APPENDIX 3: SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AND ASSOCIATED SUMMARY TABLE

Appendix 3

Summary of Submissions

#	Submitter	Support/Oppose	Reasons for Submission
1	Tom Rutherford	Support	• Does not see a reason why not to build the hotel
2	Ruth Houghton	Oppose	• Against proposed height**.** Would obstruct views of heritage buildings and shade the Octagon during winter hours. • Requests application be declined due to excessive height
3	Kathleen Aloniu	Oppose	• Hotel would take away much needed parking. Will affect submitter as leaseholder and have detrimental effect on visitors to nearby public facilities and events. Limited parking space in this area of city. • Hotel not in keeping with surrounding buildings. • Requests not build hotel on this site
4	Vivienne Cuff	Oppose	• Against glass cladding design as not in keeping with heritage look and feel of the city. Submitter not opposed to a hotel but prefers redevelopment of existing old buildings into hotel accommodation. • Opposes consent unless hotel on more appropriate site and redesigned.
5	John & James Hanan & Hansborough House Ltd	Oppose	• Application against the District Plan in numerous aspects and totally unsuitable for Dunedin • Requests application be declined in full
6	David Ryan	Support	• Good for economy of Dunedin • Hotel facilities needed to cater for growing tourism. • Jobs both directly for hotel employees, and indirectly for suppliers and other businesses that would be visited by hotel guests. • Would support Dunedin's status as a major NZ city by offering appropriate hotel facilities for local and international tourists • Requests application be approved
7	Patricia Shaw	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions • Design will have 'negative physical' effect on inner city • Will exacerbate parking difficulty • Requests application be disallowed
8	John Madden	Support	• Breach of height restrictions alone <u>not</u> sufficient argument to reject consent'. • Impact on views minor and will reduce with time as the tower blends in to view • Negative submissions on design subjective and have no place in decision making • Requests consent be granted with conditions including monitoring of construction times and sedimentation controls for earthworks
9	Carolyn Burns	Oppose	• Building height greatly exceeds height restrictions in the operative plan. • Block views to heritage buildings • Hotel will shade important areas of Dunedin e.g. Octagon, Moray Place • Building will funnel winds in and around adjacent streets. Submitter consider important consideration, particularly for elderly and people with compromised mobility visiting the library and events at town hall. • Building height will obscure views of heritage buildings and diminish associated heritage values. • Glass cladding will create contrast that further diminishes heritage and aesthetic values of area. • Requests proposal be rejected
10	Timothy Marshall	Oppose	• Against bulk and location of hotel-apartment complex • Proposal would adversely affect social activity due to visual and environmental impact. • Shading from hotel would reach the Town Hall, Public Library, St Paul's Cathedral and Octagon. • Sound pollution: sound from traffic will reflect back off the hotel. • Increase in wind corridor effect • Only a sporadic need for accommodation of this sort. Negatives outweigh the benefits. • Requests that if there is a need for more accommodation redevelopment of existing buildings be considered, such as utilising large empty buildings south of Queen's Gardens. Excellent spaces for conferences and meetings already exist – i.e. Town Hall and University.

11	Ernest Jefferson Munro	Oppose	• Height and design inappropriate. Breaches zone requirements and does not fit with the style of the area, and will block views and create shade. • Proposal will exacerbate parking problem in the area • Submitter believes plenty of better locations and preferably for low rise building. • DCC has spent money on exploratory work so disqualifies itself from objective judgement of proposal • Requests application be rejected
12	Mark Wellington – Image Services Ltd Contact	Support	• 5 star hotel good for Dunedin as currently lacks this standard of accommodation. • Great for employment and business opportunities • Requests application be approved
13	Frances Ross	Oppose	• Height well in excess of 11m limit. Submitter considers it will dwarf surrounding buildings and obscure view, especially for people living and working uphill from the hotel. It would dominate central Dunedin and not be in keeping with Dunedin's low rise building, traditional character • Design ultra modern in size, shape and materials and will not fit with surrounding building. People value historic and traditional values of the city (e.g. Vogel Street revitalisation) and the hotel goes against people's values of the city. Hotel would significantly, adversely affect Dunedin character • Shading will be a problem, and sun is much needed in Dunedin which has cool weather. Shading will be unacceptable, especially in winter. Harrop Street, Moray Place, Filleul Street and Octagon would all become colder and more shaded. • Increased wind at ground level unacceptable for pedestrians • Construction noise would be considerable. Hotel of this size would take a long time to build and construction noise would be at a very high level. Submitter considers problematic to those who enjoy quiet in surrounding areas (library, cafes, etc). • Requests application be rejected
14	Elizabeth and Murray Hanan	Oppose	• Building not compatible with adjacent structures in style and will dominate and diminish heritage buildings. Bad for tourism. • Height excessive and overpowers inner city building standards contrary to District Plan • Oppose unit title subdivision due to parking problems and traffic flow • Oppose earthworks of this magnitude • Shading and glare effects • Existing conferences facilities will be negatively affected, particularly by loss of car parking. • Requests Council oppose this development
15	John Cutler from Cutler Investments	Support	• Strongly supports development and considers it a good use of land (notes proposal affects view from his property) • Will have beneficial effects on surrounding neighbourhood • Will help future of Dunedin through employment and future opportunities • Requests proposal be accepted in full
16	Ulla Reymann	Oppose	• Proposal not in keeping with character of Dunedin • Glass structure, non-complying height and mass will negate amenity of heritage buildings and cityscape • Modern buildings should be a 'reflection of the old transformed into a vision to the future' • Requests Council oppose application
17	Neville Butcher	Oppose	• Maximum height in District Plan made in conjunction with Dunedin community and set to maintain character and scale of heritage city. Proposal majorly non-compliant. Submitter disagrees with developer's statement that that height is a specification of a 5 star hotel as it's not the case in NZ or throughout the world. Submitter considers proposed height is out of context with anything around it and will have consequential adverse effects: creating shade, changing wind currents and dominating cityscape. • Proposal will destroy heritage values which need to be protected now and for future generations. • More relevant site should be sought so the hotel can fit with city values • Requests application be rejected

18	Jacqueline Fraser	Support	• Good space for modern quality hotel and design suitable • While may alter some views reflections will enhance heritage views of city. Built against hillside so will reduce impact of the height • Supports consent
19	Jennifer Frost	Oppose	• Against very high very glass building • Dunedin has buildings of low height and low reflective nature, proposed hotel not in keeping with this style. • Building would block views and sun, and be a 'sore thumb' in Dunedin • Location next to stadium would be better • Heritage values need to be protected • Apartments do not need to be in the city centre • Requests proposal be disallowed
20	Rosemary McQueen	Oppose	• Height: Breaches height stated in DP. Height was set after extensive community consultation to increase to 16m under 2GP, and hotel far exceeds that. Disregard to community opinion and input. • Shading: Shading in Octagon will be particularly bad in winter • Block views of some businesses and residences to heritage parts of Dunedin and peninsula. • Opposed to apartments as its doubtful Dunedin has a need for this type of accommodation. Occupancy figures haven't been predicted in the application. If left unoccupied (which submitter thinks is likely) it is an insult to those residents whose views have been disrupted. • Street design: Podium steps and entrance to building does not facilitate engagement between the building and street life. • If shops are to be included they will draw retail shoppers out of the main street and affect local businesses. Would also object to chain shops being located at the hotel. • Requests application be rejected in current form, or if consented, conditions be imposed regarding height, alignment to street, restriction to hotel activity only, and on the location of vehicle parking.
21	Rod Macleod	Oppose	• Glass cladding type is not in keeping with surroundings or rest of city. • Proposed height and bulk is significantly higher than rules and significant imposed with precinct • Ownership and long term accommodation units an offensive addition to the bulk of the building • Requests modification of development if it is consented. Submitter seeks that construction and cladding should not comprise mirror glass curtain walls, and reduction of bulk by removal of all proposed apartments and penthouse units.
22	Jacob Bosshard	Oppose	• Against breach of height restrictions, which was set after considerable community and expert consultation • Height of proposed hotel would dominate area and dwarf heritage buildings. Heritage buildings should maintain dominancy in the area. • Hotel would be seen from all over Dunedin, and is 'pretentious' in size. • Against the increase in shading • Wellington and Auckland have shifted from personal, people-friendly areas to huge glass clad buildings which creates bland and impersonal effect, does not want Dunedin to follow this trend • If the proposal was accepted it would set a precedent whereby other similar buildings would be accepted which promotes a type of development Dunedin residents don't want • Oppose the proposal as is completely • Proposal needs to have height reduced, and style changed to be more modest and sympathetic (paying homage to) its surroundings. • Requests application be declined
23	Tracy Sarah Jones	Oppose	• Against glassy reflection of hotel design, not in keeping with surroundings. Hotel would dominate area and take away from heritage amenity • Shade surrounding important areas and homes, including the submitter's home • Requests consent be refused
24	Patricia Brown	Oppose	• Against bullying tone of developer stating height is not open to negotiation. Unfair considering the height restriction was formed through considerable community and expert input. • Dwarf every other building and take away from heritage amenity value of

			CBD. • Block views • Believes money made from hotel will not benefit Dunedin and that the 'trickle down' theory is unproven • The proposed retail outlet will draw tourists away from existing shops • Tourism is very important to Dunedin, and until there are safeguards in place to deal with 'cheap, glitzy' hotel developments this proposal should be declined.
25	John Crump	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions • Submitter owns home which was built with views of Town Hall and Clocktower in mind, due to height restrictions in DP they did not anticipate their views becoming blocked. Proposed hotel would dominate outlook from their property. • Oppose the breach of height restrictions. Submitter is supportive of the idea of the hotel if it stayed within the 11m height restriction. • Requests proposal be rejected
26	Mark Brunton. Acting managing agents for Erinic Investments Limited	Support	• While application supported submitter has concerns at extent of earthworks and potential piling work and effects on 71 George Street.. • Requests need for piling be eliminated, if possible, or the effects are mitigated to be less than minor in terms of both vibration and noise.
27	Barry Graham Ward	Oppose	• Location and design: proposed hotel would dominate landscape and deter tourists and locals from central areas. • Need to protect heritage style for tourists. • Negatively affect views for many residents and tourists, e.g. tourists on the Monarch boat. Dunedin residents live here because of heritage buildings and low height restrictions which create good views. • Against breach of height restriction • Shading to surrounding areas • Reduced income to existing retail and hospitality shops • Vibration from construction may negatively affect heritage buildings. Submitter does not believe the hotel will be a source of income for Dunedin. • May exacerbate stormwater issues • Create a wind tunnelling effect • Exacerbate parking problems in area • If approved will set a precedent to more breaches of height restrictions and architecture that is not in keeping with rest of city
28	Peter Malcolm William Entwisle	Oppose	• Against height; it would block views from Cargill and London Streets of heritage buildings. • Design: Modernist style, in particular the glass cladding, not in keeping with heritage buildings and 'revivalist' design. • Increase wind • Exacerbate parking issue • Requests application be declined in entirety
29	Carolyn Rennie	Support	• Supports application in its entirety. • Request Council agree to application
30	Stuart Laing	Neutral	• While the applicant is neutral in regards to the hotel submission, he believes that the height of the hotel should be reassessed to mitigate the loss of views (which affects his property and tenants). • Construction materials should be more in keeping with surrounding buildings
31	Hilary Hunt	Oppose	• Against height of hotel • Out of character with Dunedin architecture • Against the increase of shade • Negatively affect tourism. Tourists come to see heritage buildings • Wants council to oppose hotel in full • Requests consent be refused
32	Sandy Ross	Oppose	• Against location • Heritage: Hotel design is not in keeping with heritage buildings. It's increasingly important to conserve heritage feel after what Christchurch has lost, to keep Dunedin residents happy, and to attract tourists. Redevelopment of heritage buildings is something Dunedin residents are

			proud of. Keep new style buildings out of the CBD. • Requests application be rejected.
33	Penelope Sell	Oppose	• Conservation of heritage in Dunedin is important • Disagrees with claim that 5 star hotels need to be that height; Paris is constricted to buildings <4 stories high and has 5 star hotels. • Danger of setting a precedent if hotel was accepted • Not against a 5 star hotel, but it shouldn't be that tall • It will cast shadow in Octagon which is the only place in town people can sit down/eat lunch etc. • Requests application be refused
34	Richard Roberts	Support	• Need accommodation of this type in the city • Requests consent be granted
35	Rod McMeeken	Oppose	• The design is not in keeping with heritage feel. It would compromise historic image and deter tourists and people moving to the city • Requests design as is be declined. If it is to go ahead, wants alternative plans more in keeping with city buildings/landscape
36	Caroline Hensley	Oppose	• Against height and design as it is not in keeping with heritage feel of the city • Requests application be declined
37	Gavin Turner	Oppose	• Against height, which would disrupt Dunedin's skyline, views • Create wind • Create shade in important areas of CBD (esp. after 1pm) • The 84 proposed parking spaces is insufficient for the number of rooms at the hotel • Requests height be restricted to a maximum of 16m and car parks be created at a minimum ratio of one per apartment, one per penthouse, and 0.5 per hotel room
38	Wendy Turner	Oppose	• Height: Far exceeds maximum height restriction in DP. It would be intrusive, negatively affect views, and increase shade in CBD and neighbouring properties • Exacerbate parking issues. The proposed number of parking spaces in the hotel is not enough for the amount of proposed accommodation. • Requests height be restricted and design to be in keeping with surrounding buildings/streetscape, and more car parking be provided.
39	Madeleine McCoy	Oppose	• Hotel will exacerbate parking problems. Many people rely on the carpark on Filleul Street (elderly, businesses, etc). • Increase shade and lose beautiful views. Increase frost. • Money will go overseas and not benefit Dunedin • Alternative sites for hotel in Dunedin - Submitter suggests Cadbury site. • Requests application be declined
40	John and Nicola Ferguson	Oppose	• Disrupt views from their property and for neighbouring properties. • Increase shade (sunlight was a main reason they chose to buy their home) • Increase existing high traffic flows which could lead to more noise and accidents • Exacerbate parking difficulties • Reduce saleability and price of house. DP and 2GP height restrictions were put in place so this wouldn't happen, putting a hotel there would undermine community input. • Requests application be declined, and that any building on the site not exceed the 11m height restriction.
41	Lucy Marr	Oppose	• Exacerbate parking difficulties. Concerned not enough parking spaces proposed for amount of hotel accommodation • Increase shade • Negatively affect views • Design negatively affect cityscape • Hotel would benefit employment and be an investment, but the location is not suitable • Requests application rejected in favour of development on a more suitable location
42	Yolanda van Heezik	Oppose	• Design not in keeping with heritage feel and does not reflect Dunedin resident's values of the city • Against 'excessive' height which will increase shade and adversely affect views • Mirrored glass is known to cause bird collisions and death. Hotel will also

			disrupt bird movement from the hill and into the suburb • Negatively affect graduates and tourists using the town hall as the hotel does not reflect Dunedin's vision of itself as a heritage city • Request proposal be rejected in terms of height and design
43	Phil Seddon	Oppose	• Breaches DP max height of 11m • Design not in keeping with heritage feel • Reflective surface a hazard for birds often resulting in death • Breach of Rule 18.5.2; implications for traffic flows and would affect critical parts of the city e.g. Town Hall, events (graduation ceremonies) • Negatively affect tourists view of Heritage Dunedin • Requests resource consent be refused
44	Jocelyn Margaret Harris – Professor Emerita	Oppose	• Height and bulk: out of character, disrupt views of historic buildings. Paris has height restrictions and is a tourist magnet. Increase shading and wind. • Design: Inappropriate and 'out of date' as is 'more reminiscent of 1950's than the 21st Century' style. Glass materials not in keeping with surrounding stone buildings • DCC has worked hard to attract tourists to Dunedin by maintaining heritage. • Parking: Hotel will exacerbate parking problems which will in turn affect access to important cultural and social centres nearby • Requests application be declined, with the added recommendation to find an appropriate heritage building which could be renovated and enhanced.
45	William Burton	Oppose	• Height breaches height limitations set in DP. It would dominate skyline and increase wind currents • Not in keeping with heritage style • Requests application be rejected
46	Judith Burton	Oppose	• Height breaches height limitations in District plan. It will dominate area and increase shade • Size is not necessary for a 5 star hotel • Glass material not in keeping with Dunedin skyline • Requests application be rejected.
47	Andrea Wilson	Oppose	• Against height, which is not in keeping with other buildings • Against unattractive design • Requests reject application, or locate elsewhere
48	John McCall	Oppose	• Against height and design which are not in keeping with heritage values. • It will increase shading and wind funnelling • Requests application be declined on basis of negative impacts of design
49	Nicholas Bollen	Oppose	• Against breach of height restrictions. • Height and girth are out of scale • Believes traffic would increase, roundabout recommendation is not reassuring • Requests application be declined, and suggests that the proposed hotel and apartments be within what the District Plan allows
50	Greg Giles	Support	• Hotel will increase tourism and events • Believes that there is no legislation that can protect residents' views • Requests application be approved
51	Shay McDonald	Support	• Job creation (construction and after) • Increase number of tourists to Dunedin, rather than stopping at Queenstown • Approves of design and thinks contrast with surroundings is a good thing • 'Dunedin is at risk of going backwards', investors will grow the city. Dunedin has a reputation for wanting growth and improvement, but also objecting and complaining about suggestions for development • Requests application be approved
52	Diane Yeldon	Oppose	• Opposes application in entirety
53	Kirsty Mason Cooper	Oppose	• Submitter opposes location as it will increase winter shade in Octagon • Requests application be declined in current position, it should be moved elsewhere
54	Elizabeth Dickie	Oppose	• Hotel breaches the district plan height requirements which were made after community input. Breaching the requirements damages the integrity and values of the DP. • Height: It would dwarf the surrounding buildings, adversely affect Dunedin's 'attractive' skyline', block views, and increase shade in CBD • Not in keeping with heritage buildings and would dominate area

