

HUTT CITY COUNCILKOMITI RATONGA RANGATŌPŪ ME TE RAUTAKI  
POLICY, FINANCE AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held in the Council Chambers, 2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road,  
Lower Hutt on

Tuesday 9 July 2024 commencing at 2:00 pm

---

**PRESENT:** Cr A Mitchell (Chair) Mayor C Barry  
Cr K Brown Cr B Dyer  
Cr Edwards Deputy Mayor T Lewis (Deputy Chair)  
Cr K Morgan Cr C Parkin  
Cr T Stallinger

**APOLOGIES:** There were no apologies.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** J Miller, Chief Executive  
J Griffiths, Director Strategy and Planning  
A Geddes, Director Environment and Sustainability  
B Cato, Chief Legal Officer (part meeting)  
J Kingsbury, Director Economy and Development  
J Livschitz, Group Chief Financial Officer  
W Botha, Acting Head of Policy and Strategy (part meeting)  
A Gordon, Senior Policy Advisor  
D Bentley, Environmental Health Manager (part meeting)  
J Kilty, Democracy Advisor

PUBLIC BUSINESS**1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA TIMATANGA**

Whakataka te hau ki te uru  
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga  
Kia mākinakina ki uta  
Kia mātaratara ki tai  
E hī ake ana te atakura  
He tio, he huka, he hau hū  
Tihei mauri ora.

*Cease the winds from the west  
Cease the winds from the south  
Let the breeze blow over the land  
Let the breeze blow over the ocean  
Let the red-tipped dawn come with a sharpened  
A touch of frost, a promise of a glorious day.*

**2. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies.

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no public comment.

4. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS**

There were no interest declarations.

5. **RECOMMENDATION TO TE KAUNIHERA O TE AWA KAIRANGI |  
COUNCIL - 25 JULY 2024**

Approval to consult on the Control of Alcohol in Public Places Bylaw

The Senior Policy Advisor elaborated on the report.

In response to questions from members, the Senior Policy Advisor provided the following advice:

- people are allowed to transport alcohol through alcohol-free zones (AFZs).
- the Control of Alcohol in Public Places Bylaw (the bylaw) had a lifespan of five years from its adoption by Council, with an additional two-year review period. The bylaw was not reviewed within this timeframe, so it was automatically revoked.
- key stakeholders, including the Police, were consulted, and the Police requested no new areas for AFZs.
- the establishment of AFZs required evidence of apparent alcohol-related crime and disorder, which posed challenges for adding AFZs in some areas. Alcohol policies could be used to address issues in these areas.
- officers focused on engagement and were open to discussing a proposal to add an AFZ in Korokoro.
- the Police were the main source of information regarding alcohol-related issues and public disorder and played a crucial role in determining the location of AFZs.
- implementing an AFZ without Police indication of a high rate of alcohol-related crimes was challenging.
- implementing an AFZ without Police indication that there was a high rate of alcohol-related crimes was difficult.
- there was consultation with Mana Whenua.

In response to a question by a member, the Environmental Health Manager clarified that the AFZs would only be applicable in public areas, even where the map indicated they covered residential developments.

In response to a member's question, the Senior Policy Advisor noted that the Police's lack of evidence of alcohol-related crime in some areas had influenced proposed AFZs.

The Director of Strategy and Engagement emphasised the importance of using a strong evidence base to create maps and a draft bylaw for public consultation. He highlighted the need to ensure that the bylaw would stand up to public scrutiny. He stressed the importance of taking into account feedback from public engagement when finalising the bylaw. He also emphasised the need for regular reviews of the bylaw to keep it up to date with changes in Lower Hutt over time.

Mayor Barry mentioned that the land covered in map AFZ 10 was now privately owned and should be removed. He also pointed out that the map was outdated and needed to be updated to reflect the current situation. He

---

suggested that other maps with similar issues should also be corrected.

In response to a question from a member, the Senior Policy Advisor noted that recommendations on Moera had come from Public Health and were related to the alcohol policy, not the bylaw.

In response to questions from members, the Chief Legal Officer provided the following advice:

- there was a city-wide ban from 9am-5pm because some of the problem areas were also problematic at night. Most of these areas fell under the city-wide ban after 9 pm.
- the report contained a map showing the city-wide ban area from 9 pm to 5 am, indicated by an orange outline.
- the report needed to include only the maps depicting the 24-hour bans; other maps were unnecessary if the city-wide ban covered the same areas.

The Chair asked officers to clarify the language in the Statement of Proposal, which was sometimes inconsistent.

Cr Dyer expressed support for the recommendations, but noted concerns to be revisited following public consultation.

Cr Brown expressed support for anything that would lower alcohol-related harm in the community.

Mayor Barry expressed unease about the 9pm-5am restriction in the past but noted that it had been a success. He noted that the current bylaw had been working well. He said that while the bylaw needed to be reviewed, Council should not expend time and resources beyond reasonable.

