

Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council

Me Heke Ki Pōneke

Extraordinary Meeting of Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee Rārangi Take | Agenda

9:30 am Rātū, 26 Whiringa ā-rangi 2024

9:30 am Tuesday, 26 November 2024

Ngake (16.09), Level 16, Tahiwī

113 The Terrace

Pōneke | Wellington



MEMBERSHIP

Mayor Whanau
Deputy Mayor Foon
Councillor Abdurahman
Councillor Apanowicz (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Brown
Councillor Calvert
Councillor Chung
Councillor Free
Pouiwi Hohaia
Pouiwi Kelly
Councillor Matthews (Chair)
Councillor McNulty
Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Pannett
Councillor Randle
Councillor Rogers
Councillor Wi Neera
Councillor Young

Have your say!

You can make a short presentation to the Councillors, Committee members, Subcommittee members or Community Board members at this meeting. Please let us know by noon the working day before the meeting. You can do this either by phoning 04-499-4444, emailing public.participation@wcc.govt.nz, or writing to Democracy Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, giving your name, phone number, and the issue you would like to talk about. All Council and committee meetings are livestreamed on our YouTube page. This includes any public participation at the meeting.

AREA OF FOCUS

The Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee has responsibility for:

- 1) Long-term planning and annual planning.
- 2) Financial and non-financial performance oversight in relation to the long-term plan and annual plan.
- 3) Financial oversight.
- 4) Procurement policy.
- 5) Non-strategic asset investment and divestment as provided for through the long-term plan (recommending to Council where matters are not provided for in the long-term plan).
- 6) Council-controlled Organisation oversight and performance.
- 7) Council-controlled Organisation director review and appointments.
- 8) WellingtonNZ oversight and performance.
- 9) Approve asset management plans.

To read the full delegations of this committee, please visit wellington.govt.nz/meetings.

Quorum: 9 members

TABLE OF CONTENTS

26 NOVEMBER 2024

Business	Page No.
1. Meeting Conduct	7
1.1 Karakia	7
1.2 Apologies	7
1.3 Announcements by the Mayor	7
1.4 Conflict of Interest Declarations	7
1.5 Items not on the Agenda	7
1.6 Public Participation	8
2. General Business	9
2.1 LTP Amendment - Decision on capital programmes	9
2.2 Decision register updates and upcoming reports	55

1. Meeting Conduct

1.1 Karakia

The Chairperson will open the hui with a karakia.

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
---	--

At the appropriate time, the following karakia will be read to close the hui.

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

1.2 Apologies

The Chairperson invites notice from members of apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the hui, where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

1.3 Announcements by the Mayor

1.4 Conflict of Interest Declarations

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

1.5 Items not on the Agenda

The Chairperson will give notice of items not on the agenda as follows.

Matters Requiring Urgent Attention as Determined by Resolution of the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee.

The Chairperson shall state to the hui:

1. The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
2. The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent hui.

The item may be allowed onto the agenda by resolution of the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee.

Minor Matters relating to the General Business of the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee.

The Chairperson shall state to the hui that the item will be discussed, but no resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer it to a subsequent hui of the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee for further discussion.

1.6 Public Participation

A maximum of 60 minutes is set aside for public participation at the commencement of any hui of the Council or committee that is open to the public. Under Standing Order 31.2 a written, oral, or electronic application to address the hui setting forth the subject, is required to be lodged with the Chief Executive by 12.00 noon of the working day prior to the hui concerned, and subsequently approved by the Chairperson.

Requests for public participation can be sent by email to public.participation@wcc.govt.nz, by post to Democracy Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, or by phone at 04 499 4444 and asking to speak to Democracy Services.

2. General Business

LTP AMENDMENT - DECISION ON CAPITAL PROGRAMMES

Kōrero taunaki | Summary of considerations

Purpose

1. This report provides options for changes to the capital work programme in order to increase Council's debt headroom and revise its financial strategy. These options will be used to inform the 2025/26 Consultation Document for the Long-term Plan (LTP) Amendment.

Strategic alignment

2. The LTP amendment may impact one or more community outcomes, strategic approaches, and priorities to varying degrees. This will be considered in more detail as the LTP amendment takes shape.

Relevant previous decisions

3. At the 10 October Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council meeting the following was agreed:
 - Commence a process to amend the 2024-34 LTP with Council's objective being 'No Sale' of any of its shareholding in Wellington International Airport Limited.
 - Direct officers and relevant contractors to cease all work to progress the share sale including the currently scheduled report for December 2024.
 - Direct that no further money is spent on establishing a Perpetual Investment Fund (PIF) through the share sale.
4. At the 29 October Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee meeting the following was agreed or noted:
 - Council's Water Services Delivery Plan options and the impact of reduced NZTA funding will also be included in the 2025/26 Annual Plan / LTP amendment process.
 - Note that the 10 October Notice of Motion paper included a series of principles that will be used to develop options for the review of the capital programme, and these are outlined in the paper.
 - Note the principles are being used to develop options to reduce the capital works programme including as a consequence of reduced National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) revenue.
 - Agree that officers reinitiate work on a 'disaster resilience fund' and this work runs alongside the LTP amendment process, noting the purpose of the fund is to provide a form of self-insurance in the event of a disaster.

- Agree that a form of ‘disaster resilience fund’ is included in the LTP amendment as part of the options for consultation for amending the financial strategy.
- Agree that a key consideration of a ‘disaster resilience fund’ should be to minimise overheads and management costs.

Significance

5. The decision is **rated high significance** in accordance with schedule 1 of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

Financial considerations

- Nil Budgetary provision in Annual Plan / Long-term Plan Unbudgeted \$X

6. All financial considerations are outlined in the body of the report.

Risk

- Low Medium High Extreme

7. All risks have been considered and outlined within the paper and attachment.

Authors	Matthew Deng, Senior Advisor Raina Kereama, Manager Financial Planning and Policy Kirralee Mahoney, Principal Advisor Financial Planning Baz Kaufman, Manager Strategy and Research
Authoriser	Andrea Reeves, Chief Strategy and Finance Officer

Taunakitanga | Officers' Recommendations

Officers recommend the following motion:

That the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee:

1. **Receive the information.**
2. **Note** that Council is facing significant financial risk as a result of:
 - a. A large under-insurance risk – we do not have sufficient insurance to respond to future financial and natural hazard risks.
 - b. An undiversified investment portfolio.
3. **Note** that the Council previously proposed to sell its airport shareholding and invest the proceeds in a new, diversified fund as the way to respond to these issues.
4. **Note** that on 10 October, the Council resolved to initiate an LTP amendment process with a view to changing its preferred option to no sale of the airport shares.
5. **Note** that as a result of further loss modelling as part of the insurance roadmap, the insurance gap number has been updated, based on probabilistic modelling.
6. **Agree** that the following elements of a prudent financial strategy will be included in this LTP amendment:
 - a. maintain a 225% debt to revenue ratio;
 - b. increase the allocation of insurance headroom from \$272m to \$500m, to be provided for under the 225% limit;
 - c. maintain the limit on rates increases at 5-8% on average over the 10-year period.
7. **Note** that the most effective mechanism to achieve a provision of \$500m insurance headroom is a reduction in the capital programme of approximately \$400-600m over the LTP period.
8. **Note** that the National Land Transport Plan funding allocated to the Council is lower than assumed in the 2024-34 LTP. This has resulted in a shortfall of revenue of approximately \$68m. In order to mitigate the impact of this on our debt capacity, a reduction in capital expenditure is required of approximately \$130m.
9. **Note** that based on the principles noted in the body of the report, officers have identified options for reducing or rephasing the capital programme that result in total savings of \$558m over years 1-10 of the LTP being:
 - a. \$45m in Year 1;
 - b. b) \$390m in years 2 to 6;
 - c. c) \$123m of the remaining years 7 to 10 of the LTP.
10. **Note** the financial impact of the proposed capital programme savings on operating expenditure has not yet been considered. The proposed capital programme reductions will likely reduce depreciation and interest costs. This results in a reduction to the amount of rates we need to collect. Any reduction in revenue will impact the debt to revenue ratio and further reduce debt capacity.
11. **Agree** the proposed \$558m changes to the capital programme in Attachment 1 to be updated in the draft budget for Committee approval on 11 December 2024.
12. **Note** that, as agreed on 29 October, Councillors will receive further advice on the disaster resilience fund via a briefing in December, including on:
 - Fund structures and objectives and associated management costs

- Fund capitalisation (including advice on ground leases and carbon credits)
- How the fund might work alongside current insurance roadmap work.

Whakarāpopoto | Executive Summary

8. Following Council's Notice of Motion (NOM) on 10 October 2024 to remove the sale of airport shares from the LTP, the Council has commenced a process to amend its 2024-34 LTP. This amendment is being developed in conjunction with the 2025/26 Annual Plan.
9. Council faces significant financial risks –being a large underinsurance risk and a lack of diversification of its assets. The proposal to address these risks via the establishment of a perpetual investment fund funded through the sale of the airport shares is no longer being pursued by Council. Officers therefore recommend increasing debt headroom to provide a greater level of capacity to respond to a significant event. A reduction of the capital programme is the most effective way to increase the debt headroom.
10. In addition to this, the National Land Transport Plan (NLTP) funding is lower than was assumed in the 2024-34 LTP. This amounts to lost revenue of approximately \$68m over years 1 to 3 of the LTP. Due to this, further reductions of \$130m are required to the capital programme to ensure there is no impact on our debt capacity.
11. In addition to reviewing the capital programme, the Committee decision on 29 October initiated work on a smaller Perpetual PIF/disaster resilience fund. The Committee has agreed that a smaller fund will be included as part of the options consulted on for the LTP amendment. Officers will provide further advice to the Council in December about options for fund design.
12. The Committee will receive further advice on water reform consultation options at its December 2024 meeting. At this stage, the intent is that water reform options are included in the 2025 LTP amendment process for consultation with the community.

Takenga mai | Background

Development and approval of the 2024-34 Long-term Plan

13. The 2024-34 LTP was developed in a challenging environment. The city's infrastructure is aging and requires significant investment, while the cost of delivering council's existing services continues to increase as a result of inflationary pressures.
14. During the development of the 2024-34 LTP, Council identified that it faced two primary financial challenges which are still relevant and the key drivers for this LTP amendment:
 - a. A underinsurance risk – we do not have sufficient insurance to respond to future financial and natural hazard risks.
 - b. An undiversified investment portfolio - our portfolio lacks financial resilience and could be significantly impacted by a single event, which could constrain the Council's ability to support the city's recovery from such an event.

15. These risks are driving an unsustainable balance sheet position for the Council. To mitigate them, the 2024-34 LTP proposed and consulted with the community on the sale of the Council's 34% shareholding in Wellington International Airport (and a selected number of ground leases), in order to capitalise a PIF.

Notice of Motion not to sell the Council's shares in Wellington International Airport Limited

16. On 10 October 2024, Council passed a NOM to "commence a process to amend the 2024-34 LTP with Council's objective being No Sale of any of its shareholding in WIAL." This decision started the process for an LTP amendment.
17. The 'no sale' option in the NOM did not address the Council's underlying balance sheet risks, particularly the lack of diversification in the Council's investment portfolio and the underinsurance risk.
18. The proposed removal of the share sale and fund establishment from the LTP, without other mitigating measures, leaves the underlying financial risks unaddressed. It also likely severely compromises the Council's ability to meet the LGA requirement for prudent financial management.
19. In the absence of the decision to sell the shares and establish a suitably sized fund with the proceeds, the main lever available to Council to maintain the prudent financial management of the LTP is to hold increased insurance headroom on the Council's balance sheet.
20. Reducing the LTP capital programme is the most effective way to free up borrowing headroom (within existing limits) to address some of the underinsurance risks. However, even with increased headroom and a small disaster resilience fund, a significant amount of insurance risk and the risk from lack of diversification risk continues to remain unaddressed.

NLTP funding

21. In addition to this, the National Land Transport Plan (NLTP) funding is lower than was assumed in the 2024-34 LTP. This amounts to lost revenue of approximately \$68m over years 1 to 3 of the LTP. Due to this, there are further reductions required to the capital programme to ensure there is no impact on our debt capacity. This means a further reduction of approximately \$130m is required. The proposed reductions are based on the projects that have not received funding through the NLTP. Adjustments have been made to savings amounts to reflect the reduced contribution from Greater Wellington Regional Council with respect to Bus Priority projects.

Long-term Plan 2024-34 Amendment – timeline

22. At its meeting on 29 October 2024, the Committee received advice on the timeline for amending the LTP 2024-34. Both the Annual Plan and LTP amendment need to be approved and adopted before 1 July 2025. To ensure that the LTP amendment can be completed by 30 June 2025, officers have worked to a constrained timeline to develop advice relating to the capital programme:
 - 12 November – Committee workshop: financial prudence and insurance
 - 13 November – Committee workshop: capital programme review
 - 21 November – Committee Q&A/briefing on the capital programme review
 - 26 November – Committee meeting: capital programme review

-
23. The LTP amendment will run in conjunction with the development of the 2025/26 Annual Plan. The proposed LTP amendment – a No Sale of the WIAL shares – will be subject to public consultation, alongside other options to address the Council's insurance and diversification risks.

Kōrerorero | Discussion

Insurance risks

24. In the 2021-31 LTP, WCC recognised \$272m insurance headroom within its debt to revenue ratio limit of 225%. This headroom was to address the Council's uninsured risk of its assets, estimated to be \$272m at that time. Since the 2021-31 LTP was developed, this underinsurance risk has increased significantly.
25. At the adoption of the LTP in June 2024, modelling of Council's insurance risks showed that Council was underinsured by approximately \$2.6b, substantially more than the \$272m debt headroom allowed for in the previous 2021-31 LTP. Based on updated probabilistic loss modelling, the underinsurance is estimated at approximately \$1.8b (as at 15 November). The work which underpins the new understanding of the risk has been developed and led through the insurance roadmap, which has been reported to the Audit and Risk Committee.
26. There are a number of factors that have contributed to the change in the estimated underinsurance gap, which are discussed in the 20 November Audit and Risk Committee paper. A key factor has been the assessment of the impact on the above ground/vertical assets as a result of more refined probabilistic modelling.
27. Notwithstanding that the amount has now decreased, Council's balance sheet does not have the capacity to retain the full amount of this underinsurance risk, meaning that Council is exposed to potential losses in excess of its risk bearing capacity. The Council needs to look to other methods of risk financing to mitigate the increased underinsurance risk.
28. Increasing the amount of insurance headroom to \$500m (achieved by proposed reductions to the capital programme and keeping the debt to revenue ratio limit at 225%) will help to manage this risk and ensures the Council is being financially sustainable. However, this needs to be balanced with the need to appropriately invest in maintaining existing assets, and meet our LTP priorities. Therefore, the amount of decrease in the capital expenditure programme needs to be carefully considered. Councillors need to ensure that decreasing its capital programme is not creating future risks or indeed managing its assets imprudently. Such examples would include not investing for known impacts of climate change or not investing sufficiently in renewals and existing assets.

Financial Prudence

29. Council has a statutory obligation to ensure prudent management of the city's assets and liabilities. This is set out in Section 101 of the Local Government Act 2002 which states:

“A local authority must manage its revenues, expenses, assets, liabilities, investments, and general financial dealings prudently and in a manner that promotes the current and future interests of the community”.

