

Shelly Bay Oral Hearings 7 September 2017 | Schedule and Submissions

Time	Submission No.	Name, First	Name, Last	Organisation	Page Number
9:35am	985	Angela	Foster	Havana Architects Group	1
9:40am	985	Angela	Foster	Havana Architects Group	5
9:45am	561	Frances	Velvin		5
9:50am	972	Alister	Smith		9
9:55am	500	Alan	Hucks		13
10:00am	42	Callum	Strong		17
10:05am	Buffer				
10:10am	443	Craig	Oliver		26
10:15am	560	Max	Meyers		30
10:20am	1116	Andrew	Muir		34
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	Wellington Underwater Club	submission not attached to agenda
11:10am	803	Nicole	Miller	Wellington Underwater Club	
11:15am	Buffer				
11:20am	727	Grahame	Hanns		53
11:25am	1072	Stan	Andis		57
11:30am	Buffer				
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	964	Jo	Copland		80
11:55am	597	Uli	Muellner		76
12:00pm	1080, 834, 1025, 821	Brian	Finn	Park Road Post Production (1080), Weta Workshop (834), Weta Digital (1025), Peter Jackson and Fran Walsh (821)	submission not attached to agenda
12:00pm	1080, 834, 1025, 821	Brian	Finn		
12:05pm	1016	Ruth	Pemberton		85
12:10pm	996	Tim	Bollinger		89
12:15pm	607	Richard	Burrell		93
12:20pm	1086	David	Graham	Scots College Cycling Club	97
12:25pm	1086	David	Graham	Scots College Cycling Club	97
12:30pm-1pm		LUNCH			
1:05pm	953	Leigh	Malcolm		103

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	Buffer				
2:00pm	332	Pauline	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	Wultzler		155
3:30pm	1088	Thomas	Wultzler		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: **Nicole**

Last Name: **Miller**

Organisation: **Wellington Underwater Club**

On behalf of: **This submission is submitted on behalf of the Wellington Underwater Club**

Street: **PO Box 2571**

Suburb:

City: **Wellington**

Country: **New Zealand**

PostCode: **6140**

eMail: **proventure.nz@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?

See below. Main issue is around how exactly the road and seawall will be developed and how this impacts on marine life (including penguins) and current recreational users of the area including members of the scuba dive community. This is both for the time of the development and after development has finished. Are alternatives considered (i.e. ferry transport or other public transport options to minimize traffic of residents and visitors to that part of the peninsula)?

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](https://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 lives off its reputation of green and blue spaces close to town for all Wellingtonians to enjoy. Developments in intensification of housing in relative green areas and so close to sea need

Version 2 - amended schedule

to accommodate wildlife & marine life in the best possible way. Specific considerations have to be made in the planning and design phase to ensure developments and future residents don't impact further on the marine and coastal environment (dogs on leash only, predator-free best practice, specific considerations for rubbish and recycle collection to avoid pollution of surrounding area, restoration of coastal environment if impacted or possibly impacted by increased number of residents and visitors to the area and around the 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

Shelly Bay is one of the key dive sites in the harbor for the Underwater Club. We run an archaeology project at Shelly Bay documenting historic artifacts in the area around the wharf. What are the plans for developing the wharf and what will happen to the wharf structures and the artifacts? We would also like to see access ensured to be able to further document the artifacts and structures during the development phase and on ongoing basis. Will access along the road to other dive sites be compromised and how can this be mitigated during and after development?

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

We have many family members with younger children who enjoy a visit to Shelly Bay and the local cafe after a dive at Shelly Bay or along the peninsula. We would like to see the character of an area that is open to families and young & old alike maintained.

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

We would like to see careful consideration and actions towards integrating marine and wildlife in any development plans together with the needs of recreational users of the space alongside the roads and coast. Design and implementation of the development needs to include mitigating actions to avoid impact on the coast and marine life during development and after. The increased numbers of residents and visitors to the area need to be addressed by specific actions towards protecting and restoring the marine and coastal environment that might possibly be impacted.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

From: Sharon McGeown <smcgeown@parkroad.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, 14 August 2017 2:10 p.m.
To: shellybay
Subject: Submission on behalf of Park Road Post Production
Attachments: Shelly Bay Submission - Park Road.pdf; Submission on Shelly Bay proposed development - Weta Group - 14 August 2....pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good afternoon,

On behalf of Park Road Post Production I wish to lodge our opposition to the proposed sale and lease of WCC land at Shelly Bay and the development connected to that land sale.

We endorse the attached Weta Group submission on this proposal and our covering letter of support for the group submission is also attached.