			• Design: 1960's style which is not popular and has no aesthetic appeal • Doubts need for 5 star hotel due to Dunedin's size. If it does need a 5 star hotel it could be in small, luxury hotels not a 'massive' structure such as this. E.g., touristic cities in the UK do not have hotels of this size • Dunedin presently has a number of 4 star hotels which do not look full, this hotel would compete with the other hotels and would only be fully occupied on special occasions. • Requests application be rejected in its entirety
55	Barbara Else, MNZM writer and editor	Oppose	• Height: Out of character and would dwarf heritage buildings. It would adversely affect views. Increase shade in Octagon and would increase wind flow which would be particularly bad in winter • Heritage: Not in keeping with heritage buildings • Design: While some modern designs could fit in with stone, heritage buildings, this particular design with its glass façade does not. The design is not aesthetically pleasing • Parking: Exacerbate parking difficulties, including access to important cultural and social centres nearby (gives list). • Financial loss: Due to increased shade and wind, businesses that relied on the 'bustling outdoor scene would suffer serious financial losses' • Tourism: Hotel would make the area less aesthetically appealing and a place to be avoided. This would negatively affect tourism in the area. • Requests application be declined, with a recommendation to explore the option of renovating and enhancing an existing heritage building.
56	Barry Simpson	Oppose	• Height: The maximum height restriction of 16.0m allows all citizens to have reasonable views of the townscape from their residences. The tower block is 4x higher which is extremely intrusive on the landscape. • Dunedin markets itself as the "Best Small City", and therefore Dunedin needs to adhere to the height restrictions in the DP. • Design is not in keeping with its surroundings. It does not have to be the same as the heritage buildings, but more sympathetic to them. Submitter suggests 'precast concrete panels ideally with exposed basalt aggregate in the style of the panels at the Glen over bridge abutments.' Applicant suggests Delta might sell part of the adjacent mini switchyard which would allow a larger footprint area and so more rooms on a lower height. • Requests application be rejected and a new design that is more sympathetic to the area be provided
57	Les Wilson	Support	• The hotel would expand Dunedin's 'operation in tourism' • Requests application be granted
58	Stephen Kenneth Parkinson	Support	• Submitter believes project should go ahead as it will 'be beneficial to Dunedin', submitter has no issues with the design • Requests consent be granted
59	Rhonda Robinson	Oppose	• Height: height will shade Octagon during the winter. The Octagon is an important social area which is enjoyed because of its sun. Submitter sees no reason a business should 'have precedence over a city's population, especially rate payers, who pay for social amenities in the expectation that the city centre will be a sunny and inviting place'. • Requests only approval building of complying height
60	Helen McLagen	Oppose	• Height would 'spoil appearance' of the inner city • Tourists come to Dunedin because of its heritage/historic buildings and would be deterred due to the unattractive hotel design • Dunedin residents also enjoy heritage feel and it needs to be conserved. • Requests application be disallowed, or limited to three stories in height
61	Margaret Dukes	Oppose	• The height is not suitable for the location and is not in keeping with surrounding buildings • Requests application be refused or limited to four stories
62	Tash (Rosemary) Hurst	Oppose	• The height will increase shade • Design is not in keeping with the 'great small city' aesthetic, the design should be more sympathetic to its surroundings and the city in general. E.g., Wellington sky scrapers are overbearing • Requests application be rejected
63	Malcolm McQueen	Oppose	• The proposed hotel exceeds the height limit set in DP, which were made after community consultations. There is no sufficient reason to overturn them in this case • Hotel is not in keeping with Dunedin's character and would be 'destructive' to it. This would negatively affect tourism and in turn Dunedin businesses

			which rely on tourism • Hotel would reduce quality of life for Dunedin residents • Requests application be declined
64	Alison Stone	Oppose	• Height and design are inappropriate for the location of the proposed hotel. Submitter contrasts proposal with the hotel in the former post office building • Requests application be declined, unless the design modified to fit within height restrictions.
65	Teao Munro	Support	• The hotel will provide employment which is especially needed after Cadburys closes down • The hotel will allow Dunedin to have accommodation options for everyone
66	David Burchell	Oppose	• Height is inappropriate to the location which will dominate views and increase shade. • The design is not in keeping with the scale of the adjacent blocks • May negatively influence attendance at events in the Town Hall due to the loss of the public parking, particularly on evenings and weekends when the car park is publicly available. The Meridian carpark is not available in the evenings and public transport is sparse. This leaves only the Moray Place multi-storey park by the Carnegie Centre that is within walking distance of the Town Hall. • Any redevelopment of Moray Place site must provide extensive parking available in the evening and at weekends (underground would do) to compensate for the loss of the present facility • Requests application be rejected.
67	Mary Bruce.	Support	• Design and location is suitable; glass exterior, split tower arrangement and location 'back from the pedestal shopping floors' will help it blend into the existing landscape • Although height is breached this is mitigated through location, where the hill 'disguises' the extra height of the hotel • Requests application be supported
68	Jenny Burchell	Oppose	• Submitter agrees with need for a 5 star hotel • Objects to reduction in parking space, exacerbates existing parking difficulties, especially for people needing to use the Town Hall. Particularly affects people who cannot walk far. • Height is inappropriate and out of scale; it detracts from heritage buildings which in turn affects people tourism and immigration, increase wind in the area and adversely affects views. Residents should not have to sacrifice quality of life for another's commercial benefit. • Concerned about the precedent set from such a building • Design is not aesthetically pleasing and is not sympathetic to its surroundings. Does not have to be in keeping, submitter recommends 'Van Brandenburg' design • Requests application be declined
69	Paul Moodie	Support	• The proposal will bring income and employment opportunities to Dunedin, which are needed as career opportunities are disappearing. • Increase in work, activity and people to the city • Neighbours will be affected but submitter thinks this is not a suitable reason to turn down the proposal. • There has not been major development in Dunedin for too long • Long term benefits from this proposal • Requests proposal be approved
70	Alan Yi	Support	• Great economic opportunity and will help to grow the city • Requests application be approved
71	Ulf Schmidt Uchida	Oppose	• Design is not in keeping with heritage city and is out of scale. The hotel would dominate the landscape • Requests application be declined
72	Vivienne Child	Support	• Dunedin lacks high end accommodation • Submitter has family in business who will not visit Dunedin due to the lack of accommodation they consider up to standard. The hotel would attract international events • Requests application be approved
73	Gordon Speed	Oppose	• Supports the need for a five star hotel • Opposes 'excessive' height and highly reflective look which will dominate the area and detract from the 'character' of the city • Submitter disagrees with applicant's view that 5 star hotels need to be that

			high, there are many examples of 5 star hotels which blend in with their surroundings • Requests that before consent be granted development be limited to ten floors with improved design.
74	Murray Hobbs	Support	• There is a need for growth and development in Dunedin. Investment should be supported so Dunedin can re-establish itself as a major city • There are negatives; increased earthquake risk and parking issues • Requests application be approved
75	Donah Denegrie	Oppose	• Height is too high and will dominate the area. It will adversely affect the culture and public recreation in the surrounding area • Central city landscape, sun and views belong to all of Dunedin's residents, not just wealthy tourists • Requests application be declined
76	Ryan Gollner	Oppose	• Approves of job creation, tourism opportunities and growth aspects to Dunedin • Design is not in keeping with Dunedin and 'screams outsider'. The design is not sympathetic to its surroundings at all. At present, the unattractive design outweighs the positive effects because it will adversely affect culture, community and atmosphere • Requests approval of application be subject to a re-design of building
77	Louis Munro	Oppose	• The design is not in keeping, and will be detrimental to, heritage Dunedin. Dunedin's heritage feel is special and needs to be maintained • Height, shadow and visual appearance are detrimental to Dunedin • Requests application be rejected
78	Dennis Dorney	Oppose	• Against breach of DP and 2GP height restrictions. • Against location, which contains heritage buildings which attract tourists • Design should be smaller and more appropriate. • Proposal may set a precedent, if it is accepted then planning regulations will not mean anything • Take Paris as an example, a popn of 2.2 million and they do not have or need a 64.0m hotel • In terms of apartments, there are plenty of heritage buildings that could be renovated which would remain in keeping with heritage feel. There are already too many buildings up for lease in the city centre and indicates that more apartments in the city centre are not needed • Concerned that rate payers have to keep paying for legal battles involving these inappropriate developments and residents and council may tire of defending Dunedin against these applications. • The risk of Dunedin's character being ruined with developments like this, and others, is high if this hotel is approved • Requests proposal be rejected
79	Kay Elizabeth Murray	Oppose	• Against breach of DP which was made in consultation and on behalf of Dunedin residents to protect the common interests. Submitter sees little point in District Plan if it is to be overruled by approving such significant development • Design would be detrimental to streetscape • The location is inappropriate as it is useful as a car park or could be used as an environmentally friendly, public space in the future • Requests application be rejected
80	Murray Warren Petrie	Oppose	• Wind effects: Some parts of central Dunedin are already compromised by wind effects. Using wind records at Dunedin Airport are inappropriate as a reference as the wind direction is not the same. Submitter recommends using Musselburgh weather station for wind measurements • Submitter thinks wind may be a major issue in the future and detrimental to pedestrian comfort • Requests that before application is approved an appropriate wind effects assessments should be done, including a scale-model wind-tunnel test using appropriate wind measurements (not Dunedin airport measurements).
81	Neil James	Oppose	• Height is excessive, Dunedin is a great small city and should refrain from introducing skyscrapers to the city • Requests consent be declined
82	Carol and Richard Devine	Oppose	• Against height and location which will be unattractive and increase shade • Against breach of height restrictions, which were made with community involvement

			• Against design and increase in glare • Against Council 'wasting limited resources' on exploring and assisting proposals such as this • Not opposed to a new hotel development but location should be closer to the stadium, or a smaller hotel on the same site • Proposal should not contain shops or conference facilities that compete with neighbours and wants it to retain most of its existing public car parks. Wants DP and 2GP rules to be adhered to • Requests application be declined in its entirety
83	Jon Chapman	Oppose	• Design of hotel does not fit with heritage buildings or other surrounding buildings. • The design is not new and exciting to make it 'destination architecture'. The design is 'cheap looking' and is 'dated'. • Not against a 5 star hotel but the design should be more low lying, and/or more in keeping with heritage style, and/or 'new and fresh' • Requests proposal not be allowed in current configuration
84	Gordon Dalkie	Neutral	• Against the 'anonymous design' and thinks the hotel is 'possibly four storeys too high for the cityscape' • Thinks benefits outweigh the negatives • Benefits are location; close to Town Hall which is beneficial for conferences, close to retail, it activates a 'dead zone'. The location being at the 'lower hill side of the CBD' mitigates its visual presences and minimises the number of residents that lose views. • Requests proposal be supported
85	Amanda Jane Kelly	Support	• Increase job opportunities for residents • Introduce a more diverse range of people and make other businesses thrive e.g. the stadium • Requests application be accepted
86	Antonius Limburg	Oppose	• Against breach of height restrictions and it is not in keeping with other commercial buildings • Requests application be declined, or building re-designed
87	Patricia McDonald	Oppose	• The design will be visible from surrounding suburbs, and overshadow the Octagon. • It is not in keeping with heritage buildings which are currently bringing life to the city. The heritage buildings are bringing growth to the city, and tourists enjoy the heritage buildings. Dunedin's character needs to be protected and retained for future generations • Requests application be rejected
88	Tim Couch	Support	• Dunedin needs more accommodation • Requests that consent be granted
89	Lynette and Murray Hastie	Oppose	• Against height which is 'out of character' of the city centre. • The hotel would shade the octagon and surrounding areas • An existing 'character' building should be converted into a hotel instead of introducing a new hotel which would alter the character of Dunedin • Requests application be rejected
90	Jane Smith	Oppose	• Against breach of height restrictions in DP. • Need to protect heritage areas. • The need for a 5 star hotel should not override the requirements of the DP. • Design is 'outdated' and not attractive • 'Applicant has displayed arrogance in saying, "the height is non-negotiable" • Requests application be rejected UNLESS redesigned to conforms with the DP requirements and heritage values
91	Katrina Toovey	Oppose	• Against maximum height restrictions set out in the DP. The height is not in keeping with existing townscape • The hotel will increase shading over the inner city, create a wind tunnel, and obscure views for residents and workers beside and above the building • The design is not sympathetic to the surrounding architecture and will be detrimental to the character of the city • The integrity of the city's architectural landscape needs to be maintained • There are examples where beautiful cities combine commercial activities sympathetically within their existing architectural framework, which this proposal does not do. • Requests application be denied in its current form

