

**Absolutely Positively  
Wellington City Council**

Me Heke Ki Pōneke

# Ordinary Meeting of Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee Ngā Meneti | Minutes

9:30 am Rāpare, 1 Here-turi-kōkā 2024

9:30 am Thursday, 1 August 2024

Ngake (16.09), Level 16, Tahiwī

113 The Terrace

Pōneke | Wellington



---

---

## **PRESENT**

Mayor Whanau

Deputy Mayor Foon

Councillor Abdurahman

Councillor Apanowicz

Councillor Brown (Chair)

Councillor Calvert

Councillor Chung

Councillor Free (via audiovisual link)

Pouiwi Hohaia

Pouiwi Kelly

Councillor Matthews (Deputy Chair)

Councillor McNulty

Councillor O'Neill

Councillor Pannett

Councillor Randle

Councillor Rogers

Councillor Wi Neera

Councillor Young

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## 1 AUGUST 2024

---

<b>Business</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>1. Meeting Conduct</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.1 Karakia</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.2 Apologies</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.4 Confirmation of Minutes</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.5 Items not on the Agenda</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.6 Public Participation</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Petitions</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.1 Petition: Halt Thorndon Quay Roadworks until an independent project review is completed</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. General Business</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 Housing Action Plan 6-monthly Report</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.2 'Making it easier to build granny flats' - Council Submission</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.3 Decision register updates and upcoming reports</b>	<b>10</b>



# 1. Meeting Conduct

---

## 1.1 Karakia

The Chairperson declared the meeting (hui) open at 9:30am and read the following karakia to open the hui.

**Whakataka te hau ki te uru,  
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga.  
Kia mākinakina ki uta,  
Kia mātaratara ki tai.  
E hī ake ana te atākura.  
He tio, he huka, he hauhū.  
Tihei Mauri Ora!**

Cease oh winds of the west  
and of the south  
Let the bracing breezes flow,  
over the land and the sea.  
Let the red-tipped dawn come  
with a sharpened edge, a touch of frost,  
a promise of a glorious day

## 1.2 Apologies

No apologies were received.  
(Councillor Apanowicz joined the hui at 9:31am)

## 1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations

No conflicts of interest were declared.

## 1.4 Confirmation of Minutes

**Moved Councillor Brown, seconded Councillor O'Neill**

### **Resolved**

That the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee:

1. Approves the minutes of the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 5 June 2024, having been circulated, that they be taken as read and confirmed as an accurate record of that meeting.

**Carried**

## 1.5 Items not on the Agenda

There were no items not on the agenda.

## 1.6 Public Participation

### 1.6.1 Steve Piper

Addressed the meeting regarding item 2.1

### 1.6.2 Don McDonald

Addressed the meeting regarding item 2.1

(Councillor Apanowicz left the hui at 9:41am)

(Councillor Apanowicz rejoined the hui at 9:42am)

### 1.6.3 Simon Arcus on behalf of Business Central

Addressed the meeting regarding item 2.1

## Public participation tabled document

### Attachments

- 1 Don McDonald

(Councillor Free left the hui at 9:55am)  
(Councillor Free rejoined the hui at 9:57am)  
(Councillor Apanowicz left the hui at 10:03am)  
(Councillor Apanowicz rejoined the hui at 10:04am)  
(Councillor Wi Neera left the hui at 10:37am)  
(Councillor Wi Neera rejoined the hui at 10:37am)  
(Councillor Apanowicz left the hui at 10:45am)  
(Councillor Apanowicz rejoined the hui at 10:47am)

The hui adjourned at 10:49am and returned at 11:07 with the following members present: Mayor Whanau, Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Free, Pouiwi Hohaia, Pouiwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Randle, Councillor Wi Neera, Councillor Young.