30. The 2024-34 LTP received an unqualified audit opinion and struck the necessary balance providing a reasonable basis for long-term integrated decision making and coordination of the Council’s resources. WCC needs to ensure the amended LTP also strikes this balance while considering both current and future interests of the community. In order to do so it must demonstrate financial prudence.
31. Financial prudence has no clear legal definition and demonstrating prudence will depend on a Council’s individual circumstances. However, certain factors need to be taken into consideration.
32. In addition to s101, the Local Government Act 2002 includes the following, mandatory provisions to guide financial prudence:
 - a. Section 102 states “A local authority must, in order to provide predictability and certainty about sources and levels of funding, adopt the funding and financial policies”.
 - b. Section 100 states “A local authority must ensure that each year’s projected operating revenues are set at a level sufficient to meet that year’s projected operating expenses. A local authority may set projected operating revenues at a different level from that required by that subsection if the local authority resolves that it is financially prudent to do so.
 - c. In considering financial prudence, the local authority must have regard to:
 - i. maintaining levels of service;
 - ii. maintaining service capacity and integrity of assets;
 - iii. intergenerational equity; and
 - iv. compliance with local authority funding and financing policies (established under Section 102).”
33. There are also other considerations in respect of managing Council’s finances prudently. These include:
 - a. Condition and performance of assets – ensuring we have balance sheet resilience (including deferral of works such as mitigations for climate change);
 - b. Ensuring we are fully funding depreciation and retaining a balanced budget;
 - c. Debt and credit ratings;
 - d. Insurance risks;
 - e. Climate change and other known impacts on our assets;
 - f. Unplanned events; and
 - g. Rates affordability.

225% self-imposed Debt to revenue ratio limit

34. As part of a Councils financial strategy, a Council must set a quantified limit on its borrowing. WCC set a 225% debt to revenue ratio limit in its 2024-34 LTP as part of the financial strategy. This is the same limit as the 2021-31 LTP.

-
35. The Council could borrow up to a maximum of 280% debt to revenue, which is the covenant set by the Local Government Funding Agency. The Council undertakes all its borrowing through the Agency, which provides the Council with the cheapest cost of debt it can obtain.
36. Officers consider it would be imprudent to borrow up to this limit for two key reasons:
- i. Rates affordability (i.e., increased borrowing leads to operating costs such as interest which must be repaid, generally through rates);
 - ii. Council needs to maintain the ability to borrow to deal with unexpected and unknown events
37. Officers therefore recommend that the debt to revenue ratio remains at 225%.

Rates affordability

38. WCC has set a rates limit through the financial strategy in the 2024-34 LTP, of between 5-8% (excluding the sludge levy) on average over the ten years of the LTP. The average rates increase over this ten year period is forecasted to be 8%.
39. The 2007 Shand report, reviewing Local Government rating, suggested a benchmark of rates around 5% of household income being affordable. No subsequent reports have defined a benchmark for rates affordability. Currently most suburbs in Wellington are below this threshold, but some are nearing it, and this is expected to grow under the current LTP.
40. The basis for the rates increase limit is to balance affordability with increased investment required in our infrastructure. On average Wellington residents pay a lower share of their household income on rates compared to surrounding areas. Many residents benefit from relatively high incomes comparative to the New Zealand average. We also have a significant commercial sector, which allows residents to afford higher levels of services than other smaller centres.
41. We are, however, seeing a significant increase in ratepayers seeking payment plans and rates rebates. This indicates the affordability of rates is becoming more challenging. The Council had approximately 600 payment plans set up over the last quarter, compared to approximately 200 in the previous year.
42. Rates are the principal source of revenue for the Council's activities. In 2024/25, the forecasted revenue from rates is expected to be 58% of total revenue.
43. While an increase in debt headroom could theoretically be achieved by increasing revenue such as rates, given the concerns around rates affordability, this is not recommended. It is proposed that the existing rates limit (an average of 5-8% over the LTP period) be retained.
44. Officers instead propose to increase the debt headroom through a reduction in the capital programme.

Unexpected and unknown events

45. Wellington has had some significant weather events in recent years, including large rainfall and slips. The costs to remediate these have been significant and not planned for.

46. The Christchurch and Kaikoura earthquakes, Cyclone Gabrielle and the Auckland floods were extreme natural events that have cost the country significantly to rebuild and remediate.
47. During the Covid-19 pandemic, the Council had a significant shortfall in its operating revenue, including less or no dividend from the Wellington International Airport Limited. The Council borrowed to cover the shortfall, to ensure that ratepayers and our community didn't face further rates increases. These borrowings are being repaid over time through rates.
48. The Council also has numerous earthquake prone buildings and there are uncertainties about the cost of remediation in the future.
49. The debt capacity WCC holds above the 225% helps to mitigate the risk of such future unexpected and unknown events.

\$500m debt headroom for insurance

50. In the 2021-31 LTP, the Council provided \$272m headroom to respond to the estimated scale of underinsurance at that point in time. Between the 2021-31 and 2024-34 LTPs the scale of the Council's underinsurance risk increased significantly, beyond the Council's ability to fully provide for the estimated loss via its debt headroom. The proposal to sell the airport shares and invest in a perpetual investment fund was the Council's response to this increased risk.
51. While the Council has decided to no longer pursue an airport sale, the increase in the insurance risk requires a meaningful response in order to maintain a financially prudent strategy. Officers' recommendation to increase its debt headroom for insurance to \$500m in this LTP amendment is based on a similar approach to that taken by other Councils. In particular, Christchurch City Council is seeking to maintain a minimum \$600m headroom in its debt capacity as a result of a recent increase in its insurance valuations.
52. The debt headroom increase to \$500m needs to be significant, based on the significant increase of the underinsurance risk. There will not be sufficient overall headroom to completely mitigate this risk, either at \$1.8b or \$2.6b. Therefore, the reduction of the underinsurance risk based on updated modelling does not impact Officers' recommendations.
53. In total, the \$500m debt headroom for insurance plus the ability to borrow above the Council's self-imposed debt to revenue limit of 225% up to its debt to revenue covenant of 280% provides the Council with approximately \$1b of headroom in response to a major event.

Summary of recommended way forward

54. Based on these factors, Officers recommend that the financial strategy for this LTP amendment include the following elements:
 - a 225% debt to revenue ratio.
 - increase the allocation of headroom for insurance from \$272m to \$500m, to be provided for under the 225% limit. This increase in insurance headroom will be facilitated through a reduction in the capital programme.
 - maintain the limit on rates increases at 5-8% on average over the 10-year period.

Reviewing the capital programme: principles

55. Officers have utilised five principles to inform their proposal on the capital programme review. This was noted by Committee at its 29 October 2024 meeting. The principles are:
- a. **Renewals** – The capital programme should prioritise the maintenance and renewals of existing assets over upgrading or building new. Under the current LTP, renewals expenditure is already set at 75% of unconstrained renewal funding (apart from water) for the first ten years of the plan, and this is subject to a matter of emphasis by the auditor¹; any cuts to the capital programme should avoid further reducing renewals expenditure;
 - b. **In train** – Projects that are substantively in train (i.e., contractually committed and spend well advanced) should continue;
 - c. **Legislative** – The capital programme should ensure the Council meets its legislative and regulatory requirements;
 - d. **Early savings** – Changes/reductions are required over the full term of the LTP, however, savings that can be found early should be prioritised as they have more significant impacts on operating costs and capital savings required over the later years of the programme; and
 - e. **Development contributions** – Projects part funded from development contributions could move to later in the LTP period, but if removed from the plan entirely, development contributions would need to be returned and/or the DC policy amended.
56. Officers applied these principles to the review of the LTP capital programme, establishing which capital items are within scope of the review. Further refinements were made once projects were considered against:
- **Risks** – risks associated with stopping, rephasing, rescaling or continue programme and projects;
 - **Levels of service** – potential impacts on levels of service;
 - **Interdependencies** – links between programmes and projects within scope of the review; and
 - **Priorities** – impact on adopted priorities agreed in the LTP 2024-34.
57. Based on the above approach, officers developed recommendations for the programmes and projects considered within scope as follows:
- a. **No change** – the programme or project continues as outlined in the LTP;
 - b. **Low level of change** – the programme or project is recommended for rephasing over the remaining nine years of the LTP;

¹ The LTP 2024-34 audit opinion noted emphasis of two matters: uncertainty and risks over planned renewals of three waters assets, and risks associated with plans to defer renewals of transport and operational assets. These factors were taken into account when determining the principals to be applied to the review of the capital programme.

- c. **Moderate level of change** – the programme or project is recommended to continue but will be rephased out of the current LTP into Year 11 and beyond;
OR

Moderate level of change – the programme or project is recommended for rephasing and rescoping. It could remain in the out years of the LTP or be moved into years 11+;

- d. **High level of change** – stopping the programme or project is recommended.

Impact of Inflation

58. We have updated our analysis to include the estimated impact of inflation on rephased and rescope budgets. In some instances, this results in an overall increase in project budgets due to the impact of additional inflation in out years. These inflationary impacts are estimates only, as inflation rates become more uncertain in outer years, and these calculations have not been fully modelled through our budgeting system. The draft budget that will be provided to the Committee for its 17 December meeting will include the full impact of inflation.

Impact on Operating Costs

59. Reductions to the capital programme will likely result in reductions to depreciation and interest costs. This will lead to a reduction in the rates revenue required and therefore will impact the debt to revenue ratio. For example, if the Council's revenue reduced by \$100 in any given year, a reduction in the Councils borrowing of \$225 would be required to maintain the debt to revenue ratio. The resulting impact from a reduction in the capital programme will be calculated and included in the draft budget provided for the Committee meeting of 17 December 2024.

Review of current year budgets (year 1 of LTP)

60. While initially focused on years 2 to 10 of the LTP, officers have also reviewed current year projects that are yet to commence or to have funding committed, to determine if any of these projects can also be reduced, rephased, or rescope in line with the principals. Through this process, an additional \$45m of year 1 savings were identified.

Annual Plan impacts

61. The 2025/26 Annual Plan processes are being run in parallel to the LTP Amendment. This means budget items not subject to the LTP Amendment are being considered simultaneously. Through this process we have identified two areas of additional savings not included in Attachment 1. These savings are included in the total savings identified:
- a miscalculation in the waste collection service bins due to late rephasing which has now been corrected in the budget with a saving of \$13.6m in year 2.
 - an ability to remove the budget for the Newtown Community Hub in years 8 and 9 of the LTP as this is now incorporated in the Te Awa Para budget – a saving of \$24.8m.

Internal Savings

62. Officers have also identified a number of internal projects which can be rescaled. These relate to unscheduled renewals and the capital replacement fund. These savings equate to \$3.1m in years 1 to 6, and an additional \$10.6m in years 7 to 10, with total savings over the LTP of \$13.7m. These amounts are included in the total identified savings.

63. There are a small number of IT renewal related projects that officers are continuing to review in order to identify the risks of rescaling or rephasing these renewals. We will bring back further advice regarding possible savings options with the draft budget on 17 December.

Total savings identified

64. After applying the principles and taking the above matters into consideration, officers have identified total savings options of \$558m from the capital programme as follows:
- \$45m of savings in the current year (year 1 of LTP)
 - 419m of savings in year 2 to 6 of LTP
 - \$123m of savings in year 7 to 10 of LTP

Savings options are outlined in Attachment 1.

Disaster Resilience Fund and Insurance Roadmap

65. In addition to the capex reduction options listed in this paper, on 29 October, the LTP Committee reinitiated work on a perpetual investment fund (now a disaster resilience fund) and agreed that it would be consulted on as part of the LTP amendment. Officers will bring back advice by December on the following:
- Options for structure and objectives for the disaster resilience fund;
 - Options for capitalisation that could be used to establish the disaster resilience fund (i.e., advice on ground leases, carbon credits and/or other sales); and
 - How a disaster resilience fund can work alongside other work being explored through the Council's insurance roadmap (outlined below).
66. Work is also progressing on an Insurance Roadmap. This includes:
- completing detailed risk modelling of the Council's assets to inform risk selection and more targeted purchasing; and
 - developing alternative risk transfer methods to provide more insurance cover for Wellington City Council assets than can be purchased via traditional insurance products.
67. One alternative risk transfer method (as introduced via the Unaunahi Māhirahira | Audit and Risk Committee on 14 August 2024) is a captive insurance company. Officers are actively working on if/how a captive insurer could help contribute to the Council's insurance gap, noting it would only provide a part of the overall solution. However, a captive insurer is a complex solution. It needs to be considered carefully to ensure it is a viable option and that it could be set up in a way that would meet the Council's objectives.
68. This option needs to be considered alongside the establishment of a disaster resilience fund, as there are important ways in which the fund and a captive insurance company could be designed to support each other.

Kōwhiringa | Options

69. In order to increase debt headroom there are two key options: reducing the capital programme or increasing revenue. Council's primary lever to increase revenue is to increase rates. Given the concerns (detailed in this paper) around rates affordability, this option is not viewed as reasonably practicable. Accordingly, this paper focuses on capital programme changes to support a reduction in the capital programme, and thereby increase debt headroom for the organisation.
70. Options to reduce the capital programme are:
 - a. officer recommended: capital reductions as per Attachment 1. This based on the principles developed by officers;
 - b. alternative reductions within the capital programme.
71. Option A is recommended as the option that most aligns with Council's strategic objectives, minimises the risk of losing sunk costs, and meets legislative requirements. Given that the savings identified fall primarily within years 2-6 of the LTP, this option provides the most effective savings.
72. Should the Committee resolve capital reductions significantly short of the number recommended, there is a risk that Council may not be able to demonstrate financial prudence given the risks it faces.

Whai whakaaro ki ngā whakataunga | Considerations for decision-making

Alignment with Council's strategies and policies

73. The 2024-34 LTP outlines a number of Council strategies and policies. The NOM unwinds the critical part of the LTP's Financial Strategy without a specified alternative plan, leaving the Council's underlying financial and balance sheet risks unaddressed. This paper outlines the approach to help mitigate the financial and balance sheet risk.
74. The proposed capital reductions are recommended as the option that most aligns with Council's strategic objectives while delivering the identified capex reductions.

Engagement and Consultation

75. A full LTP amendment process would be undertaken including community consultation on the reasonably practicable options to address the Council's insurance and financial resilience risks and any other impacts.
76. A full engagement plan will be presented to the committee at its February 2025 meeting.

Māori Impact Statement

77. This LTP amendment process has been initiated as a result of the Council's previous decision to support the NOM. Through this NOM process, the Council's relationship with our Tākai Here partners was negatively impacted with currently uncertain longer-term implications for the partnership. It is therefore particularly important that the amendment process seek to positively uphold the partnership.

78. Commitment to our Tākai Here partners was not explicitly outlined in the principles for decision making and while officers have considered Council's commitment to Tūpiki Ora and our Tākai Here partnership in relation to capital programme reductions, a full assessment to measure the impact of programme reductions needs to be completed following the decisions outlined in this paper.
79. Currently capital projects and programmes include consideration of Council's LTP priority to celebrate and make visible te ao Māori across our city and our commitment to integrating te ao Māori into every aspect of our work.
80. While the quantity of capital programmes and projects may be reduced or deferred, the quality standards we have set for ourselves, our partners and our communities in bringing te ao Māori to life through cultural expression and design should be upheld.

