10 August 2007

## Re: Proposed Waterfront Development Plan

This submission is from the Wellington Architectural Centre, a group which represents both professional and non-professionals interested in architecture and design, and in the promotion of good design in Wellington. Any members of the Centre who are involved in projects on the waterfront or who work for firms working on the waterfront have not been involved in the writing of this submission.

## 1) Support for the Waterfront Development Plan

In the main we support the Waterfront Development Plan and see the process followed for the waterfront as a good model which should be mirrored in other public works around the city. This is an important area of our city though and must continue to exhibit high quality design decision-making.

## 2) Specific points of support

The Architectural Centre strongly supports the continuing use of the Technical Advisory Group. We support this model because it ensures that independent professional advice has a strong voice in the development of such an important part of the city. This is an excellent model which we encourage to be adopted in all other similar public projects.

We support the proposed ideas competition for Frank Kitts Park. We consider that the ideas competition was an important part of the process for achieving a successful design for Waitangi Park. In a similar vein we have previously expressed support for the design competition which produced designs for Sites 1-3 (John Wardle design) and Site 4 (UN Studio design) and we support progress on these.

We support the building of the wharewaka and wharenui/wharekai buildings and are concerned about the amount of delays caused by debates over carparking.

We also support the council's intention to encourage the continuance of wharf activities. We believe that these made significance contributions to the appeal and character of the waterfront.

## 3) Specific areas of concern

The Centre considers that the beautification of the Quays has been a superficial engagement with the Waterfront Master Plan which derived from Jan Gehl's recommendations. We do not support such tokenism. The council must engage with the Waterfront Master Plan recommendations in a meaningful manner. We encouarge the council to thoroughly implement the Waterfront Master Plan. This is an issue of effective traffic calming and the making of real connections between the waterfront and the CBD - not merely tree planting.

We still have concerns about the proposed Hilton. In particular we are unsure about the impact of such a development on this area of the waterfront which is inherently public property. We consider that this project must provide meaningful public access to the ground floors, and the continuation and encouragement of wharf functions around the site. We are concerned about the implications for increased vehicular traffic on the waterfront in relation to public safety, access for pedestrians and cyclists, and the general atmosphere of the waterfront. We also do not support the lack of indoor sports facilities in the inner city location which this development will cause. As previously



raised we are also concerned about the design of the Hilton's lack of respect for established view shafts, and this needs to be rectified.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. If you have any questions about any of the points raised please contact me.

Yours sincerely

Christine McCarthy President The Architectural Centre