

SUMMARY STATEMENT

FROM HELENE RITCHIE

M.A.; B.A., B.A.Hons., Dip.Ed., B.Ed. Studies; Dip. Business Studies (Dispute Resolution).

Chair Civic Trust

Former deputy mayor

Former Chair Civic Centre Project

Registered Psychologist

TO THE HEARINGS PANEL WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

TE NGAKAU AND WELLINGTON WATERFRONT

Thank you for hearing us on the 29th of June.

My contribution as Chair of the Wellington Civic Trust, was in regard to the Te Ngakau/ Civic Centre; Sylvia Allan's to the Waterfront.

I said that the decisions of today rest heavily on your shoulders as this would appear to be a last ditch stand to retain Wellington's Civic centre, Te Ngakau, the public heart of our City the Capital of our country.

This should be the pride and heart of the city but instead today it is rundown, with its maintenance neglected for over a decade. We think Council should retain, maintain and recognise the unique integrated architectural, heritage, civic and public space there.

We propose reuse of buildings there, not demolition.

It would appear that Council in its e.g. annual and long term plans and decisions has ignored its current District Plan and has proceeded to pre-empt any decisions of the proposed district plan and decisions yet to be made. Instead it has proceeded to lift the heritage precinct recognition in the District Plan, neglecting the significance of the buildings and structures in the precinct, and proposing demolitions without any consent requirement.

- **BACKGROUND**

Over decades, since the 50's Council began to acquire and amalgamate land and titles there until eventually in 1989 I was privileged to lead the creation of the Council agreed concept plan which then with a team of architects, engineers and other professionals, developed this unique (in Wellington and the country) civic centre as the heart (Te Ngakau) of the Capital.

As deputy mayor and councillor, I chaired that formulation of the project and Council concept approval. It is, or was, an example of local government foresight, and of a complex project achieved with ratepayer funds, within budget and time. Its totality included an

integrated whole of older buildings which were strengthened then (e.g. the town hall). New (1991) buildings were added and opened - the Council Administration (CAB) building and the Library. The City to Sea bridge with its special sculptures of Maori Sculptor, Para Matchitt, provided the safe pedestrian plaza overbridge to the Waterfront. Water was brought into the civic centre with art-work gracing the bottom of extensive pools and a waterfall. While all was added, none was demolished, despite at various times the Town Hall and the City Art Gallery building being under threat of demolition. Instead the 1940 then library (now City Art Gallery) and the Town Hall were retained.

The road, Mercer Street, dissecting the space, was partly closed and the middle became the safe sheltered, pedestrianised civic square.

- **KEY FEATURES**

The key features of importance at Te Ngakau are that:

These are public buildings in a key public space of civic and public amenity.

It still is an integrated whole and represents architecture from 1904 to the early 1990's. Nowhere else is the architecture of Aotearoa so well represented in one place. In a clockwise direction, the different architecture is of over a century in Poneke/Wellington: The Michael Fowler Centre (1983), the Town hall (1904) the MOB (1951), the CAB and Library (1991), the City Art gallery (1940), the City to Sea bridge (1991), the Civic Square (1991).

There is significant Poneke/Wellington heritage in structure and story here: The Town Hall with the historic Council Chamber, and the MOB (Municipal Office Building) represent an import legacy of civic government in the Capital. The stories of this place include all Wellington local government/civic activity and decisions for over a century. It is, and should be, the place of and a centre for local government/civic and public activity. But Wellington City Council moved all its Council meetings away from the Civic centre, in 2016, to a downtown office building. Staff are now scattered throughout Wellington City.

The square itself is an important public open space for multiple, casual and spontaneous public recreation use, whether it be a game of football, a political demonstration, or a University graduation.

The square is one of the only fully pedestrianised and safe areas in Wellington City.

The entire area has suffered severe maintenance neglect now for over a decade and today is an eyesore, with two construction sites, and the majority of the buildings emptied out.

- **OUR SUBMISSION**

Our submission was somewhat constrained by the proposals and the challenging complexity of the process before us.

The main points of our submission are:

- **REDEVELOPMENT
VS RETENTION, PROTECTION AND REUSE**

Introduction to the Proposed Plan Civic centre.

We strongly oppose:

That Council consider Te Ngakau a redevelopment site

CCZ-PREC01 :

We oppose the statement in the Council's introductory sentence, in the introduction to the chapter that Te Ngakau/civic centre is [simply and primarily,] a Redevelopment Site.

This civic centre is not a redevelopment site. We think that the current description of the Precinct as a redevelopment site is unreasonable and unrealistic.

The findings of a seminar run by the Civic Trust in 2021 were that people sought to retain as much as is possible of the existing structures and spaces for **reuse** (rather than demolition and replacement buildings).