1	Denise George	Oppose	• Against breach of height restrictions in DP • Not in keeping with surroundings • Unattractive design • Applicant is unsure of need for that amount of visitor accommodation. • The disregard to the plan shows a lack of respect for Dunedin residents and the reasons they live here • Requests application be declined
93	Diana Susan Rothstein	Oppose	• Height, design and size is not in keeping with surroundings • Requests application be turned down
94	Briar Comins	Oppose	• Height and design will adversely affect views and damage the living and financial value of homes close by; investments and workplaces would be significantly affected. Submitter is a house owner who checked before buying her property that the views would not be compromised in the future • Design would increase 'light strike', 'bird strike' from mirrored glass' • Height and design may result in 'falling glass' • Design not in keeping with heritage buildings • Cityscape and heritage feel should be protected. The hotel would dominate the area. • Thinks DCC management is complacent and shows a lack of respect for residents rights and protection over economic and commercial gain • Against rate payers money that went into the geotechnical report for the proposal, especially prior to notifying the public, 'given the site is owned by ratepayers'. • Time allowed for submissions is too brief – it 'brings into question the DCC/Managements own potential bias and culpability around the proposal'. • If approved, the proposal would set an undesirable precedent • Mr Tosswill should be background checked to prove previous projects have been compliant and completed • Mr Tosswill has '12-15 of these proposals around NZ' all of which will require significant management, expertise, financial and human resources. • Mr Tosswill states he is not the developer. This is confusing and promotes doubt to the developer's 'ethics/agenda' • Submitter doubts the transparency of the proposal's presentation of information, and should be independently reviewed, with respect to the effect on heritage, cityscape and landscape • Deter tourists and will reduce quality of life for residents. • The job creation from the hotel would be 'low-paid, largely casual, and unrewarding'. Submitter doubts this form of job creation would enrich Dunedin. Submitter believes there are greater employment opportunities elsewhere through the development of technology, environment, heritage, and the arts • 'Well-established Pin Oaks of 10 -12 meters' would be felled • Impact on aged wastewater and sewage system • Exacerbate parking issues and would support the 'monopoly' of Wilson Parking • Construction: increase in noise, dust, access restrictions, 'would incur extra work/costs for residents and business cleaning up' • Requests application be declined in entirety
95	Nancy Earth	Oppose	• Opposes height and design. It would adversely affect residents views. Submitter thinks glass design is unattractive and 'alien' • It would negatively affect community spirit and heritage buildings/values • Requests application be rejected, OR a possible approval if the applicant changes the design and height. A hotel of appropriate design would be 'welcome in Dunedin'. The design should reflect heritage values and conform to height restrictions
96	Colin Francis	Oppose	• The design is not in keeping with the surroundings • Diminish appeal of 'Dunedin's rich architectural history' • Requests application be rejected
97	Catherine Spencer	Oppose	• Against height which is non-compliant and would dwarf its surroundings, it would dominate heritage buildings in the vicinity • Height would increase shade in importance areas of the CBD, as well as compromise views from residents and workers close by and above the hotel

			• Wind tunnel effect • Submitter believes there will be an increased risk of sun strike for motorcyclists and workers near the hotel • 'the idea that a 64.0m high class fronted 5 star hotel provides the kind of quality accommodation that attracts tourists is nonsensical'. Submitter disagrees with the idea that a 5 star hotel needs to be that high • Design should be special and aesthetically pleasing, not necessarily in keeping with heritage but still sympathetic to it, for a hotel to be allowed to breach the DP and 2GP • The hotel would adversely affect the value of nearby properties • The proposal does 'not even attempt' to address the values laid out in the DP • Requests application be rejected in entirety
98	Amanda Wilson	Oppose	• Design is not sympathetic to Dunedin, and is not aesthetically pleasing. Submitter believes the CBD already contains too many unattractive buildings • Against breach of maximum height requirements. • Increase in shadows to important areas of the CBD, in particular the Octagon • Creation of a wind tunnel effect • Adversely affect views • Reduce available parking • Submitter suggests there will be increased competition with the existing student accommodation and rentals • Requests hotel be declined in its current location and design
99	Gregory Dawes	Oppose	• Against the proposal as is, and thinks the design should be more suitable, and the height lowered • The proposal would adversely affect residents living near, or uphill of, the hotel • Increase shading. Sun is vital to Dunedin residents. Reducing sun could increase frost • Against the wind effects • Design in not in keeping, or sympathetic to, its surroundings, in particular heritage structures. Submitter is not against a new design but that design should be 'in its own right, a strikingly beautiful structure'. Submitter suggests many residents will find the hotel design not aesthetically pleasing • Earthquake risk; glass design is not suitable as it is a health and safety issue in the event of an earthquake • Not against the idea of a 5 star hotel, but it should be a reflection of heritage values. • Requests application be declined, but leave possibility open for accepting a new proposal of a more suitable design and height
100	Humphrey Catchpole	Oppose	• Dunedin would benefit from a 5 star hotel • Against the design, which is not in keeping with heritage architecture • The height would mean a structure that is not in keeping with Dunedin's values to dominate the skyline • The design should be changed to be more sympathetic to heritage Dunedin • Requests application as is be declined
101	Stephen John Macknight	Oppose	• Submitter thinks the hotel would have negative effects on Dunedin, in particular in relation to heritage buildings. • The need to fulfil the demand for extra accommodation should be done so with a more sympathetic design • Requests application be declined
102	Church of Christ Community	Oppose	• Against breach of maximum height restrictions. It 'mocks' the community consultation that went into developing the height restrictions set in the DP. • The applicants comparison to other tall structures (DCC chambers, St Paul's Cathedral, etc) are not relevant as they 'achieve their heights by use of tapering spires'. The bulk of the proposal is too much, especially for the height • Increase shade in the Octagon • Negatively affect the impact of 'the spires in the upper Octagon being able to make their visual statements against an uncluttered sky'

			• Requests application be declined
103	Nicola Dean	Oppose	• The design is not in keeping with its surroundings, and will deter tourists • Wind issues • Not opposed to a 5 star hotel in Dunedin, but the design should be more 'in keeping with the heritage status that Dunedin works so hard to keep and is so proud of'. • Requests application as is be declined, or require a more appropriate design
104	Susan and Peter Irvine	Oppose	• Submitters own a rental apartment on London Street which they believe will be negatively affected by the hotel. The hotel would adversely affect views that the submitters rely on when promoting their rental property. • Submission relates to objectives and policies of both the DP and the 2GP • Against breach of height restrictions • The hotel is not in keeping with Dunedin's character and would adversely affect Dunedin. Dunedin relies on heritage buildings which makes Dunedin different to other cities (DP). The hotel would dominate views and dwarfs other structures • 'Policy 13.3.3 new buildings on corner sites should reinforce the character of the central City precincts' – this is a busy corner site in the City. It does not reinforce the existing character of the central city and, ore particularly, the heritage character buildings in the direct vicinity'. (DP) • Concerned over the precedent set if this hotel is approved • Development should enhance amenity values in the Central Activity Zone, but submitter believes this proposal detracts from amenity values • Against bulk and design which is not in keeping with townscape • Requests application be rejected
105	Christopher Naylor and Deborah Robb	Oppose	• Submitters are not against the development 'per se'. • Submitter believes that the Dunedin's architecture is unique and a draw card for tourists and residents. It needs to be maintained and protected. • The proposed height will dwarf its surroundings and will not enhance the view. Dunedin residents were involved in determining the acceptable height and is therefore an indicator that it is not acceptable • It will shade vital recreational areas of Dunedin (Octagon). • Parking is already difficult to find in the area where the hotel is proposed, and the hotel would take away the electric charging station, the submitters doubt there would be another site as suitable nearby. • Submitter disagrees with having private apartments at such a height. Heritage buildings should be refurbished to be inner city apartments. Submitter agrees with 'reduce, reuse, recycle' idea and 'thinks its crazy to damage our city by putting 64 new apartments in the sky above us whilst in the streets below sit unused heritage buildings' • Submitter wants to see an analysis of its carbon footprint for both construction and energy use. • Requests consent be declined
106	Noel Rayner	Oppose	• Against height, which would obstruct important views and have an 'imposing presence' • 'Architecturally without merit'. The design is 'ordinary and unexceptional' • Bulk is too large and pout of character with surrounding buildings • Glass cladding is unappealing and may reflect light in an adverse way • Submitter does not see the need for self-contained apartments and penthouse suites to be built at this location. They can be built elsewhere. Submitter believes they are an unnecessary inclusion. • Requests proposal be rejected
107	Rev. Dr Selwyn Yeoman	Oppose	• Against breach of maximum height requirements laid out in the DP. The proposal makes a 'mockery of everything our current regulations (established after widespread public consultation) are intended to achieve.' • Concerned the hotel would set a precedent • Disagrees with the claim that 5 star hotels need to be that high, there are plenty of examples showing otherwise • Applicants comparison to existing tall buildings is not relevant considering they reach that height through tapering spires. Submitter considers design to be too bulky • Height will cast shadows over Octagon, especially during winter. Light, warmth, and openness are greatly values by Dunedin residents in the

			Octagon, and that is at risk of disappearing due to the proposal, and the precedent that proposal sets. The Octagon will lose its value if surrounded by high-rise buildings. The spires viewed from the Octagon are aesthetically pleasing and popular sites for photographs, but the hotel will adversely affect that. • Design is not in keeping, or sympathetic to, heritage buildings. Disagrees with the use of glass cladding. Design appears 'cheap' • Exacerbate parking issue • If hotel is to be accepted in any form, it should provide parking for Dunedin residents as mitigation for the car parking site lost. • Submitter doubts that the hotel will adequately provide jobs. Job production is a benefit, but should not 'attempt to seduce the council in its decision-making'. Job increase through construction is short-term. Submitter is concerned that the hotel will be built to maximise shareholder profits and that Dunedin has already suffered seriously from outside interest 'cutting job prospects to the bone, or abandoning the city altogether • Submitter doubts the need for more hotel accommodation • Detrimental effect on views for residents • Requests application be declined
108	Robin Yvonne Higgins	Oppose	• Against breach of height restrictions, the hotel would increase shade in the Octagon in the afternoon • Proposal will take away 'valuable car parking' from the city centre • The hotel will have a 'major effect' on our 'beautiful Gothic cityscape'. • Requests that consent be disallowed
109	Margaret Hilweg	Oppose	• Submitter is a tourist from Switzerland, visiting NZ for three weeks. • From the view of a tourist, she was attracted to the 'historic and cultural specificities of the places (she had) the privilege of visiting' • Submitter enjoyed staying in a heritage building • Submitter thinks that the design is unattractive, and not aesthetically pleasing • The location amongst heritage buildings is unsuitable and should be built elsewhere, where it will be surrounding by other modern, 'banal' designs • Requests proposal be rejected in this location
110	Georgina Thomas, Lawyer, on behalf of 'Millenium and Copthorne Hotels New Zealand Limited'. Submitter owns the 3 star Kingsgate Hotel at 10 Smith Street	Oppose	• 'The submitter is not a trade competitor for the purpose of 308B of the Resource Management Act (RMA)' • Submitter's position that the proposal does not meet the purpose of the RMA (the Act), and fails to protect historic heritage of the townscape from inappropriate use and development • The proposal does not meet 'the threshold tests in section 104D of the Act, on the basis that the effects of the proposal are more than minor and the proposal is contrary to both the objectives and policies' of the DP and 2GP. • Submitter is concerned regarding the adequacy of the application and accompanying AEE. Submitter states areas of the applicants AEE which they believe are lacking detail • Submitter opposes whole application, but in particular the adverse effects on visual amenity, urban design of the surrounding area, shading of properties and public spaces, wind tunnelling on neighbouring properties and public spaces, traffic and reduced parking provisions and increased parking demand, and noise on surrounding properties • Submitter owns 3 star Kingsgate Hotel, which they do not think will compete with the proposed hotel as they target different markets. However, Kingsgate Hotel is located 'immediately adjacent to the proposed development' • The hotel design, height and materials is not in keeping with, or sympathetic to, its surroundings. Objectives and policies relating to 'townscape' state that *"development must be compatible with the existing townscape character in order that visual integrity of the central City precincts is retained"*. The description for the precinct that the proposal is located states: *"within Moray Place, large landscaped areas become dominant. The building styles are more modern, with the exception of the Town Hall, but in general they do not detract from the quality of the area, being constructed in brick and/or sympathetic to the more historic buildings"* • The effect of the breach in height restrictions is significant, and will 'be

			nearly double the height of surrounding 'tall' buildings''. The height is 'excessive'. • Bulk effects will be more than minor and dominate the submitter's property • The visual effect has not been adequately assessed in the applicant's AEE – the views over Dunedin from the submitter's hotel will be significantly, adversely altered where the outlook from some guests of the Kingsgate Hotel will look into the proposed hotel's guest rooms • The AEE does not consider the effects of bordering a residential zone. • The AEE does not adequately assess the effects of shade, although does show the increase in shade over Kingsgate Hotel for most of the morning through to 11am in winter. AEE states the shading effect will be less than minor but submitter suggests otherwise, as guests will have checked out by 11am and therefore be significantly affected. The 'transparent glass' will adversely affect privacy of guests at the Kingsgate Hotel. • Shade will also be significant on other properties and public spaces. Shade will likely affect road safety due to an increase in frost • The AEE does not include an assessment on noise, odour or negative effects to visual amenity caused by the inclusion of a large restaurant. They will likely have a more than minor effect on the submitter's property, especially since the 'back of house for the proposed development will be located directly in front of the submitter's property'. • Wind effects will be negative, affect pedestrians and will likely affect users of surrounding buildings. The applicant does not offer any form of mitigation, nor has the applicant completed the study which was recommended in the wind analysis report. • Traffic will be adversely affected and will affect the submitter's site. 'It is considered that the transport assessment provided with the application does not adequately assess these effects'. • Submitter believes that '24 staff servicing the facility' is a low amount considering all of the facilities at the hotel • It is unclear whether the inclusion of a roundabout at the Filleul Street / Moray Place intersection is a conditional upgrade • There was no AEE for noise • Submitter suggests that the activity status for the whole application should be 'a non-complying activity' • Requests application be declined
111	Gillian Mary Fleming	Oppose	• Against breach of height restrictions set out in the DP • The hotel shows a 'lack of sensitivity' to Dunedin as a heritage city • The building will shade the Octagon in winter • Against applicant stating the height is non-negotiable and that it 'flout(s)' the rules in the DP. • Requests application be refused in this location
112	Margaret Mary Glennie Jamieson	Oppose	• Not conducive to what residents see as 'Dunedin's future' • Enticing tourists through a 5 star hotel in this design would be 'at the expense of' heritage Dunedin • Requests application be declined
113	Carolyn McCurdie	Oppose	• Submitter opposes the proposed size and design • The hotel would dominate the area and is unattractive • Submitter quotes Russel Lund's comment in the ODT (8/5/17) – '"Hobart has learned from its past mistake in allowing the (hotel) to deface its signature cityscape vista. Dunedin does not have to repeat that same mistake…'". Submitter agrees with the statement. • Requests consent be refused
114	Susan Carline Adams	Oppose	• The height will negatively affect views from various city locations and will adversely affect sun, light and wind patterns in the surrounding area • The design is not in keeping with heritage buildings. Submitter quotes, and agrees with, Russel Lund's comment in the ODT (dated 08/05/17) that the hotel design is '"a remnant of outmoded thinking"' • Heritage buildings attract tourists, and the work which enhances this will be 'undermined by this proposed monstrosity'.
115	Ruth Georgina McCarthy	Oppose	• Submitter does not see the need for a hotel of such a height • Height leads to the hotel being an earthquake hazard and would dominate the area • Streets would need to be closed 'for blocks around, leading to loss of