Financial implications

81. Full financial implications will be developed and brought back to the Council as part of the Annual Plan budget and LTP amendment process. A draft budget will be brought back to the Committee on 17 December which will include:
 - Recommended budget adjustments as part of the Annual Plan process;
 - The updated capital programme;
 - The depreciation and interest implications of the amended capital programme; and
 - Updated debt to revenue ratio calculations

Legal considerations

82. Council has a statutory obligation to ensure prudent management of the city's assets and liabilities. As previously noted, this is set out at Section 101 of the Local Government Act:
83. "A local authority must manage its revenues, expenses, assets, liabilities, investments, and general financial dealings prudently and in a manner that promotes the current and future interests of the community".
84. The proposed reductions to the capital programme play a critical role in creating sufficient headroom to demonstrate a prudent financial strategy.

Risks and mitigations

85. The primary risk associated with this decision relates to financial prudence. Should the Committee resolve capital reductions significantly short of the number recommended, there is a risk that Council may not be able to demonstrate financial prudence given the financial risks it faces.
86. The capital reductions proposed will incur other risks and impacts including:
 - Community dissatisfaction from changes to the capital programme.
 - Reduced ability to achieve some KPIs and/ or strategic objectives.
 - Reduced Level of Service (LoS), city transformation takes longer to achieve.

- Possible loss of some sunk costs depending on which projects are agreed to.
 - Rephasing may result in higher costs in the future.
87. Proposed significant reductions in the capital programme may lead to a reduction in a level of service provided by Council. If this change is significant, this will need to be consulted on through the Long-Term Plan amendment process. Officers will assess the changes prior to the next committee meeting so that any required matters can be included in the consultation document.
88. The LTP Amendment is being developed on the working assumption that water reform does not result in any dis-advantageous impacts on the Councils balance sheet. Should anything result in a deviation from this, there is a risk that there could be a decrease in borrowing capacity.

Disability and accessibility impact

89. Full details will be developed through the LTP amendment process. Projects that aim to improve the city's accessibility for people with disabilities or meet accessibility requirements may be impacted by changes to the capital programme.

Climate Change impact and considerations

90. Full details would be developed through the LTP amendment process. Projects that will help meet our emission reduction target may be impact by capital programme changes.

Communications Plan

91. A full communication plan will be developed to be used across the amendment process, including key messaging, information on what is in and out of scope and updates to a public website, similar to the process used for the 2024-34 LTP.

Health and Safety Impact considered

92. The health and safety implications of any changes to the LTP will be considered as part of future reports.

Ngā mahinga e whai ake nei | Next actions

93. The next report will present a draft budget for the 2025/26 Annual Plan and LTP amendment for approval on 17 December 2024. Officials will bring back further advice regarding any further possible savings options at the same time.

A draft consultation budget be presented to Committee for audit approval on 13 February 2026.

Attachments

Attachment 1.	Capital programme review details	Page 24
Attachment 2.	Full Capital Programme	Page 52

Capital Programme Review

Principles

1. A series of principles were used to guide advice on which capital projects and programmes could be reduced, rephased or removed. These were previously shared with the LTP Committee on 10 October and 29 October. They are:
 - **Renewals** - The capital programme should prioritise the maintenance and renewals of existing assets over upgrading or building new. Under the current LTP, renewals expenditure is already set at 75% of unconstrained renewal funding (apart from water) for the first ten years of the plan, and this is subject to a matter of emphasis by the auditor. Any cuts to the capital programme should avoid further reducing renewals expenditure.
 - **Projects in train** - Projects that are substantively in train (i.e., contractually committed and spend well advanced) should continue to avoid the loss of sunk costs.
 - **Legislative** - The capital programme should ensure the Council meets its legislative and regulatory requirements.
 - **Early years** - Changes/reductions are required over the full term of the LTP, however, savings that can be found early should be prioritised as they have more significant impacts on operating costs and capital savings required over the later years of the programme.
 - **Development contributions** - Projects fully or part funded from development contributions could move to later in the LTP period, but if removed from the plan entirely, development contributions would need to be returned and/or the DC policy amended. This should be avoided.

Further refinement

2. By applying the above principles, projects/activities that are within scope of the review were identified. In-scope projects/activities were further assessed against the following:
 - a. The risks associated with changes to the projects, programmes and/or activities
 - b. Any impact on strategic priorities identified in the LTP
 - c. Any impact on Levels of Service
 - d. Any interdependencies / links between programmes and projects (e.g connections to DCs, revenue streams, other projects such as between Urban Development and Transport)
3. Each project / programme of work programme on the list below has a recommendation in one of the following categories:
 - a. **No change:** the programme or project continues as outlined in the LTP
 - b. **Low level of change:** the programme or project is recommended for rephasing or rescoping but remains in the LTP
 - c. **Moderate level of change:** the programme or project is recommended to continue but will be rephased out of the current LTP into Year 11 and beyond; OR
Moderate level of change: the programme or project is recommended for rephasing and rescoping, It could remain in the out years of the LTP *or* be moved into Years 11+.
 - d. **High level of change:** It is recommended to stop the programme or project.
4. The results of the work for consideration are represented in the tables of this document. They are grouped by the following strategic activity areas:
 - Governance
 - Environment

- Cultural Wellbeing
- Economic Wellbeing
- Social and Recreation
- Urban development
- Transport

Overall proposed capex savings

Total LTP budget	Total budget Years 2 to 6	Total in scope Years 2 to 6	Total proposed savings Years 2 to 6	Total proposed overall LTP savings
\$4.9 billion	\$2.5 billion	\$1.0 billion	\$390.4 million	\$556.8m

Detailed Capital programme review by Strategic Priority Area

Governance

Purpose

Our Governance work includes all the activities that support Council decision-making and ensuring we are accountable to the people of Wellington.

Activities in this group	Services we deliver	LTP Strategic Priorities
1.1 City governance and engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Providing accurate and professional advice, research and administrative support to elected members and community boards ■ Organising local body elections, and encouraging all Wellingtonians to have their say on who will govern their city ■ A contact centre and website providing 24/7 access to information and a place to log service faults ■ Facilitating community engagement and consultation on key decisions facing the city, including facilitating input from Council advisory groups ■ Provide information to the public about our services and change proposals ■ Setting policy and bylaws, carrying out planning and budgeting and reporting our performance ■ Management of archival information in line with legislation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Governance activities contribute to all of the strategic priorities through managing the decision-making processes.

Overall review approach

This strategic area has no allocated capex that fits with the principles for the review. The one capex item is \$146,000 for fit out needs of the Council and Committee chambers as part of the move to Jervois Quay in 2025.

Environment & Infrastructure

Purpose

This area covers an extensive range of Council services, and includes everything from open spaces, waste reduction and energy conservation to water, wastewater and stormwater. Our conservation attractions Wellington Zoo and ZEALANDIA - Te Māra a Tāne, are also part of this portfolio.

Activities in this group	Services we deliver	LTP Strategic Priorities
2.1 Parks and gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Managing and maintaining parks, reserves, beaches coastal structures, including buildings, walking and biking tracks. ■ Managing assets and maintaining the Wellington Gardens: Wellington Botanic Garden; Ōtari Wilton's Bush; Truby King Park and Bolton Street Cemetery ■ Improving urban ecology through restoration planting and appropriate management of biosecurity issues and animal pests ■ Managing daily activity on the waterfront, including property management, parking, cleaning, security and general maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Invest in sustainable, connected and accessible community and recreation facilities
2.2 Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Domestic recycling and rubbish kerbside collection and facilities for disposing of general household waste. ■ Diversion services at the Southern Landfill. ■ Education and advocacy for greater waste minimisation practices in the homes of Wellingtonians ■ Facilities for disposing of waste from hazardous and industrial sites, developments and construction activities, and emergencies and disasters ■ A recycling facility, including a shop for the sale of reusable goods ■ Supporting programmes to reduce the organisation's carbon emissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Transform our waste system to enable a circular economy
2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 Three waters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The three waters network – Drinking water, wastewater and storm water. ■ Includes reservoirs, pumping stations, fixtures including hydrants, and thousands of kilometres of pipes across the city. ■ Monitoring drinking water quality to ensure it complies with New Zealand Standards ■ Collecting, treating and disposing of wastewater in ways that protect our waterways from harmful effects ■ Managing stormwater flows, while minimising the risk of flooding and the impact of run-off on the environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fix our water infrastructure and improve the health of waterways
2.6 Conservation attractions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Wellington Zoo Trust and Zealandia (Karori Sanctuary Trust) are both Council-controlled organisations (CCOs) and are part-funded by the Council. ■ They attract visitors to our city and inform and educate about conservation and biodiversity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Revitalise the city and suburbs to support a thriving and resilient economy and support job growth

Overall review approach

The activity areas 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 relate to our three waters network and are out of scope of this review due to the requirements of the Local Water Done Well Reform, which states:

"Requirements for councils to include in their Plans baseline information about their water services operations, assets, revenue, expenditure, pricing, and projected capital expenditure, as well as necessary financing arrangements, as a first step towards future economic regulation."

Applying the principles, the renewals budgets in 2.1 Gardens, Beaches and Open Spaces, 2.2 Waste, and 2.6 Conservation Organisations were excluded from the review.

Example of other projects categorised as out of scope of the review in this area are:

- **Te Whare Wai Para Nuku Sludge Minimisation Facility:** the project is underway with construction well advanced. It also has separate IFF funding. Therefore, it is out of scope.
- **Southern Landfill extension:** Pre-liminary work is underway with the contractor due to be appointed by the end of 2024, with the main work starting in January 2025. Therefore, it is out of scope.
- **Waste collection changes:** This area was subject to extensive consultation in the 2024 LTP and received strong public support. It also has high levels of risks associated with delays. These are the same as those outlined as part of the 2024 LTP and included in the consultation document: the contract renewal, end of life of the fleet, the need for greater recycling capacity and the issues associated with bags over wheelie bins. There would also be an impact on revenue due to the planned implementation of the waste targeted rate.
- **Lincolnshire/Belmont/Stebbings:** These projects are funded through development contributions and are out of scope as they are not debt funded.
- **Zealandia upgrades:** These are planned for the out years of the programme. There are conservation impacts of not renewing the Zealandia perimeter fence as planned.

Proposed capital programme changes

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
E01	Huetepara Park	<p>Recommended option: High level of change: Stop the project and remove from the budget.</p> <p>Additional option: Low level of change: Rephase the project into the out years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ This project is budgeted for in the current financial year. However, the project is dependent on the Airport completing work on its boundary. Therefore, it is on-hold and not likely to proceed this year, meaning the budget will be requested to be carried forward into 2025/26. This means the project is in scope of this review. ■ Approx. \$15,000 has been spent of the Y1 budget so far on the planning for the proposal. Overall, the to-date spend including previous financial years is circa \$287k. This would be sunk costs. ■ As the project is dependent on the timing of Airport improvements, which are yet to occur, the continue option isn't viable as the project is already delayed. ■ This is a community-led project so there is a risk of community dissatisfaction with the removal of the project. 	<p>Total project: \$2.4m</p> <p>Recommended option saving: \$2.4m in Y1 and against overall LTP budget as project removed from the budget and not carried forward.</p> <p>Additional option: Rephase \$2.4m into out years, contributes to savings, but only to Y1 and overall LTP, not Y2 to 6.</p>
E02	Frank Kitts Park redevelopment	<p>High level of change: Remove project from the LTP and revisit as part of the 2027 LTP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ \$54.5m in the programme, but \$44m is our share – the rest was targeted to come from the other partners (Garden of Beneficence and Fale Male). ■ Keeping the carpark open will generate revenue for the Council. The carpark needs to be closed and demolished for the Fale Male and Garden to continue. ■ Indications that deferring the project will impact the partners of the current project, meaning a rescope is needed. Therefore, the option, due to the financial constraints is to stop the project and rescope through the 2027 LTP with a view to any construction happening in the out years to maximise any parking revenue. ■ Stopping the project will incur sunk costs and there is likely to need to be some residual cost needed to close down the project and investigate rescope options. This has been assumed at \$3m in Years 1 to 3. 	<p>Total project: \$54.5m \$1m in Y1, \$53.5m in Y2 to 6.</p> <p>Recommended option: Stop the project and remove from the LTP and revisit an alternate solution as part of the 2027 LTP.</p> <p>Saving: \$51.4m in Y2 to 6 and against overall LTP budget.</p>
E03	Begonia House	<p>Recommended option: High level of change: Demolish</p> <p>Additional option: No change to budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Demolition of Begonia House: Facilities would need to be closed as they pose safety hazards, and all buildings would be demolished. Initial indicative costings to demolish are approx. \$1m. There will be additional costs to factor in including consenting, "making good" the site, and financial impairment. Further work would need to be carried out to accurately scope detailed costs, however a working assumption would be approximately \$3m. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Advantages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Low financial investment required (demolition costs) ○ Utility savings □ Disadvantages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Negative impact on domestic and international visitor experience ○ Requirement to change Begonia House nursery operating model 	<p>Total project: \$8.1m</p> <p>Recommended option: Demolish the building, leaving the café portion and "make good" the area as public space.</p> <p>Saving: \$5.1m savings, in Y2 to 6</p> <p>Additional option: Minimal savings from the LTP budget or against Y2 to 6. Three budget lines would be recommended to be combined into one to create the budget needed for Begonia House. This removes the Ōtari landscape</p>

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Heritage implications as Begonia House is a contributing building in a heritage area - demolition is difficult but possible. ○ Loss of revenue from events and leased cafe. ○ Risk to existing philanthropic relationships. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Begonia House project has not yet gone through developed design & quantity surveying. ■ If we are to proceed with developed design of any alternative options, as well as the physical works, some work would need to begin in the next two years due to current issues (current condition of the structure, public safety issues (e.g. glazing and heating). \$523k has been budgeted in 2024/25 but work is paused pending decisions about next steps. ■ Alternate option: Demolition is one option however it is not the only practicable option. The next step if demolition is not preferred would be to develop practicable options to be considered by the Council and be engaged on by the public. If Councillors would like to develop this option in more detail, including further detail on demolition, then an option is to fund this work in Y2 to develop detailed options and rephase existing funding while this work is completed. 	development and Ops Centre projects from the LTP.
E06	Ōtari Landscape Development Plan	<p>Recommended option: Low level of change: Rephase project into Y6</p> <p>Additional option: High level of change: Remove from the LTP and combine budget into Begonia House</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The nursery redevelopment is one of the last projects from the 2010 Otari Landscape Development Plan. The nursery is currently an accumulation of structures and spaces installed over a long period of time and now also includes the Laboratory. No detailed planning for the development has been undertaken yet, however one outcome is to make controlled public access 'behind the scenes' possible to provide a better understanding of the conservation work that happens at Otari and to see the laboratory in action. ■ The redevelopment was scheduled to begin once the Begonia House upgrade was complete, but can be rephased. ■ From an asset condition perspective, by year 7, the existing propagation tunnel house will have reached the end of life, and the laboratory will be at overcapacity. ■ Additional option: If the work is stopped: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lab: This would limit our ability to support local, national or international research. ○ Seedbanking - we would not be able to start doing this, which would not align with the work we are doing with threatened species conservation. ○ The tunnel house: would require funding from within existing capex programme to repair or try and extend the life of the asset. The tunnel is critical to the running of the nursery. 	<p>Total project: \$3.4m</p> <p>Recommended option: If the Begonia House is demolished then this project will be rephased to start in Y6.</p> <p>Saving: This saves \$3.3m in Y2 to 6, but the overall LTP budget is a cost increase of \$470.8k due to inflation adjustments from rephasing.</p> <p>Alternate option: If the Begonia House is strengthened then it is recommended to remove this project from the LTP and place the funding towards the Begonia House.</p>
E07	Botanic Garden Ops Centre	<p>Recommended option: No change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ At this stage no detailed plans have been developed. There is a budget provision to improve the staffing areas for operational staff within the Botanic Garden. Currently staff are spread across four workspaces within the Gardens (Rose Gardens/Begonia House, Main Gardens, Nursery & Cable Car). These facilities are old and dated, and not 	<p>Total project: \$6.5m</p> <p>Recommended option: No change - If the Begonia House is</p>