Sincerely,

Sharon McGeown

SHARON MCGEOWN | SHARED SERVICES MANAGER | PARK ROAD POST PRODUCTION LTD
TELEPHONE +64 4 909 7805 | MOBILE +64 275 731 156 | WWW.PARKROAD.CO.NZ

Weta Group submission – Shelly Bay Land Sale & Development

Background

The Weta Group of Companies (the Weta Group) comprises five companies located on the Miramar Peninsula as well as associated companies. The five are digital visual effects house **Weta Digital**; design studio and physical effects manufacturing facility **Weta Workshop**; post production facility **Park Road Post Production**; with purpose-built filmmaking complex **Stone Street Studios** and **Portsmouth Rentals** camera and lighting equipment hire completing the Group offer. Frequently collaborating on large scale film projects while also functioning as independent facilities, these award-winning companies form a filmmaking hub that takes some of the world's biggest films from first concepts right through to final post production. The Group is linked with **Wingnut Films** and its related companies, and television and IP creation company **Pukeko Pictures** as well as non-film companies such as **The Vintage Aviator**, the **Weta Cave** and **Thunderbirds are Go** visitor attractions. The Weta Group is involved in the development of the proposed **Movie Museum** in central Wellington.

Overview

The Weta Group is not opposed to thoughtful and relevant development on the Miramar Peninsula including at Shelly Bay, however we are opposed to the current, proposal involving the land sale and development at Shelly Bay. The reasons for our objections are stated below. In our view, there is a significant opportunity to take a much broader, holistic and consultative approach to development across the Miramar Peninsula and the Weta Group would be willing to be a part of that. We believe this development has the potential to constrain future opportunities to such an approach. We would also be happy to present our objections in person if there is an opportunity to do so.

Reasons for objection

The reasons why we – as a Group – object to this proposal are:

1. Process

We are concerned with how the consenting process for this development was managed, with no ability for individuals, businesses or community organisations to have any say on the proposed development other than on the proposed sale of Wellington City Council (WCC) land. We are particularly concerned that the Special Housing Area legislation was utilised when clearly the nature of this development is not, in our view, what the HASHAA was intended for. This approach also had the effect of over-riding the District Plan for the area, which outlines a different vision for development at Shelly Bay. As mentioned there was no consultation with organisations such as the Miramar BID, of which Weta companies are members. This is despite a Memorandum of Understanding which outlines the WCC's responsibility to consult with the Miramar BID on matters such as this.

2. Scale of development

The proposal calls for 350 dwellings, a small hotel and rest home – and that is in the initial phase. The Weta Group believes that this is too dense and inappropriate for the area. As stated, the Council's own District Plan envisages a far different outlook for the area. It states: "Future development within Shelly Bay should recognise the different ways it is experienced by the public. The distinctive character and public significance of Shelly Bay require that new development is sensitively approached by carefully considering any potential effects on the area's special qualities. The major urban design issues to be considered by new development in Shelly Bay relate to the:

*Impact of new development on the natural character of Shelly Bay,

*impact of new development on the public amenity value and recreational potential,

*impact of new development on the historical significance of the area as a whole and any identified heritage buildings." It is difficult to reconcile these considerations with the current proposal. We would also question that suitability of the location for this level of development given the known risks around sea level rises and potential erosion in the area.

3. Construction impacts

We have identified a number of negative impacts from the development below in terms of traffic impact and pressure on Miramar's already strained infrastructure. However, these impacts will be exacerbated during the construction of any new developments at Shelly Bay given the nature of construction traffic (heavy vehicles), the limited access to Shelly Bay, and the overlap with regular commuter, business and recreational traffic into and out of Miramar and around the Peninsula.

4. Traffic impact

A principle concern with this development is the impact of the excess traffic on Miramar. As a peninsula there are natural constraints on the roading network into and around Miramar. The Weta Group, together with Wellington International Airport Limited, is one of the two major employers in the area. We acknowledge that as our businesses have grown and film productions have been located at Stone Street Studios, we have been a contributor to local traffic. We also have a significant number of employees who live in the area. The potential impact of this development both during construction and once completed are significant with the WCC noting a four-fold increase in traffic and road change requirements at the intersection with Miramar Avenue. One of the issues with any level of development at Shelly Bay is the road access itself. While some upgrades are envisaged there are no plans nor much ability to widen the road which would seem to be the only meaningful solution. 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, coupled with the additional residents and construction and service vehicles, this will severely limit the access and appeal of the area to recreational users and visitors. We believe the traffic impacts have the potential to negatively impact both business traffic to and from the Weta Group of Companies, and residents seeking to navigate around the Peninsula.