			convenience and income for other Dunedin residents' • Submitter suggests there may be glare from the glass cladding • 'Unit-title subdivisions also contribute to parking traffic flow problems, leading to greater trouble accessing' important surrounding areas. • The proposal is 'contrary to the District Plan.' • Requests proposal be rejected due to height and 'incompatible' style.
116	Nola McCoy	Oppose	• Submitter opposes the loss of parking which will affect elderly access to banks, the post office, Urgent Doctors and Pharmacy, as well as the Blood Bank which is due to move near to the location soon • Requests proposal be declined
117	Jeffrey Batts	Oppose	• Submitter thinks design is unattractive and dated and not in keeping with surroundings • The hotel would dominate skylines and dwarf surrounding buildings • Requests application be declined in current location.
118	Julienne Margaret Catchpole	Oppose	• The design is not sympathetic to surrounding buildings • Against the height of the building • Submitter is 'not against a new hotel for Dunedin' but feels that 'this design would look out of place • Requests proposal as is be declined, or for applicant to design a building more in keeping with Dunedin architecture or to use an existing building
119	Christine Boraman	Oppose	• 'The proposed hotel is poorly designed and unattractive' • The height is not in keeping with Dunedin's 'unique cityscape', and it would depreciate Dunedin • Requests proposal as is be declined, or smaller hotel be considered
120	Bianca Keen	Oppose	• Submitter is the manager of the Hostel next to the proposed hotel location and is opposed to the entirety of the application. • Requests application be declined
121	Karen Daly	Oppose	• Submitter is opposed to the height of the hotel, which will adversely affect harbour views visibility • The hotel 'demeans' the heritage of Dunedin • Requests application be declined
122	Erika Buky	Oppose	• Submitter opposes hotel design, which is 'inappropriate to the setting and Dunedin's architectural heritage'. It would dominate its surroundings and heritage buildings, would increase shading • 'Cheap' and 'dated' design • Against breach of height requirements • As the applicant states the design and height is non-negotiable, the submitter suggests rejecting the proposal outright. • If the hotel is to go through it should be of an 'environmentally sensitive, sustainably constructed, aesthetically appealing' design, or use an existing building • Requests application be rejected
123	Melanie Remy	Oppose	• Submitter opposes the height and design of the proposal, which would detract for the appeal of the centre city. • Height is out of scale and out of keeping • Protect heritage values of Dunedin • Submitter thinks such a hotel would negatively influence, social, economic, and aesthetic 'life of Dunedin'. She suggests that such a hotel would divide Dunedin between 'wealthy visitors and the largely unskilled workers whose labour would be required to support it.' Submitter is concerned that this hotel would move the city into becoming an unaffordable place to live. She does not want development in Dunedin to rely heavily on tourism or hospitality. • Submitter is concerned over the sustainability of the hotel • Requests application be declined
124	Alice Elizabeth McMeeken	Oppose	• Opposed to the design, which is not in keeping with historic surrounding buildings in the area • Requests application be rejected
125	Lea Werner	Oppose	• Dunedin is a 'Great Small City', which relies on heritage for tourism. • The hotel design and height is not in keeping with its surroundings, or with residents values and aim for the future of Dunedin relying on its heritage uniqueness. • Submitter is concerned that this form of economic development would compromise Dunedin's development in other areas, which utilise heritage buildings.

			• Requests application be declined
126	Rachel Easton	Oppose	• Against breach of height restrictions, which increase shading • Heritage buildings is what makes Dunedin special and unique and the hotel will adversely affect this • Submitter has concerns over the material chosen, which is 'cheap' and would not be a 'selling point' to Dunedin. Submitter doubts people that would utilise a 5 star hotel would want to visit a hotel which is designed in a similar way to so many others • Requests application be declined
127	Jeff Dickie	Oppose	• Against the breach of District Plan policies and objectives • Submitter sites the University area as an example where new, unattractive architectural designs dominate an otherwise aesthetically pleasing, historical area. • Submitter is concerned over amount of ratepayer's money going towards 'incompatible architectural proposals' • Requests application be rejected, and for future, similar proposals to be rejected so as not to 'waste further amounts of ratepayer's funds.'
128	Mark Taylor	Support	• Submitter believes developments such as this will 'keep Dunedin going forward' • Supports the increase in jobs and tourism that will likely eventuate from the hotel • Council has rejected 'too much development over the years' • Requests proposal be accepted
129	Ben Nettleton	Support	• 'I encourage the Panel to have regard first and foremost to Section 5 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Which states the Act's purpose is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.' • Submitter suggests the hotel would promote social, economic, and cultural wellbeing • Submitter suggests concerns over parking are not valid, as it is Council land and could alternatively be used for a different, compliant, non-notified activity which would have the same effect on parking as this hotel proposal. • Submitter doubts the hotel design and height would be 'greatly out of place' with other surrounding buildings such as 'Burns House, Otago House, Forsyth Barr House'. The buildings cited do not fit with heritage style, but have become 'part of the fabric of the Cityscape and all serve a key role in the functioning of the city' • Conference facilities are needed • The hotel would be an 'enabler' for key industries and city growth strategies. • Believes the proposal was a result of the city's resurgence, and will promote more growth. • Requests application be approved
130	Anne Johnstone	Oppose	• Submitter opposes the design, in particular the glass materials used. The design should be sympathetic to surrounding buildings • The hotel could be a 'wonderful feature of the centre of town' if designed correctly • The proposal could help to develop Dunedin and enhance 'already present attributes' • Requests there be expert influence over the design decision
131	Sigurd Wilbanks	Oppose	• The DP reflects residents values, and the proposal shows 'skant regard' for residents' agreed priorities • Especially against breach of height restrictions • Design is not in keeping with the surroundings or the city in general • Submitter is concerned the proposal would 'undermine long term economic growth' • Requests application be refused
132	Eric Lord	Support	• Submitter approves of the design and the contrast with the cityscape, suggesting that it will add a new dimension and 'spice' to the CBD, particularly due to its setting and height. • A 5 star hotel is 'desperately needed' in Dunedin. Submitter cites 'inability to be allocated a Lions test match' as evidence. • Submitter wants a slight change in design to reduce the bulk of the hotel, and suggests 'having masonry around the core and possibly within the tower's indentations, from which the greenery hang. Another possibility is

			to include masonry supports in the lower angled levels to give the effect of sepals supporting a flower'. • Requests proposal be accepted with recommendation to make changes to the cladding to mitigate the bulk of glass
133	Deb Robertson	Oppose	• Submitter is neutral towards the need for a 5 star hotel in Dunedin, and suggests 'beauty is in the eye of the beholder', although she finds the design unattractive. The submitter suggests the adverse design is exacerbated by the significantly large height restriction breach. • The submitter is neutral to the proposal if it abides by height restrictions set in the DP. Submitter suggests this would conserve Dunedin's heritage and scenic trademark for the future
134	Mike Parkes	Oppose	• Submitter is concerned over adverse effects to Dunedin's brand, which relies on 'high tech/knowledge and heritage mix' and 'the hospital/university link'. These brands have been considerably invested in. • In particular, Dunedin relies on its heritage buildings which will be dominated and negatively affected by the proposed hotel • Submitter is not opposed to the 5 star hotel in its current design which submitter thinks is unattractive, however the size will 'will irreversibly damage Dunedin's brand' for residents and future generations. • Submitter cites Queenstown as an example where height restrictions have not deterred 5 star hotels. • Submitter is not opposed to a 5 star hotel in Dunedin but would like them to 'share in our vision' in regards to being sympathetic to height restrictions and heritage • Requests application be declined
135	Otago Hearing Ltd, trading as Audiology South	Oppose	• Submitter suggests that the earthworks will have a more than minor effect on their business • Audiology South is located on the ground floor of the Community Trust House on the corner of Moray Place and Filleul Street, and will therefore be directly across the road from the proposed hotel • Audiology South is an establishing company, and are concerned the viability of their business will be compromised • The company relies on hearing testing, which makes up approx. 50% of their scheduled appointments between standard working hours. • Hearing testing needs to be completed in a room where ambient noise levels meet the requirements of ISO 8253-1:2010, which was 'considerably expensive' to meet this standard. • Submitter has no doubt that the noise produced from earthworks will adversely affect their business and compromise their viability • Submitter states that the geotechnical investigations carried out on the propsed hotel site in November 2016 produced enough subterranean noise to interfere significantly with their hearing tests, the rooms of which have been 'very well sounded' and 'treated according to industry standards'. • Earthworks and the effect on sound: Submitter states that 'the application documents do not address the effects of the proposed earthworks or construction effects, aside from stating that the Construction Management Plan will mitigate environmental effects on neighbours. This assessment is 'out of scale' as the 'earthworks proposed is considerably more than what is provided for in the District Plan, and therefore assessment of effects should reflect this'. The level of activity 'proposed comprise a restricted discretionary activity', and therefore the 'Council's discretion will be limited to, amongst other things: Assessment Matter 17.8.2 Effects on neighbours a) whether the earthworks and retaining structures will adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties during or after construction, through reduction in visual amenity, loss of privacy, shading, noise, vibration, dust, mud or any other effect. (b) the likely duration of any adverse effect, (c) Proposed measures for avoiding, remedying or mitigating these effects'. Submitter states that 'this assessment matter has not been addressed in the application, nor have the relevant objectives and policies for earthworks' and 'In particular, the explanation associated with Policy 17.3.9 states that '*Earthworks should not occur in any areas where it is not possible to avoid, remedy, or mitigate their effects*''. 'The Construction Management Plan … does not provide any indication of how long the earthworks will take, nor does it address vibration effects.' • The submitter has reviewed the Geosolve Geotechnical report 'to see if volcanic rock will be encountered, this question remains unanswered, as

			the Geosolve Report was prepared prior to plans for the hotel being available'. Submitter suggests that further information is needed to 'fully understand' the effects earthworks will have on neighbouring properties. • To summarise: the length and magnitude of the earthworks will significantly, negatively affect hearing tests at Audiology South, which will compromise the viability of the business • Submitter includes an 'Ambient Noise Level Report' taken from the Ground Floor of the Community Trust House which concludes they were 'in accordance with ISO 8253-1: 2010 clause 11' (these reports have been revised. The original submission was received on 8 May 2017, and the revised submission was received on 10 May 2017). • Requests consent be declined
136	Sharlene Verma	Oppose	• The design will have a negative impact on 'the current aesthetic' and environment • The submitter is opposed to the proposed retail facilities and 'confusing inclusion of conference facilities' • Against the breach of 'community established' height restrictions as well as the bulk of the proposed hotel • States the proposal is not of 'the sustainable minded effort of utilizing a pre-existing character-filled charmer' • Suggests the hotel would shade the Octagon, particularly in winter, which would cause an increase in frost and would adversely affect both plants, and health and safety • Submitter suggests the proposal would negatively affect businesses and economy of the local area through the reduction of parking spaces. The parking space, which the proposed hotel would be located on, is vital for residents wanting to access to important buildings (submitter gives examples) • In regards to the parking facility, rate payers were expecting to use the car park so as to access important medical facilities e.g. Urgent Doctors, Urgent Pharmacy, and the Blood Bank 'as they move later in the year'. • Submitter opposes the inclusion of retail shops which would create 'unnecessary' competition with pre-existing retail facilities. Submitter suggests that retail and hospitality business inside the proposed hotel would be chain businesses, which would do little to support 'local artisans and owner-occupied businesses', and would 'more likely cater to international investors with little interest and care for Dunedin's cultural ambiance'. • Submitter is opposed to the proposed conference facilities included at the hotel, with concerns over competition with Dunedin Centre's conference facilities • Submitter is concerned that if the hotel was accepted, it would set a precedent whereby 'public opinion can easily be repudiated'. • Submitter disagrees that the hotel would 'melt into the skyline'. • Requests proposal be declined with the current design, size and location. Suggests moving the project to a more 'feasible area'.
137	Dougal McGowan, submitted on behalf of The Otago Chamber of Commerce	Support	• The Otago Chamber of Commerce (the Chamber) 'present(s) this submission on behalf of the approximately 1000 Otago businesses that are (their) members'. The Chamber states that their members are 'large stakeholders in the economic, social and environmental future of the Otago Region' due to the estimation that their members 'contribute significantly more than half of Dunedin City's $5.75 billion GDP • The Chamber surveyed their members, of which 402 answered. 79.6% supported the proposal, 10.95% opposed, and 9.45% were unsure. • The Chamber received 130 comments which were not included in the submission document, but they 'would be happy to provide the comments to next stage of the hearings as they provide detail for people to consider.'
138	Greg/Philippa Sligo/Harris	Oppose	• Opposed to the increase in population density in the area which would create higher demand for parking and infrastructure. It would exacerbate 'traffic congestion' and submitter is opposed to the lack of 'proposals for a replacement car park' • Opposed to increase in wind turbulence which would be inconvenient for pedestrians. • Against shading, in particular because Dunedin resident's 'appreciate sunshine'. It would adversely affect residents enjoyment of the surrounding area

			• The Duomo effect: 'no buildings are permitted to be taller than their famous cathedral, known as 'the Duomo'. Submitter suggests Dunedin's 'splendid buildings' would be diminished • Against scale, which is 'out of proportion' to Dunedin's heritage buildings and adversely affect the streetscape • Requests proposal be declined in its current form
139	Amy McCarthy	Oppose	• Submitter suggests the hotel would be an earthquake risk in the centre of town • Against the adverse effect on views and shading • Submitter works on Tennyson St and the proposal would 'ruin (her) whole view of the city'. • Requests consent be declined
140	Dierdre O'Neill	Oppose	• Submitter agrees the hotel may attract tourists and be beneficial to the city • Submitter is opposed to the design; 'locals shouldn't have to live with an eyesore' • Submitter is opposed to the inclusion of apartments • Against the glass cladding which she believes to be '1980's' and unattractive • Requests proposal be declined in its current form, or designed to be more sympathetic to the surroundings. The design should not include glass materials
141	Stuart Griffiths	Oppose	• Submitter is against the breach of height requirements, which may compromise views over Dunedin. The hotel would dominate the area and adversely affect tourism • Submitter has supplied an alternative design for the hotel • Submitter suggests the DCC has 'financed' the current proposal • The proposed hotel would affect events at the Town Hall, but in particular graduation which could be affected by shade, and increased wind. • Submitter suggests the hotel would be an earthquake hazard, and cites Christchurch as an example to be precautionary in new developments, which the submitter suggests should not be clad in glass, or be over 5 stories high. • Submitter suggests Dunedin residents are supportive of hotel developments, or investors being interested in the city, but only if the designs 'imaginatively redevelop older building stock' e.g. the potential Cadbury's chocolate themed hotel
142	Meg Davidson on behalf of 'City Rise Up' community group	Oppose	• City Rise Up is a community group which was formed with the aim of 'smartening up City Rise and protecting its heritage and amenity values'. The group is interested in areas containing the postcode '9016'. • Suggests there is no evidence to back up Mr Tosswill's claim that a 5 star hotel needs to be of the height in the application. Suggests that 5 star rating differ between countries, and the NZ 'Qualmark rating system does not mention minimum capacity, height, or the need for views which Mr Tossill claims are all necessary for a five star hotel.' Submitter further suggests that due to the lack of 'internationally accepted standards for five star hotels', it also 'demolishes the developer's claim that there are few, if any, suitable alternative sites in Dunedin for a five star hotel'. • Submitter suggests redeveloping an existing heritage building instead of constructing a new building • The submitter suggests the proposal does not meet the 'requirements of the operative district plan, and parts of the proposed 2GP which have become operative.' • Suggests the hotel would set a precedent if accepted • Against adverse effects on views, and suggest the effect would be more than minor on visual impact • Suggests the location of the proposed hotel is prized real estate and 'deserves a truly iconic building' • The design is not sympathetic to its surroundings. Submitter believes it does not have to attempt to replicate heritage buildings' Edwardian and Victorian architecture, but the design should be 'presented in a new contemporary architectural language' that alludes to the heritage buildings. Submitter therefore concludes that the location is not suitable for the proposal • Adverse effects on views, and is not in keeping with heritage buildings. • Suggests streetscape amenity will adversely affected