(Councillor Rogers rejoined the hui at 11:07am)  
Deputy Mayor Foon rejoined the hui at 11:09am)

## 2. Petitions

### 2.1 Petition: Halt Thorndon Quay Roadworks until an independent project review is completed

#### Moved Councillor Brown, seconded Councillor Apanowicz the following motion

That the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee:

1. Receive the information and thank the petitioner.
2. Direct Officers to prepare a paper ~~in response to~~ **respond to requests made in** the petition to be considered ~~in~~ **by the Environment and Infrastructure Committee on 12 September 2024.**
3. **Note that the Regulatory Processes Committee meeting on 8 August 2024 is scheduled to consider options for raised safety platforms planned for Thorndon Quay.**

**Secretarial Note:** The motion moved was different to the recommendations in the officers report, the changes are marked in red and strikethrough.

#### Moved Councillor Calvert, seconded Councillor Young the following amendment

4. Agree in principle for Council to fund and undertake an independent review into the Thorndon Quay project including but not confined to the concerns raised by the petitioner, design of pedestrian crossings, benefit realisation, accuracy of accident data, the economic impact and mitigations; and the state of the water infrastructure.
5. Agree for any work associated with the construction of the pedestrian crossings be halted as soon as possible until clarity in placement and design is agreed.
6. Agree for officers to bring a draft terms of reference for the Review together with an appropriate budget, to be approved by Council at its next meeting of 5th September.

7. Agree for officers to bring a report to Council at its meeting on 5th September 2024 on how the current whole project may be paused (whether in whole or in sections) until the findings of the report are considered by Council.

**Lost**

**Secretarial Note:** Voting was taken in parts with all clause being taken separately.

A division was called for under Standing Order 27.6(b), voting on which was as follows:

**Clause 4:**

**For:**

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

**Against:**

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown (Chair), Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Free, Holden Hohaia, Liz Kelly, Councillor Matthews (Deputy Chair), Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 5:13

**Lost**

**Clause 5:**

**For:**

Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

**Against:**

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown (Chair), Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Free, Holden Hohaia, Liz Kelly, Councillor Matthews (Deputy Chair), Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 4:14

**Lost**

**Clause 6:**

**For:**

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

**Against:**

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown (Chair), Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Free, Holden Hohaia, Liz Kelly, Councillor Matthews (Deputy Chair), Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 5:13

**Lost**

**Clause 7:**

**For:**

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

**Against:**

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown (Chair), Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Free, Holden Hohaia, Liz Kelly, Councillor Matthews (Deputy Chair), Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 5:13

**Lost**

**Moved Councillor Randle, seconded Councillor McNulty the following amendment**

2. Direct Officers to prepare a paper to respond to requests made in the petition to be considered by the ~~Council Environment and Infrastructure Committee~~ on **5<sup>th</sup> September 2024** ~~12 September 2024~~.

**Lost**

A division was called for under Standing Order 27.6(b), voting on which was as follows:

**For:**

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor McNulty, Councillor Randle, Councillor Young

**Against:**

Mayor Whanau, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown (Chair), Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Free, Holden Hohaia, Liz Kelly, Councillor Matthews (Deputy Chair), Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera

Majority Vote: 6:12

**Lost**

**Moved Councillor Brown, seconded Councillor Apanowicz the following substantive motion**

**Resolved**

That the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee:

1. Receive the information and thank the petitioner.
2. Direct Officers to prepare a paper to respond to requests made in the petition to be considered by the Environment and Infrastructure Committee on 12 September 2024.
3. Note that the Regulatory Processes Committee meeting on 8 August 2024 is scheduled to consider options for raised safety platforms planned for Thorndon Quay.

**Carried**

**Tabled Documents - Item 2.1**

**Attachments**

- 1 Letter from Paul Robinson
- 2 Q&A Document

**3. General Business**

(Councillor Matthews left the hui at 11:17am)  
(Councillor Matthews rejoined the hui at 11:19am)  
(Councillor Chung left the hui at 12:24pm)  
(Pouiwi Kelly left the hui at 12:25pm)  
(Pouiwi Kelly returned to the hui at 12:26pm)  
(Councillor Chung rejoined the hui at 12:26pm)  
Mayor Whanau left the hui at 12:28pm)  
(Mayor Whanau left the hui at 12:32pm)

The hui adjourned at 12:49pm and returned at 12:55pm with all members present.

