

*Summary of Submissions  
Proposed District Plan  
Variation 11*

Wellington Waterfront  
May 2009

## Table of contents

1. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – All issues	p. 2
2. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – General	p. 31
3. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Introduction	p. 34
4. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Objective 12.2.8.6A	p. 35
5. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.3	p. 35
6. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.6	p.35
7. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.6A	p. 36
8. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.6B	p. 37
9. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.6C	p. 38
10. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.8	p. 39
11. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – References to Waterfront Framework	p. 40
12. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.1.23	p. 40
13. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.4	p. 41
14. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.4A	p. 41
15. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.4A References to Standards in 13.6.3	p. 49
16. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.4A.3	p. 49
17. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.8.14A	p. 50
18. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.8.6	p. 52
19. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.4.7	p. 52
20. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.6.1.23	p. 53
21. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.6.3.1.3	p. 56
22. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.6.3.1.3 Building Heights	p. 56
23. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.8.8.14A	p. 56
24. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Appendix 13	p. 56
25. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Design Guide General	p. 60
26. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Heritage	p. 62
27. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – View shafts	p. 63
28. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Vehicle parking	p. 64
29. Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Section 32 Report	p. 64

### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – All Issues

Sub-mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
1	Nicci Page	22 Avon Street, Island Bay, Wellington 6023	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Opposes rule 13.3.4A relating to the "Non-notification/service of resource consents"
2	Julian Gillespie	PO Box 27207 Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Opposes the provisions which shut the public out of the process of approving individual buildings i.e. Rule 13.3.4A
3	Dr Tim Halpine	5 Surrey Street, Wilton, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Opposes variation 11. The development of our waterfront should be an open process not a closed one i.e. Rule 13.3.4A
4	Aroha Ann Symonds	2 The Crescent, Roseneath, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	All decisions made should be completely transparent and that the citizens of Wellington should have a right to be consulted and their wishes to be adhered to by the council.
5	Peter John Graham	19 Beazley Avenue, Paparangi, Wellington 6037	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Opposed to the proposed rules in Variation 11 which would severely restrict public input on plans (applications for resource consent) for proposed individual buildings for Kumutoto sites 8, 9 & 10.
				Rule 13.6.1.23	Oppose the proposed reduction in the ground floor space which would be open to the public. This is a complete and undesirable change in present policy which requires all ground floor space to be open to the public.
6	Sunny Collings	202, 28 Waterloo Quay, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Requests public participation in processes of approving individual buildings and that rule 13.3.4A be rejected
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	Buildings should remain within proposed height limits
7	Tanya Asken	302 The Esplanade, Island Bay, Wellington 6023	no	Development in General	The submitter does not support the plan for any more buildings of any kind in this area and is particularly opposed to any changes to Frank Kitts Park.
8	Janet Tremewan	7 Paparata St, Karori, 6012	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the inclusion of new rule 13.3.4A because the public should be able to view plans for future buildings particularly in the Kumutoto area.
9	Gayle Cullwick	46A Grafton Rd Roseneath Wellington	-	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes new planning rules for development around Kumutoto and opposes the approach of approving a plan change to develop the area around Kumutoto instead of going for a resource

					consent for all buildings
			TBC	Rule 13.8.8.14A	The submitter opposes plans to allow Wellington Waterfront to develop buildings 15% above the proposed height limits.
10	Frances Williamson	25 Jubilee Road Khandallah Wellington 6035	no	Policy 12.2.8.6A	The submission opposes the inclusion of more detailed policy provisions for future building development on the waterfront.
				Policy 12.2.8.6B	The submission opposes the inclusion of more detailed policy provisions for future building development on the waterfront.
				Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter considers that there needs to be public consultations on the introduction of defined limits including building heights and "footprints" for development in the North Kumutoto area. Specific maximum heights and footprints must be introduced and adhered to at all times.
				References to Waterfront Framework	The submitter is opposed to the removal of references to the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide.
11	Mary Munro	1 Orari Street, Ngaio Wellington	no	12.1 Introduction Special Areas	The submission opposes the deletion of the last sentence in the second paragraph which reads: "This commitment is further described in the Framework, which also proposes governance arrangements requiring ongoing monitoring by a group of both professional and community representatives". It is requested that professional and community representatives continue to monitor governance arrangements in respect of our waterfront.
				Rule 13.3.4A	The submission opposes the inclusion of the Non-notification /service provision in this rule.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submission opposes the proposed 15% discretionary margin above the listed maximum height and requests that there should be no discretionary limit, particularly in the North Kumutoto Area.
12	Oriental Bay Residents Association Inc.	C.G. Blair 5A Hay Street Oriental Bay	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	This submission opposes the inclusion of the proposed new rule 13.3.4A to provide for new building development within the defined limits to be considered by council on a "restricted discretionary basis without the requirement for public notification".

13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	General	The submission opposes the establishment of a regulatory framework for the assessment of any new development in identified areas on the Wellington Waterfront, particularly the North Kumutoto Area and supports the current provisions
				Appendix 13	The submission opposes the introduction of defined limits that include building height and 'footprints' for development in the North Kumutoto Area. Proposed height limits are excessive
				Rule 13.3.4A	The submission opposes the inclusion of a new rule 13.3.4A which will, if approved, remove the right of the public to be notified except at the discretion of Council. Public notification should be the norm.
				References to Waterfront Framework	The submission supports the removal of references to the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide.
				Design Guide General	The submission supports the introduction of a new Design Guide that incorporates, with the removal of ambiguities and the inclusion of plain language definitions, the North Kumutoto area and that such a Design Guide should reflect the need for the design of buildings and of public space to match the expectations of the public and be congruent with the surrounding structures, especially in regard to heritage buildings and structures.
				12.1 Introduction	The submission supports the proposed changes to the governance arrangements to the waterfront.
				Policy 12.2.8.8	The submission supports the proposed changes to the governance arrangements to the waterfront.
				Policy 12.2.8.6C	The submission opposes the inclusion of a new policy along with related rules that minimise the public access to the ground floors of waterfront building and their connection with open public spaces beyond.
				Rule 13.4.7	The submission opposes the amendment to Rule 13.4.7. The amendment are considered to be unnecessary when the current provisions enforce and sustain the involvement of the public when a development more than 0 meters amsl is being considered on the Waterfront.

				View shafts	The submitter welcomes any re-definition of view protection as envisaged in the recent Environment Court's comments in regard to the Marine Education Centre and also to the "Hilton" decisions. As affirmed in these two decisions providing view-shafts, "framed views" and glimpses are not adequate substitutes for open views to the inner and outer harbour and beyond. The submitter supports view protection that also takes into account wider views from Mount Victoria or south from Stellin Park - Tinakori Hill etc.
14	Valerie Scott	9 Aorangi Terrace, Thorndon	no	General	The submitter is concerned about entire change proposal
				Rule 13.6.3.1.3	The submitter is concerned about the height of buildings that will be allowed, blocking views such as those from the City to Oriental Bay
15	Pamela Cubey	109 Campbell Street, Karori, Wellington 6012	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the specific provisions because public input to the generalised planning specifications would be restricted, and Council Officers would have too much unchallengeable authority over the plans. The 3 buildings in North Kumutoto would be able to be 15% above the proposed height limits - there are already too many building on the waterfront thus restrictive views of the harbour. The process is not an open process for public participation.
15	Pamela Cubey	109 Campbell Street, Karori, Wellington 6012	no	Rule 13.6.1.23	The proposed plan is not necessarily allowing for public access to ground floor space - there is a reduction to 60% of public access.
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay Heights, Wellington 6022	no	General	The submission opposes the establishment of a revised regulatory framework for the assessment of future resource consents for new development in identified areas on the waterfront, particularly the North Kumutoto Area / North Queens Wharf. If this process is used for Waitangi Park, the public will be excluded from participation on individual building designs in a very contentious area.
				Policy 12.2.8.3	The submission opposes the deletion of references to the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide to be replaced by special Design Guide provisions for the North Kumutoto to be included in The Central Area Urban Design Guide

				Rule 13.3.4A	The submission opposes new Discretionary (Restricted) rule which means no notification and no public participation. I believe that waterfront buildings should be assessed through the resource consent process not the District Plan. The provision for involvement to move from the resource consent stage to the plan formulation stage is likely to stymie informed public comment if involvement is kept to generalised concept design stage only as final building designs are unlikely to be notified. The retention of the zero height limit is requested.
				Appendix 13	The submission opposes the introduction of defined limits that include building height and 'footprints' for development in the North Kumutoto Area which exclude public notification. The submitter opposes a higher proportion of development in North Kumutoto as an extension of the CBD to be prescribed as a Discretionary Activity (Restricted). This means that this area is essentially privatised.
				View shafts	View Shafts should be protected. It is of concern that views from Whitmore Street could be partially blocked as the Design Guide allows for buildings to encroach and frame the view shaft
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter opposes rules that allow development up to a maximum of 15% above the heights limits which can be considered as a Discretionary Activity (Restricted) on North Kumutoto. Heights of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m above the mean sea level are too high.
				Policy 12.2.8.6 & 12.2.8.6A	The submitter opposes the deletion of rules that require buildings in the Kumutoto /North Queens Wharf area to be in scale with heritage buildings.
				Rule 13.6.1.23	The submitter opposes the inclusion of a new rule that reduces public access to ground floors ground to only 60%. This should be at least 80%. The present policy requires all ground floor space to be open to the public.
17	Elaine Cleland	8/2 Hood Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	General	1. Finances must be curbed. 2. Overseas passenger Terminal must be reconsidered and safely constructed. 3. Don't hedge Waitangi Park with stifling constructions. 4. Never build on or block out Queens Wharf. 5. Consider the poor publicity and considered lack of wisdom that will cloud the Councils future.
				Rule 13.6.3.1.3	Keep to proposed height limits

18	Wellington Civic Trust	Sedeno Bennington PO Box 10183 Wellington	yes	General	The submitter seeks to clarify the status of the waterfront framework. The submitter is of the view that it is appropriate to reconsider the relevance of the zero height limit for the North Kumutoto Area but states that the policies, rules and Design Guidelines are too broad and imprecise. They provide no assurance that the public space quality and other aspects of the Waterfront Framework will be honoured. The provisions should be revised to provide more precise language. It is also submitted that revised consent procedures be established providing for the review of proposals by an independent body of qualified professionals. Until such changes are made the zero height limit should remain and all proposals subject to public notification. In the North Kumutoto applications for all sites should be considered together.
				Appendix 13	The submitter questions the proposed maximum height limit and states that an assessment should be made aimed at minimising shading and wind effects on adjacent public space and pedestrian routes. In particular the height limit for the south end of Block B should indicate a maximum height at about the same level as Shed 13.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter does not support the proposed 15% discretionary margin above the nominated maximum heights. It is requested that this provision be deleted and flexibility obtained by reducing the maximum heights by the degree of discretion sought.
				Policy 12.2.8.6C	The Trust welcomes the inclusion of this policy but requests that the Council details specific leasing practices and procedures it would implement to ensure that the policy is effective
				Design Guide General	Review the wording of the Design Guide to provide more precise language which would be more helpful to both developers and the public.



19	Waterfront Watch Inc	PO Box 19045, Courtney Place, Wellington 6149	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	<p>This plan change seems to be an initiative to avoid legal action on new buildings on the waterfront. This has the effect of shutting the public out of the development process. The approach of doing a Plan change seems to have been chosen as it is easier for developers than going through the resource consent process. If this plan change goes through, plans to construct new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. This blocks off a potential avenue for involvement by the public and means that council officers, rather than the public or elected officials, have the authority to decide what goes where on the waterfront, and what does not. This process is a template for the 4 proposed buildings around Waitangi Park which would also exclude the public on a highly contentious part of the waterfront. Each building should have to go through the resource consent process if plans to build here ever come to fruition. We are very concerned that proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule within specified standards would go with the presumption of non-notification - this is a further attempt to exclude the public. The waterfront is a "unique and special part of the city" and any buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications. We are very concerned that buildings will be assessed on this basis as this essentially narrows the scope of what can be considered in resource consent. Given the special nature of the waterfront, it is important that all factors are taken into consideration when deciding whether or not to construct a new building here</p>
				Rule 13.6.1.23	<p>Ground floor space will not be necessarily accessible to the public but we support there being district plan rules to ensure they are "predominantly accessible". We disagree with the rule however that they should only be 60% publicly accessible. This should be at least 80%.</p>

				Appendix 13	The "zero height limit" rule was introduced to ensure that all proposed new buildings triggered a resource consent. We strongly oppose the removal of this rule. It is right that developers should be prepared to go through a robust process to build on this very special piece of land. This plan change will essentially make it easier to put buildings here. The proposed height limits of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m for the three proposed buildings above mean sea level are too high and should be set a lower level.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	We are strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption that this would be non-notified. This should be set at 5%.
				General	Design Excellence is laudable goal and one that should be adopted elsewhere in the city. However, plans to build offices and apartments on public land essentially means that the land will be privatised and we strongly oppose this.
20	Mark Raymond Horgan	2/306 Oriental Parade, Wellington 6011	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the proposed rule 13.3.4A related to the activities being "Discretionary Activities (Restricted)" with a provision for the non-notification of applications
21	Pauline and Athol Swann	47 Mairangi Road, Wadestown, Wellington 6012	yes	General	The submitters are totally opposed to the new planning rules for development around Kumutoto. As the Waterfront was gifted back to the citizens of Wellington the Council should engage fully with the public on decisions relating to Waterfront development. The submitters also oppose this variation as proposals for construction of new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. They believe that all changes on the waterfront must be dealt with through an open process. In 2004 Council adopted the Wellington Waterfront Framework to guide waterfront development in a way that make the most of this unique and special part of our city of Harbour and Hills. All proposals for changes on the waterfront should therefore comply with this framework and be dealt with in an open a manner in order that Wellingtonians are able to present their views.
				Rule 13.6.1.23	Current policy requires all ground floor space to be open to the public but under the new plans the limit would be only be 60% publicly accessible. This should be at least 80%.

