

**Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council**

Me Heke Ki Pōneke

Ordinary Meeting of Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee Ngā Meneti | Minutes

9:30 am Rāpare, 4 Mahuru 2025
9:30 am Thursday, 4 September 2025
Ngake (16.09), Level 16, Tahiwi
113 The Terrace
Pōneke | Wellington



PRESENT

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4 SEPTEMBER 2025

Business	Page No.
<hr/>	
1. Meeting Conduct	5
1.1 Karakia	5
1.2 Apologies	5
1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations	5
1.4 Confirmation of Minutes	5
1.5 Items not on the Agenda	5
1.6 Public Participation	6
2. General Business	7
2.1 Adoption of Tātou Ki Uta - Coastal Reserves Management Plan	7
2.2 Advisory Group Annual Reports 2024-2025	8
2.3 Advisory Group Transition Progress Update and Terms of Reference	8
2.4 Report back on Rainbow Action Plan	10
2.5 Harbour Quays approval to consult on the preferred option	12
2.6 Notice of Motion: Historic Heritage	13
2.7 Notification of Plan Change 1 to the 2024 District Plan	14
2.8 Fire and Smoke Nuisance Bylaw review - recommendations following consultation	14
2.9 Economic Wellbeing Strategy Annual Report	15
2.10 Decision register updates and upcoming reports	15

3. Public Excluded	16
3.1 CAB and MOB sites redevelopment heads of terms	16

1. Meeting Conduct

1.1 Karakia

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

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

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

1.2 Apologies

Moved Councillor O'Neill, seconded Deputy Mayor Foon

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Accept the apologies received from Councillor Free for partial absence, Councillor Calvert for lateness, Councillor Apanowicz, and Pouiwi Kelly for early departure.

Carried

1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations

No conflicts of interest were declared.

1.4 Confirmation of Minutes

Moved Councillor O'Neill, seconded Deputy Mayor Foon

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Approves the minutes of the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee Meeting held on 19 June 2025, having been circulated, that they be taken as read and confirmed as an accurate record of that meeting.

Carried

1.5 Items not on the Agenda

There were no items not on the agenda.

(Councillor Wi Neera joined the hui at 9:34am.)

1.6 Public Participation

1.6.1 Arunan Nobel

Arunan Nobel addressed the hui regarding item 2.3 Advisory Group Transition Process Update and Terms of Reference.

1.6.2 Bryan Patchett – Takatāpui Rainbow Advisory Council

Bryan Patchett addressed the hui on behalf of the Takatāpui Rainbow Advisory Council regarding item 2.4 Report back on Rainbow Action Plan.

1.6.3 Jade Musther – Cahoots Workshop

Jade Musther addressed the hui on behalf of Cahoots Workshop regarding item 2.4 Report back on Rainbow Action Plan.

1.6.4 Councillor Thomas Nash - Chair of the Greater Wellington Regional Council Transport Committee

Councillor Thomas Nash addressed the hui as Chair of the Greater Wellington Regional Council Transport Committee regarding item 2.5 Harbour Quays.

1.6.5 John Swan

John Swan addressed the hui regarding item 2.6 Notice of Motion: Historic Heritage.

1.6.6 Felicity Wong – Historic Places Wellington

Felicity Wong addressed the hui on behalf of Historic Places Wellington regarding item 2.6 Notice of Motion: Historic Heritage.

1.6.7 Donald McDonald

Donald McDonald addressed the hui.

1.6.8 Helene Ritchie

Helene Ritchie addressed the hui regarding item 3.1 CAB and MOB sites redevelopment heads of terms.

1.6.9 Jill Wilson – Inner City Wellington Residents Association

Jill Wilson addressed the hui on behalf of Inner City Wellington Residents Association regarding item 3.1 CAB and MOB sites redevelopment heads of terms.

1.6.10 Y Bjors

Y Bjors addressed the hui regarding item 3.1 CAB and MOB sites redevelopment heads of terms.

Attachments

- 1 Handout - Helene Ritchie

(Councillor Apanowicz left the hui at 9:46am.)
(Councillor Apanowicz rejoined the hui at 9:50am.)
(Councillor McNulty left the hui at 10:11am.)
(Councillor McNulty rejoined the hui at 10:13am.)

The meeting adjourned at 10:30am and returned at 10:46am with the following members present: Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Free, Pouiwi Hohaia, Pouiwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Gordie Rogers, Mayor Whanau, Councillor Wi Neera and Councillor Young.

(Deputy Mayor Foon rejoined the hui at 10:47am.)
(Councillor Chung rejoined the hui at 10:47am.)
(Councillor Randle rejoined the hui at 10:47am.)

2. General Business

2.1 Adoption of Tātou Ki Uta - Coastal Reserves Management Plan

Moved Councillor Abdurahman, seconded Councillor O'Neill

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Note the feedback provided and thank submitters for their input and ongoing commitment to improving outcomes for Wellington's coastal reserve areas.
3. Note that amendments have been recommended to the Plan to reflect consultation feedback (Attachment 5 Submission summary and Attachment 6 Submissions).
4. Agree to adopt Tātou ki Uta – Coastal Reserves Management Plan (as amended in Attachment 1 of this paper) and Appendix A – Rules for use and development of parks and reserves (as amended in Attachment 3 of this paper) **with the following changes:**
 - 4.1 **Amend Action 6 of Hue te Para to be brought in as medium-term actions and scheduled to commence in financial year 2028/29 or earlier.**
 - 4.2 **Amend Action 5 of Enduring Connection to be brought in as medium-term actions and scheduled to commence in financial year 2028/29 or earlier.**
5. Delegate to the Chief Executive and the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural and Economic Committee (or the relevant committee) the authority to make any amendments as agreed at this meeting and any minor consequential edits as part of finalising and publishing the Plan.
6. Agree to archive the South Coast Management Plan (2002), and the coastal sections of the Suburban Reserves Management Plan (2015) and Outer Green Belt Management Plan (2019), as these are now superseded by *Tātou ki Uta*.
7. Note that officers will return to the relevant Committee in 2026 with an updated Appendix A: Rules for Use and Development of all parks and reserves, following further work to ensure alignment across the city's wider open space network.
8. Agree to the proposed name changes in this paper, as consulted on as part of *Tātou ki Uta* as per Appendix B – Proposed Name Changes.

9. Note further targeted engagement on naming for three areas and before final recommendations /decisions are made.
10. Note the minor updates to the coastal reserve land schedules within *Tātou ki Uta* from the Koata Hātepe | Regulatory Processes Committee decision of 28 August 2025
11. Note the indicative financial information provided for implementation of *Tātou ki Uta* for consideration as part of the 2027/37 LTP (Attachment 4).

Carried

Secretarial Note: The motion moved differed from the recommendations in the officer's report, the changes are marked in red.

(Councillor Calvert joined the hui at 11:07am.)

2.2 Advisory Group Annual Reports 2024-2025

Moved Councillor O'Neill, seconded Councillor McNulty

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the advisory groups' annual reports.
2. Thank the advisory groups for their contributions.

Carried

Attachments

- 1 Councillor Free tabled document - Updated Pacific Advisory Group Annual Report.

(Mayor Whanau left the hui at 11:20am.)