### 3.1 Housing Action Plan 6-monthly Report

Moved Councillor Brown, seconded Councillor Randle

#### Resolved

That the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Note the updates included in the second six-monthly Housing Action Plan 2023-25 report (included as Attachment 1) and the Housing Strategy Risk Dashboard (included as Attachment 2).
3. Agree that the next six-monthly Housing Action Plan 2023-25 report will be presented to the Environment and Infrastructure Committee in ~~June~~ **May** 2025 to restore ~~the~~ **a** regular reporting cycle.
4. Note the findings of the Sense Partners research, which estimate the wider economic benefits of the Te Kāinga Affordable Rental Programme. (Included as Attachment 3).
5. Note the results of the annual tenant survey for the Te Kāinga Affordable Rental Programme. (Included as Attachment 4).
6. Note that there is continuing change in housing regulations and there are housing regulatory and supply gaps for the Council to continue to monitor including a joined-up approach to create homes for the most vulnerable.
7. Note officer advice that will collectively deliver improvements in the consenting functions to assist owners of earthquake-prone buildings and those wanting to build affordable and public housing.
8. **Direct officers to provide an updated housing dashboard to the Environment and Infrastructure Committee in November 2024.**

**Carried**

**Secretarial Note:** The motion moved was different to the recommendations in the officers report, the changes are marked in red and strikethrough.

### 3.2 'Making it easier to build granny flats' - Council Submission

Moved Councillor Brown, seconded Councillor Matthews

#### Resolved

That the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Approve the attached submission on the *Making it easier to build granny flats* (2024) proposal by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and the Ministry for the Environment (Attachment 1).
3. Agree to delegate to the Chair to make any minor editorial changes to reflect any feedback of the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee.

**Carried**

### 3.3 Decision register updates and upcoming reports

**Moved Councillor Brown, seconded Councillor Matthews**

#### **Resolved**

That the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee:

1. Receive the information.

**Carried**

The hui concluded at 1:27pm with the reading of the following karakia:

<b>Unuhia, unuhia, unuhia ki te uru tapu nui</b>	Draw on, draw on
<b>Kia wātea, kia māmā, te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua</b>	Draw on the supreme sacredness To clear, to free the heart, the body and the spirit of mankind
<b>I te ara takatū</b>	
<b>Koia rā e Rongo, whakairia ake ki runga</b>	Oh Rongo, above (symbol of peace)
<b>Kia wātea, kia wātea</b>	Let this all be done in unity
<b>Āe rā, kua wātea!</b>	

Authenticated: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

---

# Ordinary Meeting of Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee

## Minute item attachments

9:30 am Thursday, 1 August 2024  
Ngake (16.09), Level 16, Tahiwī  
113 The Terrace  
Pōneke | Wellington

---

### Business

### Page No.

---

#### Public Participation Tabled Documents

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| 1. Don McDonald | 2 |
|-----------------|---|

#### Tabled Documents

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. Letter from Paul Robinson | 4 |
| 2. Q&A Document              | 8 |

ADVERTISEMENT PROOF SHEET

<sup>for pp</sup>  
**Regional News**

Connecting Wellington

SB=5/6

changes with case in the \$55 500 23-09/10

→ difficult  
PARTICIPATE CALendars  
DON WANT TO SEE 1/4 OF CARS. (cross) DIE START