5. Pressure on infrastructure

Given the recent growth in a wide variety of businesses and industries on the Peninsula, the existing infrastructure has been under pressure. The Miramar BID has been active in highlighting these issues to the WCC. We anticipate that this project, if it proceeds, will put that infrastructure under much greater pressure in terms of water, waste water and electricity. Already there are issues in the area with power consumption and capacity and with waste water during periods of heavy rain. We expect that this development will add to some of these active concerns without adequately dealing with them. The WCC will be aware that critics have noted the estimated cost of the infrastructure upgrades associated with the development are understated and likely to rise over time. This would see the Council and its ratepayers exposed to any over-runs on this cost.

6. Design elements

While we applaud the Council and The Wellington Company to put forward its ideas and do not wish to limit the opportunity for any business to promote bold ideas, we do feel the design elements in the current proposal do not consider fully the unique nature of the area, the current uses and attractiveness of Shelly Bay and its surroundings and the integration of any new development into the wider Miramar community.

7. Public amenity/ green space

As noted previously, the WCC had itself intended that Shelly Bay maintains its unique character and that the retention of green space and public amenity at Shelly Bay was a key requirement. This included the Council's acquisition of land for that purpose. However, the proposed development has a strong bias towards the supply of housing with exclusive use and limited public space. Coupled with a lack of public parking this is likely to be a disincentive to Wellingtonians to come to and use the space at Shelly Bay. As residents and neighbours on the Peninsula, we do not wish the area to become an exclusive community but that it is retained as an asset for all of Wellington to enjoy.

8. Nature and character of Miramar Peninsula

We believe that this scheme has the potential to completely change the natural character of Shelly Bay. The proposed plan seems to prioritise scale over the needs of the land and of Wellingtonians. The proposed housing will be so dominant on the landscape that it will destroy much of the current value of the Shelly Bay as a recreational green space for a host of users. As the Miramar BID has noted, there is potential for development with a sensible housing profile but it must complement the character of the area, not demolish it. The proposal includes a concept for a four-story building which could loom over the natural environment of the bay. As the WCC noted in its District plan of 2002: "Future development within Shelly Bay should recognise the different ways it is experienced by the public. The distinctive character and public significance of Shelly Bay require that new development is sensitively approached by carefully considering any potential effects on the area's special qualities." We are concerned that the vast scale and size of the current proposal cannot possibly protect, let alone enhance, these special qualities of the Bay.

9. Related development concerns

We wish to note that this development has the potential to impact on other sites of significance on the Miramar Peninsula including neighbouring Watts Peninsula and Mt Crawford. We believe the proximity of the Shelly Bay site could have flow-on effects and also there are potential precedents in committing to developments of the type proposed for Shelly Bay that may influence plans for these other areas.

10. Opportunity for appropriate development

We do understand the merit and potential value of relevant development at Shelly Bay, however it is the scale and nature of that which has caused us to question the proposed land sale and development concepts. We believe any development at Shelly Bay should include more green space, less housing and much more robust consideration of transport and infrastructure impacts. For the reasons stated in (9) above we believe that WCC needs to take a much broader and holistic view on the management of green space, housing and other development needs, and the overall custodianship and development of the Miramar Peninsula. In terms of housing we believe there are options which the WCC could explore for additional housing capacity on the Peninsula which do not impact on such sensitive areas and which could also meet other community needs, such as the need for affordable housing, which the current Shelly Bay development does not meet. The Weta Group would be willing to engage in a process with other stakeholders on the Peninsula including iwi, WCC, The Wellington Company and others to work towards an alternative that will work for all. With Weta’s creative skills and capacity, we believe we could assist in finding solutions that would be dynamic and aspirational while not marginalising other parts of the community. We also believe such a process could incorporate other stakeholder groups and the community on considering the best way forward to consider other sensitive areas such as Watts Peninsula and Mt Crawford as part of an overall plan and framework for the whole of Miramar Peninsula.

Submitted on behalf of the Weta Group of Companies by

Cameron Harland Chief Executive	David Wilks General Manager	David Wright Chief Operating Officer	Dominic Sheehan General Manager
Park Road Post Production and Camperdown Studios	Weta Workshop	Weta Digital	Wingnut Films

PARK ROAD

POST PRODUCTION

Monday 14 August 2017

To whom it may concern

Re: Shelly Bay Land Sale & Development

Park Road Post Production is a purpose built post production facility catering for full sound and visual post production for digital cinema and television. We cater to both local and the growing international market places. The business is a major contributor to the economic and social community of Miramar and Wellington. We have 60 fulltime staff and employ a large number of the freelance film community during major productions.

