

---

**ORDINARY MEETING**

**OF**

**TRANSPORT AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**AGENDA**

Time: 9:15 am  
Date: Wednesday, 16 March 2016  
Venue: Committee Room 1  
Ground Floor, Council Offices  
101 Wakefield Street  
Wellington

---

**MEMBERSHIP**

Mayor Wade-Brown  
Councillor Ahipene-Mercer  
Councillor Coughlan  
Councillor Eagle  
Councillor Foster (Chair)  
Councillor Free  
Councillor Lee  
Councillor Lester  
Councillor Marsh  
Councillor Pannett  
Councillor Peck  
Councillor Ritchie  
Councillor Sparrow  
Councillor Woolf  
Councillor Young

**NON-VOTING MEMBER**

Councillor Swain (Greater Wellington Regional Council)

**Have your say!**

*You can make a short presentation to the Councillors at this meeting. Please let us know by noon the working day before the meeting. You can do this either by phoning 803-8334, emailing [public.participation@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:public.participation@wcc.govt.nz) or writing to Democratic Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, giving your name, phone number and the issue you would like to talk about.*

---

---

## **AREA OF FOCUS**

The focus of the Committee is to direct growth to where the benefits are greatest and where adverse effects are minimised, and to deliver a quality compact urban environment.

The Committee will also lead and monitor a safe, efficient and sustainable transport system that supports Wellington's economy and adds to residents' quality of life with a strong focus on improving cycling and public transport and enhancing Wellington's walkability.

**Quorum:** 8 members

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**16 MARCH 2016**

---

<b>Business</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>1. Meeting Conduct</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Apologies	5
1.2 Conflict of Interest Declarations	5
1.3 Confirmation of Minutes	5
1.4 Public Participation	5
1.5 Items not on the Agenda	5
<b>2. General Business</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Wellington Cable Car Ltd Quarter Two Report for the 3 months ended 31 December 2015	7
2.2 Oral Update - Jim Bentley, Ngauranga to Airport Programme Director - Progress on the N2A Programme	21
2.3 Oral Update - Councillor Swain, Greater Wellington Regional Council	23
2.4 Bus Rapid Transit Funding	25
2.5 Wellington Housing Accord - Nomination of Special Housing Area	29
2.6 Update on Housing Choice and Supply Project and next actions	37
2.7 Built Heritage Incentive Fund Round 3 (of 3) 2015/16	45
2.8 Forward Programme - April 2016 to September 2016	71



## 1 Meeting Conduct

### 1.1 Apologies

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

### 1.2 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.

### 1.3 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2016 will be put to the Transport and Urban Development Committee for confirmation.

### 1.4 Public Participation

A maximum of 60 minutes is set aside for public participation at the commencement of any meeting of the Council or committee that is open to the public. Under Standing Order 3.23.3 a written, oral or electronic application to address the meeting setting forth the subject, is required to be lodged with the Chief Executive by 12.00 noon of the working day prior to the meeting concerned, and subsequently approved by the Chairperson.

### 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 Transport and Urban Development Committee.***

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 meeting.

***Minor Matters relating to the General Business of the Transport and Urban Development Committee.***

No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting of the Transport and Urban Development Committee for further discussion.



---

## 2. General Business

---

### WELLINGTON CABLE CAR LTD QUARTER TWO REPORT FOR THE 3 MONTHS ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2015

---

#### Purpose

1. This report provides the Committee with the second quarter report of Wellington Cable Car Limited (the company) for the period ended 31 December 2015.

#### Recommendation

That the Transport and Urban Development Committee:

1. Receive the information.

#### Background

1. It is a requirement of the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) that where the Council is a shareholder in a council organisation it must regularly undertake performance monitoring of that organisation to evaluate its contribution to the achievement of:
  - The Council's objectives for the organisation
  - The desired results, as set out in the organisation's Statement of Intent
  - The Council's overall aims and outcomes.
2. In December 2014 Council's Governance Finance and Planning Committee resolved to bring the management of the operations of Wellington Cable Car Limited within Council.
3. The company still exists and requires a board of directors for administration and compliance purposes and it was agreed that the Chief Executive be delegated authority to appoint officers to the board of Wellington Cable Car Limited. Council officers Andy Matthews and Anthony Wilson were appointed directors of the company effective 1 April 2014 and continue in the role as directors of the company.

#### Discussion

4. The quarter two report has been received and is attached as an appendix to this report.
5. Representatives of the company will attend the Committee meeting to present the company's second quarter report and answer any questions.
6. If the Committee needs to clarify the information presented or requires additional information it can ask officers or the Chair of the Committee to seek responses from the company.

#### Attachments

- |               |   |         |
|---------------|---|---------|
| Attachment 1. | Car Cable Ltd Quarterly Report              | Page 9  |
| Attachment 2. | Car Cable Ltd Quarterly Report - Financials | Page 15 |

Author	Warwick Hayes, CCO Project Manager
Authoriser	Derek Fry, Director City Growth & Partnerships

---

## **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

### **Consultation and Engagement**

The organisations in this report consult with the Council on a wide range of matters as part of our “no surprises” relationship.

### **Treaty of Waitangi considerations**

This report raises no new treaty considerations.

### **Financial implications**

The CCOs work within the context of the Council's overall Long Term Plan and Annual Plan framework.

### **Policy and legislative implications**

This report complies with the legislative requirements of the Local Government Act (2002) and is consistent with existing Council policy.

### **Risks / legal**

Not Applicable.

### **Climate Change impact and considerations**

The CCOs work with the Council and other organisations in considering the environmental sustainability of their operations, including with the Council's Our Living City programme.

### **Communications Plan**

Not Applicable.





**WELLINGTON CABLE CAR LIMITED**

30 Glover Street, Ngauranga,  
Wellington 6035  
Phone +64 (04) 473 2721

29 January 2016

The Committee  
Transport and Urban Development Committee  
Wellington City Council  
PO Box 2199  
Wellington 6140

Dear Committee,

**WCCL QUARTERLY REPORT (SECOND QUARTER OF 2015/16, TO 31 DECEMBER 2015) TO THE WCC TRANSPORT AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**1. Executive Summary**

The Company has continued to build on its solid start to the year in the second quarter from a financial perspective.

The attached financial results are for the second quarter ended 31 December 2015, and show an pre tax net surplus for the period of \$301k compared to a budgeted surplus of \$166k; primarily due to continued strong Cable Car fare income and also careful expense management.

Given the continued strong performance of the Company and the expectation that we do not see this abating over the remaining months of the year, we have completed a re-forecast of all areas of the business. This has resulted in a projected forecast after tax surplus for the year of \$330,000 compared to the original budget of \$172,000 and this is a great testament to all the staff involved. The re-forecast also included adjusting expenditure down from an Overhead Division perspective given that planned projects are coming in under budget and reduced maintenance expenditure required given the quality and maintenance of the network in place.

The Company has progressed its discussions with possible purchasers of the Overhead pole network, and at this stage we are aiming to have a heads of agreement in place in the final quarter of this year.

From a project perspective, the Company has completed further work in relation to the Cable Car electric drive replacement project which is progressing very well. The Cable Car asset management plan is now at draft stage and is being refined which will also form the basis of further liaison with NZTA on entering into the wider Metlink public transport network.

In relation to marketing and brand development, the second quarter has seen significant activity with the Company's new branding/logo being rolled out as well as the re-developed website going live, which includes the ability to purchase Cable Car tickets online; for which initial sales have been pleasing.



Fax+64 (04) 473 2710  
Email: [info@wellingtoncablecar.co.nz](mailto:info@wellingtoncablecar.co.nz)  
Web: [www.wellingtoncablecar.co.nz](http://www.wellingtoncablecar.co.nz)



From a cash flow perspective, the Company continues to be in a solid position with cash reserves of \$2,471k (excluding the self-insurance fund of \$289k) with a negative impact of \$345k in future periods from debtors/prepayments less payables and accruals. It is expected that this negative impact will reverse significantly over the coming period as a number of accruals in respect of the Trolley Bus division are released. Given the pending de-commissioning of the Overhead Network and that the Company does not have a known price for the project, additional reserves are being maintained as a matter of conservatism; there is also significant capital replacement costs in respect of the Cable Car required in the coming years.

## 2. SOI / Business Plan Targets

<b>Financial Performance by Division – Quarter 2, 2015/16 (Excluding Tax)</b>					
	Overhead Division	Cable Car	External Activities	Corporate	WCCL Total
Budget	(57,000)	274,000	54,000	(105,000)	166,000
Actual	(56,000)	334,000	98,000	(75,000)	301,000
Variance	1,000	60,000	44,000	30,000	135,000

<b>Financial Performance by Division – Year to Date 2015/16 (Excluding Tax)</b>					
	Overhead Division	Cable Car	External Activities	Corporate	WCCL Total
Budget	(57,000)	(7,000)	54,000	(105,000)	(115,000)
Actual	(56,000)	64,000	94,000	(69,000)	33,000
Variance	1,000	71,000	40,000	36,000	148,000

<b>Cable Car Patronage Targets – 2015/16 Year</b>					
	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr	2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr	3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr	4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr	Full Year
SOI Target	186,854	268,971	365,566	189,514	1,010,905
Actual	208,059	291,942			
Variance	21,205	22,971			

<b>Cable Car Reliability Statistics – 2015/16 Year</b>					
	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr	2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr	3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr	4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr	Full Year
SOI Target	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%	>99%
Actual	99.91%	99.89%			
Result	✓	✓			



### 3. Cable Car

The financial result for the period ended 31 December 2015 is currently tracking higher than budgeted by \$61,000 which is largely due to cable car fare income (which is a flow on effect from increased passenger numbers) but also careful management of maintenance costs and the phasing of budgeted expenditure for the year.

The projects which have been undertaken by the Cable Car division, specifically from a branding and marketing perspective are starting to have a positive effect on both passenger numbers and also revenue. The Company is working diligently to endeavour that this positive trend continues.

In relation to the main variances, these include:

- Cable Car Operation Costs are \$17K over budget; being an improvement over quarter one. This relates to the phasing of marketing activities being completed, including the website re-development, and also further work in respect of the IBIS POS system and also Snapper, including integration. We believe that the current forecast remains appropriate at this time however.
- Cable Car Maintenance Costs are tracking behind budget by \$22K; being an improvement over quarter one, however this is more of a phasing difference, and upon final completion of the Cable Car asset management plan this total will be re-forecast if required.

### 4. Trolley Bus Services

The actual expenditure incurred for the period ended 31 December 2015 is significantly less than the budgeted year to date amount and this variance spans across a number of areas, both operating expenditure and capital replacements. As noted above, this is largely due to re-configuration of projects but also completed projects coming in under budget due to strict project management and cost controls.

As a specific note, noting that this is a change for the 2015/16 year, reactive maintenance costs are now categorised as operational expenditure as opposed to capital as in previous years; this change was agreed with GWRC.

The second quarter has seen the completion of the Trolley Bus Overhead Protection System (TBOP) as well as completion of the last of the capital replacement projects given the planned cessation of trolley bus services in June 2017.

In relation to the major variances, these include:

- Operational – given the re-forecast reduction in other planned work for the year, largely consisting of poling, we have provided for a rebate payment to TSL under the contract where total spend is less than \$2.7m. This has resulted in a re-forecast of the current year expenditure. In respect of WCCL internal operational costs, these have been further re-forecast down as a result of a detailed review of the work required for the year, including eliminating the need for an external field auditor which had been budgeted for but any work will now be completed by in-house resource. Reactive maintenance expenditure continues to be tracking well less than budget, which as indicated above, is due to the high quality state of the network compared to in prior periods (as well as a certain amount of random luck).