(Mayor Whanau rejoined the hui at 11:21am.)

2.3 Advisory Group Transition Progress Update and Terms of Reference

Moved Councillor O'Neill, seconded Councillor Matthews

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Adopt the recommended Terms of Reference for the Advisory Groups and Strategic Advisory Panel.

(Councillor Free left the hui at 11:38am.)

(Councillor Free rejoined the hui at 11:43am.)

Moved Councillor Abdurahman, seconded Councillor Pannett the following amendment

Resolved

2. Adopt the recommended Terms of Reference for the Advisory Groups and Strategic Advisory Panel **with the following changes:**
 - 2.1 **Agree to increase Advisory Group membership max to 12 (except for RYCAG at 16).**
 - 2.2 **Agree to review the level of remuneration for members of the Council's Advisory Groups annually.**

Secretarial Note: Voting was taken in parts. A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

Clause 2

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

For:

Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Free, Pouwi Hohaia, Pouwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Randle, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera, Councillor Young, Mayor Whanau

Against:

Councillor Abdurahman

Majority Vote: 17:1

Carried

Clause 2.1

For:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Calvert, Councillor McNulty, Councillor Pannett

Against:

Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Free, Pouwi Hohaia, Pouwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Randle, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera, Councillor Young, Mayor Whanau

Majority Vote: 4:14

Lost

Clause 2.2

For:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon, Councillor Free, Pouwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Rogers, Mayor Whanau

Against:

Councillor Brown, Pouwi Hohaia, Councillor Randle, Councillor Wi Neera, Councillor Young

Majority Vote: 13:5

Carried

(Councillor Free left the hui at 12:16pm.)

2.3 Advisory Group Transition Progress Update and Terms of Reference

Moved Councillor O'Neill, seconded Councillor Matthews the following amended substantive

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Adopt the recommended Terms of Reference for the Advisory Groups and Strategic Advisory Panel **with the following changes:**
 - 2.2 Agree to review the level of remuneration for members of the Council's Advisory Groups annually.**

Carried

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

For:

Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon, Pouwi Hohaia, Pouwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Randle, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera, Councillor Young, Mayor Whanau

Against:

Councillor Abdurahman

Absent:

Councillor Free

Majority Vote: 16:1

Carried

(Councillor Brown left the hui at 12:19pm.)
(Councillor Brown rejoined the hui at 12:21pm.)

2.4 Report back on Rainbow Action Plan

Moved Councillor Pannett, seconded Councillor O'Neill

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Adopt the proposed Rainbow Action Plan in Attachment 1 **with the following changes:**
 - 2.1 **Agree to add in the strategic context section below arts and culture “Tūpiki Ora - There is alignment in the pae hekenga for Whānau Toiora which focuses on the wellbeing of whānau/individuals. The strategy is inclusive of te hunga takatāpui and enables collaboration to occur to better accommodate actions for Māori within the rainbow action plan.”**
3. Agree to update the action plan in line with the development of the 2027-37 Long-Term Plan **with the focus on Takatāpui and other particularly marginalised members of Rainbow communities.**
4. Delegate to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee or relevant committee and the Chief Executive to make any amendments agreed by the Committee and any other minor edits to the attached Rainbow Action Plan.
5. **Note that officers intend to engage further with Rainbow communities such as Takatāpui and People of Colour and migrants.**

Carried

Secretarial Note: The motion moved differed from the recommendations in the officer's report, the changes are marked in red. A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

For:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon, Pouwi Hohaia, Pouwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Randle, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera, Councillor Young, Mayor Whanau

Against:

Absent:

Councillor Free

Majority Vote: 17:0

Carried

The hui adjourned at 12:30pm and return at 1:01pm with the following members present: Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Deputy Mayor Foon, Pouwi Hohaia, Pouwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Randle, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera and Councillor Young.

(Councillor Chung rejoined the hui at 1:02pm.)
(Mayor Whanau rejoined the hui at 1:03pm.)
(Councillor Free rejoined the hui at 1:07pm.)
(Councillor McNulty left the hui at 1:09pm.)
(Councillor Calvert left the hui at 1:13pm.)
(Councillor McNulty rejoined the hui at 1:14pm.)
(Councillor Calvert rejoined the hui at 1:22pm.)

2.5 Harbour Quays approval to consult on the preferred option

Moved Councillor Matthews, seconded Councillor Pannett

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the information
2. Agree the Harbour Quays investment objectives and preferred public transport corridor option outlined in this report.
3. Agree to consult on the Harbour Quays public transport corridor, including consultation on a proposed traffic resolution for bus stops and part-time bus lanes along the preferred bus routes **noting the following:**
 - 3.1 That the second stage suite of options for cycling improvements along Harbour Quays will be presented to the Committee at a future date.
 - 3.2 The issue of pedestrian protection from the weather will be managed in the future when budget allows.
 - 3.3 That further advice on the costs of the project will be brought back to committee given the level of certainty.
 - 3.4 That the interim and future plans for cycling provision along the route be outlined in the consultation document, including any options to reduce pedestrian/cycling conflicts along the waterfront.
4. Note that the feedback received from consultation will inform the finalisation of the business case, which will be brought back to Wellington City Council and Greater Wellington Regional Council early in 2026 for endorsement.
5. **Direct officers to arrange a shared workshop for WCC and GWRC elected members and pouiwi to understand and give input to the service design of bus routes for the Harbour Quays before the final committee decisions.**

Carried

Secretarial Note: The motion moved differed from the recommendations in the officer's report, the changes are marked in red.

Moved Councillor McNulty, seconded Councillor O'Neill the following procedural motion

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Agree that, in accordance with standing order 25.2(c), the motion under debate now be put.

Carried

(Councillor Chung rejoined the hui at 1:02pm.)

(Mayor Whanau rejoined the hui at 1:03pm.)

(Councillor Free left the hui at 2:04pm.)

(Pouiwi Hohaia left the hui at 2:12pm.)

2.6 Notice of Motion: Historic Heritage

Secretarial Note: Councillor McNulty proposed to alter the motion from the motion included in the agenda, the proposed altered motion is below. Any alteration to a notice of motion requires the agreement of the mover and the agreement of a majority of members present at the meeting under Standing Order 23.5. A vote to accept the alteration to the motion was put and was carried.

Moved Councillor McNulty, seconded Mayor Whanau the following altered notice of motion

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Direct officers to prepare advice on a Plan Change to remove or amend protections for Heritage Buildings and Structures or Areas using process contained in the Resource Management (Consenting and Other System Changes) Amendment Bill once it becomes law.

In preparing this advice officers are to consider how the change or removal of heritage protections can:

- Improve the climate readiness and resilience of the city and therefore ensure long-term protection of key assets by removing fiscal and time costs to adaptation, maintenance and growth particularly for infrastructure such as sea walls, tunnels, electricity substations or Community Infrastructure.
- Remove barriers to adaptive reuse and redevelopment.
- Address the concerns of owners and citizens who face higher costs and restrictions on their property rights and wellbeing from heritage listing through a process that allows for people to nominate buildings for delisting.
- Ensure the representation of Mana Whenua concerns with heritage listings and how those concerns might be met by this council through changes to heritage protections.