Park Road Post Production strongly supports the Weta Group Submission on the Shelly Bay Land Sale Development. This submission has had input from all in the Weta Group including Park Road and outlines our reasons for the objection.

We are happy to speak to this if required.

Yours sincerely



Cameron Harland

Chief Executive

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: **Wilks**
Organisation: **Weta Workshop**
On behalf of: **Weta Workshop Ltd**
Street: **PO Box 15208, Miramar**
Suburb: **Wellington**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6243**
Daytime Phone: **+6449094020**
Mobile: **+6421895228**
eMail: **david.wilks@wetaworkshop.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?
Please see attached submission document & cover letter

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

Please see attached submission document & cover letter

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

Version 2 - amended schedule

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

Please see attached submission document & cover letter

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

Please see attached submission document & cover letter

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments

Please see attached submission document & cover letter

Attached Documents

File
Letter of Support for Group Submission to WCC re Shelly Bay Development
Submission on Shelly Bay proposed development - Weta Group - 14 August 2017

Need Help?

Privacy Statement



MAKING IMAGINARY WORLDS A REALITY

11th August 2017

Wellington City Council
PO BOX 2199
Wellington 6140

To whom it may concern

RE: Shelly Bay Land sale – letter of support from Weta Workshop Ltd for the Weta Group Submission

This is a covering letter on behalf of Weta Workshop endorsing the Weta Group of Companies submission objecting to the Shelly Bay Land Sale and Development.

Of particular concern to Weta Workshop is the traffic impact & proposed infrastructure. We believe this will negatively impact the day to day operation of our business (at 21 Camperdown Road & 151 Park Road) and we do not believe that the project estimate for the infrastructure is sufficient for the scale of the job and which may impact on rate payers.

Weta Workshop can see the potential for Shelly Bay and Watts peninsular to be developed into another fantastic asset for Wellington. However, we believe the current proposal will adversely affect the character, accessibility and infrastructure of not just Shelly Bay, but the whole of the Miramar peninsular.

We object to the current proposal.

Kind regards

David Wilks
General Manager
Weta Workshop

Weta Group submission – Shelly Bay Land Sale & Development

Background

The Weta Group of Companies (the Weta Group) comprises five companies located on the Miramar Peninsula as well as associated companies. The five are digital visual effects house **Weta Digital**; design studio and physical effects manufacturing facility **Weta Workshop**; post production facility **Park Road Post Production**; with purpose-built filmmaking complex **Stone Street Studios** and **Portsmouth Rentals** camera and lighting equipment hire completing the Group offer. Frequently collaborating on large scale film projects while also functioning as independent facilities, these award-winning companies form a filmmaking hub that takes some of the world's biggest films from first concepts right through to final post production. The Group is linked with **Wingnut Films** and its related companies, and television and IP creation company **Pukeko Pictures** as well as non-film companies such as **The Vintage Aviator**, the **Weta Cave** and **Thunderbirds are Go** visitor attractions. The Weta Group is involved in the development of the proposed **Movie Museum** in central Wellington.

Overview

The Weta Group is not opposed to thoughtful and relevant development on the Miramar Peninsula including at Shelly Bay, however we are opposed to the current, proposal involving the land sale and development at Shelly Bay. The reasons for our objections are stated below. In our view, there is a significant opportunity to take a much broader, holistic and consultative approach to development across the Miramar Peninsula and the Weta Group would be willing to be a part of that. We believe this development has the potential to constrain future opportunities to such an approach. We would also be happy to present our objections in person if there is an opportunity to do so.

Reasons for objection

The reasons why we – as a Group – object to this proposal are:

1. Process

We are concerned with how the consenting process for this development was managed, with no ability for individuals, businesses or community organisations to have any say on the proposed development other than on the proposed sale of Wellington City Council (WCC) land. We are particularly concerned that the Special Housing Area legislation was utilised when clearly the nature of this development is not, in our view, what the HASHAA was intended for. This approach also had the effect of over-riding the District Plan for the area, which outlines a different vision for development at Shelly Bay. As mentioned there was no consultation with organisations such as the Miramar BID, of which Weta companies are members. This is despite a Memorandum of Understanding which outlines the WCC's responsibility to consult with the Miramar BID on matters such as this.