We oppose the staged redevelopment proposed by Willis Bond and the Council

- **HERITAGE PROTECTION**

We sought further heritage recognition of the Michael Fowler Centre, the MOB, the CAB, the Wellington Public Library, the Square and the City to Sea bridge. We were constrained by time and voluntary resource such that duplication of our effort was simply not possible.

We made our submission here and once regarding heritage protection of these buildings, structures and the precinct as a whole. We ask that Council be required to retain its heritage precinct recognition as in the operative District Plan.

This heritage protection applies to the Heritage chapter as well.

We noted that only two buildings in the entire civic centre have Heritage NZ/Pouhere Taonga heritage protection-the City Art gallery and the Town Hall but that the entire area is currently identified as a heritage precinct in the operative District Plan.

We opposed the Council's proposed non-recognition of the heritage importance of these buildings and of the Precinct as a whole.

We opposed Willis Bond's submission to delete two buildings from the precinct, the MOB and CAB.

- **PURPOSE CCZ-PREC01**

We requested the addition of this wording:

“The purpose of Te Ngakau./Civic Square Precinct is to provide civic activities, functions, public use and areas of open space. Any future change in the precinct must ensure that the development or change respects the special qualities of the area, including the concentration of heritage buildings.”

- **ADDITIONS TO BUILDINGS**

We oppose non-notification of additions to buildings.

We therefore oppose Willis Bond’s submission (and Council officer’s support) for a new rule for permitted status and non-notification of additions to buildings within the precinct:

Additions amount essentially to new buildings because they are defined in the Plan as modifications that have the effect of increasing gross floor area, footprint, mass or height of buildings, including the creation of new floor areas. These could be very substantial.

- **DEMOLITION**

New rule proposed before or after CCZPREC01-R7

We oppose a new rule proposed by the Council for non-notification of demolition. We seek that demolition be made a separate category of activity within the Civic Centre Precinct, **separate** from the City Centre applicable rule.

We said that all demolitions relating to this important area should be carefully considered and publicly notified.

We oppose Council’s out of hand dismissal of public notification of demolition which in their words is “neither necessary or appropriate” or are “too onerous”.

- **OPEN SPACE NEW RULE**

CCZPRERXXX

We requested a new rule as discretionary status with public notification for change or redevelopment of the existing public spaces within the precinct.

The Civic Square is much loved, and was more so when it was properly maintained.

The council proposing to not provide for public input into any change in this area is reprehensible.

The public outdoor space is as important for people to express an opinion on as the buildings that frame the square itself.

We proposed a competently drafted rule, and would like the Commissioners to seriously consider it.

As population builds up (in this already now largest 'suburb' in Wellington), it is essential that residents feel they can have a say in what their open spaces are going to be like.

- **MINIMUM HEIGHT**

CCZ-S4

We support the exclusion of buildings and structures in the Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct from the minimum height standard of buildings in the central city.

- **VEHICULAR TRAFFIC CCZ-PREC01-P1-CCZ-PREC01-P3**

We oppose what appears to be a proposed re-opening of a road (Mercer Street) going through the middle of the Te Ngakau.

P3 should clearly state that the area must be kept free of vehicular traffic.

Te Ngakau/Civic Centre is a sheltered safe pedestrianised safe precinct which was utilised by many who worked in the civic buildings and the over a million a year (3000 a day) who came to the now closed library and enjoyed the open space of the square which was created by the closure of this part of Mercer Street as part of the concept of the entire Civic Square /Te Ngakau precinct.

It is a safe space for children, families, sports games, graduates, people protesting.

- **COMMENT**

COUNCIL PRE-EMPTING BY REMOVING HERITAGE RECOGNITION OF THE CIVIC CENTRE

Council appears to have pre-empted the proposed District Plan and not adhered to its own current District Plan.

Council has removed this heritage recognition in the existing plan. It would appear that Council by doing this has pre-empted the outcome of decisions on the proposed District Plan

- **NOTE: RE MICHAEL FOWLER CENTRE CARPARK
WILLIS BOND BUILDING APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION**

There were many questions from Commissioner Daysh regarding Willis Bond's desire to get resource consent approval to build on the Michael Fowler Centre carpark.

I endeavoured to respond but with concern that this is a side issue.

I was somewhat taken aback that this was the subject before us as we were not considering a resource consent application, but were considering in a statutory process, rules and proposals for the Wellington City Council proposed District Plan.

To me, it seemed out of scope for this hearing.

However, as I knew something of this application, I mentioned that the recent so-called public notification of the Willis Bond application for resource consent was seen as inadequate. (But the public had had to take this to the Court to have that proven). It appears that the Council and Willis Bond attempted to circumvent public notification requirements in the law.