WCCL Quarterly Report – Q2 2015/16  
29 January 2016

- Retensions – a review of the retension work which is legally required to be completed in the current year has been undertaken and as a result the forecast cost in this area has been reduced by \$90k compared to the original budget.
- Pole Replacements – this continues to be an area of concern and focus, and as a result of work undertaken by the overhead team and what work Broad Spectrum (formerly Transfield Services) will be able to complete, the proposed poling work has been further reduced in the second quarter compared to that originally budgeted. WCCL's focus is to ensure that as the operations are reduced, that projects are not carried over and accruals do not need to be maintained to the same levels as in previous years.

#### **5. External Activities and Corporate**

Consistent with the other divisions of the Company, additional external income has been derived over budget (including from a pole income perspective and other third party work) and administration expenses are tracking \$66k behind budget. This administration cost variance largely relates to the phasing of budgets in respect of external assistance training, including in the areas of health & safety and legal. Depending on the amount and nature of the costs which occur in the next period a re-forecast will be completed as part of the March 2016 results.

#### **6. Other Activities**

- 2016/17 budget – This has now been agreed with GWRC, along with a re-forecast of the current year in late December.
- POS System reporting – Further to the comments in the second quarter report, the Company has been working with IBIS and we now have the finance integration (albeit manual) completed. The next and final step is to have this process automated via software development by IBIS.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further queries in relation to any of the matters contained within this report.

Yours faithfully,

**Simon Fleisher**  
Chief Executive

G:\Wellington City Council\Quarterly Reports\2016\December 2015\WCCL CCO Report Quarter 2 2015-16 to December 2015.docx





Wellington Cable Car Limited  
Profit and Loss for the Period Ended 31 December 2015

	Actual 2016 - Qtr 1 \$000	Budget 2016 - Qtr 1 \$000	Variance 2016 - Qtr 1 \$000	Actual 2016 - Qtr 2 \$000	Budget 2016 - Qtr 2 \$000	Variance 2016 - Qtr 2 \$000	Actual 2016 - YTD \$000	Budget 2016 - YTD \$000	Variance 2016 - YTD \$000	Budget 2015 / 2016 - Total \$000	Re-Forecast 2015 / 2016 - Total \$000	Variance 2015 / 2016 - Total \$000
<b>OVERHEAD DIVISION</b>												
Income	929	1,310	(380)	719	1,310	(591)	1,648	2,619	(971)	5,238	4,634	(605)
Contractor Operations Costs	412	420	8	412	420	8	824	841	17	1,681	1,755	(74)
Reactive Maintenance	60	138	78	21	138	117	81	275	194	551	433	118
Wellington Cable Car Operations Costs	237	322	85	231	322	91	469	644	176	1,289	1,223	66
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>1,373</b>	<b>1,760</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>3,521</b>	<b>3,411</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>Operating Surplus/Loss before Replacements</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>(209)</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>(375)</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>859</b>	<b>(584)</b>	<b>1,718</b>	<b>1,223</b>	<b>(495)</b>
Contact Wire Replacements / Rentensions	0	35	35	0	35	35	0	70	70	140	50	90
Pole Replacements	65	178	114	13	178	166	77	356	279	713	285	428
Feeder Pillar Replacements	2	5	3	6	5	(1)	8	10	2	20	20	0
Special Works Replacement	20	34	14	4	34	30	24	69	45	137	137	0
Business Case Items	134	177	43	32	177	145	165	354	188	707	730	(23)
<b>Total Replacements</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>859</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>1,718</b>	<b>1,223</b>	<b>495</b>
<b>Total Maintenance &amp; Replacement Cost</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>859</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>1,718</b>	<b>1,223</b>	<b>495</b>
Depreciation	56	57	1	56	57	1	112	114	2	228	228	0
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>(592)</b>	<b>1,760</b>	<b>2,733</b>	<b>(973)</b>	<b>5,466</b>	<b>4,861</b>	<b>605</b>
<b>Overhead Overall Surplus / (Loss)</b>	<b>(56)</b>	<b>(57)</b>	<b>(761)</b>	<b>(56)</b>	<b>(57)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>(112)</b>	<b>(114)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>(228)</b>	<b>(228)</b>	<b>(0)</b>
<b>COMPANY ACTIVITIES DIVISION</b>												
Cable Car Income	479	422	57	754	698	55	1,233	1,121	112	2,387	2,477	90
Cable Car Operations	226	213	(14)	230	213	(17)	456	425	(31)	847	847	0
Cable Car Maintenance	146	170	23	148	170	22	294	339	45	682	682	0
Depreciation - CC	41	42	1	41	42	1	82	84	2	168	168	0
	413	424	11	418	424	6	832	848	16	1,696	1,696	0
Electric Bus Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Electric Bus Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Electric Bus Maintenance	2	0	(2)	2	0	(2)	4	0	(4)	0	7	(7)
	2	0	(2)	2	0	0	4	0	(4)	0	7	(7)
<b>Cable Car Operating Surplus / (Loss)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>691</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>83</b>
3rd Party Services Net Contribution	8	2	6	9	2	7	16	4	13	8	23	15
External Pole Work Net Contribution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	209	0	(209)
3rd Party Overhead Projects Net Contribution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sundry External Income	87	52	34	89	52	37	176	105	71	0	294	294
<b>External Activities Operating Contribution Surplus / (Loss)</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Total Company Activities Operating Contribution Surplus / (Loss)</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>907</b>	<b>1,090</b>	<b>183</b>
Administration Expenses	70	105	36	75	105	31	144	211	66	422	392	30
Revaluation of Property, Plant and Equipment										0		0
<b>Company Activities Division Operating Surplus / (Loss)</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>(53)</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>WELLINGTON CABLE CAR - TOTAL SURPLUS / (LOSS) BEFORE TAX</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>(110)</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>213</b>
Tax Expense	9	0	9	84	0	84	94	0	94	86	140	0
Subvention Payment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(54)
<b>WELLINGTON CABLE CAR - TOTAL SURPLUS / (LOSS) AFTER TAX</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>(110)</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>The Total Surplus / (Loss) After Tax Consists of:</b>												
Total Income	1,542	1,799	(257)	1,611	2,075	(463)	3,153	3,873	(720)	7,892	7,577	(415)
Total Expenditure	(1,518)	(1,908)	391	(1,394)	(1,908)	514	(2,912)	(3,817)	905	(7,720)	(7,247)	573
	24	(110)	134	217	166	51	241	56	184	172	330	159
	(0)	(0)	0	0	0	(0)	0	0	0	0	0	0





**Wellington Cable Car Limited  
Statement of Financial Position  
As at 31 December 2015**

	2016		2015	
	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>ASSETS</b>				
<b>Current Assets</b>				
Bank Accounts Total	2,761,236		1,413,791	
Inventory	593,629		594,031	
WIP	103		225,002	
Accounts Receivable less Provision	389,776		552,990	
Sundry Debtors & Prepayments	190,550		179,400	
RWT Deductions	18,108		4,608	
<b>Total Current Assets</b>		3,953,401		2,969,823
<b>Fixed Assets</b>				
Cable Car & Civil Works				
Cable Car Equipment (2%)	5,245,132		5,042,721	
Cable Car Equipment (10%)	408,629		394,259	
Cable Car Tracks & Wires	1,363,778		1,363,778	
Furniture & Fittings	61,238		61,238	
Computer Equipment	294,017		269,590	
Computer Software	177,416		127,473	
Overhead Equipment	79,506		79,506	
Overhead Wire System	461,333		461,333	
Overhead Motor Vehicles	1,033,749		1,003,933	
Fixed Asset Clearing Account	1,946,354		38,761	
Accumulated Depreciation	(2,930,142)		(2,564,063)	
<b>Total Fixed Assets</b>		8,141,010		6,278,530
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>		12,094,411		9,248,353
<b>LIABILITIES</b>				
<b>Current Liabilities</b>				
Accounts Payable	312,169		515,470	
Accruals	613,747		501,800	
Purchases Received not yet Invoiced	104,605		(9,932)	
Ostendo Clearing Account			(918)	
GST TOTAL	56,439		(22,561)	
PAYE Suspense	12,542		10,525	
Revenue received in advance				
Prebilled charges TOTAL			(93,135)	
Total Credit Card	3,936			
Current Portion of Term Liabilities				
<b>Total Current Liabilities</b>		1,103,439		901,249
<b>Non Current Liabilities</b>				
ANZ Bank Loan facility				
Provision for Income Tax	316,236		40,217	
Deferred Tax Liability	1,019,028		567,089	
Sundry Creditors	15,140			
Telecom Lease/Rentals	1,107		5,102	
<b>Total Non Current Liabilities</b>		1,351,511		612,407
<b>Ostendo Clearing Accounts</b>				
<b>Total Ostendo Clearing Accounts</b>		87		(2,090)
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES</b>		2,455,037		1,511,566
<b>NET ASSETS</b>				
		9,639,374		7,736,786
<b>SHAREHOLDER'S FUNDS</b>				
Ordinary Shares	7,434,846		7,434,846	
Retained Earnings	2,058,349		282,109	
Revaluation Reserve				
Tax on Equity items				
<b>Less: Dividend Paid</b>	(94,380)		(94,380)	
Current Year Earnings	240,560		114,212	
<b>TOTAL SHAREHOLDER'S FUNDS</b>		9,639,374		7,736,786

**Wellington Cable Car Limited**  
**Statement of Cashflows**  
**For the Period Ended 31 December 2015**

	Year Ended 30 June 2016
<b>Cash flows from operating activities</b>	
<u>Cash was received from:</u>	
Operating receipts	5,396
<u>Cash was disbursed to:</u>	
Payments to suppliers and employees	(3,737)
Payment of Tax	(6)
Subvention Payment	-
GST	(192)
Net cash inflow / (outflow) from operating activities	1,460
<b>Cash flows from investing activities</b>	
<u>Cash was received from:</u>	
Investments	-
Interest received	58
Sale of Fixed Assets	
<u>Cash was applied to:</u>	
Purchase of fixed assets	(130)
Net cash inflow / (outflow) from investing activities	(73)
<b>Cash flows from financing activities</b>	
<u>Cash was received from:</u>	
Term Loan	-
<u>Cash was applied to:</u>	
Payment of Dividend	(0)
Term Loan	-
Net cash inflow/(outflow) from financing activities	(0)
Net Increase/(decrease) in Cash held	1,387
Opening Cash Balance	1,374
Closing Cash Balance	2,761

**Wellington Cable Car Limited  
Cashflow Reconciliation Statement  
For the Period Ended 31 December 2015**

	Year Ended 30 June 2016
Net Profit/(Loss) before tax	334
<b>Add non cash items:</b>	
Movement in provision for impairment of doubtful debts	-
Depreciation	194
Impairment/revaluation	-
(Gain)/Loss on Assets sold/disused	-
	528
<b>Add / (deduct) movements in Working Capital:</b>	
(Increase) / Decrease in accounts receivable & other assets	2,033
Increase / (Decrease) in accounts payable & other accruals	(1,168)
(Increase) / Decrease in inventory	103
<b>Add / (deduct) investing activities:</b>	
Net (gain) / loss on sale of assets	-
Net (receipt) / payment interest income	(28)
Net receipt / (payment) withholding tax	(6)
Net receipt / (payment) Subvention Payment	-
Net (receipt) / payment Income Tax	
<b>Add / (deduct) Financing activities:</b>	
Net receipt / (payment) of Dividend	
Net (receipt) / payment of Finance Leases	(2)
Net cash inflow from operating activities	1,460



---

**ORAL UPDATE - JIM BENTLEY, NGAURANGA TO AIRPORT  
PROGRAMME DIRECTOR - PROGRESS ON THE N2A  
PROGRAMME**

---

**Purpose**

1. Jim Bentley, Ngauranga to Airport Programme Director, will provide the Committee an overview of where they are with progress on the N2A Programme, the set-up of our four workstreams, the public engagement process which is currently underway, and the high level timeline they are working to.

