

**Submission on Proposed Plan Change Variation 11 –  
Amendments to Proposed District Plan Change 48  
(Central Area Review) - Wellington Waterfront**

**Summary**

We oppose:

- New planning rules for development around Kumutoto
- The idea of approving a plan change to develop the area around Kumutoto instead of going for a resource consent for all buildings
- Plans to allow Wellington Waterfront to approve buildings 15% above the proposed height limits

---

**My contact details:**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

I do / do not (*delete one*) wish to present my submission in person

-----

Place Stamp here

**Wellington City Council  
PO Box 2199  
Wellington**

### *Public involvement*

- 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.

### *Assessment of new buildings as a Discretionary Activity (Restricted)*

- 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.

### *Public accessibility*

- 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%.

### *Building heights*

- 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.
- 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%.
- 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 at a lower level.

### *Design excellence*

- This 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 we strongly oppose this.