How can I find out? Who to vote for? Newspaper Media resident assoc  
Didn't do that. Tk NZ h. Rude pp if you shoot the don. Cartoon.  
Nat lab DBL2 odds gamble. Is there any honest profssn? True qn. Sell  
my soul. Rong cand8 mcdon ewt ban lot so. Dgust sham pay \$1. false  
add up. You yellow coupon prove. No winn. Well keep the money so  
you try again, n world. Lose 90pct. For 100 year. Sky fall. Me U  
equalNZ. D post ban democy vote. So don her ald B.Sc science. Elexn  
Regi news. Satan calendar bb lon. Cannt particpn society. Predict  
31days MTH ahead? Don give the simple cal wat required. World help Pills  
appnmts hols. Don 5w X 6d, 366 -6/8 -6/800. Year. Hope rhyme 30d hath  
sept April..? Sync 100 Gregorn. Remove Thurs from wk. work 4days out of/6.  
100% months sun 1st. Saturdays 6,12,18, 24,30. Bring in Commcn allwc age  
16+ for digital Communcn phns -mins text gigs x than green heat. waste  
power poverty. Thermom save \$mm /yr. Pls donate char mission w city+  
senr drama Newtown cmnty ctre. Gamble means 100 robbery investors.  
U know bad harm. Cigs alcoh sugar movie loud hearing. Cars  
plane. Tun (===) DIA mbie supmkt. Systemic m0277845 900.

X  
6/20  
2/27  
2/20

X

X

SLIP CITY  
GAMB  
30/7/24  
1-7/8/24

→ BAD HARM  
CARS PLANE  
DONALD GAMBLE  
TUNNEL. Outstanding Harm  
KEMX  
need mechanism for the plant  
K safety

Item Environment and Infrastructure Committee - 1/08/2024 Attachment 1



The Thorndon Quay Hutt Road Collective (inc)

29<sup>th</sup> July 2024

The Chair  
Environment & Infrastructure Committee  
Wellington City Council  
Attn. Tim Brown

By Email: [Tim.Brown@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:Tim.Brown@wcc.govt.nz)

Dear Councillor Brown

**RE: Petition – Halt all Thorndon Quay Roadworks until an independent review is completed.**

Thank you for agreeing to receive the petition organised by The Thorndon Quay Hutt Road Collective (inc). This letter provides background and supporting argument for the petition.

**1. Background:** The petition asks Councillors to halt the Thorndon Quay Road Work for three reasons:

- a. Officers did not advise Councillors that certain pipes must or should be replaced as part of the project. It is Council policy that replacement of water infrastructure is the first priority.
- b. Officers failed to consider that this project and the resulting road layout would have a substantial negative impact on the Thorndon Quay economy.
- c. Safety and other data relied on by Councillors was based on advice that was not independent and free of bias.

Each of these reasons are sufficient in themselves to justify a “pause and review”. This petition should be considered against a backdrop of events that includes: -

- The Court of Appeal has found that the Council’s original decision to remove the angle car parking from Thorndon Quay was illegal. We have no doubt that the errors that gave rise to the illegal decision making have continued throughout this project. The advice that Officers have given Councillors on the Courts decision suggest that nothing has been learned from that original decision. see [Email WCC Officer to Councillors re Ct of Appeal Decision.docx](#).
- The media are publishing reports on a weekly basis that are critical of WCC’s failure to do anything about the pipes that underly these works. Confidence in Council decision making is at perilously low levels. On LinkedIn, Councillor McNulty expresses dismay that, approval of Council decision making for the Takapau Ward is at 12%. This exceptionally low figure must be due, in part, to what is increasingly seen as an “orange cone debacle”.on Thorndon Quay. If Councillors do not accept this petition, then they expose the Council to further reputational risk.

- Businesses on the street faces extraordinary rates increases, but revenue is dramatically down. This project is “out of step” with other Council imperatives. Why, when you need to increase rates by 20%+ year on year, would you decimate business's ability to pay their fair share?
- Last Friday, contractors pierced one of the 8 watermains that lie under Thorndon Quay. The consequence of this is that businesses along the northern side of Thorndon Quay were without water for most of the day because of the lack of water. This was an avoidable mistake that could have been avoided if Wellington Waters poorly concealed advice had been followed.
- Over 2000 people have signed this petition. It is, to our knowledge, the second largest petition to be presented to the Council.
- The Officers response to our petition (expressed on page 11 of the agenda for this meeting). does not address any of the issues raised in our petition. With the greatest of respect, Councillors need to decide. Whether this project is “hunky dory” and nothing needs to be reviewed. Or if material problems have been identified, then a review needs to take place, regardless of whether officers think it is necessary or not.

