not be used for granting approval under the condition above. Approvals will only be given on detailed engineering plans.
- Engineering development for drainage require permits in addition to this resource consent, such as drainage permit/building consent for private drains and public drainage permit for public drains. The consent holder shall ensure any redundant water supply, stormwater and wastewater laterals are disconnected and capped at the main. The location of capping will need to be included on the final as-built plan.
- Application for approval of the new water, stormwater and wastewater connections will need to be made to Wellington City Council prior to commencing the works.

Water Supply:

(46)(44) _____ The consent holder must provide each building with an appropriately sized metered water supply connection to the public main for domestic supply. An engraved plastic tag reading "WATER SUPPLY MANIFOLD FOR (Street No)" will need to be secured to the manifold clearly showing which property is served by the manifold. An RPZ-type backflow preventer is required if the connection is greater than 20mm DI.

(47)(45) _____ The consent holder must provide for fire-fighting requirements in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Code of Practice for Firefighting Water Supplies NZS PAS 4509:2008 and the Code of Practice for Land Development. Calculations must be provided by a suitably qualified engineer to certify that there is sufficient pressure and flow for the development to meet the Code of Practice for Land Development requirements. Calculations must be based on pressure logging (seven-day log) and flow readings taken from the nearest hydrant.

Notes:

- If a separate fire connection is required, a separate application for the fire connection will need to be submitted. Applications for fire service connections will need to provide a copy of a flow test and pressure log (seven-day log) along with supporting calculations conducted by a suitably qualified engineer as well as a detail layout plan showing the proposed connection. The design of the fire service connection and sprinkler system will need to allow for any head loss incurred by the required backflow prevention containment device.
- Please note that permission is required prior to using or testing hydrants.

(48)(46) _____ The consent holder must provide all fire connections/sprinkler connections with a double check detector check backflow prevention containment device.

Note: Upgrading of the existing water infrastructure may be required if the Code's requirements cannot be achieved or if the proposal will have a detrimental effect on existing users.

(49)(47) _____ A backflow device of a commercial or industrial site must be added to the building warrant of fitness ('BWOFF') compliance schedule for the property.

Relaying Public Mains Clear of Buildings:

(50)(48) _____ The existing public gravity water, stormwater, and wastewater mains within the proposed building site must be re-laid to achieve a minimum ~~1.5m~~ 0m distance from the building platforms (including fencing and retaining walls) and any associated foundations.

Notes:

- Any alteration or addition to the existing public drainage network is required to be carried out under a Public Drainage Permit (as distinct from a building consent) issued by the Wellington Water Land Development Team.
- All Public Drainage work is required to be carried out by a suitably experienced Registered Drainlayer, who is employed by a contractor who has an approved Health and Safety Plan and Public Liability Insurance.
- All newly constructed stormwater mains to be vested in Council will need to be approved by Wellington Water Land Development Team based on a [video or] closed circuit television ('CCTV') inspection carried out by the consent holder in

accordance with the New Zealand Pipe Inspection Manual. A pan tilt camera will need to be used, and lateral connections shall be inspected from inside the main.

Stormwater and Wastewater Connections:

~~(51)~~(49) _____ The consent holder must provide the development with a separate and direct connection to the public wastewater and stormwater networks, in accordance with the Wellington City Council Code of Practice for Land Development. Alternatively for stormwater, a separate connection may be to an approved stormwater outfall at a location accepted in writing by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Wellington Water Land Development Team.

Stormwater Neutrality and Treatment:

~~(52)~~(50) _____ To avoid impact on the receiving environment, stormwater treatment must be provided for all new roading and car parking surfaces.

~~(53)~~(51) _____ To avoid impact on downstream properties, stormwater treatment and neutrality is required for any stormwater drained to the public drainage system and the site must be provided with a stormwater retention system. The stormwater retention design must be certified by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Wellington Water Land Development Team and the following aspects must be met:

- The consent holder must construct an approved stormwater retention system in accordance with plans approved under a building consent and agreed with the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Wellington Water Land Development Team.
- The stormwater retention system(s) must be designed so that the total stormwater discharge post development from the proposed development for all events up to the 1% AEP event is less than or equal to the stormwater runoff flows prior to development.
- The stormwater retention system must facilitate water re-use within the buildings.
- The consent holder must ensure that all connections to the system are trapped to minimise debris entering the system.
- The consent holder must not increase stormwater discharge, through an increase in non-permeable areas, without Council approval as an increase in stormwater discharge may result in failure of the stormwater detention systems.

