

# Our City, Tomorrow

## Workshop 3: Synthesis and analysis

Global Research *for* Wellington City Council

14-12-2017

Absolutely Positively  
**Wellington City Council**  
Me Heke Ki Pōneke



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Overview .....	2
Analysis process .....	2
Report structure.....	2
Summary of all findings.....	3
Case Studies .....	4
Summary of section findings.....	5
Synthesis of comments .....	6
Pipitea case study .....	6
Waitangi case study .....	8
How we work together .....	10
Summary of section findings.....	10
Synthesis of comments .....	11
Policy and rules .....	11
Perceptions and engagement .....	11
Research and evidence .....	12
Residential.....	12
Economic.....	12
Other .....	13

## OVERVIEW

---

This report contains analysis of the comments received during Workshop Three 2017.

Three exercises were completed, covering a range of topics:

- Case study activities: would you/how would you change this approach? What are the barriers for implementation? What are the key tools for implementation? Who are the key people that must be involved?
  - Pipitea
  - Waitangi
- Placing growth: in the context of case study conversations where should we direct growth?
- How we work together: Reflecting on conversations during the workshop, discuss how we can continue working together. What are the barriers? What are the tools? Who needs to be involved?

### ***Analysis process***

The comments from Workshop Three were entered into NVivo qualitative analysis software, which assisted analysts in the organising and synthesis of information in to appropriate themes and topics – every comment was read by an analyst and all coding was peer reviewed. The content of the information collected informed the synthesis and presentation of findings, which appear in this report.

### ***Report structure***

This report is divided into two main sections, containing the results for each of the written workshop activities. The first section is also divided by location. Activity Two results are not included in this report as they were a practical participation task, involving placing blocks on a map, that did not provide data that could be analysed.

Each section commences with a summary of findings and is followed by a synthesis of all the comments received on that section. The synthesis of comments is broken into themes, and each theme is discussed in order of most comments made, to least comments made on each theme. Where there are a large number or range of comments, some themes are broken into sub-topics, to assist presentation of findings.

Key findings for each activity are discussed on pages 5 and 10, respectively.

## SUMMARY OF ALL FINDINGS

---

The participants of Workshop Three suggested many insightful concepts for the future of Wellington. Some clear areas where Wellington City Council could focus effort on, as well as several unique perspectives from participants, stood out within the findings.

Across the activities, a few key themes arose multiple times, which were:

- **Policies and rules:** the role of the Council and importance of effective policies, guidelines and restrictions were identified by a number of participants. Most of the suggested policies were regarding built infrastructure, particularly residential, but also included streetscapes.
  - A popular topic was policies regarding building heights. Wellington City Council could consider reviewing this policy to better suit the vision for Wellington.
  - Other policies that participants suggested were building standards and density guidelines.
- **Cost:** cost was a concern for participants. Some stated it was unclear who would pay for future development projects.
  - The cost of the Pipitea case study in particular was a concern for participants.
  - Other costs and economic factors were brought up, including the role of investment and the private sector for future projects, and affordability of residential dwellings.
- The desire for development to consider community and business was indicated by some participants. Both of these topics recurred in both activities.
  - Participants suggested the Council could consider ways to gather more feedback from the public.
  - Comments also referred to general community and green space. These suggestions implied that Wellington City Council should consider prioritising public space in future projects.
  - The role of small business and sustaining businesses was mentioned in the comments.
- Some of the unique comments suggested a range of ideas. These included:
  - Developing an Urban Development Agency.
  - Integrating the “Our City, Tomorrow” engagement process with “Lets get Wellington Moving”.
  - Utilising regional connections.

## CASE STUDIES

---

### Pipitea case study

During the workshop, participants were given case studies at two different locations. The first was in Pipitea, and included the following key ideas:

- Bring vibrancy and mix of activities to the area
- Make it green
- Build on strong connection to transport
- A place for families to live
- Places to spend time
- Celebrate government and history.

The Pipitea case study activity also asked participants to watch a video from NEC which proposed the following deliveries:

- Proposed 2400 residential dwellings
- Low SLR and flood risk
- Development located away from poor ground conditions
- Cost would be high!

### Waitangi case study

The second case study for the Waitangi location included the following key ideas:

- Make the Basin accessible and used
- Make it green
- Make it a place for active modes
- Bring water into public spaces
- Places to live
- Celebrate ecology.

The NEC video that participants watched for the Waitangi case study proposed the following deliveries:

- Proposed 2050 residential dwellings
- Would require major infrastructure upgrade to reduce SLR and flood risk
- Would require buildings designed to allow for poor ground conditions
- Cost is more balanced.