The fact is that the Willis Bond resource consent application was thrown out by the Environment Court because neither the Council's nor Willis Bond's process was adequate and the public notification had failed.

The importance of proper and public notification was emphasised by the Environment Court.

I attach reference to the Judge's decision here:

IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT WELLINGTON

I TE KŌTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA
KI TE WHANGANUI-A-TARA

Decision [2023] NZEnvC 123

IN THE MATTER

of an application under s 87G of the Resource Management Act 1991 for a direct referral of an application for resource consent for the construction of a building and associated earthworks at 110 Jervois Quay, Wellington Central

BY

MFC DEVELOPMENT LIMITED
PARTNERSHIP

(ENV-2023-WLG-002)

Applicant

Court: Environment Judge L J Semple sitting alone under s 279(1) of the Act
Hearing: In chambers at Wellington
Last Case Event: Final submissions received 2 June 2023
Date of Decision: 20 June 2023
(On the papers)
Date of Issue: 20 June 2023

DECISION OF THE ENVIRONMENT COURT

- A. The public notice issued by Wellington City Council failed to appropriately describe the location of the activity for which resource consent was sought under s 2AB of the Act, and as such, failed to meet the definition of public notification under s 2AA of the Act.



RE MFC DEVELOPMENT LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Waterfront Zone

Wellington Civic Trust Submissions and Speaking Notes for Hearing 4 (specific wording suggestions highlighted in grey)

Part of Plan	Our submission	Requested change	Officer's Recommendation and our comment
WFZ	<p>Support in part</p> <p>We generally support the concept of a special purpose zone – the Waterfront Zone - for the former Lambton Harbour Area. Our support is tempered in relation to a number of specific issues, as set out in the detailed submissions below.</p>	<p>Modify provisions that relate to the Lambton Harbour Waterfront Zone as set out in detail in the following submissions.</p>	
WFZ – P1 Sch 1	<p>Support in part</p> <p>The Introduction (paras 3, 4, 5) refers back to the Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001. This is a 2001 document, which was only ever intended to be Stage One of a three-stage process. Stage two was to prepare detailed plans for each of the sub-areas, and Stage three was an implementation and monitoring stage. The current Framework is thus no more than a framework, as has been pointed out by the Environment Court. While it is important, it lacks clarity and detail. In the absence of</p>	<p>Add after the fourth paragraph of the introduction, the following principles from the Wellington Waterfront Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The waterfront is predominantly a public area.</i> • <i>The public should be consulted – either through the stage two process or through a statutory planning process – about any proposed new buildings and any significant changes to existing buildings.</i> • <i>Ground floors of buildings will be predominantly accessible to the public.</i> <p>We also seek that the Council completes the unfinished work on the Wellington Waterfront Framework so that it provides greater detail for the future of the distinctive areas of the waterfront</p>	

	<p>Stages two and three, the principles of collective ownership and engagement from the Framework need to be incorporated more clearly in the Zone introduction.</p>		
WFZ – P1 Sch 1	<p>Support in part Para 7 of the Introduction says that all “significant” new development are publicly notified. There is no indication of what the Council might consider to be “significant”. WCT is concerned about this, and concerned about the cumulative effects of the numerous small building additions that are permitted activities in the current plan provisions which could significantly change the nature of this important public area (see quote from Wellington Waterfront Framework above). We seek clarification of what is intended.</p>	<p>Clarify the circumstances in which public notification will occur. This should include as a minimum any new building, structure or activity which requires a resource consent including any which occur in part of the area shown as Waterfront Public Open Space.</p>	
WFZ – P1 Sch 1	<p>Oppose The mapping of the Waterfront Zone shows three types of areas – Public open spaces, Queens Wharf buildings and Areas of change (2). A large part of the Zone area is outside all of these three. Such areas are either the footprints of existing buildings, or are often multi-purpose access and</p>	<p>Add a paragraph to clarify the purpose of the areas which are not within the three identified areas, including where areas are not building footprints, an open space access and connectivity function.</p> <p>Ensure that the rules do not allow for cumulative effects by filling up these publicly-accessible spaces (death by a thousand cuts).</p>	<p>We are very disappointed with the officer’s recommendations in relation to open space. There appears to be a fundamental misunderstanding about the waterfront and what its purpose actually is. The Lambton Harbour area was set up as a public with existing and some new buildings set in an open space. The Waterfront Framework mentions traffic only twice – and makes the following statement:</p>