I have set out below a discussion and supporting information on each issue.

**2. Building Expensive Roading Infrastructure Above even More Expensive Water Infrastructure.**

- a. You will be aware of the recent media attention that has been focused on WCC's decision to spend \$58m on installing bus lanes and cycle lanes along Thorndon Quay, but not replace the water infrastructure. You may be aware that Wellington Water inadvertently released a draft memo to the writer recommending that WCC replace these pipes as part of this project. See [Draft For Comment August 2022 Memo - Thorndon Quay Hutt Road 3W Renewals Prioritisation \(1\).pdf](#) and [Email Trail Thorndon Quay pipe work proposed - WWL memo from 2022 \(from Tom Hunt\).pdf](#) .
- b. The media have covered the “accidental” release of the memo recommending that certain pipe work be carried out as part of this project. Council officers state that they either did not receive the memo (our members attended a meeting where an office clearly stated that they did receive the memo) or they did, but agreed with WW that no work was required (a claim for which there is no documentary trail.
- c. The email trail that accompanies the “accidental” release paints a poor picture of Council and Wellington Waters treatment of information belonging to the public. We have refrained from lodging a complaint with the Ombudsman in the hope that Council will respond to our concerns. The reasons why this memo was not actioned are still opaque. An answer is required.

- d. The Council has a stated policy of prioritising water infrastructure works over other projects. The Council's [Development-Response-Plan-March\\_2024.pdf](#) has as its top priority a requirement that "all underground utility works to be completed before vertical or at grade street works take place". We know Officers were told that this work should be done. Not only did they choose not to, but they also chose not to advise Councillors of their decision not to do so. It is not satisfactory to hide behind the veil of LGWM when denying responsibility for this omission. The same officers were involved in both entities.
  - e. The following link shows pipe failures along Thorndon Quay for the 2 years ending December 2023. 14 of the 17 reported failures relate to the 110-year-old sewer that runs the length of Thorndon Quay. This sewer lies directly beneath the curbing, bus shelters, and other new street infrastructures that are being built (see [OIA IRO-616 - Waste and Freshwater Pipe Failures over the past two years.pdf](#)). It is extraordinary that, given the volume of these failures, the Council would spend a significant portion of the \$58m budget building on top of this pipe network – even if it was only 1 year old.
- 3. Officers failed to consider that this project and the resulting road layout would have a substantial negative impact on the Thorndon Quay economy.**
- a. The impacts that roading changes are having on Thorndon Quay businesses are severe. Typically, café trade is down 40%, pedestrian foot traffic is down 50%. One store (part of a 20 store nationwide chains) reports that it has historically been the second-best performer in that chain- it is now 2<sup>nd</sup> worst.
  - b. LGWM project officers advised that businesses would only be affected by the works adjacent to their businesses, and that the disruption would only be for 12 weeks. That is not the case - every business is and will continue to be severely impacted until the last cone is removed sometime in 2025.
  - c. In 2021, TQHRC presented a 1500 signature to Council requesting that an independent economic impact assessment be done as part of the business case development. Council officers opposed the petition, claiming there would be no impact and that "parking revenues would only reduce by an estimated \$32k p.a."
  - d. This was clearly a gross underestimate. Historically, Thorndon Quay has generated about \$1.3m p.a. in parking revenue. If data for the period, January – March 31<sup>st</sup> is annualised, then it looks like parking revenue has dropped to approximately \$430k.
  - e. The interests of cyclists, public transport users and pedestrians have been exhaustively considered. Thorndon Quay is zoned CBD, but the impacts on businesses have been excluded. Recently Simon Arcus from Business Central wrote to Liam Hodgetts expressing concern about the processes behind WCC's business case development. The [Response from Liam Hodgetts](#)

[ToBusinessCentralFromLH.pdf](#) contains the following statement “ We are unable to include any costs to businesses in our BCR calculations. The Monetised Benefits and Costs Manual explicitly states: “any changes to business or retail profitability as a result of a transport activity are also considered transfers and must be excluded from the BCR unless there are economy-wide efficiencies from increased competition.”