				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitters are strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption this would be non-notified. This discretionary level should be set at 5%
22	R. Michael and D Munro	1 Orari Street Ngaio Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter does not support the new rule 13.3.4A. The status quo should be maintained i.e. the present possibility of public involvement in the development of any building planned for the waterfront. The submitter wants to be able to see what is planned for each site and judge in detail whether the design is appropriate.
23	Jean Chapman	18 Silverstream	no	Rule 13.3.8.14A	Plans to allow Wellington Waterfront to approve buildings 15% above the proposed height limits as this is a very special part of Wellington and developers should have to go through a process to build in this area. The Zero height rule is in place to ensure all proposed new buildings exceeding that limit require a resource consent and this should not be removed.
24	Margaret Tobin	1/111 Coutts Street, Kilbernie, Wellington	no	General	The submitter is totally opposed to the new planning rules for development around Kumutoto. As the Waterfront was gifted back to the citizens of Wellington the council is committed to engage fully with the public on decisions relating to Waterfront development. The submitted opposes this Variation as proposals for construction of new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. It is believed that all changes on the waterfront must be dealt with through an open process.
				Rule 13.6.1.23	Current policy requires all ground floor space to be open to the public but under the new plans the limit would be only be 60% publicly accessible. This should be at least 80%.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitters is strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption this would be non-notified. This discretionary level should be set at 5%

25	David Lee, Chairman Action for Environment Inc	PO Box 10030 Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Variation 11 would allow three buildings, planned for the Kumutoto area of the waterfront (North of the Meridian Building), to be built without notifications or public input. This is considered wrong in principal, and a backward step. If Variation 11 is adopted it would be a reversal of council policy on public involvement in Waterfront planning. By excluding the public and leaving planning decisions on such a special land as the Wellington Waterfront to a few officials, the Wellington City Council is risking the quality if its decision-making.
				General	We are concerned that Variation 11 has been drawn up to avoid legal challenges to the proposed developments on the waterfront.
				Appendix 13	Action for Environment has serious concerns about the form and placement of the proposed buildings on the Kumutoto area of the waterfront. They will each be allowed to go 15m above building height limits (presently 29.5m, 25.3m and 17.5m above mean sea level). These buildings will effect the view shaft of the harbour from Whitmore Street. The historic Eastbourne Ferry Building will be surrounded and overtopped by one of these buildings. Covering such special open space as the waterfront with more commercial buildings seems very short-sighted considering the increased demand for adjacent open space central Wellington's rapidly growing apartment dwelling population will need.
				General	The proposed buildings on Kumutoto sites 8,9, and 10 raise wider issues, which require full public debate and input. These include: 1. Should publicly owned land on the waterfront be effectively privatised? 2. Should the Council be covering more open space on the waterfront with buildings when there is no special need for them and which would close down options for further generations of Wellingtonians? 3. Is it an appropriate role for a council to act as a developer, providing more office and retail space in competition with existing Wellington building owners / rate payers?

26	Majorie Florence Macquarrie	4 Te Hono Street, Maungatapu, Tauranga 3112	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the restriction of public input. Public input should be allowed (and encouraged) both in the initial stages of planning and throughout the process of designing individual buildings so proper consideration is given to this unique area. It is public land and the plans should look to keeping the interests of the population in general for now and into the future as a priority. Developers should be kept to strict conditions that do not breach the original protective framework. Each building plan should be able to be examined by the public as a separate identity. The process of planning should be open and available for scrutiny by the public.
				Rule 13.6.1.23	All ground floor space should be open to the public. If only 60% is allowed for, it violates the essential requirement of public access.
				View shafts	Nothing should be done to endanger views of the waterfront. The Kumutoto development will have a negative impact on the Whitmore street view shaft. Any diminishment of view shafts means that people would be looking at a collection of buildings - not - the city's waterfront
				General	The submitter seeks the withdrawal of Variation 11, and its replacement by a document which gives continuing opportunity for public input at all stages of the planning process. There should be no "loophole" which would prevent appeals to the Environment Court should this become necessary.
27	Frances Lee	24 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035	yes	12.1 Introduction Special Areas	The amendment deletes reference to the Waterfront Framework "governance arrangements including monitoring by a group of both professional and community representatives." Reason: the waterfront is a unique public space and the continuation of such monitoring is essential, with the reference reinstated ...

				Rule 13.3.4A	Non-notification of resource consents for new building developments "within the defined limits" is envisaged under the new rule 13.3.4A. Reason: Every new building in this area should be publicly notified and affected persons informed of any application. The public must have this opportunity which would be denied by the new rule, as well as denying the opportunity to appeal to the Environment Court. Presumably WCC intends to apply the details of this rule to all seven developments on the Waterfront, i.e. Kumutoto (3) and Waitangi Park (4). There is also the question of what might apply to future developments on Queens Wharf. The proposal is of great concern and the new rule should be eliminated.
				Appendix 13	The heights and footprints proposed for the Kumutoto area are far too large, i.e. heights of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m with the footprints involving most of the available sights 8, 9 and 10 on this public land. Reason: The proposal presupposes the removal of the 'zero height limit' which naturally would trigger the need for a resource consent which in turn allowed for a robust process for any new buildings throughout the whole waterfront. The three Kumutoto buildings would obscure views from the city to the harbour and totally change the ambience of what should be a peaceful and enjoyable experience for the public at this city/sea edge. The Variation needs altering to allow full and detailed public comment on each building.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The new rule 13.3.8.14A is proposed to allow maximum heights to be exceeded by up to 15%. Reason: This rule would allow excessive heights along the valuable waterfront and should be expunged from the Variation.
				Rule 13.3.1.23	It is proposed that only 60% of ground floors will be accessible to the public whereas current policy provides for all such space to be public. The Variance should be altered to allow and increase to at least 80%.
				Design Guide General	There is reference to a new design guide for the waterfront. Currently the Waterfront Framework provides this. The submitter supports this continuing until the public has a change to examine new rules. Are such rules to apply only to the Kumutoto area?
28	Shirley Marion Hampton	24 Hudson Street, Island Bay, Wellington	no	View shafts	Views of the waterfront will be affected by the new buildings of North Kumutoto: They will have a negative impact on the Whitmore street

					view shaft.
				Rule 13.3.4A	Rule 13.3.4A could limit public participation and this is opposed. Any development proposals on the waterfront or affecting the waterfront are of public interest and therefore the public should be notified of them and have the right to comment on them, before they go ahead. The waterfront is public land.
				Rule 13.3.1.23	Ground floors of waterfront buildings should all be accessible to the public; the submitter opposes the inclusion of new policy and related rules.
29	Ann Louise Mitcalfe	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	This plan change seems to be an initiative to avoid legal action on new buildings on the waterfront. This has the effect of shutting the public out of the development process. The approach of doing a Plan change seems to have been chosen as it is easier for developers than going through the resource consent process. If this plan change goes through, plans to construct new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. This blocks off a potential avenue for involvement by the public and means that council officers, rather than the public or elected officials, have the authority to decide what goes where on the waterfront, and what does not. This process is a template for the 4 proposed buildings around Waitangi Park which would also exclude the public on a highly contentious part of the waterfront. Each building should have to go through the resource consent process if plans to build here ever come to fruition. I am very concerned that proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule within specified standards would go with the presumption of non-notification - this is a further attempt to exclude the public. The waterfront is a "unique and special part of the city" and any buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications. The submitter is concerned that buildings will be assessed on this basis as this essentially narrows the scope of what can be considered in resource consent. Given the special nature of the waterfront, it is important that all factors are taken into consideration when deciding whether or not to construct a new building here

				Rule 13.6.1.23	Ground floor space will not be necessarily accessible to the public but the submitter supports there being district plan rules to ensure they are "predominantly accessible". The submitter disagrees with the rule however that they should only be 60% publicly accessible. The rule should be at least 80%.
				Appendix 13	The "zero height limit" rule was introduced to ensure that all proposed new buildings triggered resource consent. The submitter strongly opposes the removal of this rule. This plan change will essentially make it easier to put buildings here. The proposed height limits of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m for the three proposed buildings above mean sea level are too high and should be set a lower level.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter is strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption that this would be non-notified. This should be set at 5%.
				General	Design Excellence is laudable goal and one that should be adopted elsewhere in the city. However, plans to build offices and apartments on public land essentially mean that the land will be privatised and is strongly opposed.
30	Wellington Waterfront Limited	PO Box 395, Wellington	yes	Policy 12.2.8.6B	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports inclusion of Policy 12.2.8.6B requiring design excellence for significant new buildings.
				Rule 13.3.4A	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports inclusion of Rule 13.3.4A providing for new development in North Kumutoto as a non-notified Discretionary Activity (Restricted) application in accordance with the proposed maximum building height requirements of 29.5 meters for 'Block A' (site 10), 25.3 meters for 'Block B' (site 9) and 17.2 meters for Block C' (site 8).
				Rule 13.3.4A References to Standards in 13.6.3	Notwithstanding support for Rule 13.3.4A, Wellington Waterfront Limited requests that it be made clear that the 'building mass' standard (Rule 13.6.3.2) does not apply to development on the waterfront, In Wellington Waterfront Limited's opinion the reference in the marginal note to Rule 13.3.4A indicates that the building mass standard could apply when Rule 13.3.8 applies. however, Wellington Waterfront Limited understands that this was not the intention.



				Rule 13.3.8.14A	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports inclusion of Rule 13.3.8.14A providing for a discretionary 15% margin over maximum allowable building heights limits.
				Rule 13.4.7	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports the proposed amendment of Rule 13.4.7 requiring any proposed development within an "identified area", including the North Kumutoto Area, that does not comply with the Discretionary Activity (Restricted) provisions, will require consent as a Discretionary Activity (Unrestricted)
				Appendix 13	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports inclusions of the North Kumutoto Area as an "identified area" under Appendix 13, but request that: the extent of the building footprints be appropriately dimensioned (e.g. in metres from key reference points); and the building footprints shown north of Shed 13 and adjacent to Customhouse Quay ('site 9') be amended to reflect the footprint of the historic building previously occupying this site.
31	Taranaki Wharf Holdings Limited	Morrison Kent, Lawyers 105 The Terrace (PO Box 10-035) Wellington. Attn: I M Gordon	yes	Appendix 13	Taranaki Wharf Holdings Limited is opposed to the exclusion of the NZX Centre from Appendix 13 and some components of the provisions in Variation 11 related to this issue. Taranaki Wharf Holdings Limited is the registered proprietor of the two ground floor units and four office units on floors 1-4 inclusive known as the NZX Centre (the Site).
				Rule 13.6.1.23	Taranaki Wharf Holdings Limited is opposed to constraints on non-public activities on ground floor premises, and requirements for active edges. Additional constraints on ground floor activity will unreasonably restrict the potential for the Site to contribute to economic activity, and the vitality of the waterfront, and be contrary to the Wellington Waterfront Framework and Part 2 of the Act. A blanket constraint on ground floor activity in Waterfront Buildings has potential to provide an over-supply of public space resulting in unsustainable structures and spaces that diminish the social, economic and cultural vitality of the Waterfront and its specific identified areas. The submitter seeks the following decision from Council: 1. that the Site be exempted from proposed standard 13.6.1.23 or, alternatively, that standard be deleted from variation 11; 2. That the Site be exempted from the third bullet point in policy 12.2.8.6A and policy 12.2.86C , or

					alternatively, that these policies be deleted from variation11;
32	Queens Wharf Holdings Limited	Morrison Kent, Lawyers 105 The Terrace (PO Box 10-035) Wellington. Attn: I M Gordon	yes	Appendix 13	The submitter is opposed to the exclusion of the Queens Wharf Special Height Area from Appendix 13 and the consideration of height limits for the area within Appendix 13. Queens Wharf Holdings includes the registered proprietors of leasehold land in the Queens Wharf Special Heights Area. It is requested that in Appendix 13, identified height limits of either 25.5 meters or 30 meters be included which would put the Sites on an equivalent footing to two of the three identified sites at North Kumutoto, enabling sustainable building envelopes to generate economic activity and contribute to the vitality of the Waterfront.