			• Submitter suggests the car park is undesirable and presents a 'gap in the urban fabric', and is a negative amenity value, however suggests these effects are comparatively minor to the negative effects from the proposal. • Submitter suggests there is a dichotomy between fulfilling the objective laid out in the operative plan, where 'the Central Activity Zone should be 'peopled''. She suggests that although there will be an increase in people in the area due to the proposed hotel, there will be a decrease in people able to visit existing amenities such as the Town Hall. • Requests application be declined
143	Nicola Anne Jackson,	Oppose	• Submitter owns a property in City Rise • Against the dominating effect of the hotel on the view from her property • Against breach of height restrictions, which Dunedin residents have to 'adhere strictly to' • Submitter is unsure of the need for a 5 star hotel and would like a study presented • Submitter suggests that her family would consider moving from their property, and other residents might as well, which would lead to an increase in rental properties in the area. Submitter suggests the inner city would be downgraded as she believes rental properties are 'less-loved'.
144	Peter McIntyre	Support	• Submitter approves of the hotel 'on the basis it will help Dunedin, boost its tourism proposition'. Submitter believes the hotel will be viable in the long-term due to NZ's growing tourism industry • Submitter believes it is likely that once 'the Hotel is finished there is a strong likelihood that other Hotel operators will build and develop.' • Requests application be approved
145	Peter Cadogan	Support	• Believes the proposed height of the hotel makes it a 'viable project, without unduly restricting views or light' • Requests proposal be accepted
146	Alison Copeman	Support	• Believes there is a need for a five star hotel, especially for conferences • Conferences bring income to Dunedin through use of local suppliers e.g. stationary, tourism, florists etc. • Submitter has attached 'Convention Delegate Survey Report' • Submitter has reviewed the report and states the 'domestic delegate's average spend for a 3 day conference is $1500 while an internation delegate is $2000. • Requests application be accepted
147	Tristan O'Callaghan	Support	• Supports all of the application, in particular job creation, increase in tourists and 'more hotel rooms' • Requests application be accepted
148	Josh Voorkamp	Oppose	• Submitter is against the height of the hotel, and compares to the Commerce Building at the University of Otago as appearing too tall even when surrounded by other tall buildings • Hotel will damage views of St Pauls Cathedral and the Town Hall, and will be in the photographs taken of these buildings • Submitter suggests Jervois Street for the hotel location as it may 'help to revert' the flow of foot and vehicle traffic towards the University back towards the south of the Octagon • Believes the hotel would damage tourism as it would take away from the heritage look of the city • Against the developer's 'attitude' whereby he 'refuses' to negotiate on the building design. Doubts the developer's capability and believes that the developer has not built a hotel yet • Opposed to the reduction in sun in the Octagon in winter • Requests application be declined
149	Tony MacColl	Oppose	• Against the breach of the DP height requirements • The submitters property is located 'in the centre of the Anticipated View Assessment No. 10 (Anticipated View from Stuart Street), which will affect the submitters views of the harbour, peninsula and heritage buildings. Submitter believes that the amenity of surrounding residential properties will be adversely affected • Submitter believes the hotel is 'contrary to a number of Objectives and Policies of the DP, including: Objective 9.2.3', and 'Policy 9.3,3' • Submitter believes the hotel is contrary to a number of Objectives and Policies in the 2GP: Objective 18.2.2, Policy 18.2.2.3, Objective 18.2.3 and Policy 18.2.3.1

			• 'The proposed activity has been assessed as being a non-complying activity. Section 104D of the RMA provides certain restrictions for non-complying activities'. Submitter believes that the proposed activity is contrary to a number of Objectives and Policies laid out in the OP and the 2GP. 'Given the height and scale of the proposed building I am also unsatisfied that the adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated. I suggest the adverse effects of the proposed activity on my property/residential amenity will be more than minor' • Requests consent be declined
150	Esther Gilbert	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restriction requirements of the OP and 2GP. The height requirements were reached after consultation with the community, and the proposed hotel's breach of height requirements 'show(s) a complete disregard for much hard work done by many'. Submitter disagrees with the developer's idea that 5 star hotels need to be that height. • Against the design which is 'reminiscent of the likes of Auckland and Sydney'. 'The glass cladding is a stark contrast and detrimental to the current heritage cityscape, which is in the main built of stone, brick, plaster and concrete'. • Submitter is opposed to the inclusion of retail shops which would draw retail operators out of George and Princes Streets, 'where there are already a number of vacancies', which would be 'counter-intuitive to the City Council's attempts to revitalise these areas'. Also opposed to the inclusion of conference facilities which would adversely affect the Town Hall conference facilities which would result in reduced 'revenue which is currently earned directly buy the Dunedin City'. • Against the loss of car parking, which is frequently used by 'rate-payers' and the loss of parking appears 'short-sighted'. • Requests application be rejected, Or, if granted, with the following conditions: (i) that the building height does not exceed the height limit in the 2GP, (ii)That the building style is more in keeping with its neighbours, (iii) That it does not contain any apartments which are unit-titled separately from the hotel, and (iv) that it does not contain any retail outlets
151	Stuart Anderson	Support	• Submitter believes the proposed hotel will 'contribute positively to Dunedin and have benefits for the whole community in terms of economic growth and urban environment' • Requests proposal be granted
152	Allan Barnes	Oppose	• Submitter believes the proposal will dominate its surroundings • Against increase in shading • The proposed hotel is not in keeping with heritage buildings • Submitter believes that design is unattractive and too tall • Submitter opposes the hotel being built in a new building, and supports development of heritage buildings • Against breach of height requirements • Submitter believes the proposed hotel will have a negative effect on cityscape and In turn adversely affect people who use the Octagon, and the areas around Moray Place and Stuart Street. • Requests that application be rejected
153	Joseph Dougherty	Oppose	• Submitter opposes the breach of height restrictions • Believes that the design is unattractive and not suited to the 'centre of town'. • Requests that application be rejected
154	Athol Parks	Oppose	• Opposed to the location, where the proposed hotel would be 'out of context, both in terms of scale (too tall) and style' • Submitter references Russell Lund's comment in the ODT (8th May, 2017) and agrees with the idea that 'the proposal with its generic operative model is outmoded and unsuited to the boutique destination which is Dunedin.' • Believes this type of hotel development to be 'unsuitable', and supports the use of heritage and existing buildings for Dunedin's development • Requests application be declined
155	Fiona Niell	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions in the DP • Against 'loss of city character', • Against increase in shade, wind the adverse effect on views

			• Believes the hotel is not in keeping with heritage character • Requests application be declined
156	Michael Alfred Neill	Oppose	• Against the height, which is 'too high' • Against adverse effect on views and shading • Submitter believes there may be a 'reflective glare' due to the glass cladding • Requests consent be declined
157	Margaret Thomson	Oppose	• Sees no reason to breach height requirements • Believes the design to be dated and 'retro' • Supports the revival of heritage buildings, and would want the hotel to have underground parking • Doubts that the proposed roundabout would 'work here' • Submitter believes that the hotel, and its subsequent adverse effect on parking facilities in the CBD, would deter musicians from coming to Dunedin. • Submitter is against 'threatening' 'take it or leave it' attitude of the developer • Requests application be rejected as the current land use (parking facility) works well for Dunedin residents
158	Prissila Anne Bates	Oppose	• Against breach of height restrictions • Opposed to the glass 'look at me' design, as it is not in keeping, nor does it 'enhance' heritage buildings • Believes a better location for the proposed hotel in its current design is 'up at the back of the city or by the Stadium', or alternatively redesign the hotel and lower the height to conform to height requirements set out in the DP • Requests application be rejected
159	Duncan and Lynne Kean	Oppose	• Against the hotel in its current form, which will breach height restrictions and does not pay homage to heritage Dunedin • Submitters believe that Dunedin's tourism is dependent on both wildlife and heritage buildings that make Dunedin a unique city in NZ. They are concerned that the proposed hotel in its current design would detract from Dunedin's uniqueness. • Believes developer's attitude 'is one way to wind up the ratepayers'.
160	Michael Nidd	Support	• 'Economically critical', and a 'very important investment for the city including capital investments, jobs', 'visitor accommodation', 'apartment accommodation'. It will 'assist the acknowledged shortage of apartment accommodation' • Believes the design to be excellent, and is 'modern yet visually compatible with cityscape' • Supports the location, which is the 'best possible location for conferences' • Requests application be granted
161	Roy Victor Kenny	Support	• Submitter believes a new 5 star hotel is 'vital for Dunedin's future'. • Submitter is slightly concerned over the height of the hotel, but states it is of 'minimum concern'. • Requests proposal be accepted
162	Edward Stansby	Oppose	• Against the height, which is 'out of proportion' with its surroundings, and would adversely affect Dunedin's cityscape • It would dwarf other buildings in the city centre, and would detract from heritage buildings, e.g. Town Hall and St Paul's Cathedral • Opposed to increase in shade, particularly in public spaces like the Octagon in winter • Requests application be rejected
163	Norman William Ledgerwood	Support	• Submitter is a retired architect and an author • Height: The price of the land located in the CBD means that a 3 storey building is not economically viable. Submitter questions the applicant's definition of the proposed hotel as a 'high rise' considering the design • Heritage: Submitter supports the idea of preserving heritage areas of the city but questions whether the location of the proposed hotel is actually heritage. • He suggests that 'we no longer notice the long-term impact' of the '20th century architecture of varying degrees of visual quality'. He 'predict(s) that the new hotel will follow that pattern of acceptable change and in time be accepted as an important addition to the city'. • Submitter believes the design is completed with 'considerable skill' due to

			the irregular shape of the site, and that it has incorporated vehicle and pedestrian access 'well'. • Submitter suggests glass cladding will enhance views of Dunedin, and at some times views of the Town Hall St Paul's Cathedral will be reflected. He believes the hotel will have an 'ever-changing appearance ' due to the 'interplay of light and shade as the sun moves' • Submitter suggests the design will allow the hotel to be 'immensely strong and will provide excellent earthquake resilience'. Suggests glass is useful in 'earthquake-prone places'. • Design has incorporated running costs and staff capabilities in how many rooms each floor contains. Submitter suggests if the number of rooms are changed it risks 'reducing the return on investment and making the project not feasible'. • Concern regarding the lighting from the hotel influencing the lit up façade of St Pauls Cathedral in the evening, and suggest this may, if it does have an adverse effect, need to be mitigated • 'I believe that at a time when the city is losing jobs almost faster than they are being created and the Council is endeavouring to attract both visitors and new employment opportunities, it is vital that we have at least one first class hotel that will bring high spending visitors to the city.' The hotel could have the potential to attract further investment • Submitter suggests the adverse effect on residents' views may be 'not as disastrous as is presently supposed', as the 2D photos do not give justice to the design • 'economic good (for) the city must take precedence over personal concerns however genuinely they are held' • Requests application be granted without significant changes or restrictions
164	Margaret Kane	Oppose	• Opposed to the location, where the hotel would be out of place with the cityscape • Against the 'arrogant behaviour' of the developer 'to state the height and design are non-negotiable' • Not against a new hotel, however would 'prefer it to be built elsewhere' • Against breach of height restrictions • Against shade of 'surrounding buildings', and the 'impact on wind funnelling around the area, including the Octagon'
165	Neville Caird	Support	• 'Dunedin needs growth', and the proposed hotel will 'help to achieve this'. Submitter believes that 'Dunedin is going backwards' • Supports the idea that Dunedin has a need to this type of 'quality accommodation', and that it will help to attract affluent people to Dunedin • Requests application be approved in full
166	Robyn Edgar	Oppose	• Submitter believes the proposed hotel would 'destroy the views of our iconic inner city' • Agrees with Russell Lund's comments in the ODT regarding 'sensitively developed' hotels, and is against a new hotel being built 'from scratch' • Would rather the hotel be built at the Cadbury factory location • Opposed to the attitude of the developer • Requests application be declined due to its design and location
167	Sue Smaill	Oppose	• Submitter believes there is a need for a five star hotel in Dunedin • Against the proposed design, which is 'old fashioned', and is not in keeping with 'our Heritage Cityscape' • Requests hotel be declined in its current design. Alternatively, would want the hotel redesigned to be 'a hotel that we can all be proud of'.
168	Elliot Adamson	Support	• Supports the economic development that would arise from the hotel • Dunedin would benefit from increased employment, increase business to service industry, increased capacity for accommodation subsequently allowing tourism growth' • Requests application be approved, with 'caveats to include local construction companies and services' which would provide a 'boost (to) employment and local business growth'.
169	Lucinda McConnon	Support	• Benefit to Dunedin • Supports the 'juxtaposition' between the heritage buildings and the proposed hotel. She believes the design to be 'striking' • Submitter believes that development is characterised by 'taller buildings' • She is concerned by the 'short-sighted' submissions by people having a 'knee-jerk reaction to losing parks'

			• Requests application be granted
170	Lauren Burrows	Support	• Supports the proposal as Dunedin is currently 'losing other assets & jobs'. • The proposed hotel would lead to 'increased employment across industry sectors, increasing business for local service providers' and 'increased accommodation capacity' for tourism and would be a 'pull factor'. • Requests application be approved
171	Alison Scarth. Submission is the same as #94	Opposed	• Revised submission • Height: out of character with historic precinct. The proposal would dominate views and heritage buildings. Submitter describes the proposed change in view as 'obtrusive' • Design: believes the design to be 'out of date' and the glass cladding would not contrast well with the surrounding stone buildings. Submitter suggests converting a heritage building instead • Tourism: Dunedin is becoming 'more and more attractive as a tourist magnet'. Submitter states in well-known cities that attract tourists, heritage buildings are being 'enhanced and very much used'. • Parking: The parking lot is 'particularly valuable, as it provides access to important cultural and social centres nearby'. • Height and Bulk: Submitter is concerned that the hotel would 'significantly shade' the Octagon and increase wind flow. She is concerned that businesses that rely on outdoor use will suffer financially. • Requests application be declined, 'with a recommendation to explore the option of renovating and enhancing an existing heritage building'.
172	Ellen Seaton	Support	• Supports the potential increased employment across industry, service providers, business and tourism sectors • 'Possible tender for Aon Insurance' • Requests application be accepted
173	Mike Burrows	Support	• Increased employment across industry, local service providers, accommodation and would be a 'tourism pull factor' • 'It will be a great new addition to Dunedin and give a needed boost to the central city' • Requests application be accepted
174	Jane O'Dea, Heritage Advisor (Planning), for Heritage Dunedin	Neutral	• Subject site is an archaeological site as defined in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 with several buildings located on the site prior to 1900 • Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 makes it unlawful for any person to modify or destroy, or cause to be modified or destroyed, the whole or any part of an archaeological site without the prior authority of Heritage New Zealand • Important that resource consent conditions be imposed to manage the discovery of archaeological material are aligned with the requirements of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. • Full archaeological assessment and an archaeological authority under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 is required. • Requests that should consent be granted advice note be included in consent relating to requirements for archaeological sites under Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.
175	Lois Galer	Oppose	• The design of the hotel is not in keeping with heritage surroundings. It will dominate the area and dwarf the heritage structures • Adverse effect on views for residents and workers • Submitter believes the hotel will adversely affect tourism which relies on Dunedin being the 'best preserved city in NZ'. • Suggests a better size would be 4 – 5 stories, and a better location would be on Dowling Street carpark • Requests application be declined
176	George Varsanyi	Oppose	• Submitter is concerned the 'beautiful historic character' of Dunedin will be adversely affected and changed • Requests application be declined
177	Paul Wernham	Oppose	• Submitter lists relevant precinct values and rules laid out in the District Plan, and states 'it is my opinion that on the basis of these aspects of the proposal this application should be declined' • States the hotel is 'completely unsympathetic to the cityscape in this location as it does not comply with any of the values of the District Plan.' • Suggests there may bring 'some economic development, which is debateable,' but contrasts the remaining values of the DP 'Environment,