~~(54)~~(52) _____ Prior to completion of the construction works, the consent holder must prepare a draft Operation and Maintenance Manual for all stormwater devices setting out the principles of the general operation and maintenance for the stormwater system(s) and associated management devices. The draft Operations and Maintenance Manual must be submitted to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Wellington Water Land Development Team for certification and is to include, but not be limited to:

- a detailed technical data sheet
- a programme for regular maintenance and inspection of the stormwater system
- a programme for the collection and disposal of debris and sediment collected by the stormwater management device or practices
- a programme for post storm maintenance
- a programme for inspection and maintenance of outfall erosion
- general inspection checklists for all aspects of the stormwater system, including visual check of sumps

- a programme for inspection and maintenance of any vegetation associated with the stormwater devices.

~~(55)~~(53) Any combination of exposed (i.e. unpainted) galvanised steel (with greater than 99% zinc coating) or copper may result in contamination of stormwater runoff upon corrosion of surfaces and therefore stormwater from these materials used for exterior construction (including but not limited to roofing, cladding, gutters and downpipes) must not be discharged to the public stormwater network unless treated on-site by a water quality device. For the avoidance of doubt, this condition does not apply to copper alloys such as brass and bronze.

As-Built Plans:

~~(56)~~(54) At the conclusion of engineering works, the consent holder must submit as-built drawings that meet the requirements of *Wellington Water Regional As-built Specification for Water Services* for water supply, wastewater and stormwater drainage.

~~(57)~~(55) Once an as-built plan has been submitted and within one month of completion of the drainage works and/or before vesting of assets, the consent holder must arrange for a final inspection with the Wellington Water Senior Drainage Inspector.

Notes:

- Where possible, all as-built plans are to be submitted in both hard copy (PDF) and electronically. Electronic copies are to be submitted in CAD format (.DWG file) drawn in the NZGD 2000 New Zealand Transverse Mercator' coordinate system.
- Engineering plans and as-built plans will be required to be in terms of the New Zealand Vertical Datum 2016 (NZVD2016).
- Wellington Water Ltd may require an easement in gross in favour of Wellington City Council over the public water, wastewater and stormwater mains.

Oak Tree Relocation:

~~(58)~~(56) The contractor engaged by the consent holder to carry out the transplanting works and aftercare must demonstrate a proven record of successfully transplanting and establishing large mature trees. A statement of experience must be submitted to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer prior to commencement of the transplanting works.

~~(59)~~(57) Prior to the commencement of the transplanting works, the consent holder must provide to the Council for certification a transplanting methodology and aftercare programme by their nominated contractor. The methodology and aftercare programme must be in general accordance with the Arboricultural Report, job no. 35419, by Arborlab, dated November 2021.

~~(60)~~(58) To allow the best chance of survival following its relocation, the oak tree must be provided with a soil vault and irrigation system (as outlined in section 16 of the Arboricultural Report) and an artificial lighting system (as outlined in section 17 of the Arboricultural Report) in its new location.

Heritage:

Photographic Record:

~~(64)~~(59) _____ The consent holder must submit to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer (in consultation with the Cultural Heritage Advisor) a photographic record in digital format, and labelled with a location and date, and these locations should be noted on a plan or elevation.

Prior to carrying out the photographic record, the consent holder must liaise with the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer (in consultation with the Cultural Heritage Advisor) to agree the positions from where photos are to be taken. The archival photographic record must be submitted at the following stages, or upon request:

(a) Prior to Development:

Undertake a photographic record showing the existing external fabric on the west elevation (window and surrounding stonework) of Parliament House before it is removed, and including:

- Photographs of the window and associated fabric in situ;
- Overall views from different angles; and
- Views of any significant details of the window.

(b) During Development:

Photograph the removal of the window and its aftermath, including:

- Storage of the window and its surrounds;
- Work to remediate the loss of fabric; and
- The installation of the bridge.

(c) Following Development (but no later than three months of the completion of construction [of the bridge link to Parliament House](#)):

Photographic record of the [above](#) completed works [to Parliament House](#), taken from the photographic record locations used for (a) above.

Design Details and Mitigation Measures:

~~(62)~~(60) _____ The consent holder must engage a suitably qualified and experienced conservation architect (and a suitably qualified urban designer where relevant) to provide advice on and input into all detail design and implementation on all heritage-related aspects of the project.

~~(63)~~(61) _____ The consent holder must engage a suitably qualified and experienced conservation architect to prepare a Temporary Protection Plan(s) ('TPP') that includes measures to protect the existing heritage fabric that are prepared according to Christchurch City Council, *Heritage Information, Guideline 14: Temporary Protection of Heritage Items*, Christchurch City Council, n.d. and Frens, Dale H., *Temporary Protection Number 2, Specifying Temporary Protection of Historic Interiors during Construction and Repair*, US National Park Service Cultural Resources, 1993.

The TPP must be submitted to and certified by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer (in consultation with the Cultural Heritage Advisor) prior to the commencement of works to Parliament House.

~~(64)~~(62) The works to Parliament House must be undertaken in accordance with the certified TPP.