	<p>connection areas, public “shared areas” where slow-moving vehicles, pedestrians and those using micro-mobility devices (including bikes) co-exist. These are also part of the public open space network. The purpose of these areas should be made very clear in the description of the Zone. We are concerned that these areas do not appear to be specifically excluded from further encroachment by buildings and private residential use and could lose their connectivity function.</p>		<p><i>“As a general principle, vehicle traffic is restricted or excluded from moving on and around the waterfront. Access for service and emergency vehicles will be allowed in a controlled manner, but minimised, as will access for car parking. There will be no routes dedicated to different forms of access, except for a pedestrian-only section of the promenade by Shed 5 because of congestion at this narrow part of the promenade. Otherwise, pedestrians, cyclists, service and emergency vehicles will all share the same space, while still giving pedestrians priority.”</i></p> <p>The officer’s analysis seems disrespectful of the submission - we understand that roads are roads and wharfs are in the coastal marine area and therefore not in the district. The most concerning points relate to (c) which says: <i>“Service lanes and areas, vehicle parking and loading/offloading spaces: for example, Lady Elizabeth Lane, vehicle parking, vehicle loading/offloading spaces. The main activity here is transport and servicing activities in the Zone, where the Public Open Space objectives and policies are less appropriate in my view.”</i></p> <p>This is directly contrary to the purpose of these public open spaces as set out in the Framework and shows a complete misunderstanding of the way the Waterfront is supposed to work. We note that the purpose of these areas is not set out in the Plan in any way, and they are likely to become subject to encroachment if the Plan’s rules are not better clarified.</p> <p>We suggest that a further paragraph is added at the end of the Introduction for the Zone which actually says what the unallocated space is intended for and picks up the key</p>
--	---	--	---

			<p>aspects from the Framework’s description – along the lines of “<i>the remainder of the waterfront area which does not comprise legal road and is not included in one of the three categories above is intended to remain available to the public primarily for pedestrian and cycle movement, with limited and controlled service and parking access</i>”.</p> <p>It is very worrying that this area is seen as available for further building – see para 61 of the Officer’s report.</p>
Plan maps	<p>Support in part We support all the areas shown as Waterfront Public Open Space in the plan maps. We seek enlargement of this area where-ever possible. The area between the Circa building and the Te Papa building has been omitted from Open Space. This is a key open space area and one of the most heavily-used in the whole Zone.</p>	<p>Retain all the areas shown as Public Open Space in the Waterfront Zone and add additional areas where-ever possible. Change the space between the Circa and Te Papa to Waterfront Public Open Space.</p>	<p>We are very concerned that the large open space area between Circa and Te Papa is not shown as open space – this is one of the area’s most important open spaces and should be recognised and protected as such regardless of ownership.</p> <p>We are grateful for the recommendation for two smaller areas of open space to be mapped, but notice that some open space area is shaved off near the public toilets in QE Lane without explanation. We oppose this change and don’t know on what basis that recommendation is made. There is no submission seeking less open space.</p>
WFZ-O1	<p>Support in part Currently part of this objective is vague and does not help provide a vision for the zone, particularly the part that states “the unique and special components and elements”.</p>	<p>Modify the purpose statement as follows: “Activities and development in the Waterfront Zone contribute to Wellington’s identity and sense of place, with public spaces, buildings and other structures that reflect the unique <u>location and existing character of</u> and special</p>	<p>We would still like to see the existing character recognised, as it was carefully planned for and is appreciated.</p>

		components and elements that make up the waterfront.”	
WFZ-O3	Support in part The objective is poorly worded and hard to understand.	Rewrite as follows: “The Waterfront’s public open spaces <u>identified on the planning maps</u> mapped as specific controls are protected and maintained for temporary activities and recreational activity only”.	OK
WFZ-O5	Support in part Connectivity throughout the Zone needs to be emphasised. We are concerned that this is not provided for or protected by a description or policy provision and yet it is vital to the future of the waterfront. We seek that the heading and text of this Objective includes this connectivity throughout the zone and not just from the harbour, to the City Centre and to public transport.	Add at the end of the heading: “ <u>and throughout the Zone</u> ” Add at the end of the Objective: “ <u>and connectivity is provided throughout the Zone</u> ”	OK
WFZ-O7	Support in part Connectivity within the Zone’s open spaces (whether labelled as public open space or not), has been a fundamental part of the development of the waterfront area. WCT seeks that this is a consideration when assessing any developments or activities. We also note that some of the items listed in 2. do not seem to interface with the Waterfront Zone.	Modify item 1. To read: “1. Within the zone, including on its role, and <u>function and connectivity</u> ; and” In 2., we query the validity of items c, d, e, and f. We are not aware of such interfaces with the Zone. We seek correction as appropriate. 2. At interfaces with: a. Heritage buildings, heritage structures and heritage areas;	OK