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
		<p>Additional option: High level of change: Remove from the LTP and combine budget into Begonia House</p>	<p>fit for purpose. The aim was to look at the option to build a more suitable base for staff, and to condense the staffing areas throughout the garden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff will continue to work from their existing work areas. We will have to continue to undertake basic maintenance and budget for renewals to ensure the facilities remain as good as they can be given the circumstances and current condition. The facility at the back of the Begonia House (Rose Gardens Depot), is the depot in the poorest condition. The plan for the future of this depot is being considered in the wider Begonia House upgrade plan, given the connection between the two buildings. Funding is in the out years, however it is linked to the Begonia House proposal. If the Begonia House is demolished the Ops Centre project will need to be maintained. This funding could also be moved to Begonia House to make up for the shortfall in budget to strengthen that facility. 	<p>demolished then this project in Years 8 to 10 will need to proceed.</p> <p>Alternate option: If the Begonia House is strengthened then it is recommended to remove this project from the LTP and place the funding towards the Begonia House.</p>
E08	Johnsonville urban green space development	<p>Recommended option: High level of change: Stop the project, but continue with the sale and use the proceeds to pay back debt.</p> <p>Additional option: Low level of change: Continue with sale, but rephase land purchase to later years of the LTP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to this programme being funded from the proceeds of the sale, there is no impact towards the savings target if the project goes ahead as is. However, if it continues as planned, it is recommended to rephase the purchase of new land to allow time for suitable land to be located. No land is currently earmarked for this proposal. This is a community-supported project so there is a risk of community dissatisfaction with the removal of the project. 	<p>Recommended option: Proceeds of sale contribute to reducing debt.</p> <p>Additional option: No impact on debt or capital review savings total.</p>
E09	Southern Landfill Carbon Unit Purchases	<p>Low level of change: Rephase the programme to out years of the LTP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchases in Years 2 to 6 totalling \$23m could be released as the current stock of carbon units is sufficient for satisfying our ETS obligations up until May 2031. However, ultimately these purchases are necessary and if there are any changes in regulations, or the estimates of our emissions, additional units could be needed sooner than 2031. Current practice is purchasing units when the price is lower, this change will mean we are purchasing the units within the year we are surrendering them. This will subject us to price fluctuations and paying higher prices for the units. 	<p>Total project: \$45m across the LTP.</p> <p>Recommended option: Remove funding from Y2 to 6.</p> <p>Savings: \$23.2m in Y2 to 6</p>

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
E10	Organics Processing (In partnership with PCC/HCC)	Low level of change: Rescope programme within LTP to complete lower cost alternate model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The capital (\$20.3 million) allocation for organics processing in the LTP was based on the business case originally presented in September 2023. Since the adoption in June 2024, officers have begun to investigate an alternative local organic processing solution as a risk mitigation to regional facility procurement not reaching a viable solution. While this alternative work has not concluded, an alternative solution at the Southern Landfill and/or the regional procurement are likely to achieve a processing facility solution for a lower amount than the current \$20.3m. Given the current funding constraints, the proposed new allocation is \$10m. This will still include the provision of \$4.6m capital funding from the landfill surplus, so the total to be funded by debt is \$5.4m. 	<p>Total project: \$20.3m across the LTP.</p> <p>Recommended option: Rescope to \$10m</p> <p>Savings: \$11.5m savings in Y2 to 6, plus \$4.6m of the funding for the project to come from Landfill Surplus not debt. Total remaining debt requirement \$5.4m</p>
E11	Wellington Zoo upgrades	No change: Lions upgrade continue as planned Moderate level of change: Savannah rephase out of the LTP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The upgrades of the Lions habitat and Savannah habitats are planned for the second half of the LTP. There is not enough space in the current configuration to deliver the best animal welfare outcomes for lions and giraffes, and the Zoo is committed due to ages and stages of the animals at the Zoo to care for both of these species in the long-term. The lions upgrade involves creating a new habitat in a nearby area and then moving them once construction is complete. This enables the zoo to care for them during construction and moving them to a new area makes space to expand the Savannah habitat. This project was originally budgeted for \$19.4m and through a value engineering exercise with quantity surveyors it was already reduced to \$12.6m to make savings in the 2024 LTP. It is recommended that this project remain out of scope and continue as planned. However, the Savannah project can be rephased into the outer years 11+ of the Long-term Plan to occur at a later time. 	<p>Total project: Lions: \$12.6m in Y5 to 8 Savannah: \$1.2m in Y9 and 10</p> <p>Recommended option: No change for the Lions, but rephase the Savannah project into Years 11+. This saves \$1.2m in the LTP)</p>
Indicative savings – Years 2 to 6				\$94.5m (Overall LTP savings \$97.7m)

Economic Development

Purpose

The mahi for Economic development supports a thriving economic, employment and events sector.

Activities in this group	Services we deliver	LTP Strategic Priorities
3.1 City Promotions and business support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Promoting Wellington to domestic and international visitors to encourage the growth of the tourism sector. ■ Supporting high-quality events, such as World of Wearable Art, which generate cultural and economic benefits for the city. ■ Operating civic venues for entertainment, performances and business events ■ We operate and maintain the new convention and exhibition centre. ■ Delivering programmes that support businesses to deliver innovation, increase the visibility of te ao Māori and mana whenua create and retain jobs, increase the rating base, support economic growth in target sectors and transition to a circular economy. ■ Attracting and supporting business activity across Wellington. ■ Improving the city's national and international connections, including with our eight sister cities across the world. ■ We provide support and funding to the BIDs for improvements to their local business districts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Revitalise the city and suburbs to support a thriving and resilient economy and support job growth

Overall review approach

As per the principles, the renewals budgets in 3.1 City Promotions and business support were excluded from the review. These budgets make up the majority of the capex for this area.

Proposed capital programme changes

Reference	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
EW01	Venues upgrades	High level of change: Stop the project.	Removing this budget line has minimal impact as budget is not currently allocated to any projects. Therefore the budget is considered to be all in scope to be removed.	Total project: \$13.2m Saving: \$9.8m in Y2 to 6, with a further \$3.4m of savings in Y7. (\$13.2m removed from the overall LTP budget)
Indicative savings - Years 2 to 6				\$9.8m (Overall LTP savings \$13.2m)

Cultural Wellbeing

Purpose

The mahi for Cultural Wellbeing helps our city be recognised as the cultural capital of New Zealand.

Activities in this group	Services we deliver	LTP Strategic Priorities
4.1 Arts and Cultural Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing the city's art collection, including the Wellington Collection at the Ngauranga Gorge collection store which is cared for by Experience Wellington. Funding Experience Wellington across its sites: Wellington Museum, City Gallery Wellington, Cable Car Museum, Nairn Street Cottage, Space Place at Carter Observatory, Capital E Funding contribution to Te Papa Advising on and supporting community events, delivering free public events, and supporting major cultural events. Direct grants support to creative sector organisations, agencies and projects at professional and community levels. This includes support for events and festivals and grants that directly target Māori creatives. Infrastructure support to the sector through management of Toi Poneke and Hannah Playhouse, and governance overview of civic venues managed on council's behalf by WellingtonNZ Supporting, delivering or commissioning public art around Wellington Facilitating career pathways for artists and arts organisations; advocating for creative value in Wellington. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nurture and grow our arts sector Revitalise the city and suburbs to support a thriving and resilient economy and support job growth Celebrate and make visible te ao Māori across our city

Overall review approach

Applying the principles, the renewals budgets in 4.1 Arts and Cultural Activities were excluded from the review. These were minimal for this area and only in Y1. Therefore, the majority of the Year 2 to 6 budgets remain in scope.

Example of other projects categorised as out of scope of the review in this area are:

- [REDACTED]

Proposed capital programme changes

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
CW01	Bond Store upgrade	Low level of change: Rephase to start in Y5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have a 2030 deadline for the building (without the four-year extension which has not yet been through Parliament). We are required to take some action before the deadline. The occupational assessment has stated the building can be occupied. But another occupancy safety review is required in 2027. If we defer beyond Y5, there is the risk the building won't be able to be occupied. 	<p>Total project: \$20.5m</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase to start in Y5.</p> <p>Saving: The rephasing saves \$3.8m in Years 2 to 6, plus \$1.5m in Y1. However the overall LTP budget is a cost increase of \$2.4m due to inflation adjustments from rephasing.</p>
CW02	Art Installations	Moderate level of change: Rephase and rescope the project to the out years of the LTP.	<p>This is a discretionary/reactionary spend budget and not attached to any specific projects.</p> <p>The recommendation is to remove the budgets for Y2 to 5 to contribute towards the savings total.</p>	<p>Total project: \$867k in LTP</p> <p>Saving: \$316k in Y2 to 6</p>
Indicative savings - Years 2 to 6				\$4.0m (Overall LTP savings \$2.0m)

Social and Recreation

Purpose

The mahi for Social and Recreation is focused on the health and wellbeing of the community, through open space and recreation networks, community facilities and services, and public health regulatory services.

Activities in this group	Services we deliver	LTP Strategic Priorities
5.1 Recreation Facilities and Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing, maintaining and servicing seven pool facilities, outdoor sports facilities in the city, four community recreation centres, croquet facilities, tennis, netball and basketball half courts, and the Ākau Tangi Sports Centre. Managing and maintaining 107 playgrounds and skateparks, and other Council-owned recreational facilities, including the Berhampore golf course and two marinas. Delivery of programmes to those for who cost is a barrier to encourage participation in leisure activities. Supporting the Basin Reserve Trust, a CCO that manages and operates the Basin Reserve to continue to attract national and international events to Wellington. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invest in sustainable, connected and accessible community and recreation facilities Increase access to good, affordable housing to improve the wellbeing of our communities Revitalise the city and suburbs to support a thriving and resilient economy and support job growth
5.2 Community Facilities and Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access for all to a wide array of items to borrow through 13 libraries and an online library presence and to community spaces and marae, including a citywide network of over 25 community centres and five community halls. Ensuring the public toilets and changing rooms are accessible clean and safe. Support for community groups through advice and grants, plus work with external agencies and support outreach programmes to end street homelessness and address begging. Provision of lease properties (over 1,900 units) to Te Toi Mahana Community Housing Provider. Facilitation of affordable rental housing in the city through the Te Kāinga programme of CBD apartment conversions. Managing and maintaining two cemeteries at Karori and Mākara, and providing cremation services at Karori Cemetery, plus the partnership with our Tākal Here partners in the running of Opau Urupā. An effective CDEM welfare response and social recovery and co-ordination of the multi-agency response to a major shock event that affects the city. To provide technical input into natural hazard planning to avoid the risks in the first place. 	
5.3 Public Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We continue to focus on processing of alcohol licenses, food safety certificates, dog registrations, gambling consents and health licenses for businesses and activities that could impact human health. We will also continue to operate animal control service and litter enforcement. 	

Overall review approach

Applying the principles, the renewals budgets in 5.1 and 5.2 were excluded from the review. Activity area 5.3 Public Health has no capex allocated in the LTP.

Example of other projects categorised as out of scope of the review in this area are:

- **Makara Cemetery expansion, plus cemeteries and cremation budgets:** The Council has statutory requirements it must meet in providing and managing its cemeteries. Therefore, this project and others related to the Karori or Makara Cemeteries have been categorised as out of scope.
- **Degasification of the pool network:** This project is tagged to be funded from the Climate Resilience Fund. This will reduce our emissions and help us meet our Te Atakura goals. It also has opex savings attached.
- **Community safety initiatives:** This is a priority to address city safety needs during the Long-term Plan.

Proposed capital programme changes

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
SR01	Khandallah Pool upgrade	<p>Recommended option: Moderate level of change: Rephase and rescope the project into the out years of the LTP</p> <p>Additional option: Low level of change: Rephase the option into out years</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The proposal is to reduce the plan to the project proposed in the 2024 LTP consultation, which was to close the pool and landscape the site, which will include improving flood mitigation, and creating a new entranceway into Khandallah Park. The current estimated cost to deliver this option is \$4.5m. ■ This project received strong community support in the LTP after it was tagged for demolition. There is a high risk of community dissatisfaction with the removal of the project. ■ Savings in this area are dependent on the pool being demolished and replaced with a green space. Continuing with the project as a pool will not contribute any capex savings. ■ Rephasing the upgrade pool project into outer years will have an impact as the pool will remain non-compliant with NZ Pool Water standard NZS5826:2010, and hence not compliant with WCC Public Health Bylaw (Public Pools) 2019. We have engineering experts testing the exact water flow rates later in November, which will dictate the maximum number of customers allowed at any one time to meet compliance. This could lessen the already low seasonal pool utilisation. It would particularly impacts those hot summer days, where the majority of attendance occurs, along with the ability to host school bookings. 	<p>Total project: \$7.9m</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase and rescope to start work in Y6 and decrease budget from \$7.9m as per the LTP proposal that was consulted on. The cost of the project retained in the budget is \$5.1m (\$4.5m + inflation).</p> <p>Saving: \$6.5 in Y2 to 6, plus \$660.4k in Y1. The overall LTP budget is a cost saving of \$2.8m due to inflation adjustments from rephasing the project.</p> <p>Additional option: Rephase and keep current scope, noting the LTP recommendation to work in 2024/25 with the community on options within the budget.</p> <p>Saving: \$7.9m in Y2 to 6, but none overall as \$7.9m + plus inflation put into Y6 to 8.</p>
SR02	Grenada North Community Sports Hub and Synthetic Turf Tawa/Grenada	<p>Recommended option: Low level of change: Rephase into later years of the LTP</p> <p>Additional option: High level of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Final concept design report is complete including costing, and the business case is now underway. ■ Developed and detailed design: estimated to be completed in the current financial year (mid-2025). ■ Project dates back to original master planning done in 2011 and was budgeted in 2021 LTP. ■ The park is just north of the Belmont/Lincolnshire/Stebbings new subdivisions and the masterplan identified the site as being able to respond to an increased need for facilities in the area. 	<p>Total project: \$14.9m, with \$446k in Y1, and including \$2.5m for an artificial turf.</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase into out years after Y1 spend. Y5: \$272k (inflated) for consenting, Y6 and Y7: \$15.9m (inflated) for construction</p> <p>Saving: \$7.4m in Years 2 to 6. However, the overall LTP budget is a cost increase</p>