Carried

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

For:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Brown, Deputy Mayor Foon, Pouwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Randle, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera, Councillor Young, Mayor Whanau

Against:

Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Councillor Pannett

Absent:

Councillor Free, Pouwi Hohaia

Majority Vote: 13:3

Carried

(Pouwi Hohaia rejoined the hui at 2:23pm.)
(Councillor McNulty left the hui at 2:25pm.)
(Councillor McNulty rejoined the hui at 2:29pm.)

2.7 Notification of Plan Change 1 to the 2024 District Plan

Moved Councillor Matthews, seconded Councillor Apanowicz

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Approve Plan Change 1 as presented to the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural and Economic Committee for notification pursuant to Schedule 1 Part 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
3. Approve the Chairperson of the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee and the Chief Executive to be able to make minor changes and edits, as required, to the plan change prior to public notification.
4. Approve that officers seek an exemption from the Minister for the Environment to notify Plan Change 1.

Carried

Attachments

- 1 Councillor Randle tabled document - Q&A document (redacted)

The hui adjourned at 2:32pm and returned at 2:38pm with the following members present: Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Brown, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon, Pouwi Hohaia, Pouwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Pannett, Councillor Randle, Councillor Geordie Rogers, Mayor Whanau, Councillor Wi Neera and Councillor Young.

(Councillor Apanowicz rejoined the hui at 2:40pm.)

2.8 Fire and Smoke Nuisance Bylaw review - recommendations following consultation

Moved Councillor O'Neill, seconded Councillor Wi Neera

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Receive the submissions made during public consultation on the draft Fire and Smoke Nuisance Bylaw 2025 (attachment 1) and the submissions summary and recommendations document (attachment 2).
3. Agree to the recommended updates for the final Fire and Smoke Nuisance Bylaw 2025 (attachment 3).
4. Note that in response to some submission points, operational guidelines setting out the key considerations and standard process for authorised officers when assessing fire and smoke nuisance complaints will be updated and published on the Council's website.
5. Recommend that Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council:
 - 5.1 Adopt the proposed Fire and Smoke Nuisance Bylaw 2025 on 11 September 2025.
 - 5.2 Authorise the Chief Executive and the Mayor or Deputy Mayor to amend the Fire and Smoke Nuisance Bylaw 2025 to include any minor updates and consequential edits, where wording has not already been agreed at the Committee meeting.
 - 5.3 Note that, if adopted, the Fire and Smoke Nuisance Bylaw 2025 will come into effect on 20 October 2025, revoking Part 3: Fire and Smoke Nuisance of the Wellington Consolidated Bylaw 2008.

Carried

(Councillor Brown left the hui at 2:44pm.)

2.9 Economic Wellbeing Strategy Annual Report

Moved Deputy Mayor Foon, seconded Councillor Apanowicz

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Note that the Economic Wellbeing Strategy will be reviewed in 2026.

Carried

2.10 Decision register updates and upcoming reports

Moved Councillor Abdurahman, seconded Councillor O'Neill

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Receive the information.

Carried

Moved Councillor O'Neill, seconded Deputy Mayor Foon

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Extend the meeting beyond six hours, in accordance with standing order 11.7.

Carried

3. Public Excluded

Moved Councillor Rogers, seconded Pouwi Hohaia

Resolved

That the Kōrau Mātinitini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee:

1. Pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, exclude the public from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting namely:

General subject of the matter to be considered	Reasons for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
3.1 CAB and MOB sites redevelopment heads of terms	<p>7(2)(c)(i) The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information or information from the same source and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied.</p> <p>7(2)(h) The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.</p> <p>7(2)(i) The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</p>	<p>s48(1)(a) That the public conduct of this item would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under Section 7.</p>

~~2. Direct officers to consider the release of publicly excluded information that can be publicly released following the hui.~~

2. Agree to release this paper considered in public excluded with the necessary commercial elements redacted following execution of the Heads of Terms.

Carried

Secretarial Note: The motion moved differed from the recommendations in the officer's report, the changes are marked in red.

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

For:

Councillor Apanowicz, Councillor Calvert, Councillor Chung, Deputy Mayor Foon, Pouwi Hohaia, Pouwi Kelly, Councillor Matthews, Councillor McNulty, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Randle, Councillor Rogers, Councillor Wi Neera, Councillor Young

Against:

Councillor Abdurahman, Councillor Pannett

Absent:

Councillor Brown, Councillor Free

Majority Vote: 14:2

Carried

The hui went into public-excluded session at 3:27pm and returned from public-excluded session and concluded at 5:03 pm with the reading of the following karakia:

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

Authenticated: _____
Chair

4 September public meeting. Public participation

Helene Ritchie A former deputy mayor and chair of the civic centre project; current Chair of The Wellington Civic Trust

RE CAB and MOB sites redevelopment heads of terms. Public excluded

Kia ora Koutou katoa,

I wish to make a few points

1. This discussion and decision should not be secret. To be frank it is disgraceful to do.
2. This is our land not the land of a handful of councillors and officers.
3. This public land should not to be leased privately or for commercial purpose.
4. Do not do a temporary tacky plastic fantastic Disneyland with foodtrucks
5. Do not make any irrevocable agreement with Precinct
6. Stop all negotiation with Precinct immediately
7. Instead invite the public and professionals in a public open competition for a park.

A civic centre park is still possible. A Poneke Park for the people

- According to the OIA information I have now received from the Council, the Te Ngakau/Civic centre demolished MOB/CAB site is still in Council ownership.
- Council has told me that no deal has yet been signed with the Auckland developers Precinct to lease this huge site, and to build a tall (over ten storey) bulk building on it.
- But today Council will discuss and decide in secret the 'heads of terms of agreement' with Auckland developers Precinct.
- I am told in the OIA reply that "there is currently no deadline for completion of the negotiations as they are complex".
- I want Wellingtonians to fight to keep this place in the heart of our City as a park.
- I am asking mayor and councillors to commit to a public park competition inviting professionals and the public to put forward ideas and design.

TODAY Stop all further negotiation.

- The first step today is to stop the Council making any kind of agreement with Precinct Properties and to **stop** all current negotiation with Precinct properties.
- No property developer should be able to hold onto such key Council land while Council "negotiates".
- No such decision should be entered into even if officers attempt to persuade

the mayor and councillors that this would or even might be reversible.

In no way should these Auckland developers be given priority

through a long term lease over this land to one day build an over ten storey huge in bulk commercial building at a key entrance to Te Ngakau the heart of our City.

INSTEAD AGREE TO A PUBLIC AND PROFESSIONAL COMPETITION.

- The sooner we turn this into something elegant, endemic, green and open space, and the better for us and our City.
- Significant members and groups in the City and living around civic centre already supported a park without knowing whether the lease had been consummated or not.

- The next step should be a competition for a park design just like the competition for Waitangi Park which took about a year and resulted in a unique green public open space with an opened stream leading down to the harbour.
- Professionals and the general public - ratepayers and residents should all be invited to participate in this competition – to produce ideas and design.
- **The most important first step now is to ensure that the Council votes against any decision to pursue in any way heads of terms of agreement with Precinct Develop**

APPENDIX.

I have attached the key features of Waitangi Park competition as an example.

