

---

**REPORT 2**  
*(1215/52/IM)*

## **FEEDBACK ON THE 2010/11 DRAFT WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

---

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

To provide the Strategy and Policy Committee with a summary of the feedback received during consultation on the draft Waterfront Development Plan for 2010/11, and to recommend the adoption of the Plan.

### **2. Executive Summary**

There was overall support for a number of projects – the business cases for the tensile fabric structure and ice-skating rink, development of the service jetty building, feasibility review of Waitangi Park buildings and the Queens Wharf master plan.

Equally, there were a greater number of submissions in opposition to some aspects of waterfront development – the Kumutoto toilets, Variation 11, the siting of the Chinese garden in Frank Kitts Park and general opposition to there being more buildings on the waterfront.

There were seventy-seven submissions to the draft 2010/11 Waterfront development Plan. However, there were no aspects of the 2010/11 draft plan that were supported or opposed by a clear majority of submitters.

Accordingly, officers recommend that no changes be made to the draft 2010/11 Waterfront Development Plan and that the Strategy and Policy Committee approve the current draft Plan.

### **3. Recommendations**

Officers recommend that the Committee:

- 1. Receive the information.*
- 2. Approve the draft 2010/11 Waterfront Development Plan attached as Appendix 3.*
- 3. Approve the 2010/11 programme of work attached as Appendix 4 of this report.*

4. *Note that Wellington Waterfront Limited will report back to Council with business cases that demonstrate whether or not the tensile fabric structure and the ice-skating rink are financially viable before seeking Council approval to proceed with either project.*
5. *Delegate to the Portfolio Leader, Urban Development & Transport, the authority to approve any amendments to the 2010/11 Waterfront Development Plan.*

## **4. Background**

The Strategy and Policy Committee has the delegation to approve the Annual Development Plan for the waterfront. The Wellington Waterfront Framework (the Framework) states that this is to be done through a balance of making good progress on the waterfront and providing the public with sufficient opportunity to be involved in the process.

The Annual Development Plan outlines the work programme to implement the objectives of the Framework. It has been developed directly from the concepts as laid out in the Framework, and includes how developments will be done, a phasing schedule and a financial model for the proposed work.

The draft 2010/11 Waterfront Development Plan continues to implement the principles of the Framework and was approved for public consultation by the Strategy and Policy Committee on 15 April 2010.

A copy of the draft 2010/11 Plan is attached as Appendix 3 and a programme of work for the Waterfront for 2010/11, derived from the Waterfront Development Plan is attached as Appendix 4.

## **5. Discussion**

### **5.1 Methodology**

Consultation on the draft 2010/11 Waterfront Development Plan opened on 4 May 2010 and closed at 5pm on 2 June 2010. The consultation lasted for 28 calendar days (22 working days).

The plan was advertised in the Dominion Post and on the Council's website. The Council made the draft plan and submission form available at the Council Service centre at 101 Wakefield Street and at Wellington City Libraries. Copies were available on request and the information could also be downloaded from the Council's website.

Seventy-seven submissions were received - a summary of all the submissions is attached as Appendix 1 to this report and a full copy of all submissions is attached as Appendix 2.

Nineteen submissions were received from individual submitters via Wellington Waterfront Limited (WWL). WWL approached a number of its contacts and asked them to make submissions to the draft 2010/11 plan. WWL facilitated the submission process by summarising key elements of the draft plan and emailing them to their contacts and asking for their feedback. As a result, the submissions were received directly by WWL, who then forwarded them to Council.

The analysis in section 5.2 summarises the key issues from the submissions made to the draft 2010/11 Plan. The scope of the analysis aims to be broad enough to inform the Committee's decision but sufficiently focused to be accessible and meaningful.

Of the seventy-seven submissions:

- seventy were made by individuals
- seven were made by groups

Fourteen submitters made oral presentations to the Strategy and Policy Committee at the 10 June 2010 meeting.

The website and formal submission forms included a privacy statement which outlined that all submissions (including name and contact details) are published and made publicly available to elected members and the public.

## **5.2 Summary of written submissions**

The summary below outlines the key matters raised by the submitters.