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
		change: Stop project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The park has poor drainage meaning it is currently not fit for purpose as a sports venue so brings in under \$5k of revenue each year. It is under-utilised compared to other fields of a similar size. ■ Main concepts include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Sportsfields - To increase usability, the proposal includes developing an artificial turf, levelling the two grass fields and improving drainage. □ Paths - Improvements such as widening footpaths and adding new walking tracks for ease of access and better visibility. □ Play - Increase informal recreational and play opportunities, by improving the playground, adding nature play elements and casual court space. □ Access - Enhance access to the Caribbean Reserve such as including a circuit track linking into the park and improved bike, car and bus parking. ■ Budget for current year is 2024/25 is \$465k. YTD (September) spend is \$87k. ■ Significant community and sport club engagement/consultation has already been undertaken to date. There are expectations for construction to begin in 2026. ■ Potential cost escalation if project moved into later years (Inflation, material cost increases) 	<p>of \$1.3m due to inflation adjustments from rephasing.</p> <p>Additional option: Remove project and stop work. Saving: \$14.5m in Years 2 to 6 and from the overall LTP budget, plus further potential savings in Y1.</p>
SR03	<p>Playgrounds - Upgrades This budget is for new playgrounds to fill gaps in the network as opposed to work on current playgrounds.</p>	<p>Low level of change: Rephase to the out years of the LTP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The funding in Year 2 is tentatively tagged to a new play area in the Rongotai area. ■ The budget in Year 3 is for new play area in Ian Galloway Park, associated with masterplan for the site, which will start this year. It is also linked to Plimmer Funding to upgrade Ian Galloway Park, which is also currently budgeted in 2026/27. Rephasing this budget will result in needing to rephase the Ian Galloway Park project, as the play area needs to be built as part of the wider upgrade project. ■ Overall impact is that we will not meet the requirements of the playground policy - which is addressing gap provision where it has been identified playgrounds need to be built to meet walkability criteria, especially around growth and intensification. ■ No consultation has been undertaken yet for these new builds. 	<p>Total project: \$1.6m across full LTP Recommended option: Rephase from Y2 and Y3 to Y6 and 7 respectively. Saving: Saving of \$247k in Y2 to 6. However, the overall LTP budget has a cost increase of \$79k due to inflation adjustments from rephasing.</p>
SR04	<p>Destination Skate Park - Kilbirnie Park</p>	<p>Recommended option: Low level of change: Rephase work to out years of the LTP.</p> <p>Additional option: High</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The planning work is well-advanced. Concept design is complete. Technical site and ground investigations and initial high-level QS is complete. ■ We are now in the process of completing the procurement for next stage - detailed design & build. ■ Current plans are that by the end of 2024/25 we will have completed a Developed and Detail Design, public engagement and consenting / approvals. Then 2025/26 is scheduled for construction. 	<p>Total project: \$8.1m, including \$2.2m from the Plimmer Fund.</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase into out years including some Y1 spend, with Y5: \$500k for consenting and Y6 and Y7: \$7.3m + inflation for construction</p>

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
		level of change: Stop the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design has already been valued engineered to reduce to the scope to fit existing budget, and to deliver on the initial outcomes of the destination skatepark. The work (design and delivery) is a specialist skillset - we have worked closely with a specific supplier on all the design work to date. There is a risk that they will walk away from the project if it is delayed, and then it will be unable to be delivered. Also note that the rest of the skatepark money was removed from the LTP. Budget this year is \$300k, with \$35k already spent. Last year, (2023/24) the spend was \$217k (\$117k Plimmer / \$100k project budget). These would be sunk costs if the project is stopped entirely. If the project continues, it will be rephased, to \$500k in Y5, and then spread the bulk of the construction work over Y6 and Y7. Changes to this and other Plimmer projects will mean a re-look at the 10-year Plimmer programme will be likely. 	<p>Saving: \$2.6m in Years 2 to 6, plus moving \$2.2m from Plimmer Fund. However, the overall LTP budget has a cost increase of \$902.5k due to inflation adjustments from rephasing.</p> <p>Additional option: Stop and remove full budget.</p> <p>Saving: \$5.6m removed from the budget in Years 2 to 6, (minus \$35k sunk costs, but plus any additional Y1 savings), which contributes to overall LTP savings.</p>
SR05	Karori Event Centre Fitout	High level of change: Stop the project and provide further advice on next steps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This project is budgeted for in the current financial year. However, the project is unlikely to be completed this year and is therefore in scope of the review as capex will be proposed to be carried forward into Y2. Cost estimate is now delayed until December 2024. Weather tightness assessments are being carried out and any financial impact of these is currently unknown. Indications are the current budget is not big enough for project, therefore there is a high risk budget increases will be needed to complete the project. The size of the increase is unknown and likely not available in time for the LTP amendment process. This project has some community support, therefore there is a risk of community dissatisfaction with the removal of the project. More than \$1m has been contributed directly by the community and thought will need to be given on how to address this. 	<p>Total project: \$2m</p> <p>Recommended option saving: Stop the project and remove the funding, and provide further advice on next steps for the building.</p> <p>Savings: \$2m in Y1 and against overall LTP budget as project removed from the budget and not carried forward.</p>
SR06	Te Awa Mapara CFNP Centralised Booking System	Low level of change: Keep part of budget and rephase the rest.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$300k is allocated for a new integrated booking system. This is a necessary spend and tied to the opening of Te Mataphi as it is the system the new library will use. The rest is for building upgrades and is currently placeholder funding with investigations to be carried out. 	<p>Total project: \$113.0m over the LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Keep \$300k in Year 2 for the booking system, and rephase the rest of the programme to start in Year 6.</p> <p>Saving: \$7.5m saved in Years 2 to 6. This also saves \$49.8m (including inflation) in the out years of the LTP as the \$25m budgeted in each of Y9 and in Y10 will be pushed into Y11 and Y12. New full LTP total: \$63.3m.</p>

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact																												
SR07	Housing Upgrade Programme Phase 2 Single Capital Programme	Recommended option: Moderate level of change: rephase and rescope part of the project.	<p>A rephasing exercise has been undertaken on the HUP2 programme with the objectives of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Reducing the forecast spend in the first 5 years of the LTP. The recommended option results in \$94.8m (inflated) of deferred costs and savings when compared to budget. ■ Fulfilling Deed of Grant requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Providing upgraded properties in conformance with Deed of Grant (quality / quantity). □ Completing upgrades by 2038 (conclusion of Deed of Grant). ■ Continuing to maintain momentum in the programme. ■ Retain key Council resources dedicated to Capital Projects (HUP2). These key resources provide project management support to a range of projects outside of the business unit. ■ It is envisaged any proposed changes to this project would start in Y1 not in Y2. ■ The recommended option defers funding from the first 7 years of the LTP into Years 8 to 13. It also makes a \$10.4m saving against the full LTP budget ■ It includes: 13 new buildings across 2 sites (~72 units), divesting 6 sites, Upgrade remaining (~743 units), strengthening 8 EQP HUP1 buildings to 34%NBS, and Granville hand back to the Tenths Trust. 	<p>Total project: \$437.8m in this LTP with \$33.1m in Y1, \$294.2m in Y2 to 6 and the remaining \$110.5m in Y7 to 10.</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase the programme with the below changes proposed for Y1 to 6 (Inflated).</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>LTP budget</th> <th>Revised budget</th> <th>Savings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2024/25</td> <td>\$33,147,999</td> <td>\$6,901,485</td> <td>\$26,246,514</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2025/26</td> <td>\$35,700,001</td> <td>\$18,841,142</td> <td>\$16,858,859</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2026/27</td> <td>\$52,122,000</td> <td>\$40,700,944</td> <td>\$11,421,056</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2027/28</td> <td>\$74,576,157</td> <td>\$55,178,108</td> <td>\$19,398,049</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2028/29</td> <td>\$65,264,791</td> <td>\$54,345,559</td> <td>\$10,919,233</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2029/30</td> <td>\$66,570,088</td> <td>\$53,130,413</td> <td>\$13,439,674</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Savings: \$72.0m in Y2 to 6 plus a further \$26.2m in Y1. The overall LTP total for the programme decreases to \$429.2m with some spending moved into Y11+.</p>	Year	LTP budget	Revised budget	Savings	2024/25	\$33,147,999	\$6,901,485	\$26,246,514	2025/26	\$35,700,001	\$18,841,142	\$16,858,859	2026/27	\$52,122,000	\$40,700,944	\$11,421,056	2027/28	\$74,576,157	\$55,178,108	\$19,398,049	2028/29	\$65,264,791	\$54,345,559	\$10,919,233	2029/30	\$66,570,088	\$53,130,413	\$13,439,674
Year	LTP budget	Revised budget	Savings																													
2024/25	\$33,147,999	\$6,901,485	\$26,246,514																													
2025/26	\$35,700,001	\$18,841,142	\$16,858,859																													
2026/27	\$52,122,000	\$40,700,944	\$11,421,056																													
2027/28	\$74,576,157	\$55,178,108	\$19,398,049																													
2028/29	\$65,264,791	\$54,345,559	\$10,919,233																													
2029/30	\$66,570,088	\$53,130,413	\$13,439,674																													
Indicative savings - Years 2 to 6			\$96.3m (Overall LTP savings \$61.3m)																													

Urban Development

Purpose

The mahi for Urban Development is focused on the way the city is developed and how it shapes the quality of life and experience for residents and visitors.

Activities in this group	Services we deliver	LTP Strategic Priorities
6.1 Urban Planning, heritage and public spaces development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Carrying out urban planning and urban regeneration work to guide how the city will grow over time ■ Enabling smart, compact urban growth through a multifaceted approach of planning, design and policy. ■ Complementing compact urban growth through the provision of facilities and amenity in Wellington's streetscapes, public spaces, along its waterfront, and in its centres. ■ Reviewing the District Plan to ensure the city grows in line with our agreed plans ■ Ensuring Wellingtonians have sustainable choices to move around our city as well as an attractive and well-functioning mixed neighbourhoods to live, work and recreate in. ■ Maintaining Wellingtonians' sense of place and pride by embracing the city's heritage and public spaces, including the waterfront ■ Ensuring infrastructure is in place to provide for current and future housing and business demand ■ Establishing robust plans, policies, designs and coordination to ensure infrastructure is in place to provide for current/future housing/business demands. ■ Enabling the protection, restoration and enhancement of Wellington's heritage and character assets – including buildings, areas, trees, monuments, and sites of significance to tangata whenua. ■ Ensuring that planning and cultural heritage plans and actions enable ways to make the narratives of our Tākaī Here partners increasingly present and recognised. ■ Conserving the city's heritage for future generations by assisting building owners to strengthen at-risk heritage buildings and storytelling of Wellington's cultural heritage in new developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Transform our transport system to move more people with fewer vehicles ■ Increase access to good, affordable housing to improve the wellbeing of our communities ■ Revitalise the city and suburbs to support a thriving and resilient economy and support job growth ■ Collaborate with our communities to mitigate and adapt to climate change. ■ Celebrate and make visible te ao Māori across our city
6.2 Building and Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Timeliness of consenting and compliance service ■ Sufficient and timely access to Council advice for building owners as required ■ Building consents – ensuring buildings are safe, in accordance with the Building Act 2004 ■ Resource consents – ensuring natural resources are used sustainably, in line with the Resource Management Act 1991 ■ Assessing earthquake-prone buildings and delivering on the resilience programme. 	

Overall review approach

Applying the principles, the renewals budgets in 6.1 were excluded from the review. Activity area 6.2 Building and Development has one capex project allocated in the LTP, the Town Hall, which is out of scope (as below). This area makes up the majority of the capex in Urban Development.

Example of projects categorised as out of scope of the review in this area are:

- **Town Hall:** the project is underway with construction well advanced. Therefore, it is out of scope.
- **Subsurface asset data project:** the project is underway with work well advanced. Therefore, it is out of scope.
- **44 Frederick St pocket park:** The creation of this park is required by resource consent. The building next to the site has been completed and it is a requirement of that consent that the park be built. Therefore, for regulatory and legal reasons, this project is out of scope.

Proposed capital programme changes

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
UDO1	Suburban town centres	Recommended option: Moderate level of change: Rescope and rephase to later years. Additional option: High level of change: Stop the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Proposal is to remove the physical work from the first five years of the plan but retain the \$500k in Y4 and Y6 to complete planning work on the next centres. ■ Physical work would then start from Y7 of the plan. ■ The majority of the city's centres have not been upgraded for more than 25 years and are nearing the end of their useful life (poor lighting, amenities and overall look). Delaying the full programme for the full decade would have further impacts on this. 	<p>Total project: \$11.0m across the LTP. Recommended option: Remove Y3 and Y5 spend, but retain planning work. Saving: \$4.3m in Y2 to 6, and to overall LTP budget as budget removed.</p> <p>Additional option: Stop the project. Saving: \$11.0m across the full LTP, with \$5.9m removed from the budget in Y2 to 6.</p>
UDO2	Laneways	High level of change: Stop project for Y2 to 7.	No risk identified. This is a discretionary budget only and is not currently attached to a project. These budgets have been used in the past, but no work is currently planned. The removal can include Y1 which is not yet spent.	<p>Total project: \$2.6m across the LTP. Recommended option: Remove budget for programme for Y2 to 7 and restart in Y8. Saving: \$2m from total LTP budget, with \$1.3m from Y2 to 6 and \$205k from Y1.</p>
UDO3	Green Network Plan - Inner City Greening	Low level of change: rephase budget from Y2 to 5.	The proposal is to rephase the budget from the first five years of the plan into to the second half of the plan. This will push out the Council's commitment in the Green Network Plan to double the number of trees in the central city and improve the greening of the existing urban spaces. This funding was included as an increase to the budget as part of the 2024 LTP.	<p>Total project: \$4.5m across the LTP. Recommended option: Rephase budget for programme for Y2 to 5 and restart in Y6. Saving: \$2.7m saved in Y2 to 6. The overall LTP budget savings are \$374k due to inflation adjustments from rephasing.</p>
UDO4	Te Ngākau	Moderate level of change: rescope and rephase to later years of the LTP and Year 11+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ This budget is a future provision for civic EQP buildings. ■ It is recommended to remove the budget not allocated to set projects, this is the funding from Years 5 to 8. ■ We have a EQP notice 2030 deadline for the MFC building (without the four-year extension which has not yet been through Parliament). We are required to take some action before the deadline. Therefore it is 	<p>Total project: \$203.3m Recommended option: Remove unallocated budget in outer years and move MFC allocation to Y6 to fit current deadline. Saving: \$20.5m from Y2 to 6, plus \$69.0m (inflated) from Y7 to 10.</p>

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	Financial impact
			<p>proposed to move the Y9 and 10 funding to Y6 and 7. This provides for a bare minimum level of funding that would enable demolition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note however that this does not constitute a decision to demolish. The future of the MFC will need to be informed by investigative work and the venues strategy. 	<p>Noting Y9 and 10 funding moving to Y6 and 7. The total LTP budget reduces to \$113.8m</p>
Indicative savings – Years 2 to 6				\$28.8m (Overall LTP savings \$95.8m)

Transport

Purpose

The mahi for Transport is to provide an efficient and connected transport network that supports our City to grow and densify while ensuring that our streets are balanced and gives all Wellingtonians agnostic of age and ability, safe, enjoyable and low carbon options to connect and get where they need to go.