		<p>b. Scheduled sites and areas of significance to Māori;</p> <p>c. Mapped public open spaces;</p> <p>d. Identified pedestrian streets;</p> <p>e. Residential zoned areas;</p> <p>f. Open space zoned areas; and</p> <p>g. The coastal marine area.</p>	
WFZ-P1	<p>Support in part</p> <p>We seek two changes to this policy for enabled activities:</p> <p>Firstly that Public transport activities are removed and added to P2, and secondly that Visitor accommodation is only enabled above ground floor.</p> <p>We support connections to public transport, including ticketing facilities and stops adjacent to on-street public transport. In the past, this area has been proposed to have a connected light rail or similar system passing through it. That remains a future possibility, but it is not one that should be a permitted activity, as included under this policy. The definition of “public transport activities” is extremely wide, as follows:</p> <p>“Means the use of buildings and/or land for the purpose of providing for passenger transfer and access to, and</p>	<p>Delete item 6, and transfer to WFZ – P2.</p> <p>Modify item 7 to read “Visitor accommodation above ground floor”</p>	<p>Accept the officer’s recommendation on public transport, which is to limit it to existing roads.</p>

	<p>storage/servicing of, public transport services, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. train stations; b. bus stations/exchanges; c. rapid transit stops; d. ferry terminals; and e. ancillary ticketing and passenger facilities, charging/fuelling stations, storage and maintenance depots, offices and retail.” <p>Most of these activities are entirely unsuited for location on the precious and scarce resource of Wellington’s waterfront land.</p> <p>We are opposed to ground floor use of the Waterfront Zoned area for visitor accommodation. This activity should be treated on the same basis as residential, and permitted at above ground floor only.</p>		
WFZ-P2	<p>Support in part We seek that public transport activities are included under this policy as managed activities.</p>	Add public transport activities to this list.	OK
WFZ-P3	<p>Support in part Add visitor accommodation at ground level as an incompatible activity.</p>	Modify item 3 to read: “Ground floor residential <u>and visitor accommodation</u> activities”	
WFZ-P4	<p>Support in part</p>	Modify item 3 as follows:	OK

	Add recognition of connectivity to this list.	“3. Provides well-designed, <u>connected</u> and safe public space and pedestrian, cycle and micro-mobility access;”	
WFZ-P5	Support in part This policy sets the 35% building coverage requirement for the zone. However, the way it is expressed is open to confusion. The links to “building” and “site” definitions indicate that the measure would be based on individual site calculations. This becomes complex given that some areas are on long-term lease (which meets the RMA definition of subdivision). We suggest one means of clarifying what is intended, but acknowledge that there may be others.	Modify item 1 as follows: “1. A balance of buildings and open space with no more than 35% building <u>site</u> coverage over the whole Waterfront Zone to form a sense of openness and transition between the dense city centre environment and the expansiveness of Te Whanganui a Tara;”	When we made the submission seeking clarification, we didn’t take into account that the Waterfront Zone includes the very extensive areas of road within the Zone. If this extensive area is taken into account, then the 35% building coverage is far too extensive – enabling more like a 50% coverage of the available land, which is inconsistent with the purpose of the Zone – and which would not reflect the unique location and character of the Zone. We suggest that the 35% should apply to the whole area of the Zone, excluding public roads.
WFZ-P7	Support Retain this policy unchanged.		OK
WFZ-P9	Support Retain this policy unchanged.		OK
WFZ-P10	Support Retain this policy unchanged.		OK
WFZ -R6	Oppose Remove Public transport activities from permitted activities so that they default to Discretionary status.	Delete WFZ-R6	Agree with officer’s recommendation which would limit these activities to public roads + PO Sq.
WFZ -R7	Oppose Modify rule so that it applies to Visitor accommodation on the	Replace current rule as follows: “ WFZ-R7 Visitor accommodation 1. Activity status: Permitted Where:	

	same basis as residential activities throughout the zone.	a. The activity is located above ground floor level. Cross-reference – also refer to NOISE-R5 and NOISE-S4 for noise-sensitive controls near the Port Zone.” Add non-complying status where permitted standards are not achieved.	
WFZ – R10	Support We support the limited permitted car parking activity status, and the default to non-complying in this area. In particular we support the car parking for people with mobility issues.	Retain the rule unchanged.	OK
WFZ -R13	Support in part We oppose the provision that buildings in the Waterfront Zone may be demolished to provide private outdoor living space. That is inconsistent with the rules applying to residential activities and contrary to the description of the purpose of the area as for public use and future generations.	Modify WFZ-R13 1.a.ii as follows”: “ii. Enables the creation of public space or for private outdoor living space ; or	OK
WFZ – R14	Support in part We oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m2 per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and	Modify WFZ-R14.1.c as follows: “c. The aggregate area of all buildings <u>and structures</u> in the contiguous public open space does not exceed 50200 m2 per hectare.” Add at the end of WFZ-R14.2:	We continue to seek the reduction in scale of permitted building extensions and new building in the open space areas of the Waterfront (R14 and R15). A 200m ² addition to a building or a new building is equivalent to one large house for every football field, and there are few open spaces on the waterfront of that size. The types of reasons to have such