				Rule 13.6.1.23	The submitter opposes the constraints on non-public activities on ground floor premises, and requirement for active edges. Additional constraints on ground floor activity will unreasonably restrict the potential for the Sites to contribute to social and economic activity, and the vitality of the Waterfront, and be contrary to the Wellington Waterfront Framework and Part 2 of the Act. A blanket constraint on ground floor activity in Waterfront buildings has potential to provide an over-supply of public space resulting in unsustainable structures and spaces that diminish the social, economic and cultural vitality of the Waterfront and its specific identified areas. The submitter requests the following: That the Sites be exempt from proposed standard 13.6.1.23 or this standard be deleted from Variation 11; The the Sites be exempt from general matter 3 in policy 12.2.8.6A and policy 12.2.8.6C, or alternatively, that these policies be deleted from Variation 11 and other consequential amendments
33	Brian John Burrell	38 Marewa Road, Hataitai, Wellington 6021	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the specific provisions of proposed Districts Plan Variation 11 that would restrict or prevent public participation and or input into final designs and placement of new buildings.
				Rule 13.6.1.23	Variation 11 has the potential to allow or permit reduced public access to 'ground floor' areas of any new buildings.
				General	That the district plan change variation 11 be withdrawn
34	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Anne Neill, General Manager, Central Region, New Zealand Historic Places Trust PO Box 2629 Wellington	yes	Objective 12.2.8.6A	The NZHPT supports the proposed objective, but is concerned that under the Methods proposed for giving effect to this objective it applies, only to heritage buildings and not to other heritage items. The Harbour Board iron gates and rails are registered under the Historic Places Act 1993 as Category II historic places and should be considered. It is specifically requested that the words "or structure" be included to the final bullet-point under the heading 'Additions and Alterations'.
				Rule 13.3.4	The NZHPT objects to the insertion of the following text "except buildings and structures within identified areas un Rule 13.3.4A," as the provision for new buildings and structures in the North Kumutoto Area is not supported.

				Rule 13.3.4A	The NZHPT does not support the inclusion of buildings and structures in the North Kumutoto area as Restricted Discretionary Activities, and considers full Discretion should be retained over development in this area to protect historic heritage, view shafts and public open space. If the rule is accepted then it is requested that historic heritage and view shafts be included as matter of discretion.
				Heritage	The historic heritage adjacent to the North Kumutoto area forms part of the character of the area, and the proposed location and height of the buildings provided for under Rule 13.3.4A, have the potential to adversely affect the heritage values of these items. Although the explanation under Objective 12.2.8.6B states that "particular consideration will be given to the relationship of new buildings with adjacent listed heritage buildings", the Rule as proposed does not require this, as heritage is not included as a matter of discretion which Council can consider if the new buildings in this area are processed as Restricted Discretionary Activities.
				View shafts	It is possible that new buildings contained within the proposed footprints on the North Kumutoto site could alter or obscure important view shafts down Whitmore Street. If buildings exceed the footprints identified in proposed Appendix 13, they would almost certainly adversely affect the view shaft. The Rule as proposed provides no requirement for consideration of view shafts by decision makers.
				Rule 13.3.4A.3	The design of public space is retained as a matter of council discretion under proposed Rule 13.3.4A.3 for the North Kumutoto area. Appendix 13, however, identifies limited area available as public open space.
				Appendix 13	The NZHPT opposes proposed Appendix 13, with regards to the building footprint and height of proposed building sites (block A and C) near the Eastbourne Ferry Terminal. It is requested that Appendix 13 be amended to provide more open space, greater consideration of the surroundings of historic heritage, particularly Sheds 11, 13 and 21, and the Eastbourne Ferry Terminal, and greater distance between Block A and Shed 21.

35	Ronald William England	PO Box 27-368, Marion Square, Wellington 6141	yes	General	The submitter requests that the Wellington Waterfront be made a different area from the C.B.D, by defining it as a Special Ecological Zone, giving it unique planning parameters.
36	Craig Thomas Palmer	29 Moir Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter is opposed to this planning scheme for the Kumutoto sites on the waterfront on the grounds that it would substantially exclude the citizens of Wellington from any assessment of the merits for each proposed development. That the planning scheme for Kumutoto should allow public notification of each proposed development
				Rule 13.6.1.23	The requirement to have all ground floor space as being open to the public should be required in all cases.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	There should be no in-house discretion to increase height limits.
37	Georgina Preston & Bill Viggers	23 Ngaio Rd, Kelburn, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitters are particularly concerned with the proposed rule 13.3.4A which would mean that new buildings can be approved by council without public notification. All Wellingtons and in particular affected parties have a right to know of any proposed development so they can comment, modify or oppose it. This is part of the democratic process.
				Design Guide General	The Waterfront Framework should be kept as a Design Guide.
38	Howard Ellis, Fran Parkin and B & V Duthie	Apartment 3.18/28 Waterloo Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitters oppose the outcomes of Variation 11 that if adopted in the Kumutoto North area would mean that building consent applications would enjoy a non notified status.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitters oppose the height restrictions for buildings in this area would be relaxed to allow for up to 15% over and above the height limits presently set out in the existing plan.
				12.1 Introduction	The submitters oppose the deletion in 12.1 of the sentence "This commitment is further described in the Framework, which also proposed governance arrangements requiring ongoing monitoring by a group of both professional and community representatives."
				Policy 12.2.8.6	The submitters oppose the deletion in 12.2.8.6 of " In the Kumutoto /North Queens Wharf area buildings will be in scale with heritage buildings."

				Policy 12.2.8.6B	Amend the proposed sentence in 12.2.8.6B as follows: "Careful assessment will also be given to development proposals that <del>might approach or equal</del> exceed the specified building height and footprint requirements as it is the Council's view that the issue of design quality is even more important in such cases."
				Policy 12.2.8.8	The submitters oppose the deletion in 12.2.8.8 of "Governance arrangement for the waterfront include a broadly based group of both professional and community representatives. This group will have primary responsibility for the on going planning and development of the waterfront, as well as responsibility for monitoring all proposed developments. The group will actively engage the public in waterfront decision-making.."
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place, Kensington, Wellington	yes	Policy 12.2.8.6	The submitter opposes the insertion of "building". Developments, other than building, should not be excluded from this policy
				Policy 12.2.8.6A	The submitter requests that "related" be deleted. This policy should apply to stand alone public spaces as well as those related to new buildings.
				Policy 12.2.8.6A	With the proposed layout it appears policy 12.2.8.6 no longer has METHODS. The submitter suggests either 12.2.8.6A wording be appended to 12.2.8.6 to make it a single policy or that the METHODS under 12.2.8.6A explicitly state that they apply to both policies. Unless the design guide is at least as stringent the submitter opposes the deletion of "In the Kumutoto /North Queens Wharf area buildings will be in scale with heritage buildings". It is unclear why the annotated version in the appendix numbers the list of matters being deleted '17. the principles and objectives of the Wellington Waterfront Framework." onwards. Using numbers rather than simple bullet dots for such lists is significantly better as it allows easy, unambiguous reference to made to any list item. However, as the remainder of the section uses bullet dots, it is not appropriate to sort that out under this variation.

				Policy 12.2.8.6B	The submitter opposes the words "In the North Kumutoto area building 'sites' have been identified and the associated Plan provisions provide for an appropriate level of development as a Discretionary Activity (Restricted)." Any building development (new or significant alteration) here should be publically notified and go through resource consent processing as discretionary (unrestricted), unless it is classified to be non-complying or prohibited. The submitter also opposes the following: "Careful assessment will also be given to development proposals that might exceed the specified building height and footprint requirements..."Council should simply enforce footprint and, with the exception of any nominally zero limit, height requirements.
				Policy 12.2.8.6C	METHODS Although I support the underlying idea, the requirements "To ensure that the ground floor of buildings be predominantly accessible to the public" is unclear and probably to weak. Firstly to avoid doubt I ask "predominantly" be replaced by "for a minimum of 12 hours per day" (as 12.2.5.2). Secondly "accessible to the public" needs to be clearer or properly defined. It is requested that without charge or any other restriction" be appended to the expression. If that is not the intent then allowing any commercial use of the ground floors is opposed.
				Policy 12.2.8.8	The submitter requests that "or" be replaced by "and" and "outside those areas" be deleted. The critical point is the proposal to delete the requirement "Thus, the public will be consulted the development of plans for the waterfront (Stage 2 of the waterfront planning process) and enabled to participate through the statutory planning process about any proposed new buildings and any significant changes to existing building." That guaranteed public consultation for any proposal for new or significantly changed buildings as well as at this point (varying the District Plan is essentially stage 2 of the water front planning process).
				Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the provision for non notification. If there is no more effective mechanism to ensure any building or alteration is publicly notified, then the height limit should be kept at zero.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	Unless the height limit is zero (see above) the submitter requests that the provision allow a 15% (higher) margin be deleted.

				Rule 13.3.8.6	The submitter supports this rule, provided there is not provision for an exception to "13.6.3.3.1 No building or structure shall intrude on any view shaft as show in Appendix 11"
				Rule 13.4.7	The submitter request that this be replaced with "The construction of a new, the alteration of existing, and addition to existing, buildings and structures in the Lambton Harbour Area are Discretionary Activities (Unrestricted).
				Rule 13.6.1.23	The submitter requests that "60%" be replaced by "90%" and "for a minimum of 12 hours per day" be appended.
				Design Guide General	The submitter supports the wording within Appendix 4 "There are an infinite range of design solutions as to how a building could sit in Block A, B or C". Provision (Nk) G2.1 contradicts the introduction of Appendix 4. that only one of block A, B, C can be built and is therefore opposed. Provision (Nk) G2.3 is opposed in that it implies that buildings may exceed the specified height limits. Exceeding specified height limits should simply not be allowed, unless a nominal limit of zero is being used. Provision (Nk) G3.6 is supported – maintains the 'floor' of the public spaces as a single uninterrupted flat surface. This simple horizontal plane is part of the wharf's character. Provision (Nk) G3.7 The submitter is unaware of any council policy on light pollution, but there should be one and any lighting requirements like this should refer to it. Provision (Nk) G4.3 for car parking should be discouraged, particularly for commuters. Provision (Nk) O5.0 is strongly supported "To enhance the pedestrian links and experience in the area." Provision (Nk) G6.1 is opposed.
40	Ken New	31 Sugarloaf Road, Brooklyn, Wellington 6021	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule would include a presumption of non-notification. The waterfront is special and any plans for buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications. The zero height limit should be retained and proposals dealt with as a discretionary activity (unrestricted).
				View shafts	Views of the harbour will be affected by new buildings. Although the proposed North Kumutoto buildings would not intrude directly onto the extension of the Whitmore Street alignment (the official "view shaft"), the development would have a negative impact on harbour views from



					lower Whitmore Street by dramatically reducing their breadth.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter is strongly opposed to buildings being allowed to breach current height limits by 15%. The submitter believes that the existing height limits for the three proposed North Kumutoto buildings are already too high.
				Rule 13.6.1.23	A current long-standing city policy requires all ground floor space to be open to the public. Variation 11 proposed to reduce the requirement for general public access to ground floor areas to only 60% public access. On the face of it, this may seem reasonable since there is limited demand for retail facilities on the waterfront. But this is the wrong logic – it is the submitters view that it is not that there is not enough demand for shops in the bases of the buildings, it is that there are too many buildings. Reduce the number of buildings and the ones that remain will support a moderate retail trade for small businesses (and for cafés and bars in particular).
41	Pat Linney and Linda Linney	37 Treasure Grove, Hataitai, Wellington 6021	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitters oppose non-notification of resource consent for new building developments within the defined limits. Every new building in this area should be publicly notified. This should also apply to possible development in Waitangi Park.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitters oppose any new rule that allows maximum heights to be exceeded by 15%. Our understanding is that a maximum height is set for a good reason. The Kumutoto buildings would obscure views from the city to the harbour.
42	David Stephen Capper	147 The Ridgeway, Mornington, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the new provisions in which public input is restricted, height controls are relaxed and ground floor access restricted.
				Rule 13.6.1.23	The submitter opposes the new provisions in which public input is restricted, height controls are relaxed and ground floor access restricted.