~~(65)~~(63) Prior to the commencement of construction of the MUS building and works to Parliament House, the consent holder must submit to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer a set of detailed design drawings showing the full and final details for the link bridge to Parliament House. The information must be prepared by an appropriately qualified person and be designed to:

- Minimise damage to the heritage fabric in accordance with best practice and the TPP above.
- Minimise aesthetic and structural impact on Parliament House.
- ~~confirm~~ Confirm that the connecting bridge between MUS and Parliament House be structurally independent; designed to be as visually open and unobtrusive as possible; and attached to the heritage building as lightly as practicable.
- Use appropriate, high-quality materials.
- ~~Achieve a reduction in the size of the columns to support the bridge as far as practicable.~~

The final design and details must be certified by the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer (in consultation with the Cultural Heritage Advisor) prior to the commencement of construction of the MUS building.

~~(66)~~(64) The works must be undertaken in accordance with the final design and details certified under **condition (65)** above.

~~(67)~~(65) Prior to commencement of the works to Parliament House, the consent holder must submit a brief method statement for appropriate long-term storage of the windows and other heritage fabric removed from Parliament House, and must include:

- Details of where items will be stored.
- Details of where the key to the storage will be located and who will have access to this.
- Details of who will be responsible for regular visits to check that items have not been damaged or removed, and how this information will be recorded.

Urban Design:

Building Design Detail:

~~(68)~~(66) Prior to each building construction commencing, the consent holder must submit a set of drawings showing the full and final details to be used for certification by the Compliance Monitoring Officer. The information must include the following details and provisions:

- Final details for the exterior building materials (including finish and colour).
- Final design and detailing of the link bridge, in accordance with the Heritage conditions above.
- End-of-trip facilities for staff.
- ~~Signage on the buildings, which must be limited to for~~ Signage on the buildings, wayfinding, and traffic management.
- Any interpretative information.

Note: The Compliance Monitoring Officer will liaise with the Urban Design Advisor to confirm that the materials and design are appropriate.

~~(69)~~(67) The final details of the building design must be constructed in accordance with detailed design as certified under **condition (68)** above.

Landscaping Design Detail and CPTED:

~~(70)~~(68) Prior to construction commencing, a final landscape plan(s) must be submitted to, and certified by, the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer. The final landscape plan(s) must include the following details and mitigation measures:

- Materials to be used for pedestrian areas and paving
- Planting
- Exterior lighting
- Design detail for the finishing of any seismic joints visible from a public space.

The information submitted must be to a quality and outcome consistent with the application drawings and as far as reasonably practicable, the recommendations in section 5.2 of the CPTED Assessment prepared by Boffa Miskell Ltd (Appendix 10 of the application).

Note: The Compliance Monitoring Officer will liaise with the Urban Design Advisor to confirm that the details are appropriate.

~~(74)~~(69) The landscaping and other elements certified under **condition (70)** above must be established on-site prior to occupation of the new buildings.

~~(72)~~(70) Any modifications at any time to the design or layout or structures of the landscaping in order to address wind conditions arising from construction of either of the two new buildings must be submitted to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer (in consultation with the Urban Design Advisor) for certification.

~~(73)~~(71) Prior to occupation of the new buildings, the consent holder must submit to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer confirmation that CCTV monitoring and measures for the safety of people accessing on-site external car parking at night have been put in place as per the recommendations of the CPTED Report prepared by Boffa Miskell Ltd (Appendix 10 of the application).

Wind:

~~(74)~~(72) At the detail design stage and during the development of the finalised plans required by the Heritage and Urban Design conditions above, the consent holder must, in consultation with their architectural and wind advisors, further consider and assess wind mitigation with the objective of making the proposed on-site pedestrian areas as safe and attractive as far as reasonably practicable.

The particular focus of this work must be documentation of:

- (i) the means of dealing with safe transition between indoors and outdoors to the west entrance of MUS by screening and/or providing large (i.e. >2.53m) wind lobbies;
- (ii) integration of CPTED concerns, landscaping, windbreaks and natural lines of walking across the site and into and out of the building entrances; and

- (iii) identification within the landscape plan of suitable sheltered outdoor seating areas that receive sun and are out of the extreme northerly winds.

~~(75)~~(73) The consent holder must then provide a written statement to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer outlining the wind measures that have been considered and the rationale for their inclusion in or exclusion from the final design.

Iwi Consultation:

~~(76)~~(74) Prior to the application for building consents for the construction of the MUS and BAL buildings (whichever building consent is lodged first), the consent holder must provide to the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer a report that:

- Summarises the results of consultation with Te Āti Awa, Ngāti Toa and Taranaki Whānui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika (and with any other Māori); and
- Identifies the specific design elements representative of tangata whenua, mana whenua, Māori values and cultural landscapes associated with Māori that will be included in the finished buildings, plaza and plantings.