	<p>non-continuous nature of the spaces.</p> <p>The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.</p>	<p>“The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] <u>and the Wellington Waterfront Framework</u>”.</p> <p>Add reference to the Wellington Waterfront Framework also in the following parts of this Rule: 4, 5, 6.</p> <p>Modify WFZ-R14.5.a as follows: “a. The alterations or additions do not extend the footprint of the existing building by more than 2.55% of the footprint at 18 July 2022; and” Alternatively, replace 2.5% by 50m2.</p>	<p>provision suggested in the officer’s report (public toilets, shelters, small cafes) should be provided for, and mostly are, in the area’s public buildings. The rule sets up the opportunity for a proliferation of inappropriate structures for the scarce resource of open space.</p> <p>We also continue to seek a limitation of no more than 2.5% footprint extension of existing buildings as restricted discretionary activities and without public notification. There are already large buildings on the waterfront and little open space. The only place these buildings can expand into is part of the valued circulation and connectivity space addressed earlier. 5% extension is too large.</p> <p>The Wellington Waterfront Framework has been referenced in previous plans, and has been through a very extensive public process. As explained in our submission the Framework was never completed, but it is all we have to guide development in this special area. The case referred to in the officer’s report decided to have regard to the Waterfront Framework as a policy document (not a design guide). We would be happy with that sort of policy reference (which is what we sought). If the Commissioners don’t think they can do that, then we urge that you recommend to the Council that they produce some sort of document to guide waterfront development.</p>
--	---	--	--

			The Design Guides Introduction which is referenced is so generic that it is irrelevant.
WFZ – R15	<p>Support in part</p> <p>We oppose the permitted aggregate area of new buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m² per hectare in 1. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.</p>	<p>Modify WFZ-R15.1.c as follows:</p> <p>“c. The aggregate area of all buildings <u>and structures</u> in the contiguous public open space does not exceed 50200 m² per hectare.”</p> <p>Add at the end of the second paragraph in WFZ-R14.2:</p> <p>“The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] <u>and the Wellington Waterfront Framework</u>”.</p> <p>Add reference to the Wellington Waterfront Framework also in the following parts of this Rule:</p> <p>2, 6</p>	See above.
WFZ – R16	<p>Support in part</p> <p>The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.</p>	<p>Add reference to the Wellington Waterfront Framework in this Rule</p>	
WFZ – R17	<p>Support in part</p> <p>The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.</p>	<p>Add reference to the Wellington Waterfront Framework in this Rule</p>	

<p>WFZ – R18</p>	<p>Support in part Outdoor storage areas should either be precluded from establishing, or, if permitted, be extremely limited in area within this Zone. The screening provision is inadequate for a primarily public area, as screening from road or site boundaries provides inadequate protection for users of the area.</p>	<p>Add a maximum area of 10m² to the permitted activity part of this rule.</p> <p>Require screening around the immediate perimeter of the storage area itself.</p>	<p>Re outdoor storage – given that this is a public area, outdoor storage should not be provided and if it has to be, it should be extremely limited in area and well-screened. The suggestion that the Waterfront should accommodate this type of activity at all is pretty primitive in this day and age. It can only take up valued public and circulation space. We consider it should be strongly discouraged. We would like to see our suggestion of a maximum of 10m² accepted. It is a sad day when detailed provisions are added to the Plan at the request of FENZ, but the overall implication of the provision in relation to the public interest and public use and enjoyment of this public area are ignored.</p>
<p>WFZ – S6</p>	<p>Support in part In line with an earlier submission on policy, we are concerned that the reference to “site” in relation to coverage may result in difficulty in interpreting this rule. The Zone consists of a number of sites (as defined), whereas the rule, in line with the policy, is intended to apply to the Zone as a whole.</p>	<p>Remove the word “site” in the Rule heading and in the rule itself.</p>	<p>In line with our earlier point, we would like this provision to apply to the whole Zone, but excluding the public roads.</p>

Notes prepared by Sylvia Allan, BSc(Hons), Dip TP, FNZPI

City Centre Zone – Te Ngakau/Civic Centre Precinct

Wellington Civic Trust Submissions and Speaking Notes for Hearing 4 (specific wording suggestions highlighted in grey)