2. Scale of development

The proposal calls for 350 dwellings, a small hotel and rest home – and that is in the initial phase. The Weta Group believes that this is too dense and inappropriate for the area. As stated, the Council's own District Plan envisages a far different outlook for the area. It states: "Future development within Shelly Bay should recognise the different ways it is experienced by the public. The distinctive character and public significance of Shelly Bay require that new development is sensitively approached by carefully considering any potential effects on the area's special qualities. The major urban design issues to be considered by new development in Shelly Bay relate to the:

*Impact of new development on the natural character of Shelly Bay,

*impact of new development on the public amenity value and recreational potential,

*impact of new development on the historical significance of the area as a whole and any identified heritage buildings." It is difficult to reconcile these considerations with the current proposal. We would also question that suitability of the location for this level of development given the known risks around sea level rises and potential erosion in the area.

3. Construction impacts

We have identified a number of negative impacts from the development below in terms of traffic impact and pressure on Miramar's already strained infrastructure. However, these impacts will be exacerbated during the construction of any new developments at Shelly Bay given the nature of construction traffic (heavy vehicles), the limited access to Shelly Bay, and the overlap with regular commuter, business and recreational traffic into and out of Miramar and around the Peninsula.

4. Traffic impact

A principle concern with this development is the impact of the excess traffic on Miramar. As a peninsula there are natural constraints on the roading network into and around Miramar. The Weta Group, together with Wellington International Airport Limited, is one of the two major employers in the area. We acknowledge that as our businesses have grown and film productions have been located at Stone Street Studios, we have been a contributor to local traffic. We also have a significant number of employees who live in the area. The potential impact of this development both during construction and once completed are significant with the WCC noting a four-fold increase in traffic and road change requirements at the intersection with Miramar Avenue. One of the issues with any level of development at Shelly Bay is the road access itself. While some upgrades are envisaged there are no plans nor much ability to widen the road which would seem to be the only meaningful solution. 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, coupled with the additional residents and construction and service vehicles, this will severely limit the access and appeal of the area to recreational users and visitors. We believe the traffic impacts have the potential to negatively impact both business traffic to and from the Weta Group of Companies, and residents seeking to navigate around the Peninsula.

5. Pressure on infrastructure

Given the recent growth in a wide variety of businesses and industries on the Peninsula, the existing infrastructure has been under pressure. The Miramar BID has been active in highlighting these issues to the WCC. We anticipate that this project, if it proceeds, will put that infrastructure under much greater pressure in terms of water, waste water and electricity. Already there are issues in the area with power consumption and capacity and with waste water during periods of heavy rain. We expect that this development will add to some of these active concerns without adequately dealing with them. The WCC will be aware that critics have noted the estimated cost of the infrastructure upgrades associated with the development are understated and likely to rise over time. This would see the Council and its ratepayers exposed to any over-runs on this cost.

6. Design elements

While we applaud the Council and The Wellington Company to put forward its ideas and do not wish to limit the opportunity for any business to promote bold ideas, we do feel the design elements in the current proposal do not consider fully the unique nature of the area, the current uses and attractiveness of Shelly Bay and its surroundings and the integration of any new development into the wider Miramar community.

7. Public amenity/ green space

As noted previously, the WCC had itself intended that Shelly Bay maintains its unique character and that the retention of green space and public amenity at Shelly Bay was a key requirement. This included the Council's acquisition of land for that purpose. However, the proposed development has a strong bias towards the supply of housing with exclusive use and limited public space. Coupled with a lack of public parking this is likely to be a disincentive to Wellingtonians to come to and use the space at Shelly Bay. As residents and neighbours on the Peninsula, we do not wish the area to become an exclusive community but that it is retained as an asset for all of Wellington to enjoy.

8. Nature and character of Miramar Peninsula

We believe that this scheme has the potential to completely change the natural character of Shelly Bay. The proposed plan seems to prioritise scale over the needs of the land and of Wellingtonians. The proposed housing will be so dominant on the landscape that it will destroy much of the current value of the Shelly Bay as a recreational green space for a host of users. As the Miramar BID has noted, there is potential for development with a sensible housing profile but it must complement the character of the area, not demolish it. The proposal includes a concept for a four-story building which could loom over the natural environment of the bay. As the WCC noted in its District plan of 2002: "Future development within Shelly Bay should recognise the different ways it is experienced by the public. The distinctive character and public significance of Shelly Bay require that new development is sensitively approached by carefully considering any potential effects on the area's special qualities." We are concerned that the vast scale and size of the current proposal cannot possibly protect, let alone enhance, these special qualities of the Bay.

9. Related development concerns

We wish to note that this development has the potential to impact on other sites of significance on the Miramar Peninsula including neighbouring Watts Peninsula and Mt Crawford. We believe the proximity of the Shelly Bay site could have flow-on effects and also there are potential precedents in committing to developments of the type proposed for Shelly Bay that may influence plans for these other areas.

