



8 September 1999

Mr Stuart Macaskill
Chairman
Wellington Regional Council
P O Box 11-646
WELLINGTON

ORIGINAL
OF FAXED COPY

Dear Stuart

I refer to your letter of 4 August 1999 addressed to Nigel Could. This letter related to interest in our Company's development plans for our Kaiwharawhara land. Nigel has asked that I compile and forward to you a brief note covering the background of relevant issues.

The Company is committed to acting and has always acted in a matter consistent with being a good corporate citizen. The Company is committed to being environmentally responsible.

We fully participated in the statutory process providing for the establishment of the Wellington Regional Coastal Plan and the Wellington City District Plan. This process is continuing with our Company bringing to a conclusion the final remaining outstanding matters which have been referred to the Environment Court of which the height limits at the Kaiwharawhara Reclamation are but one issue.

With regard to the Kaiwharawhara Reclamation we have consulted with interest groups on a number of occasions and each of the meetings was amicable. It was our view that the key concerns of the groups that talked with us had been met. We will be meeting with these groups again to consult further and to correct a number of misconceptions that various groups have.

Again with regard to the Kaiwharawhara Reclamation and consultation with the Wellington City Council, we voluntarily offered and agreed to the incorporation in the proposed consent order an obligation to consult with interest groups when our Company wishes to proceed with any development works at Kaiwharawhara.

There is agreement between ourselves and the Wellington City Council as to the content of the Consent Order which provides in general terms for a height limit of 18.6 metres with a site coverage limitation of 50%. This has taken a significant amount of time in negotiations. Much of this with the Wellington City Council outlining and explaining our needs and those of the adjoining property owner Tranz Rail Limited.

CentrePort Limited
PO Box 794
Wellington, New Zealand
Telephone +64 4 495 3800
Facsimile +64 4 495 3820
www.centreport.co.nz

I have read the submissions of Joyce Griffin for Action for the Environment Inc which accompanied your letter of 4 August 1999. Unfortunately, much of the content of that submission is incorrect. My comments are as follows:

1. The Port Company secured the Kaiwharawhara Point Reclamation for the purpose of future port development and the value of that reclamation was taken into account in establishing the value of the business. There has never been any undertaking or intention indicated, either by the former Wellington Harbour Board, our Company or the Wellington Regional Council for the reclamation to be gazetted as a reserve. To the contrary our Company has never hidden the fact that the area will, at some time in the future, be developed as an operational port area. To prevent this development would have adverse implications for the value and future of the Company.
2. The area has and will continue to be used for operational port activity and the future use of the reclamation for port activity was part of the trade off releasing/gifting the **Lambton** Harbour Project Area to the citizens of Wellington.
3. Public access to the Kaiwharawhara Point Reclamation has been curtailed for many years. Access is and has been locked off. The public can access land adjoining the motorway by using a rail bridge. This accessible land is under the control of the Crown (Transit). It appears the interests groups may be **confused** over the differing ownerships of these areas.
4. The so called "Sesqui Sign" issue had nothing to do with, ie is irrelevant to the ownership or rights of use of the Kaiwharawhara Point Reclamation. The sign was erected based on support from Wellington City Council who also agreed the sign should not be resurrected following its demise.
5. Some time after the reclamation was created the then WHB responded to representations from community groups by organising a limited planting programme as an interim to improve the appearance of the area until the port proceeded with a comprehensive development. The plantings however were unsuccessful and none of the trees survived. A few flax bushes of an introduced specie do appear to remain. Given the harsh environment in this area these plants must be exceptionally hardy;
6. The future of the Kaiwharawhara Point land as open space has been fully debated with the interested parties being involved and the outcome was for the removal of the Open Space Character Area and its replacement with the Operational Port Character Area, but with an unrealistic limitation on height at 12 metres. Our Company, along with Tranz Rail, have been able to demonstrate to the Council that a height limit of at least 18.6 metres is necessary to facilitate the establishment of the normal type structures associated with port operational activity. The visual impact of such structures, having regard to the site coverage limitations, would be momentary in terms of their effect of the vista of the remaining port area and the city beyond. The development of the area for operational port activity and its impact is a

subjective issue with probably an equal number of people supporting the interest factor generated by a vibrant operational port activity to those wishing to see an open space area.

7. There is no doubt that the Company will and does require the Kaiwharawhara Reclamation. The health of the Company and many related businesses rests on our ability to efficiently move cargo and of particular relevance forestry products. The reclamation is established adjacent to deep water and with a rail siding. The site is capable of being developed with direct access **from** the motorway. The growth of forestry cargo has been very strong and is projected to accelerate. Coping with, and supporting this growth, requires the reclamation. Further any relocation of freight activity from wharves near the city will probably require the development of the reclamation.
8. The “computer generated simulated photographs” of the site that are in circulation bear no **resemblance** to any possible development. Any development would have to take place much closer to sea level, ie with a radically different height profile to that purported to be shown by the faked pictures. The computer generated simulated photographs pictures appear to have been taken from the perspective of someone lying down under the motorway armco barrier of the motorway. This is unlikely to be a pursuit entertained or even attempted by many.

Finally, whatever activity our Company establishes on the site it will and will have to meet **the** statutory environmental controls applicable at the time of development. Should there be any **further queries with** regard to the above please do not hesitate to contact us regarding the same.

Regards



Ken Harris
Chief Executive