Part of Plan	Our submission	Requested change	Analysis and Speaking Notes
<p>CCZ - Introduction</p>	<p>Support in part</p> <p>WCT notes that the Introduction to this section includes a statement that, despite the intensification required:</p> <p>“the Zone also contains measures to ensure that buildings and spaces are designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be of (sic) accessible and of a good quality; • positively contribute to public space and built form of the City Centre; • offer a suitable level of amenity for users such as access to sunlight and open space; • provide opportunities for active and passive recreational pursuits; and • mitigate relevant adverse effects.” 	<p>Add an explanation to the Introduction as to the scarcity of available public open space in the City Centre Zone, and how this shortfall is going to be corrected through the Plan and other methods available to the Council.</p>	<p>This submission is proposed for rejection out of hand. While the District Plan may not be the vehicle to actually attain land for open space in the city centre, we consider the Council should actually be identifying and mapping sites in its plan. This used to happen in the past (eg Midland Park and other pocket parks were shown in the District Scheme and progressively acquired by the Council).</p>

City Centre Zone – Te Ngakau/Civic Centre Precinct

	<p>We do not see any provisions in the Zone that would provide additional public space in an area that is recognised as having a significant shortfall to meet existing needs. We consider that a statement to that effect should be added in the Introduction, and that the wording should explain how the shortfall is going to be made up before further residential development is provided for.</p>		
<p>CCZ-PREC01</p>	<p>Support in part</p> <p>WCT generally supports the recognition of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct within the Central City Zone, and the specific introductory statement and aims that apply to the Precinct. However, the introductory sentence portrays the precinct as redevelopment area. The findings of a seminar run by the Civic Trust in 2021 were that people seek to retain as much as possible of the existing buildings, structures and spaces for reuse (rather than demolition and replacement buildings). We seek</p>	<p>Retain CCZ-PREC01 with its current wording, except for the modifications requested below: “The purpose of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct is to provide for civic activities, functions, <u>public use</u> and areas of open space. and redevelopment of Any future change in the precinct <u>must</u> while ensuring that <u>the any future development or change</u> respects the special qualities of the area, including the concentration of listed heritage buildings.”</p>	<p>Officer’s report - Accepted the “public use” addition. Rejected the rest. We think that the current description of the Precinct as a redevelopment site is unreasonable and unrealistic. We notice that two of the building which were included in this statement as part of the precinct are proposed to be crossed out in the later text (this at the request of Willis Bond whose submission we opposed) and that none of the other buildings and structures we have asked to be recognised for their heritage values have been recommended for inclusion (the Michael Fowler Centre, the Municipal Office Building, the Civic Administration Building, Wellington Public Library and the City to Sea Bridge) in earlier hearings (I need to check this, but we missed this earlier hearing). The rephrasing we are seeking would correct this unfortunate statement. We also wish to keep the</p>

City Centre Zone – Te Ngākau/Civic Centre Precinct

	that this is reflected in the introductory statement. (Note that in a later submission point we seek additional buildings and structures for heritage protection because of the importance of their contribution to the existing built quality and character of the precinct).		reference to the Municipal Office Building and the Civic Administration Building, as they are part of the Precinct character.
CCZ-PRECO1 - CCZ-PRECO3	Support WCT generally supports the three objectives that apply to the Precinct.	Retain these objectives.	Objective 1 and 3 remain unchanged. Small changes are proposed to Obj 2 in the officer’s report, which we probably wouldn’t argue with.
CCZ-PRECO1-P1 - CCZ-PRECO1-P4	Support WCT generally supports the four policies that apply to the Precinct. However, we seek changes to P2 in line with our submission on the introductory statement above, and P3 to clearly state that the area must be kept free of vehicular traffic.	Retain these policies, with the exceptions below where we seek these changes to be made: “P2 Provide for managed change in the staged redevelopment of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, and its connections with the transport network, wider City Centre Zone and Waterfront Zone, including: 1. Enhancing the public function, pedestrian network and public spaces within the precinct; 2. Maintaining its special character by managing the	From the officer’s report, it is still going to be described as a “staged redevelopment” area, with several other mentions of new development. That is not at all necessary as part of the Precinct description and policies – the policies should be neutral in that respect. We consider than “managed change” is a much more appropriate policy for such an important area in the District Plan. Not sure what we say about vehicle access, except that it has always been underground except for the MFC which was a parking area. The Civic Square was always a clean safe traffic-free area for childrens’ play and adult use. The officer’s report does not agree with our suggestion, but suggest this could be reworded to refer to the Civic Square only.