Given these two case study scenarios, the overall workshop question participants were asked to respond to, for both case studies, was: ***Would you/ how would you change this approach? What are the barriers for implementation? What are the key tools for implementation? Who are the key people that must be involved?***

## Summary of section findings

Below is a summary of the key themes and suggestions made on the Pipitea case study:

- **Cost** was mentioned most frequently in comments. Most comments referred to the general high cost of the project and expressed concerns about this. However, some discussed other economic concerns relating to investment and financial incentives for particular types of development.
- **Earthquake risk** was identified by a number of participants. Comments suggested they felt concerned about seismic stability.
- **Government agencies and Council** were referred to a few times. Participants stressed the importance of collaboration and leadership between and from their Council and significant government agencies such as NZTA.
- **Community and green space** were two concepts referred to by a few participants. Comments suggested a preference for including green space in the scenario. Participants also indicated they would value community space and engagement.
- **Other comments and suggestions** covered a broad range of topics including:
  - Developing Thorndon Quay
  - Investment in research of other models of development
  - Development of the Gateway Zone
  - Connections to adjacent suburbs
  - Development that allows businesses to grow and be accessible
  - Large proportion of land in public ownership
  - Using existing infrastructure
  - Motorway needs to be people and pedestrian friendly

Below is a summary of the key themes and suggestions on the Waitangi case study:

- **Suggestions** for changes or additional development to the Waitangi scenario was the most popular theme. Participants referred to a number of ideas including:
  - Physical additions, such as green space, water sensitive design, new tourist/visitor precincts, and extending Courtenay Place.
  - Planning and vision suggestions such as a better structure/master plan for the area, being more pragmatic about utilising ground floor area, and thinking bigger than just Kent/Cambridge Terraces.
- **Key people** were identified by the participants. People suggested government agencies such as NZTA, Wellington Councils, developers, urban designers, small businesses, through to community groups and schools. This suggests participants felt the scenario would need, co-operative action, involving a range of groups.
- **Government agencies and Council:** Participants mostly just stated the names of government agencies and councils including NZTA, GWRC, WCC and Wellington Water. A couple of participants suggested the role of Council as a leader, and the need to create a district plan that supports the provision of amenity in the CBD.
- **Transport** was mentioned by a few participants, covering topics including pedestrians, cyclists, mass transit, transport connections and corridors.
- **Business, community and residential development** were all mentioned by a few participants each. These comments suggested that these are elements that should be considered appropriately by decision makers in future development.

### Pipitea case study

<p><b>Economic costs</b></p> <p><b>12 comments</b></p>	<p>Several participants expressed their concern with the cost of this case study scenario. Some participants generally stated the scenario was high cost.</p> <p>Three participants specifically referred to the cost of the motorway cover/bridge.</p> <p><i>Bridge is more expensive than the land value itself</i></p> <p>Other comments covered a range of topics; participants notes are included verbatim:</p> <p><i>Current market is not viable, development model isn't giving developers less room to develop/make right decisions</i></p> <p><i>Don't invest large amounts of money on the fault line</i></p> <p><i>Finance Incentives in sensible places</i></p> <p><i>Scale SHR development (too big) -barrier \$100 million is their limit), limitation of people that can purchase 8-9K per sqm2 -not affordable housing (which is a key focus area)</i></p>
<p><b>Earthquake risk</b></p> <p><b>6 comments</b></p>	<p>Some participants questioned the seismic costs and stability of the proposed development. One comment also suggested “mandatory seismic remediation for foundations”</p> <p><i>Ability to get out in an emergency</i></p> <p><i>Seismic costs (base isolate)</i></p> <p><i>Earthquake prone</i></p>
<p><b>Suggestions</b></p> <p><b>5 comments</b></p>	<p>Some participants discussed other areas of potential development. A range of suggested projects included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Developing Thorndon Quay.</li> <li>– Investment in research of other models.</li> <li>– Development of the Gateway Zone.</li> <li>– Connections to adjacent suburbs.</li> <li>– Development that allows businesses to grow and be accessible.</li> </ul> <p><i>Invest in research of other models -co-operative development - multiple developers (finance and government, partnerships - public and private)</i></p> <p><i>Develop Thorndon Quay -work out maximum development, talk to owners, Boulevard concept with major cycle route and public transport (not private cars and parking)</i></p>
<p><b>Government agencies and council</b></p> <p><b>5 comments</b></p>	<p>Participants referred to the role of the Council, Wellington Water, NZTA, and the Crown with regard to this case study scenario.</p> <p><i>Will only work as partnership with Crown/TA</i></p> <p><i>Infrastructure e.g. Council and Wellington water etc.</i></p> <p><i>Legislative barriers (NZTA -financial and otherwise)</i></p>