			arts and culture, social wellbeing.' • Against the breach of height restrictions • Visually dominating, and is not in keeping with heritage surroundings • Concern regarding falling glass • Requests application be rejected
178	Chas Tanner	Oppose	• Submitter suggests the hotel will have a dominating effect on its surroundings, and the location is inappropriate for the 'high rise' design • Requests application be declined
179	Katrina McKenzie	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions which was decided on after 'much consultation'. 'It is therefore not right that citizens have to fight to have their district plan adhered to.' • Believes the hotel height would look 'appalling out of place'. • Requests application be declined
180	Elizabeth Jane Kerr	Oppose	• Submitter suggests that the proposal does not 'meet the threshold tests in section 104D of the Act' because the submitter believes the effects of the hotel are more than minor • Believes the application is insufficient in 'verifiable analysis' and that the geotech report is 'general' and completed when the plans for the hotel were unavailable. • Submitter intends to address the topics of the DP and 2GP, the architectural integrity and urban design, and the sale of land and central city parking at the hearing. • 'fails to protect the historic heritage of the Dunedin townscape from inappropriate use and development' • Believes there will be adverse cumulative effects including negative effects on 'vision, architectural coherence and notions of liveability that the Community sets great store by for maintenance, upgrade and development of Dunedin's urban core' • Concern regarding the hotel setting a precedent • Requests application be declined in entirety
181	Richard Clark	Oppose	• 'not opposed to a new hotel in the city' • Believes the design to be unattractive and out of character with the 'existing architectural heritage of the city'. Would like the design to be more 'sympathetic' to the city • Against the breach of height restrictions • Believes the hotel would be a 'blot on the landscape' • Against the increase in traffic, and doubts whether a roundabout would be effective • Submitter suggests the Cadbury factory site would be better suited for this development • Does not approve of allowing the hotel 'to access the aquifers for the city supply' • Requests application be declined
182	Richard Wilson	Oppose	• Against the breaches in the DP rules • It would shade important areas of the CBD. 'Dunedin owns the sunny side of the town hall' • It would have a negative effect on 'ground level winds' • 'it would change the demographic of the cities people' and suggests the hotel would adversely affect residents wellbeing • Doubts the need for a hotel directly in the city centre, and suggests it is not needed • Requests application be declined, and for further development that breaches the 'zoning rules' unreasonably should not be considered. Submitter wants before and after photos considered with sun so that residents can better understand the effects of shading. Submitter also would like 'comprehensive wind tunnel and computer model tests carried out to determine the effect this large building would have on Dunedin's wind scape'
183	Ross Price	Oppose	• Originally supported the idea of the hotel, however after reviewing the inclusion of apartments suggests the proposal is an 'apartment building first and a hotel second' with the apartment section built at 'virtually no cost and little consideration to neighbours or the city'. Suggests this would set a 'dangerous' precedent. • Requests application be declined due to breaching the height limit
184	Alan Starrett	Oppose	• Submitter doubts the need for a 5 star hotel

			• He is opposed to the design, which is not in keeping with its surroundings. Submitter is not opposed to a modern design, but feels the design is not suited. • Against the loss of carparks • Suggests a better location would be Dowling Street • Requests proposal be rejected
185	Jason Graham	Support	• Submitter supports the design • Suggests that for a city to develop, boundaries should be pushed, and that a 5 star hotel being located in the centre of the city is beneficial to development and vitality. • Believes the breach of height restrictions to be the 'heaviest non-compliance' however it is located 'within a collection of tall buildings around the 30m to 40m range' and is therefore in context. Submitter argues that the 'permitted height conditions carries little weight' due to the existing non-complying buildings • Believes the adverse effect of shading to be minor due to the limited number of hours it will occur • Suggests that the negative effect on residents views will be 'minimal' • Supports the glass cladding which promotes diversity and evolution in the city. The glass will help to 'soften' the building and integrate it into the skyline, which will 'enable it to blend in'. • The hotel will enable Dunedin to be 'a great and modern city' • Requests application be accepted
186	Anne Mechen	Neutral	• Submitter is the 'owner/licensee of Kiddies Campus' which is the nearest neighbour of the proposed site. • States: 'This will impact on our business financially and possibly the health and wellbeing of the children in our care if the impacts are not mitigated'. • Concerns regarding construction and vehicle noise, which children are 'sensitive to' and may disrupt teaching sessions. Children may be exposed to 'excessive noise when they are outside'. Noise will also disturb the sleep of the younger children.' • Concern regarding the dust and fumes from excavation and vehicle movements beside the boundary having a negative effect on children and staff • 'Potential accidents with items falling across or through the boundary into an area with children' • 'Vehicles crashing through the boundary fence and into areas occupied by children'. • Submitter lists mitigations for safety and noise that will need to be completed and states that some of them are 'out of the budget' and unfeasible as they rent the building • Concerns regarding the change to microclimate around the buildings, which could affect their business • Suggests considering heat and light reflection in the applicant's AEE • Request that if granted, that the developer is required to work with neighbouring businesses to mitigate the impact on the businesses during construction.' • Concern over 'the financial implications during (the period of construction), both lost income and cost to mitigate the issues mentioned above, as well as the health, safety and wellbeing of the children and staff who are part of the Kiddies Campus community.'
187	Raymond Michael Jackson	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions set out in the DP • Suggests the design will create a 'degraded street level pedestrian environment' due to an increase in shadow and wind tunnels • Submitter is opposed to the effect the hotel will have on views, and states that residents' views are important, and 'should trump those of transient visitors'. In the proposed location, the hotel would 'dominate' the view. • Suggests the location for the proposed hotel should be south of the Octagon, where it will be in keeping with the surrounding architecture • Requests application be rejected
188	Denise Elaine Snell	Oppose	• Submitter is opposed to the detrimental effect on 'the environment, size, location, views, shading (and) heritage' • Requests application be rejected in its present design
189	Sue Griffiths, Sandra Buchanan,	Oppose	• Submitters work at 40A Filleul Street, which is a 'building specifically altered to accommodate 9 consulting rooms for psychotherapists and

	Shona Wilson, and others at 40A Filleul Street		counsellors to provide a mental health service'. • Having a 'calm and confidential', quiet, 'light and open feel' is needed for their work. • Submitters chose current location through 'careful and considerate preparation', and it would be difficult to relocate. • Submitters are concerned that noise would disrupt their current quiet environment • Opposed to the potential increase in shading, which adversely affects the 'light and open feel (that) is good for the work (they) do'. • Concern regarding the decrease in parking spaces available • Concerned over effects to privacy and confidentiality aspects of their service, which will 'create problems' for their clients, who value the 'quiet and confidential nature' of their current service. • Requests application be declined, due to more than minor effects on their business.
190	Mary Thompson	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions • Against earthworks • Not in keeping with heritage surroundings • Against increase in shading and adverse effect on views • 'The glass façade may reflect sunlight in strange angles into other working spaces', submitter states that the 'small Derek Ball sculpture by the library' had to be removed due to this effect, and assumes the hotel would have a similar, worse effect. • Concern over the earthworks disrupting underground springs and streams and may affect groundwater flow • Concern that if tourism decreases in the future the hotel could be used for resident accommodation but that would not be feasible considering the 'limited vehicle access' • Requests application be declined or be restricted to a height that is 'lower than the Town Hall façade'. Underground excavation should be at a minimum and surveyed for streams and springs
191	Glen Turner	Support	• Considers the hotel is an investment that Dunedin needs • Believes the design to be interesting and not overbearing on the cityscape • Construction jobs will bring financial support to the city • The hotels daily operation will increase Dunedin's growth and sustainability • Doubts that a developer would ever propose a five star hotel that is directly in keeping with heritage buildings, e.g. built out of stone. Suggests that glass cladding is contemporary • Submitter is concerned that if the hotel is not accepted then it will adversely affect the cities vitality – leading the city 'left behind'. • Requests application be accepted
192	Ceri Warnock	Oppose	• Against the breach of height, 'front or side yards,' 'veranda requirements', and 'signage' requirements of the District Plan • Suggests the hotel will have 'major adverse effects and is contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan.' • Suggests the AEE is incomplete, inaccurate, incorrect in some places, and inadequate. States that the deficiencies need to be re-addressed and the 'matter re-notified'. • Believes the hotel would have an overbearing and dominating effect on its surroundings • Against the increase in shade and wind tunnels • Suggests materials are out of context • Believes the design is bulky and will 'close off public areas and views' • The location is not suitable • Suggests the design will make the hotel building unsustainable; wonders about the effect of heat loss through the glass building, the effect of Dunedin's 'aggressive marine environment' on the viability of the hotel, and the anticipated longevity of the building. • Concerned over the hotel 'undermining' the integrity of the District Plan • Against the adverse effect on parking in the location. • Concern over the building being able to be used as a 5 star hotel, the submitter states that the developer has not had interest from a hotel operator, nor does it have the 'amenities' conducive to a 5 star hotel. 'Applicant appears to have no track record of developing 5 star hotels, or any proven successful relationships with 5 star hotel operators'

			• 'The application does not state how many unit titles there will be, or does not clearly state this in a way that enables submitters to submit fully on the proposal.' • Doubts that the number of rooms, height and bulk are needed for a five star hotel, as the developer suggests they are. • Requests application be refused
193	Simon Johnston, Misbeary Holdings Limited	Oppose	• Submitter is opposed to breaches in height, external design, appearance, signage, earthworks, , subdivisions rules, • Submitter against the breaches to , Rule 9.5.2(i), Rule 9.5.2(ii), Rule 18.5.3 and 18.5.3 • Against 'all breaches of either the City Plan or 2GP, either notified as part of the application, or any that the submitter finds are breached after independent inquiry • Requests application be rejected in entirety
194	Wade Taylor	Support	• 'Dunedin needs growth and to attract high quality investments in to our city' • Supports the 'blend of old and new' architecture • Requests application be approved
195	David Mercer	Support	• 'the city needs modern and new facilities' • Requests application be granted
196	Paul Benedict Cadogan	Support	• Dunedin needs the hotel due to 'ever increasing functions/conferences/sport fixtures/concerts that are now being held' • Does not believe that the building's breach of height restrictions have a significant, negative effect • Suggests the shade will move throughout the day and will have minimal effect during the winter months. Does not think it will significantly shade the Octagon • Cites Melbourne as an example, where their first glass skyscraper was controversial but led to an influx of development • The adverse effect on view will be minimal, as 'they will only lose part of their view'. • Submitter is an architectural designer, and has no issues with the design and look • Requests application be approved
197	Campbell Douglas Shaw	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions laid out in the district plan. Doubts the efficacy of the District Plan if the hotel is approved • 'I consider the towering bulk of this building to be ugly and offensive,' submitter suggests the hotel is not in keeping with its surroundings and would dominate the area • Against the increase in shade, in particular in the Octagon • Suggests an adverse effect on tourism – whereby tourists are attracted to Dunedin due to its wildlife and Victorian architecture • Against the adverse effect on parking in the CBD, and is concerned it will affect the submitter's ability to 'attend events or transact business' in the area. 'I may not be able to attend concerts or use the library in future'. • Requests application be declined
198	Nic MacArthur	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions • 'The design is completely out of character' with its surroundings due to its height, bulk and design • Against increase in wind funnelling and shading and adverse effects on views • Suggests it will have a dominating effect on the Octagon • Requests application be declined
199	Helen Bradbury	Oppose	• The appearance is not in keeping with its surroundings • Against breach of height restrictions and the developer's statement that the height is non-negotiable • May have a dominating effect on views • Against the inclusion of apartments, and if removed would decrease the height of the hotel which would be beneficial • Doubts the need for more accommodation • Suggests an adverse effect on tourism
200	Dr DeWana Ray Kerr	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions and suggests the height of the hotel would adversely affect the 'beautiful views'. 'People pay for their views believing they are protected by the District Plan.' • Sustainability: 'I do not understand how we can expect to reach our goal of

			net zero carbon emissions when we continue to increase our unnecessary travel and associated greenhouse gas emissions.' Suggests emphasising the need for accommodation for tourists is 'irresponsible' • Suggests the hotel construction would have an adverse effect on residents' abilities to hire tradespeople • Requests application be declined, or to be reduced in height to fit with the District Plan's 11.0m height restriction
201	David Taylor	Support	• Suggests that allowing 'high class accommodation' will allow the centre city to develop • Requests application be approved
202	Chris Lovell-Smith	Oppose	• Against the height of the building, which will adversely affect views and dominate the skyline • Against the adverse effect on parking • Against 'extensive' earthworks and may increase hazards due to 'recent seismic activity in the SI of NZ' • 'There seems to be no supporting documentation justifying the proposal in terms of customer/client need' • Suggests there will be an adverse on 'wind and rain on pedestrians' • Sees little benefit to the proposal • Requests application be declined
203	Paul Beale	Support	• Submitter supports the application
204	Robert Sidney James Thornton	Oppose	• Submitter references Jan Gehl, a 'great Danish architect', and agrees with his statements regarding liveability and walkability, which is promoted by having buildings of three to six storeys. • Heritage buildings attract tourists to the city, and this may be adversely affected due to the negative effects on views created by the hotel. • Concerned regarding a reflective glare from the glass façade • Requests application be declined
205	Marilyn Johnson	Oppose	• Supports the idea that Dunedin needs more tourist accommodation, however does not think the location for the proposed hotel is suitable • Suggests it will be out of character, and not 'fit in/enhance' the area • Not sensitive to heritage buildings • Against the severe reductions in parking spaces available in the CBD. Suggests this effect will be more than minor to residents • Requests application be declined
206	Inger Gledhill	Oppose	• The height would be 'incompatible' with surrounding buildings, including heritage buildings, in the area • Against the increase in shade which would adversely affect people using the Octagon • Against negative effect on parking, and suggests that buses would be needed for the tourists using the hotel, which would further the negative effect • Requests application be declined as the developer says the plan is non-negotiable regarding height and size
207	Bronson Te Tau, National Marketing Manager for Night 'n Day Foodstores Limited	Support	• Supports the increase in accommodation, as the city 'desperately' needs it • Supports the need for a 5 star • 'Increase revenue for Dunedin businesses particularly in the CBD' • Improved Dunedin economy • Increase job opportunities • Requests application be approved
208	Virginia Nicholls, The Otago Southland Employer's Association	Support	• Tourist numbers are expected to increase and therefore a hotel 'of this stature would be welcomed' • Economic benefit to Dunedin in terms of 'more jobs for the construction of the hotel', increased direct employment, indirect benefits, 'long term benefits for Dunedin retailers' • Location is ideally 'situated close to our vibrant city'. • Good 'walking distance' to conference facilities • 'The rates on a hotel of this size will be significant, which will benefit the Dunedin City Council and therefore the Dunedin rate payers' • A 5 star hotel would attract more affluent spenders to Dunedin, which will benefit 'our city and surrounding regions' • The glass façade may reflect the heritage buildings surrounding it, which will provide 'another dimension to the landscape' it is situated
209	Southern Heritage Trust	Oppose	• Southern Heritage Trust (SHT) is an NGO