Key features of that park's design:

- A high level of mixed recreational uses for a diverse range of users;
 - Sophisticated and effective environmentally sustainable design focussed on Water Sensitive Urban Design;
 - Connectivity to the urban framework within which the waterfront site is positioned; and
 - Amplification of the park's physical components by woven narratives pertinent to the Wellington region, referencing both the natural and cultural heritage of the site.
- The interpretation of cultural narrative and site history are central to the design concept and are woven throughout the park's detailing and spatial composition. This approach, fully integrating site interpretation into the built form, is possibly most evident in the realisation of the Waitangi Stream and the Graving Dock. Both of these are major components of the site's Water Sensitive infrastructure and clear acknowledgements of the site's historical past and its significance to local Iwi of The Tenth's Trust.

Waitangi Park is a benchmark for sustainable landscape design in the Wellington Region. The park's environmentally sustainable design and the water sensitive urban design strategy not only contribute to improve water quality but also add to the visual appeal of the park generating a unique character for the place. Sustainability features incorporated into Waitangi Park include:

- Water conservation (daylighting and cleaning of Waitangi Stream, collection and treatment of storm-water, harvesting of storm-water for irrigation);
- Quality improvement of urban storm water runoff (no net increase of pollution in natural water systems);
- Bio-diversity, cultivation and use of native species sourced locally;
- Use of renewable energy (wind/solar power) and thereby the reduction of greenhouse gases.
- Cultural narrative and histories are central to the design concept and include a waharoa and pou carved by local artists. Other interpretive elements include the graving dock, the powhiri mound and the waka landing areas.
- Since its opening, Waitangi Park has hosted numerous travelling exhibitions, performances and events and provided a valuable public outdoor arena for Wellington to showcase the arts. Arts based activity is also integral to the daily life of the park through the constantly changing aerosol art on specially installed screens that stand alongside the skate park.

PACIFIC ADVISORY GROUP

Annual Report

1 July 2024 – 30 June 2025



Foreword from the Chair and Deputy Chair

Talofa lava, Fakaalofa lahi atu, Mālō e lelei, Kia orana, Ni sa bula vinaka, Taloha ni, Ia orana, Kam na mauri, Hāfa Adai, Kia ora, and warm Pacific greetings,

As Chair and Deputy Chair of the Pacific Advisory Group (PAG), we are honoured to reflect on a year of deep engagement, cultural advocacy, and strategic contribution. This year has been one of both celebration and challenge. We have continued to amplify the voices of Pacific peoples in Wellington City, ensuring that our communities are not only heard but respected and included in Council processes.

This year brought significant challenges, including the advisory group model changes, which sparked important conversations about representation, equity, and cultural responsiveness. Throughout this, PAG has remained steadfast in its commitment to uphold Pacific values and advocate for a model that reflects the diversity and mana of our communities.

Our members have contributed to key Council initiatives, including the Fale Malae project, the Long-Term Plan, and climate adaptation strategies. We have also supported Pacific Language Weeks, civic engagement efforts, and cultural events such as the Pasifika Festival that strengthen identity and belonging for our communities.

We acknowledge the resilience of our communities, especially as they continue to face housing pressures, economic challenges, and political pressures which disproportionately

affect our Pacific communities. Despite these barriers, Pacific peoples continue to enrich the life of our city through their leadership, creativity, and enduring cultural presence.

As we reflect on the past year, we are filled with gratitude for the collective strength and wisdom of our PAG members. Each person who has served, past and present, has brought their heart, cultural knowledge, and leadership to this space. Their contributions have shaped the work of PAG and ensured that our communities are represented with integrity and care. We acknowledge the time, energy, and commitment that our members have given, often beyond what is seen. Their service has upheld the values that we hold very dear - respect, unity, and service to our people. It is through their dedication that PAG has remained a strong and trusted voice within Council, and we honour them for walking this journey with us.

As Chair and Deputy Chair, we are deeply committed to guiding PAG in a way that honours our legacy, preserves institutional knowledge, and lays the foundation for a sustainable future of Pacific leadership in local government. As we step into this next chapter, we do so with a profound sense of responsibility, both to those who paved the way before us and to those who will carry the torch forward.

We recognise that the true strength of PAG lies not only in its advocacy, but in its enduring ability to hold space for Pacific values, voices, and visions within civic decision-making. It is through this collective strength that we continue to influence meaningful change, foster belonging, and ensure that Pacific perspectives remain visible, valued, and vital in shaping the future of our city.

We thank our fellow members for their courage, wisdom, and service. We also acknowledge the support of Council staff, community partners, and all those who have walked alongside us. Most importantly, we thank our Pacific communities for their trust in us to carry their voices within Council.

We look forward to strengthening relationships, uplifting our communities, and ensuring that Pacific peoples remain at the heart of Wellington City's future.

Fa'afetai tele lava, Vinaka vakalevu, Kilisou Shapwur, Meitaki ma'ata, Mālō 'aupito, Fakaaue lahi, Fakafetai and thank you.



[Maria Mitimeti and Laauli Joseph Seupule](#)

Our Journey

PAG was formally established in 2003 by Wellington City Council following the adoption of the *Intercultural Relationships Framework*. This was a landmark moment in the Council's commitment to equity and inclusion, recognising the need for Pacific peoples to have a dedicated space for influence and advocacy within local government.



The formation of PAG was significant not only for its timing but for its composition. It was designed to include representatives from Wellington's main Pacific nation groups—Samoa, Cook Islands, Fiji, Niue, Tonga, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Melanesia, and Micronesia. This structure enabled the diversity of Pacific identities and experiences to be reflected in Council advice and decision-making.

From its inception, PAG has served as a cultural and strategic bridge between Council and Pacific communities. Members have brought lived experience, cultural knowledge, and leadership, deeply rooted in their communities. This connection has enabled PAG to provide insights that reflect the realities, aspirations, and challenges of Pacific peoples in Wellington City.

While the Pacific population is a smaller proportion of the Wellington City population it remains a vibrant and influential community, particularly in areas such as Newtown, Berhampore, and the Northern suburbs. Pacific peoples contribute significantly to Wellington's cultural, social, and economic fabric, despite facing challenges such as housing insecurity, displacement due to gentrification, and underrepresentation in civic spaces.

The need for representation is underscored by the fact that Pacific communities often maintain strong ties to Wellington through work, education, faith, and cultural networks, even when they reside outside the city boundaries. PAG's role in advocating for these communities both within and beyond the formal geographic limits is essential to ensuring that Pacific voices are not only heard but centred in Council processes.



Our Members

As at July 2025, PAG members included representatives from Samoa, Cook Islands, Fiji, Melanesia, Micronesia, Niue, Tonga, Tokelau, and Tuvalu.

1. Maria Mitimeti – Niue (Chair)
2. Laauli Joe Seupule – Samoa (Deputy Chair)
3. Āpeafusia Katalina Semisi – Tokelau
4. Divesh Prakash – Fijian
5. Inangaro Vakaafi - Niue
6. Mary Moeono-Kolio – Samoa
7. Nate Rigler Siguenza – Micronesia
8. Nia Bartley – Tuvalu
9. Sandra Tisam – Cook Islands
10. Suliana Veā – Tonga

In the past year we farewelled seven members, including former co-chairs Natalia Fareti and Anthony Carter, and in December 2024 we welcomed two new members, Divesh Prakash and Mary Moeono-Kolio.