**Recommendation**

That the Transport and Urban Development Committee:

1. Receive the information.

**Attachments**

Nil

Author	Antoinette Bliss, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Geoff Swainson, Manager Transport and Waste Operations



---

## ORAL UPDATE - COUNCILLOR SWAIN, GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

---

### Purpose

1. The Committee will receive an update from Councillor Swain, Chair of The Greater Wellington Regional Council Sustainable Transport Committee.

### Summary

2. At the Wellington City Council (WCC) meeting on 26 August 2015, the Council (WCC) agreed to appoint the Chair of the Sustainable Transport Committee from Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC), as a non-voting member of the Council's Transport and Urban Development Committee.

### Recommendation

That the Transport and Urban Development Committee:

1. Receive the information.

### Discussion

3. Councillor Swain, Chair of The Greater Wellington Regional Council Sustainable Transport Committee will update the Committee on transport projects.

### Attachments

Nil

Author	Antoinette Bliss, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Anusha Guler, Acting Director Governance





---

## BUS RAPID TRANSIT FUNDING

---

### Purpose

1. The report seeks approval to re-purpose the Wellington City Council funding component for the Ngauranga to Airport Bus Rapid Transit Business Case towards the delivery of “quick wins” associated with the broader corridor objectives. The original funding approval came via recommendation of the Transport and Urban Development Committee to Council on the 5 August 2015 for Council to contribute \$375,000 (as a capital expenditure overspend) to the Bus Rapid Transit Business Case. This need has been superseded.

### Summary

2. The Ngauranga to Airport Governance Group have recommended that Wellington City Council give priority to delivering some “quick wins” which include a number of signalised intersection improvements within the Central Business District (CBD) and a reconsideration of a 30km/hr speed zone across the CBD.
3. There is no funding available in the Long-term Plan (LTP) for these activities however there is the opportunity to utilise the funding previously allocated to the Bus Rapid Transit Business Case.

### Recommendations

That the Transport and Urban Development Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Agree to the “quick wins” priority as recommended by the Ngauranga to Airport Governance Group.
3. Recommend to the Council that the previously agreed \$375,000 contribution towards the Bus Rapid Transit business case be used as the Wellington City share contribution to the implementation of the priority 1 and 2 quick wins (noting that the total cost will be \$721,000 comprising \$375,000 from WCC and \$346,000 from New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)).

### Background

4. The Ngauranga to Airport project has morphed in scope beyond originally being established to progress the implementation of Bus Rapid Transit and finding a solution to ease traffic congestion at the Basin Reserve. It now seeks to also coordinate other transport and land use planning activity within the CBD which impacts upon the transport corridor functionality. This change in scope has the potential to delay some proposed projects within the corridor but provides opportunity to accelerate others. An example of potential delay is the confirmation of cycle routes within the CBD as the route preference would be linked into the Network Operating Framework output which in turn is not due until late 2016. Examples of opportunities to accelerate work programmes also exist but subject to the caveat that these are generally outside current work programmes.
5. Using the assessment criteria below the original list of 7 activities was prioritised and recommendations were made to the Ngauranga to Airport Governance Group:

- Ability to be quickly implemented (ideally quicker than six months); and
- Low cost (less than \$0.3M); and
- Will not constrain wider N2A decisions and implementation; and
- Will deliver benefits for the users of the transport system; and
- Value for money.

The Ngauranga to Airport Governance Group has chosen to advance the following projects as “quick wins”:

- Optimise traffic signals at key locations throughout the CBD; and
- Speed limits within the CBD.

The fuller description of each of these activities is in the table below:

Priority	Description	Indicative Benefits	Current Status	Timing	Costs	Issues
1	Series of improvements that will individually cost less than \$300k. These include optimising and adding new traffic signals, and safety works on the Golden Mile.	Improving safety and access to the Golden Mile, for all modes Providing quicker, more reliable journeys in and through the city outside peak morning and evening travel times. Making it faster and safer to walk and cycle into, and around, the CBD.	Planning is complete and approximately 10% have been implemented.  WCC secured additional staff resource to manage these improvements.	Completed in the next 9 months.	Approximately \$521k funded through National Land Transport Fund by WCC/NZTA. CBD speed limits	None
2	Revisit the proposal for a 30 km/h speed limit throughout the CBD	Making walking and cycling safer. Help boost cycling as a travel mode and enhance current work to improve cycling in the city.	Proposal is ready for reconsideration	WCC officers progress proposal through usual channels.	No funding allocated but estimated to cost \$200k for signage	Consultation and Council Committee decisions required.

These projects/activities are now being recommended to Wellington City Council by the Ngauranga to Airport Governance Group for their approval and implementation.

## Discussion

6. Work on the “quick win” activities is normally undertaken as part of business as usual but funding constraints in recent past years have slowed/ halted delivery. The accelerated delivery envisaged as part of “quick wins” is not part of current business activity funding or in the 2015/2025 LTP.
7. Both of the “quick win” priorities identified will have highly visible outcomes. Priority 1 activities include improved CCTV coverage at 7 sites which will enhance responsiveness to issues on the network, will include pedestrian countdown timers at 9 sites and a number of pedestrian cancel buttons and pedestrian crossing improvements.
8. Priority 2 will lower maximum traffic speeds within the CBD to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. This may be a game changer by influencing the extent to

which additional infrastructural solutions for active mode transport needs to be considered.

9. The work is eligible for a funding contribution from NZTA. The exact mechanism for how this “out of programme” funding will be addressed is still being determined but NZTA have confirmed that their share will be made available.
10. The concept of “quick wins” is laudable from the perspective that a complete hiatus in progress on projects within the CBD and broader N2A corridor is untenable.
11. The two “quick wins” identified not only ensures some work within the CBD continues to advance but also could influence the outcomes of other projects temporarily placed on hold.

### Options

12. Approve the re-purposing of the Bus Rapid Transit Business Case funding to enable the “quick wins” as recommended by the Ngauranga to Airport Governance Group to be advanced; or
13. Not approve the re-purposing of the funding and await the completion of the coordination work being undertaken by the Ngauranga to Airport Project.

### Next Actions

14. Pending the decisions of the Transport and Urban Development Committee and Council staff will respond accordingly.
15. If funding is made available then the improvements as envisaged under priority 1 will begin immediately. The priority 2 review of the 30km/hr speed limit will also commence immediately with an implementation plan being developed and presented to the Transport and Urban Development Committee as soon as possible.

### Attachments

Nil

Author	Geoff Swainson, Manager Transport and Waste Operations
Authoriser	Anthony Wilson, Chief Asset Officer

---

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### Consultation and Engagement

This report is in response to a recommendation from the Ngauranga to Airport Governance Group. Other than the membership of this group (and its constituent parties) there has been no broader consultation. There will be wider consultation around the implementation of actions resulting from the recommendations if adopted.

### Treaty of Waitangi considerations

None known.

### Financial implications

The proposal envisages a different use for funding previously made available for the Bus Rapid Transit Business Case. The original funding for \$375,000 of CAPEX and was to be "*reflected in the 2015/16 Annual Report as an capital expenditure overspend.*"

If this funding was made available for the purposes outlined in this report then the total expenditure would be \$721,000 comprising \$375,000 from WCC and \$346,000 from NZTA. Both the original project and this proposed funding use are out of the scope of the current Long Term Plan.

There will be operational costs associated with the proposed changes but it is expected that these will be absorbed within the current operational budgets.

### Policy and legislative implications

There will be the need for further council resolutions to formalise changes to speed limits and other changes to parking restrictions.

### Risks / legal

No legal risks other than the need to obtain council resolutions for enforcement purposes have been identified.

### Climate Change impact and considerations

None.

### Communications Plan

Pending the outcomes of the deliberation on this report.

---

## WELLINGTON HOUSING ACCORD - NOMINATION OF SPECIAL HOUSING AREA

---

### Purpose

1. This report seeks the Committee's agreement to recommend to the Minister of Building and Housing one Special Housing Area (SHA) in accordance with the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013 (HASHAA).

### Summary

2. The Council entered into a Housing Accord with Government in June 2014. The Accord sets targets for the number of dwellings and sections consented across the city over the five year period of the Accord.
3. Since the Accord was agreed, the Council has recommended three tranches of SHAs to the Minister, totalling 24 sites:
  - Tranche 1 - Eight sites covering the principal growth areas of the city including greenfield development in the northern growth area, central area apartment development, and medium density residential areas in Johnsonville and Kilbirnie.
  - Tranche 2 – 13 sites covering a range of opportunity sites and a mixture of greenfield, medium density and redevelopment opportunities across the city.
  - Tranche 3 – a further four sites covering infill and redevelopment opportunities across the city (note: Shelly Bay was nominated as part of Tranche 2 then amended as part of Tranche 3, for a total of 24 sites).
4. A fourth tranche is now proposed for nomination to the Minister of Building and Housing as an SHA. The proposed site is:
  - 1 Abbott Street, Ngaio – privately owned
5. In recommending this site to the Minister of Building and Housing, the Committee is not agreeing to any particular development proposal. Rather, the decision to recommend these areas is a procedural one that makes available the alternative consenting path provided by the HASHA Act. A resource consent application is still required and will be assessed in accordance with the legislation, including assessment against the relevant District Plan provisions.
6. The recommended site is zoned for residential development. The site presents an opportunity for redevelopment. A map of the proposed site is attached to this report.

### Recommendations

That the Transport and Urban Development Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Recommend to the Council that the Minister of Building and Housing approve the following special housing area and associated qualifying development criteria as identified in the Special Housing Area map:
  - a. 1 Abbott Street, Ngaio, with qualifying development criteria being 2 or more

dwellings or allotments.

3. That the Chair of the Transport and Urban Development Committee and the Chief Executive be delegated to approve any minor editorial changes to the Special Housing Area map.