Activities in this group	Services we deliver	LTP Strategic Priorities
7.1 Transport network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Planning, delivering, maintaining and operating our transport systems and network, which includes footpaths and access ways, bike lanes, bus priority lanes, roads, bridges and tunnels. ■ Supporting Wellington Cable Car Limited ■ Enhancing the attractiveness of walking or cycling around the city, through urban design, new infrastructure and promotion of active transport. ■ Supporting the city's public transport network by providing space for the network to run efficiently. ■ Ensuring our transport network is safe by making improvements and education ■ We look after the city's roadside plants, remove and prune hazardous or overgrown vegetation, spray weeds and supply free plants to residents to plant on road reserves. ■ We also clean city and residential streets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Transform our transport system to move more people with fewer vehicles. ■ Celebrate and make visible te Ao Māori across our city. ■ Revitalise the city and suburbs to support a thriving and resilient economy and support job growth.
7.2 Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Enforcement of metered public parking spaces in central Wellington and other forms of parking primarily located in the central city including Taxi Stands Loading Zones, mobility parking, bus stops and other designated parking areas. ■ Monitor and enforce parking restrictions (including residents and coupon parking zones) in all suburbs and respond to parking related requests from the public. ■ Manage off-street parking where available, including by operating the Clifton Terrace carpark ■ Support events that take place across the city through dedicated parking and enforcement ■ Electric vehicle chargers on Council owned land ■ Dedicated car parking spots for car sharing services (currently Mevo and CityHop) 	

Review approach

Applying the review principles to the transport programme, the renewals budgets in 7.1 and 7.2 were excluded from the review. There were also projects that were significantly in train or committed, therefore some of the remaining capex is unable to be rephased. The out-of-scope areas for Transport is a significant proportion of the total capex budget for this area.

The impact of the National Land Transport funding shortfall is that \$130m needs to be reduced from the LTP transport budget over the life of the Long-term Plan. This will neutralise the impact of the shortfall of revenue on the Council's debt to revenue ratio. This needs to be as front loaded as practicable, however committed projects limits the ability to make all the reductions in the first five years of the plan. See more details on this funding shortfall below.

The projects that need to be reduced due to the lost NLTP funding are also the same ones that are deemed in scope of the wider capex review, limiting the savings that can be made.

Example of other projects categorised as out of scope of the review in this area are:

- **Thorndon Quay and Hutt Road:** This project underway, with construction well advanced. The majority of funding is for the current financial year. Therefore, it is out of scope.
- **New roads:** There are projects in the out years that are tagged to the development of land in the Lincolnshire/Stebbings/Tawa area. These are funded by DCs and also out of the time needed to make savings. Therefore, they are out of scope.

National Land Transport Plan funding

In addition to the overall savings review, this area is also impacted by the reduction in funding from the National Land Transport Plan (NLTP). New Zealand Transport Agency | Waka Kotahi (NZTA Waka Kotahi) approves funding on a three-year cycle based on the Government's priorities for the same period. The funding level approved for one three-year period is not an indication of funding in the future years.

To date NZTA Waka Kotahi has co-funded the majority of the Council's transport programme at a Funding Assistance Rate (FAR) of 51%. The 2024 LTP assumed that this level of funding would continue. However, the level of funding provided is dependent on the amount of funding available nationally. Due to national funding constraints, the 2024-27 the allocation was less than budgeted.

During development of the Long-Term Plan (LTP) and as part of the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP), the Council submitted a funding bid to the National Land Transport Plan (NLTP) for assistance funding for the transport program between 2024-27. The bid consisted of five parts:

- **Maintenance, Operations and Renewals (MOR)** - the programme of maintenance and renewal of roading and structure infrastructure.
- **Low-Cost, Low-Risk (LCLR)** - includes items such as safety programmes, resilience projects, behaviour change and minor works up to a maximum investment of \$2m per project.
- **Improvements** - includes items such as new builds, street changes and improvements to level of services on existing assets such as the bike network programme projects. The investment is from \$2m per project.
- **Investment planning (only opex)** - includes business as usual funding for transport strategy development such as the Wellington City Transport Plan.
- **Road safety promotion (only opex)** - includes safety promotion and education activities that promote the safe use of the land transport network through education, awareness raising and by public information to users of the transport network. Conducted in co-ordination with the GWRC and The Police.

The total revenue loss for Years 1 to 3 compared to the LTP budget assumptions is \$68.2 million (\$63.2 million capex and \$5 million opex). The total loss of revenue of \$68.2 million assumes GWRC continue its funding for 50% of the costs of the Rapid Transit Bus Corridor Programme (Harbour Quay and Eastern Connection). The GWRC contribution to these projects is \$29.1 million over Years 1-3 of the LTP.

A key focus for the review of the Transport programme in response to the decreased NLTP funding has been to neutralise the impact on the Council's 2024 LTP Financial Strategy borrowing limits - a debt:revenue ratio of 225%. Consequently, an additional saving of about \$130m transport capex needs to be found.

Impact of the shortfall

- **Maintenance, Operations and Renewals (MOR):** In the 2024-34 LTP it was assumed that 80% of the MOR programmes would receive 51% funding from NZTA Waka Kotahi. It has agreed to fund 83% of the programme for the 2024-27 period, **an increase of \$0.9m.**
 - This area is out of scope of the overall capex review as it is renewals budget items.
- **Low-Cost Low-Risk (LCLR):** In the 2024-34 LTP it was assumed, based on "normal" LCLR funding received, that 83% of the LCLR programmes would receive 51% funding from NZTA Waka Kotahi. NZTA Waka Kotahi has declined to provide any funding for LCLR programmes over the 2024-27 period. This decision leaves a revenue shortfall of \$24.3 million over the 2024-27 period for LCLR projects. This funding shortfall impacts the following LCLR programmes transport minor works:
 - cycling minor works,
 - slip remediation,
 - minor resilience improvements,
 - walking improvements,
 - safer route to school,
 - parking upgrades,
 - LED upgrades,
 - speed management, and
 - travel demand management.
- **Improvements:** In the 2024-34 LTP it was assumed, based on "normal" improvements projects funding, that an average of 89% of the Improvement Projects would receive 51% funding from NZTA Waka Kotahi. NZTA Waka Kotahi has only agreed to fund 46% of the projects to this level. This leaves a revenue shortfall of \$35.8m over the 2024-27 period for Improvements projects.
 - The projects which have received funding as assumed are listed below:
 - Chaytor Street wall strengthening project (\$9.1m),
 - Grosvenor Terrace wall strengthening (\$2.8m at enhanced FAR of 76%), and
 - Bike Network projects already underway (\$9.6m).
 - Golden Mile upgrades (\$63.3m in capex and \$1.3m in opex)
 - Thorndon Quay upgrades (\$26.3m)
 - The remaining improvements projects have not received any funding from NZTA Waka Kotahi. These projects include:
 - Central City Corridors Improvements – Harbour Quays (\$44.4m) and Eastern corridor connections (\$14.9m) joint bus priority projects 50/50 funded together with GWRC.
 - New road – Mark Ave to Grenada North (\$7.9m)
 - Resilience Improvements – Aotea Quay Overbridge investigation (\$0.6m) and Kelburn Viaduct seismic strengthening with investigation and design between year 1 to 3 of LTP (\$0.5m)
 - Bike Network Programme – Evans Bay Stage 2, Brooklyn and the next tranche of the programme - approximately 20 km of the strategic network to be delivered by end of year 3 (\$39m).

Note: the central city walking and cycling upgrades projects are part of the improvements programme, however Council did not seek or assume funding assistance in the LTP – this programme budget is \$18.5m over 2024-27 period.

Proposed capital programme changes

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	NLTP Revenue change	Proposed savings
NLTP Low-Cost Low-Risk projects – no funding received					
T01	Retaining walls	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however of the \$6.5m budget for Year 1, \$4m is already committed. This means the majority of the savings will need to be made in Years 2 and 3. The projects that are ranked as low to moderate risk will be rephased into the out years of the LTP Those rated Moderate to High will be spread over Years 2 to 6 to make some savings. 	\$7.9m revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$58.9m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$9.1m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$24.6m savings overall.</p>
T02	Minor Works Upgrades	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however of the \$2.9m budget for Year 1, \$3.3m is already committed due to carry forwards of projects started in 2023/24 and finished this financial year. This means the majority of the savings are targeted to be made across years 2 to 6. This budget is spent on targeted safety improvements across the network. Work includes traffic calming measures, upgrading intersections to improve safety, raised pedestrian crossings, installation of signs, road markings, handrails, etc. The proposal is to complete Year 1 as planned and reduce the remaining LTP budget to approx. \$1m per year for Y2 to 10. 	\$2.6m revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$23.9m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$4.8m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$8.4m savings overall.</p>
T03	Drainage upgrades	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, and minimal budget is committed. This means the majority of the savings to mitigate the NLTP impact can be made in Years 1 to 3. The proposal is to reduce this budget across all 10 years of the plan, with the approx. \$400k per year from Y3 to 10 changing to \$150k p/y. 	\$489.6k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$4.4m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$1.1m savings made in Years 2 to 5, \$2.5m savings overall.</p>
T04	Build Back Better	High level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and stop the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however the proposal is to remove this budget line entirely after Y1. Making savings to the overall total and helping mitigate the NLTP impact. 	\$612k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$10.6m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Remove the programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$5.4m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$10.1m savings overall.</p>
T05	Reactive minor works	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years of the \$1.2m budget. For Year 1, \$240k is already committed. The savings needed can be made across the first five years of the plan by halving the budgets in Years 2 to 5. This will then return to \$1m from years 6 to 10 meaning an additional saving of about \$200k per year. This budget is spent in response to safety requests from the community via Fresh Services. Work includes installation of signs, road markings, handrails, etc 	\$1.5m revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$13.2m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Rescope programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$2.7m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$3.7m savings overall.</p>
T06	Bridge Improvements	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however of the \$2.9m budget for Year 1, only \$1.6m is already committed. This means most of the mitigation can be removed from the Y1 budget, with further savings in Y2 and 3. This budget includes the Kelburn viaduct strengthening and Aotea Quay overbridge investigations (improvement projects) and other bridges around the city. Much work investigating seismic impacts is already committed, however physical work can be rephased. The proposal is to reduce this budget across all 10 years of the plan, with the approx. \$1.4m per year from Y3 to 10 changing to \$800k p/y. Savings of about \$1.3m is proposed for Y1, however \$273.9 additional funding is needed in Y2 to met commitments already made. This is due to the high risk of some structures being at the end of serviceable life. Work on Kelburn viaduct has not begun and can be delayed if existing structural risks are accepted. 	\$1.8m loss revenue	<p>Total project: \$13.2m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$1.7m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$5.4m savings overall.</p>
T07	Tunnels Upgrades	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however of the \$338k budget for Year 1, \$250k is already committed. This means the majority of the savings will need to be made in Years 2 and 3 and beyond. Karori Tunnel strengthening is critical. The project was already delayed about five years ago due to archaeological concern. Now water seepage has increased and tunnel failure risk has increased. The proposal is to continue Karori Tunnel across Year 1 and 2, then reduce the budget from \$350 to \$400k p/y to \$100k from Y3 to 10. 	\$413.8k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$3.7m across the full LTP.</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$1m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$2.2m savings overall.</p>
T08	Retaining Wall Resilience Upgrades. This includes Ngaio Gorge and Wadestown routes.	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retaining Wall Resilience Upgrades (\$688k loss) Ngaio Gorge Resilience Upgrades (\$212k loss) Ngaio Gorge Retaining Wall Strengthening (\$613k loss) Grosvenor Terrace Wall Strengthening (\$263k gain, improvement project) Some of this programme is committed or needed for safety/resilience reasons, but some savings can be made in Years 2 and 3, and across the full LTP. Remaining Ngaio Gorge work can be rephased as the temporary measures are sufficient at this stage, except for work on Ngaio Gorge/Kaiwharawhara Road rock bluff works. Grosvenor Terrace received full funding for the first three years. Can complete first years and rephase later parts of the project. 	Overall this line had a \$1.3m revenue loss, which includes a \$263k revenue gain for one project.	<p>Total project: \$23.7m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$2.1m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$3m savings overall.</p>

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	NLTP Revenue change	Proposed savings
T09	Rural Road Upgrades	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however of the \$100k budget for Year 1, \$70k is already committed for Ohariu Valley Safety improvements. This means the majority of the savings will need to be made in Years 2 and 3. The proposal is to save the remaining \$30k not committed in Y1 and halve the budget for the remainder of the LTP. 	\$122k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$1.1m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$248k savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$472k savings overall.</p>
T10	LED Street Light Transition	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years and savings can be made across all years, with more built into Y1 to 3. Finish replacement of LEDs and install new poles on walkways (48 sites with 2 poles per walkway on average). Proposals is to reduce to five sites per year Y1-3 then eight per year from Y4-7. 	\$662k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$4.2m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$1.9m savings made in Years 2 to 5, \$2.7m savings overall.</p>
T11	Speed Management Upgrades	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however of the \$2m budget for the full 10 years and overspend is already forecast due to new legislative requirements. This means the majority of the savings will need to be made in Years 2 and 3. The majority of this budget is for the installation of 137 electronic signs to indicate school zones, plus an additional 132 static signs. This enables variable speed limits around schools. The proposal is to increase funding for this area to install the signs over Y1 and 2 of the plan. Then reduce all other years to zero. However, overall this is an increase in this budget line. 	\$192k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$2m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Increase project to make safety improvements needed.</p> <p>No Savings: \$2.5m increase in the budget overall, with an additional \$4.5m needed in Y1 and 2, but a reduction of \$1.8m in Y3 to 10. Total LTP budget increases to \$4.8m (inflated)</p>
T12	Parking Upgrades and Parking Management Plan	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however of the \$5m budget for Year 1 to 3, the majority is already committed. This means savings will be spread over the full LTP. This area has a revenue impact which will help with mitigation. Owhiro Road south improvements are awaiting cost estimation and details design confirmed from traffic engineers, but construction is planned for December this year. But not other improvements, meaning the rest of the budget can be reduced to 25%. The Newtown East parking management plan is in delivery and the Wadestown Parking Management Plan is currently in planning, with physical work planned in February 2025. This construction can be delayed to Y2. Proposed to continue with parking changes which also have a flow on revenue impact such as those associated with Coupon Parking and Resident's Permits. This budget covers installing the physical changes needed to enact the plans (e.g. signs and road markings). 	\$1.1m revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$5m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase and reduce programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$732k savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$1.4m savings overall.</p>
T13	Safer Routes to Schools	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however of the \$500k budget for Year 1, only \$150k is already committed. This means this budget can be rescope to accommodate the mitigations needed due to the revenue loss. The proposal is that in Y1 to 3 the \$500k is reduced to \$150k with for site investigations of some of the 24 high risk schools, for designs options and to pilot safety improvements at one school. This budget then increased to \$300k from Y4. 	\$612k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$5.5m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$1.4m savings made in Years 2 to 5, \$2.7m savings overall.</p>
T14	Footpath upgrades	No change: Continue as planned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This budget was reduced in the LTP (from about \$3m per year to \$3m over three years) and the programme currently only has capacity to build one new footpath every three years. It is proposed to not reduce this budget further except for saving the Y1 budget that is not committed - about \$135k. 	\$742.1k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$6.3m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Continue as programmed, with Y1 savings only (\$135k).</p>
T15	Bus Priority Improvements	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years and there is currently no programme allocated to this budget for the LTP. Therefore, it is proposed to reduce it to 33% of budget. This budget is for minor works on the bus network, such as work on bus shelters. 	\$184k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$1.6m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$515k savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$1m savings overall.</p>
T16	Footpaths Structures Upgrades	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, however the \$350k budget for Year 1 is already committed. This means any savings will need to be made in Years 2 and 3. The proposal is the finish what is committed over Y1 and 2 then decrease from about \$370k p/y to \$200k p/y. This budget is for structures that support footpaths (accessways, steps, bank remediation) 	\$367k revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$3.9m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$633k savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$1.3m savings overall.</p>
T17	Cycleways Minor Works	Moderate level of change: Rescope budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years, and the project planned for Y1 is on hold, meaning savings can be made across all years. The proposal is to reduce the budget to 49% for Y1 to then increase to \$1m in Y6 to 10. This budget is for items such as footpath bike racks. 	\$1.7m revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$12.1m across the full LTP</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make overall savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$2.7m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$3.6m savings overall.</p>
Total LC-LR indicative savings				\$22m revenue loss	\$33.5m (Overall LTP savings \$70.5m)

