



Downtown Carpark Redevelopment Project

From [REDACTED]
Date Thu 4/16/2026 10:55 AM
To Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>
Cc [REDACTED]

Your Comment on the Downtown Carpark Redevelopment Project

Please include all the contact details listed below with your comments and indicate whether you can receive further communications from us by email to substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz.

1. Contact Details	
Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.	
Organisation name (if relevant)	
First name	[REDACTED]
Last name	[REDACTED]
Postal address	[REDACTED]
Home phone / Mobile phone	[REDACTED]
Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)	[REDACTED]

2. We will email you draft conditions of consent for your com		
YES	I can receive emails and my email address is correct	

Please provide your comments below, include additional pages as needed.

-

Objection to Fast Track application Downtown Carpark Redevelopment:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

It is great to see that the FTA has taken on board some of the feedback already provided during the Resource Consent Application.

However, it is undeniable that the application still does not comply with multiple rules and regulations and is going to have a significant impact on surrounding property.

Some of the breaches during the construction phase (now 5.5 years) are going to have enormous negative impact. We will not object to all breaches but will focus on the ones directly impacting our livelihood.

As an owner of five units at the Sebel Hotel – we wish to hereby lodge our STRONG objection to the application. We are supportive of regeneration of the basic precinct, and realistic about the impact on the surrounding area (both positive and negative).

We acknowledge the applicant has made some minor improvements to the proposal (noise management during construction, length of construction period etc.).

However, breaches of the council guidelines remain and will seriously impact on the ability for the Hotel to function as a viable/profitable unit.

As owners of five hotel units, we have weathered the impact of the Covid Lockdowns and the resulting periods of negative income from the hotel units. As Appendix 36 (Economic Impact – pg 21) shows, Hotels should be in a much better position going forward with both the International Convention Centre and the CRL opening in 2026, and tourism numbers, currently at 92% of pre-covid levels, and set to surpass these volumes soon. However, we cannot afford to have this renaissance overturned through the impacts of the demolition and build work by the applicant.

The many serious breaches of guidelines will have a serious impact on our ability to earn an income from our units. For example; **The Noise impact mitigation suggestions in the application (Appendix 38) include not renting out our rooms!**

In other words – the applicant is happy for us to be in a position where we may have negative income flows for up to 5.5. years so that the applicant can minimize noise mitigation measures and construction cost.

It is unacceptable for the applicant to expect us to sacrifice the income so they can save costs on mitigation measures.

I have two areas of concern. The main one is the impact during construction. The secondary one is with some design items.

Impact during demolition and construction:

1) Noise impact on building and peaceful enjoyment of the area and residences.

Prolonged loss of income due to **visual, audible and physical impact** on our building and surroundings **during** the 5.5 year **construction** period. Our guests deserve quiet enjoyment of the hotel property. The noise breaches are extreme!

The Marshall Day report (appendix 16 – original application – appendix 38 in the updated application) is clear; internal **noise levels will be well in excess of what is acceptable** INSIDE the hotel. The rules allow for up to 35dB but the report anticipates up to 50dB, which they acknowledge is high enough **that “communication would begin to be affected. This will be disturbing for people trying to sleep”** (page 14). The reports also totally ignore the fact that the hotel guests arrive via the street and would be subjected to the full noise(70dB anticipated) when choosing the hotel as a place to stay and for residents whilst trying to access their property.

Secondly, the report erroneously presumes *“this is a hotel generally for short stays only”* and totally **ignores that the Sebel Building also has a considerable number of permanent residents in occupation.** We also have airline staff and tourists arriving during the day expecting to be able to sleep during the day. With work allowed from 6.30am till 10.30pm (Mon –Fri) and 7am to 11pm (Sat) the impact clearly is huge.

The mitigation proposed (appendix 38) is for the Hotel to only let rooms in areas more removed from the building site!

2) Vibration rules breaches and impact on occupancy

The proposal is to breach/**exceed** vibratory sheet piling regulations **by 100%** and overall vibration rules for a period of upto 10 months (demolition). Discomfort to the Hotel occupiers is inevitable and may affect our occupancy levels and hence income.

3) Impact due to restricted access/ traffic management

The proposal is to close the Lower Hobson street slip lane (Southbound) and the right to turn right towards Custom Street West (for a period of 5.5 years!!!)

As a result vehicle traffic (in)to the Sebel carpark/lobby area coming from the Eastern Suburbs or central city will only be possible via long, complicated diversions (not easily signposted).

Can anyone please explain how we are supposed to run a profitable Hotel and Residential apartment complex when access is severely restricted for such an extended period of time?

The vehicle **access** to Custom Street West coming from Quay Street must be kept operational.

4) Dust nuisance (and resulting extra maintenance cost for BC)

It is inevitable that there will be a lot of dust created both during the demolition process and during construction. This will obviously create problems in several areas:

- a. Guests dining outside on patios for the commercial restaurant units in the Viaduct (part of our BC) will not wish to be outside (loss of income)
- b. The building façade and access steps on both sides will become dusty much quicker than usual causing considerable cost to wash the building more frequently (extra maintenance cost for the BC)
- c. The air-conditioning units and fans etc. on the building roof will have dust ingress causing premature wear and tear (extra maintenance cost for the BC)

5) Potential damage to our building (extra BC maintenance cost)

It is unacceptable that there will be **breaches of the vibration limits** during demolition (up to 10 months). The result could be damage to the Sebel Hotel building (cracks etc.) and cause extra maintenance costs for owners.

Design item concerns:

- 1) long term impact due to not only removing existing **car parking** but due to creating a huge extra demand from retail shoppers, visitors to office suites etc. for whom no parking has been provided. This clearly breaches council rules.
- 2) long term value reduction due to light obstruction
- 3) There is no replacement for the safe pedestrian crossing from the site to the viaduct harbour currently offered by the overbridge.
- 4) There is no clarity about how traffic will be expected to go from East to West across the bottom of town (with the Quay Street to Hobson Street connection potentially severed).

What would we like the Fast Track Committee to do?

We would like to see the application amended to fit council guidelines:

- 24 month demolition/construction period
- no breaches of noise and vibration rules
- no closing of public access roads and footpaths
- further mitigation of other breaches

- providing some public parking in the completed complex

We understand that not all of this may be achievable.

As a minimum, we expect the application to be modified to further reduce the impact on our building and our ability to earn a fair income from our property. Where this is impossible, **we would expect compensation for the lost income and the increased costs** caused directly and solely by the applicant's inability to work within the council guidelines.

[REDACTED]

As Director of Lada Commercial Investments LTD – unit 221, 85 Custom Str. West (The Sebel)

As owner of unit 407 and 622, 85 Custom Street West (The Sebel)

As Trustee of the Bonne Family Trust – unit 420 and 421, 85 Custom Street West (The Sebel)