

Shelly Bay Oral Hearings 7 September 2017 | Schedule and Submissions

Time	Submission No.	Name, First	Name, Last	Organisation	Page Number
9:30am	985	Angela	Foster	Havana Architects Group	1
9:30am	561	Angela	Foster	Havana Architects Group	5
9:35am	561	Frances	Velvin		5
9:40am	972	Alister	Smith		9
9:45am	500	Alan	Hucks		13
9:50am	42	Callum	Strong		17
9:55am	Buffer				
10:00am	95	Craig	Boyes		22
10:05am	443	Craig	Oliver		26
10:10am	560	Max	Meyers		30
10:15am	1116	Andrew	Muir		34
10:20am	488	Dan	Henry		36
10:25am	48	Duncan	McKee		40
10:30am-10.45am		MORNING TEA			
10:50am	1066	Mike	Britton	Wellington Branch of the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ Incorporated	43
10:55am	1066	Mike	Britton	Wellington Branch of the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ	43
11:00am	309	Michelle	Rush		49
11:05am	803	Nicole	Miller		
11:10am	804	Nicole	Miller		
11:15am	Buffer				
11:20am	727	Grahame	Hanns		53
11:25am	1072	Stan	Andis		57
11:30am	405	Ian	Cassels		63
11:35am	752	Yvonne	Weeber		66
11:40am	566	Jim	McMahon	Wellington Civic Trust	70
11:45am	566	Jim	McMahon	Wellington Civic Trust	70
11:50am	Buffer				
11:55am	597	Uli	Muellner		76
12:00pm	964	Jo	Copland		80
12:05pm	1016	Ruth	Pemberton		85
12:10pm	996	Tim	Bollinger		89
12:15pm	607	Richard	Burrell		93
12:20pm	1086	David	Graham	Scots Colleague Cycling Club	97
12:25pm	1086	David	Graham	Scots Colleague Cycling Club	97
12:30pm-1pm		LUNCH			
1:05pm	953	Leigh	Malcolm		103

Time	Submission No.	Name, First	Name, Last	Organisation	Page Number
1:10pm	429	David	Hazlett		107
1:15pm	1140	Faye	Bishop		111
1:20pm	581	Karen	Smyth		113
1:25pm	1087	Chris	Horne		117
1:30pm	Buffer				
1:35pm	631	Derek	McCorkindale		120
1:40pm	729	Russell	Tregonning		126
1:45pm	24	Sea	Rotman	Sustainable Energy Advice Ltd	130
1:50pm	24	Sea	Rotman	Sustainable Energy Advice Ltd	130
1:55pm	663	Nicole	McKee		134
2:00pm	332	Nicole	Swann		138
2:05pm	846	Nick	Tipping		142
2:10pm	Buffer				
2:15pm	374	Bernard	O'Shaughnessy		146
3:00-3.15pm		AFTERNOON TEA			
3:20pm	890	Thomas	Wutzler		151
3:25pm	1088	Thomas	Wutzler		155
3:30pm	1088	Thomas	Wutzler		155
3:35pm	186	Nina	Stevenson		161

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **angela**
Last Name: **foster**
Organisation: **foster+melville architects**
On behalf of: **Angela Foster & Roger Walker on behalf of: Havana Architects Group (registered architects): Paul Kerr-Hislop Roger Walker Angela Foster Michael Melville Michael O'Brien Ken Bryant Alan Minty Sally Ogl**
Street: **80 Adelaide Road**
Suburb: **Mount Cook**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6021**
Daytime Phone: **+64272948611**
Mobile: **+64272948611**
eMail: **af@fmarchitects.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Not only will it provide much needed housing in an area already serviced by existing infrastructure, it will upgrade one of Wellington's favourite city scenic routes.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

Wellington does not have the money to develop the area effectively on its own, nor is it core business to do so. A developer has resources to research options and provide the commercial expertise to make the site work. The most viable option is a partnership with the developer leading, and the council moderating the public zones to enable it to provide guardianship in the long term.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

It will active the edge of the harbour, and encourage an upgrade of the foreshore in general. An intensive development would also provide the population for a small community to develop and grow and enrich the area.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

Continued public use is essential when looking to activate the waters edge alongside commercial activities. This can also help to enhance and populate retail entities.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

985

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Frances**
Last Name: **Velvin**
Organisation: **WCC rate payer**
Street: **41 Belvedere Road**
Suburb: **Hataitai**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **NZ**
PostCode: **6021**
Daytime Phone: **04 9707660**
eMail: **cfvelvin@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

I strongly DO NOT support the proposal submitted by Shelly Bay Ltd. The proposed development will severely and adversely affect the natural environment and recreational value of that section of the coastline both to Shelly Bay and the road from Miramar Avenue. The proposal is unsympathetic to the raw beauty of the area that is due to its undeveloped nature. The increased infrastructure, high rise buildings, high traffic volumes, widening of the road, and years of construction will severely detract from its natural and wild beauty that has drawn Wellingtonians to the area for many generations. There is no environmental impact report for the impact on the coastline, the birdlife, flora, fishing, and recreational value. This is an essential document for all major developments and its omission is serious. Nor is there an impact assessment on the affect of construction on Wellingtonians who already use this section of the coastline, or on the already serious traffic congestion from the Eastern suburbs. I also note that the WCC consent restricts discharge/runoff through the storm water drainage system but makes no mention/restriction on erosion/discharge directly in to the sea. Given the proximity to the coast this should have also been restricted. There is lack of transparency around why WCC has engaged only with Shelly Bay Ltd, why the urgency to have this particular proposal promoted at such hast or why ratepayers are expected to pay so much toward a private development and associated infrastructure costs. I don't agree with the WCC saying that the total cost is only \$2m rather than \$10m because the cost is offset with the sale of land for \$8. The sale of land is a cost in itself because we no longer have the benefit of owning that land. The proposal includes ~350 apartments/houses. This puts too much strain on the roads and infrastructure (water, waste water, sewage, etc) and therefore this number should not be included a proposal for Shelly Bay. The area was made a HASHAA area to alleviate the housing shortage yet I saw nothing in the proposal that the homes must be affordable for the average person/family. Consequently, the area is likely to become an elitist development that most Wellingtonians won't be able to afford to live in.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

The WCC should retain ownership of the land so that it can retain control of that land and gain income from it.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

The land earmarked for lease is right on the waterfront. All waterfront land should remain under WCC control, to be open space so as to retain the beautiful wide views of the harbour. Everyone should have access to all the waterfront at all times.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

Green space and walkways are the key to retaining the beauty of this area. The bay should be kept as open spaces with no buildings on the waterfront, though at the base and up the hill might be acceptable. Shelly Bay should not allowed to become a shopping centre/destination! Cafes, bars and shops are already located on the down town waterfront and are not necessary here, other than in very limited numbers. Keep the atmosphere unsophisticated, natural and relaxed. Parking should be kept away from the waterfront to ensure safe access to the walkway and beaches.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

I am extremely concerned about the adverse affect of widening the road on the aesthetic and recreational value of the coastline between Miramar Ave and Shelly Bay. The whole of the northern section of the Miramar Peninsula coastline is an attraction, not just Shelly Bay. This has been completely overlooked in the proposal. The current proposal is to construct a footpath. This is likely to take out many of the beautiful trees that grow between the road and sea; there will be a lack of parking thus restricting access to the beaches for swimming, fishing and picnicking; and the beaches will likely be severely damaged. Should the road be widened further, as the WCC suggests, there will be major destruction of the beaches. I strongly oppose this to happen. I've enjoyed the Evans Bay eastern coastline for many decades and will be extremely disappointed if the WCC supported its destruction.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Alister**
Last Name: **Smith**
Organisation: **Home Owner**
On behalf of: **Alister Smith & Chris Burnett**
Street: **1A Elphinstone Avenue**
Suburb: **Strathmore Park**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **04 9713703**
Mobile: **021 02832320**
eMail: **zakchris@clear.net.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 Not really supportive
 Neutral
 Supportive
 Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Mainly because it is in all the best interest of all of us here to have money coming in here as long as the biggest amount goes towards the whole Community in a whole.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 Not really supportive
 Neutral
 Supportive
 Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

As long as the whole Community ,meaning rate payers can have more money coming in here by a way of revenue in some way.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for

commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

Once again it will be of a benefit to the community as long as a percentage of the lease money goes back into the Community here.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

As long as there is not going to make too much congestion around Shelly Bay.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Just be more considerate of the people that live around the Shelly Bay as we will have to live with these decisions for the rest of our lives.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Alan**
Last Name: **Hucks**
Street: **149 Marine Parade**
Suburb: **Seatoun**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **+64272218883**
Mobile: **+64272218883**
eMail: **alanhucks@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Supportive on the condition of many incentives and consequences being in place for the length of the lease/sale. Developer must contribute ongoing costs for maintenance and modernisation. Council must create accurate and measurable criteria for performance of the developer for duration of the lease.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

Reflection that the parking and infrastructure is not sufficient for the proposed residents and public visitors (including those local Miramar/Seatoun residents who use the road for commuting/access to activities) The Council rental leases for buildings be strictly controlled to allow low income artists

and community residents to utilise and afford to rent the area as they currently have prior to development. Not enough public space has been allocated nor has the parking along the road from Miramar wharf and Scorching Bay been considered for major events that happen regularly like marathons, bike races, fireworks, festivals etc. Alternative access should be considered from the top of Mapuia down to the Shelly Bay development.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

Keen to hear your views on strategic themes for WCC for the new Shelly Bay development and what the opportunity can be used for to develop Arts and Culture, Tourism and Historic initiatives for the citizens. Keen to see some leadership around what policies for building ecosystems and public good can be applied in this sale and lease rather than the measure of economic impact via rates and taxes. Safeguarding a 100 year lease to a commercial operator appears to have profit at the centre of all decisions... just want to be wary of public good initiatives alongside this opportunity for the WCC - Legacy stuff and exciting stuff for the city. (we have enough cafe's, bars and restaurants - what else can we pioneer here??) I would hope that the offer to renters is open to those who have established Shelly Bay as a hive of artistic activity and the pioneers are given affordable rates to stay and continue to benefit from the new ecosystem. These companies and individuals set up there for multiple reasons (mostly low rent) and have helped create Shelly Bay into a destination with little or no outside help from Council (or developers). I would urge anyone not to forget these people and reward them for their hard work in making this 'gem'(rough but lovely gem) the place it is today. Ask yourself the question - what type of atmosphere do you want there? Is it a chance for Wellington to front foot our arts and culture scene? Make a world leading showcase of talent? Please don't make it yet another hub of cafes and restaurants with no soul.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

My only real concern is that as the WCC is providing a leasehold of the land that will be used for commercial and community purposes that the same policies are honoured as if it was leasing the land itself to wellington businesses, individuals and community organisers. Is there any policies that the WCC uses for tenants and commercial leases that should be carried over to the Shelly Bay co? Also great to see the peninsular developed. I'd hate to see this turn into a playground for the rich when the ecosystem has been developed over the last few years by small business and artists.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Traffic and building disruption is inevitable and once the construction is done then it can't be reversed. All major issues should be over budgeted for as will invariably go over time and cost. There isn't a theme to this development apart from a loose idea of high end housing and retail space for visitors. What is the objective beyond housing that the WCC s trying to achieve? Is this a jewel is Wgtn crown then don't let it be under invested in to meet the outcomes of the developer. Make it something truely special and invest for the long view.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Callum**
Last Name: **Strong**
Street: **171 Marine Parade**
Suburb: **Seatoun**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6022**
Mobile: **0226721048**
eMail: **callum.strong@tepapa.govt.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

No consideration has been given to the vehicular impact on Massey Road, Karaka Bay Road and Marine Parade. The applicant calls this route 'recreational'. However there will be an increase in traffic - both recreational and business related on this access route. There is already a problem with speeding traffic between 209 and 165 Marine Parade in Worser Bay as this is the first wide straight part of the route. I believe that traffic calming chicanes and speedhumps should be included on this stretch of road. There is an opportunity here to increase the width of the sanddunes through a chicane in front of properties from 165 - 175 Marine Parade. No consideration has been given to increase of recreational users of the Seatoun Bays beaches. The traffic report only shows 'average' delays for the Mirimar Ave intersection. Full metrics on peak delays should be included as this is likely to run into many minutes as I have experienced under the current situation. I currently rent space at Shelly Bay from so am a regular user of the road. Concerned the road width will impact on Shelly Bay Road beaches. I have lived in Wellington 38 years and spent many a weekend with my Uncle gathering kai moana in the early 80's as a kid. These beaches so close to the city allow so many private quiet spots to enjoy. The peace will be lost for ever. Concerned that the applicant sees fit to hijack the number 30 bus route by increasing the time and inevitable change in timetable that increasing the bus route from Shelly Bay to Scorching in the mornings.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral

- Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

I believe as other developers have offered that the valuation is too low. The lease is also too low over a 125 year term. The 5.5 million to maintain Shelly Bay as is is a saving of 4.5 million to the council over \$10 million contribution. This is also setting a bad precedent for developer handouts when no other development has ever received such help. Cap the investment at 5.5 million.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

The lease is too low over 125 years. The council should look at investing in the properties themselves to create new revenue. Reduce rates not increase!

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

Shelly Bay already has the best cafe in Wellington, art gallerys, shops, parking seating, walkway

and green space. The cafe serves beer. A brewer and boutique hotel does not offer me as a local ratepaying resident any benefit.

42

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

A smaller scale development would be more appropriate for this environment. A long term staged development would be preferable so that traffic and environmental impacts could be managed.

Attached Documents

File
165-209 marine parade drag strip

Need Help?

Privacy Statement



Version 1

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Craig**
Last Name: **Boyes**
Street: **PO Box 14321**
Suburb: **Kilbirnie**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6241**
Daytime Phone: **04 939 1217**
eMail: **c.boyes@kfamilylaw.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

I wish to preserve public access by motor vehicle to the Peninsular. I enjoy driving around it. I enjoy fishing from the shore. There are a number of important areas from which to fish. I enjoy launching my kayak from it. These are all things that are part of what makes Wellington such a great place to live in. I think it's one thing to allow someone to use the land is part of the old airforce base. It's quite another to take away from Wellingtonians their access to these wonderful amenities. I think you should modify your plans to respect these uses or send the developpers somewhere else.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

I am supportive provided you don't change access rights to the coastal road, access to the

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

I am supportive provided you don't change access rights to the coastal road, access to the beaches and the walkway that already exist.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

I am supportive provided you don't change access rights to the coastal road, access to the beaches and the walkway that already exist.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

I am concerned that you have not thought through who uses the Peninsular and how it is used by so many Wellingtonians.

Attached Documents

File

File

No records to display.

95

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Craig**
Last Name: **Oliver**
Street: **58 Tannadyce Street**
Suburb: **Strathmore Park**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6022**
Mobile: **027 443 2242**
eMail: **craig.oliver57@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

There are many reasons I do not support the WCC entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd but I will focus on two. The first is parking. The developer has stated there will be one carpark for every household. Given the value of the proposed residences/apartments and the likely makeup of the families that will own them the likelihood is that the majority of households will have two cars. This doesn't include the the boutique hotel, rest home or businesses that are going to operate there (Chocolate Fish Cafe) let alone any visitors whether they be private or business oriented. As there are approximately 350 residences proposed the number of cars estimated by whomever did the numbers seems to be understated almost deliberately and given there are going to be a maximum of 120? public carparks I don't see where everyone is going to park. The other parking issue is along the 2.5km access road from Miramar Avenue. Over the last 60 years I have enjoyed picnics, swims, fishing with my father and then my children all along that piece of coastline and that will no longer be available to future generations of Wellingtonians under this proposal because there will be nowhere to park. The other issue is related to the first and that is traffic. I see in the promotional material there is comment that there will need to be minor alterations to the intersection of Miramar Avenue and Shelly Bay Road. Whoever made that comment has obviously never tried to get into or out of Shelly bay Road currently let alone sat in nose to tail traffic in Miramar Avenue during peak hour traffic on pretty much any day of the week. The reality is that traffic comes to a near standstill twice a day during peak hours as commuters try to get to work or their children to school and until the situation between the Basin Reserve and Cobham drive is resolved adding several hundred more cars into the mix is going to increase the problem markedly, and the council have said there is no plan for public transport!

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

The proposed scheme is so out of character with the area and the whole peninsular as well as any other developments that have taken place (Fort Dorset being the last one) that it will ruin the nature of the area forever. How this land ever became able to be considered under the HASHAA scheme is beyond belief. To have high density residential building to a height of 27 metres where the rest of the peninsular is only allowed 8 metres is a joke. The new carpark building at Wellington Airport is only marginally taller and that is completely overbearing on the landscape. I agree that the area needs development but not like this. DO IT ONCE AND DO IT RIGHT. That was something my grandfather said to me and his words are as true today as the day he said them to me over 50 years ago. Maybe the Island Bay cycleway is a good place to look for decisions that haven't worked out!