Ref	Initiative	Proposal	Impact and risks	NLTP Revenue change	Proposed savings
NLTP Improvement Programme –remaining not linked to above budgets					
T18	Mark Ave to Grenada North	Low level of change: Neutralise NLTP funding and rescope project to make overall savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NLTP impact is across three years and this is a DC funded project so has no impact on debt. This budget has been reduced to mitigate the lost NLTP funding. It was assumed the project would be funded about 41% from NLTP funding and the remaining from DCs. The programme has been reduced by 41% across the full programme not just the first three years. 	\$3.2m revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$54.8m</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make savings towards NLTP mitigation.</p> <p>Savings: \$21.6m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$22.3m savings overall. (DC Funded)</p>
T19	Cycleways	Moderate levels of change: Rescope and rephase over the full LTP and into Years 11+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is to now change from a 10-year delivery timeline to a 20-year delivery timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Years 1 to 5: finish the primary network which is largely in train or about to be completed In Years 6 to 10: do the last connections into the primary spine In years 11+: rephase the secondary network out of the current LTP. Due to committed costs in Year 1, the programme is unable to fully neutralise the impact of the NLTP funding in the first three years of the LTP. However, this impact can be realised over the life of the LTP by making further savings and rephasing. The inner ring of routes into the central city are largely completed or expected to be completed in the current financial year. These projects are out of scope as they are part of the 'finish what has been started' area. In the May 2024 LTP decision, the BNP programme was reduced by \$80m and the delivery model changed from first installing transitional projects followed by more permanent street transformations to delivering projects once as a hybrid model - minimised civic works but more permanent materials. 	\$20.2m revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$99.0m in LTP budget</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make savings towards NLTP mitigation.</p> <p>Savings: \$14.2m savings made in Years 2 to 6, \$40.7m savings overall.</p> <p>Total programme reduced to \$58.4m</p>
T20	Golden Mile Upgrades	Moderate levels of change: Rescope and remove some over the full LTP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The full Golden Mile project has NLTP funding for a staged delivery over 3 years. It is proposed that it be rescope to just do Courtenay Place and remove the Lambton Quay portion of the project. The Courtenay Place stage of the project is estimated at about \$53m. The new design is complete for Courtenay Place and ready for contract procurement and implementation. The Golden Mile project has NZTA funding approved and this level of change could trigger reassessment of funding for the entire Golden Mile. This risk is high. 	Currently has full NLTP funding. This would likely be impacted by reducing the scope of the project	<p>Total project: \$112.9m in LTP budget (with 51% of this being NZTA funded).</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to \$53.2m to make savings.</p> <p>Savings: \$59.7m savings made in Years 1 to 6. However, actual WCC savings are \$29.3m as 51% is NZTA funded.</p>
	City Streets		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The full LTP budget is \$165m and is split in the projects below, plus unallocated spend in Years 4 to 10. It is recommended to remove the budget not allocated to set projects. This will mean no additional funding for any additional key arterial routes in next 10 years other than for the projects below. For the Bus Priority Projects - \$32.2m is the Council assumed savings in Y4 to 10 as this is part funded by GWRC. 		Y4 to 10 savings from unallocated budget removal for Bus Priority and Central City upgrades: \$88.3m, with the WCC share (minus GWRC) being about \$51.9m
T21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harbour Quays Corridor Upgrades <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus Priority 	Moderate levels of change: Rescope and rephase over the full LTP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that this project be rescope to a reduced deliverable and rephased to occur in Years 1 to 3. This will just provide funding for the interim changes, but not for permanent ones. This is consistent with the Bike Network approach. The total project is planned to be reduced from \$51.6m to \$10m. This is assumed to still be part funded by GWRC. 	\$10.8m revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$51.6m in LTP budget</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make savings towards NLTP mitigation and overall total.</p> <p>Savings: \$41.6m savings made in Years 1 to 3 and overall. Total project reduced to \$10m in Y1 to 3. However, actual WCC savings are \$20.8m as this is 50% paid for by GWRC.</p>
T22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastern Corridor Upgrades <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus Priority 	Moderate levels of change: Rescope and rephase over the full LTP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that this project be rescope to a reduced deliverable and rephased to occur in Years 1 to 3. It is recommended that funding be removed for the bike, pedestrian and place improvements in the original scope, and instead provide targeted public transport improvements instead of ones across the whole corridor. The total project is planned to be reduced from \$16.5m to \$6m. This is assumed to still be part funded by GWRC. 	\$3.6m revenue loss	<p>Total project: \$16.5m in LTP budget</p> <p>Recommended option: Reduce programme to make savings towards NLTP mitigation and overall total.</p> <p>Savings: \$10.5m savings made in Years 1 to 3 and overall. Total project reduced to \$6m in Y1 to 3. However, actual WCC savings are \$5.3m as this is 50% paid for by GWRC.</p>
T23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central City Upgrades - Public Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walking and Cycling 	Low levels of change: Rephase one project into Years 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This budget is for the Central City cross-city cycleway connection, and pedestrian improvements on Dixon St and Cuba St. No NLTP funding was assumed for these projects. It is recommended that the cross-city cycleway connection continue as this is a key link route in the primary spine routes. It is recommended that Dixon St also continue, but phasing is confirmed so that it aligns with any changes to the Golden Mile. The recommendation is to rephase Cuba St to Year 6 - and revisit the timing if the Council buys the land at 155 Cuba St (currently a carpark) as this would change the design of the project. 	None assumed	<p>Total project: \$18.5m in Years 1 to 3.</p> <p>Recommended option: Rephase Cuba St project.</p> <p>Savings: \$3.8m savings overall with phasing TBC. Total project reduced to \$18.5m</p>
Indicative savings - Years 2 to 6				\$37.8m revenue loss	\$103.8m (Overall LTP savings \$168.4m)
Overall Transport Indicative savings - Years 2 to 6				\$59.8m revenue loss	\$137.3m (Overall LTP savings \$238.9m)

Strategic Activity	Strategic Activity name	Activity	Activity Name	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	LTP Total (Year 1-10)
1	Governance	2000	Committee & Council Processes	\$0	\$146,449	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$146,449
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2067	Wgtn Waterfront Development	\$1,000,000	\$1,020,000	\$1,042,440	\$7,670,691	\$32,632,396	\$11,095,015	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$54,460,541
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2033	Zoo renewals	\$1,311,000	\$1,341,976	\$1,406,364	\$1,823,297	\$1,901,118	\$1,912,877	\$1,956,873	\$2,158,934	\$2,204,272	\$2,250,562	\$18,267,273
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2034	Zoo upgrades	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$700,000	\$4,500,000	\$7,118,000	\$350,000	\$800,000	\$13,768,000
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2135	Zealandia	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,700,000
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2001	Property Purchases - Reserves	\$0	\$6,538,710	\$1,459,416	\$4,673,595	\$0	\$4,770,856	\$4,861,503	\$15,739,546	\$7,696,333	\$7,026,064	\$52,766,023
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2003	Parks Infrastructure	\$1,349,313	\$1,597,845	\$1,441,985	\$1,717,257	\$1,743,154	\$1,845,401	\$1,432,720	\$999,951	\$1,163,486	\$2,049,125	\$15,340,236
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2004	Parks Buildings	\$394,615	\$1,168,505	\$976,326	\$976,230	\$1,068,075	\$1,226,540	\$1,053,151	\$1,000,086	\$1,099,862	\$1,116,042	\$10,079,433
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2005	Plimmer Bequest Project	\$500,000	\$2,191,228	\$1,042,460	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,695,807	\$1,152,018	\$0	\$0	\$6,581,513
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2006	Botanic Garden	\$1,311,440	\$3,800,530	\$5,827,611	\$519,528	\$3,500,788	\$2,429,288	\$642,134	\$2,695,966	\$4,350,273	\$2,685,157	\$27,762,715
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2008	Coastal	\$1,354,636	\$2,231,871	\$850,738	\$509,770	\$855,779	\$653,236	\$826,916	\$594,298	\$825,557	\$840,417	\$9,543,218
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2009	Town Belt & Reserves	\$4,729,396	\$933,034	\$1,179,680	\$1,456,269	\$1,355,047	\$4,201,382	\$4,105,630	\$4,365,512	\$6,386,071	\$5,347,147	\$34,059,167
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2010	Walkways renewals	\$1,342,644	\$1,216,789	\$1,933,901	\$3,264,445	\$2,708,986	\$3,128,915	\$3,649,847	\$1,478,932	\$1,679,563	\$3,386,071	\$23,790,092
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2068	Waterfront Renewals	\$3,984,642	\$4,278,683	\$4,187,203	\$2,484,250	\$3,575,983	\$3,088,951	\$2,124,072	\$1,740,027	\$1,762,701	\$2,001,876	\$29,228,388
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2011	Southern Landfill Improvement	\$15,334,088	\$24,327,410	\$35,839,807	\$28,987,460	\$11,159,975	\$5,059,459	\$5,438,921	\$6,951,295	\$7,181,157	\$7,521,200	\$147,800,773
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2013	Water - Network renewals	\$4,927,424	\$12,199,024	\$19,943,862	\$16,393,798	\$13,769,322	\$17,745,715	\$12,021,396	\$23,886,225	\$22,800,501	\$24,576,658	\$168,263,925
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2015	Water - Water Meter upgrades	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,093,029	\$33,484,855	\$43,188,628	\$42,011,051	\$9,321,894	\$0	\$143,626,762
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2016	Water - Network upgrades	\$2,775,093	\$1,733,964	\$1,728,147	\$4,438,292	\$4,022,863	\$2,340,053	\$1,158,178	\$1,301,118	\$1,180,806	\$1,266,570	\$21,945,084
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2019	Water - Reservoir renewals	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$967,127	\$4,443,464	\$5,410,591
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2020	Water - Reservoir upgrades	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,934,254	\$5,924,619	\$7,858,873
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2023	Wastewater - Network renewals	\$30,569,954	\$23,953,070	\$27,123,175	\$73,756,869	\$60,265,294	\$45,613,299	\$39,253,844	\$39,631,922	\$28,249,221	\$25,950,533	\$394,367,179
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2024	Wastewater - Network upgrades	\$19,808,500	\$19,996,795	\$10,133,371	\$6,385,651	\$2,244,843	\$15,026,968	\$14,817,168	\$14,671,802	\$27,535,310	\$85,814,402	\$216,434,809
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2028	Stormwater - Network upgrades	\$2,195,000	\$2,198,625	\$2,236,934	\$3,013,324	\$7,985,452	\$23,031,809	\$55,123,776	\$45,600,776	\$5,174,129	\$9,072,073	\$155,631,898
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2029	Stormwater - Network renewals	\$1,526,115	\$1,590,815	\$11,086,560	\$4,800,635	\$3,561,502	\$3,609,196	\$2,730,759	\$7,805,856	\$12,289,397	\$4,013,608	\$53,014,443
2	Environment and Infrastructure	2146	Sludge Minimization	\$116,429,404	\$140,936,583	\$16,625,494	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$273,991,481
3	Economic Development	2035	Wellington Venues renewals	\$4,703,637	\$2,851,096	\$2,142,555	\$5,713,451	\$6,036,569	\$4,553,820	\$1,127,521	\$2,928,114	\$7,099,432	\$4,039,167	\$41,195,361
3	Economic Development	2036	Venues Upgrades	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,196,124	\$3,260,047	\$3,321,987	\$3,385,105	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,163,263
4	Arts and cultural activities	2042	Arts Installation	\$119,820	\$76,575	\$78,260	\$79,903	\$81,501	\$83,050	\$84,628	\$86,236	\$87,788	\$89,368	\$867,128
4	Arts and cultural activities	2148	Toi Pōneke Art centre relocation to new building	\$275,000	\$3,350,000	\$2,085,000	\$95,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,805,000
4	Arts and cultural activities	2038	Gallery & Museum Upgrades	\$1,685,981	\$12,315,753	\$5,754,399	\$957,371	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,713,504
4	Arts and cultural activities	2129	Wellington Convention & Exhibition Centre (WCEC)	\$353,751	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$353,751
4	Arts and cultural activities	2041	Te ara o nga tupuna - Maori heritage trails	\$1,067,995	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,067,995
5	Recreation facilities and services	2058	Branch Library - Renewals	\$411,345	\$200,188	\$171,725	\$344,473	\$984,707	\$711,389	\$467,550	\$322,702	\$594,625	\$357,004	\$4,565,709
5	Recreation facilities and services	2061	Community Centres and Halls - Upgrades and Renew	\$4,340,141	\$248,730	\$337,441	\$539,605	\$498,942	\$432,139	\$510,674	\$617,661	\$621,840	\$452,781	\$8,599,953
5	Recreation facilities and services	2064	Safety Initiatives	\$2,244,826	\$121,794	\$124,474	\$127,212	\$129,883	\$132,481	\$134,998	\$144,510	\$147,255	\$149,906	\$3,457,340
5	Recreation facilities and services	2151	Te Awa Mapara	\$100,000	\$300,000	\$0	\$3,750,000	\$3,750,000	\$3,750,000	\$25,372,500	\$25,372,500	\$25,372,500	\$25,372,500	\$113,140,000
5	Recreation facilities and services	2050	Basin Reserve	\$437,415	\$136,126	\$183,674	\$314,322	\$690,416	\$2,882,667	\$969,026	\$1,667,689	\$406,304	\$303,848	\$7,991,487
5	Recreation facilities and services	2054	Library Materials Upgrade	\$4,490,575	\$2,727,368	\$2,414,426	\$2,467,393	\$2,519,053	\$2,513,802	\$2,561,564	\$2,751,084	\$2,803,188	\$2,853,645	\$28,102,098
5	Recreation facilities and services	2055	Library Computer and Systems Replacement	\$1,784,822	\$807,911	\$648,531	\$373,014	\$380,835	\$443,914	\$452,348	\$609,929	\$480,538	\$489,187	\$6,471,030
5	Recreation facilities and services	2056	Central Library - Upgrades and Renewals	\$80,691	\$2,682,994	\$36,022	\$36,815	\$146,396	\$38,339	\$99,893	\$156,190	\$41,726	\$42,477	\$3,361,544
5	Recreation facilities and services	2057	Branch Library - Upgrades	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,643,257	\$11,121,464	\$0	\$24,764,721
5	Recreation facilities and services	2043	Aquatic Facility upgrades	\$1,270,460	\$6,015,000	\$3,012,732	\$4,964,047	\$3,752,726	\$3,877,708	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,892,672
5	Recreation facilities and services	2044	Aquatic Facility renewals	\$3,180,007	\$3,437,901	\$1,459,208	\$2,347,286	\$2,236,648	\$2,207,681	\$1,398,497	\$2,339,648	\$2,784,148	\$2,621,806	\$24,012,829
5	Recreation facilities and services	2045	Sportsfields upgrades	\$889,526	\$6,544,169	\$6,275,929	\$450,926	\$456,324	\$469,745	\$495,495	\$479,966	\$526,371	\$510,613	\$17,099,065
5	Recreation facilities and services	2046	Synthetic Turf Sportsfields renewals	\$1,600,000	\$170	\$0	\$0	\$583,215	\$1,378,793	\$1,490,209	\$0	\$1,760,566	\$3,760,394	\$10,573,348
5	Recreation facilities and services	2047	Synthetic Turf Sportsfields upgrades	\$0	\$0	\$2,491,262	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,491,262
5	Recreation facilities and services	2048	Recreation Centre Renewal	\$138,722	\$694,967	\$2,848,590	\$66,868	\$467,491	\$268,463	\$51,479	\$258,484	\$284,214	\$8,455,468	\$13,534,746
5	Recreation facilities and services	2049	ASB Sports Centre	\$101,250	\$59,720	\$113,607	\$65,280	\$82,701	\$163,450	\$86,544	\$923,445	\$1,305,334	\$23,188	\$2,924,518
5	Recreation facilities and services	2051	Playgrounds renewals & upgrades	\$2,699,070	\$7,525,416	\$1,878,183	\$3,196,121	\$2,080,217	\$1,852,197	\$1,759,234	\$2,081,627	\$2,700,016	\$2,002,479	\$27,774,560
5	Recreation facilities and services	2052	Evans Bay Marina - Renewals	\$1,217,027	\$154,396	\$1,451,501	\$138,004	\$1,718,925	\$168,614	\$52,155	\$35,184	\$61,413	\$140,290	\$5,137,509
5	Recreation facilities and services	2053	Clyde Quay Marina - Upgrade	\$13,822	\$87,105	\$389,481	\$22,337	\$530,083	\$25,133	\$5,370	\$319,999	\$37,494	\$30,938	\$1,461,761
5	Recreation facilities and services	2062	Burial & Cremations	\$338,930	\$1,018,694	\$2,412,891	\$2,441,494	\$1,236,365	\$684,623	\$522,058	\$448,563	\$632,098	\$363,056	\$10,098,771
5	Recreation facilities and services	2063	Public Convenience and pavilions	\$1,418,371	\$642,890	\$2,067,162	\$1,882,295	\$2,329,889	\$1,242,630	\$801,883	\$807,365	\$1,266,488	\$867,913	\$13,326,886
5	Recreation facilities and services	2059	Housing upgrades	\$1,762,221	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,762,221
5	Recreation facilities and services	2060	Housing renewals	\$47,110,503	\$50,929,609	\$61,388,214	\$89,485,808	\$81,560,285	\$79,522,732	\$75,943,491	\$53,624,869	\$27,486,373	\$24,060,274	\$591,112,159
5	Recreation facilities and services	2065	Emergency Management renewals	\$86,157	\$87,881	\$89,814	\$91,790	\$93,718	\$95,592	\$97,408	\$104,023	\$106,000	\$107,908	\$960,290
6	Urban Development	2070	Central City Framework	\$1,876,076	\$6,710,403	\$3,751,494	\$1,662,521	\$2,889,193	\$1,453,998	\$3,002,970	\$933,749	\$2,531,189	\$371,074	\$25,182,669
6	Urban Development	2073	Suburban Centres upgrades	\$997,421	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$997,421
6	Urban Development	2074	Minor CBD Enhancements	\$62,281	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$221,466	\$225,674	\$2,069,653	\$234,101	\$2,144,831	\$4,958,006
6	Urban Development	2076	Earthquake Risk Mitigation	\$57,851,686	\$69,900,179	\$24,887,981	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$157,639,846
6	Urban Development	2147	Subsurface Data Project Capex	\$1,544,024	\$220,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,764,024
7	Transport	2094	Cycling Network Renewals	\$25,214,519	\$12,122,609	\$19,029,383	\$4,787,747	\$6,078,064	\$7,043,776	\$9,568,510	\$11,516,297	\$12,214,565	\$7,636,782	\$115,212,253
7	Transport	2077	Wall, Bridge & Tunnel Renewals	\$7,975,000	\$12,775,995	\$13,068,474	\$8,510,709	\$8,696,515	\$9,991,537	\$10,190,155	\$18,504,694	\$9,417,002	\$9,594,642	\$108,724,723
7	Transport	2078	Asphalt & Other Seal Renewals	\$1,654,417	\$1,566,955	\$1,634,884	\$1,839,115	\$1,916,992	\$1,996,216	\$2,076,715	\$2,226,226	\$2,270,683	\$2,313,791	\$19,495,993
7	Transport	2079	Chipseal Renewals	\$4,572,792	\$4,757,967	\$4,964,179								