Our Contributions



PAG brings knowledge and insight into Council about how the different needs of Wellington's Pacific communities can be addressed in the context of Council's roles and responsibilities. It is recognised that members come from and remain connected to their communities. From this foundation, members share their expertise and lived experience in this advisory role and engage with their communities and others as part of the wider Council consultation processes.

During the 2024–2025 financial year, PAG has continued to play a vital role in representing Pacific communities across Wellington City. Through our work on key initiatives such as the Fale Malae project, the Long-Term Plan, and climate adaptation strategies, we have demonstrated the importance of Pacific leadership in civic life. We have also supported

cultural events such as the Pasifika Festival and language weeks that celebrate our identity and strengthen our collective wellbeing.

This year, we have contributed to the following areas:

- Provided strategic advice on the Fale Malae development and cultural heritage planning
- Participated in the Long-Term Plan consultation process, advocating for Pacific priorities
- Supported Pacific Language Weeks and cultural events across the city
- Engaged in discussions on climate adaptation and resilience planning
- Contributed to the review of the Council's advisory group model, advocating for culturally responsive representation
- Maintained strong community connections through talanoa sessions and outreach
- Highlighted the impact of housing pressures on Pacific communities
- Contributed to planning and policy discussions on water infrastructure,
- Engaged in climate change mitigation and adaptation initiatives, while advocating for funding criteria that support equitable engagement and participation from Pacific communities

PAG's work this year has focused on continuing the legacy of its founding members while laying a sustainable foundation for future Pacific leadership. We continue to offer our support for the Council to grow its cultural competency in relation to Pacific communities.

We fundamentally believe that Council needs Pacific people in decision-making positions. The changes to membership numbers and representation proposed in the model change to

advisory groups reflects a lack of Pacific capability within the Council (around the table and within the organisation). This has major consequences for Pacific peoples in Wellington.

Our Legacy

1. Pasifika Festival

In 2024, PAG in partnership with Council staff and community collaborators, launched a three-year cultural journey through the Pasifika Festival. This refreshed approach was designed to honour the Pacific experience of migration, belonging, and identity. At the heart of this journey is a vision to establish the festival as a powerful platform for storytelling, connection, and celebration that reflects and uplifts the voices of Pacific peoples.

The journey began with the theme *Homeland*, paying tribute to our ancestral roots across the Pacific. A commissioned Pacific stone sculpture by artist Leo Semau was introduced as a blank canvas, symbolising the beginning of our shared narrative. Festival attendees were invited to meet the artist and reflect on the concept of homeland, laying the foundation for a collective exploration of Pacific identity and heritage.

Building on this momentum, the 2025 festival embraced the theme *Journey*, focusing on migration stories and the voyage across the sea. The event brought our vision to life through traditional and contemporary music, dance, food, and visual art. Leo Semau returned with the partially carved anchor stone, inviting attendees to contribute to its transformation. This interactive element became a powerful symbol of shared experience and resilience, deepening community engagement and reinforcing the festival's evolving narrative.



The success of the 2025 Pasifika Festival was reflected in the high level of community participation, overwhelmingly positive feedback from attendees, and strong media coverage. PAG played a pivotal role in supporting and promoting the event and contributed to planning discussions, cultural programming, and outreach efforts. Our involvement ensured the festival was inclusive and representative of the diverse Pacific nations, amplifying Pacific voices and visibility across the region.

A special acknowledgement is extended to the Wellington City Council Festival Team, led by Zoe Christall and Karl Kite Rangi whose tireless work and commitment ensured that the voices of our communities were seen and heard throughout the festival journey. Their leadership was instrumental in the creation of a Pacific youth talent incubator. This visionary initiative was designed to nurture emerging Pacific creatives and ensure the

legacy of PAG continues through the next generation. This incubator provides a pathway for young artists, performers, and storytellers to develop their craft, connect with mentors, and contribute meaningfully to the cultural fabric of Wellington.

Looking ahead, the final phase of our festival journey will be guided by the theme *Arrival*. This chapter will celebrate the establishment of Pacific identity in Aotearoa and honour the contributions of Pacific peoples to New Zealand's cultural landscape. The completion of the anchor stone sculpture will serve as a lasting symbol of belonging, resilience, and collective strength.

As we move into this next chapter, our aspiration is for the Pasifika Festival to evolve into a truly community-led celebration that is shaped by the voices, creativity, and leadership of Pacific peoples across Wellington. We envision a future where our communities continue to lead, inspire, and carry forward the stories that define us, with the Pasifika Festival as a vibrant platform for cultural expression and connection.



2. The Fale Malae

We reaffirm our strong and ongoing support for the development of Fale Malae. We see this initiative as a vital expression of Pacific identity and leadership within the civic and cultural landscape of Wellington. The Fale Malae represents a unique opportunity to embed Pacific histories, and aspirations into the heart of our capital city. This project will create a space that welcomes all, while honouring the distinct contributions of Pacific peoples to Aotearoa.

We encourage Council to continue its support for the vision that the Fale Malae Trust is bringing to life. The proposed site at Frank Kitts Park, alongside Te Wharewaka o Pōneke and the waterfront, offers a powerful location for cultural visibility, storytelling, and connection. The Fale Malae will serve as a place where Pacific communities can gather, celebrate, and lead.

For PAG, the Fale Malae aligns with our commitment to strengthening Pacific leadership, visibility, and cultural infrastructure in local government. It reflects our shared legacy and our aspirations for future generations. We believe this project will not only enrich Wellington's cultural fabric but also stand as a national symbol of belonging, resilience, and Pacific excellence.

Challenges and Reflections: Advisory Group Review

The review of Council's advisory groups has brought significant changes, prompting PAG to reflect on its impact and the path forward. While the intention behind these changes was to enhance strategic alignment and connectivity, the implementation process prompted important conversations among current and former PAG members, as well as within our wider Pacific communities.

The restructure involved the removal of ethnic-specific seats, a reduction in group size to eight members, and a requirement for existing members to reapply under new criteria. These changes were introduced without a clear transition plan, which led to the unintended loss of institutional knowledge and the disruption of long-standing relationships built on trust, service, and cultural leadership.

From a Pacific perspective, the process highlighted a need for deeper relational engagement and cultural understanding. Both elements foundational to meaningful partnership. The communication approach challenged principles of open, respectful dialogue and impacted confidence and trust. It also underscored the importance of recognising Pacific values such as collective identity, reciprocity, and continuity in leadership.

One of the key concerns raised by PAG members is the separation of 'lived experience' from 'representation' within the new model. For Pacific peoples, these concepts are deeply interconnected. Our identities are shaped by our cultures, histories, and lived realities, which in turn inform how we serve and represent our communities. The move away from identity-based representation does not reflect the nuances within our Pacific communities, which is disappointing given the history and intent behind the structure in which PAG was formed. Identity-based representation created opportunities for smaller communities to share the specific needs and aspirations of their people.