10. Opportunity for appropriate development

We do understand the merit and potential value of relevant development at Shelly Bay, however it is the scale and nature of that which has caused us to question the proposed land sale and development concepts. We believe any development at Shelly Bay should include more green space, less housing and much more robust consideration of transport and infrastructure impacts. For the reasons stated in (9) above we believe that WCC needs to take a much broader and holistic view on the management of green space, housing and other development needs, and the overall custodianship and development of the Miramar Peninsula. In terms of housing we believe there are options which the WCC could explore for additional housing capacity on the Peninsula which do not impact on such sensitive areas and which could also meet other community needs, such as the need for affordable housing, which the current Shelly Bay development does not meet. The Weta Group would be willing to engage in a process with other stakeholders on the Peninsula including iwi, WCC, The Wellington Company and others to work towards an alternative that will work for all. With Weta’s creative skills and capacity, we believe we could assist in finding solutions that would be dynamic and aspirational while not marginalising other parts of the community. We also believe such a process could incorporate other stakeholder groups and the community on considering the best way forward to consider other sensitive areas such as Watts Peninsula and Mt Crawford as part of an overall plan and framework for the whole of Miramar Peninsula.

Submitted on behalf of the Weta Group of Companies by

Cameron Harland Chief Executive	David Wilks General Manager	David Wright Chief Operating Officer	Dominic Sheehan General Manager
Park Road Post Production and Camperdown Studios	Weta Workshop	Weta Digital	Wingnut Films

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: **Wright**
Organisation: **Weta Digital Limited**
Street:
Suburb: **WELLINGTON**
City: **WELLINGTON**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6022**
Daytime Phone: **049096760**
Mobile: **0274451398**
eMail: **dwright@wetafx.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?
refer submission

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
refer submission

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

Version 2 - amended schedule



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
refer submission

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
refer submission

8. What other comments or questions do you have?

Comments
refer submission

Attached Documents

File
Submission on Shelly Bay proposed development - Weta Group - 14 August 2017
Weta Digital Shelly Bay Submission 14 August 2017

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

1025

Version 2 - amended schedule

Weta Group submission – Shelly Bay Land Sale & Development

Background

The Weta Group of Companies (the Weta Group) comprises five companies located on the Miramar Peninsula as well as associated companies. The five are digital visual effects house **Weta Digital**; design studio and physical effects manufacturing facility **Weta Workshop**; post production facility **Park Road Post Production**; with purpose-built filmmaking complex **Stone Street Studios** and **Portsmouth Rentals** camera and lighting equipment hire completing the Group offer. Frequently collaborating on large scale film projects while also functioning as independent facilities, these award-winning companies form a filmmaking hub that takes some of the world's biggest films from first concepts right through to final post production. The Group is linked with **Wingnut Films** and its related companies, and television and IP creation company **Pukeko Pictures** as well as non-film companies such as **The Vintage Aviator**, the **Weta Cave** and **Thunderbirds are Go** visitor attractions. The Weta Group is involved in the development of the proposed **Movie Museum** in central Wellington.

Overview

The Weta Group is not opposed to thoughtful and relevant development on the Miramar Peninsula including at Shelly Bay, however we are opposed to the current, proposal involving the land sale and development at Shelly Bay. The reasons for our objections are stated below. In our view, there is a significant opportunity to take a much broader, holistic and consultative approach to development across the Miramar Peninsula and the Weta Group would be willing to be a part of that. We believe this development has the potential to constrain future opportunities to such an approach. We would also be happy to present our objections in person if there is an opportunity to do so.

Reasons for objection

The reasons why we – as a Group – object to this proposal are:

1. Process

We are concerned with how the consenting process for this development was managed, with no ability for individuals, businesses or community organisations to have any say on the proposed development other than on the proposed sale of Wellington City Council (WCC) land. We are particularly concerned that the Special Housing Area legislation was utilised when clearly the nature of this development is not, in our view, what the HASHAA was intended for. This approach also had the effect of over-riding the District Plan for the area, which outlines a different vision for development at Shelly Bay. As mentioned there was no consultation with organisations such as the Miramar BID, of which Weta companies are members. This is despite a Memorandum of Understanding which outlines the WCC's responsibility to consult with the Miramar BID on matters such as this.

2. Scale of development

The proposal calls for 350 dwellings, a small hotel and rest home – and that is in the initial phase. The Weta Group believes that this is too dense and inappropriate for the area. As stated, the Council's own District Plan envisages a far different outlook for the area. It states: "Future development within Shelly Bay should recognise the different ways it is experienced by the public. The distinctive character and public significance of Shelly Bay require that new development is sensitively approached by carefully considering any potential effects on the area's special qualities. The major urban design issues to be considered by new development in Shelly Bay relate to the:

*Impact of new development on the natural character of Shelly Bay,

*impact of new development on the public amenity value and recreational potential,

*impact of new development on the historical significance of the area as a whole and any identified heritage buildings." It is difficult to reconcile these considerations with the current proposal. We would also question that suitability of the location for this level of development given the known risks around sea level rises and potential erosion in the area.