Strategic Activity	Strategic Activity name	Activity	Activity Name	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	LTP Total (Year 1-10)
7	Transport	2095	Bus Priority Planning	\$150,000	\$153,178	\$156,519	\$159,934	\$163,263	\$166,498	\$169,797	\$173,023	\$176,279	\$179,595	\$1,648,086
7	Transport	2096	Footpaths Structures Renewals & Upgrades	\$656,154	\$625,004	\$639,375	\$654,082	\$668,315	\$682,190	\$695,713	\$727,248	\$741,624	\$755,587	\$6,845,292
7	Transport	2097	Footpaths Renewals	\$4,212,559	\$3,758,113	\$3,846,309	\$3,936,645	\$4,023,049	\$4,107,326	\$4,189,368	\$4,490,969	\$4,580,571	\$4,667,490	\$41,812,400
7	Transport	2098	Footpaths Upgrades	\$1,339,317	\$959,706	\$1,241,005	\$1,003,650	\$1,295,964	\$1,045,726	\$1,348,462	\$1,087,172	\$1,401,715	\$1,128,736	\$11,851,454
7	Transport	2099	Street Furniture Renewals	\$223,486	\$202,358	\$207,221	\$212,209	\$216,864	\$221,405	\$225,826	\$244,220	\$249,090	\$253,815	\$2,256,495
7	Transport	2100	Pedestrian Network Accessways	\$306,154	\$267,928	\$274,236	\$280,698	\$286,873	\$292,898	\$298,756	\$322,475	\$328,925	\$335,174	\$2,994,116
7	Transport	2101	Traffic & Street Signs Renewals	\$946,000	\$1,061,518	\$1,085,825	\$1,110,688	\$1,135,010	\$1,158,730	\$1,181,846	\$1,205,423	\$1,229,409	\$1,252,706	\$11,367,155
7	Transport	2102	Traffic Signals Renewals	\$2,150,000	\$2,412,396	\$2,467,783	\$2,524,442	\$2,579,877	\$2,633,950	\$2,686,576	\$2,740,253	\$2,794,948	\$2,847,996	\$25,838,222
7	Transport	2103	Street Lights Renewals & Upgrades	\$1,316,556	\$1,387,381	\$1,461,989	\$1,512,699	\$1,561,607	\$1,608,346	\$1,652,634	\$997,447	\$1,019,116	\$1,040,015	\$13,557,791
7	Transport	2104	Rural Road Upgrades	\$100,000	\$102,000	\$104,346	\$106,746	\$109,094	\$111,385	\$113,613	\$115,885	\$118,203	\$120,449	\$1,101,722
7	Transport	2105	Minor Works Upgrades	\$5,006,000	\$4,286,924	\$4,382,530	\$6,081,462	\$5,121,191	\$5,225,553	\$5,328,440	\$5,433,354	\$5,538,654	\$5,642,172	\$52,046,281
7	Transport	2106	Fences & Guardrails Renewals	\$1,014,846	\$964,285	\$986,594	\$1,009,428	\$1,031,529	\$1,053,082	\$1,074,088	\$1,123,903	\$1,146,266	\$1,167,986	\$10,572,007
7	Transport	2107	Speed Management Upgrades	\$70,000	\$204,397	\$208,691	\$213,075	\$217,338	\$221,469	\$225,677	\$229,964	\$234,105	\$238,319	\$2,063,035
7	Transport	2109	Parking Upgrades	\$4,714,283	\$915,404	\$940,299	\$961,857	\$197,468	\$201,542	\$205,529	\$209,595	\$213,710	\$217,724	\$8,777,412
7	Transport	2141	LGWM - City Streets	\$11,538,045	\$27,574,580	\$37,646,636	\$19,700,231	\$10,888,130	\$11,105,893	\$11,328,012	\$11,543,246	\$11,762,568	\$11,986,058	\$165,073,398
7	Transport	2142	LGWM - Early Delivery	\$45,013,772	\$20,927,223	\$28,139,553	\$32,393,075	\$15,567,144	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$142,040,767
7	Transport	2108	Parking Asset renewals	\$1,216,000	\$786,322	\$720,096	\$1,043,233	\$788,098	\$1,034,547	\$875,848	\$1,865,173	\$2,304,408	\$1,938,623	\$12,572,346
7	Transport	2152	Charged Up Capital	\$864,024	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$864,024
10	Council	2133	Quarry Renewals & Upgrades	\$8,761,413	\$6,439,247	\$5,960,709	\$66,541	\$67,884	\$69,187	\$70,509	\$20,686	\$20,970	\$21,302	\$21,498,448
10	Council	2140	Security	\$719,413	\$752,010	\$786,427	\$821,191	\$837,615	\$853,529	\$869,746	\$1,240,412	\$1,663,052	\$918,464	\$9,461,859
10	Council	2111	Capital Replacement Fund	\$3,551,173	\$4,723,159	\$4,827,069	\$4,928,437	\$5,027,006	\$5,122,519	\$5,219,847	\$5,571,020	\$5,671,298	\$5,773,382	\$50,414,910
10	Council	2117	Unscheduled infrastructure renewals	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,693,223	\$2,741,701	\$2,791,051	\$8,225,974
10	Council	2118	Health & Safety - Legislation Compliance	\$372,131	\$379,945	\$388,304	\$396,458	\$404,388	\$412,071	\$419,900	\$442,854	\$450,826	\$458,940	\$4,125,818
10	Council	2126	Business Unit Support	\$9,285,000	\$8,273,857	\$4,278,194	\$4,368,036	\$4,455,397	\$4,540,050	\$4,626,310	\$4,714,210	\$4,799,066	\$4,885,449	\$54,225,570
10	Council	2119	Civic Property renewals	\$5,267,760	\$11,006,515	\$1,509,729	\$2,469,180	\$3,632,313	\$1,486,661	\$805,498	\$3,435,832	\$2,436,477	\$3,945,596	\$35,995,562
10	Council	2120	Commercial Properties renewals	\$5,533,158	\$2,519,261	\$1,021,688	\$2,697,917	\$6,750,559	\$3,655,354	\$1,099,779	\$2,230,857	\$3,160,648	\$2,592,393	\$31,261,615
10	Council	2121	Community & Childcare Facility renewals	\$160,059	\$281,747	\$416,486	\$861,064	\$1,629,732	\$921,466	\$245,958	\$896,843	\$1,187,179	\$660,094	\$7,260,628
10	Council	2127	Workplace	\$40,892,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,892,000
10	Council	2128	Civic Campus Resilience and Improvements	\$107,605,219	\$40,437,404	\$31,655,733	\$5,410,470	\$21,733,644	\$22,146,583	\$22,567,368	\$22,996,148	\$23,410,079	\$23,831,460	\$321,794,109
10	Council	2112	Information Management	\$4,029,843	\$5,292,501	\$701,043	\$1,781,139	\$2,115,893	\$1,049,064	\$758,087	\$772,490	\$1,109,232	\$1,129,198	\$18,738,490
10	Council	2114	ICT Infrastructure	\$3,750,000	\$3,828,750	\$1,565,193	\$1,598,062	\$1,630,023	\$1,660,994	\$1,692,553	\$1,724,711	\$1,755,756	\$1,787,360	\$20,993,401
Total				\$694,853,158	\$642,418,967	\$481,216,926	\$449,326,997	\$442,300,744	\$445,094,134	\$454,142,318	\$487,602,212	\$378,807,359	\$421,251,106	\$4,897,013,922

DECISION REGISTER UPDATES AND UPCOMING REPORTS

Kōrero taunaki | Summary of considerations

Purpose

1. This report provides an update on which previous decisions have been implemented and which are still outstanding. It also provides a list of items scheduled to be considered at the next two meetings (hui).

Strategic alignment

2. N/A. This report is considered at every ordinary meeting and assists in monitoring progress.

Author	Leteicha Lowry, Senior Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Sean Johnson, Democracy Team Leader Andrea Reeves, Chief Strategy and Finance Officer

Taunakitanga | Officers' Recommendations

Officers recommend the following motion:

That the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee:

1. Receive the information.

Whakarāpopoto | Executive Summary

Decision register updates

3. A full list of decisions, with a status and staff comments, is available at all times on the Council website. Decisions where work is still in progress, or was completed since the last version of this report can be viewed at this link:
<https://meetings.wellington.govt.nz/your-council/decision-register?UpdatedSinceLastMeeting=true&CommitteeName=K%C5%8Drau+T%C5%8Dt%C5%8Dp%C5%AB+%7C+Long-term+Plan%2C+Finance%2C+and+Performance+Committee%2BP%C5%ABroro+Tahua+%7C+Finance+and+Performance+Committee%2BP%C5%ABroro+Maherehere+%7C+Annual+Plan+%7C+Long-Term+Plan+Committee>
4. If members have questions about specific resolutions, the best place to ask is through the written Q&A process.
5. This body passed 18 resolutions at the last meeting. All are now complete.
6. 65 in progress resolutions were carried forward from previous reports:
 - 3 are now complete and 62 are still in progress.

Upcoming reports

7. The following items are scheduled to go to the next two hui:

-
8. Rāapa, 11 Hakihea 2024 (Wednesday, 11 December 2024):
- 2025/26 Annual Plan approve draft budget (Chief Strategy and Finance Officer).
 - Statements of Expectation to Council-controlled organisations (Chief Economic and Engagement Officer).
 - CCO Board Appointments (Chief Economic and Engagement Officer).
 - Water Reform - Preferred delivery model and consultation options (Chief Infrastructure Officer).
 - Report of the Unaunahi Māhirahira | Audit and Risk Committee of 20 November 2024.
9. Rāpare, 13 Hui-tanguru 2025 (Thursday, 13 February 2025):
- 2024-34 LTP Quarterly 2 Performance Report (Chief Strategy and Finance Officer).
 - Te Toi Mahana Quarterly Report (Chief Infrastructure Officer).
 - Rating Policy Review Consultation Outcome & Updated Rating Policy (Chief Strategy and Finance Officer).

Takenga mai | Background

10. The purpose of the decisions register is to ensure that all resolutions are being actioned over time. It does not take the place of performance monitoring or full updates. A resolution could be made to receive a full update report on an item, if desired.
11. Resolutions from relevant decision-making bodies in previous trienniums are also included.
12. Elected members can view public excluded clauses on the Council website: [Council meetings decision register](#).
13. The upcoming reports list is subject to change on a regular basis.

Attachments

Nil