Despite the challenges, PAG has actively supported a constructive path forward, centered on Pacific values and inclusive practices one that centers Pacific values, fosters inclusive practices, and strengthens cultural leadership across Council spaces. We have actively contributed to processes that promote belonging and respect for Pacific



peoples. This includes supporting recruitment practices that are welcoming and culturally responsive, offering guidance to ensure Pacific candidates are engaged in ways that reflect our values of hospitality, relational depth, and collective identity. We have encouraged approaches that go beyond procedural fairness to embrace the spirit of inclusion where Pacific voices are not only present but meaningfully heard and valued.

PAG remains steadfast in its role as a connector between Council and Pacific communities, working to ensure that decision-making processes are informed by lived experience, representation and cultural insight. Looking ahead, we invite Council to reflect on these experiences with openness and humility, and to work alongside our communities to uphold the mana of our communities and reflect the aspirations of Pacific peoples in Wellington City.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge Sam Hutcheson and her work alongside PAG in the review of the Advisory Groups. We honour her contributions with immense gratitude. Sam embodied the values of kindness, sincerity, and respectful engagement. From our very first talanoa, her genuine care and thoughtful listening stood out. She approached our feedback with humility and integrity, ensuring that the voices of PAG were heard and considered with compassion.

We also extend our sincere appreciation and gratitude to Alisi Folaumoetu'i for her dedicated service and unwavering support of PAG and our Pacific communities. Alisi's contribution has been marked by deep respect, humility, and a strong sense of duty to our people. Her commitment to nurturing relationships, upholding cultural integrity, and ensuring that Pacific voices were heard and valued has been evident in every aspect of her work. She brought wisdom, calm, and clarity to our spaces, and her presence strengthened the collective leadership of PAG. Her service has been a reflection of the values that guide our communities, respect for others, care for relationships, and a deep responsibility to serve with heart. We thank Alisi for her time, energy, and the grace with which she carried out her role. Her contribution will not be forgotten.

Appendix I: Member Attendance

There were 12 meetings within the July 2024 – June 2025 period for which this report covers.

	Total	Attendance
Anthony Carter (term ended Oct 2024)	2	100%
Āpeafusia Katalina Semisi	9	75%
Fiemalie Pe Fale (resigned April 2025)	7	78%
Inangaro Vakaafi	6	50%
Lauli Joseph Seupule	11	92%
Maikali Kilione (resigned Oct 2024)	1	50%
Maria Clark	12	100%
Natalia Fareti (term ended Oct 2024)	2	100%
Nathaniel Rigler	8	67%
Nesleen Pentani Hamilton (resigned Nov 2024)	2	66%
Nia Bartley	7	58%
Sandra Tisam	8	67%
Suliana Veā	9	75%
Divesh Prakash (appointed in Dec 2024)	7	88%
Mary Moeono-Kolio (appointed in Dec 2024)	4	50%

Questions & Answers

Kōrau Mātinini | Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee

Thursday 04 September (Rāpare 04 Mahuru 2025)

2.1 Adoption of Tātou Ki Uta - Coastal Reserves Management Plan

1. Why is fire listed as prohibited where it appears there are occasions where it is permitted or should be managed?

The starting point is that fires are prohibited in all parks and reserves across Wellington because of the significant fire risk and environmental impacts. This is consistent with existing Council policy.

However, the rules also identify specific exclusions on page 14 where fire use may be permitted under conditions and this includes some coastal areas:

- Cultural or public events (such as hāngi or ceremonial fires), which can be permitted as *Managed Activities* with safety plans in place.
- Gas-fuelled barbecues, which are allowed under the barbecues rule.
- Designated coastal areas, where fire use may be permitted subject to strict conditions and in line with Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) fire season rules. (see page 14)

As part of the plan, Council also proposes guidelines to support decisions around fires restrictions, manage fire risks on beaches and support responsible fire behaviour.

In short, the “prohibited” rule reflects the general position across all reserves, while the exclusions provide for carefully managed use in limited situations.

2. Will fires still be permitted at Princess Bay?

Yes – fires at Princess Bay will still be permitted (subject to FENZ rules). The plan recognises that some coastal areas, including Princess Bay, have historically allowed small fires, and Council intends to retain this provision. Clear guidelines will be developed to set out exactly where and how fires can occur, and all fire use will remain subject to Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) rules and seasonal restrictions (e.g. requiring a permit in a Restricted Fire Season, and no fires in a Prohibited Fire Season).

3. If the Clyde Quay Boat Harbour Improvement Plan of \$400k above funding in the LTP were to be progressed how would this be funded? Could this be funded through charges to boat users of Clyde Quay?

An improvement plan at Clyde Quay Boat Harbour would need to go through a business case process and be considered for funding through the future Long-term Plan (LTP). The harbour is both a public space and a facility used by clubs, mooring holders, and the wider public. Charging boat users has not been explored to date. As part of a business case, we could assess the feasibility and appropriateness of different funding options, including whether user charges could contribute.

4. At what stage of the process are we at for reviewing toilets for Island Bay beach?

This work is scheduled within the renewal and upgrade programme for public toilets and pavilions managed by PSR. As part of the current financial year programme, the building will be assessed and priority works will be undertaken on the exterior to address immediate condition requirements. Alongside this, an assessment will be carried out and a preliminary scope and briefing document will be prepared to outline potential improvement or renewal requirements for future planning. The works would be programmed to take place within the following three to five years, subject to funding and prioritisation within the wider capital works programme.

5. What are the next recommended actions, or next opportunity to review dog access to beaches if wildlife protection is not adhered to?

The Dog Policy is reviewed every 6-years, and the last review was completed in 2024.

However, under the Dog Policy there is a process for reviewing dog exercise areas (sections 5.10–5.12). This enables Council to modify or disestablish areas where wildlife protection is not being met. Any such changes require a process, including public consultation and Councillor decision, with consideration of both current use and the conservation needs of wildlife, and compensatory spaces provided where possible.

Through the Tātou ki Uta we are proposing to examine three priority sites of high wildlife value with nesting seabirds to look at further restrictions at or near Moa Point, Oruaiti Reserve, and past Te Rimurapa. The plan also includes actions to strengthen dog control in wildlife-sensitive areas, improve kororā signage, and support penguin aversion training.

6. What would be the potential outcomes of Te Kopahau being reclassified as a reserve? Would it have better outcomes for native ecosystems

It's taken that this question relates to the unformed legal road (ULR) beyond the Te Kopahou Visitor Centre. If a legal road (formed or unformed) is stopped under the Local Government Act 1974 and then vested in Council as reserve and classified under the Reserves Act 1977, its legal status changes. Transport regulations would cease, and the Reserves Act regulations would then apply. In short, reclassifying a road as a reserve shifts its status from movement to protection and recreation.