43	Ann Paisley Ryan	67 Para Street, Miramar, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the introduction of a new rule to provided for new building development to be considered by the council on a restricted discretionary basis without the requirement for public notification.
				Appendix 13	The submitter opposes the introduction of defined limits for development in the Kumutoto area which seems to refer to new buildings. Limits in these have in some cases been ignored by developers and subsequently by the council
				References to Waterfront Framework	The submitter opposes the removal of references to the waterfront framework as a design guide. This guide gives greater emphasis to the importance of the public right to enjoy the waterfront area as a waterfront. Changes to the district plan, variation 11, will result in restricting or preventing any submissions, comments or input from the public.
44	Wendy Poste	47 Wye Street, Island Bay, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Restricted discretionary basis without the requirement for public notification is a very disturbing proposal - no community consultations is not a good idea from an employers point of view - we the rate payers
45	The Architectural Centre Inc	PO Box 24178, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The Architectural Centre does not support the proposal for waterfront buildings to be non-notified Discretionary Activities (Restricted). It is considered that removing the obligation for publicly notified consent will undermine the ability of the interested parties to be involved in the planning of the waterfront, as without publicly notified consents there will be no legal obligation for council to ensure public involvement. We consider that the role of public input into the waterfront has been a productive one. As such, the Architectural Centre considers that the zero-height limit has been a useful mechanism for triggering Notified Resource Consents.

				Design Guide	The public voice cannot in and of itself determine design excellence. Neither though can a Design Guide, nor a District Plan. These are mechanisms for setting the bar of meritocracy. Design Guides provide a utopian and woolly wish list which has little, if any, legal clout. Although we support a new Design Guide for the North Kumutoto area, and realise the limitations on the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide, such guides are crude instruments to assist designers lacking the skill to produce even average standards of design. Exceptional design requires independent expertise. We therefore strongly advocate for a strengthened and more public role for TAG - a kind of TAG on steroids - and we recommend that members of TAG be appointed by professional bodies, rather than by council, and that reports from TAG about specific developments be included as part of the documentation made available in the public Resource Consent process.
				References to Waterfront Framework	The Architectural Centre believes that proposing a Design Guide and removing references to the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide will largely accomplish legal sustainability post-Hilton. We do not believe that a reduced legal obligation for public notification is a necessary requirement for legal sustainability.
				Rule 13.6.1.23	The Architectural Centre support the new policy and rules ensuring that the ground floors of buildings are predominantly accessible by the public and have active edges.
				Vehicle parking	The waterfront has existing parking which is more than sufficient. Given the council's policies to reduce private automotive traffic in the central city and to encourage more sustainable modes of transportation, parking reduction on the waterfront and elsewhere should be given serious and meaningful action, rather than lip-service. Parking spaces on the waterfront must be progressively reduced.
				Section 32 Report	The Architectural Centre considers the Section 32 documentation to be more than insufficient. We do not feel that this is not a genuine or helpful exploration of options and demonstrates cynical administration expediency. It clearly demonstrates that a wider range of ideas, thinking and opinions is needed.

				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The Architectural Centre understands the rationale for this to ensure height variation along a streetscape, to prevent visual monotony - though consider 15% far to high - an excess of what is really needed. We also know that such good intentions have become an expectation to build to the "maximum plus" among the developer community.
				Appendix 13	Appropriate building height and bulk has a direct relationship to design excellence. While clearly any building will obscure views and likely increase shade to areas, additionally increasing the height of buildings in this northern section of waterfront is likely to significantly diminish sunlight to public areas along the waterfront. The Architectural Centre strongly encourage the council to commission and publish a full day lighting study, and to realise that the protection of sunlight from 12-2pm (as is common) is sufficient for the waterfront which has usage at multiple times during the day, especially (but to only) for weekend recreation.
46	Southern Environmental Association c/o	Robert Logan 15 High Street Island Bay Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Southern Environmental Association opposes those aspects of the plan change that could result in buildings being erected on the waterfront without specific resource consent or without public notification.
				Appendix 13	Southern Environmental Association opposes changes to the existing provisions relating to building height and the proposed new planning rules for development around the Kumutoto area
47	Jennie Henton	17 Milne Terrace, Island Bay, Wellington 6023	no	Rule 13.3.4A	This plan change seems to be an initiative to avoid legal action on new buildings on the waterfront. This has the effect of shutting the public out of the development process. The approach of doing a Plan change seems to have been chosen as it is easier for developers than going through the resource consent process. We are very concerned that proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule within specified standards would go with the presumption of non-notification - this is a further attempt to exclude the public. The waterfront is a "unique and special part of the city" and any buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications.

				Rule 13.6.1.23	Ground floor space will not be necessarily accessible to the public but the submitter supports there being district plan rules to ensure they are "predominantly accessible" however, with the rule that they should only be 60% publicly accessible is not supported. This should be at least 80%.
				Appendix 13	The "zero height limit" rule was introduced to ensure that all proposed new buildings triggered resource consent. The removal of this rule is strongly opposed. It is right that developers should be prepared to go through a robust process to build on this very special piece of land. This plan change will essentially make it easier to put buildings here. The proposed height limits of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m for the three proposed buildings above mean sea level are too high and should be set a lower level.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	We are strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption that this would be non-notified. This should be set at 5%.
				Policy 12.2.8.6B	Design Excellence is laudable goal and one that should be adopted elsewhere in the city. However, plans to build offices and apartments on public land essentially means that the land will be privatised, this is strongly opposed.
48	Estelle Cook	6 Kenmore Street, Newlands, 6037	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the inclusion of new rule 13.3.4A allowing new building development to be considered by the council on a "unrestricted discretionary" basis without a requirement for public notification. The waterfront is one of Wellington's more spectacular assets and is enjoyed by people of all ages and walks of life. Therefore the public should always have the opportunity to be involved in the development process. The retention of the zero height limit approach is requested.
				Design Guide	The submitter supports a design guide that would recognise the need for outstanding design of new buildings. Boring and/or hideous buildings on the waterfront must be avoided. Public involvement could also help.

				Rule 13.6.1.23	Ground floors of waterfront buildings should be 75% publicly accessible. Waterfront buildings should be of high benefit to the general public. e.g. museums, galleries, theatres, events venues. dinning. Apartments and offices do not provide this benefit so should not be allowed.
49	Alex Mitcalfe Wilson	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	This plan change seems to be an initiative to avoid legal action on new buildings on the waterfront. This has the effect of shutting the public out of the development process. The approach of doing a Plan change seems to have been chosen as it is easier for developers than going through the resource consent process. If this plan change goes through, plans to construct new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. This blocks off a potential avenue for involvement by the public and means that council officers, rather than the public or elected officials, have the authority to decide what goes where on the waterfront, and what does not. This process is a template for the 4 proposed buildings around Waitangi Park which would also exclude the public on a highly contentious part of the waterfront. Each building should have to go through the resource consent process if plans to build here ever come to fruition. The submitter is very concerned that proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule within specified standards would go with the presumption of non-notification - this is a further attempt to exclude the public. The waterfront is a "unique and special part of the city" and any buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications. The submitter is also concerned that buildings will be assessed on this basis as this essentially narrows the scope of what can be considered in a resource consent. Given the special nature of the waterfront, it is important that all factors are taken into consideration when deciding whether or not to construct a new building here
				Rule 13.6.1.23	Ground floor space will not be necessarily accessible to the public but the submitter supports there being district plan rules to ensure they are "predominantly accessible" however, the rule that they should only be 60% publicly accessible is opposed. This should be at least 80%.

				Appendix 13	The "zero height limit" rule was introduced to ensure that all proposed new buildings triggered resource consent. The submitter strongly opposes the removal of this rule. It is right that developers should be prepared to go through a robust process to build on this very special piece of land. This plan change will essentially make it easier to put buildings here. The proposed height limits of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m for the three proposed buildings above mean sea level are too high and should be set a lower level.
				Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter is am strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption that this would be non-notified. This should be set at 5%.
				General	Design Excellence is laudable goal and one that should be adopted elsewhere in the city. However, plans to build offices and apartments on public land essentially means that the land will be privatised and strongly oppose this.

### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – General

Sub-mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Relief Sought
7	Tanya Asken	302 The Esplanade Island Bay Wellington 6023	no	Development in General	The submitter does not support the plan for any more buildings of any kind in this area and is particularly opposed to any changes to Frank Kitts Park.
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street Mount Victoria Wellington 6011	no	General	The submission opposes the establishment of a regulatory framework for the assessment of any new development in identified areas on the Wellington Waterfront, particularly the North Kumutoto Area and supports the current provisions
14	Valerie Scott	9 Aorangi Terrace Thorndon	no	General	The submitter is concerned about entire change proposal
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road Karaka Bay Heights Wellington 6022	no	General	The submission opposes the establishment of a revised regulatory framework for the assessment of future resource consents for new development in identified areas on the waterfront, particularly the North Kumutoto Area / North Queens Wharf. If this process is used for Waitangi Park, the public will be excluded from participation on individual building designs in a very contentious area.
17	Elaine Cleland	8/2 Hood Street Mount Victoria Wellington 6011	no	General	1. Finances must be curbed. 2. Overseas passenger Terminal must be reconsidered and safely constructed. 3. Don't hedge Waitangi Park with stifling constructions. 4. Never build on or block out Queens Wharf. 5. Consider the poor publicity and considered lack of wisdom that will cloud the Councils future.



18	Wellinhyon Civic Trust	Seddon Bennington PO Box 10183 Wellington	yes	General	The submitter seeks to clarify the status of the waterfront framework. The submitter is of the view that it is appropriate to reconsider the relevance of the zero height limit for the North Kumutoto Area but states that the policies, rules and Design Guidelines are too broad and imprecise. They provide no assurance that the public space quality and other aspects of the Waterfront Framework will be honoured. The provisions should be revised to provide more precise language. It is also submitted that revised consent procedures be established providing for the review of proposals by an independent body of qualified professionals. Until such changes are made the zero height limit should remain and all proposals subject to public notification. In the North Kumutoto applications for all sites should be considered together.
19	Waterfront Watch Inc	PO Box 19045 Courtney Place Wellington 6149	yes	General	Design Excellence is laudable goal and one that should be adopted elsewhere in the city. However, plans to build offices and apartments on public land essentially means that the land will be privatised and we strongly oppose this.
21	Pauline and Athol Swann	47 Mairangi Road Wadestown Wellington 6012	yes	General	The submitters are totally opposed to the new planning rules for development around Kumutoto. As the Waterfront was gifted back to the citizens of Wellington the Council should engage fully with the public on decisions relating to Waterfront development. The submitters also oppose this variation as proposals for construction of new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. They believe that all changes on the waterfront must be dealt with through an open process. In 2004 Council adopted the Wellington Waterfront Framework to guide waterfront development in a way that make the most of this unique and special part of our city of Harbour and Hills. All proposals for changes on the waterfront should therefore comply with this framework and be dealt with in an open a manner in order that Wellingtonians are able to present their views.

24	Margaret Tobin	1/111 Coutts Street Kilbernie Wellington	no	General	The submitter is totally opposed to the new planning rules for development around Kumutoto. As the Waterfront was gifted back to the citizens of Wellington the council is committed to engage fully with the public on decisions relating to Waterfront development. The submitted opposes this Variation as proposals for construction of new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. It is believed that all changes on the waterfront must be dealt with through an open process.
25	David Lee, Chairman Action for Environment Inc	PO Box 10030 Wellington	yes	General	We are concerned that Variation 11 has been drawn up to avoid legal challenges to the proposed developments on the waterfront.  The proposed buildings on Kumutoto sites 8,9, and 10 raise wider issues, which require full public debate and input. These include: 1. Should publicly owned land on the waterfront be effectively privatised? 2. Should the Council be covering more open space on the waterfront with buildings when there is no special need for them and which would close down options for further generations of Wellingtonians? 3. Is it an appropriate role for a council to act as a developer, providing more office and retail space in competition with existing Wellington building owners / rate payers?
26	Majorie Florence Macquarrie	4 Te Hono Street Maungatapu Tauranga 3112	no	General	The submitter seeks the withdrawal of Variation 11, and its replacement by a document which gives continuing opportunity for public input at all stages of the planning process. There should be no "loophole" which would prevent appeals to the Environment Court should this become necessary.
29	Ann Louise Mitalcfe	4 Hadfield Terrace Kelburn Wellington 6012	yes	General	Design Excellence is laudable goal and one that should be adopted elsewhere in the city. However, plans to build offices and apartments on public land essentially mean that the land will be privatised and is strongly opposed.
33	Brian John Burrell	38 Marewa Road Hataitai Wellington 6021	no	General	That the district plan change variation 11 be withdrawn
35	Ronald William England	PO Box 27-368 Marion Square Wellington 6141	yes	General	The submitter requests that the Wellington Waterfront be made a different area from the C.B.D, by defining it as a Special Ecological Zone, giving it unique planning parameters.

