

**Before Independent Hearing Commissioners appointed by Wellington
City Council**

In the matter of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

And

In the matter of hearing of submissions on the Proposed Wellington City District
Plan

Between

Oyster Management Limited

and

Wellington City Council

Statement of corporate evidence of Tom Jamieson on behalf of
Oyster Management Limited (submitter 404)

Hearing Stream 4

Dated 15 June 2023

MinterEllisonRuddWatts.

PO Box 105 249 Auckland City 1143

T +64 9 353 9700

Solicitor acting: Amy Dresser | amy.dresser@minterellison.co.nz

Partner responsible: Bianca Tree | bianca.tree@minterellison.co.nz
901418988:3

MAY IT PLEASE THE COMMISSIONERS

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Alexander Thomas Jamieson.
2. I hold a Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Commerce.
3. I currently hold the position of Commercial Asset Manager at Oyster Management Limited (**Oyster**). I have been in this position since April 2022.
4. My previous work experience includes working for CBRE Investment Management in Australia and Nuveen Investment Management in the United Kingdom.
5. I provide this evidence in support of Oyster's submissions on the Proposed Wellington District Plan (**Proposed Plan**). This statement relates to the City Centre Zone (**CCZ**) of the Proposed Plan.

SCOPE

6. My evidence will address the following matters:
 - (a) Background to Oyster and its Wellington City Centre properties;
 - (b) The commercial constraints of development feasibility; and
 - (c) The importance of having rules and standards that enable high quality development in the City Centre zone.
7. In preparing my evidence, I have reviewed:
 - (a) The CCZ chapter of the Proposed Plan;
 - (b) The draft statement of evidence of Joe Jeffries; and
 - (c) The draft statement of evidence of Kevin Pugh for Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited.

BACKGROUND TO OYSTER AND OYSTER'S WELLINGTON CITY CENTRE PROPERTIES

8. Oyster is a commercial property and fund manager that manages a portfolio of office, retail, large format retail, and industrial properties throughout New Zealand. Oyster manages approximately \$2.0 billion in commercial property assets.
9. Oyster's office assets comprise of commercial business parks and CBD offices. Its retail assets include regional shopping centres, outlet centres, suburban convenience centres, large format retail, and supermarkets. Its industrial assets comprise of logistic, manufacturing, and warehouse facilities in established industrial areas.
10. Oyster's investment strategy is to partner with retail and wholesale investors, as well as capital partners, to maximise the long-term fundamentals of commercial property investment. We do this through a proactive, disciplined management strategy, which has been proven to provide stable, risk adjusted returns over two decades.
11. Oyster is committed to holding a sustainable portfolio of properties and partnering with investors and tenants to meet environmental goals.
12. As Oyster continues to reinvest in its portfolio, it wishes to ensure that the Proposed Plan has appropriate controls that recognise the commercial constraints of development and enable high quality development in the CCZ.
13. Oyster owns the following properties in the CCZ:
 - (a) **Pastoral House – 94 Lambton Quay:** This property is an 18-level office tower with ground floor retail. It is located between Lambton Quay and the northern end of The Terrace. The property is largely occupied by MBIE – levels 2-18 with 10+ years remaining lease term, with the ground floor retail premises occupied by BNZ, Kiwibank and two café operators.
 - (b) **Fujitsu Tower – 141 The Terrace:** Fujitsu Tower is a 17-level office tower situated above a two-level retail podium known as the Cable Car Shopping Centre, which is held under separate ownership. It is in a central location, with dual frontages on The Terrace and Lambton

Quay. The property is occupied by five office tenants and a café tenancy. Main tenants are Ministry of Justice, NZ Productivity Commission, Beyond Services Limited and the Asia New Zealand Foundation.

THE IMPORTANCE OF HAVING RULES AND STANDARDS THAT RECOGNISE THE COMMERCIAL CONSTRAINTS OF DEVELOPMENT AND ENABLE HIGH QUALITY DEVELOPMENT IN THE CITY CENTRE ZONE

14. When Oyster undertakes a development project it will consider the relevant rules and standards in the district plan. If rules and standards are not complied with and resource consent is required the cost, timeframe, and risk for a project increase and Oyster's appetite to undertake the development is reduced.
15. When undertaking a development, Oyster generally designs the development to trigger as few requirements for resource consent as possible. Therefore, the rules and standards in the Proposed Plan have a strong bearing on the scale of a development, and in turn whether that development will be commercially feasible.
16. If the rules and standards in the Proposed Plan are restrictive, or impose unnecessary consent triggers, it can lead to a less efficient use of the site, reduced innovation, lack of unique design features, and lost opportunity for enhanced public amenity. Overall, inappropriate rules and standards can result in a worse outcome.
17. Oyster considers it important that the rules and standards support high quality development to be undertaken. High quality buildings are important for creating a vibrant City Centre where people want to live, work, and visit.
18. There are various rules and standards in the Proposed Plan that will have a bearing on development. I have addressed some of the key provisions that will have implications for development in the CCZ below. I have also reviewed a draft of the statement of evidence by Kevin Pugh, and I agree with his comments in respect of project feasibility and concerns around the time and cost of the resource consent process.

Building height

19. The building height allowed by the Proposed Plan is particularly important.
20. Building height is a key factor in assessing the feasibility of a development. Greater building height makes a development more feasible because fixed costs can be spread across more floor area. Spreading the costs of development allows developers to focus on superior design, seismic strength capabilities, aesthetically pleasing and user-friendly floor-fitouts, additional building amenities and sustainability initiatives that make high quality buildings. In particular, the added costs for seismic strengthening are particularly important in the Wellington context, and it is important that there is flexibility in the optimum building height to account for this.
21. I understand that the Council Officer recommends removing height limits in the CCZ. I support the recommendation for unlimited height limits in the CCZ.

Other rules and standards


22. There are other rules and standards in the CCZ chapter that are overly restrictive and may inhibit development of new buildings or redevelopment of existing buildings.
23. For example, under CCZ-R19 any alterations or additions that alter the external appearance of a building require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. This rule is overly restrictive as resource consent will be required for minor alterations and additions that do not have a material impact on appearance. The requirement for resource consent is an additional and unnecessary cost on property owners that will discourage improvements to the exterior of buildings.
24. Another example is standard CCZ-S8. CCZ-S8 as notified, requires that any new building or addition to an existing building adjoining a street with an active frontage control must be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary. While I agree that it is important to have an active frontage, there can be good design outcomes such as provision of an outdoor seating area by

setting a building back. This control is overly restrictive and should support outcomes that may further enhance the activation of the street frontage.

CONCLUSION

25. Mr Jeffries' evidence addresses the specific provisions that require amendment, and I support these amendments to support ongoing development and investment in the Wellington CBD.
26. For the reasons set out in this evidence I seek that the Hearing Panel grant the relief sought by Oyster as refined in Appendix 1 to Mr Jeffries evidence.

DATED at Auckland this 15 June 2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tom Jamieson' with a stylized flourish at the end.

Tom Jamieson