## Background

7. The Council entered into a Housing Accord with Government in June 2014 in order to increase housing supply in the city, and by extension improve housing affordability.
8. The Accord outlines targets for the number of dwellings approved and sections consented across the city. The targets are as follows:

Targets – total number of dwellings and sections consented				
Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five
1000	1500	1500	1500	1500

9. The Council has since that time recommended three tranches of Special Housing Areas totalling 24 sites. These areas are now in place.
10. As part of nominating the first tranche of sites, the Council agreed to a range of assessment criteria under which future sites would be assessed for nomination as SHAs. The site proposed for nomination in this tranche has been assessed against those criteria.
11. The Council also approved a series of incentives to aid in the uptake of consenting opportunities presented by the approved SHAs. These incentives spanned a range of measures from financial to process incentives, as follows:
  - **Process incentives**
    - A one-stop-shop consent function, which will use the streamlined consenting processes under the HASHA Act; and
    - Proactive engagement with the development community, infrastructure providers and key stakeholders.
  - **Financial incentives**
    - A two year period of deferred rates increases on greenfield subdivisions in excess of 30 allotments or dwellings (from the time Council signs off the subdivision (s224(c)), or when the land is sold; and
    - Waiving of pre-application resource consent fees.
  - **Council targeted investment**
    - Some of the SHAs are in areas where the Wellington Urban Growth Plan has signalled growth will be encouraged through the provision of growth supporting infrastructure and public realm improvements.
12. Since the Accord was agreed, officers have been focused on the implementation of the Accord and monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Accord. Implementation activities have focussed on engagement with the development community, and this has led to a number of sites being nominated to the Council for consideration as SHAs. This was particularly the case for tranches two and three.

## Discussion

13. The site proposed for nomination provides a redevelopment opportunity of a site that is presently zoned for residential development.
14. Approval of this site will take the overall number of SHAs in Wellington to 25 (compared to over 100 in Auckland) and will be the final tranche of sites to be recommended to the Minister given the impending expiry of the relevant legislation, discussed below.
15. The proposed site is:

Site	Description
1 Abbott Street, Ngaio	Approxiamtely 1800m <sup>2</sup> site zoned Outer Residential. The site contains a number of existing buildings including the former All Saints Church building and neighbouring vicarage.

### *Consistency with the Wellington Housing Accord*

16. The site proposed for nomination is consistent with the Housing Accord's aim of increasing housing supply. The site would provide a redevelopment opportunity within the existing urban footprint of the city, thereby also achieving the Council's general policy aim of urban containment.

### *Consistency with the District Plan*

17. The site is zoned Outer Residential. The residential development of the site is therefore consistent with the District Plan policy intention, as confirmed by its zoning.
18. The site contains site specific controls relating to the heritage listed church building located on it. Recommendation of the site as an SHA does not approve a development proposal, nor signal that a development proposal would ultimately be approved. Where a site such as this is subject to a particular District Plan provision (such as a heritage listing), this provision will be taken into account, as it would normally be, in considering any future resource consent application.

### *Infrastructure availability*

19. Comments were sought on the availability of three waters infrastructure for the site. Wellington Water Ltd (WWL) have advised that in respect of water and wastewater, there are no known supply or capacity issues. In respect of stormwater, WWL advise that there are network capacity issues which would need to be addressed at the resource consent stage.

### *Landowner and Iwi views*

20. The landowner is supportive of the site being nominated as an SHA. The site is not known to have any particular significance to iwi, is not a site identified in the District Plan as a 'Maori Site' nor is it located within a 'Maori Precinct' as identified in the District Plan.

### *Demand for Housing*

21. Ongoing demand for housing exists within the present urban area of the city, with a moderate rate of growth evident. The proposed site could cater for redevelopment in a manner consistent with the surrounding Outer Residential zoning,



*Qualifying Development Criteria*

22. Qualifying development criteria relate to the number of dwellings/sections required within each Special Housing Area for a development to be able to progress under the HASHA Act. The recommended criteria for this proposed Special Housing Area is consistent with previous Council decisions on Tranches 1-3 for redevelopment/infill sites of 2 or more.

**Communication and Engagement**

23. Officers have consulted with the landowners of the site proposed for nomination in preparing this report.
24. No consultation beyond that undertaken with landowners is proposed as part of recommending this site. Officers have consulted staff from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and WWL in preparing this paper.
25. A Communications Plan for the Housing Accord was prepared in 2014 following the signing of the Accord. A press release will be issued following the nomination of this fourth tranche of sites to the Minister of Building and Housing.

**Next Actions**

26. Following the nomination of this fourth tranche to the Minister of Building and Housing, officers will continue to focus on implementing the existing SHAs and ongoing monitoring and reporting.
27. The Committee should note that the HASHA Act contains a sunset clause that means SHAs expire in September 2016. The practical implication of this, is that resource consent applications for developments within an SHA must be lodged with Council by that time.
28. Officers intend to bring the Housing Accord monitoring report for the first half of the 2015/2016 financial year to the next TUD Committee meeting in April.

**Attachments**

- Attachment 1. Aerial Map - All Saints Church, 1 Abbot St, Ngaio Page 34  
Attachment 2. Zoning Map - All Saints Church, 1 Abbott St, Ngaio Page 35

Authors	Mitch Lewandowski, Principal Advisor Planning John McSweeney, Principal Advisor Planning
Authoriser	Anthony Wilson, Chief Asset Officer



---

## **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

### **Consultation and Engagement**

Officers have consulted with the landowner of the site proposed for nomination, along with officials from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, and Wellington Water.

### **Treaty of Waitangi considerations**

There are no known implications.

### **Financial implications**

There are no known implications.

### **Policy and legislative implications**

Council has signed a Housing Accord with the Crown. The Special Housing Area recommended for approval will need to be approved by the Minister of Building and Housing, and Cabinet, before being gazetted and included as a schedule to the Housing Accord and Special Housing Areas Act as Special Housing Areas.

### **Risks / legal**

There are no known risks or legal implications from the recommendation of this site as a Special Housing Area.

### **Climate Change impact and considerations**

The proposed Special Housing Area provides for a redevelopment opportunity of site within the existing urban footprint in a site zoned for residential development. This would support the Council's policy of general urban containment. Promoting a compact urban form reduces the consumption of fossil fuels and harmful greenhouse gas emissions which result in negative climate change impacts.

### **Communications Plan**

A Communications Plan has been prepared for the implementation of the Housing Accord. A press-release will follow the recommendation of this site to the Minister of Building and Housing as a Special Housing Area.









---

## UPDATE ON HOUSING CHOICE AND SUPPLY PROJECT AND NEXT ACTIONS

---

### Purpose

1. This report provides an update on recent community consultation regarding medium density housing and seeks Committee approval to revise the priorities associated with the work programme for the Housing Choice and Supply project.

### Summary

2. Community consultation was recently undertaken in Tawa, Karori, Khandallah, Island Bay and Newlands.
3. Issues raised during consultation by the respective communities has identified a need for further community engagement and investigation, particularly in Karori, Khandallah and Island Bay, before progressing further in these suburbs.
4. It is proposed to move forward with the project in Tawa and Newlands and undertake further targeted engagement with the communities of Karori, Khandallah, and Island Bay.

### Recommendations

That the Transport and Urban Development Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Agree that officers will undertake further medium-density housing investigations in Newlands, with a view to undertaking consultation for a Draft District Plan Change in mid-2016.
3. Agree that officers will continue to prepare a Plan Change proposal for Tawa and Newlands for public notification at the end of 2016.
4. Agree that officers continue with additional targeted engagement with the Khandallah, Island Bay and Karori communities on options for medium-density housing and town centre planning.

### Background

5. Housing supply is a national issue, particularly for large cities. The Wellington Urban Growth Plan highlights housing choice and supply as a key issue, noting there is a need for approximately 21,400 more dwellings in the next 30 years. The other key driver for greater housing choice is the increasing diversity of household composition and a significant growth in one and two person households. More people are looking for new, smaller, low maintenance, energy efficient homes. The current housing stock is not diverse enough to meet these changing needs.
6. Medium density housing has been identified as one way of expanding housing choice options in our suburbs. Medium Density Residential Area zones already apply in Johnsonville and Kilbirnie.
7. Initial consultation (phase 1) was undertaken in March and April 2015 in the Tawa and Karori communities. The initial consultation sought feedback on where a medium

density residential area could occur in each of these suburbs and the planning provisions that could apply. Following this feedback, a draft Plan Change was prepared. A further phase of consultation (phase 2) on the Draft District Plan Change was undertaken in November-December 2015 with the Tawa and Karori communities. This specifically targeted feedback on a draft boundary and provisions that could apply to proposed medium-density housing zone in these suburbs.

8. At the September 2015 TUD meeting, it was resolved that officers would initiate consultation (phase 1) with the Khandallah, Island Bay and Newlands communities on options for greater housing choice in those suburbs. As with Tawa and Karori earlier in the year, this phase of consultation sought feedback on where a medium density residential area could occur in each of these suburbs and the planning provisions that might apply. Consultation also sought feedback around the commercial centres in Khandallah and Island Bay as part of the Town Centres planning project. A Town Centre Plan is already in place for Newlands.
9. The latest consultation exercise (both phase 1 and phase 2) has identified some concerns within the various communities that require further consideration and investigation before advancing further with a plan change process concurrently across all of the identified suburbs. It is also evident that additional engagement is required with the respective communities before progressing further.
10. It is proposed to prioritise resources in two suburbs, while building upon previous community engagement across all five suburbs.

## Discussion

### Summary of feedback from Oct-Dec 2016 consultation

11. Officers spent three days at 'drop-in' centres in each community, which were followed by an evening community meeting. Information about the projects was provided via a public mail out, social media, and the Council's website pages were updated over the course of the consultation period to include more information about the proposed changes and other supporting material.
12. Written feedback was also sought – brief summaries are provided below.

#### *Feedback from Phase One consultation with Khandallah, Island Bay and Newlands Communities*

13. Many submitters understood the need to provide greater housing choice due to the increasing diversity of households. However concerns were raised about:
  - The existing suburban infrastructure (particularly roading) and whether this is adequate to accommodate growth;
  - The impact on character and residential amenity; and
  - Achieving good quality design
- **KHANDALLAH** - in general, submitters were concerned with the prospect of medium-density housing being introduced primarily due to loss of existing character, lack of infrastructure capacity, and/or a perceived low demand for medium-density housing in Khandallah. Many submitters did, however, acknowledge that additional housing choice and supply is a matter that needs addressing and suggested that this could be delivered in an alternative format to medium-density housing.

- **ISLAND BAY** - submitters were generally evenly split between those who support and those who oppose introducing medium-density housing in Island Bay. Where support was noted, it was generally to locate this near the town centre and/or along public transport routes. Many submitters were concerned about the impact on the local character of Island Bay and existing residential amenity levels. It is apparent that residents in Island Bay are feeling the effects of a number of Council projects occurring simultaneously.
- **NEWLANDS** – submitters were evenly split between those who support and those who oppose introducing medium-density housing in Newlands. Submitters were concerned with how medium density housing would affect residential character and current amenity levels. They also questioned the impact additional traffic would have on existing traffic flows along Newlands Road. Consultation was not undertaken on the Town Centre plan as the Newlands Centre Plan was adopted in 2009 and recent upgrade works have occurred in and around the Newlands Centre.

*Feedback from Phase Two consultation with Karori and Tawa Communities*

14. Officers developed a draft District Plan Change that was influenced strongly by the initial feedback received from the communities of Tawa and Karori in March/April 2015. The second phase of consultation focused primarily on the following:
- MDRA zone showing a proposed boundary
  - the building standards that control development in the new residential zone
  - changes to the Residential Design Guide and Objectives/Policies
- **KARORI** - Submitters requested that any formal proposal for medium density residential development be deferred until issues associated with the capacity of Karori Road have been explored and solutions identified. A preliminary transport assessment has been commissioned as a result of this feedback. It is expected that this work will help inform transport and road funding decisions for Karori Road and the town centre. There were also many constructive submissions relating to the location of the draft medium-density housing boundary, which will require further analysis.
  - **TAWA** - the majority of submitters support the proposed design standards and believe they provide enough certainty of what type of development may occur. Generally, there was equal distribution between those who consider the draft boundary is too large compared with those who consider it too constrained. A number of constructive suggestions on refining the boundary were received – often based around topography, limited access or flooding.