49	Alex Mitcalfe Wilson	4 Hadfield Terrace Kelburn Wellington 6012	yes	General	Design Excellence is laudable goal and one that should be adopted elsewhere in the city. However, plans to build offices and apartments on public land essentially mean that the land will be privatised and this is opposed.
----	-------------------------	--	-----	---------	---

#### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – 12.1 Introduction

Sub- mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
11	Mary Munro	1 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington	no	12.1 Introduction Special Areas	The submission opposes the deletion of the last sentence in the second paragraph which reads: "This commitment is further described in the Framework, which also proposes governance arrangements requiring ongoing monitoring by a group of both professional and community representatives". It is requested that professional and community representatives continue to monitor governance arrangements in respect of our waterfront.
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	12.1 Introduction	The submission supports the proposed changes to the governance arrangements to the waterfront.
27	Frances Lee	24 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035	yes	12.1 Introduction Special Areas	The amendment deletes reference to the Waterfront Framework "governance arrangements including monitoring by a group of both professional and community representatives." Reason: the waterfront is a unique public space and the continuation of such monitoring is essential, with the reference reinstated ...
38	Howard Ellis, Fran Parkin and B & V Duthie	Apartment 3.18/28 Waterloo Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011	no	12.1 Introduction	The submitters oppose the deletion in 12.1 of the sentence "This commitment is further described in the Framework, which also proposed governance arrangements requiring ongoing monitoring by a group of both professional and community representatives."

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Objective 12.2.8.6A**

<b>Sub- mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
34	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Anne Neill, General Manager, Central Region, New Zealand Historic Places Trust PO Box 2629, Wellington	yes	Objective 12.2.8.6A	The NZHPT supports the proposed objective, but is concerned that under the Methods proposed for giving effect to this objective it applies only to heritage buildings and not to other heritage items. The Harbour Board iron gates and rails are registered under the Historic Places Act 1993 as Category II historic places and should be considered. It is specifically requested that the words "or structure" be included to the final bullet-point under the heading 'Additions and Alterations'.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.3**

<b>Sub- mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay Heights, Wellington 6022	no	Policy 12.2.8.3	The submission opposes the deletion of references to the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide to be replaced by special Design Guide provisions for the North Kumutoto to be included in The Central Area Urban Design Guide

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.6**

<b>Sub- mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay Heights, Wellington 6022	no	Policy 12.2.8.6	The submitter opposes the deletion of rules that require buildings in the Kumutoto /North Queens Wharf area to be in scale with heritage buildings.
38	Howard Ellis, Fran Parkin and B & V Duthie	Apartment 3.18/28 Waterloo Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011	no	Policy 12.2.8.6	The submitters oppose the deletion in 12.2.8.6 of " In the Kumutoto /North Queens Wharf area buildings will be in scale with heritage buildings."

39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place, Kensington, Wellington	yes	Policy 12.2.8.6	The submitter opposes the insertion of "building". Developments, other than building, should not be excluded from this policy
----	-------------------	---	-----	-----------------	---

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.6A**

<b>Sub- mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
10	Frances Williamson	25 Jubilee Road, Khandallah, Wellington 6035	no	Policy 12.2.8.6A	The submission opposes the inclusion of more detailed policy provisions for future building development on the waterfront.
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay Heights, Wellington 6022	no	Policy 12.2.8.6A	The submitter opposes the deletion of rules that require buildings in the Kumutoto /North Queens Wharf area to be in scale with heritage buildings.
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place Kensington Wellington	yes	Policy 12.2.8.6A	The submitter requests that "related" be deleted. This policy should apply to stand alone public spaces as well as those related to new buildings. With the proposed layout it appears policy 12.2.8.6 no longer has METHODS. The submitter suggests either 12.2.8.6A wording be appended to 12.2.8.6 to make it a single policy or that the METHODS under 12.2.8.6A explicitly state that they apply to both policies. METHODS Unless the design guide is at least as stringent. The submitter opposes the deletion of " In the Kumutoto /North Queens Wharf area buildings will be in scale with heritage buildings." It is unclear why the annotated version in the appendix numbers the list of matters being deleted '17. the principles and objectives of the Wellington Waterfront Framework." onwards. Using numbers rather than simple bullet dots for such lists is significantly better as it allows easy, unambiguous reference to made to any list item. However, as the remainder of the section uses bullet dots, it is not appropriate to sort that out under this variation.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.6B**

<b>Sub-mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
10	Frances Williamson	25 Jubilee Road Khandallah Wellington 6035	no	Policy 12.2.8.6B	The submission opposes the inclusion of more detailed policy provisions for future building development on the waterfront.
30	Wellington Waterfront Limited	PO Box 395 Wellington	yes	Policy 12.2.8.6B	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports inclusion of Policy 12.2.8.6B requiring design excellence for significant new buildings.
38	Howard Ellis, Fran Parkin and B & V Duthie	Apartment 3.18/28 Waterloo Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011	no	Policy 12.2.8.6B	Amend the proposed sentence in 12.2.8.6B as follows: "Careful assessment will also be given to development proposals that <del>might approach or equal exceed</del> the specified building height and footprint requirements as it is the Council's view that the issue of design quality is even more important in such cases."
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place Kensington Wellington	yes	Policy 12.2.8.6B	The submitter opposes the words "In the North Kumutoto area building 'sites' have been identified and the associated Plan provisions provide for an appropriate level of development as a Discretionary Activity (Restricted)." Any building development (new or significant alteration) here should be publically notified and go through resource consent processing as discretionary (unrestricted), unless it is classified to be non-complying or prohibited. The submitter also opposes the following: "Careful assessment will also be given to development proposals that might exceed the specified building height and footprint requirements...". Council should simply enforce footprint and, with the exception of any nominally zero limit, height requirements.
47	Jennie Henton	17 Milne Terrace Island Bay Wellington 6023	no	Policy 12.2.8.6B	Design Excellence is laudable goal and one that should be adopted elsewhere in the city. However, plans to build offices and apartments on public land essentially means that the land will be privatised this is strongly opposed.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.6C**

<b>Sub-mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	Policy 12.2.8.6C	The submission opposes the inclusion of a new policy along with related rules that minimise the public access to the ground floors of waterfront building and their connection with open public spaces.
18	Wellinhyon Civic Trust	Seddon Bennington PO Box 10183, Wellington	yes	Policy 12.2.8.6C	The Trust welcomes the inclusion of this policy but requests that the Council details specific leasing practices and procedures it would implement to ensure that the policy is effective
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place, Kensington, Wellington	yes	Policy 12.2.8.6C	Although the submitter supports the underlying idea, the requirement "To ensure that the ground floor of buildings be predominantly accessible to the public" is unclear and probably to weak. Firstly to avoid doubt it is requested that "predominantly" be replaced by "for a minimum of 12 hours per day" (as 12.2.5.2). Secondly "accessible to the public" needs to be clearer or properly defined. It is also requested that "without charge or any other restriction" be appended to the expression. If that is not the intent then allowing any commercial use of the ground floors is opposed.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Policy 12.2.8.8**

<b>Sub-mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	Policy 12.2.8.8	The submission supports the proposed changes to the governance arrangements to the waterfront.
38	Howard Ellis, Fran Parkin and B & V Duthie	Apartment 3.18/28 Waterloo Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011	no	Policy 12.2.8.8	The submitters oppose the deletion in 12.2.8.8 of "Governance arrangements for the waterfront include a broadly based group of both professional and community representatives. This group will have primary responsibility for the on going planning and development of the waterfront, as well as responsibility for monitoring all proposed developments. The group will actively engage the public in waterfront decision-making.."
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place, Kensington, Wellington	yes	Policy 12.2.8.8	The submitter requests that "or" be replaced by "and" and "outside those areas" be deleted. The critical point is the proposal to delete the requirement "Thus, the public will be consulted the development of plans for the waterfront (Stage 2 of the waterfront planning process) and enabled to participate through the statutory planning process about any proposed new buildings and any significant changes to existing building." That guaranteed public consultation for any proposal for new or significantly changed buildings as well as at this point (varying the District Plan is essentially stage 2 of the water front planning process).



### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – References to Waterfront Framework

Sub-mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
10	Frances Williamson	25 Jubilee Road, Khandallah, Wellington 6035	no	References to Waterfront Framework	The submitter is opposed to the removal of references to the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide.
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	References to Waterfront Framework	The submission supports the removal of references to the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide.
43	Ann Paisley Ryan	67 Para Street, Miramar, Wellington	no	References to Waterfront Framework	The submitter opposes the removal of references to the waterfront framework as a design guide. This guide gives greater emphasis to the importance of the public right to enjoy the waterfront area as a waterfront. Changes to the district plan, variation 11, will result in restricting or preventing any submissions, comments or input from the public.
45	The Architectural Centre Inc	PO Box 24178, Wellington	no	References to Waterfront Framework	The Architectural Centre believes that proposing a Design Guide and removing references to the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide will largely accomplish legal sustainability post-Hilton. We do not believe that a reduced legal obligation for public notification is a necessary requirement for legal sustainability.

### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.1.23

Sub-mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
27	Frances Lee	24 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035	yes	Rule 13.3.1.23	It is proposed that only 60% of ground floors will be accessible to the public whereas current policy provides for all such space to be public. The Variance should be altered to allow and increase to at least 80%.
28	Shirley Marion Hampton	24 Hudson Street, Island Bay, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.1.23	Ground floors of waterfront buildings should all be accessible to the public, the submitter opposes the inclusion of new policy and related rules.

### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.4

Sub-mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
34	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Anne Neill, General Manager, Central Region, New Zealand Historic Places Trust PO Box 2629, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4	The NZHPT objects to the insertion of the following text "except buildings and structures within identified areas un Rule 13.3.4A," as the provision for new buildings and structures in the North Kumutoto Area is not supported.

### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.4A

Sub-mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
1	Nicci Page	22 Avon Street, Island Bay, Wellington 6023	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Opposes rule 13.3.4A relating to the "Non-notification/service of resource consents"
2	Julian Gillespie	PO Box 27207 Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Opposes the provisions which shut the public out of the process of approving individual buildings i.e. Rule 13.3.4A
3	Dr Tim Halpine	5 Surrey Street, Wilton, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Opposes variation 11. The development of our waterfront should be an open process not a closed one i.e. Rule 13.3.4A
4	Aroha Ann Symonds	2 The Crescent, Roseneath, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	All decisions made should be completely transparent and that the citizens of Wellington should have a right to be consulted and their wishes to be adhered to by the council.
5	Peter John Graham	19 Beazley Avenue, Paparangi, Wellington 6037	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Opposed to the proposed rules in Variation 11 which would severely restrict public input on plans (applications for resource consent) for proposed individual buildings for Kumutoto sites 8, 9 &10.
6	Sunny Collings	202, 28 Waterloo Quay, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Requests public participation in processes of approving individual buildings and that rule 13..3.4A be rejected
8	Janet Tremewan	7 Paparata St, Karori, 6012	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the inclusion of new rule 13.3.4A because the public should be able to view plans for future buildings particularly in the Kumutoto area.
9	Gayle Cullwick	46A Grafton Rd, Roseneath,	-	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes new planning rules for development around

		Wellington			Kumutoto and opposes the approach of approving a plan change to develop the area around Kumutoto instead of going for a resource consent for all buildings
10	Frances Williamson	25 Jubilee Road, Khandallah, Wellington 6035	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter considers that there needs to be public consultations on the introduction of defined limits including building heights and "footprints" for development in the North Kumutoto area. Specific maximum heights and footprints must be introduced and adhered to at all times.
11	Mary Munro	1 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submission opposes the inclusion of the Non-notification /service provision in this rule.
12	Oriental Bay Residents Association Inc.	C. G. Blair5A Hay Street, Oriental Bay	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	This submission opposes the inclusion of the proposed new rule 13.3.4A to provide for new building development within the defined limits to be considered by council on a "restricted discretionary basis without the requirement for public notification".
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submission opposes the inclusion of a new rule 13.3.4A which will, if approved, remove the right of the public to be notified except at the discretion of Council. Public notification should be the norm.
15	Pamela Cubey	109 Campbell Street, Karori, Wellington 6012	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the specific provisions because public input to the generalised planning specifications would be restricted, and Council Officers would have too much unchallengeable authority over the plans. The 3 buildings in North Kumutoto would be able to be 15% above the proposed height limits - there are already too many building on the waterfront thus restrictive views of the harbour. The process is not an open process for public participation.
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay Heights, Wellington 6022	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submission opposes new Discretionary (Restricted) rule which means no notification and no public participation. I believe that waterfront buildings should be assessed through the resource consent process not the District Plan. The provision for involvement to move from the resource consent stage to the plan formulation stage is likely to stymie informed public comment if involvement is kept to generalised concept design stage only as final building designs are unlikely to be notified. The retention of the zero height limit is requested.