### **5.2.1 Tensile fabric structure**

Twenty-two submissions supported the proposal that WWL should develop a business case to demonstrate the financial viability of a tensile fabric structure in the transition zone. Nine submissions were against this proposal; the reasons for this included the sun being kept out, the structure not providing protection from wind and rain and it being a long way from the lunch-time sports users.

There were two submissions stating that the siting of the tensile fabric structure in the transition zone between Te Papa and Waitangi Park constituted a breach of the agreement between WWL and Chaffers Marina berth holders. WWL have noted that provision has been made for the berth holders car parking entitlements in their business case planning.

### **5.2.2 Ice-skating rink**

Twenty-two submissions were in support of the proposed ice-skating rink with six opposing it because they felt that a wharf was not the right place for an ice-skating rink, and that it would be costly to run. One submitter stated that wax rinks 'don't work' while another presented an oral submission on the possible

benefits of Solar Powered Ice Rinks (SPIR). Some submitters felt that the proposed rink would be better located in Waitangi Park.

### **5.2.3 Development of the Kumutoto service jetty building**

Twenty-one submissions supported this proposal with one opposing it due to concern that its development may impact negatively on more substantial future changes. Other comments in relation to this proposal were a desire for the resource consent to be publicly notified, for the design to be sympathetic with the ferry terminal and for the building to be small and low-lying.

### **5.2.4 Feasibility studies on Waitangi Park competition-winning buildings**

Twenty submissions supported reviewing the feasibility of these projects while eleven were opposed, largely because they felt there shouldn't be any buildings at all in Waitangi Park. Most of the opposing submissions felt that Waitangi Park was very popular and works well as it is, and were concerned that buildings could cast a significant portion of the park into the shade, and reduce the amount of public open space.

There was also concern that an inability to find developers for the UN Studio and Wardle buildings may result in designs being abandoned and that high levels of public access could be exchanged for more easily marketed apartment blocks.

It was also noted that, during the development of the Waterfront Framework the same submitter noted that the Leadership Group was unable to agree on whether or not there should be new buildings on Waitangi Park and significant public debate ensued.

Further to this it was felt that should the competition-winning designs not proceed, the public should again be consulted on a range of options that included leaving the land as open space, having temporary structures or reserving the site for a future Te Papa expansion.

### **5.2.5 Queens Wharf master plan**

Nineteen submissions supported the Queens Wharf master planning process while five submissions questioned it for a number of reasons. These reasons included concern that no members of Waterfront Watch or the public were in the steering group, the length of time it could take to strengthen and redevelop the wharf and a lack of information on the planning so far.

### **5.2.6 No more waterfront buildings**

Eighteen submissions opposed buildings on the waterfront, some stating that there should only be small, low-storey buildings no high rises (7 submissions), and others saying that there should be no more building of any description (11 submissions).

### **5.2.7 Kumutoto toilets**

While the toilets were approved for construction by the Council prior to the draft plan going out for consultation, fifteen submissions opposed them with three noting their support. The reasons given for opposing the toilets included the design and cost being inappropriate, and that toilets should be incorporated into the ground floors of existing buildings or that the motorhome toilets should be made available to the public.

### **5.2.8 Variation 11**

Twelve submissions were opposed to Variation 11 with three submissions supporting it. This is not a project within the draft plan per say however it's being appealed to the Environment Court has led to WWL suspending planning on sites 8 and 9. A further four submissions which didn't specifically mention variation 11, did oppose the proposed buildings on sites 8-10.

### **5.2.9 Chinese garden**

Two submissions supported the proposal to construct a Chinese garden in Frank Kitts Park while eleven submitters were opposed to it, mainly because they felt Frank Kitts Park works well as it is and that the Chinese garden should be in Waitangi Park as was originally intended.

### **5.2.10 Other submission points**

There were two noteworthy submissions in relation to health and safety on the waterfront. The first stated that wharf ladders should be clearly visible at day and night to enable people who fall in to climb out. The second was concerned over cyclists and pedestrians having to share space, which could be hazardous for blind and vision impaired walkers, children and the elderly. These matters have both been referred to WWL so that they can be considered in their business planning.

A number of submitters suggested that dedicated cycleways on the waterfront and / or the Quays might resolve the issues created by pedestrians and cyclists sharing narrow spaces on the waterfront, allied with cyclists using excessive speed on occasion. Several submitters commented on the Great Harbour Way, and that it should be recognised in the plan and given greater priority.

