

---

**ORDINARY MEETING**

**OF**

**CITY STRATEGY COMMITTEE**

**MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS**

**Time:** 9:30 am  
**Date:** Wednesday, 1 November 2017  
**Venue:** Committee Room 1  
Ground Floor, Council Offices  
101 Wakefield Street  
Wellington

---

**Business**

**Page No.**

---

**1.4.2**

1. Victor Davie, Waterfront Watch

2

Waterfront Watch

City Strategy Committee: 1 Nov 2017

When was this agenda and reports released for the public?

There are no images or drawings of the revised plans.

Item 2.1

Page 7

7. states that the main concerns in the opposing submissions was the building height exceeding the maximum of 16 and 19 metres. But no heights were mentioned of the proposed building in the public consultation material. So how were submitters to know of these? Look up the 2012 Environment Court Decision? I think not.

8. The proposed building still exceeds the Environment Court ruling by half a metre on the south end and nearly a metre on the north end. I note that the plant room has been reduced from 2.8m to 1.3m. Is this 1.5 reduction possible for such a vital function.

Page 8

10. Public consultation to the best of my knowledge did not include any plans.

14. Were any submitters connected with the architect or the Council?

Page 9

ii) The reduced heights still don't comply with the Environment Court ruling for Site 9.

22. mentions that the waterfront and Wellington needs more high quality and well designed buildings. Surely, the purpose for this proposed building needs to be made known. Perhaps another office building on the wrong side of the city?

Page 10

*Officer comment:*

I note that Numbers 28 to 32 all relate to the council's opinions of the Environment Court rulings on height requirements for Sites 9 and 10.

Number 32 in particular claims that the Site 10 building was allowed to be 26.25m above AMSL. Please be aware that the "plant room" referred to is a small area on the roof comprising a height of 3.85m. This results in the roof of

the building on Site 10 only being a maximum height of 22.4m which is in accordance with the Environment Court's Variation 11 ruling.

35. Willis Bond hasn't decided what the proposed building will be used for. Surely this basic requirement should be revealed by now.

TAG review of the revised design

Pages 13 & 14

*Changes to the south end of the building*

It is evident that TAG is unhappy with the changes made as they've mentioned in 3, 4, 5 & 6. Appears there's still a long way to go with the design work.

7. Relation to Viewshafts

It is clear that the Waring Taylor Street viewshaft is of considerable concern. This needs to be clarified promptly in conjunction with the District Plan.

10. Roofline

TAG are critical of the elimination of the "wing" roof. The public consultation information was very vague in this respect as the "wing" roof was poorly illustrated. It had the appearance of being a considerable number of photovoltaic panels.

11. Ground floor

It is stated that there is a "5m overhang to the north that provides for a sheltered occupiable space to the north of the building". Hopefully this is contained within the ground footprint of the building and not from overhang of floors above.

Page 16

20. The only reference about ground floor or basement parking is made here. Is provision being made for parking on site?

Item 1.4.2 Attachment 1

Site 10 development 31. 10. 17