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

I simply don't see any benefit for the public.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive

- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

The public spaces are only of use if there is sufficient parking and reason for people to go there. The proposal includes note of a microbrewery and other commercial operations but if commercial operators don't see these as viable they won't set them up. Likewise the developer isn't bound according to what I have read, to actually develop these commercial spaces. As for the 'village Green' it appears to be a token gesture which is unlikely to be of much value and I suspect will be totally underused. The other issue is the assertion that the cost to the ratepayer is only going to be two million dollars (\$2million). I would like to see some independent costings as I suspect that figure is grossly understated and as the 50/50 split on the cost of the infrastructure is capped at \$20million, we the ratepayers will be liable for any overruns.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

I agree the area needs some development. The area does have the potential to be the Jewel in the Crown for Wellington and future generations and as such the Council has an obligation to its ratepayers and those fire generations of ratepayers to ensure the best possible decisions are made. Central Park in New York covers an area of 341 hectares. The balance of the land on the Miramar peninsular is under 100 hectares. Surely we can preserve this as open space and parkland for future generations and make Wellington the envy of other capital cities worldwide.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Max**
Last Name: **Meyers**
Street: **54 Strathavon Road**
Suburb: **Miramar**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **021 482315**
Mobile: **021 482315**
eMail: **maxmeyers100@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

1 It is an effective way to use the resource, using the expertise of a proven effective local developer. and making use of the land. 2 The area has potential for residential use and reserve/recreation and these are compatible and the housing will enable recreational uses to be more widely enjoyed by local residents and visitors. 3 If the project does not go ahead there will be much less value in the land. The housing component will have no value and the use value of the reserve areas will be less. 4 The proposal will create an attraction for the Wellington area and create additional jobs and an additional visitor destination.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

Shelly Bay Development - Proposed Sale and Lease of Council Land from Meyers, Max

560

1 It will realise considerably more value from the land than leaving it as it is. 2 It will deal with the wasting/degraded buildings and wharfs which will eventually have a cost to demolish or maintain. 3 It will generate ongoing rates revenue for the council. 4 It will revitalise the area and make it a much more attractive place to visit for locals and visitors. 5 I see this as an ideal time to improve Massey memorial, just up the road that is undervalued as it is overgrown with ine trees and has poor access and parking.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

1 I think this is a good idea as it keeps equity in the project so that council benefit in the long term from the added value the project will create. 2 It also helps the developer in the initial stages as it will allow the area to be developed at an earlier stage and getting the commercial elements in place early will help with the sucess of the area from a public, visitor point of view.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

1 It is important to have adequate public toilets. My experiance overseas is that these can easily become overloaded at peak periods. This could be public/private facilities.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

1 The addition of 350 homes will add to the eastern suburbs traffic problem. The additional population will be larger than any other development since Maupia. This is no reason not to do the project, but emphasises the need to get on and find a solution. 2 As noted above, Massey Memorial at the end of the Miramar Peninsular has got lost. It can hardly now be seen being overgrown by surrounding pine trees. It also has a modest walk up access that is inappropriate for the significance of the memorial. Consideration should be given to extending the road improvements to the memorial, to improving parking, upgrading by significantly widening the access path to be appropriate for the memorial, as well as clearing the old pine trees so it can be seen from around the harbour.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Proposal for the Council to sell/lease part of its land at Shelly Bay

We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged. You can answer these questions online at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay, email your thoughts to shellybay@wcc.govt.nz or post this form to us (no stamp needed). **Tell us what you think by 5pm, Monday 14 August 2017.**

Privacy statement – what we do with your personal information

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Section 1 – your details

Your name*:	ANDREW MUIR
Your email or postal address*:	a.muir@paradise.net.nz 86 Tio Tio Rd, Scentoon, Wellington. 6022
You are making this submission:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> as an individual <input type="checkbox"/> on behalf of an organisation. Your organisation's name:
I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillors:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If yes, please give your phone number so that a submission time can be arranged*:	9340710

*mandatory field

Section 2 – questions about the proposal

<p>The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay</p> <p>1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development• the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of housing and commercial/retail facilities• a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development. <p>Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do not support at all <input type="checkbox"/> Not really supportive <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive <input type="checkbox"/> Very supportive</p> <p>What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?</p> <p>The Council land should remain open space with rotten wharfs and buildings demolished</p>
<p>2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay</p> <p>What is your level of support for that proposal?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Do not support at all <input type="checkbox"/> Not really supportive <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive <input type="checkbox"/> Very supportive</p>

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

It is too close to the sea - and too low - and will be inundated by sea level rise in the next 100 years

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for housing and commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes?

1st fold here - fasten here once folded

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

There is no adequate infrastructure to support development and the cost will be expensive - if private land is to be developed then it should be at private cost only.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

The Shelly Bay access is inadequate to support 350 units. The only access is restricted by the Airport. New Residential Development should be at least 10 metres above sea level. Rate Payers cannot afford to be involved financially - there are many more pressing needs - like Earthquake proofing existing infrastructure.

Free Post Authority Number 2199

Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council
Me Heke Ki Pōneke

410-19 29 JUL 17 CARRIED BY NEW ZEALAND POST
Free 
>>> GOT A QUESTION? VISIT WWW.NEPOST.CO.NZ/HEL

FREEPOST 2199
Gerald Blunt (279)
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Dan**
Last Name: **Henry**
Street: **170 Darlington Road**
Suburb: **Miramar**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **+6421355848**
Mobile: **021 355 848**
eMail: **beaconhillpictures@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

My reasons are many, but number one is that the costs of the required improvements to the infrastructure, such that the development can proceed, are far too great, and still not quantified. You suggest a 50-50 split, but it's subsequently been stated that the developer's contribution be capped at \$10 million. One only needs to look at costings of large scale infrastructure work proposed for similar areas in the eastern suburbs to realise the true cost of this element will be far more than \$20 million, and likely upwards of \$40 to \$50 million. The council does not appear to have independently costed the works, but rather taken the developer at his word. There is no sound reason for committing generations of ratepayers to this expense. The ratepayers will bear the cost and the developer will reap all the profit. The second is that I think Wellingtonians will lose far more than they gain by this development proceeding. We'll lose access to a large amount of accessible land. Granted much of the base and its associated roads are currently privately owned, but in practice, the public have right to roam. We'll lose access to the 2.5km of coastline, through loss of parking. Instead, we'll have 350 private dwellings, and a 50m by 30m lawn. Any suggestion that outsiders will be welcome here is cynical - and hopelessly optimistic at best.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

I strongly disapprove of selling this land and building such intensive housing. I understand that Wellington needs more housing, but 350 dwellings alone is not going to fix it, and this area is not the place. The fact that the road and the infrastructure cannot support such intensive building should be a clue. There is land elsewhere in the city - even on the peninsula which is better suited to housing.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

The sea-level rise factor makes this a poor decision. Who will be responsible for mitigating risk to buildings and improvements, when the rising sea makes these areas unsafe? The tenant? Or the ratepayer as landlord? I understand there's directive from central government enforcing a 'retreat' from coastal areas lower than 1.9m above sea level. By my reckoning this would encompass more than a third of the area being considered for lease. I cannot fathom why more detailed analysis had not been done in this area prior to the resource consent being granted.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

I think public spaces are hugely important. To the extent that I think any development in the Bay should be close to 100% publicly accessible. I guess the 350 houses are there to gain maximum profits for the developer.. but I think the Council should have sought multiple visions for the area, rather than be lead by one developer. So -public spaces are good - but what's proposed here is in NO way enough. The village green is tiny. A walkway? - for goodness sake, it's the coast! Of course there should be a walkway! That's like telling us you'll provide fresh air for all visitors. Parking - there is not enough. What's available will be used by residents. There's no public transport planned, no cycle-way planned, ... so people will HAVE to drive. It's a handbrake to the whole space. A cafe? ..ok, but not exactly visionary is it.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

I've covered only a few main points here. The increased traffic flow has clearly not been thought through, with regards to the downstream effect on an already stressed Cobham Drive; The bizarre way this development has been ushered through the HAASHA Act - deliberately to avoid consultation and notification of consent, it would seem; I fear greatly that this proposal is the thin end of the wedge. That phases two and three of this concrete jungle will ruin Mt Crawford and Watts Peninsula forever. I realise the scope of this submissions process is limited to the sale and lease of two land parcels, and it NOT seeking general views on he potential of the area - but I think the Council has a great opportunity here; a chance to shape the beginnings of something truly world class in an area that is the best real estate, in the best city in the world. I would urge Councillors to take the long view - and decide to make their legacy something far greater than an urban slum. Thanks for reading this far. I do appreciate it. Cheers, Dan

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Duncan**
Last Name: **McKee**
Organisation: **Ratepayer**
On behalf of: **McKee whanau**
Street: **47 Hohiria Road**
Suburb: **Hataitai**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6021**
Daytime Phone: **04 3863253**
Mobile: **027 295 0643**
eMail: **LE303@xtra.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

I will address the matter in person at the hearing.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Submission from Forest & Bird, Wellington Branch, on the Shelly Bay Proposal (Service Request No 368659)

Our Details

Name	Mike Britton		
Address	Chairperson, Forest & Bird, Wellington Branch P O Box 4183, Wellington 6140		
Email	wellington.branch@forestandbird.org.nz		
We are making this submission on behalf of an organisation	Yes	Name of organisation	Forest & Bird, Wellington Branch
We would like to make an oral submission to the Councillors	Yes	Contact phone number	021 054 3456

Introduction

This submission is made to Wellington City Council (WCC) on behalf of the Wellington Branch of the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society New Zealand Incorporated. Forest & Bird is New Zealand's leading independent conservation organisation, which has since 1923 played an important role in preserving New Zealand's environment and native species.

Grass-roots support for Forest & Bird is achieved through our local branches, which operate semi-autonomously to carry out local environmental projects. Wellington Branch, with approximately 1,700 members, has concerns about the proposed development, which could directly and indirectly affect wildlife adversely.

Special Housing Areas and the Resource Management Act

The enabling legislation for Special Housing Areas (SHAs) is the *Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013* (HASHAA). While the HASHAA overrides some parts of the *Resource Management Act 1991* (RMA), it does not supplant the major part of the RMA.

Part 2, section 34 of the HASHAA states that slightly greater weight is to be given to the purpose of the Act (that is, the HASHAA) than to the provisions of Part 2 of the RMA. However, this does *not* mean that the RMA is to be ignored — it means that the provisions of the RMA still apply, but in certain cases greater weight is to be given to the purpose of the HASHAA.

In other words: a resource consent application under the HASHAA cannot simply ignore the environmental protections built into the RMA, but should explicitly state where the protections of Part 2 of the RMA are considered to have less weight than the HASHAA.

The applicant's Service Request document (SR 368659) acknowledges this in many sections of the application, but otherwise makes little mention of the impact of the proposal on the natural environment. Furthermore, there appears to be little justification for the site's categorisation as an SHA under the criteria of the HASHAA, especially in light of the additional infrastructure that will be needed. We ask that either the applicant or WCC specify the criteria under which this site qualifies as an SHA and produce evidence to support this assertion.

Where the word "environment" is used in the application, it often refers to "the surroundings". There is little consideration of the impact on wildlife or plants and trees, other than reference to the possible relocation of some pōhutukawa (which, of course, although they may have some heritage value, are not native to Wellington).

We ask that a full environmental impact report be produced that will take into account the effects on the native vegetation of the area and the marine life, especially Little Penguins (kororā, *Eudyptula minor*), which are known to nest in the area.

Features of the proposed development

This proposed development will:

- be isolated from the core infrastructure and facilities of both the Miramar Peninsula and the central city
- have an impact on the peninsula's wildlife both during construction and from an increase in the permanent population — with over 350 residential dwellings — as well as their visitors, hotel guests and other Wellingtonians visiting the proposed café and other facilities in the area
- abut the marine environment and be vulnerable to rising sea levels and storm surges
- create a projected four-fold increase in vehicle traffic, which will increase the proportion of heavy metals from road runoff and potentially increase the presence of these toxins in the sea unless adequate safeguards are put in place.

There is no plan for any local shopping facilities, nor any plan for a convenient bus service in the short to medium term. Wellington prides itself on the proportion of its citizens using public transport, but apart from a suggested ferry service, the proposal makes no effort to avoid a large increase in car traffic along a narrow access road. Since WCC is to play a major part in the development, it would be unacceptable for it to agree to a clearly retrograde plan.

Wildlife

This proposal will affect not only the wildlife on the shore (such as the kororā) but also the foreshore and inter-tidal zone, with an impact on oystercatchers and other vulnerable species. However, the greatest impact is likely to be on kororā.

We request that the development not result in any loss of coastal edge and that areas of ecological and geological value be protected, for example: the cliffs and cliff faces, which are nesting habitat for some species of birds (other than kororā).

Kororā

Kororā (or Little Penguins, also often known as Little Blue Penguins) are the only seabirds known to nest along the strip of coastline between Cobham Drive and Shelly Bay. They are worthy of particular consideration as they are classified by the Department of Conservation (DoC) as “at risk and in decline” in urban areas — the population around Wellington Harbour and along the South Coast is in slow decline (unlike the kororā population on Matiu/Somes Island, which is not threatened by development, dogs or cars).

DoC's website entry on kororā notes that:

“Dogs are likely the greatest threat to Little Penguins. Cats, ferrets and stoats will also kill them. Little Penguins are also killed crossing coastal roads.

“These threats have increased with more coastal development bringing more dogs and the clearance of traditional nesting sites.” (Our italics)

Kororā have high site fidelity — they return to their natal area to breed even if the topography has changed. They are often killed by vehicles when travelling between nest-sites and the sea, or searching for a nest-site which has been lost through development or road-widening.

In October 2016 a penguin detector dog found kororā activity at 12 sites along Shelly Bay Road between the proposed Shelly Bay development and the Miramar cutting. The majority of these were natural nest sites in riprap or burrows in natural clay banks. In this same area, Forest & Bird's Places for Penguins project has 7 nest-boxes situated on the seaward side of

the road. We ask that provision be made to ensure these nest sites remain, because there is nowhere else kororā can safely nest along this stretch of coastline.

Kororā require suitable nesting places and a means to get to them. Riprap, made with large and irregular shaped rocks, built to a depth of 2m and with large voids between boulders, can offer good nesting opportunities. This is increasingly being used in suitable coastal areas to provide a margin between the ocean and coastal roads, since, as well as being kororā-friendly, it also provides much greater protection against increasing tidal and storm surges than a near-vertical sea wall, which will always eventually get undermined.

The two major threats to kororā on land are dogs and cars. A close check should be kept on the number of kororā killed or injured in the area and the cause identified, where this is possible. If the number increases significantly, WCC should be ready to restrict those activities most responsible for the deaths. Knowing that kororā are present in the area and that the species is at risk and in decline, we expect safeguards for kororā well-being will be integrated into the final design and that WCC will strictly enforce controls on activities that are known to cause harm to kororā, especially dogs off-lead.

It is possible that a barrier of suitable design could prevent kororā from crossing the road, if coupled with enough nesting opportunities along the foreshore. There may possibly be opportunities for underpasses for kororā to access higher ground, although it seems likely that all areas of higher ground suitable for kororā will be under development.

The access road

We have already highlighted the considerable increase in traffic that the proposed development will generate. If, at some future time, a bus service is provided, it is likely that the road will be widened. It appears that road-widening is also being contemplated by WCC for other reasons, such as providing more room for cyclists and pedestrians as traffic volumes grow.

In the shorter term, the development at Shelly Bay will require considerable construction traffic, a point that seems to be glossed over in the application. Shelly Bay Road is already in only moderate condition and likely to require upgrading before heavy construction vehicles can use it. Any such upgrading would have an adverse impact on the marine and shore wildlife.

We consider that all of the various options proposed for the road between Cobham Drive and Shelly Bay have serious deficiencies. Along most of its length, there is insufficient room to allow for walkers, cyclists and the increased motor traffic without unacceptable damage to the coastal edge, which is important for the survival of wildlife, some locally rare plants and increasingly rare coastal ecosystems.

We therefore ask that before any development at Shelly Bay goes ahead, WCC should resolve all the outstanding issues relating to the future of the road around Miramar Peninsula. (For example: restricting activity to walking and cycling around the northern end of the peninsula, between the Massey Memorial access point and Scorching Bay, would be of substantial assistance to wildlife and recreation — provided of course that there are restrictions on dogs in these areas and that dog control regulations are actually enforced).

We also ask that WCC consider options that would allow a safe, separate footpath that does not destroy the coastal edge nor ruin kororā habitat, together with measures to enhance cyclists' safety.

One option being discussed by WCC is the provision of a cantilevered walkway. While we do not support this option, if it were to be implemented it might be possible to position nest-boxes beneath it.

However, the difficulties with this option are:

- **kororā access:** the provision of suitable kororā access routes
- **volunteer access:** the difficulty of access by Forest & Bird volunteers to ensure the safety of the kororā and to maintain and monitor the nest-boxes on a regular basis
- **rubbish:** this coast is a lee shore in a nor'westerly — débris tends to build up along the shore as a result and it is currently a repository for washed up rubbish and dumped waste — all highly detrimental to wildlife.

If the road or walkway is cantilevered out over the current shoreline, rubbish will need to be removed on a regular basis or it will be a hazard to wildlife. The area beneath should be inaccessible to the public, with locked gates or similar, allowing only authorised access (for example: by WCC staff or Forest & Bird volunteers tending the nest-boxes).

The proposal discusses making the road safer by reducing the speed limit to 30km/h. While we support this, we consider this inadequate without further measures. The current 40km/h limit is already widely ignored. Forest & Bird volunteers use this stretch of road regularly and find that if you travel at the speed limit, drivers behind you will often exhibit impatient and aggressive behaviour, tailgating and hooting.

We ask that the speed limit be enforced by effective speed calming measures and that consideration be given to safe crossing facilities for kororā.

Climate change

The effects of climate change appear to have been largely disregarded. The application mentions that buildings will be raised a couple of metres above the current sea level, but this can only be a short-term measure, and of course it will not protect the access road from inundation as the sea level rises.

In line with scientists' predictions, it is becoming apparent to everyone that mean sea levels are rising and extreme weather events are becoming increasingly common. Furthermore, recent analysis suggests that the changes are happening more rapidly than even many of the most pessimistic had predicted. It appears to us to be a gross oversight to discount the effect of climate change as minor and to construct a coastal community without undertaking a comprehensive environmental impact assessment.

The development appears to have minimal contingency for sea level rise. It commits WCC, as a partner in this development, to actively support an untenable future for residents of the development. We question whether Wellington ratepayers would support the building of a seawall along the entire length of Shelly Bay Road and Massey Road. Furthermore, such a seawall would effectively remove the entire length of this coast from being kororā habitat.

Loss of amenity

As one of our members notes:

“In any other major city, such an asset so close to the city centre would be highly treasured and preserved to enhance the essential and diverse recreational requirements for the health and well-being of a large urban population.”

This area is one of the few places left in the city where people can watch seabirds and native marine animals such as seals, minutes from the city, without getting stuck on a traffic jam.