**Forward Programme**

*Housing Choice and Supply*

15. As shown with Council's experience with implementing the first round of Medium Density Residential Areas in Johnsonville and Kilbirnie; upzoning land in established residential suburbs can be challenging and contentious. Notwithstanding this, it is important to support new growth areas to ensure an adequate forward supply of housing opportunities.
16. Originally it was proposed to progress Tawa and Karori as the priority suburbs, which would then be followed by Newlands, Island Bay and Khandallah. However the

transport infrastructure constraints with the Town Centre planning in Karori require further investigation before advancing with the Housing Choice and Supply project. Based on feedback from the initial phase of consultation, Island Bay and Khandallah also require further investigation and focused engagement with the local communities before progressing on to the Draft Plan Change stage.

17. Therefore, Tawa and Newlands stand out as the two suburbs to progress at this time because they rate highly against the criteria, have the land capacity to support the Council's goal of increasing housing choice and supply, and are either well on the way to obtaining a Town Centre Plan or have an existing one already in place.
18. A communication and engagement plan is currently being prepared by officers to assist with ongoing engagement within each community.

#### *Town Centre Planning*

19. Community involvement for the Town Centre planning project has occurred in conjunction with the Housing Choice and Supply consultation.
20. It is proposed to temporarily suspend the town centre planning work in **Khandallah** and **Island Bay**. As resources become available, a dedicated workstream will be reinstigated. A town centre plan has already been developed for **Newlands**.
21. **Tawa**: Concepts have been developed for physical improvements around the town centre, which address issues identified during the initial consultation with businesses and the wider community. Consultation relating to these concepts was carried out with the community in November-December 2015 and officers are currently working through the feedback from this latest round of consultation.
22. It is envisaged that formal consultation will be undertaken on a Town Centre Plan for Tawa in mid-2016. Officers will update this committee prior to the commencement of formal community consultation on a Draft Town Centre Plan.
23. The Long Term Plan allocates a budget of \$1,000,000 in 2018/19 to implement works identified in the town centre plan. A request has been made by *Vibrant Tawa* to bring some of this funding forward through to the 2016/17 Annual Plan.
24. **Karori**: Discussions with key land owners and businesses are ongoing to investigate potential changes to the way the town centre operates.
25. Officers are continuing with investigations and further consultation where necessary to identify whether zone changes are needed to address the contrasting commercial zoning and land supply issue identified for the Tawa and Karori Town Centres.

#### **Priorities and Next Actions**

26. Based on the above and following the latest round of consultation, a three-tier set of priorities has been identified, with a summary of the assessment set out in Table One below.
  - Priority One Areas: Proceed now
  - Priority Two Areas: Some additional work required, proceed as resources and required information become available
  - Priority Three Areas: Some additional work required and further engagement required with the community. Proceed as resources become available.



Table One: Priorities for future medium density areas

Suburb	Priority	Explanation
Tawa (Recommended)	1	<p>Tawa rates highly against the key criteria considered necessary to support medium-density housing. In addition, the constraints are manageable and strong progress is being made with the related Town Centre planning project.</p> <p>Further investigations are ongoing regarding the capacity of the three-waters infrastructure system to cope with additional growth.</p> <p>It is proposed that a formal Plan Change be notified in late 2016 for Tawa (and Newlands).</p> <p>Progress continues with the Tawa Town Centre Planning project with officers continuing with the development of a draft town centre plan. Further community consultation will be undertaken later in 2016.</p>
Newlands (Recommended)	1	<p>The town centre in Newlands was recently upgraded and a Newlands Centre Plan is currently in place. This recent investment and strategic framework supports the continued progress with the Housing Choice and Supply project in this suburb.</p> <p>Further investigations are ongoing regarding a character assessment, the carrying capacity of Newlands Road, and ability of the three-waters infrastructure system to cope with additional growth.</p> <p>A second phase of consultation is planned for mid-2016 on a <i>draft District Plan Change</i> proposal for Newlands (i.e. identical process to that recently undertaken in Tawa and Karori. A joint Newlands and Tawa Plan Change would then be notified in late 2016.</p>
Karori	2	<p>As identified previously, Karori faces infrastructure constraints that require further investigation and continuing engagement around options with the Karori community.</p> <p>The road capacity and associated solutions will be investigated in an integrated manner with the Housing Choice and Supply Project. It is recommended that formal progress on the Housing Choice and Supply project be placed on temporary hold in Karori until resolution of the transport and roading issues. Community engagement will continue outside of the formal process.</p> <p>Work continues on the Town Centre planning project, with ongoing discussions occurring with key stakeholders.</p>
Island Bay	3	<p>Island Bay is a strong candidate for medium density housing, however, it is proposed that the Housing Choice and Supply and the Town Centre planning projects be placed on temporary hold in Island Bay to enable officers to work with the community on key infrastructure and character issues raised as part of the consultation process.</p>
Khandallah	3	<p>Similarly, it is proposed to work further with the Khandallah community to review the project's objectives and better understand the impact medium density housing would have</p>

		<p>upon the local character of Khandallah. A preliminary character assessment has been commissioned to assist with conversations moving forward.</p> <p>Accordingly, more time is required to effectively engage with the local community before advancing with a draft plan change proposal. It is anticipated that this engagement process will continue until late 2016.</p>
--	--	---

### Attachments

Nil

Author	Karen Williams, Senior Advisor Planning
Authoriser	Anthony Wilson, Chief Asset Officer

---

## **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

### **Consultation and Engagement**

This paper advises that further community consultation and engagement will be undertaken. Consultation has been undertaken in each of the suburbs, however the results of the process to-date has identified that more targeted community engagement is required moving forward.

### **Treaty of Waitangi considerations**

All District Plan work is required to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi under s8 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

### **Financial implications**

There are no financial implications associated with the recommendations in this paper. As indicated previously, funding related to growth impacts on transport and infrastructure will need to be allocated in the next LTP. Funding requirements for infrastructure in Newlands is yet to be determined.

### **Policy and legislative implications**

District Plan policy development supports the outcomes of the Wellington Urban Growth Plan.

### **Risks / legal**

This project is only at the stage of informal public consultation and there are no legal risks associated with the project at this point.

### **Climate Change impact and considerations**

The Housing Choice and Supply project seeks to provide housing choice by facilitating medium density development options in areas appropriately zoned near commercial centres and key public transport networks. Promoting a compact urban form reduces the consumption of fossil fuels and harmful greenhouse gas emissions.

### **Communications Plan**

A targeted engagement and communications plan is currently in the process of being developed. It will specifically identify an agreed communications and engagement approach for the respective communities as the project progresses.



---

## BUILT HERITAGE INCENTIVE FUND ROUND 3 (OF 3) 2015/16

---

### Purpose

1. This is the third round of the increased Built Heritage Incentive Fund (BHIF) using the eligibility and assessment criteria adopted at the April 2015 Transport and Urban Development Committee meeting.
2. This paper seeks Committee approval to allocate grants as recommended below.

### Summary

3. Eleven applications were received this round seeking funding of \$558,939.59. The original information provided through the online applications has been made available to Councillors through the Hub dashboard.
4. A total of \$274,713.00 is available for allocation in this the final round of the 2015/16 financial year. This total includes additional funds from unpaid allocations, unspent BHIF advisor salary and surplus from the 2015/16 Resource Consent Reimbursement Scheme.
5. The recommendation is that a total of \$274,600.00 is allocated to the eleven applicants in this round.
6. A summary of each of the eleven applications is outlined in Attachment One. This includes the project description, outcomes for the heritage building and commentary relating to previously allocated grants.
7. Officers are satisfied that there are no conflicts of interest involved in any of the applications.
8. Attachment Two contains the current BHIF eligibility and assessment criteria

### Recommendations

That the Transport and Urban Development Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Agree to the allocation of Built Heritage Incentive Fund Grants as recommended below.

### Background

9. The Built Heritage Incentive Fund (BHIF) is a key initiative of the Wellington Heritage Policy 2010. The policy demonstrates Council's "commitment to the city's built heritage to current owners, the community, visitors to the city and to future generations". The BHIF helps meet some of the additional costs associated with owning and caring for a heritage property.
10. During the 2012/22 Long Term Plan deliberations it was agreed that the BHIF will focus on "*on remedying earthquake prone related features or securing conservation plans / initial reports from engineers.*" As such, funding has been prioritised accordingly with 15% of the allocation going toward projects conservation projects (e.g. repairs to joinery or glazing, protective works on archaeological sites, and maintenance reports) and 85% to seismic strengthening projects annually.

11. In accordance with the current eligibility and assessment criteria the following factors are considered in determining the support of BHIF applications:
  - the risk of the heritage value diminishing if funding is not granted
  - confidence in the proposed quality of the work/professional advice
  - the project is visible and/or accessible to the public
  - the project will provide a benefit to the community.
12. Continuing on from above, consideration is then given to the following when recommending the amount of funding:
  - the value of the funding request
  - the value of the funding request when considered against the total project cost
  - parity with similar projects in previous rounds
  - equitable distribution in the current round
  - the amount of funding available for allocation.
13. There are additional allocation guidelines for conservation and seismic applications as follows:
  - For conservation, restoration, repair or maintenance works:
    - The heritage significance of the building<sup>1</sup> and the degree to which this significance will be enhance or negatively impacted by the works
    - If the building is on the Heritage New Zealand list
  - For seismic strengthening projects:
    - The heritage significance of the building<sup>2</sup> and how the works will benefit or negatively impact its heritage significance.
    - If the building is on the [Heritage New Zealand list](#).
    - If the building is on the [WCC Earthquake-prone building list](#)
    - [The](#) expiry date of a s124 Notice under the Building Act 2004.
    - [The](#) building being in one of the following focus heritage areas<sup>3</sup>: Cuba Street, Courtenay Place or Newtown shopping center heritage area.
    - Joint strengthening applications – a project that strengthens more than one attached building.
14. To ensure funds are used appropriately, conditions may be suggested in certain circumstances should funding be approved

## Discussion

15. It is recommended that:
  - Eleven applicants are allocated \$274,600.00 from the 2015/16 BHIF. The eleven eligible applications recommended for funding have provided the necessary information and meet the criteria for the fund.
16. The officer panel (consisting of Heritage, Funding, District Plan and Building Resilience officers) have assessed the eleven applications received this round against the current priority and stated criteria of the BHIF (Attachment Two). Assessment summaries are

---

<sup>1</sup> The Council has assessed all heritage buildings and a heritage inventory report is available from the Heritage Team.

<sup>2</sup> The Council has assessed all heritage buildings and a heritage inventory report is available from the Heritage Team.