Potential benefits of classifying this area as reserve could include:

- No expectation of public vehicle access, as there is with a ULR, making restrictions more straightforward to apply and enforce.
- A clear statutory mandate under the Reserves Act to protect native ecosystems, wildlife habitats, and a range of other values including natural, scenic, historic and landscape on the ULR land.
- More flexibility in the way that public access is managed around the coast, noting that the Reserves Act provides for ensuring, as far as possible, the preservation of public access along the coast e.g. re-routing tracks outside the ULR to avoid sensitive areas.
- Integration with adjoining reserve land enabling a more consistent approach to coastal reserve management, restoration, and recreation planning.
- Stronger tools for Council rangers: Under the Reserves Act, rangers have clearer statutory authority to enforce reserve rules. This includes the ability to issue fines or prosecute for

breaches of the Act, bylaws, or reserve management plans. For example, activities such as lighting fires, damaging vegetation, camping without permission, or bringing vehicles into prohibited areas can be explicitly controlled and enforced under reserve status. (These can also be enforced through other bylaws) This creates a stronger legal backing for day-to-day management than is available on legal roads, where enforcement is usually limited to general bylaws and requires police involvement.

- Provides enduring statutory protection, unlike bylaws which can be more easily amended or challenged, the Reserves Act protection is generally for the long term, requiring a complex process up to Ministerial level to revoke reserve status.
- Public consultation requirements through reserve management plans, ensuring decisions about use, access, and protection reflect community and mana whenua input. (But recognising this has also been captured by reserve management plans anyway).

Council already has powers under the Land Transport Act 1998 to restrict or prohibit vehicles on beaches and unformed legal roads through bylaws. This means vehicle access to coastal roads can be managed now, without reclassification.

The process to stop a road sits under the Local Government Act 1974, and is a lengthy process involving public notification, the opportunity for objections (which may be determined by the Environment Court if not resolved), and a formal council resolution. In this case, it is likely that a decision would end up at the Environment Court, based on feedback received in the submissions.

Reclassification does not guarantee resourcing or immediate ecological improvement of the ULR and adjacent land. Outcomes still depend on funding, enforcement, and active management.

The land is under council jurisdiction anyway, there are a number of NZ Coastal Policy Statement and Wildlife act that work to protect the coastal area anyway. The status implies the beach is for unfettered vehicle use it doesn't reflect how people value and care for and use beaches.

7. Re the bait house - what are the councils responsibilities for Health and safety checks on the building? How often do we undertake checks?

As the owner of the Bait House, Council has obligations under both the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 and the Building Act 2004, even while the building is leased. Because the Bait House has been assessed as earthquake prone (EQP), Council has specific obligations under the Building (Earthquake-prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016. These include displaying the prescribed EQP notice on the building, notifying tenants and building users of the status, and progressing seismic strengthening works within the regulatory timeframe set for the seismic risk zone (due 26/06/2036). Noting the more recent Building (Earthquake-prone Building Deadlines and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2024 extended remediation deadlines by four years for eligible buildings, providing time for a broader review of the seismic risk management system.

Alongside seismic obligations, Council must ensure the overall building fabric is safe and maintained and keep landlord-controlled areas (such as roofs, external areas, and plant spaces) safe, our last building condition assessment was carried out in 2023 and helped develop a renewal programme for the facility. The tenant is responsible for managing daily health and safety risks relating to their work activities within their leased space, while Council must continue to consult, cooperate, and

coordinate with the tenant on overlapping responsibilities, including emergency procedures and site-wide hazards.

Frequency of checks at the Bait House:

- **Earthquake-prone status** – Reassessed as required by legislation, or sooner if major works or seismic events occur. We are undertaking a life safety assessment of the building.
- **General landlord inspections** – During the term of a lease, our standard conditions require that tenants are responsible for maintaining the internal aspects of the building. Council will continue to manage and undertake the structural and external maintenance of the premises. Leases are generally granted for two terms. At the renewal stage, Council will carry out a thorough inspection of both the building and the tenant viability to ensure they are in a position to continue occupying the space. In addition, inspections occur on a more informal basis, such as when Council officers or contractors are on site or attending meetings with tenants
- **Reactive checks** – As soon as practicable if hazards, incidents, or maintenance concerns are reported.

8. What are the risks of leaving the budget on pollution and stormwater actions 18 and 20 (on page 231) out for so many years?

Actions 18 and 20 relate to long-term improvements rather than urgent stormwater operations and require collaboration with the new water entity and Greater Wellington Regional Council. They are currently unfunded, which means proposals will need to be developed for consideration through the next LTP process. However, officers have agreed that these actions can be brought forward as medium-term, scheduled to commence in 2028/29 or earlier. Delivery will still depend on discussions with Metro Water and the development of a stormwater service level agreement.

2.2 Advisory Group Annual Reports 2024-2025

1. Some advisory groups have not reported member attendance. Could attendance for all advisory groups please be provided?

The Ethnic Communities Advisory Group have not provided attendance data in their report as they have not met for a full year.

Democracy Services can provide the following attendance data from the 7 ECAG meetings held from February-August 2025:

Attendance 2024-2025									
Meeting Dates	10-Dec-24	4-Feb-25	19-Mar-25	4-Mar-25	1-Apr-25	6-May-25	3-Jun-25	8-Jul-25	5-Aug-25
Count	Joint Advisory Groups Induction meeting 11	12	Joint Advisory Group session - AP/LTP Amendment consultation	11	11	12	11	11	9
Bayan Abu-harbid	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Apologies
Chelsea Wong She	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Faiza Abukar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Judah Seomeng	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Apologies	Apologies	Apologies
Manisha Morar	Yes	Yes	Apologies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nora Abdelrahman	Yes	Yes	Apologies	Apologies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nuzha Saleem	Yes	Yes	Apologies	Yes	Apologies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Apologies
Rachel Qi	Apologies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sam Adaickalam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sum Sum Tsui	Yes	Yes	Apologies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Warkina Tujuba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yarang Mom	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

2.3 Advisory Group Transition Progress Update and Terms of Reference

1. Why is the rate for RYAC lower than other advisory groups?

Answer: The attendance fee for RYAC is equivalent to other advisory groups fees when calculated on a pro-rated basis. Co-chairs were consulted on the proposed fees and appreciated the equity applied to the Advisory Group attendance fees.

2. How is the pro-rata rate calculated for RYAC?

Answer: RYAC members receive the same hourly rate as all other Advisory Groups. The hourly rate for all Advisory Groups is \$60. The duration of Youth Council meetings is 1.5 hours, which amounts to \$90, while meetings for other Advisory Groups last 2 hours, totalling \$120. The difference in meeting length is because RYAC participants have specific needs for meeting timings due to their age.

2.4 Report back on Rainbow Action Plan

1. What is the update on the Trans Art/ Crossing in Berhampore? What process and timeline will we have to go through before we get an outcome?

The project has now been assigned to the City Design team. Exploration of high-level options, including the original flag location, has commenced and Officers will be meeting with NZTA/Waka Kotahi to discuss these further. The community will be re-engaged following the election. A brief update will be provided to the community representatives in the interim.

2.5 Harbour Quays approval to consult on the preferred option

1. With these bus lanes, how many traffic lanes each way will there be on Whitmore Street during peak hours?

No change. Whitmore Street's lane configuration will remain as these are now with two general traffic lanes in each direction. Bus lanes are only proposed for Customhouse and Jervois Quays, Wakefield and Cable Streets.

2. Will the bus routes that will use the Harbour Quay bus stops during peak time also use these stops during off-peak times or will they switch to the primary Lambton/Willis/Manners corridor?