3. Construction impacts

We have identified a number of negative impacts from the development below in terms of traffic impact and pressure on Miramar's already strained infrastructure. However, these impacts will be exacerbated during the construction of any new developments at Shelly Bay given the nature of construction traffic (heavy vehicles), the limited access to Shelly Bay, and the overlap with regular commuter, business and recreational traffic into and out of Miramar and around the Peninsula.

4. Traffic impact

A principle concern with this development is the impact of the excess traffic on Miramar. As a peninsula there are natural constraints on the roading network into and around Miramar. The Weta Group, together with Wellington International Airport Limited, is one of the two major employers in the area. We acknowledge that as our businesses have grown and film productions have been located at Stone Street Studios, we have been a contributor to local traffic. We also have a significant number of employees who live in the area. The potential impact of this development both during construction and once completed are significant with the WCC noting a four-fold increase in traffic and road change requirements at the intersection with Miramar Avenue. One of the issues with any level of development at Shelly Bay is the road access itself. While some upgrades are envisaged there are no plans nor much ability to widen the road which would seem to be the only meaningful solution. 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, coupled with the additional residents and construction and service vehicles, this will severely limit the access and appeal of the area to recreational users and visitors. We believe the traffic impacts have the potential to negatively impact both business traffic to and from the Weta Group of Companies, and residents seeking to navigate around the Peninsula.

5. Pressure on infrastructure

Given the recent growth in a wide variety of businesses and industries on the Peninsula, the existing infrastructure has been under pressure. The Miramar BID has been active in highlighting these issues to the WCC. We anticipate that this project, if it proceeds, will put that infrastructure under much greater pressure in terms of water, waste water and electricity. Already there are issues in the area with power consumption and capacity and with waste water during periods of heavy rain. We expect that this development will add to some of these active concerns without adequately dealing with them. The WCC will be aware that critics have noted the estimated cost of the infrastructure upgrades associated with the development are understated and likely to rise over time. This would see the Council and its ratepayers exposed to any over-runs on this cost.

6. Design elements

While we applaud the Council and The Wellington Company to put forward its ideas and do not wish to limit the opportunity for any business to promote bold ideas, we do feel the design elements in the current proposal do not consider fully the unique nature of the area, the current uses and attractiveness of Shelly Bay and its surroundings and the integration of any new development into the wider Miramar community.

7. Public amenity/ green space

As noted previously, the WCC had itself intended that Shelly Bay maintains its unique character and that the retention of green space and public amenity at Shelly Bay was a key requirement. This included the Council's acquisition of land for that purpose. However, the proposed development has a strong bias towards the supply of housing with exclusive use and limited public space. Coupled with a lack of public parking this is likely to be a disincentive to Wellingtonians to come to and use the space at Shelly Bay. As residents and neighbours on the Peninsula, we do not wish the area to become an exclusive community but that it is retained as an asset for all of Wellington to enjoy.

8. Nature and character of Miramar Peninsula

We believe that this scheme has the potential to completely change the natural character of Shelly Bay. The proposed plan seems to prioritise scale over the needs of the land and of Wellingtonians. The proposed housing will be so dominant on the landscape that it will destroy much of the current value of the Shelly Bay as a recreational green space for a host of users. As the Miramar BID has noted, there is potential for development with a sensible housing profile but it must complement the character of the area, not demolish it. The proposal includes a concept for a four-story building which could loom over the natural environment of the bay. As the WCC noted in its District plan of 2002: "Future development within Shelly Bay should recognise the different ways it is experienced by the public. The distinctive character and public significance of Shelly Bay require that new development is sensitively approached by carefully considering any potential effects on the area's special qualities." We are concerned that the vast scale and size of the current proposal cannot possibly protect, let alone enhance, these special qualities of the Bay.

9. Related development concerns

We wish to note that this development has the potential to impact on other sites of significance on the Miramar Peninsula including neighbouring Watts Peninsula and Mt Crawford. We believe the proximity of the Shelly Bay site could have flow-on effects and also there are potential precedents in committing to developments of the type proposed for Shelly Bay that may influence plans for these other areas.