<sup>3</sup> This focus is based on high numbers of earthquake-prone buildings in one heritage area as well as the levels of traffic that occur in these areas.

included at Attachment One. As agreed by all of the above teams, it is recommended that all applications be allocated funding as follows:

	<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Total Cost</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount eligible for funding</b>	<b>Amount Recommended ex GST if applicable</b>
1	The Wellington Samoan Assembly of God, 193 Rintoul Street – Structural engineers assessment	\$8600.00	\$8600.00	\$8600.00	\$8600.00
2	The Albermarle Hotel , 59 Ghuznee Street – Seismic strengthening	\$616,000.00	\$123,000.00	\$616,000.00	\$60,000.00
3	290 Willis Street – Painting, window refurbishment, reinstallation of decorative detail	\$1,600,000.00	\$47,196.00	\$47,196.00	\$24,100.00
4	The former St George's Church Vicarage, 40 Ferry Street – Seismic Strengthening and conservation	\$214,468.28	\$53,602.07	\$214,468.28	\$23,500.00
5	The former Tramway Hotel, 114 Adelaide Road – Seismic assessment and design	\$70,690.00	\$70,690.00	\$70,690.00	\$30,000.00
6	Jaycee Building, 99 Willis Street – Seismic strengthening concept design	\$28,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$28,000.00	\$10,000.00
7	The former Khandallah Automatic Telephone Exchange (KATE), 86 Khandallah Road – Conservation Plan	\$8,800.00	\$8,800.00	\$8,800.00	\$8800.00
8	T & G Building, 203 Lambton Quay – Seismic strengthening	\$585,380.33	\$100,000.00	\$400,000.00	\$70,000.00
9	The former Boys' Institute Building, 30 Arthur Street – Reconstruction of original facades investigation and	\$14,735.00	\$10,735.00	\$14,735.00	\$6,500.00

	assessment				
10	216 Cuba Street – Seismic strengthening and conservation	\$133,506.52	\$133,506.52	\$103,506.52	\$24,100.00
11	Wellington Harbour Board, 1 Queens Wharf	\$23,000.00	\$11,500.00	\$11,500.00	\$9000.00

### Financial considerations

17. The recommended allocations for this round of the BHIF are within the funding levels provided for in the 2015/16 Annual Plan.

### Long Term Plan considerations

18. The recommended allocations for this round of the BHIF are consistent with the priorities of the 2012/22 Long Term Plan.

### Options

19. The Transport and Urban Development Committee can chose to agree to the recommendations as above, or propose an alternative recommendation in accordance with Committee procedures.

### Next Actions

20. Successful applicants have 18 months to undertake the work and provide evidence of completion to Officers before the allocated funding is paid out.

### Attachments

- Attachment 1. Summary of Applications to the Built Heritage Incentive Fund 2015/16 Round 3 (of 3) Page 50
- Attachment 2. Built Heritage Incentive Fund Eligibility Criteria Page 66

Author	Vanessa Tanner, Senior Heritage Advisor
Authoriser	Warren Ulusele, Manager City Planning and Design



---

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### Consultation and Engagement

Outline the consultation that has occurred in the development of the proposal and the report taking into account the views of the CCO's, relevant external agencies, Maori and other interest groups. Include the community views on the issue. Where the known views are set out, show how the community is impacted.

N/A

### Treaty of Waitangi considerations

Example: The proposal is to be located on a site that Mana Whenua regard as important. The site is the former shoreline and waka used to moor there prior to reclamation. The Tenth Trust has been approached and considers the proposal an appropriate use of the land.

N/A

### Financial implications

- Be clear what the costs relate to. What time frame, operating and/or capital and whether it is indicative or a final cost.
- Have Finance reviewed the costs?
- Be clear if this ties the Council to future financial implications rather than none now but raises expectations that it will be funded later.
- Discuss the financial implication of the proposal – is funding within the LTP or Annual Plan, does it require a budget amendment? Are there operation cost implications. Is any funding coming from external parties. State clearly if there are no financial implications.

The recommended allocations for this round of the BHIF are within the funding levels provided for in the 2015/16 Annual Plan.

### Policy and legislative implications

Explain how these have been considered as part of the implementation.

The Built Heritage Incentive Fund (BHIF) is a key initiative of the Wellington Heritage Policy 2010.

### Risks / legal

Outline the risks and legal implications, if required.

Officers are satisfied that there are no conflicts of interest involved in any of the applications.

### Climate Change impact and considerations


N/A

### Communications Plan


Outline the communications plan, if required.

A press release is created on the day Committee makes its decision on funding allocations.

**Summary of Applications to the Built Heritage Incentive Fund 2015/16 Round 3 (of 3)**

<b>Project 1</b>	The Wellington Samoan Assembly of God - 193 Rintoul Street
<b>Applicant</b>	Assembly of God (Wellington Samoan) Trust Board
<b>Project:</b>	Structural Engineers Assessment
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$8600.00
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$8600.00
<b>Amount eligible for funding</b>	\$8600.00
<b>Recommended Grant</b> ex GST if applicable	\$8600.00
<div style="display: flex; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="flex: 1;">  </div> <div style="flex: 2; padding-left: 10px;"> <p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributes to the Berhampore Shopping Centre Heritage Area (Map Reference 6, Symbol Reference 34)</li> <li>• Built in 1900, under the aegis of the Vivian Street Baptist Church Trust Board</li> <li>• The exterior of the church has been little altered over time and corresponding high has a level of authenticity in its architecture and materials.</li> <li>• It has a distinctive double-bay entry porch, of a Gothic Revival flavour, set up above the street level, a substantial gable-roofed nave with evenly-spaced arched double-hung windows (with lead-light glazing) along the sides, and is enlivened with a modest amount of architectural trim and detail, including dentilling at the tops of the barge boards.</li> <li>• The church maintains strong support from the Samoan community.</li> </ul> </div> </div>	
<b>The Issue</b>	The floor of the building is sinking and requires repiling. The applicant proposes to seismically improve the subfloor brace to 100% NBS.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>The building is not on Council's Earthquake Prone Building List however, the project is supported from a heritage and building resilience perspective. It is noted that conservation plan has already been prepared for the building and that the Church's approach is consistent with their conservation architect's advice.</p> <p>The proposed work fits with the seismic strengthening component of the BHIF, previous grants for similar works include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$15,000 Detailed seismic assessment and design 40, Ferry Street, Seatoun July 2015 round.</li> <li>• \$10,000 Seismic strengthening detailed design and conservation plan, 287 Cuba Street October 2015 round.</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	The grant will:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this heritage building.</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated with maintaining a heritage building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional condition(s)</b>	<b>BHIF</b>	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply of the structural engineer's report to WCC for full repiling work</li> </ul>

<b>Project 2</b>	The Albermarle Hotel – 59 Ghuznee Street
<b>Applicant</b>	C & T Griffiths Family Trust
<b>Project:</b>	Seismic strengthening
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$616,000.00
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$123,000.00
<b>Amount eligible for funding</b>	\$616,000.00
<b>Recommended Grant ex GST if applicable</b>	\$60,000.00
<div style="display: flex; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="flex: 1;">  </div> <div style="flex: 2;"> <p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan Individually Listed Map Reference 16 Symbol Reference 130. Contributing to the Cuba Street Heritage Area</li> <li>• The Albemarle Private Hotel is an exuberant and eclectic example of Edwardian Classical commercial architecture.</li> <li>• The building was designed by James Bennie, a prominent local architect</li> <li>• The building has an historic association the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century Temperance Movement</li> <li>• The building is part of the social history of the Cuba, Vivien and Ghuznee Street 'red-light' district of Wellington, and the subsequent gentrification of the area.</li> <li>• The building retains significant original building fabric</li> <li>• Heritage NZ List Category II</li> </ul> </div> </div>	
<b>The Issue</b>	The building was issued a notice under section 124 of the Building Act 2004. The notice signifies that the building is earthquake prone as its seismic performance, based on engineering advice, falls below 33% of the NBS. The building's notice expired in May 2013.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	The applicant proposes to seismically strengthen the building to 70% NBS. A conservation architect is involved in the project.  The project is supported from a heritage and building resilience perspective. The proposed work fits with the seismic strengthening component of the BHIF, previous grants for similar works include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$100,000 seismic strengthening and façade retention, NZMA Building, 26 The Terrace, July 2015 round</li> <li>• \$60,000 towards seismic strengthening of 216 Cuba Street, October 2015 round.</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	The grant will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed heritage building;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribute to removing this building from the Earthquake Prone Building List.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Additional condition(s)</b></p> <p><b>BHIF</b></p>	<p>Release of funds is subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A BHIF sign to be supplied by WCC is affixed prominently to the front of the building or site throughout the duration of the works.</li> <li>Evidence that the applicant has communicated with Heritage New Zealand in regard to archaeological requirements under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, evidence that this has been undertaken must be provided to WCC before works commence.</li> <li>Project engineer sign off on completion of strengthening works</li> </ul>



<b>Project 3</b>	290 Willis Street
<b>Applicant</b>	Corner Holdings Limited
<b>Project</b>	Painting, window refurbishment, reinstatement of decorative detail
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$1,600,000.00
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$47,196.00
<b>Amount eligible for funding</b>	\$47,196.00
<b>Recommended Grant ex GST if applicable</b>	\$24,100.00

**Building Information**



- District Plan Individually Listed Building; Map 16, Symbol 255/3
- 290 Willis Street is a handsome two-storey Victorian villa that dates from c.1878, with an 'operating theatre' addition that dates from 1914. The building is notable for its elegant and symmetrical Willis Street façade and for the unusual agglomeration of additions to the sides and rear of the property that are indicative of its changing use and fortunes over the past 130 years.
- The building has had a range of uses that are representative of the history of Willis Street. It was occupied as a boarding house, a grand family residence and as a private hospital.
- The building and the two adjoining elm trees have townscape value for their location on a prominent corner at the entrance to the motorway on-ramp.


<b>The Issue</b>	The building has been uninhabited for the past 20 years and is currently in need of maintenance and refurbishment. The painting and refurbishment of heritage fabric is part of a project to convert the building to three apartments.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	The project is supported from a heritage perspective as it contributes to the conservation and adaptive reuse of this heritage building. The proposed work fits with the conservation component of the BHIF, previous grants for similar works include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$30,000 Exterior repair, plaster and painting Columbia Private Apartments 32 Cuba Street October 2015 round</li> <li>• \$20,000 repiling, roof repair, painting interior and exterior, plumbing and electrical works Holy Trinity Church Ohariu March 2015 round</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	The grant will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed building.</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated maintaining a heritage building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A BHIF sign to be supplied by WCC is affixed prominently to the front of the building or site throughout the duration of the works.</li> <li>• WCC Heritage Team's onsite approval of works.</li> </ul>

<b>Project 4</b>	Former St George's Church Vicarage - 40 Ferry Street, Seatoun
<b>Applicant</b>	Fiona Roberts
<b>Project</b>	Seismic strengthening and conservation
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$214,468.28
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$53,602.07
<b>Amount eligible for</b>	\$214,468.28
<b>Recommended Grant (ex GST if applicable)</b>	\$23,500.00
 <p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan Individually Listed Building; Map 7, Symbol 119</li> <li>• Constructed in 1924 this building makes use of the English Domestic Revival style to create the impression of an English country village vicarage.</li> <li>• The building is historically associated with Seatoun's Anglican community and the neighbouring St George's church.</li> <li>• Because of the role it has played as the vicarage for the building contributes to the identity of Seatoun's Anglican community.</li> <li>• Heritage New Zealand List Category II</li> </ul>	
<b>The Issue</b>	<p>This building is outside of the scope of WCC's Earthquake Prone Policy as such it has not been assessed by Council or listed on the Earthquake Prone Buildings list however it is a two story unreinforced masonry building considered to be a seismic risk.</p> <p>This building received funding of \$15,000 for seismic assessment and design of a seismic strengthening proposal as a result of a successful BHIF application in the July 2015 round The proposed strengthening is the next phase the applicant's project.</p>
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>The proposed work fits with the current priority of the BHIF and previous grants for similar works include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$50,000 seismic strengthening 108-111 Cuba Street March 2015 round</li> <li>• \$50,000 seismic strengthening Quaker Meeting House, 7 Moncrief St Mt Victoria, July 2015 round</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed heritage building;</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated maintaining a heritage building;</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	<p>Release of funds is subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A BHIF sign to be supplied by WCC is affixed prominently to the front of the building or site throughout the duration of the works.</li> <li>• Project engineer sign off on completion of strengthening works</li> </ul>