			• Agrees on the economic need for a five-star hotel in Dunedin • They believe there to be a significant negative impact on 'visual amenity and heritage values' • Believe there will be a 'dominating' impact on the streetscape, the 'focal point' of the city • Submitters list heritage views that will be adversely affected • Submitters suggest that the hotel will have an adverse effect on tourism which is drawn to heritage buildings. • Suggest there should be a more gradual heightening of buildings from residential zones to the CBD • They 2GP submissions were rushed • They oppose the applicant's suggestion that First Church sets a precedent for the height, as it is not relevant because it tapers into a spire. • The proposal would breach 'RMA Section 7c, which requires impacts on surrounding amenity values to be minimised', and suggest that there would be significant, more than minor, adverse effects on 'Category 1-listed heritage buildings that are immediate neighbours' of the proposal. • Submitters believe that Dunedin is already suffering from a loss of character through modern style buildings in the Octagon, and argue that this proposal would 'erode those values still further' • Concern that the proposal breaches height restrictions and is not in keeping with heritage surroundings, which would set a precedent for further development of this kind and adversely affect Dunedin's tourism industry. • Agree with developer's statement that the location can be developed from being a car park, but argue that any proposed building should be a lower height. • Precedent: As stated above, submitters are concerned regarding a precedent set for tall, modern buildings in the CBD. They ask Council to think about the cumulative effects these buildings would have on 'shading, wind, sunlight and amenity values' • Suggest there will be an adverse effect on residents' views and general enjoyment of the city, as many residents value the heritage feel of the inner city. They argue the hotel would be 'imposing' for residents • Argue that effects to Dunedin's amenity would be significantly affected • Requests application be declined
210	Joanna Dowd on behalf of Aurora Energy Limited	Neutral	• Background: 'Aurora owns, operates and maintains an electricity distribution network in the Dunedin and Central Otago regions.' 'Aurora is committed to providing its customers in the region with an effective and secure supply of electricity'. 'Aurora's Smith Street zone substation is located at 8 Smith Street' and serves 'a number of commercial customers in the Central City'. 'Aurora has planned works for the Smith Street zone substation over the next planning period' • 'Aurora is therefore concerned that the proposed construction and operation of the site, especially for the residential use, does not result in issues associated with reverse sensitivity.' • Aurora is neutral towards the proposal, but is concerned regarding 'appropriate health and safety considerations, around electricity assets during construction activities and the location of the high voltage Smith Street one Substation. To ensure safety is not compromised the following is required;… Aurora therefore require that no crane movements be permitted over or across the substation. In addition, the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safety Distances sets out the distance requirements necessary for the installation and maintenance of overhead electric lines and other electrical works previously subject to particular provisions contained in the Electrical Supply Regulations 1984'. If not complied with there is a potential risk to 'Aurora's ability to supply electricity if construction works involve movement of material over the substation.' Furthermore – 'no landscaping is to be planted on the boundary of the substation that would interfere with its normal operation', 'Correspondence with an Aurora engineer is required prior to any excavations occurring on the boundary of the substation site to ensure that underground cables and the earth grid are not damaged, and to ensure that the foundations of the substation are not undermined', and to prevent construction materials to be stored at the boundary of the substation site which would allow the boundary fence to be scalable – as the substation is

			a controlled area and access is prohibited • They note that there is no mention of the electricity assets of Aurora on the neighbouring site or the need for connections to connect to the Aurora network stated in the application. If approved, Aurora would provide the source of electricity supply to the development, and easements for such services would be required • Upgrade works are programmed for the Smith Street zone substation in 2020-2021. 'Allowing the development of a more sensitive activity (e.g. residential use) near Aurora's substation may results in actual or perceived health, safety and operational risks. Encroachment may also lead to restrictions being placed on the continuation or upgrading of existing infrastructure due to amenity concerns. These may, in turn, create an undue restriction on the ability for the assets to be used to meet forecast demand.' 'Aurora therefore seeks assurances from the applicant that the operation and maintenance of its assets will not be adversely affected by issues associated with reverse sensitivity and seeks a no-complains covenant offered as a condition of consent'. • Submitter advises that Aurora neutral towards the application being approved, but if approved then Aurora seeks conditions attached to any approval that will address the issues outlined in their summary.
211	Evan Matheson	Support	• Dunedin would benefit from the proposed hotel development • Believes the location is ideal • Requests application be accepted
212	Alice Bartlett	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restriction • The design is not sensitive to its surroundings, including heritage buildings and is 'lacking in commitment to urban amenity'. Suggests the design is unattractive and would dominate the surroundings • Requests consent be declined
213	Suzanne Louis Lund	Oppose	• Amenity: Submitter owns a property on Cargill Street and Royal Terrace, and states she is an affected party. Submitter believes the amenity of the properties will be greatly affected by the 'over scaled architectural non-entity' and 'permanently downgraded'. Suggests that the proposal does not "maintain and enhance amenity values" as per the RMA 1991, Section 7. • View: States that 'the insuperable difficulty for the applicant is that the Harrow St view shaft that the hotel obliterates with its height is specifically protected under Section 13 of the operative District Plan. (Townscapes). Section 13.5.2 states that "4 of the best urban vistas to be obtained of Dunedin are out of the Octagon Townscape precinct", being i) the view of the First Church Spire from Moray place looking down Harrop St"'. Submitter states that 'all four' of the urban vistas listed in 'Section 13.5.2 will be destroyed by the proposed 61m tall hotel.' 'the massive proportions and height of the proposal are fatal to all of the view shafts and virtually all of the precinct values for Townscape Precincts TH02, (Octagon) and TH03, (Moray Place)' • View: submitter disagrees with the developer's statement that; 'the perceived mass of the building will be less if residents have views into the building', submitter suggests that is incomparable to 'the protected vista of the Cathedral, Town Hall,' etc. Submitter also suggests that the transparency of the glass will be *less* than the application suggests, which will exacerbate the dominating effect of the hotel on its surroundings. • Suggests that Anderson & Co, the planners behind the proposal, are ignoring basic requirements of a best practice AEE by not including effects on shade, views, privacy and amenity for residential neighbours. Submitter suggests they have done this purposefully as the submitter believes after consideration of these effects, it would show the proposal would have more than minor effects on its neighbours and therefore would not comply with the Act. States that the submission completely ignores the effects of the proposal on Cargill Street. Submitter's husband has used Anderson and Co planners in the past and has been satisfied with the level of detail in their AEE's – suggests that the applicant has asked the planners to not include some factors in their AEE. • Against the design, height and scale of the proposal 'and all of the effects generated from the scale and height and lack of regard to District plan Townscape and other provisions'. Believes there would be a precedent for other tall, non-compliant buildings in the city centre. Submitter states the

			hotel height and design do not fit in with the precinct values. • Opposed to the exacerbation of parking difficulties in the inner city. Does not believe that the proposed number of car parks is enough. 'The parking problems in the central city will be exacerbated by this development, as it is removing a public carpark, and then proposing an accommodation development that alone has a parking shortfall of equivalent to the entire capacity of the carpark it is to be built upon.' Submitter suggests that 'the loss of these carparks will mean that, along with other recent DCC initiatives, there are around 600 – 700 carparks that will be lost from the CBD' which will be a significant problem for businesses. • Suggests there is a 'lack of rigour and completeness of the application' • Believes there to be 'economic uncertainty of the project' and that there is 'financial risk to Council' • Submitter has 'serious' doubts over the financial viability of the scheme, and estimates that the hotel construction alone would cost over $100 million, after design and furnishings etc the submitter estimates the end value of the project would need to be 'at or over $160 million'. She states there is an 'unproven demand' for the hotel rooms and apartments. 'Mr Tosswill may be planning to bring in a Chinese construction company who will park a retired cruise ship at the waterfront for the duration of the project and have their workers stay there' but submitter suggests this is not 'fanciful' nor will it drive the cost of construction down enough to make the project financially viable. • Submitter is concerned about the liability that the building control division of the DCC will be exposed to, in relation to its building consent approval and compliance monitoring. She cites a QLDC example whereby 'a large number of hotel and apartments have been built in Queenstown and the individual hotel rooms and apartments are sold off individually. A body corporate is then responsible for repairs and maintenance. The developer has no long term or permanent stake in the completed structure, and therefore no incentive to specify materials and pay for quality standards with the long term in mind'. The QLDC 'has spent $3.6 million just on legal fees for remedial building liability cases which will rise to close to $4 million by the end of this year'. • Submitter suggests that if the hotel was accepted, it would set a precedent and therefore 'make an irrelevance out of the Council's 2GP plan' • Submitter has attached a different Resource Consent Application for visitor accommodation in Queenstown by Anderson & Co in order to show what the submitter believes is a difference in quality of the planners' AEEs. • Requests consent be declined
214	Chris Grave on behalf of Configure Express	Oppose	• Submitter is opposed in the reduction of the 30 casual car parks, and 102 leased car parks that will exacerbate parking difficulties in the city centre and adversely affect the submitter's business. • Submitter's business relies on the car parks which support the safety and convenience for their all-female cliental. He argues that it is 'impractical for (their) clients to use public transport to utilise (their) business'. • Requests application be declined. Would support the proposal <u>if</u> there was no loss of leased and public parking
215	Julienne Watson	Oppose	• Against the height, which would dominate the inner city and would adversely affect cityscape, views and sun. • Supports the re-use of heritage buildings for 5 star accommodation and does not think the hotel in its present glass design would be as successful in Dunedin • Requests application be declined. Would accept a 'hotel designed to fit with the character and proportion of the existing buildings'.
216	Tom McLean	Oppose	• Against the breach of the height restriction. • Concern regarding shade and wind funnels around the city centre • Believes the hotel to be out of keeping with Dunedin. The submitter suggests that the design is 'not memorable' and therefore not unique enough to warrant 'break(ing) or chang(ing) the rules' • Requests the hotel to be 'smaller or more imaginative', 'one that does not compromise the look and attractiveness of Dunedin's historical centre'
217	Andrew Stewart	Oppose	• Submitter objects to the height of the hotel • Requests application be declined
218	Robyn Sperling	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions as the hotel would 'overwhelm the city centre' and it is out of keeping and dominates the 'fine heritage

			buildings' in Dunedin. • Concern over the shade which would affect cafes and businesses in the Octagon and surrounding streets • Concern regarding the potential wind funnel around the hotel • Exacerbate parking difficulties in the city centre, which will create issues for users of the library, town hall, art gallery, etc. • Suggests a heritage building reused as a five star hotel would reflect Dunedin's values • Requests application be rejected
219	Russel Sim	Oppose	• 'The proposal fails to meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, and fails to protect the historic heritage of the Dunedin townscape from inappropriate use and development.' • Suggests effects of the hotel are more than minor and that the proposal 'is contrary to the objectives and policies of the Dunedin City council District plan, and the 2GP' • The location is better used as a car park, rather than a hotel which will close up some of the 'very little open space' in the city centre, and increase the shade around it • The community input into the District Plan and the 2GP, and their beliefs should not be compromised by 'unknown outside interests'. • Requests proposal be rejected
220	John Holmes	Oppose	• The DCC 'owns the properties subject to this application and there would appear to be a conflict of interest for the Council to be involved in making any recommendations on the submission', he states that 'it would be a major conflict of interest for the Council to consider the application. The hearing panel should not contain any members of the DCC so as to avoid any perception of Conflict of Interest.' • Submitter believes there would be more appropriate wind stations that would better represent the wind environment in the city centre, rather than using the 'exposed site at Momona airport'. 'On page 6 the report states… wind conditions on the Moray Place footpaths would be likely to exceed the recommended criterion for safety during south-westerly and west-south-westerly winds.' 'Pedestrians in Moray Place and around the Hotel building could experience unpleasant and even dangerous wind conditions.' He highlights the report's statement; 'there is a fairly high probability that wind conditions on the Moray Place footpaths, adjacent to the proposed development, will be in excess of the criterion for safety with some possibility of the cumulative (comfort) criteria also being exceeded.' He further submits that he agrees with the report that 'a successful scale-model wind-tunnel study' needs to be completed in order to ensure pedestrians' safety and comfort levels are maintained. • Traffic: Submitter highlights that the transport assessment 'estimates 22 coach movements per day (page 12) and a further 20 truck movements but then sums it to a total of 21 coach and medium truck movements a day (third paragraph on page 12).' He believes that is a mistake and it should be '42 movements per day'. He suggests that the traffic movements entering the hotel from George Street end of Moray Place will cause congestion. He appreciates the dangers this could cause as he regularly uses this part of the road to access the congregation of St Paul's Cathedral – there could be an adverse effect on safety of road users • Traffic: The plans indicate a right turn into a 12.0m roundabout in Moray Place, which would be difficult for a 13.0m coach. Submitter is concerned 'major congestion would occur' when events are on at the Town Hall.' It would be virtually impossible for a safe coach turning path to enable a left turn from the exit onto Filleul Street. • Submitter states that the section at 62 York Place is included in the Site Survey Plan (Page 9) but is not 'part of this application'. If it is indeed additional parkin for the hotel then there will be traffic implications for York Place and there 'should be some mention of it in the application.' • Submitter believes a model included with the application would be better than the series of artistic photographs, which he considers underestimates the height of the building • Shade: Believes there will be shade from 2pm onwards in the Octagon in winter, which may deter residents and tourists from using the Octagon to some extent. • Residents have a 'high sensitivity to the Urban character/visual amenity or

			visual sensitivity receptor, and therefore the submitter believes that 'deep shadow in the Octagon' from the hotel would rank as a "Moderate" Effect/Impact', or even a 'significant' effect • Reflection: Submitter is concerned over the 'bright reflections' that could come from the hotel, especially cause by the setting sun – which may cast a glare over residential areas to the west of the hotel. States there needs to be some assessment of reflected light from the low lying sun in the morning and evening. 'Bright lights can be a hazard'. • Shop frontage: Concern over pedestrian access to the ground level shops and their safety from the '1.6 to 1.8m drop between the pavement and the excavation'. • Podium: 'The architects statement (page 1) talks about a 9 to 100m high semi-glazed steel structure following the slope of the road boundary. There are no details or sketches of this in the document and it is difficult to imagine what the architect has in mind' • Submitter 'seek(s) clarification over the composition of the hearing panel so there is no conflict of interest between the panel and the Dunedin City Council', 'would like further detailed clarification of wind assessment following detailed analysis using data sourced more locally than Momona Airport', 'recommend(s) that a scale model of the actual building should be constructed and used in wind tunnel testing to assess the likely impact of winds on the safety of pedestrians in the vicinity of the hotel', 'a more detailed traffic management plan must be developed and become a condition of any Resource Management consent', and seeks clarification of the 62 York Place section for car parking. • Requests application be declined, or the height to be reduced (possibly by removing the apartment levels) and the design more sympathetic to its surroundings,
221	Michael Baker	Oppose	• Concern regarding location – suggests that other locations may not have been considered and that, combined with other high rise buildings, there will be an adverse effect on views. The height of the hotel be an earthquake risk • The design of the hotel is not sympathetic to heritage buildings, and there may be a loss to heritage amenity – which is contrary to the DP • Concerned that the hotel may not actually bring 'increased business' • Height: against the DP, will 'loom' above the city • Loss of sun around the library and town hall effects are considered by the submitter to be more than minor • Suggests that roundabouts are not suitable across intersections without a similar flow across all incoming roads • Concern that a precedent would be set for high rise office blocks etc. Submitter describes Dunedin as 'unique' due to the low rise nature of the city • Concern over the length of construction, where cranes could 'dominate the skyline for weeks' • Requests application be declined as it is contrary to the district plan
222	Niall McColm	Oppose	• Height: Against the breach of height restrictions and will have an overbearing effect on the cityscape. • The hotel will 'effect the character of the inner city'. The design is not outstanding • A five star hotel should reflect the city it is built in and the residents' values – which the submitter feels the hotel in its current design does not • Requests application be declined as is, or made to conform to the height restrictions, and to be designed in a way that 'relates to Dunedin and high performance sustainable systems'.
223	Bill Munro	Support	• Submits that Dunedin as a lack of inner city higher end accommodation • The city 'should welcome investment' • Requests application be accepted
224	Francisca Griffin	Oppose	• Against the height of the hotel, which would create 'significant shading of the surrounding areas' • Requests application be declined
225	Sue Novell	Oppose	• Against the height and design – which 'does not enhance the surrounding area of town' • It is not sympathetic to the 'historical feel that is the draw card of Dunedin.'