Metlink is proposing to primarily operate express services on the Harbour Quays, which only operate during the peak or currently terminate at Brandon St. However, there are also some all-day services proposed on the Harbour Quays which are yet to be determined.

3. Why was the option to use the Mercer/Wakefield/ Cuba (or Mercer/Wakefield/Victoria) route not considered as this was the previous southbound bus route when Manners Street was a pedestrian mall?

This was out of scope of the project (time, cost and geographic).

4. Can a copy of the Benefit Cost Spreadsheet calculations that show a BCR of 2.9 be provided?

Yes. See table 24, under section 4.12 Economic Analysis for preferred option of the draft Harbour Quays Business Case

5. Can a copy of the Multi-Criteria Analysis scoring spreadsheet be provided?

Yes. See Appendix E of the business case. This was done in a workshop where participants were asked to score the 'do minimum' and two short listed options directly into the presentation with associated notes.

6. Have the faster bus travel times from using the harbour quays based on the improved bus travel times or do they include the walking access times (which may be longer for many commuters)?

No. Travel times are based on the bus journey only, to travel from the intersection of Courtenay Place and Kent Terrace in the south, to the intersection of Whitmore Street and Lambton Quay in the North.

7. How much longer in walking time will it take commuters that currently take their bus from a Lambton/Willis/Manners Street bus stop that will now have to go to a bus stop on the Harbour Quays?

This is dependent on the origin or destination of the individual bus user and their individual preferences. Metlink have undertaken user acceptance workshops to understand what the potential for change is.

8. What modelling has been undertaken that confirms passengers will walk over to the Harbour Quay bus stops vs trying to take a bus along Lambton Quay and interchanging when these bus routes converge?

None. This is dependent on the origin or destination of the individual bus user and their individual preferences. Metlink have undertaken user acceptance workshops to understand what the potential to change is.

9. Can a copy of the traffic modelling report be provided?

This is provided as Appendix F of the Business Case.

10. What are the predicted increased travel times for AM and PM peak traffic because of the conversion of the kerbside lane from traffic to a bus lane?

General traffic delays on Harbour Quays using the latest model results are up to 4 minutes.

General traffic delays on State Highway 1 are up to 4 minutes when the project is complete and up to 6 minutes in 2033.

Whilst not modelled, a presentation given to WCC councillors on 3 September 2024 stated that current (at that time) speeds of buses on the Golden Mile was 8km/hour. Analysis showed that if all buses remained on the Golden Mile, saturation point would be reached at 130 buses per hour in each direction. At this point buses would be travelling down the Golden Mile at 3-6km/hr and the wider transport network would also be impacted including side roads. From this it could be inferred that under a scenario where all buses remain on the Golden Mile, general traffic travel times will also be impacted by slower speeds.

11. Cycle ways - if the proposed route south is Featherston Street, what is the proposal for the northbound route?

When considering route options, consideration was given as to the impact on potential routes, but given that cycleways are outside of the scope for the Harbour Quays bus priority work no further analysis was undertaken within this project. Separately there is work being carried out under the Cross City Bike Connections project that is looking at creating an off-road path parallel to the Harbour Quays between the road and the waterfront promenade.

12. What is the risk of the Golden Mile diversion of bus use to Wakefield street at risk if this proposal is delayed?

Golden Mile diversions will be using the same stop locations as proposed by Harbour Quays on both Wakefield Street and Cambridge Terrace. If the Harbour Quays project is delayed, they will implement the stops under temporary traffic management and then must reinstate them back current state if needed.

If the Harbour Quays proposal is approved at a later date the temporary stops will then need to be rebuilt in a permanent way.

13. Can we please put Wellington Grey Power groups on our list to engage with on this?

Yes – they are on our list already.

14. How many kilometres of bus only and bus priority lanes were installed between 2004 and 2024?

Year (Calendar)	Sum of Length in Km
2004	1.13
2005	0.30
2009	1.26
2010	0.69
2011	0.09
2013	0.53
2022	0.28
2023	0.78
2024	1.38
Total	6.44

15. How many kilometres of bus only and bus priority lanes have been installed in 2025 or are planned to be installed in 2025 e.g. Thorndon Quay?

As of May 2025, a total of 3.36 Km of bus-only/bus-priority lanes have been built, including 2.54km on Thorndon Quay and 0.82Km on Hutt Road.

16. How many kilometres of bus only and bus priority lanes are expected to be installed in 2026 if the Harbour Quays project proceed as currently proposed?

Harbour Quays Southbound 1.22km

Harbour Quays Northbound 1.45km

2.6 Notice of Motion: Historic Heritage

- 1. I'm not clear on the outcome of this motion.- Does this mean that heritage status can be lifted from any heritage listed privately owned building at any time, but there is still a process with external commissioners to go through?**

If carried, the outcome of the notice of motion is that officers will return to committee with advice on the scope of a historic heritage plan change.

Any future plan change which proposes delisting of heritage buildings would be publicly notified for submissions and be considered by an independent hearing panel, before returning for a Council decision.

2.7 Notification of Plan Change 1 to the 2024 District Plan

No questions were received.

2.8 Fire and Smoke Nuisance Bylaw review - recommendations following consultation

No questions were received.

2.9 Economic Wellbeing Strategy Annual Report

- 1. Summer of Tech placed 132 roles in the 2024 calendar year with most of those being placed in the later half of the year. Why are they reported as only having placed 7 in the 24/25 reporting period?**

Omission in reporting. Summer of Engineering programme had 7 internships completed through the programme, led by the summer of tech. Due to low employer demand for this element of the programme, the focus has now shifted back to regrowing Summer of Tech for 2025/26

Summer of tech placed 69 roles in the Wellington region through Summer of Tech over summer 2024/25, spread across 24 employers (TBC)

- 2. The first impact report of Taiawa at \$11.9m to Wellington GDP and 127 jobs- are these all new and or increased figures? Or are they the first benchmark measurement of being under the new hub?**

This is the first benchmark measure of Taiawa tech hub, which opened in June 2024.

2.10 Decision register updates and upcoming report

No questions were received.

3.1 CAB and MOB sites redevelopment heads of terms

1. Were the draft heads of terms supposed to be attached to this paper?

As noted in the paper, the content of the Heads of Terms are detailed within the paper.

2. The recommendation is to agree to the Heads of Terms as outlined in the paper, are the Heads of Terms exclusively the option period and the development agreement?

Yes – the Heads of Terms form the basis of the negotiations to finalise the Development Agreement.

4. What is our knowledge of Climate/sea level rise liquefaction modelling?

The CAB site sits on the higher ground relative to the rest of the precinct and is exposed to less flooding/sea level rise based on our latest climate change modelling. The CAB site soil is less prone to liquefaction as it is like Te Matapihi Soil (Grade C), and better than the ground condition of Wellington Town Hall (Grade C/D).

5. Are we working alongside the tech sector who are looking for places or a precinct?

There is an opportunity to advocate for the Developer to engage with the Tech sector as they are sourcing the market to secure a tenant.

7. Do we have the options of working with precinct on the possibility of a market for Wellington? / temporary or permanent?

All options will be considered.

8. What are the risks to Wellington having to pay anything further through this deal?

There are no financial risks for WCC through executing the Heads of Terms. This is the basis on which the Development Agreement will be agreed.