<b>Project 5</b>	The Former Tramway Hotel -114 Adelaide Road
<b>Applicant</b>	IPG Hotels Limited
<b>Project</b>	Seismic assessment and seismic strengthening design
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$70,690.00
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$70,690.00
<b>Amount eligible for</b>	\$70,690.00
<b>Recommended Grant (ex GST if applicable)</b>	\$30,000.00
	<p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan Individually Listed Map 6, Symbol 397</li> <li>• The building is a rare surviving example of typical late Victorian Hotel</li> <li>• The building occupies a prominent corner site and the scale, form and visual interest of the building's exterior detail contrast with the commercial and industrial buildings on Adelaide Road. The building provides a transition between the commercial development in Adelaide Road and the period housing in Drummond Street.</li> <li>• The building has a long history as a local hotel and has some historic value for its association with liquor licensing laws, and with the recent gentrification of Newtown.</li> </ul>
<b>The Issue</b>	The building was issued a notice under section 124 of the Building Act 2004. The notice signifies that the building is earthquake prone as its seismic performance, based on engineering advice, falls below 33% of the NBS. The building's notice expired in December 2013.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	The project is supported from a heritage and building resilience perspective. The proposed work fits with the seismic strengthening component of the BHIF, previous grants for similar works include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$30,000 Seismic engineering assessment Former BNZ, 79 Manners Street, March 2014 round</li> <li>• \$15,000 Seismic strengthening detailed design Wellington Trades Hall Incorporated, 124 Vivian Street October 2015 round</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	The grant will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge the heritage values of this individually listed heritage building;</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated with maintaining heritage buildings.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply of engineering and assessment reports and detailed design to WCC</li> </ul>



<b>Project 6</b>	Jaycee Building – 99 Willis Street
<b>Applicant</b>	Jim Viatos Family Trust
<b>Project</b>	Seismic strengthening concept design
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$28,000.00
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$20,000.00
<b>Amount eligible for</b>	\$28,000.00
<b>Recommended Grant (ex GST if applicable)</b>	\$10,000.00
 <p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan Individually Listed Map 17, Symbol 347</li> <li>• The Jaycee Building is a 1920s concrete framed commercial building and has aesthetic value for the unusual, lively and eclectic arrangement of Classical decorative elements on the Willis Street façade.</li> <li>• The Jaycee Building has aesthetic value for its role in the townscape, defining the eastern side of Willis Street and being seen in association with a number of other heritage buildings at a nodal point on Wellington's Golden Mile - the intersection of Willis, Manners and Boulcott Streets.</li> <li>• The building has historic value for the period when it was occupied by the Jaycees, a significant but relatively low profile community group.</li> <li>• There are technical values in the reinforced concrete structure of the building, for which engineering drawings still exist.</li> </ul>	
<b>The Issue</b>	<p>The building was issued a notice under section 124 of the Building Act 2004. The notice signifies that the building is earthquake prone as its seismic performance, based on engineering advice, falls below 33% of the NBS.</p> <p>This building received funding of \$10,000 for seismic assessment as a result of a successful BHIF application in the March 2015. The proposed concept design is the second phase of the applicant's project.</p>
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>The proposed work fits with the current priority of the BHIF and previous grants for similar works include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$15,000 towards seismic assessment and design 251-255 Cuba Street March 2015 round</li> <li>• \$15,000 Seismic strengthening detailed design Wellington Trades Hall Incorporated, 124 Vivian Street October 2015 round</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge the heritage value of the individually listed building</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated with maintaining</li> </ul>

	heritage buildings.
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Copies of seismic designs for 34-45%NBS and 67% NBS</li> </ul>

<b>Project 7</b>	86 Khandallah Road, Ngaio – The former Khandallah Automatic Telephone Exchange (KATE)
<b>Applicant</b>	Onslow Historical Society
<b>Project</b>	Conservation Plan
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$8800.00
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$8800.00
<b>Amount eligible for funding</b>	\$8800.00
<b>Recommended Grant</b> ex GST if applicable	\$8800.00




**Building Information**

- District Plan Individually Listed Building; Map 21, Symbol 177
- The former Khandallah Automatic Telephone Exchange (KATE) is a good representative example of a functional, utilitarian public building with a well-designed decorative façade. It was designed by the offices of the Government Architect, John Campbell.
- The building is the second oldest surviving automatic telephone exchange in New Zealand, and is the only remaining automatic exchange in substantially original condition. Given the importance of the telephone in the development of communications from the 1880s to the present day, this building has high historic value.
- The building is held in high public esteem by the local community and this can be seen by the efforts of the Onslow Historical Society to obtain and maintain the building after it was scheduled for demolition.
- Heritage New Zealand Listed Category I

<b>The Issue</b>	Repairs and maintenance work is required to be undertaken on K.A.T.E to conserve the building. A conservation plan will identify and prioritise that work for the Onslow Historical Society and assist them in the management and care of the building.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	This is the first step to managing a historic building and considered best practice. The proposal fits with the conservation component of the BHIF, previous grants for similar works include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$6,500 Wesley Church, 75 Taranaki Street Conservation Plan August 2014 round.</li> <li>• \$10,000 287 Cuba Street Seismic strengthening detailed design and conservation plan October 2015 round</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	The grant will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed</li> </ul>




	<p>heritage building;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledge the additional costs associated maintaining a heritage building;</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	<p>Release of funds is subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply of the conservation plan to WCC</li> </ul>


<b>Project 8</b>	T & G Building, 28 Grey Street, 203 Lambton Quay
<b>Applicant</b>	Mark's Folly Limited
<b>Project</b>	Seismic Strengthening
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$585,380.33
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$100,000.00
<b>Amount eligible for</b>	\$400,000.00
<b>Recommended Grant (ex GST if applicable)</b>	\$70,000.00
 <p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan Individually Listed Map 1, Symbol 185</li> <li>• The building is aesthetically significant for its bold, sculptural facade, a crucial element in the Lambton Quay streetscape, and perhaps the best example in the city of the Chicago style.</li> <li>• The architectural style of the building was developed for T&amp;G Mutual Assurance as a distinct 'house-style' by the architectural practice of A&amp;K Henderson. The building has value as part of a group of T&amp;G Mutual Assurance buildings located across Australasia.</li> <li>• The building has historic value for its association with T&amp;G Mutual Assurance, one of the biggest and most successful insurance companies in Australasian history.</li> <li>• The building is in largely authentic condition, particularly on its exterior and in significant interior spaces such as the main foyer. The building is a rare surviving example of a head office building from the first half of the 20th century in the CBD of Wellington</li> <li>• Heritage New Zealand Listed Category I</li> </ul>	
<b>The Issue</b>	The building was issued a notice under section 124 of the Building Act 2004. The notice signifies that the building is earthquake prone as its seismic performance, based on engineering advice, falls below 33% of the NBS.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>The owner has accepted the Environment Court ruling that the building may not be demolished and is now undertaking seismic strengthening and restoration of the building. The applicant intends to engage a conservation architect in the project.</p> <p>The project is supported from a heritage and building resilience perspective. The proposed work fits with the seismic strengthening component of the BHIF, previous grants for similar works include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$100,000 seismic strengthening and façade retention, NZMA Building, 26 The Terrace, July 2015 round</li> <li>• \$60,000 towards seismic strengthening of 216 Cuba Street, October 2015 round.</li> </ul>

---


<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	The grant will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated with maintaining heritage buildings.</li><li>• Contribute to removing this building from the Earthquake Prone Building List.</li></ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A BHIF sign to be supplied by WCC is affixed prominently to the front of the building or site throughout the duration of the works.</li><li>• Conservation architect input, assessment and endorsement of the proposal</li></ul>

<b>Project 9</b>	Former Boys' Institute Building – 30 Arthur Street
<b>Applicant</b>	Phoenix Estates Limited
<b>Project</b>	Reconstruction of original facades investigation and assessment
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$14,735.00
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$10,735.00
<b>Amount eligible for</b>	\$14,735.00
<b>Recommended Grant (ex GST if applicable)</b>	\$6,500.00
 <p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan Individually Listed Map 16 Symbol 17</li> <li>• Built in 1906, the building is architecturally unusual in that it features a mixture of Edwardian Revivalism, Stripped Classicism and Gothic styles.</li> <li>• The building is historically associated with the Wellington Boys' Institute, an interdenominational charity movement which sought to assist working class boys in their spiritual, physical and mental development.</li> <li>• The building is the only remaining structure on the north side of Arthur Street and acts a reminder of how the street once looked prior to the development of the 2005 Inner City Bypass.</li> </ul>	
<b>The Issue</b>	The building was modified sometime between 1934 and 1958 and gables removed. The current owner wishes to investigate the possibility of reinstating the gables or some form of them to represent the building's original design.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	The proposal to reconstruct lost architectural detail from this building may or may not be an appropriate response to the building's conservation and interpretation. An investigation by a heritage expert is an important first stage in establishing the appropriate conservation outcome for this building and is supported from a heritage perspective and fits the conservation component of the BHIF.
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	The grant will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise the heritage values of this individually listed heritage building</li> <li>• Determine whether reconstruction is an appropriate response to this heritage building</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports supplied to WCC</li> </ul>



<b>Project 10</b>	216 Cuba Street
<b>Applicant</b>	The Red Raspberry Company Ltd
<b>Project</b>	Seismic Strengthening and conservation
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$133,506.52
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$103,506.52
<b>Amount eligible for</b>	\$103,506.52
<b>Recommended Grant (ex GST if applicable)</b>	\$24,100.00
<b>Building Information</b>	
 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan Individually Listed Map 16, Symbol 90. Contributing to the Cuba Street Heritage Area</li> <li>• Designed by Young and Fearn and built in 1921, this two-storey Stripped Classical masonry building is representative of the architecture and history found in Cuba Street</li> <li>• Despite some unsympathetic changes over the years the building remains largely unchanged, it is an important part of the local streetscape, it makes an important contribution to the character of the area, and it has relatively high heritage value.</li> <li>• Heritage New Zealand Listed Category II</li> </ul>	
<b>The Issue</b>	<p>The building was issued a notice under section 124 of the Building Act 2004. The notice signifies that the building is earthquake prone as its seismic performance, based on engineering advice, falls below 33% of the NBS.</p> <p>This building received funding of \$6,956.52 for seismic assessment as a result of a successful BHIF application in the October 2013 round and a further \$60,000 was allocated for seismic strengthening in the October 2015 round.</p>
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>As a result of seismically strengthening the building to 70% NBS the shop front is required to be replaced. The applicant proposes to recreate and repair the original shop front. The proposed project has the involvement of a conservation architect and is supported from a heritage perspective. In the October 2015 round officers considered that the seismic strengthening of the building should be prioritised for funding in that round and Officers recommended that the applicant apply to a subsequent round. This is the final stage of the applicant's strengthening and conservation project.</p>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed heritage building;</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated with maintaining heritage buildings</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF</b>	Release of funds is subject to:

condition(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A BHIF sign to be supplied by WCC is affixed prominently to the front of the building or site throughout the duration of the works.</li><li>• Project architect sign off on completion of works</li></ul>
--------------	---