If this proposed development goes ahead, with the likely widening of the road that is suggested in some parts of the application, we ask that large parts of the area should be kept in their current state (which we accept is, in some cases, already highly modified) to allow wildlife and native plants to continue to thrive.

Other concerns

We ask that the agreement between WCC and the developer require a high standard of maintenance, appearance and minimal impact on the environment from factors such as rubbish, pollution, noise, or activities detrimental to wildlife.

The proposed complex may increase boat traffic and measures will need to be taken to protect wildlife (such as kororā, seals and dolphins that occasionally visit the area) from jet-skis and motor boats travelling at high speed. A maximum speed limit for powered craft of 5 knots should be imposed within 200m of the Miramar coast. A noise limit should also be imposed on watercraft to preserve the peaceful nature of the area.

The application also gives insufficient consideration to the natural features of the site and shows scant concern for its open space classification. Section 8.4 of the application (*Actual and Potential Effects* [SR No 368659, p 33 et seq]) discusses effects on adjacent properties but ignores or treats as minor the environmental impact. Although the area was previously used by the defence department, the proposed multi-storey dwellings are quite different in scale from the department's single-storey buildings.

Mitigation of adverse effects

The Design Panel required by WCC (mentioned in a note in Section 12.0 of the application [SR 368659, p63]) should include a design panel member who has environmental design credentials — this member would be the design panel member jointly appointed by the applicant and WCC. We would expect this designer to be familiar with, and have design experience using, water sensitive urban design (WSUD) methods in addition to having ecological expertise.

Provisions of the consent by WCC (Notice of Decision, p10, clauses 22 and 24) on control of material need to include measures that require the marine environment to be free of the contaminants mentioned in these clauses.

We are also particularly concerned about stormwater and wastewater (Ibid, p17, clauses 55 and 56). We ask that:

- no contaminants are able to enter the marine environment during extreme weather events (which will be more frequent due to climate change), and
- no stormwater be directed into the marine environment without filtration and removal of contaminants, and
- roadside drainage is similarly treated, consistent with the principles of WSUD.

The proposed landscaping of the site (Ibid, p19, clauses 59 and 64) should require species that are native to the ecological area. There is no reason to use any exotic or New Zealand species that are not native to Wellington. In particular, we do not agree with clause 65, which requires the transplanting of pōhutukawa (*Metrosideros excelsa*); although these pōhutukawa may have some limited heritage value, it would be more far-sighted to use for landscaping purposes trees that are native to Wellington, such as northern rātā (*M. robusta*).

However, we do agree with the notes in the Notice of Decision following clauses 61 and 64 (Ibid, p19–20). The notes in these clauses suggest that ngaio (*Myoporum laetum*) should be used in place of Chinese elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*) — we strongly agree that there is absolutely no justification for the use of *U. parvifolia*.

Other mitigation could include:

- planting the foreshore to be kororā-friendly habitat, although the opportunities for this may be extremely limited by road-widening and site development
- prohibiting fishing from the wharf (since fishing gear endangers kororā and most marine life — it is not widely appreciated that seabirds frequently get tangled in fishing line or swallow baited hooks, and that the outcome is generally an agonising death)
- enforcing dog control measures.

In summary

We ask that:

- in general:
 - the Design Panel include a panel member with environmental design credentials
 - there be no loss of areas with high ecological value, including on the cliffs above the road
 - there be effective enforcement of dog control regulations
- for the development site:
 - either the applicant or WCC specify the criteria under which this site qualifies as an SHA and produce evidence to support this assertion
 - a full environmental impact report be produced that will take into account the impact of sea level rises on the long-term sustainability of the site, and the effects of the development on the native vegetation of the area and on the marine life
 - WCC impose speed and noise limits on watercraft to preserve the peaceful nature of the area
 - WCC require any new planting to include only species native to the ecological area
- for Shelly Bay Road and Massey Road:
 - there be no loss of the road edge and coastal land in kororā nesting areas (most of Shelly Bay Road and Massey Road), since there is nowhere else kororā can safely nest along this stretch of coastline
 - before any development at Shelly Bay goes ahead, WCC resolve all the outstanding issues relating to the future of the road around Miramar Peninsula, such that large parts can be kept in their current state to allow wildlife and native plants to thrive
 - WCC implement measures to improve the long-term safety of for cyclists and pedestrians without destroying the coastal edge or ruining kororā habitat
 - roadside drainage be treated, consistent with the principles of WSUD, and that no contaminants are able to enter the marine environment during extreme weather.

We wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Mike Britton
Chairperson
Forest & Bird, Wellington Branch

14 August 2017

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Michelle**
Last Name: **Rush**
Street: **32 Abbott Street**
Suburb: **Ngaio**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6035**
Daytime Phone: **+6444791730**
Mobile: **+274574414**
eMail: **rush.m@xtra.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Shelly Bay is a beautiful place, and Wellington needs to see it better cared for, and we also need more houses closer to town. This satisfies on a number of fronts. Having council help enable this, especially when it has a responsibility regardless to manage existing, run-down buildings makes sense. However, I believe that WCC is not making the most of this opportunity, and that it needs to tie its investment to some improvements to the proposals being put forward: Three things are missing, that I believe would make a huge difference: 1) Road access. It is madness to rely on the current narrow road for such a major development. An alternative route needs serious investigation. 2) The proposal does not include a camping ground. WCC currently doesn't have one, and this site would be the perfect place for one. 3) Social housing. Whilst I note that some housing is being provided for papakainga, which I strongly support, I would like to see provision of a portion of the homes as social housing a condition of council support for this development: this is an area with flat access, and close to amenities at Miramar, and in a nice place with access to good schools nearby: it is ideal for social housing, including older people, those with disabilities, and families. Don't let this opportunity go! And if this requires further council investment to realise, please do so. I would like to see my rates supporting poorer Wellington families to access good quality housing in a nice place. More on these matters below.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral

- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

Continuing the matter of my conditional support for the reasons above, here are what I see as the benefits and issues: Benefits are that it provides some income generation for the council. Issues are that this development consent application doesn't include provision for social housing. If a portion of this council land, and/or a condition of sale of the land, could see part of what is developed earmarked for social housing (I'm thinking the ground floor apartments for instance, good for families, the disabled, and old people...) then it would have my full support. No developments should be being allowed without social housing anymore. We have far too much inequality as it is.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

It is a good concept, as it retains the land in public ownership, yet enables people to work near to home, and/or provide services for the new community and visitors. It would be good to see some quality design guidelines incorporated to the consent conditions, so that we don't end up with anything hideous like big box retailing slapped on the waterfront.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

This sounds great. However WCC is missing a major opportunity for a camping area to be part of this development: it's a beautiful place; it would attract a wider range of tourists (domestic and international) - and it would provide another income stream for the businesses that establish here... for all these reasons I'd like to see that form part of what WCC does here. If you're spending dollars to upgrade infrastructure anyway, it would make sense to ensure that this sort of use is provided for w.r.t. waste water etc.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Has alternative road access been considered? If it hasn't, please do so and report on this to submitters. Has council considered synergies between the future for Mt Crawford and Shelly Bay? In my view, an alternative roadway makes even more sense when this wider picture is taken. Why is a development put through under the 'special housing area' provisions and all the privileges that come with that class of consent, allowed to have no provision for social housing? I do hope WCC is amending its policy on this with urgency. It is shocking to me that this is the case.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Grahame**
Last Name: **Hanns**
Street: **Suite 3, 248 Willis Street**
Suburb: **Te Aro**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6011**
Daytime Phone: **027 428 1028**
eMail: **seadog.invest@xtra.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 Not really supportive
 Neutral
 Supportive
 Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Supporting the development will add a vibrant seaside village to the city. A new port for the East/West Ferry to pick up and drop off residents and visitors; making the ferry service more viable to the Eastern bays. Seen as a point of interest to people flying into the city as they arrive. Tidying up an area that has been neglected. Providing much needed accommodation in a city with limited land resources.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 Not really supportive
 Neutral
 Supportive
 Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

Filling a gap in the housing shortage in a city short of land resources.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

Balancing an area with residential/business activity; therefore creating local communities.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

Benefits of providing families with another outdoor city area to enjoy and share memories. Creating a vibrant outdoor environment for all to enjoy. Attraction for visitors to the City.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

**Apartment D44/25 Graham Street
Petone,
Lower Hutt 5012**

Telephone: 970 7450

Email = stanpatandis@gmail.com

12th August 2017

**Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington**

Attention: Gerald Blunt (279)

SUBMISSION re: Shelly Bay sell/lease part of its land at Shelly Bay

To whom it may concern,

I do not support the Wellington City Council in its bid to enter into any Arrangements, Contract or Partnership with Shelly Bay Ltd.

Introduction:

My name is Stanley Andis, recent resident of Petone.

I lodge this submission as an individual on my own behalf.

I do not represent any organisation.

Prior to moving to my current address, I had been a resident of Wellington for 78 years.

As such I was a Wellington Ratepayer for 52 years at my previous address of 36 Ahuriri Street, Strathmore Park.

I was President of the Strathmore Park Progressive and Beautifying Association (Inc) for 24 years.

In my capacity as President I represented the Strathmore Park Community on the Moa Point Waste Water Community Liaison Group (CLG) for 24 years.

Prior to its voluntary winding up I was President of the (RANAG) = Residents Air Noise Action Group (Inc).

I was the Chair Person of the Eastern Suburbs Steering Group comprising of eastern suburb Resident Associations in the 1980's.

During the term of my community involvement I participated in Environment Court Proceedings on behalf of RANAG and two occasions on behalf of the Moa Point CLG.

I also attended a District Licensing Application by the Strathmore Local for an Alcohol Licence at their property in Strathmore Avenue.

In August 2015 I was awarded the Absolutely Positively Award for services to the Community.

SUMMARY:

I have read the documents that have been made available on the WCC website, and quite frankly I am disturbed that this proposal is all but signed off by the Council.

It is inconceivable that a non notified Resource Consent Process has progressed to the extent where the public consultation process is merely a formality.

This process would indicate that there is a sense of urgency, and yet when the documents are scrutinised the development will not be completed for at least 13 years.

The introduction of HASHAA without any shadow of doubt is an Act that is completely foreign to the Community.

From my point of view and involvement in community issues the implications of HASHAA or its existence have never been communicated to me.

While ignorance of the Law is not an excuse, the extent and implications of this Act should have been broadly advised to the public at large.

Clearly the Wellington City Council has taken advantage of this procedure to circumvent an entire process and has consequently become involved in a process that is tarnished with a veil of secrecy.

While the housing shortage in Wellington needs to be addressed I cannot accept that the Council has entered into an agreement that was undertaken in the manner that is unfolding day by day.

As such the Wellington City Council in my view needs to address and review its stance and the extent of its involvement in issues relating to Building Developments.

The Local Government Act 2002 lays down the requirement that Local Bodies must "consult" with the public prior to authorising expenditure for Draft Annual Plans.

Inevitably the Wellington City Council has followed this procedure in accordance with the Act.

Having been part of many processes involving the Long Term Plan and Draft Annual plans I cannot recall any occasion where a decision has been approved by Council as a result of the Consultation process.

Past history indicates that Council documents are made available to the ratepayer after recommendations have been completed by Council Officers, and then put out for "Consultation" prior to Council approval.

This proposal is a case in point where the Council has been totally involved with a prospective developer to the extent where an agreement has been reached in accordance with the legal requirement of the Act.

To complete the process all that is required is a so called "Consultation" process similar to what is currently in place and provides a 4 week period for submissions to conform to the Act.

The ratepayer's opinions become a secondary consideration as the decision has virtually been agreed upon.

Further to this, Council has drawn up a Memorandum of understanding with the developer without knowledge of the ratepayer.

The Council proposes to commit several million dollars to this agreement without a clear and decisive amount to fulfil a budgeted expenditure regime.

To the best of my knowledge expenditure for this project has yet to be included in the Long Term Plan and Draft Annual Plan.

Neither does there appear to be a District Plan change to permit this proposal.

Dominion Post Advertisements:

Advertisements in the Dominion Post Newspaper (lodged by Shelly Bay Ltd) dated July 22nd, July 29th and 5th August clearly imply that the ratepayer will be committed to \$2 million.

The implication that for \$2 million *"we can have a world class destination with new housing, employment and attractions that will make Wellington an even better place to live."* is an outrageous claim.

The advertisement implies that \$5.85 million will be required to *"maintain Shelly Bay's neglected buildings and infrastructure."*

The buildings have been left to rack and ruin from the day that the RNZAF vacated the location.

Where is the documentation indicating why the buildings should or will be restored?

Where is the consultation process of the ratepayer by Council that concludes \$5.85 million has been approved for the restoration?

When referring to documents obtained through the OIA by Undersea Construction and GK Shaw the wharf piles are beyond repair.

The buildings as illustrated are clearly neglected and run down.

When the buildings are in such a dilapidated state, the question remains as to why any process should be followed or finance committed toward such a futile exercise.

In my view all of these buildings including the wharves should be demolished, with site being cleared and the land converted to public open space.

While HASHAA aims to fast track housing developments the Act does not provide WCC to commit ratepayer's funds to enter into secret arrangements or agreements.

Even though the Act might suggest that a non notified Resource Consent is desirable clearly the lack of public input is totally unsatisfactory or acceptable.

The current "Consultation" process is clearly one of fulfilling a legal requirement that does not commit, indicate or suggest that changes will be made in accordance with public opinion.

I totally disagree with any arrangement or agreement where the Wellington City Council and Shelly Bay Ltd where \$10 million for each party would be committed to public infrastructure improvements or renewal.

It is noted that should there be a requirement for road widening then the onus of responsibility falls on to the shoulders of the Wellington City Council.

This is totally unacceptable.

If road widening was required then a Resource Consent would be required to be applied through the Greater Wellington Regional Council at the expense of the Wellington City Council.

This arrangement is totally unacceptable.

As the Development is the responsibility of Shelly Bay Ltd then this party in my view must shoulder the burden of responsibility.

I totally disagree with the implication that the Wellington City Council should be held responsible for the Infrastructure relating to sewage and it being piped to Salek Street with the need to install a pump station.

As the Development is that of Shelly Bay Ltd it is that party as Developer who should be party to all expenses relating to that service.

The current sewage and storm water infrastructure in the eastern suburbs has reached its full capacity and any undue overload from additional flow rates would severely impact on the existing infrastructure.

The water supply via a water reservoir should be the responsibility of Shelly Bay Steel Ltd and not that of the Wellington City Council.

I totally disagree with the Traffic Report that the impact of 4700 vehicle movements would only have a "minor" impact on the traffic intersection at Miramar Avenue and Shelly Bay Road.

Already the traffic congestion from Wellington Airport on Cobham Drive plays a major part on traffic congestion, the fact that airport traffic will increase in future will without doubt play a major role on future traffic flows.

Traffic congestion during the so called "rush hours" has reached the stage where traffic flows through Wellington Road, Ruahine Street and Mt Victoria Tunnel are in a situation that cannot cope.

These roads should be widened immediately to relieve the congestion with the chances of that occurring are not even on the horizon.

A suggested remedy at the Miramar Avenue has been the addition of traffic lights or the addition of a roundabout.

In my view Traffic lights would create unacceptable congestion.

A Roundabout would probably be worth considering.

Whatever the remedy, 4700 new vehicle movements will impact on this intersection in major proportions, a far cry from "minor" impacts.

Conclusion:

Wellington City has demonstrated a complete lack of transparency in this process to date.

When ratepayers' monies are involved there cannot be any circumstances where commercial sensitivity prohibits public information.

The Wellington City Council in my view has exceeded its authority by entering into arrangements where ratepayers' monies have been committed without due process.

That a non notified Resource Consent process has been completed without public input is unacceptable.

HASHAA may well have been implemented to speed up the process but when this development will take 13 years, I can see no reason why the Council has taken the action that has taken place.

The impact on rates has not been discussed.

The commitment to open ended expenditure is firmly placed on the shoulders of the Wellington City Council.

This is totally unsatisfactory and unacceptable.

I wish to appear for an oral submission with a time allocation of 30 minutes.

Based on my comments, I do not support the Wellington City Council to enter into any arrangements, Contract or Partnership with Shelly Bay Ltd.