Monitoring and Review:

~~(77)~~(75) Prior to starting work the consent holder must advise the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer of the date when work will begin. This advice must include the address of the property and the Service Request number and be provided at least 48 hours before work starts, either by telephone on 04 801 4017 or email to rcmonitoring@wcc.govt.nz.

~~(78)~~(76) The conditions of this resource consent must be met to the satisfaction of the Council's Compliance Monitoring Officer. The Compliance Monitoring Officer will visit the site to monitor the conditions, with more than one site visit where necessary. The consent holder must pay to the Council the actual and reasonable costs associated with the monitoring of conditions (or review of consent conditions), or supervision of the resource consent as set in accordance with section 36 of the Act. These costs¹ may include site visits, correspondence and other activities, the actual costs of materials or services, including the costs of consultants or other reports or investigations which may have to be obtained. More information on the monitoring process is available at the following link:
<https://wellington.govt.nz/property-rates-and-building/building-and-resource-consents/resource-consents/applying-for-a-resource-consent/monitoring-resource-consent-conditions>

¹ Please refer to the Council's current schedule of Resource Management Fees for guidance on the current administration charge and hourly rate chargeable for Council officers.

Advice Notes:

1. The land use consent must be given effect to within 5 years of the granting of this consent, or within such extended period of time as granted by the Council pursuant to section 125 of the Act.
2. Section 36 of the Act allows the Council to charge for all fair and reasonable costs associated with the assessment of your application. We will confirm in due course whether the time spent on the assessment of this application is covered by the initial fee paid. If the time exceeds the hours covered by the initial fee you will be sent an invoice for additional fees. If the application was assessed in less time you will be sent a refund. For more information on your fees contact planning.admin@wcc.govt.nz.
3. Where appropriate, the Council may agree to reduce the required monitoring charges where the consent holder will carry out appropriate monitoring and reporting back to the Council.
4. This resource consent is not a consent to build. A building consent may be required under the Building Act 2004 prior to commencement of construction.
5. This resource consent does not authorise any works that also require consent from the Greater Wellington Regional Council. If necessary, separate resource consent(s) will need to be obtained prior to commencing work.
6. A vehicle access bylaw consent is required under Part 5, Section 18 of the Council's Consolidated Bylaw 2008 for the construction of a kerb crossing or driveway within legal road.
7. Out of courtesy, it is suggested that you advise your nearest neighbours of your intention to proceed with this land use consent, your proposed construction timetable and contact details should any issues arise during construction.
8. As far as practicable all construction activity related to the development must take place within the confines of the site. No buildings, vehicles, materials or debris associated with construction may be kept on Council land, including the road, without prior approval from the Council. Please note that landowner approval is required under a separate approval process and that this will need to be sought and approved prior to any works commencing.

For more information on the traffic management process and what further separate landowner approvals may be required in relation to the logistics of working within the legal road either contact the Transport Asset Performance team or visit this link:

<https://wellington.govt.nz/services/parking-and-roads/road-works/work-on-the-roads/permissions-and-approvals>

9. The methods set out in the Greater Wellington Regional Council guideline for erosion and sediment control for the Wellington Region should be followed when undertaking earthworks on the site:
<https://www.gw.govt.nz/assets/Documents/2022/03/Erosion-and-Sediment-Control-Guide-for-Land-Disturbing-Activities-in-the-Wellington-Region.pdf>
10. The WIAL1 Designation protects the airspace for the safe and efficient operation of Wellington International Airport. The Designation requires that any person proposing to construct or alter a building or structure, which does the following, must advise

Wellington International Airport Limited (WIAL) and obtain approval from them under section 176 of the Act:

- a. a new building/structure, additions and/or alterations or a crane or scaffolding which penetrates the Take-off and Approach Surfaces and exceeds a height of 8m above existing ground level; or
- b. a new building/structure, additions and alterations or a crane or scaffolding which penetrates the Conical, Inner Horizontal, or Transitional Side Slopes of the Airport; or
- c. a new building/structure, additions and/or alterations or a crane or scaffolding which results in a height of more than 30m above ground level in the remainder of the Designation area (Outer Horizontal Surface).

You can find the obstacle limitation surfaces at the link below and you can contact WIAL at planning@wellingtonairport.co.nz for any questions that you might have or if you need to seek their approval:

<https://eplan.wellington.govt.nz/proposed/rules/0/258/0/10267/0/32>

11. As consent involves construction works in the Central Area the consent holder may be required to provide details about how the construction will integrate with other major construction projects. For more information contact the Network Activity Manager by email: denise.beazley@wcc.govt.nz

~~44.~~12. In order to provide for the efficient relocation of the heritage oak tree in advance of construction of MUS and BAL, the tree relocation activity will not be subject to Construction Management Plan, Erosion and Sediment Control Management Plan, Contaminated Land Management Plan, Construction Traffic Plan and Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan conditions.