19	Waterfront Watch Inc	PO Box 19045, Courtney Place, Wellington 6149	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	This plan change seems to be an initiative to avoid legal action on new buildings on the waterfront. This has the effect of shutting the public out of the development process. The approach of doing a Plan change seems to have been chosen as it is easier for developers than going through the resource consent process. If this plan change goes through, plans to construct new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. This blocks off a potential avenue for involvement by the public and means that council officers, rather than the public or elected officials, have the authority to decide what goes where on the waterfront, and what does not. This process is a template for the 4 proposed buildings around Waitangi Park which would also exclude the public on a highly contentious part of the waterfront. Each building should have to go through the resource consent process if plans to build here ever come to fruition. We are very concerned that proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule within specified standards would go with the presumption of non-notification - this is a further attempt to exclude the public. The waterfront is a "unique and special part of the city" and any buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications. We are very concerned that buildings will be assessed on this basis as this essentially narrows the scope of what can be considered in a resource consent. Given the special nature of the waterfront, it is important that all factors are taken into consideration when deciding whether or not to construct a new building here
20	Mark Raymond Horgan	2/306 Oriental Parade, Wellington 6011	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the proposed rule 13.3.4A related to the activities being "Discretionary Activities (Restricted)" with a provision for the non-notification of applications
22	R. Michael and D Munro	1 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter does not support the new rule 13.3.4A. The status quo should be maintained i.e. the present possibility of public involvement in the development of any building planned for the waterfront. The submitter wants to be able to see what is planned for each site and judge in detail whether the design is appropriate.

25	David Lee, Chairman Action for Environment Inc	PO Box 10030, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Variation 11 would allow three buildings, planned for the Kumutoto area of the waterfront (North of the Meridian Building), to be built without notifications or public input. This is considered wrong in principal, and a backward step. If Variation 11 is adopted it would be a reversal of council policy on public involvement in Waterfront planning. By excluding the public and leaving planning decisions on such a special land as the Wellington Waterfront to a few officials, the Wellington City Council is risking the quality if its decision-making.
26	Majorie Florence Macquarrie	4 Te Hono Street, Maungatapu, Tauranga 3112	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the restriction of public input. Public input should be allowed (and encouraged) both in the initial stages of planning and throughout the process of designing individual buildings so proper consideration is given to this unique area. It is public land and the plans should look to keeping the interests of the population in general for now and into the future as a priority. Developers should be kept to strict conditions that do not breach the original protective framework. Each building plan should be able to be examined by the public as a separate identity. The process of planning should be open and available for scrutiny by the public.
27	Frances Lee	24 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Non-notification of resource consents for new building developments "within the defined limits" is envisaged under the new rule 13.3.4A. Reason: Every new building in this area should be publicly notified and affected persons informed of any application. The public must have this opportunity which would be denied by the new rule, as well as denying the opportunity to appeal to the Environment Court. Presumably WCC intends to apply the details of this rule to all seven developments on the Waterfront, i.e. Kumutoto (3) and Waitangi Park (4). There is also the question of what might apply to future developments on Queens Wharf. The proposal is of great concern and the new rule should be eliminated.
28	Shirley Marion Hampton	24 Hudson Street, Island Bay, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Rule 13.3.4A could limit public participation and this is opposed. Any development proposals on the waterfront or affecting the waterfront are of public interest and therefore the public should be notified of them and have the right to comment on them, before they go ahead.

					The waterfront is public land.
29	Ann Louise Mitcalfe	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	This plan change seems to be an initiative to avoid legal action on new buildings on the waterfront. This has the effect of shutting the public out of the development process. The approach of doing a Plan change seems to have been chosen as it is easier for developers than going through the resource consent process. If this plan change goes through, plans to construct new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. This blocks off a potential avenue for involvement by the public and means that council officers, rather than the public or elected officials, have the authority to decide what goes where on the waterfront, and what does not. This process is a template for the 4 proposed buildings around Waitangi Park which would also exclude the public on a highly contentious part of the waterfront. Each building should have to go through the resource consent process if plans to build here ever come to fruition. The submitter is very concerned that proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule within specified standards would go with the presumption of non-notification - this is a further attempt to exclude the public. The waterfront is a "unique and special part of the city" and any buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications. I am very concerned that buildings will be assessed on this basis as this essentially narrows the scope of what can be considered in a resource consent. Given the special nature of the waterfront, it is important that all factors are taken into consideration when deciding whether or not to construct a new building here
30	Wellington Waterfront Limited	PO Box 395, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports inclusion of Rule 13.3.4A providing for new development in North Kumutoto as a non-notified Discretionary Activity (Restricted) application in accordance with the proposed maximum building height requirements of 29.5 meters for 'Block A' (site 10), 25.3 meters for 'Block B' (site 9) and 17.2 meters for Block C' (site 8).

33	Brian John Burrell	38 Marewa Road, Hataitai, Wellington 6021	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the specific provisions of proposed Districts Plan Variation 11 that would restrict or prevent public participation and or input into final designs and placement of new buildings.
34	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Anne Neill, General Manager, Central Region, New Zealand Historic Places Trust PO Box 2629, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	The NZHPT does not support the inclusion of buildings and structures in the North Kumutoto area as Restricted Discretionary Activities, and considers full Discretion should be retained over development in this area to protect historic heritage, view shafts and public open space. If the rule is accepted then it is requested that historic heritage and view shafts be included as matter of discretion.
36	Craig Thomas Palmer	29 Moir Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter is opposed to this planning scheme for the Kumutoto sites on the waterfront on the grounds that it would substantially exclude the citizens of Wellington from any assessment of the merits for each proposed development. That the planning scheme for Kumutoto should allow public notification of each proposed development
37	Georgina Preston & Bill Viggers	, 23 Ngaio Rd, Kelburn, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitters are particularly concerned with the proposed rule 13.3.4A which would mean that new buildings can be approved by council without public notification. All Wellingtons and in particular affected parties have a right to know of any proposed development so they can comment, modify or oppose it. This is part of the democratic process.
38	Howard Ellis, Fran Parkin and B & V Duthie	Apartment 3.18/28 Waterloo Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitters oppose the outcomes of Variation 11 that if adopted in the Kumutoto North area would mean that building consent applications would enjoy a non notified status.
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place, Kensington, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the provision for non notification. If there is no more effective mechanism to ensure any building or alteration is publicly notified, then the height limit should be kept at zero.
40	Ken New	31 Sugarloaf Road, Brooklyn, Wellington 6021	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule would include a presumption of non-notification. The waterfront is special and any plans for buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications. The zero height limit should be retained and proposals dealt with as a discretionary activity (unrestricted).
41	Pat Linney and Linda Linney	37 Treasure Grove, Hataitai, Wellington 6021	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitters oppose non-notification of resource consent for new building developments within the defined limits. Every new building in

					this are should be publicly notified. This should also apply to possible development in Waitangi Park.
42	David Stephen Capper	147 The Ridgeway, Mornington, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the new provisions in which public input is restricted, height controls are relaxed and ground floor access restricted.
43	Ann Paisley Ryan	67 Para Street, Miramar, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the introduction of a new rule to provided for new building development to be considered by the council on a restricted discretionary basis without the requirement for public notification.
44	Wendy Poste	47 Wye Street, Island Bay, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	Restricted discretionary basis without the requirement for public notification is a very disturbing proposal - no community consultations is not a good idea from an employers point of view - we the rate payers
45	The Architectural Centre Inc	PO Box 24178, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The Architectural Centre does not support the proposal for waterfront buildings to be non-notified Discretionary Activities (Restricted). It is considered that removing the obligation for publicly notified consent will undermine the ability of the interested parties to be involved in the planning of the waterfront, as without publicly notified consents there will be no legal obligation for council to ensure public involvement. We consider that the role of public input into the waterfront has been a productive one. As such, the Architectural Centre considers that the zero-height limit has been a useful mechanism for triggering Notified Resource Consents.
46	Southern Environmental Association	Robert Logan 15 High Street, Island Bay, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	Southern Environmental Association opposes those aspects of the plan change that could result in buildings being erected on the waterfront without specific resource consent or without public notification.
47	Jennie Henton	17 Milne Terrace, Island Bay, Wellington 6023	no	Rule 13.3.4A	This plan change seems to be an initiative to avoid legal action on new buildings on the waterfront. This has the effect of shutting the public out of the development process. The approach of doing a Plan change seems to have been chosen as it is easier for developers than going through the resource consent process. We are very concerned that proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule within specified standards would go with the presumption of non-notification - this is a further attempt to exclude the public. The waterfront is a



					"unique and special part of the city" and any buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications.
48	Estelle Cook	6 Kenmore Street, Newlands, 6037	no	Rule 13.3.4A	The submitter opposes the inclusion of new rule 13.3.4A allowing new building development to be considered by the council on a "unrestricted discretionary" basis without a requirement for public notification. The waterfront is one of Wellington's more spectacular assets and is enjoyed by people of all ages and walks of life. Therefore the public should always have the opportunity to be involved in the development process. The retention of the zero height limit approach is requested.
49	Alex Mitcalfe Wilson	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.3.4A	This plan change seems to be an initiative to avoid legal action on new buildings on the waterfront. This has the effect of shutting the public out of the development process. The approach of doing a Plan change seems to have been chosen as it is easier for developers than going through the resource consent process. If this plan change goes through, plans to construct new buildings will not be able to be appealed to the Environment Court, unless they breach Plan rules. This blocks off a potential avenue for involvement by the public and means that council officers, rather than the public or elected officials, have the authority to decide what goes where on the waterfront, and what does not. This process is a template for the 4 proposed buildings around Waitangi Park which would also exclude the public on a highly contentious part of the waterfront. Each building should have to go through the resource consent process if plans to build here ever come to fruition. The submitter is very concerned that proposals under the Discretionary (Restricted) rule within specified standards would go with the presumption of non-notification - this is a further attempt to exclude the public. The waterfront is a "unique and special part of the city" and any buildings to be erected on it, wherever they are, should be publicly notified, and affected persons informed of any applications. The submitter is also concerned that buildings will be assessed on this basis as this essentially narrows the scope of what can be considered in a resource consent. Given the special nature of the waterfront, it is important that all factors are taken into

					consideration when deciding whether or not to construct a new building there
--	--	--	--	--	--

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.4A References to Standards in 13.6.3**

<b>Sub- mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
30	Wellington Waterfront Limited	PO Box 395, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4A References to Standards in 13.6.3	Notwithstanding support for Rule 13.3.4A, Wellington Waterfront Limited requests that it be made clear that the 'building mass' standard (Rule 13.6.3.2) does not apply to development on the waterfront, In Wellington Waterfront Limited's opinion the reference in the marginal note to Rule 13.3.4A indicates that the building mass standard could apply when Rule 13.3.8 applies however, Wellington Waterfront Limited understands that this was not the intention.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.4A.3**

<b>Sub- mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
34	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Anne Neill, General Manager, Central Region, New Zealand Historic Places Trust PO Box 2629, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.4A.3	The design of public space is retained as a matter of council discretion under proposed Rule 13.3.4A.3 for the North Kumutoto area. Appendix 13, however, identifies limited area available as public open space.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.8.14A**

<b>Sub-mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
6	Sunny Collings	202, 28 Waterloo Quay, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.8.14A	Buildings should remain within proposed height limits
11	Mary Munro	1 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submission opposes the proposed 15% discretionary margin above the listed maximum height and requests that there should be no discretionary limit, particularly in the North Kumutoto Area.
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay Heights, Wellington 6022	no	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter opposes rules that allow development up to a maximum of 15% above the heights limits which can be considered as a Discretionary Activity (Restricted) on North Kumutoto. Heights of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m above the mean sea level are too high.
18	Wellinhyon Civic Trust	Seddon Bennington PO Box 10183, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter does not support the proposed 15% discretionary margin above the nominated maximum heights. It is requested that this provision be deleted and flexibility obtained by reducing the maximum heights by the degree of discretion sought.
19	Waterfront Watch Inc	PO Box 19045, Courtney Place, Wellington 6149	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	We are strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption that this would be non-notified. This should be set at 5%.
21	Pauline and Athol Swann	47 Mairangi Road, Wadestown, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitters are strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption this would be non-notified. This discretionary level should be set at 5%
23	Jean Chapman	18 Silverstream	no	Rule 13.3.8.14A	Plans to allow Wellington Waterfront to approve buildings 15% above the proposed height limits as this is a very special part of Wellington and developers should have to go through a process to build in this area. The Zero height rule is in place to ensure all proposed new buildings exceeding that limit require a resource consent and this should not be removed.