10. Opportunity for appropriate development

We do understand the merit and potential value of relevant development at Shelly Bay, however it is the scale and nature of that which has caused us to question the proposed land sale and development concepts. We believe any development at Shelly Bay should include more green space, less housing and much more robust consideration of transport and infrastructure impacts. For the reasons stated in (9) above we believe that WCC needs to take a much broader and holistic view on the management of green space, housing and other development needs, and the overall custodianship and development of the Miramar Peninsula. In terms of housing we believe there are options which the WCC could explore for additional housing capacity on the Peninsula which do not impact on such sensitive areas and which could also meet other community needs, such as the need for affordable housing, which the current Shelly Bay development does not meet. The Weta Group would be willing to engage in a process with other stakeholders on the Peninsula including iwi, WCC, The Wellington Company and others to work towards an alternative that will work for all. With Weta’s creative skills and capacity, we believe we could assist in finding solutions that would be dynamic and aspirational while not marginalising other parts of the community. We also believe such a process could incorporate other stakeholder groups and the community on considering the best way forward to consider other sensitive areas such as Watts Peninsula and Mt Crawford as part of an overall plan and framework for the whole of Miramar Peninsula.

Submitted on behalf of the Weta Group of Companies by

Cameron Harland Chief Executive	David Wilks General Manager	David Wright Chief Operating Officer	Dominic Sheehan General Manager
Park Road Post Production and Camperdown Studios	Weta Workshop	Weta Digital	Wingnut Films

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: **Peter**
Last Name: **Jackson**
Street: **145 Park Road**
Suburb: **Miramar**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6022**
eMail: **dominic@wingnutfilms.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

Version 2 - amended schedule

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

Attached Documents

File
Submission on Shelly Bay proposed development -14 Aug 2017

Need Help?

Privacy Statement

**Submission to Wellington City Council
Proposal to sell and lease land in Shelly Bay to redevelop the area**

From Peter Jackson and Fran Walsh

As residents, business owners and neighbours to Shelly Bay, we wish to lodge our objection to the proposed development at Shelly Bay as it currently stands.

The Miramar Peninsula holds a very special place in our hearts.

We have called the Peninsula home for the past 30 years. Our children grew up here; we have pursued our film-making dreams here; and along the way have established an industry that now supports thousands of Wellingtonians.

We genuinely appreciate the Council's desire to improve and enhance Shelly Bay. As residents who enjoy living here and who have business based here, we don't begrudge anyone who wants to live in the area or create new business opportunities here.

However, it is clear to us that given the enormity of the infrastructure that will be required to support over 350 residential dwellings, hotel, rest home and commercial businesses etc, that Wellington ratepayers are subsidising what is essentially a property speculator's money-making venture.

The land itself will be sold for a bargain basement price and Wellingtonians will be saddled with an enormous debt for infrastructure to make this venture viable. Who profits in the end? Certainly not the people in most need of social housing. Even the smallest property on a seaside location in the Eastern suburbs sells for somewhere between six to seven hundred thousand dollars. This is hardly entry level housing. Taking the conservative price of six hundred thousand per unit and times that by 250 (assuming each Citiblox house is \$300,000 per unit) the profit flowing back to the developer is roughly \$75,000,000!

Out of interest has the developer shared with the council the cost price of a single Citiblox dwelling? Does the WCC have a dollar figure for the cost of upgrading Shelly Bay's roading, sewage, water supply, power etc? Having explored this site for a film museum many years ago, we were led to believe by council experts that upgrading Shelly Bay's basic infrastructure alone would cost Wellington ratepayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

It seems to us that Wellingtonians lose both ways. The public coastal land that was always available to all for outdoor leisure activities will be lost to high density, expensive housing which itself will be heavily subsidised by Wellington ratepayers.

As has been stated in a number of critiques of the proposal there are shortcomings with the current proposal in relation to:

- Road access and suitability
- Infrastructure limitations and the costs of establishing and sustaining the infrastructure for such a large development

- Reduction in green space and reduced access to the area for visitors, bikers, walkers and joggers
- Flow-on impacts on residents and businesses on the Miramar Peninsula
- A lack of transport services to the area
- Traffic management during construction and once established
- Potential impact on sensitive areas of historical and cultural significance in the area

Shelly Bay along with Watts Peninsula and Mt Crawford are vital and historically important sites in Wellington's history and, we believe, its future.

Any development on or near these sites needs careful consideration and custodianship by Wellington City Council and that must include consultation with all stakeholders.

Such a process could include iwi, community, businesses including developers, central and local government.

In the meantime, we would be opposed to the Council's plans to sell and lease Shelly Bay land to the development that is currently proposed and with the development itself.

We would like to make an oral submission in support of this position.

Submitted by:

Peter Jackson

Fran Walsh