			• It would dominate views, the town hall and the Octagon, and would cast shadows and create wind funnels • Requests application be declined in its current form and would welcome proposals 'for a cascading terraced structure, a few stories high.'
226	Stephanie Evans	Oppose	• Submits that the building is 'too high for the immediate surroundings including recreational public spaces.' • The design is not sympathetic to its surroundings • 'This is not the ideal location for this hotel' • Requests application be declined in its current form, or to 'reduce in height and size' with a new design that is in keeping with its surroundings, or keep the design and move to 'a different location further away from the Octagon.'
227	Chris Harris	Support	• Dunedin needs a 5 star hotel that will help to grow Dunedin's tourism economy, and help to offset job losses in other industries. • Submits that Dunedin has needed a five star hotel for a long time • Believes the roundabout will be suitable to assist with slowing vehicles and promote pedestrian safety. • Believes that the design is not too overbearing, relative to other tall buildings in the central city. • 'The applicants have clearly shown that views from nearby properties will not be significantly impacted. Any interruption of view caused by the proposed building cannot be so great as to warrant outright rejection of resource consent for such an important and desperately needed economic development for the Dunedin community.' • Requests application be approved
228	Janet Wyllie	Oppose	• Against the height, which is non-complying and 'does not fit' with Dunedin's heritage. Does not agree with the inclusion of apartments in a hotel which increases the height of the hotel unnecessarily in her view. • Against the shading, particularly in the winter • Against the creation of a wind funnel • Against the exacerbation of parking difficulties in the city centre • Does not approve of the design which she believes to be unattractive and 'cheap' • Believes the Cadbury building would be a better fit • Concerned that tourism would decrease due to the shading effect in the Octagon in winter • Requests proposal be rejected in entirety
229	Ron Scott Gilkison	Support	• Supports all parts of the application • Dunedin needs 'such a facility to progress' • Supports the design • Requests application be accepted
230	Diana Margret Struthers	Oppose	• Believes the hotel would adversely affect residents' and visitors' wellbeing due to increase in shade and therefore an associated drop in temperatures, as well as the increase in wind and noise from the hotel • Does not think the hotel is in keeping with its surroundings and it would adversely affect heritage Dunedin. • Concern regarding the reflection and dominating effect of the hotel • Against the breaches of the District Plan, which was created after community input • Requests application be refused
231	Robert Burns	Oppose	• Against the loss of views from the existing buildings • Not sympathetic to surroundings and does not 'beautify the central city' • Increase in shade • Concerned over traffic and parking problems • Believes the proposal is 'being rushed through without due public consultation' • Requests application be declined
232	Sam Gilchrist	Support	• Submitter is concerned that the proposal will not be built due to 'the negative attitudes of our local Heritage advocates' • Requests proposal be accepted
233	Bridie Lonie	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions • Concerned that the hotel 'will overwhelm the historic centre of the city' • Requests application be rejected, *or* to be built at a lower, 'more contextually suitable design'

234	Liz Angelo	Oppose	• Against adverse effect to views and is not sympathetic to heritage buildings • Supports the view of 'City Rise Up' • Requests application be declined
235	Colin Cheyne	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions • Submits that the hotel does not enhance the 'heritage value of its surroundings' and is not of exceptional architectural merit • Concerned that the proposal, if accepted, would make a 'mockery' of the democratic process that established the District Plan • Requests application be declined, or modified so it does not exceed the 11m height limit
236	Jenny Bunce	Oppose	• Against the height, which will adversely affect the cityscape, views, increase shading • Against the breaches of the District Plan • Believes the design is 'outdated' and not sympathetic to its surrounding heritage buildings – suggests it would 'reduce the quality of down-town experience for residents' • Doubts the need for a five star hotel in Dunedin • Concerned over an adverse effect to tourists due to the 'spoiling of the heritage landscape' • Against the inclusion of apartments into the hotel • Requests application be declined
237	Alex Lovell-Smith	Support	• Believes there is a need for accommodation, particularly for events • Submits that Dunedin is a 'hodge-podge' city with a variety of differing buildings, including heritage, and that a modern designed hotel will not adversely affect the city • The hotel will ensure 'the ongoing success of Dunedin', and the visitors to the hotel would positively affect the economy • Requests application be approved
238	Toby Scott	Oppose	• 'The application fails at law' • 'The applicant does not appear to have any track record of delivering a 5 star hotel anywhere in NZ' • Concerned that the applicant has not identified a hotel operator • Believes the design to be unattractive and 'extremely poor' • Concerned that the hotel does not meet the level of amenities one would expect of a 5 star hotel • Suggests that the applicant may not even be seeking a hotel operator, and instead – if consent is given – the hotel will be built and turned into apartments • Against the location • Requests application be declined and 'a working party comprised of a mix of public and private sector parties be formed to consider the question of how and where Dunedin could accommodate a 5 star hotel'.
239	Erin Martin	Oppose	• Against the breach of height restrictions, which is 'out of scale' and could 'dominate' the cityscape • Concern over the increase in shading and wind tunnelling • Concerned the hotel will adversely affect Dunedin's heritage buildings • Requests application be rejected due to non-compliance. Submitter would support a hotel that 'fits and respects our city'.
240	Michael Ovens	Oppose	• Oppose the entirety of the application, 'especially the podium style design, the lack of street integration, no active edge' • Against breaches of District Plan's rules • Requests application be declined, or 'designed to comply with the District Plan requirements (Submission screenshot of text submitted on-line – some details could not be retrieved)
240	Heart of Dunedin Inc	Support	• 'such development is key to the economic success and vibrancy of Dunedin's CBD' • Requests consent be granted
241	Clare Munro-West	Oppose	• Against the height and design, the design of which the submitter believes to be 'dated' • Reusing a heritage building is more apt for Dunedin, and should be 'of the correct size' • Proposal underwhelming and does not represent Dunedin
242	Charlotte Kahn	Oppose	• Against the location and design

			• Concern that views and sun will be blocked for residential housing in the area • Would like a heritage building to be reused for the hotel, or the Cadbury's building in Vogel St precinct • Requests application be rejected
243	Elizabeth Kahn	Oppose	• Against the height and bulk of the proposal • Supports utilizing a heritage building for a new hotel • Believes design to be unattractive • Doubts there will be financial benefits for anyone but the developer • Wants a 'boutique' hotel which is in line with 'boutique/designer shops' • Requests application be declined, and would support a hotel that utilises 'what we already have – Cadbury factory, Vogel Precinct
244	Jenepher Glue	Oppose	• Against the non-compliant nature of the proposal • Against increase in shade to Octagon in winter • Exacerbates parking difficulties • Location is incorrect • Against glass façade, 'wood survives earthquakes' • Requests application be declined.
245	Jasmyn Williams	Oppose	• Submits that the hotel is 'too tall' and not appropriate for the city centre • Against the height and bulk, which will affect the submitter's house she is renting • Requests consent be refused
246	Grace Cushla Marshall	Oppose	• Same as above (#245)
247	Kenya Nikita Leong	Oppose	• Same as above
248	Laura Caroline Hay	Oppose	• Same as above
249	Amber Gorrie	Oppose	• Same as above
250	Cameron Land Sinclair	Oppose	• Objectors the height, size, design, and believes the hotel to be out of context with 'the rest of the city'
251	Bella Mary O'Mahoney	Oppose	• Against the height and design of the hotel and believes the hotel to be unsympathetic to 'our heritage city', it is 'out of context'
253	Jacqueline Lesley Sinclair	Oppose	• Against the design and the non-compliant height • The proposal will 'dwarf all surrounding buildings, especially those of heritage height' against the location of the proposal which is 'in the midst of a heritage city' • Believes the design to be 'ugly' and 'out of context' with surroundings • Requests application be declined in its current form, or to allow the hotel if it meets 2GP height requirement
254	Donna Fay Watson	Oppose	• Believes design to be 'inappropriate' and out of keeping with Dunedin's heritage city. • Height: against the breach of the DP height restrictions, the height 'would dominate sight-lines anywhere in the central city area' • Wind and shade: concern regarding wind-shear (adverse effects on safety), shade • Requests application be declined
255	Brenda Jeanette Leigh	Oppose	• Agrees there is a need for a 5 star hotel, but suggests the proposed location is inappropriate • The design is not sympathetic to its surroundings • Against the exacerbation of parking difficulties • Requests application be declined or to be within height restrictions
256	John William Stewart	Oppose	• Against the height of the proposal which breaches height restrictions and would dominate the Dunedin townscape • Requests application be declined or to be within height restrictions
257	Judith May Ringland	Oppose	• Against the height and position of the building, which is too high and 'dominating'. • Against the increase in shade over the city centre • Out of keeping and detracts from character buildings • Requests application be declined
258	Alexander Fraser Ringland-Stewart	Oppose	• Against the height and visual impact of the hotel • It will 'overshadow the city's historic Town Hall and Cathedral' • Believes that the hotel will have a negative visual impact on the look of the city for visitors and residents • Requests application be declined

259	Solomon Ringland-Stewart	Oppose	• Against the height and location, which 'would overshadow a central part of Dunedin' • Believes the hotel would be 'out of keeping' with the rest of the city • Requests application be declined
260	Josephine Heather Waring	Oppose	• Against the height, which submitter believes is too big for the site as it will shadow the Octagon – which will in turn have an adverse effect on the businesses and cafes on the lower half of the Octagon • Suggests that the hotel design is out of keeping with its surroundings, and not sympathetic to Dunedin's heritage values • Requests application be declined
261	Malcolm Saba Farry	Support	• Submitter states 'Dunedin has been making it too difficult for a top international hotel to be secured' • Believes that a 5 star hotel is vital for the economy and Dunedin's future • Submits that refusing ventures such as this 'is extremely detrimental to our reputation and to the availability of top line tourist accommodation' • Requests application be granted
262	David Harry Tucker, on behalf of the Cathedral Church of St Paul	Oppose	• Submitter is 'a retired consulting engineer', and 'currently the Keeper of the Cathedral Fabric' aka 'Chairman of the Works Committee at St Paul's Cathedral' • St Paul's Cathedral is located opposite the proposed site • States that the application 'ignores the effects on the century old Cathedral' • States that St Paul's Cathedral is highly significant to Dunedin's tourism sector, and suggests the view of the Cathedral will be dominated by the hotel. Submitter suggests this will be visitor's first real view of Dunedin, 'their reaction will be one of confusion, what is Dunedin really about? Heritage or Contemporary?' • Concern over an adverse effect to tourism • Concerned over a reduction in sunlight, particularly in winter. 'Much of the charm of enjoying a coffee in the Octagon in winter's dappled sunlight will be lost'. A similar effect will occur in the Cathedral's gardens which will reduce the enjoyment its' users • Height and bulk: questions the purpose of the DP if height restrictions are 'patently ignored', the height and bulk will dominate the heritage buildings • Wind: 'No evidence of the prevailing winds is given'. 'Clearly wind flow monitoring is essential'. Concerned that the basis of city wind criteria used is that from Wellington, where Wellingtonians are used to wind and therefore 'their standards are probably unsuitable for Dunedin.' • Fire safety: Is concerned whether Dunedin's fire service will have the resources available to 'fight a fire on the upper levels of the building', with the added fire risk that multi-storey buildings have 'above 10 stories'. • Traffic: Suggests there will be a 'huge difference' to traffic, especially on 'that side of Moray Place' • Pedestrian traffic: 'Retail shopping, operating on Sundays, will create unacceptable noise and nuisance at services held during that day.', however, 'some of the Cathedral community point out that an increase in pedestrian traffic could result in greater exposure of the Cathedral to the public and are happy with the proposal' 'The Harrop St DCC car park will have to be converted into an attractive, pedestrian friendly area. The Cathedral is at present working on this idea.' • Supports the need for a five star hotel, but believes the location is wrong. Suggests alternatives. • Requests application be declined
263	N. N. McMillan, First Church of Christ	Oppose	• Submission is on behalf of members of First Church of Christ • 'Members of the Church' are concerned over noise and dust during the construction phase which may be a 'potential issue for our Reading Room and study area', for church services and for the advance preparation of services (open on differing hours/days) • Traffic congestion and disruption – concern regarding the increased traffic flows in Moray Place and York Place 'as motorists seek alternative parking places.' • Believe the design to be out of keeping with 'heritage qualities' which will create a conflicting image 'that characterises Dunedin and impels tourists to visit the city'. • Requests application be declined

264	Jason and Tami Sargeant	Neutral	• Submitters support the development of a hotel in Dunedin 'in principle' but have concerns; • Effect of noise and dust pollution which will likely have an adverse effect on Kiddies Campus at 52 York Place. Submitters have two children who attend Kiddies Campus. • Concerned for all the children who attend Kiddies Campus, but especially for (their) daughter who has a complex heart defect and the presence of additional dust may negatively impact on her health • Noise from the construction will likely affect the children's sleep which is 'critical for children'. 'Good sleep supports their development in all areas.' Submitters are 'extremely' concerned that the noise from construction would adversely affect children's 'wellbeing and their educational development'. The 'sleep room' is also located in the closest proximity to the proposed construction. • Concerned that there may be an ongoing impact on the privacy of their children • 'Concerned about the long-term impact of the hotel on the privacy of (their) children.' 'There is an outside playground which (their) children enjoy playing in' – the playground is beneficial to their growth and development – and submitters are concerned that the hotel would have direct views into the playground, and 'strongly object' to the possibility of photos being taken, people being able to watch the children play, and are particularly concerned of this in the summer months. If the hotel is approved, they ask for a condition to be attached regarding the privacy of the children, which needs to be negotiated with the owners of Kiddies Campus, in the construction phase. • 'It is our strong belief that the owners of Kiddies Campus and the parents should not be liable for any costs for noise and dust mitigation and privacy protection initially or ongoing.'
265	Paul Le Comte	Neutral	• Submitter states there may be a change in privacy of the surrounding apartments • Concern regarding an increase in wind speed due to the hotel • Suggests that some submissions are NIMBY arguments, which would halt any reasonable development that is designed to be taller than surrounding buildings • Believes that design aesthetic is 'in the eye of the beholder' • 'Glass cladding isn't a crime' • Requests application be approved
266	Valeri Schillberg	Oppose	• Submitter is an international architect • Believes the project is out of scale for the area, does not fit in with the 'surrounding fabric' or in a way that is 'juxtaposing' • Requests application be rejected in its current form
266	Geoff Thomas	Support	• 'believe this development will promote growth for Dunedin by offering increased tourism and visitor opportunities with more accommodation options.' • Supports the idea that Dunedin needs high end accommodation for 'high profile visitors and investors' • Suggests that the hotel would 'promote further use of Dunedin's major facilities like Forsyth Barr Stadium' • Requests application be approved
267	Rose McRobie	Oppose	• The proposal is not in keeping with Dunedin's historic buildings 'and the housing in City Rise' • Concerned over the height and bulk, and its subsequent effect on wind and shading effects, loss of views across the city, the loss of car parks and the increase pressure on city parking • Against the design • Suggests a negative effect on people using the Octagon and Moray Place as it will affect access to business, entertainment and leisure, church and ecumenical activities, hospitality and other services in the central city • Requests application be declined in entirety
269	Jane Perry	Oppose	• Against the proposal's height, the inclusion of penthouses, apartments, retail activities and conference facilities, its design and the layout • Requests application in current form be rejected, and if approved conditions placed on it • STATES SUBMISSION IS ATTACHED BUT THERE IS NO ATTACHMENT

270	Majorie Orr	Oppose	• The design would be incompatible with its surroundings • Obstruct city views • Requests application be declined
271	D. R. Pederson	Oppose	• Believes design to be unattractive and detrimental to surrounding heritage buildings. It would dominate the area • Requests application be declined