Yours faithfully,

Stan. Andis

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **ian**
Last Name: **Cassels**
Organisation: **self**
On behalf of: **self**
Street: **252 Left Bank**
Suburb: **Te Aro**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6011**
Daytime Phone: **8024291**
Mobile: **021390871**
eMail: **ian@twc.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 Not really supportive
 Neutral
 Supportive
 Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

It is precisely what Wellington needs - diverse housing range, better harbour use, tourism attraction, Friday Night Fish and Chips

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 Not really supportive
 Neutral
 Supportive
 Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments
as before

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

Stops Wellington looking like a decrepit City - improves choices and raises the reputation of the City

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

The reinstatement of Taranaki Whanui and proof of the cooperation pledged in two documents

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Yvonne**
Last Name: **Weeber**
Street: **143 Queens Drive**
Suburb: **Lyllall Bay**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **0272225390**
Mobile: **0272225390**
eMail: **weebery@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

I do not support the agreements that are proposed between Wellington City Council and Shelly Bay Ltd. The existing roading, beaches and open spaces should remain accessible to all Wellington ratepayers and users now and in the future. The resource consent should have been fully notified explaining to the public of Wellington City that this was being proposed. If the developer can not develop this land without a sale, lease and 50/50 split of infrastructure costs then the development should not go ahead. I am aware that accurately quantified costs for significant infrastructure have not been assessed, therefore it does not make economic sense to Wellington ratepayers to have anything to do with this development. I also asked at one of the consultation days if the plan was accurate and was told it was not. Effectively the Councillors are proposing to sell undefined land to support over development in Shelly Bay.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the

Comments

This development is not an affordable housing development and will not result in housing that the majority of Wellingtonians can afford. It is very unclear as to why Wellington City Council is supporting this type of development to this degree. The amount of housing will increase the amount of cars travelling on a narrow windy road that is used by a large number of cyclists. The proposal needs to consider reducing the number of houses and increasing the diversity of other uses for employment and general passive and active recreation. Wellington City Council also has no clear plans of what it is going to do with the land around Shelly Bay. This whole end of the Miramar Isthmus should be considered for a total Masterplan prior to any development or resource consent taking place in Shelly Bay

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

At present the plans for this development do not support enough diversity. The proposal needs to consider reducing the number of houses and increasing the diversity of other uses for employment and general passive and active recreation. Any development in Shelly Bay should be through a fully notified resource consent.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

Shelly Bay Development - Proposed Sale and Lease of Council Land from Weeber, Yvonne

752

The amount of housing and intensity is not sensitive to the area or the Shelly Bay guidelines in the Wellington District Plan. The development is putting a large number of houses at the end of a long narrow windy road. The development needs to be truly mixed use and consider the future recreation potential of this coastline and this end of the Miramar Peninsula. Any development in Shelly Bay should be through a fully notified resource consent.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Why was this development undertaken as a non notified resource consent under the HASHA legislation? It would appear to me that a number of issues have not been sorted prior to granting this consent. The proposal needs to consider reducing the number of houses and increasing the diversity of other uses for employment and general passive and active recreation. Any development in Shelly Bay should be through a fully notified resource consent. The number of cyclists who use this road have not been considered in an appropriate way in the design. The road does not increase the cycling safety it decreases it. The use of angle parking along a section of road within the development is not appropriate and very dangerous for cyclists. The increase in the number of cars that are anticipated to use the road is inappropriate for this area.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Jim**
Last Name: **McMahon**
Organisation: **Wellington Civic Trust**
Street: **PO Box 10183, The Terrace**
Suburb:
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6143**
Mobile: **027 292 4649**
eMail: **secretary@wellingtoncivictrust.org**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

The Wellington Civic Trust is not opposed in principle to any plans to improve this important area so future generations of Wellingtonians can enjoy Shelly Bay. However, we have significant concerns about this particular proposal by The Wellington Company. These include: Lack of a wider master -plan for the Miramar Peninsula Although the council has made encouraging progress in enhancing Miramar town centre, there has been a failure to develop a comprehensive master-plan for the Miramar Peninsula including Shelly Bay. This proposed development does not appear to form part of a wider strategy for Miramar Peninsular, in particular, the preservation of its historic sites, natural amenity and ease of public access. Costs We are concerned that the investment associated with providing and maintaining infrastructure to support the proposed housing density have not been fully stated. This includes road access and water, storm water and sewerage reticulation. We urge the council to seek a full cost-benefit analysis before proceeding further.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

Special Housing Area (SHA) criteria We oppose the use of the SHA criteria for the proposed development as it: * Is not set within an existing urban area. * The existing infrastructure will require extensive development to service the expected increase in population density * The proposed development does not support the current ease of access and amenity value of the area for most Wellingtonians * The types of housing proposed for the area will not alleviate Wellington's current shortage of affordable dwellings.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

Contrary to Wellington City Council's Shelly Bay Design Guide The proposed development itself appears to contravene the Council's own Shelly Bay Design Guide, in relation to space, building height, build form, impact on natural character and impact on public amenity value. The trust urges the Council to consider the heritage value of buildings within Shelly Bay including the Submarine Mining Depot Barracks.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

Loss of public amenity areas Many Wellingtonians are drawn to Shelly Bay's popular open space

Shelly Bay Development - Proposed Sale and Lease of Council Land from McMahon, Jim organisation: Wellington Civic Trust
and recreational opportunities not available in the inner city. The re-development of the area will result in a transfer of space currently accessible to the public to a private developer. Public use will be diminished or lost with a permanent resident population.

566

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Insufficient consideration of sea level rises The impact of sea level rise due to climate change on the Shelly Bay site does not appear to be factored into the proposed development.

Attached Documents

File
Wellington Civic Trust Shelly Bay FINAL

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Wellington Civic Trust

Submission for consultation on proposed re-development of Shelly Bay site by The Wellington Company

The Trust

The Wellington Civic Trust was established in 1981 with the aim of helping make Wellington the best of all possible places to live and work. The trust comprises individual and business members — planners, architects, engineers and citizens.

We work to:

- encourage public participation in decisions that affect our city
- ensure good planning and design to address the challenges of the future
- preserve the best of the old, but encourage new development which will enhance our city
- protect and enhance the unique character and the many natural features of the city, including the skyline, the town belt and the harbour
- encourage green space and environmentally conscious development
- develop a pedestrian- and cycle-friendly environment
- safeguard the waterfront as a public amenity
- support transport options that enhance the city and health

Summary

The Wellington Civic Trust is not opposed in principle to any plans to improve this important area so future generations of Wellingtonians can enjoy Shelly Bay. However, we have significant concerns about this particular proposal by The Wellington Company. These include:

Lack of a wider master -plan for the Miramar Peninsula

Although the council has made encouraging progress in enhancing Miramar town centre, there has been a failure to develop a comprehensive master-plan for the Miramar Peninsula including Shelly Bay. This proposed development does not appear to form part of a wider strategy for Miramar Peninsular, in particular, the preservation of its historic sites, natural amenity and ease of public access.

Loss of public amenity areas

Many Wellingtonians are drawn to Shelly Bay's popular open space and recreational opportunities not available in the inner city. The re-development of the area will result in a transfer of space currently accessible to the public to a private developer. Public use will be diminished or lost with a permanent resident population.

Contrary to Wellington City Council's Shelly Bay Design Guide

The proposed development itself appears to contravene the Council's own Shelly Bay Design Guide, in relation to space, building height, build form, impact on natural character and impact on public amenity value. The trust urges the Council to consider the heritage value of buildings within Shelly Bay including the Submarine Mining Depot Barracks.

Costs

We are concerned that the investment associated with providing and maintaining infrastructure to support the proposed housing density have not been fully stated. This includes road access and water, storm water and sewerage reticulation. We urge the council to seek a full cost-benefit analysis before proceeding further.

Insufficient consideration of sea level rises

The impact of sea level rise due to climate change on the Shelly Bay site does not appear to be factored into the proposed development.

Conclusion

The Wellington Civic Trust urges Wellington City Council to re-consider this proposed development. We wish to present our submission to Wellington City Council in person.

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Uli**
Last Name: **Mueller**
Street:
Suburb: **Miramar**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **+6443887884**
Mobile: **+64272922296**
eMail: **uli@epi-interactive.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

This is a dense housing developing which will define the area in a negative way for generations to come. It will destroy the natural character of the area and cut off the area for general use of the public. We do have a great opportunity to make something very special out of the is area, fostering recreation, tourism and ecology - the planned development is in contrast a poor example of housing development. I would have loved to see e.g. a competition about the use of the land with consultation of the public - utilising the great creative capital of the city (e.g. Weta, Universities, artists etc), I'm sure a much greater vision for the area would be able to be developed My main concerns for the development are: - Huge traffic impact, the road into town is already congested and this would add to it. No wider traffic concept has been developed. - The additional traffic on Shelly Bay Rd would impact negatively cyclists, pedestrians, recreational fisherman, divers, windsurfers and others who currently enjoy this stretch of the coast - Just a narrow pathway is planned for pedestrians; cyclist will be forced onto the road - Capped infrastructure cost for the developer - the rate payer has to pay any addition and carries the risk; this has been badly negotiated and plays into the pockets of the developer - Very limited parking and recreational space at the development - No eco concept - I think WCC should lead the way to a greener city, what about a zero emission development??? - none of it is addressed in the concept, sustainability hasn't been addressed at all - The development looks like 'concrete jungle' to me, it will look ugly from the CPD and have no appeal for e.g. visitors and Wellingtonians wanting to enjoy the area; it is no social / affordable housing either

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all

- Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

Concerns see above; I don't opposed development in this area in general, however I think this is a poor concept with no long-term vision

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

Again - there hasn't been any consultation with the public how these buildings should / can be used; it hasn't e.g. been specified what will happen to the wharf

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

From the proposal it is unclear how much parking actually will be available and be provided. The

southern side just seems to be housing, with some recreational / public space on the northern beach. However the dense housing will destroy the natural character of the space.

597

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

'Shark Bay' is the most frequently used flat-water windsurfing spot in Wellington. From the proposal it is not clear what will happen to the spot and if parking / access will be provided.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Jo**
Last Name: **Copland**
Street: **23 Roseneath Terrace**
Suburb: **Roseneath**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6011**
Daytime Phone: **04 801 5535 (home/ev)**
Mobile: **021 885 691**
eMail: **jcopland87@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

This plan is for a private development which requires WCC and rate-payer funding to allow an exclusive housing development. This will adversely affect the beauty, accessibility and utility of this extremely popular public area. Shelly Bay itself, the coastal drive and the beaches are areas of unspoiled natural beauty which Wellingtonians and visitors to Wellington have enjoyed for decades. Each weekend there are cyclists, runners, walkers and those on scenic drives - over summer there are many families using the beaches for swimming, picnicking and fishing. These benefits are priceless. As a recreational 'playground' for Wellingtonians, this area is priceless. The proposed development will destroy this for everyone. I oppose WCC selling or leasing this publicly-owned land for this purpose. The opportunity cost is simply too high. Housing can go anywhere, but the potential recreational uses of this area cannot be substituted. Developed properly this area could provide an unsurpassed space for all Wellingtonians and visitors to enjoy. The land should be enhanced as public space for use by the whole population as was originally intended when the Defence Force quit the Bay. Also-- 1. Having refused WCC funding, WCC should gain expert opinion on how to improve the sea-front space which is highly-valued by the public as a popular recreation area. Any additional infrastructure should also be subject to expert design input rather than left to the current single developer. There is no hurry to do this: the existing buildings have lain idle there for many years. The Council should resist being pressured by the current proposed developer and the Tenths Trust. It should stop the current plan, pause and rethink. 2. The Miramar to Shelly Bay road is popular for many functions: cyclists, walkers, fisher-people, beach-lovers, picnickers and many other recreationalists highly value this Peninsula route. The information provided thus far is insufficient to assess how the proposed changes to the road and walkway will impact accessibility to the beaches - I have been told by council representatives that there will be no / reduced parking availability from Miramar Wharf to Shelly Bay. How will the public get to the beaches? Is this access to be denied to everyone for the benefit of a few, subsidised by ratepayers? As a consequence of this development, this coastal route will become an urban thoroughfare - the recreational value of it to the public will be completely destroyed - cyclists, runners, walkers, fishing, beach going - all these activities which should be done in peace and safety will simply be ruined by traffic, noise and pollution. Cyclists and others will be expected to

share the road space with cars and large construction vehicles during the many years while development proceeds; this will be unsafe. Also, Wellington City Council has promoted Ciclovía along this part of The Great Harbour Way/ Te Aranui O Poneke, an event which has attracted thousands of Wellingtonians. People of all ages and abilities cycle, walk, run, skateboard, wheelchair the route with beach-side activities run for children who are able to ride the road safely. The Great Harbour Way is supported by WCC as a safe & wide access route for pedestrians & cyclists around the whole perimeter of Wellington Harbour. This development with its narrow congested roadway will disturb this potential tourist attraction as well as deny locals easy & safe access. 3. This type of development normally requires a collector road of 14m width with an 8m berm. The proposed road will only be modified to be 6m wide for 2 lanes & a 1.5m wide walkway ie 7.5m in toto, about 1/3 of what is normally considered safe. This narrow roadway will be expected to carry about 4 times the current traffic volumes. This will disturb not only human use but also conservation values--there are about 15 little blue penguin nesting sites along this portion of the coast. GWRC has not given consent for further widening of the road: any such would be destructive and further threaten the marine environment. The roadway is low-lying: predicted sea-level rise inundating the access way has not been considered properly. 4. There is no provision for public transport. This has health & climate implications. The quadrupled car numbers will generate climate-hostile emissions and unhealthy particulate pollution. WCC has strong aims and written policies to act against and adapt to climate change which is an existential threat to humanity. The Council also has legal responsibilities to protect the health of its citizens. There is hopeful talk of the ferry being a form of transport. This mode is already unreliable and will likely become more so as more severe weather events increase as climate change kicks in. In any case, ferries do not make profit, so would need to be subsidised by the ratepayers. GWRC has no plans to provide bus transport or fund a wharf for a ferry. 5. The SH1 route to & from the Eastern suburbs is already congested at peak times. It is proposed that the increased traffic generated along Cobham Drive will be accommodated by NZTA -planned improvements--but these are hypothetical at present. Many Wellingtonians see that all-electric rapid transport like light rail from CBD to the airport & Miramar via the hospital will be a superior way to relieve congestion, reduce emissions and pollution, to cope with increased traveller volumes in the longer term. It is well known that increasing urban motorways attracts more cars and become congested again quickly. 6. The economic benefits to the city are hypothetical estimates. Accurately quantified costs for significant infrastructure have not been assessed. In my view, the benefits for public recreation are priceless and will outweigh other purely dollar estimates of benefit. 7. The area is one of natural beauty and as such is a tourist attraction in its own right. Developed as an enhanced public space, it will be both a visitor attraction and a place for Wellingtonians to enjoy in peace and safety, adding to the value of Wellington as a desirable destination and place to live and work.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to [page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay](http://wellington.govt.nz/shellybay)

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

See comments under 1. above.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

See comments under 1. above.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

The plan is for an overdeveloped private housing development. This plan should be abandoned, see comments in 1. above. The entire area should be developed as an enhanced recreational space for the whole population.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

1. Once lost, this area can never be regained for the public and future generations. It should never be allowed to be captured by a few. 2. In addition it is an absolute affront to ask ratepayers to contribute to the funding of something that takes so much from them. Personally I am happy to pay rates to contribute to the city infrastructure and services for the benefit of myself and other Wellingtonians. I strongly object to paying rates to subsidise a private development. The benefits here are to the few who can afford the exclusive housing and the developers who will profit from the sale of that housing. The people of Wellington lose more than they gain from this proposal. 3. Just because it can be done doesn't mean it should be done. It is a time for wise heads to take a

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Ruth**
Last Name: **Pemberton**
Street: **31 Sugarloaf Road**
Suburb: **Brooklyn**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6021**
Daytime Phone: **(04) 384 7298**
eMail: **ruth.pemberton@paradise.net.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Environmental impact. Both the construction phase and the resulting buildings are likely to not only disturb, but destroy, the coastal habitat used by korora (Little Penguins). These are one of Wellington's taonga, which DoC records as being at risk and in decline in urban areas. Insufficient existing infrastructure. The proposed development is for an area that currently has limited infrastructure. Much upgrading will be required and ratepayers will be expected to pay for a large proportion of this. Special Housing Areas are required to have existing adequate infrastructure. Lack of consideration of the impact of climate change. This development is very close to the coast. Although there is a suggestion that the buildings will be raised by 2 metres, there is no guarantee that this will be sufficient to raise them above future MHW and storm surge levels, resulting from climate change. No doubt, residents will want their properties protected from a higher sea level and will expect the Council to pay for any mitigation, such as a seawall. This would be another expense that would fall to ratepayers. In addition, a seawall along the coastline would prevent korora from accessing their nesting sites.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

As above.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

As a member of the Wellington Branch of Forest & Bird and an active volunteer for its Places for Penguins project, I support the submission being presented by the Wellington Branch of Forest & Bird.

Attached Documents

1016

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Tim**
Last Name: **Bollinger**
Street: **182 Abel Smith Street**
Suburb: **Te Aro**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6011**
Daytime Phone: **04 495 9432**
Mobile: **027 4 383 081**
eMail: **tim.bollinger@dia.govt.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

The sale of a piece of publicly accessible Council land (much of which is currently given over to open space and greenery) for a private development is contrary to preserving the public amenity of this area. The lease of the other area for \$5.5 million will effectively put multi-millions of dollars into the hands of the private property developers over the next 125 years, and prevent those facilities from being used for publicly determined purposes. The additional cost of supporting infrastructure is unclear. The 'Have Your Say' document suggests that infrastructure cost will be \$20 million, with Council paying for half that, while a news article in 14 July 2017 Dominion Post (p.A5) estimates that the bill could be as much as \$40 million. Then all your figures - used extensively in publicity about this consultation - would be wrong - and possibly cost us much much more. Greater attention to the real costs need to be fully and openly investigated and documented. Further, it is of deep concern to me that the citizens of Wellington are not being consulted on the development itself, which has already received Resource Content approval, The development proposes FAR too many private off-street parks, making access to and from the development almost entirely dependent upon private motor vehicle traffic, and requiring massive upgrading and widening of the road with the destruction of natural beach fronts that give this geographic area of Wellington its special character and ecological integrity. The Resource consent was granted under the terms of the 'Special Housing Areas Act' which have proved notoriously unreliable in providing ANY social housing anywhere in the country while by-passing important checks and balances for the public, the community and the environment. Under such terms, the consent for this development may have been gained legally, but when we are talking about an area which is obviously up-market exclusive residential beachfront property to be built upon an important publicly accessible natural amenity (a whole coastline, in fact), then there are questions of ethics, morals and social justice to be answered as well. Just because you can, doesn't mean you should! I would like to see restrictions placed on the developer by the Wellington City Council upon the number of planned private car parks, with a guarantee of new public transport infrastructure to support the development. The 'Have Your Say' document gives over two paragraphs to speculation about a public ferry service 'proposed by the developer'. Such a ferry service (and other public transport facilities) should be contingent and conditional upon any agreement with the developers, so as to minimize the amount

of environmental damage to the existing coastline. Not allowing residential properties to have cars would reduce the need to upgrade the road, and save on the infrastructure costs, as well as the natural environment! If necessary reduce the number of units.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments
See above.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments
See above.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all

- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

What's with the micro brewery? Does the Wellington City Council really think that there's a need for ANOTHER one? I can't help feeling that this is just a superficial appeal to a currently trendy local business model whose success may well have peaked by the time that this development is completed. Why not a local music recording studio? Or a boutique fashion label? I would like to see more of these areas given over to 'Community space' rather than hand-picked commercial enterprises. The proposed 'Village Green' area amounts to less open green space than exists in the current configuration and would be barely enough for the families and children in the 350-plus adjacent new residential properties, let alone the anticipated additional tourist numbers. Again, far too much public space is planned to be given over to parking and vehicle traffic (see comments above)

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

I am deeply concerned about the environmental and public amenity outcomes of this development. The WCC has chosen to subsidise and support an ambitious private speculative venture, whose financial outcomes are dependent upon currently inflated property prices, and whose profits are almost entirely derived from its exclusive beachfront location - which depend upon a the public amenity. There is no doubt that this area is (and always has been) important to ALL Wellingtonians, and its beauty and special place in our hearts make it an area whose future should not be arbitrarily decided upon by a single self-appointed property development company. Who would have thought that anyone who cares about the city would think that the nicest thing that we could do with it? The structures and facilities that they propose are entirely out of scale with the coastal beach environment and the limited amount of useable land available. The fact that one company is doing the whole 350-plus dwellings, means that it will provide a backdrop less like the mosaic of buildings that populate the other coastlines of Wellington harbor, and more like that of a single institutional development - of row six story high buildings. Not a good look for any new urban centre, let alone one in the jewel of Wellington's crown. I also believe that the developers and the City Council do not take into account the full cost of the infrastructure required to support this development, and have given only cursory attention to the intense environmental damage that the transformation would have upon the area. They have not even considered public transport, or impact on local ecology in their equations. We are expected to consider these as an additional nice-to have. The size and quantity of private development units should be halved at least, and Council-owned areas retained for public development for public amenity. (I wish to supply further documentation to the committee when I submit in person). Thanks.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Richard**
Last Name: **Burrell**
Street: **62 Brougham Street**
Suburb: **Mount Victoria**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6011**
Daytime Phone: **04 3842880**
Mobile: **0292441913**
eMail: **richard@building-solutions.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

NO Public process Land is worth \$25 - \$30 mill Council will spend \$30 mill on infrastructure Will add another 6000 cars per day on road and WCC has no plans for 4 lanes to the city

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

This is a luxury housing project 350 apartments at \$700,000 plus 14 Houses at \$4 mill plus Where is the 20% social housing? Where is the 300 car parks for weekend visitors Where are the 100 car parks for retirement home

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to

Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

There are no benefits to the city Put the 12000m2 of land to the market

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

The city has 8000m2 of green lawn at Shelly bay it owns More the building of the front and open up as a park for all Wellingtonians The planed park is too small

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

The \$13 mill infer structure number given by WCC is incorrect Please make all numbers public?