	One participants suggested the creation of an Urban Development Agency.
<b>Community</b> <b>3 comments</b>	<p>Three comments referred to community. These comments are included verbatim since they each covered slightly different topics.</p> <p><i>Build for community development -mixed use and community area,</i></p> <p><i>Cover the motorway with green space and build beside it, more community involvement.</i></p> <p><i>The Right Community</i></p>
<b>Green space</b> <b>3 comments</b>	<p>Green space was suggested by a few participants. These comments discussed their preference for green space in the case study scenario.</p> <p><i>Retain park by USA Embassy -OR GREEN SPACE -It's one of the few 'sunshine' spaces for workers in the area.</i></p> <p><i>Liked 'bridging' idea but could be green connection</i></p>
<b>Other</b> <b>6 comments</b>	<p>Other comments are included verbatim, since they covered a range of one-off topics.</p> <p><i>Road Edges, especially Tinakori Street by Motorway needs to be people pedestrian friendly</i></p> <p><i>Developers</i></p> <p><i>High risk</i></p> <p><i>Large part of land in public ownership</i></p> <p><i>High volume of land with some easy wins, what is the residential model amalgamating land problem for private development model. Who is going to pay.</i></p> <p><i>Existing Infrastructure</i></p>

## Waitangi case study

---

### Suggestions

8 comments

Participants discussed a range of additional concepts or changes to the Waitangi case study scenario.

Suggestions included some physical additions such as: turning Terraces into green space, a flood overflow channel and water sensitive design, developing tourism/visitor precincts, and extending Courtenay Place.

A few participants referred to ways of thinking and planning. Their suggestions included:

*Structure Plan/Master Plan for the area? -1st floor permeable to flooding*

*Be more pragmatic about utilising ground floor area cone shape doesn't fit at all.*

*Thinking bigger than just Kent/Cambridge Tce*

---

### Key people

7 comments

Participants identified a number of key people who would need to be involved in this project. Comments simply stated the different groups, without providing detail about what their role would be or how they would be involved

- Transport groups (NZTA and GWRC).
  - Community.
  - Wellington City Council.
  - Developers.
  - Urban Development Authorities (UDA).
  - Crown.
  - Urban designers.
  - Small business.
  - Car sale-yard owners.
  - Schools.
  - Health.
- 

### Government agencies and council

7 comments

Most participants simply stated the Council and government agencies as being involved in the project. The most commonly referred to agencies were Wellington City Council, NZTA, the Crown and other Wellington Council bodies (e.g. Wellington Water and GRWC).

Two comments expanded slightly further on this. One stated the Council's role was to inform developers of what to do. Another referring to the district plan change to support provision of amenity in the CBD.

---

### Transport

6 comments

A few participants mentioned aspects of transport, including pedestrians, cyclists, mass transit, transport links and corridors.

*Mass transit plans require space*

*What is the pedestrian/cycling provision?*

*Retain a transport link? Depends on LEWM needs transport spine to go elsewhere to make it work?*

Two participants mentioned the Lets Get Wellington Moving engagement campaign.

---

---

*Elephant in the Room -Lets Get Welly Moving? E.g. Basin Flyover  
aka No 2 -2Bridges and Tunnel -what goes thru our transport  
corridors*

*SH1 (LGWM)*

One other comment referring to the tunnelling of the state highway is included verbatim.

*Causes: BLIGHT since 1960s -Tunnel state highway asap!*

---

**Businesses**

**5 comments**

Five participants mentioned businesses. Comments covered a range of topics including:

- The role of small business
  - Finding an alternative location for current businesses
  - Long term business changes
  - Amalgamation of Hania Street businesses to redevelop the area.
  - The role of car sale-yards
- 

**Community**

**5 comments**

A few participants referred to community aspects of the scenario. Two mentioned the future community and generations, questioning what should be designed for these groups looking forward.

Two participants also specifically referred to schools.

*Future community -what do you want??*

*Service providers -schools, small business, health*

---

**Residential**

**4 comments**

Participants discussed different aspects of residential dwellings. These comments are included verbatim.

*Lack of design standards for apartments*

*Gated community -space in middle of apartment building  
unfriendly -open space on roof*

*Apartment design guide -internal amenity and liveability  
(residents and long-term rentals)*

*Co-op housing models for apartments*

---

**Other**

**7 comments**

Participants mentioned other topics. Some comments were very short, or lacked context and were therefore difficult to associate with a theme. These comments are included verbatim.