We take this to mean that because 51% of this project is being funded by NZTA, we cannot factor impacts on business into our business cases. This seems to fly in the face of commonsense. Would this statement be tenable if you replaced the words “business and retail profitability” with “beneficiary and social housing user wellbeing”? Clearly it wouldn’t stand the sniff test. So why is it tenable to exclude impacts on business from the BCA process?

4. **Safety and other data relied on by Councillors was based on advice that was not independent and free of bias.**
  - a. A company (Viastrada Ltd (that has provided safety audits and advice on Wellington’s cycle network has a principal (John Lieswyn) that has at material times also been an officer of Cycle Action Network see ( [CAN Meeting Notes Nov 21.png](#) and [Co Offive Viastrada Ltd.jpg](#).. Despite extensive searching, I can see no disclosure of this dual interest to Councillors. This creates the perception of potential bias. This is not just an ethical oversight – it also has significant impacts on the use and interpretation of data. If safety and other data had been objectively analysed, then officers may have presented a variety of options for improving safety on Thorndon Quay – rather than the single option that led to the court of Appeal finding that WCCs original decision to remove the angle parking was illegal.
  - b. The way that data has been used, and the business case development processes used for this project clearly needs reviewing.
5. The reasons for accepting this petition are compelling. Our petition is not about whether bike/bus lanes are a good or bad thing. Instead, our petition is about Council decision making. There is clear prima facie evidence that officers did not provide Councillors with the information that they require to make good decisions concerning these street works.A pause and review is required.

Nga Mihi



Paul Robinson  
021 444495  
paul@thewoolstore.co.nz

## Questions & Answers

### Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee

#### 1 Here-turi-kōkā 2024 (01 August 2024)

##### Item 2.1 Petition: Halt Thorndon Quay Roadworks until an independent project review is completed

1. How much would it cost to halt the TQ roadworks until an independent project review completed?

**For a short pause - ie a couple of weeks, we would be liable for suspension costs of \$9,000 per day. Any longer than that and we may be exposed to further claims from the contractor.**

1. How much would an independent project review cost?

**It is difficult to estimate in the absence of a defined scope for the review but as a guide, a typical Treasury gateway project review costs around \$75k.**

2. For how long would TQ roadworks need to be halted to enable an independent project review to be completed?

**It is difficult to estimate in the absence of a defined scope for the review but as a guide, a Treasury gateway project review typically takes 8 weeks from start to finish.**

3. Does removing a speed bump from a road design require another Traffic Resolution process and, if so, what is the legal basis on which this is required?

**No.**

4. Does removing the raised element of a pedestrian crossing from a road design require another Traffic Resolution process and, if so, what is the legal basis on which this is required?

**No.**

5. How much would be saved if the speed bumps were removed from the TQ Roadworks?

**There are no speed bumps in the Thorndon Quay design. There are raised safety platforms.**

**We estimate the cost saving of removing the raised safety platforms would be \$625,000. However, the crossings would no longer align with NZTA guidelines.**

6. How much would be saved if the raised element of the TQ pedestrian crossings were removed from the TQ Roadworks?

**See question 5.**

7. If the TQ Roadworks were completed without the speed bumps how much would it take to add them in later?

**If raised platforms were added retrospectively there would be extra cost and time to install, for which funding cannot be guaranteed. This could be negotiated back into the existing contract but the costs and time to complete are uncertain.**

8. How much would be saved from removing the planned signalised pedestrian crossing on the Old Hutt Road outside Gun City?

**We estimate the cost saving would be approximately \$125,000.**

9. What were the timelines specified?

**The project is on track to be completed on schedule by June 2025.**

10. Were officers aware of the water mains on Thorndon quay? Were these pipes due for replacement? Were any of them on the critical list?

