

Purpose: To represent and advocate for all Auckland city centre residents to Auckland Council and other relevant agencies/organisation. The purpose of such representation is to make known the concerns of residents, to work for the best possible living environment and to support community building in the City Centre.



ccrg.org.nz

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER of an application by Auckland Council for non-complying resource consent for the construction, operation, use, occupation and maintenance of a new public space in the Ferry basin between Princes Wharf, Pier 2 and the Ferry Building.

SUBMISSION ON PUBLICLY NOTIFIED APPLICATION FOR ALTERATIONS TO THE FERRY BASIN

RESOURCE CONSENT BUN60338600, CST60338601, DIS60338602, LUC60338603

Dated 12 July 2019

To Auckland Council
By email haylee.minoprio@at.govt.nz

Name of Submitter Auckland City Centre Residents' Group (CCRG)

This is a submission on an application from Auckland Council for resource consents as follows.

Site Address

109-129 Quay Street, land and wharf between the eastern edge of Princes Wharf and the western edge of the Ferry Building

Application Numbers

BUN60338600, CST60338601, DIS60338602, LUC60338603

Name of Applicant

Auckland Council

Applicant's email address

Haylee.minoprio@at.govt.nz

Proposal

Auckland Council has applied for resource consents to provide enhanced public space in the area between Princes Wharf, Pier 2 and the Ferry Building. The development of the new public space is proposed to be undertaken in two main stages: -Stage 1 (this application) includes the demolition of the existing wharf and deck and replacement with a new piled structure in the Coastal Marine Area (CMA) incorporating a tidal shelf of interconnected spaces, a Pohutukawa coastal forest connecting the tidal shelf to Quay Street, tidal pools and outcrops.

This submission opposes the whole application.

This submission relates to entire application.

auckland city centre residents' group

po box 106 667 auckland 1143

The submitter is not a trade competitor of the applicant.

The submitter wishes to be heard in support of the submission.

If others make a similar submission the submitter will not present a joint case with them at the hearing.

The specific parts of the application that the submission relates to are the entire application.

The submitter requests that the entire application be **declined**.

REASONS FOR SUBMISSION

The proposal does not promote social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing and is inconsistent with Part 2 RMA sections 104 (1) and (6).

The proposal is an unnecessary extension into harbour space when reasonable and more appropriate alternatives for improved public spaces can be provided in several different downtown locations without compromising the visible and usable water space within the ferry basin.

The proposal compromises the outcomes required for the Downtown Ferry basin in Auckland Transports' 10 year Ferry Development Plan.

The proposal does not support activation of Queens Wharf as required under the Passenger Ferry Terminal Improvements outlined in the 2012 Waterfront Plan.

The proposal destroys the last remaining area of heritage waterfront space on Auckland's city centre waterfront, being the space between Princes and Captain Cook wharf. There are a cluster of built heritage items within this immediate area which will be adversely affected by these proposed changes. Anchoring this cluster is the Ferry Building, Listed by Heritage New Zealand as a Category 1 historic place (List No. 102) and included in the Auckland Unitary Plan heritage schedule. Over time, we have seen the gradual degradation of the Ferry Building by the addition of balconies, canopies, ducting and an array of air filtration units clamped onto the building which accumulatively diminish the heritage values of the place and its primary function as a Ferry Building. Furthermore, extending into the harbour on the seaside elevation, as is proposed in this resource consent, maroon's the building even further displacing the building's relationship with the sea.

Parts of the proposed public space is recognised by Heritage New Zealand in The Harbour Historic Area Listing (List No. 7158) and includes 19th and early 20th century remnants. The CCRG supports the concept of a public space however not at the detriment to these remnants. The Wharf Pavilions (or kiosks) must remain in situ whilst the works take place with effort to restore them back to their original iteration, prioritised. This would extend to the removal of the glass walls to enhance public enjoyment and the restoration of the Marseille roof tiles (on both structures). Commercial operation from these pavilions should cease as this would be incongruous with the intent of the area as a public space and either become interpretive spaces or activations where community and or public benefit are prioritised.

The overall proposal is funded, or party funded, from the contested sale of the public space known as QEII square and, as such, should have been subjected to Clause 2.3 and 3.1 of Auckland Councils Significance and Engagement Policy as required in the Local Government Act 2002. Engagement around funding, as part of the Long Term Plan, or as part of other statutory processes such as Road Stopping is inadequate for citizens to determine what options were investigated and provide them with adequate information together with the opportunity to decide on their preferred option.

No new/enhanced public spaces are being provided, as replacement for the QEII square, rather existing public space is being repurposed. No information, or opportunity has been provided that would allow citizens to decide whether any compromise required should come from ferry activities or POAL activities and, as this is a strategic decision, it should have been subjected to councils Significance and Engagement Policy.

The proposal comprises one project that is to be constructed in two stages with the value and impacts of each stage dependent on the other but, with no information provided on the second stage of the project, it is impossible for the effects of the overall project to be determined.

Without adequate information on both stages of the project it is also not possible to measure how, or if, the objectives of the 2012 City Centre Master Plan and Waterfront Plan are being delivered.

The proposal adversely impacts on pedestrian amenity on, and around, what will be some of the busiest pedestrian areas in the city centre connecting bus, train and ferry passengers between Albert Street, Queen Streets and ferry terminals.

The proposal makes little reference to its connection with Queens wharf which was purchased by taxpayers and ratepayers at a cost of \$40m specifically for the provision of public, ferry, and cruise spaces in the downtown area and which numerous studies have confirmed is the preferred area for improved public space on the waterfront i.e. Admiralty Steps/Queens Wharf south as providing the best connection to Queen Street.

RELIEF SOUGHT

For the reasons stated above, the entire application should be declined or, as a minimum, deferred until such time as adequate information is available to determine the effects of the overall Downtown Public Space project and Council has exercised its capacity, as 100% shareholder in POAL, for any changes considered necessary in the Statement of Intent so as to facilitate developments related to the Central Wharves Strategy and specifically the Harbour Edge Stitch and Admiralty Steps proposals.

Dated this9th day of July 2019.

Signed for and on behalf of the Submitter.



Adam Parkinson

Secretary CCRG