A number of submissions noted the likely future increases in inner-city living and therefore the even greater requirement to provide leisure and recreational

open space. This was given by some as a reason for no further waterfront development, as was the fact that they considered that the waterfront looks great as it is.

There were some comments on the Council's consultation processes, with several submitters noting that there should be more constructive and open consultation with the public for each major development. This was felt especially in relation to the Queens Wharf master planning process, where it was considered that there should be greater community representation on the steering group, and Variation 11. Several submissions specifically stated that Council does not listen to the results of its consultation processes.

### **5.3 Oral submissions**

The submissions covered a range of issues, much of which had already been addressed via the written submissions though there were two themes which developed through the course of the oral submissions.

The two themes essentially related to there being no more waterfront development. Firstly because it was felt that the waterfront looks very good as it is currently. Secondly, it was felt that having successfully guided waterfront development since 2001, now might be an opportune time for the Waterfront Framework to be reviewed.

### **5.4 LTCCP implications**

Officers noted in the report to the Strategy and Policy Committee on 15 April, when seeking approval to publicly consult on the draft plan, that the projects planned for the 2010/11 year can be managed within existing budgets. Following the consultation, no changes are being recommended to the plan and accordingly, no new financial implications have arisen.

The draft 2010/11 Plan is consistent with the principles of the Waterfront Framework which in turn is reflected in the 2009/19 LTCCP as the guiding policy for waterfront development.

## **6. Analysis of submissions**

The table below gives a high level summary of the key areas of feedback addressed by submitters in their responses. There were 77 submissions in total, compared to 73 received for the 2009/10 draft plan and 13 received in 2008/09.

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Silent</b>
Business case for tensile fabric structure	22	9	46
Business case for ice-skating rink	22	6	49
Development of Kumutoto service jetty building	21	1	55
Feasibility review of Waitangi Park	20	11	46

competition-winning buildings			
Queens Wharf master plan	19	5	53
Waterfront buildings – only small, low-storey buildings / no buildings of any kind	n/a	7 / 11	59
Kumutoto toilets	3	14	60
Variation 11	3	12	62
Chinese gardens in FKP	2	11	64

The first five proposed projects in the table above - business cases for the tensile fabric structure and ice-skating rink, development of the service jetty building, feasibility review of Waitangi Park buildings and the Queens Wharf master plan – all received a significant number of supporting submissions, and there were more submissions in support than in opposition.

The other four matters in the table – general waterfront development, the Kumutoto toilets, Variation 11 and the Chinese garden - received more submissions in opposition than in support. All these matters relate to decisions which have already been made, some of them a number of years ago, for example, the siting of the Chinese garden in Frank Kitts Park. There hasn't been a significant change in circumstances, and nor is there enough opposition to suggest that these are widely held views amongst a significant proportion of the population.

Perhaps the single-most significant feature of the above high-level analysis is the number of submissions which were silent on the above issues. While this most likely reflects a range of views spread across a variety of aspects of the waterfront, it also suggests that there isn't a widely-held view by a majority that either strongly supports or strongly opposes what is proposed in the plan.

All the development to date has been in accordance with the Waterfront Framework, which was the result of extensive public consultation across the community. Accordingly officers recommend that no changes are made to the draft 2010/11 plan following public consultation.

## **7. Conclusion**

The consultation process allowed individuals and groups to provide their thoughts and suggestions on the 2010/11 draft Waterfront Development Plan. Following an analysis of the submissions, officers recommend that no changes be made to the draft plan and that the draft plan be approved by the Committee.

*Contact Officer:*

*Ian Clements, Portfolio Manager, Council Controlled Organisations*

## Supporting Information

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*C378 Wellington Waterfront Project; A312 Wellington Waterfront Operations; CX131 Wellington Waterfront Development.*

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

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

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

*This is not a significant decision. The decision has been assessed under the decision-making framework of the LGA as appropriate following the consideration of section 79 LGA 2002. It is noted that the decision does not give rise to any inconsistent decisions, and is consistent with the Waterfront Framework.*

### **5) Consultation**

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

*Consultation was undertaken on the proposal.*

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

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

### **6) Legal Implications**

*The LGA decision-making framework has been considered in this paper.*

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

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