24	Margaret Tobin	1/111 Coutts Street, Kilbernie, Wellington	TBC	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitters is strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption this would be non-notified. This discretionary level should be set at 5%
27	Frances Lee	24 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The new rule 13.3.8.14A is proposed to allow maximum heights to be exceeded by up to 15%. Reason: This rule would allow excessive heights along the valuable waterfront and should be expunged from the Variation.
29	Ann Louise Mitcalfe	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter is strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption that this would be non-notified. This should be set at 5%.
30	Wellington Waterfront Limited	PO Box 395, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports inclusion of Rule 13.3.8.14A providing for a discretionary 15% margin over maximum allowable building heights limits.
36	Craig Thomas Palmer	29 Moir Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	There should be no in-house discretion to increase height limits.
38	Howard Ellis, Fran Parkin and B & V Duthie	Apartment 3.18/28 Waterloo Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011	no	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitters oppose the height restrictions for buildings in this area would be relaxed to allow for up to 15% over and above the height limits presently set out in the existing plan.
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place, Kensington, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	Unless the height limit is zero (see above) the submitter requests that the provision allow a 15% (higher) margin be deleted.
40	Ken New	31 Sugarloaf Road, Brooklyn, Wellington 6021	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter is strongly opposed to buildings being allowed to breach current height limits by 15%. The submitter believes that the existing height limits for the three proposed North Kumutoto buildings are already to high.
41	Pat Linney and Linda Linney	37 Treasure Grove, Hataitai, Wellington 6021	no	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitters oppose any new rule that allows maximum heights to be exceeded by 15%. Our understanding is that a maximum height is set for a good reason. The Kumutoto buildings would obscure views from the city to the harbour.

45	The Architectural Centre Inc	PO Box 24178, Wellington	no	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The Architectural Centre understands the rationale for this to ensure height variation along a streetscape, to prevent visual monotony - though consider 15% far to high - an excess of what is really needed. We also know that such good intentions have become an expectation to build to the "maximum plus" among the developer community.
47	Jennie Henton	17 Milne Terrace, Island Bay, Wellington 6023	no	Rule 13.3.8.14A	We are strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption that this would be non-notified. This should be set at 5%.
49	Alex Mitcalfe Wilson	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.3.8.14A	The submitter is strongly opposed to building heights going 15% above the height limits as a Discretionary (Restricted) activity, with the presumption that this would be non-notified. This should be set at 5%.

#### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.3.8.6

Sub- mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place, Kensington, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.3.8.6	The submitter supports this rule, provided there is not provision for an exception to "13.6.3.3.1 No building or structure shall intrude on any view shaft as show in Appendix 11"

#### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.4.7

Sub- mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	Rule 13.4.7	The submission opposes the amendment to Rule 13.4.7. The amendment is considered to be unnecessary when the current provisions enforce and sustain the involvement of the public when a development more than 0 meters amsl is being considered on the Waterfront.

30	Wellington Waterfront Limited	PO Box 395, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.4.7	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports the proposed amendment of Rule 13.4.7 requiring any proposed development within an "identified area", including the North Kumutoto Area, that does not comply with the Discretionary Activity (Restricted) provisions, will require consent as a Discretionary Activity (Unrestricted)
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place, Kensington, Wellington	yes	Rule 13.4.7	The submitter request that this be replaced with "The construction of a new, the alteration of existing, and addition to existing, buildings and structures in the Lambton Harbour Area are Discretionary Activities (Unrestricted).

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.6.1.23**

<b>Sub-mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
5	Peter John Graham	19 Beazley Avenue, Paparangi, Wellington 6037	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	Oppose the proposed reduction in the ground floor space which would be open to the public. This is a complete and undesirable change in present policy which requires all ground floor space to be open to the public.
15	Pamela Cubey	109 Campbell Street, Karori, Wellington 6012	no	Rule 13.6.1.23	The proposed plan is not necessarily allowing for public access to ground floor space - there is a reduction to 60% of public access.
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay Heights, Wellington 6022	no	Rule 13.6.1.23	The submitter opposes the inclusion of a new rule that reduces public access to ground floors ground to only 60%. This should be at least 80%. The present policy requires all ground floor space to be open to the public.
19	Waterfront Watch Inc	PO Box 19045, Courtney Place, Wellington 6149	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	Ground floor space will not be necessarily accessible to the public but we support there being district plan rules to ensure they are "predominantly accessible". We disagree with the rule however that they should only be 60% publicly accessible. This should be at least 80%.
21	Pauline and Athol Swann	47 Mairangi Road, Wadestown, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	Current policy requires all ground floor space to be open to the public but under the new plans the limit would be only be 60% publicly accessible. This should be at least 80%.
24	Margaret Tobin	1/111 Coutts Street, Kilbernie, Wellington	TBC	Rule 13.6.1.23	Current policy requires all ground floor space to be open to the public but under the new plans the limit would be only be 60% publicly accessible. This should be at least 80%.
26	Majorie Florence Macquarrie	4 Te Hono Street, Maungatapu, Tauranga 3112	no	Rule 13.6.1.23	All ground floor space should be open to the public. If only 60% is allowed for, it violates the essential requirement of public access.
29	Ann Louise Mitcalfe	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	Ground floor space will not be necessarily accessible to the public but the submitter supports there being district plan rules to ensure they are "predominantly accessible". I disagree with the rule however that they should only be 60% publicly accessible. This rule should be at least 80%.

31	Taranaki Wharf Holdings Limited	Morrison Kent, Lawyers, 105 The Terrace, (PO Box 10-035) Wellington. Attn: I. M. Gordon	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	Taranaki Wharf Holdings Limited is opposed to constraints on non-public activities on ground floor premises, and requirements for active edges. Additional constraints on ground floor activity will unreasonably restrict the potential for the Site to contribute to economic activity, and the vitality of the waterfront, and be contrary to the Wellington Waterfront Framework and Part 2 of the Act. A blanket constraint on ground floor activity in Waterfront Buildings has potential to provide an over-supply of public space resulting in unsustainable structures and spaces that diminish the social, economic and cultural vitality of the Waterfront and its specific identified areas. The submitter seeks the following decision from Council: 1. that the Site be exempted from proposed standard 13.6.1.23 or, alternatively, that standard be deleted from variation 11; 2. That the Site be exempted from the third bullet point in policy 12.2.8.6A and policy 12.2.86C , or alternatively, that these policies be deleted from variation11;
32	Queens Wharf Holdings Limited	Morrison Kent, Lawyers, 105 The Terrace, (PO Box 10-035) Wellington. Attn: I. M. Gordon	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	The submitter opposes the constraints on non-public activities on ground floor premises, and requirement for active edges. Additional constraints on ground floor activity will unreasonably restrict the potential for the Sites to contribute to social and economic activity, and the vitality of the Waterfront, and be contrary to the Wellington Waterfront Framework and Part 2 of the Act. A blanket constraint on ground floor activity in Waterfront buildings has potential to provide an over-supply of public space resulting in unsustainable structures and spaces that diminish the social, economic and cultural vitality of the Waterfront and its specific identified areas. The submitter requests the following: That the Sites be exempt from proposed standard 13.6.1.23 or this standard be deleted from Variation 11; The the Sites be exempt from general matter 3 in policy 12.2.8.6A and policy 12.2.8.6C, or alternatively, that these policies be deleted from Variation 11 and other consequential amendments
33	Brian John Burrell	38 Marewa Road, Hataitai, Wellington 6021	no	Rule 13.6.1.23	Variation 11 has the potential to allow or permit reduced public access to 'ground floor' areas of any new buildings.
36	Craig Thomas Palmer	29 Moir Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	The requirement to have all ground floor space as being open to the public should be required in all cases.
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place,	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	The submitter requests that "60%" be replaced by "90%" and "for a



		Kensington, Wellington			minimum of 12 hours per day" be appended.
40	Ken New	31 Sugarloaf Road, Brooklyn, Wellington 6021	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	A current long-standing city policy requires all ground floor space to be open to the public. Variation 11 proposes to reduce the requirement for general public access to ground floor areas to only 60% public access. On the face of it, this may seem reasonable since there is limited demand for retail facilities on the waterfront. But this is the wrong logic - it is the submitter's view that it is not that there is not enough demand for shops in the bases of the buildings, it is that there are too many buildings. Reduce the number of buildings and the ones that remain will support a moderate retail trade for small businesses (and for cafés and bars in particular).
42	David Stephen Capper	147 The Ridgeway, Mornington, Wellington	no	Rule 13.6.1.23	The submitter opposes the new provisions in which public input is restricted, height controls are relaxed and ground floor access restricted.
45	The Architectural Centre Inc	PO Box 24178, Wellington	no	Rule 13.6.1.23	The Architectural Centre support the new policy and rules ensuring that the ground floors of buildings are predominantly accessible by the public and have active edges.
47	Jennie Henton	17 Milne Terrace, Island Bay, Wellington 6023	no	Rule 13.6.1.23	Ground floor space will not be necessarily accessible to the public but the submitter supports there being district plan rules to ensure they are "predominantly accessible". However the rule that they should only be 60% publicly accessible is not supported. This should be at least 80%.
48	Estelle Cook	6 Kenmore Street, Newlands, 6037	no	Rule 13.6.1.23	Ground floors of waterfront buildings should be 75% publicly accessible. Waterfront buildings should be of high benefit to the general public. e.g. museums, galleries, theatres, events venues. dining. Apartments and offices do not provide this benefit so should not be allowed.
49	Alex Mitcalfe Wilson	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Rule 13.6.1.23	Ground floor space will not be necessarily accessible to the public but the submitter supports there being district plan rules to ensure they are "predominantly accessible". However, the rule that they should only be 60% publicly accessible is opposed. This should be at least 80%.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.6.3.1.3**

<b>Sub-mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
14	Valerie Scott	9 Aorangi Terrace, Thorndon	no	Rule 13.6.3.1.3	The submitter is concerned about the height of buildings that will be allowed, blocking views such as those from the City to Oriental Bay
17	Elaine Cleland	8/2 Hood Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	Rule 13.6.3.1.3	Keep to proposed height limits

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Rule 13.8.8.14A**

<b>Sub-mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
9	Gayle Cullwick	46A Grafton Rd	-	Rule 13.8.8.14A	The submitter opposes plans to allow Wellington Waterfront to develop buildings 15% above the proposed height limits.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Appendix 13**

<b>Sub-mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	Appendix 13	The submission opposes the introduction of defined limits that include building height and 'footprints' for development in the North Kumutoto Area. Proposed height limits are excessive
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay Heights, Wellington 6022	no	Appendix 13	The submission opposes the introduction of defined limits that include building height and 'footprints' for development in the North Kumutoto Area which exclude public notification. The submitter opposes a higher proportion of development in North Kumutoto as an extension of the CBD to be prescribed as a Discretionary Activity (Restricted). This means that this area is essentially privatised.