**WCC senior management did not receive any advice directly from the LGWM project team or Wellington Water that there were any water assets requiring renewal within the next five years as part of the TQHR project.**

11. Do we have any data on foot traffic and business performance?

The Council's insight's team has been monitoring spend (using Marketview data which accounts for 70% of eftpos terminals in NZ) before and during construction and note that on average Thorndon Quay spend is largely in line with the benchmarked Wellington CBD spend. Due to the recession and other factors such as public sector service cuts, spend is down across the board year on year. There are no foot traffic sensors in the area, but we are investigating installing them.

12. What was the timeline specified to complete the project?

The project is on track to be completed on schedule by June 2025.

13. How are we meeting this timeline?

We are on schedule.

14. Is there ongoing communication with businesses for this project?

There are several channels for businesses to receive information and contact the project team if they have further questions. These include the [transport project page](#), monthly newsletter updates from WCC, stakeholder updates via email, regular meetings with the construction contractor, and the specific engagement before construction work begins in the businesses area. There is also a direct project line to Downer that businesses can contact.

15. Can the costs mentioned in the petition be attributed to all of the improvements of the Thorndon Quay project?

**It is unclear what this question relates to.**

16. Is there an info or hotline / q and a page/updates/ business comms for this project?

**See Question 14.**

### **3.1 Housing Action Plan 6-monthly Report**

1. Free waste collection. Are recycling and food waste collection services provided as part of this?

How are we incentivising waste minimisation if we are offering free waste collection?

**Free recycling is provided along with waste collection. Food waste collection services are not currently provided but will be investigated. The content plan for our quarterly resident newsletter (due for release in September) includes an education and advice section to encourage waste minimisation. The advice will focus on the role of residents to influence at each step of the waste hierarchy.**

2. How are we continuing our advocacy for tenants to receive IRRS?

**Officers have been awaiting further policy announcements from the Crown relating to redirections, IRRS placements and funding to support increasing social housing supply. The MHUD update published 18 July 2024 confirmed the 380 IRRS places contracted to Te Toi Mahana are separately funded - so are not counted towards, or have any implications for, the 1500 new places funded through Budget 2024. While Wellington has not been deemed a priority area for the first 500 places (set aside to reduce the reliance on emergency and transitional accommodation), we will continue to work alongside the Trust and our Central Government partners as future funding and policy decisions are made relating to the remaining**

1000 places. We are committed to advocating for increased IRRS places for Te Toi Mahana, and to secure more social housing funding for Pōneke.

Further information on recent Crown announcements from the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development can be found here:

<https://www.hud.govt.nz/news/budget-2024-delivery-of-500-community-housing-provider-homes>

<https://www.hud.govt.nz/funding-and-support/partnering-for-new-housing-opportunities>

3. How does support and encouragement of co- Housing models fit into the action plan? Are we getting many requests for these? Are we seeing more of an uptake of co-housing models in Wellington? Are we giving any thought to ways we can support co-housing to become a more of an option?
  - Action 2.10 seeks to understand how Council can encourage more co-housing developments in the city by investigating the barriers faced by those aspiring to undertake co-housing projects. This includes conducting a case study of the 132 Owen Street site which has been purchased by a co-housing group, led by a local architect.
  - This sale settled in June 2024 and officers will provide ongoing updates through the HAP reporting cycle on the barriers and opportunities as they present themselves through this project. To date the new owners have worked through their design process to agree on three units laid out around a shared courtyard with shared facilities and amenities. They aim to submit for building consent in the next 6 months. They are concurrently refining their co-housing agreement for the construction process and ongoing life of the building with their lawyers.
  - Note that both the Building Code and 2024 District Plan do not differentiate when it comes to co-housing developments. The requirements applied to co-housing developments are the same as those applied to any other form of housing.

- The City Consenting and Compliance team (CCC) do not separately identify applications for co-housing in our records, they are recorded the same way as other residential developments, but anecdotally, we receive very few applications for this type of development. The case study of 132 Owen Street may identify what barriers contribute to this.
- In addition CCC frequently receives requests for advice about multiple tiny homes on a single site, without the shared facilities envisaged by co-housing models.