**RECOMMENDED:** (Cr Mitchell/Cr Brown)

**Minute No. PFSC 24301**

*"That the Committee recommends Council:*

- (1) *notes that section 147 of the Local Government Act 2002 grants Council the power to make bylaws for alcohol control purposes;*
- (2) *notes that the Control of Alcohol in Public Places Bylaw (the Bylaw) outlines alcohol-free zones across Te Awa Kairangi ki Tai Lower Hutt;*
- (3) *notes that Council's previous Control of Alcohol in Public Places Bylaw was revoked in December 2023, and the development of a new Bylaw requires consultation;*
- (4) *agrees to include the following proposals in the draft Bylaw for consultation:*
  - (a) *the alcohol-free zones and maps from the previous bylaw with minor adjustments to reflect changes in town centres; and*
  - (b) *the ability of the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Mayor and Committee Chairs, to authorise temporary alcohol-free zones in certain circumstances;*

- (5) *agrees with the Statement of Proposal attached as Appendix 1;*
- (6) *notes that public consultation on the Bylaw will occur from 26 July to 25 August 2024;*
- (7) *notes that the Committee has previously agreed to hear public submissions on the proposed Bylaw at its meeting on 10 September 2024; and*
- (8) *notes Council will consider adopting the proposed Bylaw on 1 October 2024."*

## 6. HERITAGE BUILDINGS - CHANGES TO FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Report No. PFSC2024/3/168 by the Policy Lead

The Policy Planning Manager and Policy Advisor elaborated on the report.

In response to questions from members, the Policy Planning Manager and Policy Advisor provided the following advice:

- there were between 50 and 60 additional heritage buildings identified in Council's draft District Plan from Council's Operative District Plan.
- two new applications have been ongoing since the heritage briefing a week ago, resulting in changes to Table 1 in the report.

In response to questions from members, the Director of Strategy and Engagement explained that the proposal was built on the idea that the current settings and incentives would replace the previous ones. He mentioned that there would be briefings for members to discuss the new settings. He acknowledged that some of the concerns raised by members could be addressed during discussions about the new settings for heritage funding.

In response to further questions from elected members, the Policy Planning Manager and Policy Advisor provided the following advice:

- engagement with stakeholders had not yet occurred, but it would happen during the process.
- there was an error in paragraph 8(a) of Council's draft District Plan. It mistakenly implied that heritage buildings could be demolished under the proposed consenting schemes. However, Council's draft District Plan does not allow for the demolition of heritage buildings.
- generally, relocation of a heritage building occurred off-site. However, there were instances where heritage buildings needed to be relocated on-site to avoid hazards.

Cr Edwards expressed support for the policy and emphasised the need to understand how it would align with the current funding, which he viewed positively.

Cr Dyer supported Cr Edwards' comments, mentioning that establishing the heritage grant fund during the trial of the new funding model might make it challenging to evaluate its success.

Deputy Mayor Lewis and Cr Stallinger supported the comments made by Crs Edwards and Dyer. |

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Mitchell/Cr Edwards)

**Minute No. PFSC 24302**

*"That the Committee:*

- (1) notes on 27 April 2021 Council approved the Taonga Tuku Iho – Heritage Policy and sought further advice on proposed conservation incentives tools for built heritage;
- (2) notes the two heritage conservation tools currently operating are the Heritage Grant Fund

- and the rates remission mechanism, both of which are underutilised;*
- (3) agrees that officers develop two new heritage incentive tools:
    - a. a resource consent fee waiver for heritage building owners (for non-demolition consents); and*
    - b. additional pre-application advice to support heritage building owners with resource consent applications;**
  - (4) notes that officers will report back to the Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee on 19 November 2024 to seek agreement to:
    - a. discontinue the Heritage Grant Fund and the rates remission mechanism for historic heritage; and*
    - b. the detailed criteria and guidelines for implementing the proposed resource consent fee waiver and advice;**
  - (5) notes that activity to conserve and improve sites and areas of cultural significance have previously not qualified for funding under the Heritage Grant Fund;*
  - (6) notes that officers will report back to the Committee on 19 November 2024 to seek agreement on the detailed criteria and an implementation plan for a 12-month trial to support sites and areas of cultural significance;*
  - (7) notes that costs associated with the proposed 12-month trial would be covered by reallocating up to \$30,000 in funding from the Heritage Grant Fund and will therefore be financially neutral; and*
  - (8) notes that if agreed by Council, the amended approach would be trialled after the proposed District Plan is notified (in early 2025)."*

## 7. INFORMATION ITEM

### Komiti Ratonga Rangatōpū me te Rautaki | Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee Forward Programme

Memorandum dated 24 June 2024 by the Democracy Advisor

In response to questions from members, the Director of Economy and Development noted that the Infrastructure and Regulatory Committee would consider a submission on the Setting of Speed Limits Rule on Thursday, 11 July 2024. He said the Minister of Transport would decide on speed changes over the next few months. He noted that signalling from central government had suggested that speed bumps were not a priority.

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Mitchell/Cr Dyer)

**Minute No. PFSC 24303**

*"That the Committee receives and notes the draft forward programme for 2024 attached as Appendix 1 to the memorandum."*

## 8. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

## 9. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Mitchell/Deputy Mayor Lewis)

**Minute No. PFSC 24304**

*"That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:*

### 10. *Rates remission application*

*The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:*

(A)	(B)	(C)
<i>General subject of the matter to be considered.</i>	<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter.</i>	<i>Ground under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution.</i>
<i>Rates remission application.</i>	<i>The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons. (s7(2)(a)).</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exist.</i>



*This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as specified in Column (B) above."*

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 2.53 pm, public excluded began at 2.55 pm and finished at 3.37 pm.

A Mitchell  
CHAIR

**CONFIRMED as a true and correct record  
Dated this 25th day of July 2024**