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

SUBMISSION ON SHELLY BAY

SUBMISSION BY:

SCOTS COLLEGE CYCLING CLUB
c/o David Graham
SCOTS COLLEGE
1 Monorgan Rd,
Strathmore Park,
Wellington 6022

The Scots College Cycling Club would like the opportunity to be heard

Please contact Sally Dossor sally.dossor@gmail.com 0212478665 to arrange the submission time

INTRODUCTION

1. Scots College has had an active road cycling programme for 8 years. We have about 20-30 cyclists at any one time. The programme runs with the assistance of keen cycling parents and teachers who coach and ride with the boys.
2. Boys start cycling at year 6 or 7 (ages 10 -12) and many of these boys cycle through to year 13 (age 17-18). Our boys compete at North Island and National events. Several of our boys achieve at a National level and have been selected to cycle in New Zealand development squads. We aim to cater for all levels of cyclist and one of the great legacies of our club is that the boys develop a love of cycling which means that they will continue with cycling for transport, leisure and fitness long after they leave school.

Our training/training on Shelly Bay Road.

3. We cycle all year round. We train as a school group 2 x per week at 6.45 am – 8 am and go on the road in all but extreme weather conditions (when we train on wind trainers at the College). Safety is paramount. All cyclists must achieve a 'road ready' competency before cycling on the road. All must have front and rear lights, as for most of the year at least some of our ride is before daylight.
4. The north and south Miramar peninsula is our most regular cycling route. We choose this route as it:
 - is relatively free from morning commuter traffic
 - is flexible, as depending on the prevailing wind we can also choose the direction we cycle
 - Is a good training ride distance (15 ish km) – before leaving the flat to do hill training
 - is low stress (for cyclists and their anxious parents)
 - is close to the College
5. We use the route for bunch training rides but also train for team time trials (which is one of the events at both the North Island and National school competitions) and sprint training. We tend to split into groups according to ability/ speed. Our junior riders ride at 26-28 km/hr, our intermediate at 30-32 km/hr and our seniors at 34 plus km/hr.
6. The majority of our boys cycle another 3 or 4 days after school and on weekends on top of our school training times. Many of these rides are on the Miramar peninsula, because of the low traffic environment, which is particularly supported by parents when their boys are training alone. As mentioned in the PNP Club submission, the Wellington PNP junior coach (Gary Gibson) runs a junior ride around the peninsula on the weekend and our younger boys (up to the age of 14) ride in that programme.
7. Our experience of the road in its current condition and with the existing traffic volumes is:
 - The road has improved as a cycling environment since the speed cushions and 40km/hr speed limit have been put in. This has significantly reduced the boy racers

and the low suspension cars. In our experience, these drivers have a very low tolerance for cyclists and sometimes abuse and intimidate our riders

- If we are only going to ride ½ the peninsula our preference is to ride the north peninsula (Seatoun to Miramar) over the south (Airport to Seatoun) because of the lower traffic environment and fewer parked cars. Breaker Bay Road has 1500 vpd (which isn't much more than the current vehicle count on Shelly Bay of 1200 vpd) but when we are cycling in the mornings, there is a noticeable difference between the two
- When we ride the north peninsula we currently encounter very few vehicles in the mornings. When we ride at other times there is more traffic but most drivers are reasonably tolerant of us and wait for an appropriate time to cross the centre line to pass us
- The road surface is not in great condition, particularly close to the shoulder. This makes it more difficult (and not very comfortable) for us to stay close to the shoulder when cars are passing
- There is no shoulder – so we can not move left when cars want to pass us
- On sunny days, it is Wellington's 'scenic drive' of choice. Particularly on the weekends, it can get very busy and can be very dangerous.
- The scenic drive status sometimes creates issues in itself. Recently one of our cycling Dads was on a midday/midweek ride and got knocked off his bike by a motorist who was looking at the view

OUR SUBMISSION

8. Our concern with the overall proposal relates to the effects on cycling and the effects on cyclists using Shelly Bay Road.
9. Our concern primarily relates to safety, however, for our riders (and we expect the cycling community overall) the effects also go beyond safety and relate to the loss of amenity and the concern for the potential loss of this important cycling route for recreation.

Current use

10. There is little information in the Resource Consent (RC) application and the supporting Traffic Design Group (TDG) report about current cycling type, times and volumes.
11. In particular, this is all that the TDG report covered in respect of the existing cycling use/numbers:

Shelly Bay Road is currently used largely for recreational purposes, accommodating some cyclist and pedestrian demands, especially on weekends.
12. This was the subject of a further information request, for current and projected cycling numbers using Shelly Bay Road. We have been provided with a letter from TDG (27 October 2016) which has some further information but it is by no means a detailed assessment (the cycling information is for one day only, May 2016).
13. The information is not consistent with our own use and observations of the use by others.

Adequacy of the assessment of effects on cycling

14. We are concerned that the baseline data lacks depth and understanding and that the effects of the proposal on road cycling has consequentially not been considered, before conclusions on traffic effects were reached.
15. In particular, the AEE submitted by the applicant draws the conclusion that:

...it is concluded that the proposed residential and retail, hospitality and commercial activities can be accommodated with little adverse effects on the surrounding transport network, and more particularly within a substantially improved Shelly Bay Environment. The proposal is therefore acceptable with respect to traffic related effects.

16. And the TDG report concludes as follows:

In conclusion:

-
 - the increase in traffic will not adversely affect the capacity on Shelly Bay Road and Miramar Avenue intersection;
 - possible solutions to public transport and improved access by foot and by cycle could be investigated and would add to the accessibility of the proposed development;
 - overall this assessment finds that the traffic-related impacts would be minor and that the level of use and activity can be properly and safely accommodated in this location.
- (emphasis added)*

17. The conclusions above were adopted in the non-notified Notice of Decision issued by the Council, albeit with some minor modifications (to the realigned road within the development) and further approval processes for detailed design (but none of which materially address cycling safety on Shelly Bay Road).

18. Consequentially we are concerned that the consented development has overlooked the effects on road cycling – from both a safety and recreational value perspective.

Increase in vehicle movements

19. The RC application states that vehicle movements will increase from 1200 to 4700 per day. The projected am and pm peaks will be 436 vehicle movements. These are considerable increases.

20. We first ask that Council carefully considers whether 4700 vpd is in fact accurate, and consider the degree of confidence it has in that estimate.

21. This is a unique site (which is a traffic generator in itself) and an acknowledged scenic drive route. There are a bundle of uses proposed that are all traffic generators in addition to an already highly variable base use (largely impacted by weather). The actual vehicle movements associated with the proposed commercial uses, hotel and aged care facility will have significant numbers of staff and visitors & customers associated with them. Staff travel is being managed through a staff travel management plan under the conditions of the consent but there will be no control over visitors and customers. And there can be no reliance placed on bus or ferry services.

Impact of increased vehicle movements

22. The current carriageway is narrow and not in good condition. There is no shoulder, and in the few places there is room for a shoulder it is unformed and unsuitable for road cyclists to move left onto. Rather, the current condition of the road (particularly at the edge) forces cyclists towards the centre of the road, as the edge is rough and in some areas potholed.

23. The narrow carriageway requires vehicles to cross the centre line to pass cyclists. This will be more so the case for the inevitable increased truck and bus/coach movements. We seriously question how large vehicles travelling in opposite directions will be able to pass comfortably when there are cyclists on the road.

24. With the current very low traffic volumes (and little oncoming traffic) cars pass us safely now. With increased traffic our cyclists will be passed with much-increased frequency, and the manoeuvres will be more difficult because of increased oncoming traffic. As is well known the road is winding – and we are concerned drivers will get frustrated and make jubious passing moves and/or pass too close to cyclists. This is when accidents happen and cyclists get run into the ditch or worse, hit by a vehicle.

25. Officers provided us with examples of roads with similar traffic volumes to that projected for Shelly Bay.

26. From the list, there were only 2 that we regularly cycle on. The boys experience on these roads is:

- Awa Road. When going uphill (from Miramar) this is not that safe due to the number of cars parked on the side of the road. Cars passing have to cross the centre line and get irritated with us and have to avoid conflict with oncoming traffic. When going uphill (from Worser Bay) cars can get past us reasonably safely once past the sharp corners because the road is wider at that point (as long as there are no cars parked on the side of the road). When going downhill (in either direction) it is Ok because we go the same speed or faster than the cars.
- Happy Valley Road, Owhiro Bay; this is a regular route we use for hill endurance training. When the boys were asked how busy it is - they said it is 'very busy' and estimated being passed by 'heaps ... like maybe 80-150 cars' in the time of the gradual climb (8-12 min). Where there is a shoulder, cars can pass quite safely, but where there is no shoulder cars are forced to stay on the cyclist side of the centre line (because of oncoming traffic). On these narrow bits, cars passing feel like they are only about 20-30cm away.

27. Little comfort is taken from these examples of roads with similar traffic volumes.

Footpath from the development site to Miramar Ave

28. The RC, the consultation material for the land sale/lease and the Councils own report on infrastructure by Calibre Consulting (commissioned by City Shaper, 1 September 2016) is mixed on whether cyclists are intended to be on the 1.0-1.5m footpath or share the road space. Certainly, our road cyclists would never use such a path, and it would be dangerous for them (and any pedestrian they meet) to do so.

29. It is noted that Mr Spence's assessment accepts this.

Road Widening

30. It is understood that some widening will occur to achieve a minimum of 6.0m at all parts. There is no detail on this, so we would like clarification whether it is proposed for the road to be widened to 6.5m or even 7.0m?
31. From what we have heard so far, we are not hopeful. The carriageway is at or nearly at that measurement (ie 6.0m) now so we question whether there will be any change to the physical dimensions of the carriageway at all. Our concern is that the first priority will be to allocate space to construct the 1.0-1.5m footpath and that even if there is room to increase the carriageway (above the minimum of 6.0m) that there will not be funding available within the \$20M allocated for all infrastructure (given the other considerable demands of the project).
32. It is noted that the Wellington Company (as reported by the Dominion Post on Saturday 12 August 2017) appears to take no responsibility for the roading issues beyond the site. It is concerning that the key Development partner is a reluctant participant in any road widening. Refer:
Earl Hope-Pearson, from the Wellington Company, said it was the council looking at road widening and developers would be happy with no widening.
33. The Calibre Consulting report (1 September 2016) states that were this to be a new/greenfields development it would require a 14m carriageway under the Council's Code of Practice (plus footpaths and berms). This obviously would have significant environmental effects and create a highly urbanised environment and is not being proposed (or requested) here.
34. But it does give an indication of a 'text book' safe road environment and how far short this is. It raises doubts as to whether the intensity of development is appropriate given the existing physical environment and its current use.
35. The Calibre Consulting report states:
...the various options and alternatives [referring to road widening and footpath/cycle path] will all provide roading infrastructure that will adequately service the scale of the development proposed. Whilst the finished result may not

be fully compliant with standard Code of Practice requirements or 100 percent satisfactory to all parties, it will be of a scale and standard that sufficiently and appropriately caters for the development proposal.

36. This statement gives little comfort that there has been an appropriate assessment of the significantly undersized carriageway and its ability to accommodate the traffic generated by the development, current traffic volumes and existing and projected cycling use. This is particularly the case given that the author of this report appears to assume that cyclists will be on the 1.0-1.5m wide pedestrian/cycle lane.

Traffic through the actual development

37. The applicant states in its application that the realigned road and the angle park arrangements will be much like Oriental Parade.
38. When the boys were asked “where the worst places to cycle in the City are” – they said Happy Valley and Oriental Parade (travelling from the City) particularly when it’s a nice day.
39. Council’s traffic engineer (Mr Spence) refers to the carriageway being widened (through the development) from 6.0m to 6.5m to enable coaches and trucks to pass cyclists. He states that a reduced speed limit (the same as all other Suburban Centres of 30km/hr) will ensure that cyclists will coexist with other traffic and a busy pedestrian environment.
40. This area will not be too much of an issue for our early morning training – but it will affect weekend and after school rides and the bulk of other cyclists who use the road (and not the cycle path).
41. We suggest that the Council reviews this area as to whether the proposal will mitigate the impacts and create a safe environment.
42. We also ask that should this proposal go ahead that the angle parking within the development is very strictly enforced so that it is not able to be used as overflow parking overnight (eg by staff working at the hotel, aged care facility or other commercial uses and residents with more than one car). Drivers making reverse movements to exit these angle parking spaces early in the morning (to avoid parking enforcement) will be a hazard to cyclists (who they may not be expecting to see at such an early time of day).

Parking in the development

43. The development is understood to have ‘under catered for’ for parking, which at one level is a good thing.
44. However, we do question if this will mean that cars will park on the road (thereby taking up carriageway) in and to the north and south of the development site. On busy ‘activity and trip generating’ days, then parking will be at a premium. We have to be very careful when cycling around Scorching Bay on busy summer days as cars park anywhere they can.

Speed

45. The current speed limit of 40km/hr is not enforced - and our riders observe that cars regularly travel above this speed.
46. Enforcement will be required particularly when traffic volumes increase in order for cyclists and traffic to co-exist. We understand this is a police resource issue – but measures such as feedback speed signs and potentially more speed cushions (but designed so they work for cyclists) would be important.

Timing of road widening works/conditions

47. It is noted that the proposed carriageway widening (if it is to happen) and footpath do not (obviously at least) appear as a condition of the resource consent and that consequentially there is no detail on the timing of construction and requirement regarding its commissioning.
48. Further, the Council in its own Q & A consultation material even suggests that what is proposed will need to be reviewed and may need to be improved:

QUESTION 14. How will you maintain safe, comfortable access to the coast road on foot or by bike, with the increase in traffic and years of heavy trucks during building?

It is proposed the road from the Miramar Avenue intersection to Shelly Bay be six metres wide (as it is now) for vehicles and cyclists, with an additional 1.5 metre adjacent pathway. The Council would be responsible for the construction of the road and would monitor the road during construction and after it is complete to make sure it is safe and suitable, and improve it if required. A traffic management plan will be in place during construction.

49. This with respect is in the wrong order. A full and proper assessment needs to be done before the proposal proceeds.
50. Furthermore, we trust that provision will be made to maintain road access (with preferably a suitable surface for cycling) around the Peninsula at all times – in particular when the road is realigned within the development site.

Construction traffic

51. The condition of the road will be made worse by increased vehicle movements and in particular construction vehicles. The Council is urged to fund road improvements to ensure the condition of the road is improved.
52. There are no conditions on the resource consent re vehicle movements for construction vehicles (e.g. avoiding morning and evening peak and avoiding weekends). This (as is the usual practice) is left to a Construction Management Plan approval process. It is suggested that a way is found to consult the cycling community on this plan prior to approval.

Interface with the RC

53. Normally, for a development of this scale and on such a site of significance, the Council and the wider community could be confident that the RC process has identified and explored all issues fully and put in place appropriate mitigation.
54. As illustrated by the extracts from the RC process (refer above) we are concerned that the streamlined RC process followed in this case has meant that this has not occurred – certainly insofar as it relates to cycling.
55. We therefore ask that Council, resource consent aside, re-opens this issue (as part of this decision) so that it and the community can be confident the effects on cycling are acceptable.