<b>Project 11</b>	Wellington Harbour Board Shed 7 – 1 Queens Wharf
<b>Applicant</b>	Wharf Offices
<b>Project</b>	Investigation for roof repair
<b>Total project cost</b>	\$23,000.00
<b>Amount requested</b>	\$11,500.00
<b>Amount eligible for</b>	\$23,000.00
<b>Recommended Grant (ex GST if applicable)</b>	\$9,000.00
	 <p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan Individually Listed Map 17, Symbol 161</li> <li>• Shed 7 is a particularly fine example of a Harbourboard office building / warehouse that was designed by prominent local architect Frederick de Jersey Clere. The building is notable for the regularity of its facades, and the controlled and skilful use of Classical details and ornamentation; most particularly the oriel window to the south west corner.</li> <li>• The building is a local landmark that runs along the western boundary between the harbour and city. It has group value as one of a pair of buildings, designed by Clere, that flank the entrance gates to Queen's wharf, and contributes to the Post Office Square Heritage Area.</li> <li>• The building has a strong historical association with the Wellington Harbour Board and housed the wharfinger's office and a woolstore.</li> <li>• Heritage NZ List Category I</li> </ul>
<b>The Issue</b>	In the past 18 months the existing butynol roof has been leaking. The Bodycorp propose to commission an architectural and engineering investigation and remediation report on the issue.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	Maintaining the building in a watertight condition is critical for its conservation and continued use. The proposal to investigate the leaking roof is consistent with the conservation component of the BHIF previous grants for similar works include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$20,000 Repiling, roof repair, painting interior and exterior, plumbing and electrical works Holy Trinity Church Ohariu March 2015 round.</li> <li>• \$20,000 Repair and reclad 260 Riddiford Street October 2015 round</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	The grant will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed heritage building;</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated with maintaining heritage buildings</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report to be supplied to WCC</li> </ul>

---

## **Built Heritage Incentive Fund**

### **Eligibility Criteria**

Criteria 1 to 5 must be met or the application will not be accepted. If any of criteria 6 to 8 are not met, we may not accept the application, or alternatively any funding allocation will be conditional on meeting these criteria.

The eligibility criteria are:

1. The application relates to a heritage-listed building or object, or a building identified as contributing to a listed heritage area. See the Wellington City District Plan [heritage listed areas, buildings and objects](#).
2. The applicant is the owner or part-owner of the heritage building or object. This includes a private owners, body corporates, charitable trusts or church organisations. If an application is from a body corporate or a trust, we need evidence that all relevant members approve of the project. The Crown, Crown entities, district health boards, community boards, Council-controlled organisations and Council business units are not eligible.
3. The planned work aims to physically improve the building's structural integrity, public access, safety or historic aesthetic.
4. The works applied for have not started prior to the Council Committee decision on the application.
5. The application includes at least one recent (within three months from fund round closing date) quote or estimate from a registered builder or recognised professional and relates directly to the work applied for. For quotes or estimates relating to a larger project, or including work not relating to heritage conservation work, the quote must identify the heritage component cost. If the invoiced amounts are significantly different from the original estimated costs or relate to work that was not applied for, the Council will revise your payment accordingly.
6. The application demonstrates the work will conserve and enhance the building or object's heritage significance. If your project is likely to impact heritage elements of the building, we need you to work with a recognised conservation architect to ensure the works maintain and enhance the building or object's heritage significance. See assessment guideline 1 for further information on this.

- 
7. The application includes evidence that the owner of the property can meet the full project costs. Typically this evidence will be in the form of financial documents such as audited accounts or bank statements.
  
  8. The application does not relate to a building, object, or part of a building or object that has an unclaimed or not yet finalised funding agreement under the Built Heritage Incentive Fund.



---

## Assessment Guideline

### How we assess applications

Here are our primary assessment principles so you can make the best application you can. We strongly encourage you to contact Council's heritage team on 4994444 or [heritage@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:heritage@wcc.govt.nz) to get advice about how best to approach your project or application.

1. Our three primary assessment guidelines are: The project maintains and enhances the building or object's heritage significance. To achieve this, you will need to work with a recognised conservation architect. The Council will determine which category the work fits in.

Here is how the conservation architect requirement works:

- If the work is for the design phase of a seismic strengthening project, or for invasive testing as part of a detailed seismic investigation, the funding application can include quotes or estimates for advice from a recognised conservation architect once the project begins.
  - If the project is for construction works (including seismic works), conservation or large scale restoration works, you must send us advice from a recognised conservation architect as part of your application.
  - If the project is for a detailed seismic investigation that requires no invasive testing, or for a small repair, maintenance or restoration project, or for another project that avoids any effects on the heritage elements of the building, advice from a recognised conservation architect will not be required.
2. The project aims to remedy a seismic risk to the public and maintain the building's heritage significance and/ or its contribution to the heritage area. This includes:
    - Buildings on the [WCC Earthquake-prone building list](#)
    - The building has high-risk features that pose a threat to the public. These are architectural features, such as chimneys, veneers, gables, canopies, verandahs, pediments, parapets and other exterior ornamentation, water tanks, tower-like appendages, fire escapes, lift wells, facades, plaster, and other heavy renders that a seismic engineer identifies as posing a risk to the public.
  3. Evidence that the projected costs are as accurate as possible and Council has a high degree of confidence the building owner is willing to, and financially capable of proceeding with the project. See eligibility criterion 4 above.

---

## How we allocate funding

For all applications, when allocating funding we consider:

- The risk of the heritage value diminishing if funding is not granted
- Confidence in the quality of the proposed work
- The project is visible and/or accessible to the public
- The project will provide a benefit to the community
- The value of the funding request
- The value of the funding request when considered against the total project cost
- Parity with similar projects in previous rounds
- Equitable distribution in the current round
- The amount of funding available for allocation.

There are additional allocation guidelines for conservation and seismic applications.

### Conservation applications

When deciding allocations for conservation, restoration, repair or maintenance works, we use the above guidelines and also consider:

- The heritage significance of the building<sup>4</sup> and the degree to which this significance will be enhanced or negatively impacted by the works
- If the building is on the [Heritage New Zealand list](#)

### Seismic strengthening applications

When deciding allocations for projects aiming to remedy seismic risk, we consider the above guidelines and:

- The heritage significance of the building<sup>5</sup> and how the works will benefit or negatively impact its heritage significance.
- If the building is on the [Heritage New Zealand list](#).
- If the building is on the [WCC Earthquake-prone building list](#).
- The expiry date of a s124 Notice under the Building Act 2004.
- The building being in one of the following focus heritage areas<sup>6</sup>: Cuba Street, Courtenay Place or Newtown shopping centre heritage area.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Council has assessed all heritage buildings and a heritage inventory report is available from the Heritage Team.

<sup>5</sup> The Council has assessed all heritage buildings and a heritage inventory report is available from the Heritage Team.

<sup>6</sup> This focus is based on high numbers of earthquake-prone buildings in one heritage area as well as the levels of traffic that occur in these areas.



- Joint strengthening applications – a project that strengthens more than one attached building.
- The building's 'Importance Level' (IL) as defined by Australian and New Zealand Structural Design Standard AS/NZS1170.0 or any revision of this standard.
- The location of the building to a 'strategic route' as defined by all roads marked in colour on [District Plan Maps 33 & 34](#).

### **If you are allocated a grant**

Once you have been allocated a grant by the Council Committee you have 18-months to complete works and submit an 'accountability' application in the online funding portal in order to get paid out.

Attach all invoices, reports and other information relating to the project. The submission must include funding agreement conditions, such as a site visit by WCC heritage advisor. If the invoiced amounts are significantly different from the original estimated costs or relate to work that was not applied for, the Council will revise your payment accordingly. The Council will pay the grant into your bank account once all information is received. We prefer to pay full and final payments, however we may agree on a part payment if a project has stalled for an acceptable reason.

---

## FORWARD PROGRAMME - APRIL 2016 TO SEPTEMBER 2016

---

### Purpose

1. To present the Transport and Urban Development Committee with the forward programme, outlining the papers that will be considered by the Committee for the remainder of the year.

### Recommendation

That the Transport and Urban Development Committee:

1. Receive the information.

### Background

2. The Transport and Urban Development Committee forward programme reflects the policy work streams for the Committee as prioritised by the Governance, Finance and Planning Committee (under its delegations) at its meeting held on 11 June 2015. This forward programme also includes operational / “business-as-usual” work requiring decisions in accordance with the delegations of the Transport and Urban Development Committee.

### Discussion

3. The Transport and Urban Development Committee Forward Programme will be presented to each meeting of the Committee.
4. It should be noted that the forward programme as presented in Attachment 1 may be subject to change and that there is the flexibility to respond to any opportunities and obligations that may arise during the next 6 months and as such, any changes will require the removal or re-prioritisation of other items.

### Attachments

Attachment 1. Transport and Urban Development Committee Forward Programme

Page 72

Author	Antoinette Bliss, Governance Advisor
Authoriser	Anusha Guler, Acting Director Governance

Transport and Urban Development Committee Forward Programme

**Thursday, 14 April 2016**

Report Title	Description
Epetition	Installation of Judder Bars or similar strategy on Monorgan Rd
Traffic Resolutions	31 Traffic Resolutions
Oral Update Councillor Swain	Councillor Swain provides update on GWRC transport projects each meeting
Forward Programme	Work programme end of September 2016
Car Sharing Policy	Report back on Consultation
Enhancing our sense of place through Street Signs	Report back as per TUD resolutions 4 February 2016 meeting.

**Thursday, 19 May 2016**

Report Title	Description
Oral Update Councillor Swain	Councillor Swain provides update on GWRC transport projects each meeting
Forward Programme	Work programme end of September 2016
Hutt Road Cycle Path and other Transport Improvements.	Officers will report on the results of the consultation to make improvements to the Hutt road for Pedestrians, Public Transport and those on Bikes, Committee will be asked to approve construction and give approval to the traffic resolutions that will give effect to the scheme.

**Thursday, 16 June 2016**

Report Title	Description
Traffic Resolutions	Variety of traffic and parking restrictions.
Oral Update Councillor Swain	Councillor Swain provides update on GWRC transport projects each meeting
Forward Programme	Work programme end of September 2016

**Thursday, 11 August 2016**

Report Title	Description
Oral Update Councillor Swain	Councillor Swain provides update on GWRC transport projects each meeting
Built Heritage Incentive Fund	Grants Round
Forward Programme	Work programme end of September 2016

**Thursday, 15 September 2016**

<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Description</b>
Traffic Resolutions	Variety of traffic and parking restrictions.
Built Heritage Incentive Fund- August 2016	Recommendations for the Built Heritage Incentive Fund- closing date 19 August 2016.
Oral Update Councillor Swain	Councillor Swain provides update on GWRC transport projects each meeting
Forward Programme	Work programme end of September 2016