18	Wellinhyon Civic Trust	Seddon Bennington PO Box 10183, Wellington	yes	Appendix 13	The submitter questions the proposed maximum height limit and states that an assessment should be made aimed at minimising shading and wind effects on adjacent public space and pedestrian routes. In particular the height limit for the south end of Block B should indicate a maximum height at about the same level as Shed 13.
19	Waterfront Watch Inc	PO Box 19045, Courtney Place, Wellington 6149	yes	Appendix 13	The "zero height limit" rule was introduced to ensure that all proposed new buildings triggered resource consent. We strongly oppose the removal of this rule. It is right that developers should be prepared to go through a robust process to build on this very special piece of land. This plan change will essentially make it easier to put buildings here. The proposed height limits of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m for the three proposed buildings above mean sea level are too high and should be set a lower level.
25	David Lee, Chairman Action for Environment Inc	PO Box 10030, Wellington	yes	Appendix 13	Action for Environment has serious concerns about the form and placement of the proposed buildings on the Kumutoto are of the waterfront. They will each be allowed to go 15m above building height limits (presently 29.5m, 25.3m and 17.5m above mean sea level). These buildings will affect the view shaft of the harbour from Whitmore Street. The historic Eastbourne Ferry Building will be surrounded and overtopped by one of these buildings. Covering such special open space as the waterfront with more commercial buildings seems very short-sighted considering the increased demand for adjacent open space central Wellington's rapidly growing apartment dwelling population will need.
27	Frances Lee	24 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035	yes	Appendix 13	The heights and footprints proposed for the Kumutoto area are far too large, i.e. heights of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m with the footprints involving most of the available sights 8, 9 and 10 on this public land. Reason: The proposal presupposes the removal of the 'zero height limit' which naturally would trigger the need for a resource consent which in turn allowed for a robust process for any new buildings throughout the whole waterfront. The three Kumutoto buildings would obscure views from the city to the harbour and totally change the ambience of what should be a peaceful and enjoyable experience for the public at this city/sea edge. The Variation needs altering to allow

					full and detailed public comment on each building.
29	Ann Louise Mitcalfe	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Appendix 13	The "zero height limit" rule was introduced to ensure that all proposed new buildings triggered resource consent. The submitter strongly opposes the removal of this rule. This plan change will essentially make it easier to put buildings here. The proposed height limits of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m for the three proposed buildings above mean sea level are too high and should be set a lower level.
30	Wellington Waterfront Limited	PO Box 395, Wellington	yes	Appendix 13	Wellington Waterfront Limited supports inclusions of the North Kumutoto Area as an "identified area" under Appendix 13, but request that: the extent of the building footprints be appropriately dimensioned (e.g. in metres from key reference points); and the building footprints shown north of Shed 13 and adjacent to Customhouse Quay ('site 9') be amended to reflect the footprint of the historic building previously occupying this site.
31	Taranaki Wharf Holdings Limited	Morrison Kent, Lawyers, 105 The Terrace, (PO Box 10-035) Wellington. Attn: I. M. Gordon	yes	Appendix 13	Taranaki Wharf Holdings Limited is opposed to the exclusion of the NZX Centre from Appendix 13 and some components of the provisions in Variation 11 related to this issue. Taranaki Wharf Holdings Limited is the registered proprietor of the two ground floor units and four office units on floors 1-4 inclusive known as the NZX Centre (the Site).

32	Queens Wharf Holdings Limited	Morrison Kent, Lawyers, 105 The Terrace, (PO Box 10-035) Wellington. Attn: I. M. Gordon	yes	Appendix 13	The submitter is opposed to the exclusion of the Queens Wharf Special Height Area from Appendix 13 and the consideration of height limits for the area within Appendix 13. Queens Wharf Holdings includes the registered proprietors of leasehold land in the Queens Wharf Special Heights Area. It is requested that in Appendix 13, identified height limits of either 25.5 meters or 30 meters be included which would put the Sites on an equivalent footing to two of the three identified sites at North Kumutoto, enabling sustainable building envelopes to generate economic activity and contribute to the vitality of the Waterfront.
34	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Anne Neill, General Manager, Central Region, New Zealand Historic Places Trust PO Box 2629, Wellington	yes	Appendix 13	The NZHPT opposes proposed Appendix 13, with regards to the building footprint and height of proposed building sites (block A and C) near the Eastbourne Ferry Terminal. It is requested that Appendix 13 be amended to provide more open space, greater consideration of the surroundings of historic heritage, particularly Sheds 11, 13 and 21, and the Eastbourne Ferry Terminal, and greater distance between Block A and Shed 21.
43	Ann Paisley Ryan	67 Para Street, Miramar, Wellington	no	Appendix 13	The submitter opposes the introduction of defined limits for development in the Kumutoto area which seems to refer to new buildings. Limits in these have in some cases been ignored by developers and subsequently by the council
45	The Architectural Centre Inc	PO Box 24178, Wellington	no	Appendix 13	Appropriate building height and bulk has a direct relationship to design excellence. While clearly any building will obscure views and likely increase shade to areas, additionally increasing the height of buildings in this northern section of waterfront is likely to significantly diminish sunlight to public areas along the waterfront. The Architectural Centre strongly encourage the council to commission and publish a full day lighting study, and to realise that the protection of sunlight from 12-2pm (as is common) is sufficient for the waterfront which has usage at multiple times during the day, especially (but to only) for weekend recreation.
46	Southern Environmental Association	Robert Logan 15 High Street, Island Bay, Wellington	yes	Appendix 13	Southern Environmental Association opposes changes to the existing provisions relating to building height and the proposed new planning rules for development around the Kumutoto area

47	Jennie Henton	17 Milne Terrace, Island Bay, Wellington 6023	no	Appendix 13	The "zero height limit" rule was introduced to ensure that all proposed new buildings triggered a resource consent. The removal of this rule is strongly opposed. It is right that developers should be prepared to go through a robust process to build on this very special piece of land. This plan change will essentially make it easier to put buildings here. The proposed height limits of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m for the three proposed buildings above mean sea level are too high and should be set a lower level.
49	Alex Mitcalfe Wilson	4 Hadfield Terrace, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	yes	Appendix 13	The "zero height limit" rule was introduced to ensure that all proposed new buildings triggered resource consent. The submitter strongly opposes the removal of this rule. It is right that developers should be prepared to go through a robust process to build on this very special piece of land. This plan change will essentially make it easier to put buildings here. The proposed height limits of 17.5m, 25.5m and 30m for the three proposed buildings above mean sea level are too high and should be set a lower level.

#### Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Design Guide General

Sub-mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street Mount Victoria Wellington 6011	no	Design Guide General	The submission supports the introduction of a new Design Guide that incorporates, with the removal of ambiguities and the inclusion of plain language definitions, the North Kumutoto area and that such a Design Guide should reflect the need for the design of buildings and of public space to match the expectations of the public and be congruent with the surrounding structures, especially in regard to heritage buildings and structures.
18	Wellinhyon Civic Trust	Seddon Bennington PO Box 10183 Wellington	yes	Design Guide General	Review the wording of the Design Guide to provide more precise language which would be more helpful to both developers and the public.

27	Frances Lee	24 Orari Street Ngaio Wellington 6035	yes	Design Guide General	There is reference to a new design guide for the waterfront. Currently the Waterfront Framework provides this. The submitter supports this continuing until the public has a change to examine new rules. Are such rules to apply only to the Kumutoto area?
37	Georgina Preston & Bill Viggers	23 Ngaio Rd Kelburn Wellington	no	Design Guide General	The Waterfront Framework should be kept as a Design Guide.
39	Mr Michael Taylor	10 Laurent Place, Kensington, Wellington	yes	Design Guide General	The submitter supports the wording within Appendix 4 "There are an infinite range of design solutions as to how a building could sit in Block A, B or C". Provision (Nk) G2.1 contradicts the introduction of Appendix 4. that only one of block A, B, C can be built and is therefore opposed. Provision (Nk) G2.3 is opposed in that it implies that buildings may exceed the specified height limits. Exceeding specified height limits should simply not be allowed, unless a nominal limit of zero is being used. Provision (Nk) G3.6 is supported - Maintains the 'floor' of the public spaces as a single uninterrupted flat surface. This simple horizontal plane is part of the wharf's character. Provision (Nk) G3.7 the submitter is unaware of any council policy on light pollution, but there should be one and any lighting requirements like this should refer to it. Provision (Nk) G4.3 Provision for car parking should be discouraged, particularly for commuters. Provision (Nk) O5.0 is strongly supported "To enhance the pedestrian links and experience in the area". Provision (Nk) G6.1 is opposed.
45	The Architectural Centre Inc	PO Box 24178 Wellington	no	Design Guide General	The public voice cannot in and of itself determine design excellence. Neither though can a Design Guide, nor a District Plan. These are mechanisms for setting the bar of meritocracy. Design Guides provide a utopian and woolly wish list which has little, if any, legal clout. Although we support a new Design Guide for the North Kumutoto area, and realise the limitations on the Waterfront Framework as a Design Guide, such guides are crude instruments to assist designers lacking the skill to produce even average standards of design. Exceptional design requires independent expertise. We therefore strongly advocate for a strengthened and more public role for TAG - a

					kind of TAG on steroids - and we recommend that members of TAG be appointed by professional bodies, rather than by council, and that reports from TAG about specific developments be included as part of the documentation made available in the public Resource Consent process.
48	Estelle Cook	6 Kenmore Street Newlands Wellington 6037	no	Design Guide General	The submitter supports a design guide that would recognise the need for outstanding design of new buildings. Boring and/or hideous buildings on the waterfront must be avoided. Public involvement could also help.

#### Summary of Submissions – DPV 11 - Heritage

Sub- mission Number	Submitters Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard	Provision	Submission/Relief Sought
34	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Anne Neill, General Manager, Central Region, New Zealand Historic Places Trust PO Box 2629, Wellington	yes	Heritage	The historic heritage adjacent to the North Kumutoto area forms part of the character of the area, and the proposed location and height of the buildings provided for under Rule 13.3.4A, have the potential to adversely affect the heritage values of these items. Although the explanation under Objective 12.2.8.6B states that "particular consideration will be given to the relationship of new buildings with adjacent listed heritage buildings", the Rule as proposed does not require this, as heritage is not included as a matter of discretion which Council can consider if the new buildings in this area are processed as Restricted Discretionary Act ivies.



**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – View shafts**

<b>Sub- mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
13	Rosamund Averton	12/17 Brougham Street, Mount Victoria, Wellington 6011	no	View shafts	The submitter welcomes any re-definition of view protection as envisaged in the recent Environment Court's comments in regard to the Marine Education Centre and also to the "Hilton" decisions. As affirmed in these two decisions providing view-shafts, "framed views" and glimpses are not adequate substitutes for open views to the inner and outer harbour and beyond. The submitter supports view protection that also takes into account wider views from Mount Victoria or south from Stellin Park - Tinakori Hill etc.
16	Christine Greenwood	9 Taipakupaku Road, Karaka Bay Heights, Wellington 6022	no	View shafts	View Shafts should be protected. It is of concern that views from Whitmore Street could be partially blocked as the Design Guide allows for buildings to encroach and frame the view shaft
26	Majorie Florence Macquarrie	4 Te Hono Street, Maungatapu, Tauranga 3112	no	View shafts	Nothing should be done to endanger views of the waterfront. The Kumutoto development will have a negative impact on the Whitmore street view shaft. Any diminishment of view shafts means that people would be looking at a collection of buildings - not - the city's waterfront
28	Shirley Marion Hampton	24 Hudson Street, Island Bay, Wellington	no	View shafts	Views of the waterfront will be affected by the new buildings of North Kumutoto: They will have a negative impact on the Whitmore street view shaft.
34	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Anne Neill, General Manager, Central Region, New Zealand Historic Places Trust PO Box 2629, Wellington	yes	View shafts	It is possible that new buildings contained within the proposed footprints on the North Kumutoto site could alter or obscure important view shafts down Whitmore Street. If buildings exceed the footprints identified in proposed Appendix 13, they would almost certainly adversely affect the view shaft. The Rule as proposed provides no requirement for consideration of view shafts by decision makers.
40	Ken New	31 Sugarloaf Road, Brooklyn, Wellington 6021	yes	View shafts	Views of the harbour will be affected by new buildings. Although the proposed North Kumutoto buildings would not intrude directly onto the extension of the Whitmore Street alignment (the official "view shaft"), the development would have a negative impact on harbour views from lower Whitmore Street by dramatically reducing their breadth.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Vehicle parking**

<b>Sub- mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
45	The Architectural Centre Inc	PO Box 24178, Wellington	no	Vehicle parking	The waterfront has existing parking which is more than sufficient. Given the council's policies to reduce private automotive traffic in the central city and to encourage more sustainable modes of transportation, parking reduction on the waterfront and elsewhere should be given serious and meaningful action, rather than lip-service. Parking spaces on the waterfront must be progressively reduced.

**Summary of Submissions - DVP11 – Section 32 Report**

<b>Sub- mission Number</b>	<b>Submitters Name</b>	<b>Address for Service</b>	<b>Wishes to be heard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Submission/Relief Sought</b>
45	The Architectural Centre Inc	PO Box 24178, Wellington	no	Section 32 Report	The Architectural Centre considers the Section 32 documentation to be more than insufficient. We do not feel that this is not a genuine or helpful exploration of options and demonstrates a cynical administration expediency. It clearly demonstrates that a wider range of ideas, thinking and opinions is needed.