CONCLUSION

56. The Council is the enabler of this project. As decision-makers, you hold the key to whether it is appropriate for the development to proceed. In considering its decision we ask that the Council takes responsibility now for understanding the impacts fully and ensuring the safest and most effective cycling environment possible.
57. To achieve this we ask that before agreeing to allow the lease/sale that Council obtains an independent review of the effects cycling environment and if the effects are not acceptable, the available mitigation measures (along with full costings).
58. Failure to address this now will leave it to chance and be an opportunity lost. If road improvements are required they will be solely the Council's responsibility (once the \$10M cap of contribution is exhausted).
59. Or worse still, an unsafe environment may be created that rules out this route as a safe place to cycle. Such an outcome would be a bad outcome for our cycling programme and a very significant erosion of the recreational values of the Miramar peninsula.

Date: 14 August 2017

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Leigh**
Last Name: **Malcolm**
Organisation: **none**
Street: **10 Hungerford Road**
Suburb: **Lyll Bay**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **027 2175505**
Mobile: **027 2175505**
eMail: **leighmalcolm10@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

I have no support for the agreement for the selling of public land to a private developer. The infrastructure part of private development is usually paid for by the developer. This have been ignored with the council proposing that 50% is paid with public money for a private development to progress. Shelly Bay Ltd have advised that \$10 million is the maximum they will contribute. So if there is an increase in the money required for the infrastructure beyond that amount. The council will be required to pay extra cost. It has been acknowledged in the documentation that the council would have to fully met any costs of road improvement that exceed the agreed budget. There has been a lot of discussion about the road infrastructure but the infrastructure needed for a new water supply and waste water treatment along with lighting, gas and electrical supply for the development. This will also be part of contribute from the 50% infrastructure cost that the council will be paying.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

I see several issues with the proposal. Once this land has been sold for this development it is gone from the public ownership and the developer can use it for his own financial gain. The proposed buildings and public spaces are only a concept so the finished structures can be changed. The sale of the land is a deal where the money gained from the sale is put back directly into the cost of the infrastructure. The benefit of the land is not being gain by the public. The proposal is asking the rate payer to support a development that does not have the interest of the public as is first priority.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

I have issues with this proposal. The leasing of the land becomes the same as sold land as it is for such a longer period of time that no future financial income can be gains from it. If the space is developed by the council and promotes public space. If the public money is available to pay for half of the infrastructure that should be pay by the developer. That money should be used to make the existing buildings viable as commercial endeavours,

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

I do not support a public green area development that is presented as part of a private development. The council could use the rate payers money to develop the area for the public following the suggestions of the rate payer not the desires of a private developer .At present there are many artists working in studios at Shelly Bay. With the council's expression of supporting the arts there is no support of the arts in this development. The limited parking facilities make it extremely difficult for the elderly to access the green space with the limited parking that is proposed. The plan shows a limited number of facilities to be accommodated and ends up being facilities that benefit mainly the private housing development at the cost to the rate payer. The numbers of public that can access this area at any one time is undermined with the expectation that the majority of the public will arrive on bikes or park the car at the cutting end of Shelly bay and walk down the road for several kilometres to reach the public area. This is not an option for the numbers of days that the weather hinders a bike ride or mobility effects to individuals. Not enough parking spaces allocated at the public green area. No indicated public toilet facilities.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Traffic at the cutting entrance to Shelly Bay road has much congestion at present, so the extra traffic that will be generated from the 350 residences and proposed commercial businesses will increase this problem. Shelly bay road currently has many little parking areas along the water side of the road where people park and access to the rock areas for fishing, swimming and relaxing. With the proposed footpath put in along the length of road from the cutting to the shelly bay village area this access is completely lost. People will have to either park at the cutting end or the Shelly bay public parking end of the road and walk. Access to the natural areas will be also lost. The traffic that use Shelly Bay road will also change. Not only will there be an increase of cars from the 352 dwellings but 100 workers vehicles, taxis, delivery trucks, refuse collections trucks, maintenance vehicle and buses will also be using the road. (Though it was indicated at one of the public meetings that a bus service was not in the foreseeable future but was recorded on the master plan on Page 12) At present it is difficult to pass cyclists on many parts of the road as bends have limited views of the roads ahead. Conflicting ideas have been put forward to have the cyclists 1. on the road, 2. have them share the footpath. It is naïve to think that because you want people to use predominantly bikes, to walk or use public transport that this will be the case. I feel that public money and proposed land sale is being used for the benefit of a private developer to make money and the public facilities benefit the privileged few who can afford a residence in this development. A gated community just without a physical gate For the money that will be spent by the council to prop up and enable this development to go ahead the same amount of money can be used to improve the buildings that are already exist on the council land (only in a poor condition as they have been neglected by the council) There are other people interested in developing this area. I see no evidence that any others have they been given the same options to buy or lease the land as this developer.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **David**
Last Name: **Hazlett**
Street: **12 Calgarry Avenue**
Suburb: **Thorndon**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6011**
Daytime Phone: **044707703**
Mobile: **044707703**
eMail: **david@purr.cc**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

There is only talk of costs not profits. For Shelly Bay Ltd to undertake such a venture there has to be 2 motivations, firstly to make a good return on capital invested and secondly have the resources available to carry out such a development. Why should the rate payers of Wellington subsidise the profits of a private company? If Shelly Bay Ltd was successful in its application to develop the site it should do so with its own resources and not rely on subsidies to make it work. The figure of the value of the development is stated at around \$500 million surely within that value figure there is at least \$20 million available for the infrastructure spend.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

The area being sold by the council will have the lowest density housing and by deduction be the most expensive to be sold. Surely the councils intention should be to provide housing for the less well off, there is no mention of affordable housing units being offered to first time buyers or indeed for essential services employees who have to live in Wellington.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

Why is the council offering a 125 year lease? Because with being a landlord does come with responsibilities and in all likely hood the area in question will be under water in 125 years time leaving the council open for damages of all sorts from Shelly Bay Ltd. If the council wishes to proceed with this development sell the site outright for a greater sum than the \$5.5 million on offer.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

Does Wellington need another microbrewery cafe boutique hotel? They are only there to ramp up the value of the other commercial sites. Walkways and green spaces are fine and should be encouraged - after all it is mainly on the council's own property and it is a facility that rate payers can already enjoy without having to pay out vast sums to subsidise the development. We have enough buildings without any distinction in Wellington already these are bland before they begin.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

429

Comments

The focus of the booklet and the development proposal is particularly one sided it focuses on the costs of continued council ownership £5.85 million to refurbish existing buildings - ironically this would provide a better revenue stream to the council over 125 years, if the council did refurbish and retain ownership of the commercial areas If Shelly Bay Ltd wants the development to proceed they should dip their hand into their own pocket - pay for the infrastructure upgrades and pay market price for all the council land. It is not up the the Wellington rate payers to subsidise the development. Even paying for all of the costs as most other developers do, Shelly Bay will still make handsome profits from the proposal. The council will still benefit in terms of rates and other surcharges once the development is completed. It is the councils responsibility to put their ratepayers first, not to subsidise developers.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Proposal for the Council to sell/lease part of its land at Shelly Bay

We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged. You can answer these questions online at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay, email your thoughts to shellybay@wcc.govt.nz or post this form to us (no stamp needed). Tell us what you think by 5pm, Monday 14 August 2017.

Privacy statement - what we do with your personal information

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Section 1 – your details

Your name*:	Faye Bishop
Your email or postal address*:	Unit R, 44 Roxburgh Street, Mt Victoria, Wellington 6011
You are making this submission:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> as an individual <input type="checkbox"/> on behalf of an organisation. Your organisation's name:
I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillors:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If yes, please give your phone number so that a submission time can be arranged*:	04 384-2369

*mandatory field

Section 2 – questions about the proposal

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of housing and commercial/retail facilities
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Cost to rate payers. Private business should fund own project
Loss of Council land.
Roading. Shelly Bay road not adequate to manage increased traffic volume
East side of Evans Bay open space for families, picnics, ferries.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

No benefit to general population. Issues with roading. Too large a number of dwellings for the area

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for housing and commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes?

No benefit to general population of ratepayers. Issues with roading and water and sewage infrastructure

1st fold here - fasten here once folded

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Rising sea level - does this fit with other research by WCC?

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

This is one area of open space suitable for people to relax and play in Evans Bay. For families an outing without great expense as it currently is.

2nd fold here

J003726

Free Post Authority Number 2199

**Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council**
Me Heke Ki Pōneke



FREEPOST 2199
Gerald Blunt (279)
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Karen**
Last Name: **Smyth**
Street: **13 Rolleston Street**
Suburb: **Mount Cook**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6021**
Daytime Phone: **04 381 3913**
Mobile: **021 0766 096**
eMail: **karendavid@xtra.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Shelly Bay is a beautiful, underdeveloped asset to Wellington. The proposed developments will take away this unique, and well-used public asset. In brief - yes, deal to the run-down existing infrastructure. Fix the buildings and the wharf. The former military buildings can be gently developed for unique housing - suited to the history of the area and providing more housing that does not look like an international resort. Keep the Chocolate Fish café, with all its charm and open areas.. Much could be achieved within the Council's estimate of \$5.85 million to refurbish the buildings and maintain the infrastructure to a minimum standard. Should the Council enter into its proposed agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd, vast amounts of funding will be required both short and long-term. Our asset will become just another expensive and exclusive area of apartments, cafes, and boutique shops. I urge the Council to take a minimalist approach, not to be dragged in by plans and promises of increased values. These are hardly ever offset by the cost of development. The argument that the land without this huge development is worth 'significantly less' to the Council is only one part of the debate.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

see earlier comments at Q1

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

None.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

see response at #1. Certainly, the property/properties have been greatly neglected, but there are already places to walk, green places, seating and parking, a café, and access to the beach. (Bars at the end of the coastal road do not sound particularly sensible, ditto the micro brewery). The coastal road could do with a more-defined footpath.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Repair and restore this unique area, without being 'tempted' by all the plans put up by developers.
Tread carefully before destroying what we have and appreciate (and use).

581

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

John Christopher Horne
28 Kaihuia Street
Northland
WELLINGTON 6012
Phone 475 7025

14 August 2017

Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
WELLINGTON 6140
ShellyBay@wcc.govt.nz

To whom it may concern

SUBMISSION: SHELLY BAY DEVELOPMENT – PROPOSED SALE AND LEASE OF COUNCIL LAND

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal, and for making hard copies of the document available at WCC reception.

I wish to speak in support of this submission.

Background

I am a long-term resident of Wellington. My outdoor interests centre on tramping, walking, native plant communities, indigenous ecosystems, natural landforms, and the pre-European and post-settlement associations with them.

On Friday 11 August, I alighted from the no. 24 Miramar Heights at the first stop on Akaroa Drive, Maupuia. I walked the entire length of the Maupuia Walkway from there to Shark Bay, then walked along Shelly Bay Rd to Shelly Bay. (Total walk time c. 40 minutes). I spent time walking around the entire Shelly Bay site. I noted the dilapidated state of some of the buildings, and the long-decommissioned above-ground pipe-tracks. I also noted the vegetation on the steep slopes behind the site. The plant communities include a substantial proportion of typical Wellington, regenerating native-forest species.

To reach the no. 24 Miramar Height bus route, I walked up the old military road (Russian threat 1880s vintage, and World War 2 vintage) from Shelly Bay, passing the ten historic munitions magazines, and up to the bus stop at the former Mt Crawford Prison. (Total walk time c. 30 minutes).

I understand that Treescape Limited has a contract to fell pine trees above Shelly Bay. I believe that the pine trees are on LINZ/Defence land. Is the felling in any way related to the proposed development of Shelly Bay? If so, in what way is it related?

Non-notified resource consent for the proposed development

I regard all Wellingtonians as parties likely to be affected by this proposal, whether they can see the site from their homes, or not. Thus I fail to see how Wellington City Councillors could vote to accept the application for resource consent as non-notified.

Submission

I support the provision of a village green and walkway/cycleway.

I oppose the proposed sale and lease of Council land in its entirety.

Reasons for my opposition:

1. The proposed development would produce a suburb which would be largely car- and motor-bike-dependent, contrary to Wellington City Council's policy of fostering walking, cycling, and the use of public transport;
2. The proposed development would be contrary to WCC's objective of becoming a carbon-neutral capital, and contrary to complying with NZ's ratification of the 2015 COP21 Paris Agreement which requires us to slash greenhouse-gas emissions;
3. The scale of the proposed development is out of keeping with the semi-rural setting on the flanks of Miramar Peninsula, sometimes known as Watts Peninsula;
4. The volume of traffic – 4700 vehicles per day - that it is predicted would be generated by the proposed development would far exceed the capacity of the winding, narrow, scenic drive that is Shelly Bay Road, The traffic would make travel along Shelly Bay Road from the Miramar Cutting most unpleasant and hazardous for walkers and cyclists;
5. If a footpath were to be provided from Miramar Cutting to Shelly Bay, it would have to be 1.65 m wide, as required by the NZ Transport Agency's *Planning and Design Guide*. The 1.5 m width as cited in the document is not acceptable;
6. If the proposal were to proceed, provision would be required to prevent cars being parked on the path used by walkers and cyclists;
7. The route of the no. 24 Miramar Heights bus service is too far from Shelly Bay to be any use, except for recreation purposes – walking and running – either to and from the Maupuia Walkway, or to and from the former Mt Crawford Prison;
8. The provision of a ferry service to and from Queens Wharf would probably require the purchase of another vessel, and would be dependant on the weather;
9. If the impact of the proposal were such that Shelly Bay Road had to be widened by cutting back into the already steep slopes of Carter Reserve and other land above the road, it could destabilise the slopes, so widening on the seaward side of the road would be required. This would involve Greater Wellington Regional in the consent process, because the widening would be into the Coastal Marine Area.
10. Widening Shelly Bay Road into the Coastal Marine Area could destroy burrows of kororā, the little blue penguin, and make more hazardous their trip across the road to habitat in Carter Reserve, and other lands, above the road;

11. Any road works at the intersection of Shelly Bay Road and Miramar Avenue must not interfere with the two historic tunnels in the Mapuia ridge;
12. I do not support having ratepayers contributing to the large estimated cost of increasing the capacity of the storm-water network, and waste-water network for the benefit of Shelly Bay Limited;
13. I do not think that the necessary changes to Shelly Bay Road from Miramar Cutting to Shelly Bay would be fully consistent with Wellington City Council's Great Harbour Way project;
14. I am not aware of any Environmental Impact Assessment of the project as described in the document.
15. If the already consented proposal for 280 apartments, 58 town-houses and 14 stand-alone homes proceeds, I believe that the result would be a somewhat soulless suburb, rather more up-market than Grenada North.

Yours sincerely

Chris Horne

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Derek**
Last Name: **McCorkindale**
Organisation: **self**
On behalf of: **self**
Street: **22 Burnham Street**
Suburb: **Seatoun**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **043887847**
Mobile: **0292747811**
eMail: **derekmcc@xtra.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Explained in attachment - Ratepayer subsidy to developer, sale of land, free underwrite for developer, binary outcomes, insufficient car parking, low rates revenue and lack of clarity around wharf rebuild

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

No benefit- the land should be sold in the form of a 125 year lease to ensure future Councils (and ratepayers) retain control.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to

Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

Hopefully will create a vibrant destination for everyone to enjoy. 128 Carparking spaces seems too few

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

This is a mixed and 'balanced' development suitable for the site providing public access is retained and enhanced. Infrastructure is insufficient and hopefully the costings are accurate and the work will be sufficient.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

See attached document

Attached Documents

File
Shelly Bay Submission

Need Help?

Shelly Bay Submission

Objections to the proposal in its current form

1. \$3m subsidy by Wellington City Council (“WCC” or “the Council”), in other words the rate payers, to a private property developer Shelly Bay Limited (“SBL”) – The infrastructure costs are estimated to be \$13m which are normally paid by the developer however the Council is generously offering to pay \$3m towards this. The manner in which this has been disclosed in the Consultation Document is misleading in my view as the \$7m estimated public works has been added to the \$13m infrastructure to arrive at a total of \$20m. The Council is proposing to pay half of this, because SBL has capped its contribution at \$10m. What are the grounds for the Council subsidising the developer? The Council should renegotiate these terms and require SBL to pay the full \$13m. What is so special about the \$10m figure that SBL says it cannot go beyond? After all it is supposedly a \$500m development!
2. Sale or lease – why is the Council selling a 0.3ha portion of land? What is the logic? The Council’s position should be to retain long term ownership for ratepayers and future Councils. Therefore the Council should only agree to lease its land. In another 125 years the 0.3ha parcel which is proposed to be sold now could be a strategic parcel when the initial lease expires on the other 0.6ha and therefore the Council at that time may be restricted in what it can do.
3. “Free underwrite” to the developer -the reference to possible further road upgrading requirements above that included in the \$13m estimate is said to be a cost borne exclusively by the Council should it arise (Q and A Page 5 Question 10) . This gives the developer a free ride if, due to the development, it is determined that further roading improvements are necessary. The negotiated arrangements should ensure SBL is jointly exposed to this contingent liability, rather than have it fall entirely onto the ratepayers.
4. Binary outcomes – the Consultation Document page 9 says that “it is estimated it would cost the Council \$5.85m just to refurbish the buildings and maintain the infrastructure Alternatively the Council could enter into the proposed agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd”. This seems to indicate there are only the two choices. Surely there are many others. For a start the Council could simply demolish the buildings at presumably a much lesser cost. The estimate to refurbish the 2 buildings and maintain infrastructure seems high. Is the proposed refurbishment standard too high? Also won’t the Council have an obligation to maintain the infrastructure even if the SBL development proceeds or does this expense pass to the developer?
5. Misleading visuals – the artist’s impressions of the development show an impressive wharf structure as part of the development. The Consultation document is silent as to the future construction of wharves or demolition of the existing wharves, which belong to SBL (Question 21). Hopefully the Council or perhaps the Regional Council have control over wharf development. I would support wharf construction along the lines of the artist’s impression providing yachts could tie up to the wharf and that the public has unrestricted access to it.
6. Insufficient car parking – the provision of 128 time-limited carparks will be inadequate if the current patronage of Chocolate Fish is anything to go by. On a busy day I would estimate there could be at least 50 vehicles for this café alone. Presumably there is at least one car parking space per apartment/residence included in SBL’s proposals as well as the provision of visitor car parking for the apartments and the rest home otherwise these vehicles would put additional pressure on the limited spaces.