City Centre Zone – Te Ngakau/Civic Centre Precinct

		<p>form, scale and intensity of development;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Ensuring land use activities and <u>any new</u> development are planned and designed in a co-ordinated, site-responsive, comprehensive and integrated manner; and 4. <u>Enabling new development</u> and a range of activities that are integrated and compatible with existing buildings and land uses in the precinct.” <p>Add to P3, a new item, 4, which reads “<u>Avoids vehicle access at surface level within the precinct</u>”.</p>	
<p>New Rules, immediately before or after CCZPREC01-R7</p>	<p>New Rule Requested Demolition</p> <p>WCT seeks that Demolition of buildings is made a separate category of activity within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, separate from the City Centre applicable rule. At present it appears that there is no ability for</p>	<p>Add new rule CCZPRE-RXX: Demolition or removal of buildings and structures in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>The demolition or removal of a building is required to</u> 	<p>Suggestions rejected out-of-hand in officer’s report. The officer says these suggestions are neither “necessary or appropriate”, or are “too onerous”. This is one of the very few available public spaces in the central city, and the public absolutely should have a right to comment on changes to them. We note the extent of privatisation of the buildings round the square and the seeming lack of acceptance that the public should be allowed to take an interest in</p>

City Centre Zone – Te Ngakau/Civic Centre Precinct

	<p>the acceptability of demolition of an existing building or structure to be considered as a separate matter from the development of a consented new building or creation of public space (we note that the current rule for demolition of buildings does not refer to the rule by which a new building in the Precinct may seek consent, CCZ-R18, which may be a lacuna in the plan or a deliberate omission). We consider that all demolitions relating to this very important area should be carefully considered and publicly notified.</p> <p>New Rule Requested Change to Open Space</p> <p>We are also concerned that there is no rule for the Precinct that relates to the modification of existing open space or the development of new open space. We seek an additional rule similar to that in the Waterfront Zone.</p>	<p>avoid an imminent threat to life and/or property.</p> <p>2. Activity status: Discretionary Where the demolition or removal of a building or structure; i. Enables the creation of public space; or ii. Is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building.</p> <p>3. Activity status: Non-complying Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZPRE-RXX 1 or 2 cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PRE-RXX 2. or 3. must be publicly notified.</p> <p>Add a further new rule CCZPRE-RXXX;</p> <p>Development of new public space, or modification of existing public open space in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct</p>	<p>the design or the useability of the public space and what surrounds it.</p> <p>Our concern is that, if a new building is proposed (and it must be publicly notified), demolition of the existing building on the site becomes a permitted activity, so there is no ability for a submitter to comment on the merits of the building that is being removed as part of an application. We proposed that such demolitions should be a discretionary activity. The non-complying status should remain where there is no proposal for a replacement building.</p> <p>We suggested a competent rule for this (which has been slightly garbled by an addition in the officer’s report) and we would like the Hearing panel to seriously consider this.</p> <p>We also seek a new rule, as discretionary status, with public notification, for change or redevelopment of the existing public spaces within the Precinct. The Civic Square is much-loved, and was more so when it was properly-maintained, and the Council not providing for public input into any change in this area is reprehensible. The public space is just as important for people to express an opinion on as the buildings that frame the Civic Square. Once again, we proposed a competently-drafted rule,</p>
--	---	--	---

City Centre Zone – Te Ngakau/Civic Centre Precinct

		<p>1. Activity status: Discretionary The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022].</p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PRE-RXXX must be publicly notified.</p>	<p>which we would like the Commissioners to seriously consider. As population builds up in the City Centre, it is important that residents feel they can have a say in what their open spaces are going to be like.</p>
CCZ – S4	<p>Support</p> <p>WCT supports the exclusion of buildings and structures in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct from the minimum height of buildings standard.</p>	<p>Retain CCZ-S4, exclusion 2.</p>	<p>We support the recommendation that there should be no minimum height applying in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct.</p>

Other points (in addition to the list of submissions above):

- We supported other submitters seeking a design panel be established and all Central City developments be subject to their review. We fully support the recommendation that this be recorded as a Method in the Plan, and urge the Council to get on with it. We don't know what the criteria will be, but we suggest anything that fronts a public space should be subject to that.
- We opposed a submission of Willis Bond which asked for a new non-notified rule for additions and alterations to buildings within the Precinct. There are 2 important definitions in the plan:
Additions: *means modifications to a building or object that have the effect of increasing the gross floor area, footprint, mass or height of the building or object and includes the creation of new floor levels.*

City Centre Zone – Te Ngakau/Civic Centre Precinct

Alterations: *means modifications to a building or object that do not have the effect of increasing the gross floor area, footprint, mass or height of the building or object. Excludes: maintenance and repair.*

The officer's recommendation is to accept this submission and provide for alterations and additions without notification, but new buildings still require notification (see track changes to Rule CCZ-PREC01-R78). We would accept the suggestion in respect of alterations (as defined), maintenance and repair. However, the suggestion of additions, which could be very substantial, should not be provided for as they are likely to be of equal or greater interest to the public as a new building.

Notes prepared by Sylvia Allan, BSc(Hons), Dip TP, FNZPI