*Co-ordination -Mechanisms to get car sales land to be developed*

*UDA -compulsory acquisition? No good, demand and effect  
economics for this.*

*\$2 Billion Project*

*Infrastructure*

*LEW Moving Solution*

*Larger prices of land*

*Keep life or Street network*

---

## HOW WE WORK TOGETHER

---

Workshop question: *Reflecting on conversations during this workshop discuss how we can continue working together.*

- *What are the barriers?*
- *What are the tools?*
- *Who needs to be involved?*

### Summary of section findings

Participants reflected on the workshop activities and discussed a broad range of topics. Workshop participants identified some clear barriers, tools, and people who need to be involved.

- **Policy and rules** were suggested by several participants. Comments referred to many different aspects of Council policy or restrictions including: height restrictions, density guidelines, plan and strategy formation and delivery mechanisms.
- **Perceptions and engagement** was a frequently mentioned topic. Participants identified the need for community engagement. A few comments also stated a change in behaviour and perceptions is required to work together on a new vision and concepts for Wellington.
- **Research and evidence** was expressed as an important aspect of future development. Participants discussed modelling, research, and evidence from outside Wellington as key mechanisms for change.
- **Residential:** several participants suggested concepts for living, including mixed communities, multi-generational, high density, mixed affordability, and mixed household types.
- **Economic** aspects were mentioned by a few participants. These comments referred to different financial costs and development challenges.

### Policy and rules

---

#### 11 comments

Participants referred to Council rules such as building density, height, and incentives. Comments discussed preference for 70/80 units/building, height limits that enable 11/12 storey buildings to be developed, and incentivising businesses to develop 'living areas'.

*Height limits need to be able to build 11/12 storey buildings for feasibility*

Other comments relating to policies and planning tools included:

- Relationship with other plans and strategies, including the long-term plan.
- What would the delivery mechanism be for this?
- More freedom and better building guidelines.
- Plans that identify development areas in the CBD and suburbs.

A few other comments discussed outlying topics regarding policy and rules.

*Integration between "Lets get Welly moving" and "Our City Tomorrow"*

*Risk if fully notified consent in central area*

*What's the role of compulsory acquisition?*

---

### Perceptions and engagement

---

#### 11 comments

A few participants discussed community engagement. Comments similarly stated support for more engagement between the decision makers and the general public.

*Whose vision? How do we ensure we get feedback from the wider community*

Several comments referred to perceptions and behaviour. Some stated a change in behaviour and perceptions is required to enable collaboration on a new vision and concepts for Wellington.

*What behaviours/perceptions/pre-conceptions do we want people to leave behind to achieve this vision*

*What levers do we have to create change - especially in a market driven system*

*People oppose things next door - pushes development to areas of least opposition*

---

## Research and evidence

---

### 7 comments

Several participants discussed using research, evidence and modelling to inform future actions.

*How do we bring anecdotal evidence from overseas and apply it to Wellington - need research*

*3 water capacity modelling*

*Research into liveable, low cost buildings for residential development*

---

## Residential

---

### 6 comments

Comments that referred to residential dwellings suggested a number of different living concepts. These included:

- Need to change types of apartments on offer to get more people into high density.
  - Kid-friendly and elderly-friendly apartments.
  - Need a range of apartment sizes for different household types.
  - Mixed community development is challenged by two to three-bedroom units with small to no margins, and no appetite for development.
  - There is a cost to invest in green and affordable homes.
  - Using people's cultural beliefs to convince them to buy into apartment living.
- 

## Economic

---

### 3 comments

Three participants mentioned economic factors. These comments are included verbatim as the topic of them varied.

*Timeframes/finance = maintaining impetus*

*Banks increase risk averse as approach lending caps*

*Cost to invest in green and affordable homes*

---

## Other

---

### 9 comments

A few other comments discussed the city vision. Participants discussed articulating the vision and having leaders that promote it, partnering all areas to make things happen, and regional connections and discussions.

*Sell the sizzle and show regional connections*

Some outlying comments discussing types of infrastructure were also received. The suggested infrastructure included green space, car parking and road space as barriers to liveability, and integrated infrastructure (e.g. flooding car parks, open spaces).

*More green space that substitutes for backyards - barbeques, gardening, dog exercise areas*

One other comment regarding the tension between development and affordability/fit in place was received.

*Tension between quality development that fits in place and affordability*

---