7. Inadequate level of rates revenue - \$1.5m of annual rates revenue seems very low for the scale of this development (supposedly up to \$500m). Dividing \$1.5m by 350 properties produces rates per property of approximately \$4300. This seems very low given there will also be commercial operations (cafes, bars and a microbrewery) as well as a 50 bed hotel and (according to the Dompost) a rest home catering for 140 residents. Has the Council offered some form of rates relief to this development or is part of the development exempt from rates perhaps on cultural grounds?
8. Risk analysis – Cash flow profile – presumably the expenditure for infrastructure and public works will occur over the extended time frame of the development. However the currently proposed amount of \$8m to be paid by SBL to WCC for the land should be received in full upfront before SBL has access to, or undertakes any work on any of that site area. The settlement terms should not expose the Council to settlement and performance risks.
9. Recreational potential – as a user of Shelly Bay on some summer afternoons I am aware of how sunny the beachfront is right up until the sun sets. The Council has the potential to transform the stony beach into a highly appealing sandy beach for all Wellingtonians to enjoy (by transporting sand to at least part of the waterfront). There is no mention of any such plan in the development but I feel this would be a spectacular enhancement for the entire Shelly Bay area. If it is not contemplated now, at the very least the development agreement with SBL should provide for beautification initiatives such as this to be carried out in the future.

Derek McCorkindale

14 August 2017

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Russell**
Last Name: **Tregonning**
Street: **5 Anne Street**
Suburb: **Wadestown**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6012**
Daytime Phone: **027 4446805**
eMail: **rutrego@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

This plan is for a private development which requires WCC and rate-payer funding to allow an exclusive housing development. This will destroy the ambience of a popular public area. I oppose WCC selling or leasing publically-owned land for this purpose. It should be enhanced as public space for use by the whole population as was originally intended when the defence Force quit the Bay. Also-- 1. Having refused WCC funding, WCC should gain expert opinion on how to improve the sea-front space which is highly-valued by the public as a popular recreation area. Any additional infrastructure should also be subject to expert design input rather than left to the current single developer. There is no hurry to do this: the existing buildings have lain idle there for many years. The Council should resist being pressured by the current proposed developer and the Tenth's Trust. It should stop the current plan, pause and rethink. 2. The Miramar to Shelly Bay road is popular for many functions:cyclists, walkers, fisher-people, beach-lovers, picnickers and many other recreationalists highly value this Peninsular route. Cyclists and others will be expected to share the road space with cars and large construction vehicles during the many years while development proceeds; this will be unsafe. Also, Wellington City Council has promoted Ciclovía along this part of The Great Harbour Way/ Te Aranui O Poneke, an event which has attracted thousands of Wellingtonians. They cycle, walk, run, skateboard, wheel-chair the route with beach-side activities run for children who are able to ride the road safely.The Great Harbour Way is supported by WCC as a safe & wide access route for pedestrians & cyclists around the whole perimeter of Wellington Harbour. This development with its narrow congested roadway will disturb this potential tourist attraction as well deny locals easy & safe access. 3. This type of development normally requires a collector road of 14m width with an 8m berm. The proposed road will only be modified to be 6m wide for 2 lanes & a 1.5m wide walkway ie 7.5m in toto, about 1/3 of what is normally considered safe. This narrow roadway will be expected to carry about 4 times the current traffic volumes. This will disturb not only human use but also conservation values--there are about 15 little blue penguin nesting sites along this portion of the coast. GWRC has not given consent for further widening of the road: any such would be very destructive and further threaten the marine environment. The roadway is low-lying--predicted sea-level rise inundating the access way has not been considered properly. 4. There is no provision for public transport. This has health & climate

implications. The quadrupled car numbers will generate climate-hostile emissions and unhealthy particulate pollution. WCC has strong aims and written policies to act against and adapt to climate change which is an existential threat to humanity. The Council also has legal responsibilities to protect the health of its citizens. There is hopeful talk of the ferry being a form of transport. This mode is already unreliable and will likely become more so as more severe weather events increase as climate change kicks in. GWRC has no plans to provide bus transport or build a wharf for ferries. 5. The SH1 route to & fro the Eastern suburbs is already congested at peak times. It is proposed that the increased traffic generated along Cobham Drive will be accommodated by NZTA-planned improvements--but these are hypothetical at present. Many Wellingtonians see that all-electric rapid transport like light rail from CBD to the airport & Miramar via the hospital will be a superior way to relieve congestion, reduce emissions and pollution to cope with increased traveller volumes in the longer term. It is well known that increasing urban motorways are more expensive than light rail built on existing streets. More roads attract more cars and become congested again quickly. 6. The economic benefits to the city are hypothetical estimates. Accurately quantified costs for significant infrastructure have not been assessed. In my view, the benefits for public recreation are priceless and will outweigh other purely dollar estimates of benefit.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

See above under 1.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments
see above under 1.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments
see above under 1. I support public space enhancement at the Bay for the general public , but the existing plan depends on an over-ambitious private housing development. This should be abandoned as noted above.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged. You can answer these questions online at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay, email your thoughts to shellybay@wcc.govt.nz or post this form to us (no stamp needed). **Tell us what you think by 5pm, Monday 14 August 2017.**

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Sea**
Last Name: **Rotmann**
Organisation: **SEA - Sustainable Energy Advice Ltd**
Street: **43 Moa Point Road**
Suburb: **Moa Point**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **0212469438**
Mobile: **0212469438**
eMail: **drsea@orcon.net.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

- Seems to be socialising costs and privatising profits - like with the airport extension - Minimum information around how threats from rising sea levels, tsunamis and earthquakes was provided. Putting buildings to 2.1m above sea level is laughably inadequate. Has any information been given by an insurer or re-insurer about the likelihood of not being able to retain or afford insurance in the lifetime of these buildings? - Huge environmental and social impacts on the south coast, minimal information provided, doesn't look like a proper impact assessment was undertaken, nor has any information on such impacts been provided to the public - Generally biased reporting and publicising of this issue, it's clear where WCC sits already - Very dubious and non-transparent of WCC to fast-track this huge development which has been under so much public scrutiny, even leading to a prominent iwi leader going to jail for corruption, without notifying the public. - How does this fit the Special Housing criteria when this clearly will not be affordable housing but rather a gated community for rich people? - How will this add to the already hugely problematic traffic congestion along Cobham Drive? How will this development and an increase of traffic on Cobham Drive deal with already fast-accelerating sea level rise and increased storm surges? - 3500 extra vehicles a day on this part of the coast is a massive and unsustainable increase - Unclear if all iwi members were properly consulted and their wishes were indeed taken into account - The proposal is ugly, over-developed, has no apparent sustainability criteria, and does not fit with the stunning natural environment that is our taonga - Does not fit into Paris Agreement or our goal to become a 'Low-carbon capital' - Ian Cassels is not the man to be trusted to do the right thing on such an iconic part of our coast, he has put eyesores up all over this town already - Wellington is NOT Sausalito! We need to be realistic of who we are and what is special about our 'coolest little capital'. This isn't it. Where is the creativity, resilience to its harsh environment, and sustainability that we'd like to pride ourselves in?

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

It is public land, selling it to Ian Cassels will mean it will go from being able to be enjoyed by all to only being enjoyed by the few (rich). This housing development, which WCC did not give us the ability to submit on, is an eyesore and will not survive the coming threats, even in the medium term (particularly, rising sea levels, storm surges and tsunamis). Leaving it in our hand gives us the say of what should be done with it. The past criminal activities and corruption surrounding some of the major players means there should be extra transparency applied, not less. The public will not thank you for this, it will despise you for losing such a special part of our coastline to neoliberal greed and shortsighted profit-mongering, without giving us a proper say.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

See above. Keep it in the public hand so we can have a say of what should happen with this land!

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

Why can't we have better public spaces and facilities without having to let Ian Cassels develop an eyesore without any input from the public? This should be an ideal example of how creative and green our city can be, not more of the same 80s thinking where greed is god and global issues like runaway climate change don't exist.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

This whole thing is yet another outrage committed by the WCC on behalf of big-ticket developers. It is very similar to the airport runway and Capital Express subsidies where it is clear that the Council's agenda is to bleed ratepayers for the benefit of private investors. There are a lot of strong feelings especially on the Miramar Peninsula about what to do with Shelly Bay, and ignoring our collective and individual wishes in such an outrageous manner will lead to massive protests. This was such a great opportunity to showcase our city to become part of the global movement to honour the Paris Agreement and work towards Carbon Neutrality. This is the opposite and extremely uncreative to boot. Makes me less proud to be a Wellingtonian who loves to live here.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Nicole**
Last Name: **McKee**
On behalf of: **My whanau in Hataitai**
Street: **47 Hohiria Road**
Suburb: **Hataitai**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6021**
Daytime Phone: **04 386 3253**
Mobile: **027 44 00 567**
eMail: **nic303@xtra.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

My children were born in our home at Hohiria Road, Hataitai. Since before their births and afterwards we have on nearly weekly basis visited the Shelly Bay area. The attraction of Shelly Bay is the peaceful, serene, unobtrusive distraction of nature that we have access to at our doorstep, so close to city. I do not pay rates in the Wellington City so that i can lose that piece of paradise and have to pay for for infrastructure. I do not want to see a housing development or a commercial development go up on a piece of land that cannot support those developments without taking money from my pocket to pay for it. Wellington City Council, your rate payers pay rates to have this piece of bliss - not for you to go selling it. If you sell our land for commercial gain then you are not looking after the Wellington people, you are looking short term only. Have you seen the water around those bays? Have you noticed how clear and beautiful it is? If you sell this land and allow development you will forever destroy that. Destroy the fishing. Destroy the places that my children, my husband and I created our whanau memories on the rocky beaches around the bays. Any development there will not benefit us. It will not benefit Wellington. It will commercialise special places and not make them special anymore. Keep what we have. Look long term gain not short term. Long Term means allowing your rate payers and visitors a piece of paradise close to the city and beaches. Beaches that uniquely shelter us from southerly's and northerlies. Think of your people - hei tangata.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive

- Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

This isn't just a matter of building homes on the land. It's ripping the land up to build on. It's making us rate payers pay more for the infrastructure that will need to be placed there. It's about selling us out for your own profits, profits that will not benefit myself or my family in any way. You will take away from us the place of peace that we enjoy and charge us for doing it. The development will not stop there. Once you start, it will not stop. I see absolutely NO BENEFITS to housing on this piece of land. Put affordable housing in Wellington where people need it and have the funds to purchase it. This development is for the rich only and does nothing to benefit those that need homes in Wellington.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

NO BENEFITS. There is a big retail complex in Lyall Bay. You have Miramar shops around the corner. The eastern suburbs are not in any need for another retail complex. You will destroy the outlook the area has. Any commercial property will be big and take away the views of the area. It does not suit that area at all. There is no reason to go to Shelly Bay except to enjoy the peace, visit the beaches and relax. Stop trying to destroy that.

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive

Very supportive

663

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

You don't need to propose public spaces - WE ALREADY HAVE IT and WANT TO KEEP IT THE WAY IT IS. I can go around the corner to Miramar if i want a cafe, a bar or a shop. What sort of Council are you to think that you should put a bar out there and have people drive home from it around those bays? STUPID

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

I would be happy for a rates increase to maintain Shelly Bay as the public and serene place that it currently has. Don't do it. Put your resources into developing somewhere closer to the facilities that are required like schools, bus stops and do it for those that need housing. Stop looking after the rich and the elite. Start looking after your people.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Pauline and Athol**
Last Name: **Swann**
Organisation: **Our family**
Street: **47 Mairangi Road**
Suburb: **Wadestown**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6012**
Daytime Phone: **(04) 4728 417**
eMail: **athol.swann@paradise.net.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Loss of green space and the the predicted traffic to increase from 1200 to 4700 vehicles a day adding to the already congested Cobham Drive Ratepayers cost - Wellington ratepayers will continue to pay for this development after the developers have gone. Resource consent is for 13 years and access to Shelly Bay will be limited in this time while massive construction work takes place. Large construction vehicles will regularly trave the road between Miramar Avenue and Shelly Bay. Of great concern is Climate Change and sea level rising which will reduce the width of the road and endanger all the new buildings planned. Shelly Bay should remain a recreational area and certainly needs some improvements but a dense housing complex is not the right mix for this public space.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

As above very few benefits and the loss of public open space.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

Once again we ratepayers are paying!

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

With some repairs and improvements to recreational facilities is all that is needed.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

332

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Nick**
Last Name: **Tipping**
On behalf of: **Wellington musicians**
Street: **Apartment 1, Park Mews, 54 Moxham Avenue**
Suburb: **Hataitai**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6021**
Daytime Phone: **0211414680**
Mobile: **0211414680**
eMail: **nick.tipping@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

I am a former Head of Jazz at the NZ School of Music at Victoria University, and a professional musician of 20 years' experience. I present 'Inside Out', NZ's only nationally broadcast jazz radio show, on RNZ. In 2016, I graduated with a PhD in Musicology and Jazz Studies from Victoria University and Massey University. My topic was the Wellington jazz scene, in the context of the wider Wellington and NZ music scenes. Jazz musicians are everywhere in the Wellington scene- from Fat Freddy's Drop, the Richter City Rebels, Little Bushman, the NZSO, Orchestra Wellington, the Rodger Fox Big Band, and countless other groups all feature jazz musicians. A typical month will see between 80 and 100 jazz gigs in central Wellington alone. However, as is always the case, those musicians only just scrape by on their earnings, and so affordable rehearsal space is vital for this to continue. While many of the buildings in Shelly Bay are run down and in need of repair or replacement, they have been used for years as practice space and creative studios by Wellington's arts and music communities. Over the past decade or so, many such spaces have been demolished and/or repurposed, meaning there are fewer and fewer venues for musicians to get together, work on their artform, and prepare for performance. Venues such as the old studios in Wright St, and the building that is now the Third Eye on Karo Drive, have been taken out of the equation so that their space could be developed for other purposes. Each time the musicians have been forced to find or pay for alternative rehearsal space. The reason I am 'not really supportive' of this proposal is that in the many pages of proposals for Shelly Bay, the effect of this repurposing of space has been ignored. It will have the effect of denying many local musicians the opportunity for affordable practice and rehearsal space. These are the same musicians who play at Council and parliamentary functions, university graduations, civic events, festivals like CubaDupa and the Newtown Festival, and, ironically, private functions for people of a similar demographic to those who will be buying properties in the new development; as well as who populate the broader Wellington music scene which the Council promotes as the country's finest. I do not anticipate this submission having any effect on the proposal. I am making it in order to raise with the Council the fact that gentrification has meant that local musicians are being squeezed out of affordable accommodation in Wellington. It's great that the council is supportive of the new Music Hub, and that \$500k is being allocated by the mayor towards 'a major Matariki festival and backing local

artists and performers to present their work in the council's major Wellington venues'. However the artists and performers mentioned here all have to rehearse and practice somewhere. These vanishing local rehearsal spaces have given rise to some of the country's best known musicians, but they are in more and more danger of disappearing. My PhD research illustrated the way that local jazz musicians drive the Wellington music scene, enabling the higher profile musicians to succeed. However, it also made the point that is being illustrated by this development: that those local musicians must contend with an environment which does not support them, and often does not even acknowledge them. Unfortunately the Shelly Bay development is another in the long line of developments which make it harder and harder for those musicians to function.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

As above

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

As above

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops;

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

I am always supportive of greater public spaces in Wellington. However, if they come at a cost to the arts scene as mentioned above, then I think a balance needs to be struck. Unfortunately this proposal does not attempt to find that balance.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

I am very happy to be contacted regarding any aspect of this submission. This submission does not represent the opinion of my employer(s).

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

From: Bernard O'Shaughnessy <bernardfree13@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, 3 August 2017 11:30 a.m.
To: GRP: Councillors; Councillor Chris Calvi-Freeman; sarah.free@wcc.govt.wcc;
Councillor Paul Eagle; shellybay
Subject: SHELLY BAY PROPOSAL
Attachments: IMG_20170803_0001.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Councillors'

The following comments are added to my submission regarding the proposed development at Shelly Bay.

1) In 2009 I attended a community meeting at the Miramar Golf Course and the CEO of the WCC (Gary Poole - since resigned) and the Chair of the Port Nicholson Trust Iwi (Sir Love - since disgraced) spoke to more than 200 of us locals.

2) In attendance also was Councillors Apriana-Mercer, Rob Goulden, Celia Wade-Brown who have all since been voted out. Leonie Gill was also present (since deceased). Iona Pannett was also present. At different times during the evening I spoke with all of them.

3) I also spoke with Gary Poole and Sir Love and gave them each a copy of my proposal for the developments in the Bay. I also attended a later meeting at the Port Nicholson Trust offices.

4) My ideas tabled were as follows:

- A) Build a tourist hotel there
- B) Build multi storied apartments
- C) Have shops/cafes and an small shopping area
- D) Have a surf life club there to provide for safe swimming/kite surfing and all water sports/yacht club
- E) Have a community multi purpose hall to include music/drama/arts/film
- D) Have a Gondolier go from there up the hill to the old Mt Crawford Prison.
- E) Have a Gondolier go from the hill top down to Weta movie sites
- F) Have a 'Lurge" from the hill top to Weta sites.
- G) Convert Mt Crawford Prison to an Industrial Hospitality site for trainees:
Note it is an 150 bed mothballed prison with commercial kitchen, wonderful views and should be used in the interests of the wider society. Sir Love liked that idea.

H) Have bike tracks and walk trails around the Miramar Peninsula to provide for the increased interest in bikes for persons of all ages.

I) Have the Shelly Bay wharf enhanced and developed to allow for cruise tourist ships to berth there. (Note: I have been disappointed over the years to witness the appalling lack of focus on the arrival of international cruise ships, which bring heaps of \$ benefits to our city, yet our welcome 'onto the jetty' is sad. Even when we had the 'Overseas terminal' it was better than the complete lack of welcoming facilities now experienced. Remember also that because of the duplicity of the GWRC Centerpoint is stuffed.

J) Have a daily ferry service from Shelly Bay to the city to be linked and enhance with the East-West service. I think we under use our harbour for the transport of passengers by ferry.

So I still think these ideas I had put forward in 2009 are relevant today in terms of the Shelly Bay Proposal. Very interesting that Dompost now reporting on the matter.

But I have a range of questions on the cost of this project. I think the split should be %40 on the ratepayer and %60 on the developer.

I would add in however the wider overall plan must be addressed. That is communication and transport connections are needed over the whole city and I have advocated on that before.

K) Light rail from the Railway Station to the Airport.

The route to be Railway Station

along waterfront - Te Papa

Up the middle of Kent/Cambridge Tce

around the East side of Basin Reserve

(Have traffic lights for vehicles to stop/go)

Light rail up Adelaide Road

Turning at Hospital Road and up that road

(That gives a rail stop at the Hospital & GG's house & Newtown)

Then along the back of Mein St on the edges of the green belt

Then up to an earth cutting onto the top end of Wellington Rd.

(Put a road/cycle way bridge over top so people can get to the

SPCA and Mt Victoria) (so we don't need to double the car tunnel)

Down Wellington Road turning past the Aquatic Centre/sports hub

Then down Rongatai Rd turning onto Coutts St

That aligns to the tunnel under the Airport so the light rail can

can go that way and bingo, you are at the airport!

Cost \$2billion and climbing. Make it a PPP. (Sir Michael Fowler agreed.).

L) Also as a tourist and transport option have trams run from Shelly Bay (after unloading the cruise tourists) to the airport, a bit like the wonderful trams at Queen Elizabeth Park.

M) Together with my keenness for light rail is of course is to have seawalls on Petone to CBD, CBD it self, both sides of Lyall Bay, and Island Bay. The seawall to provide for security of utilities like sewage/water/communications to be enhanced and protected given the climate change situation we are in. Councillor Foster/Nicholls knows my plan. We could have walking and cycle ways on top of the seawalls. I have put the cost to council before for that project as being \$1billion, but over 30 years would be a realistic BCA.

N) Added to this 'bigger city vision' I trust Councillors will also agree to have the Library opening hours at Newtown extended on Saturday to 4:30pm.

Well, this is my submission.

Yours sincerely

Bernard O'Shaughnessy

Proposal for the Council to sell/lease part of its land at Shelly Bay

We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged. You can answer these questions online at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay, email your thoughts to shellybay@wcc.govt.nz or post this form to us (no stamp needed). **Tell us what you think by 5pm, Monday 14 August 2017.**

Privacy statement - what we do with your personal information

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Section 1 – your details

Your name*:	BERNARD O'SHAUGHNESSY
Your email or postal address*:	Bernardfree@gmail.com
You are making this submission:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> as an individual <input type="checkbox"/> on behalf of an organisation. Your organisation's name:	
I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillors: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
If yes, please give your phone number so that a submission time can be arranged*:	
021-0623275	

*mandatory field

Section 2 – questions about the proposal

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of housing and commercial/retail facilities
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement? But

* The cost split should be 40/60 @ WCC fronts 40%

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Enhance the run down area
and celebrate our harbour.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for housing and commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes?

Must ensure general public have right of access

1st fold here - fasten here once folded

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Huge benefits, but must still be allowed
entry for general public to swim & have BBQ.
Area must be under a liquor ban!

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Yes - lots of comment as attached.

2nd fold here

Free Post Authority Number 2199

Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council

Me Heke Ki Pōneke



FREEPOST 2199
Gerald Blunt (279)
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140

J003726

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Thomas**
Last Name: **Wutzler**
Street: **PO Box 15198, Miramar**
Suburb:
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6243**
Mobile: **0272500600**
eMail: **thomas@helfen.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

- The sale / lease of Council land is key to the whole development. By selling/leasing this land you are committing to a development which will change the nature, appearance and character of an iconic area of Wellington and which breaches the Council's District Plan. - I object to the proposed spending by Council on infrastructure for what is a private development. I also consider that Council has not adequately costed the proposed infrastructure works and has not provided for a fair contribution to costs by the developer.

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

Comments

- I take issue with the scale of the proposed development and the fact that the housing proposal

appears to run roughshod over the Council's own District Plan. It is too dense which introduces other issues such as the increased amount of traffic for Miramar and more particularly Shelly Bay Road introducing safety issues and likely congestion issues particularly during the prolonged intended build period. - As per my comments below, the lack of access by others creates 'private enclave' in an area currently enjoyed by many. - I am open to development of the area but it must be development in keeping with its iconic status and location and its history.

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

- There is a lack of information on what the proposed use of the buildings will be; - I would have expected a transparent tender process for the leasing of any land / buildings;

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
 - Not really supportive
 - Neutral
 - Supportive
 - Very supportive
-

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

- The supposed publically available green spaces are negligible in an area that has long provided amenity and recreational space for all Wellingtonians. There is a lack of public parking particularly due to the need to widen the road. This will essentially mean that 'outsiders' will lose the Shelly Bay amenity creating a 'private enclave'.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

- I object to the use of the HASHAAA when clearly there are no plans for affordable housing as intended by this legislation. - I object to the manner in which the proposal over rides the District Plan comments and intentions for Shelly Bay - I object to the complete lack of public consultation on the proposal. This lack of public consultation has led to the proposal for an inappropriate development and not one in which all Wellingtonians can share. - I object to the fact that it appears that Council has relied on the developers information and not undertaken its own due diligence of the claimed benefits and impacts of the development - I have concerns regarding ongoing rate payer funded costs particularly in light of Council's own reports on rising sea levels;

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement



14 August 2017

Thomas Wutzler, Chair
Miramar Business Improvement District
c/- Y Legarth
P.O. Box 11060
Wellington

Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140
New Zealand
info@wcc.govt.nz

Dear Sir / Madam,

[This is a submission on the proposal to sell and to lease land at Shelly Bay](#)

M BID **does not support** the proposal to sell public land, or to provide a long-term lease of public land at Shelly Bay for housing. M BID consider that the sale and lease is not in the public interest. While M BID oppose the sale and lease of the land, if it is to be sold, then the council should only dispose of the land on the open market, and should obtain full market value.

We consider that the land should be retained in public hands, because

- the sale and long term lease proposal limits the future opportunities for the local business and wider community in the public interest.
- the lack of affordable housing in the development proposal calls into question the public interest aspects of the proposal to sell and lease land.
- there is no assurance of on-going right of access for the public to land that becomes privately owned 'village green'.
- the amount of publically owned flat accessible open space coastal land should not be reduced.
- the proposal has the potential to set a precedent, using public land to fund private development.
- the infrastructure costs and responsibility for on-going maintenance are unknown at this stage. The Council's share of the costs and their expenses are un-capped. New and replacement sea walls the length of North & South Bay protecting the development have not been taken into account.



Our concerns arise from the significant financial consequences from the cost of infrastructure; the loss of flat accessible land that has coastal access and recreational values; and the loss of opportunity to undertake a wider strategic planning approach to the use, development and protection of Miramar Peninsula. M BID consider that there are viable alternatives to the sale and lease of the public land and wishes to work with the developer and the council to identify an approach that is in keeping with the natural and recreational values of the area.

The council land should be retained in the public interest for legal road, open space, and for recreational access. The 50 / 50 split of the costs and responsibility for the infrastructure remains uncertain, and there is no contingency in the event of costs escalating over the 13 year plus life of the project. While the development on private land is not opposed, it should be in keeping with the district plan Shelly bay design guide principles and the existing open space zoning requirements.

The sale and long term lease of public land should only be considered where there is a clear public good. In this case, the Shelly Bay land should be retained to provide future opportunities for public recreational use of the peninsula; and to provide some resilience for managing climate change and to provide public owned recreational spaces; and commercial uses that provides public access and services to recreational users of the area.

Publically owned open space is a critical component of the fabric of our urban environment which can make a substantial contribution to communities' quality of life. Equally, insufficient, inaccessible or poorly designed and integrated provision of open spaces can contribute to poor environmental quality, with consequent impacts on factors ranging from health to house prices. The Council should retain legal rights of public access in the community interest. Urban open spaces can play a key role in providing a range of benefits to businesses and the community, both living on the peninsula and visitors from the City and from some distance away.

The sale and long term lease could create a precedent; and the community should have the assurance that when land is not surplus; and where it also remains suitable for the purposes for which it was obtained; that council decisions provide for the retention and protection of that public asset for the public use, in the public interest.

M BID would like to make a presentation at the hearing about the sale and lease of the council land at Shelly Bay. Unfortunately, MBID are unable to provide a comprehensive response to the consultation on the sale and lease of the land at Shelly Bay in writing at this time, because of the difficulty obtaining information on our questions, first asked on the 23rd of December 2016.

M BID appreciate the recent efforts, and are still working through the documents that we received on 10 August 2017.

What are the issues with the sale of land.

The Government have a guideline that suggests that building consents should not be issued where land is lower than 1.9m from the high tide mark. The 2013 Tonkin Taylor report commissioned by WCC places South Bay under water at 1.6m above the high tide mark along with some parts of the Peninsula road.



Seawalls

The council will continue to be responsible for the road and these seawalls during the life of the development. At a sea level rise of 2.2m North Bay is under water and most of the peninsula road. Already under the right sea conditions, tide and wave action at North Bay results in the road being awash. South bay is more sheltered by the condemned wharf that currently reduces wave action.

Road costs

The road between Miramar Ave and Shelly Bay is too narrow for a development of this size at 6m wide. There will be very limited parking over this 2.5km stretch of road and the proposed pathway will be built out of crushed lime stone. Parking will only be placed where small bits of land jut out along the way. This impacts on 2.5km's of beaches being accessible to Wellingtonians. A green field carriage way for a development of this size should be 14m plus 8m of berm (Pathways & Parking). There is no public transport alternative.

Market value not assured

Council are to lease a strip of land for \$5.5M but at a fixed term rent of \$44k per year for the 125-year life of the lease. This equates to less than 1% of 5.5M per year. A second piece of land is to be sold for \$2.5M. The land includes buildings that will be used by the developer. In 2002, the council acquired the land for a cost of \$4.4M so that it could legalise the road and use the remainder for public open recreational spaces, in keeping with the area.

Infrastructure issues facing Miramar

The Council was required to consider if adequate infrastructure could be provided to service the development before it recommended Shelly Bay to the Minister as a special housing area.

To date the funding and maintenance of the total cost of the infrastructure necessary to support the consented development at Shelly Bay is uncertain. The council have only relied on the developers reports and this expense is capped at \$10M.

No analysis has been done on the impact of the Shelly Bay development on the already impaired infrastructure in the Miramar business area.

Council decisions on prioritising expenditure should be the subject of the public process set out in the 10 year Long Term Plan and Annual Plan. There are a number of issues facing Miramar that the MBID have brought to the council's attention over the past 3 years.



Traffic

Traffic entering and leaving via Miramar Ave. intersections, entrances to businesses, tree alignment/ vision issues, parking. Waste water and storm water. None of which have been addressed or budgeted for.

Construction traffic and increase vehicle traffic at the intersection Miramar Ave and Shelly Bay road. There will be a requirement for traffic lights to control this. Already the council are talking about lights at the intersection of Miramar Ave, Tauhinu Rd, Portsmouth Rd. If a major housing development goes ahead at Mt Crawford and Watts Peninsula there will be traffic lights required at the Maupuia Rd intersection. Parking will continue to be a problem in Miramar and all this fast-tracks the likelihood of residence parking.

Loss of future opportunities - MBID's Vision for the Miramar Peninsula

The MBID have the opportunity, as part of their submission to offer an alternative that could be broadly seen as an offer to enter into discussions with iwi and council to work towards an alternative that will work for all.

There's a fantastic opportunity here to be inclusive of iwi who really need support in making good business judgments for their future generations and to not look at Shelly Bay as cutting their losses. Why not include them for the long haul in recreation, sustainable commercial development and tourism. Watts Peninsula is the jewel in the crown for Wellington. With Weta's creative skills and energy linked to the museums and Matiu/Somes Island we could build something truly iconic for generations to come.

Yours sincerely,

Thomas Wutzler

Miramar Business Improvement District

I do wish to present my submission at a hearing.

My preferred method of contact is by Email: admin@miramarpeninsula.org.nz

Please refer correspondence to:

c/- Y Legarth

P.O. Box 11060

Wellington 6142

Yvonne cell: 022 0493300

Proposal for the Council to sell/lease part of its land at Shelly Bay

We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged. You can answer these questions online at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay, email your thoughts to shellybay@wcc.govt.nz or post this form to us (no stamp needed). **Tell us what you think by 5pm, Monday 14 August 2017.**

Privacy statement - what we do with your personal information

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Section 1 – your details

Your name*:	Miramar BID
Your email or postal address*:	Thomas Wutzler, Chair Miramar Business Improvement District
You are making this submission:	
<input type="checkbox"/> as an individual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> on behalf of an organisation. Your organisation's name:	
I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillors: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
If yes, please give your phone number so that a submission time can be arranged*:	
	<i>c/- Yvonne Legarth 022 493300</i>

*mandatory field

Section 2 – questions about the proposal

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of housing and commercial/retail facilities
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

Public land on the coast should be kept by the council, used for public purposes, and a strategy developed for public recreational use of all of the land on the peninsula; owned by the council for the free public use; as a destination for visitors and the community

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

The council land should be retained in the public interest for legal road, open space, and for recreational access. The 50 / 50 split of the costs and responsibility for the infrastructure remains uncertain, and there is no contingency in the event of costs escalating over the 13 year plus life of the project. While the development on private land is not opposed, it should be in keeping with the district plan Shelly bay design guide principles and the existing open space zoning requirements . The lack of affordable housing in the development proposal calls into question the public interest aspects of the proposal to sell and lease land. There is no assurance of on going access for the public to land that becomes privately owned "village green", the amount of publically owned flat accessible open space coastal land should not be reduced. - see attachment

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for housing and commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes?

Long term leases should only be issued for the public good, and should assure future opportunities for commercial use that supports the public recreational use of the peninsula; and to provide some resilience for managing climate change and to provide public owned recreational spaces

1st fold here - fasten here once folded

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all Not really supportive Neutral Supportive Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Publicly owned open space is a critical component of the fabric of our urban environment which can make a substantial contribution to communities' quality of life. Equally, insufficient, inaccessible or low quality provision can contribute to poor environmental quality, with consequent impacts on factors ranging from health to house prices. Public should have legal rights of access, and land ownership by the council provides those rights. Urban open spaces can play a key role in providing a range of benefits to businesses and the community, both living on the peninsula and visitors from the City and from some distance away.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

The proposal sets a precedent of some concern, because the council has not undertaken a programme to classify land under the reserves act, so that the community can be assured that there are council policies that provide for its retention and protection for the public use and retention for uses that are in the public interest.

see attached

2nd fold here

J003726

Free Post Authority Number 2199

**Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council**

Me Heke Ki Pōneke



FREEPOST 2199
Gerald Blunt (279)
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140

Introduction



We want to hear your views on the proposal for the Council to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly Bay so a comprehensive development of housing and public space can go ahead as envisaged.

Privacy Statement

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Nina**
Last Name: **Stevenson**
Street: **40 Kiriwai Road**
Suburb: **Paremata**
City: **Porirua**
Country:
PostCode: **5024**
Daytime Phone: **04 2339734**
Mobile: **0272333363**
eMail: **Fabiola.stevenson@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
- Agent
- Both

Submission

The Council is proposing to sell and lease part of its land at Shelly bay to Shelly Bay Ltd that plans to develop housing and public space in Shelly Bay. The agreement includes a proposal for the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd to each fund half of the cost of public infrastructure and public space improvements. You can read more detail on the proposals and view related information at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

1. It is proposed that the Council enters into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd that involves these main elements:

- the sale of a plot of Council land to Shelly Bay Ltd enable housing development,
- the lease of a plot of Council land and two buildings to Shelly Bay Ltd to enable the development of commercial/retail facilities,
- a 50/50 split between the Council and Shelly Bay Ltd for the cost of infrastructure improvement (including the Council's seawall and road) and public space development.

Overall, what is your level of support for the Council entering into an agreement with Shelly Bay Ltd to develop Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

What are your main reasons for supporting/not supporting this agreement?

I personally think it's God's creation and now we're going to DESTROY this BEAUTIFUL ENVIRONMENT over a silly construction for all the wealthy people?! Think about what's really important Do you REALLY need this? Soon if we keep on doing this over and over again what do you think will happen? STAND up for the world SAY your opinion! Stand up! And imagine how it would have an impact on the wild life!! How would you feel if one day some body RAMDONLY turned up and kick you out of your home to build something we don't really need!. STAND UP WELLINGTON IONS DONT LET OTHER PEOPLE DISTROY OUR WORLD!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Kindest regards Nina Stevenson (9 years old)

2. The Council is proposing to sell an area of land to Shelly Bay Ltd so it can be developed as housing. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

3. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to sell the area of land so it can be developed as housing?

4. The Council is proposing to lease an area of land and two buildings on the waterfront to Shelly Bay Ltd so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes. To see the plot of land referred to, go to page 10 of the consultation document at wellington.govt.nz/shellybay

What is your level of support for that proposal?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

5. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the proposal for the Council to lease that area of land and two buildings so the area can be developed for commercial/retail purposes.

Comments

6. The proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay include a waterfront walkway; green space; parking and seating; cafes, bars and shops; a microbrewery and a boutique hotel.

Overall, what is your level of support for the proposed public spaces and facilities at Shelly Bay?

- Do not support at all
- Not really supportive
- Neutral
- Supportive
- Very supportive

7. What do you see as the benefits and/or issues with the public spaces and facilities?

Comments

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Who at do you think the kids say? It's our city too you Know

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

