

HUTT CITY COUNCILKOMITI ITI MAHERE Ā-NGAHURUTANGA / MAHERE Ā-TAU  
LONG TERM PLAN/ANNUAL PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held in the Council Chambers,  
2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt on  
**Friday 16 May 2025 commencing at 9:30 am**

---

**PRESENT:**

Mayor C Barry (Chair)	Cr G Tupou
Cr G Barratt	Cr J Briggs
Cr K Brown	Cr B Dyer
Cr S Edwards	Cr A Mitchell
Cr K Morgan	Cr C Parkin
Cr N Shaw	Cr T Stallinger

**APOLOGIES:**

Deputy Mayor T Lewis

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

J Miller, Chief Executive  
A Blackshaw, Director Neighbourhoods and Communities  
J Griffiths, Director Strategy and Engagement  
A Geddes, Director Environment and Sustainability  
J Kingsbury, Director, Economy and Development  
J Livschitz, Group Chief Financial Officer  
B Hodgins, Strategic Advisor  
P Hewitt, Head of Transport  
D Nunnian, Manager Financial Planning and Performance  
R Hardie, Head of Strategy and Policy (part meeting)  
G Campbell, Head of Mayor's Office  
J Roberts, Head of Environmental Protection (part meeting)  
A Nelson, Head of Parks and Reserves (part meeting)  
T Johnstone, Head of Planning (part meeting)  
R Barton, Head of Building Control (part meeting)  
W Botha, Corporate Planning Lead (part meeting)  
J Lamb, Head of Business and Economy (part meeting)  
I Brown, Head of Aquatics  
S Titze, Parks Project Manager (part meeting)  
D Bentley, Environmental Health Manager (part meeting)  
K Glanville, Senior Democracy Advisor  
V Gilmour, Democracy Advisor

**PUBLIC BUSINESS**

1. **OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA TIMATANGA**

Whakataka te hau ki te uru	<i>Cease the winds from the west</i>
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga	<i>Cease the winds from the south</i>
Kia mākinakina ki uta	<i>Let the breeze blow over the land</i>
Kia mātaratara ki tai	<i>Let the breeze blow over the ocean</i>
E hī ake ana te atakura	<i>Let the red-tipped dawn come with</i>
He tio, he huka, he hau hū	<i>a sharpened air.</i>
Tihei mauri ora.	<i>A touch of frost, a promise of a</i>
	<i>glorious day.</i>

2. **APOLOGIES**

**RESOLVED:** (Mayor Barry/Cr Briggs) **Minute No. LTPAP 25201**

*"That the apology received from Deputy Mayor Lewis be received and leave of absence granted."*

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Comments are recorded under the item to which they relate.

**RESOLVED:** (Mayor Barry/Cr Briggs) **Minute No. LTPAP 25202**

*"Pursuant to Standing Order 16.2, the time limit for public comment be extended to allow all public speakers to speak."*

4. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS**

Cr Briggs declared a conflict of interest as he was the Acting Chief Executive of Hutt Valley Youth Health Trust (Vibe) and a member of the Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce.

5. **RECOMMENDATIONS TO TE KAUNIHERA O TE AWA KAIRANGI COUNCIL - 16 May 2025**

a) Progressing Decisions on the Final Annual Plan 2025-26

Speaking under public comment, **Mike Fisher, Chair and Karen Yung, Deputy Chair of the Petone Community Board**, spoke to the Board's feedback on the Annual Plan. They recommended deferring the proposed 50c increase in paid parking charges in Petone for at least a year, citing ongoing community concern and the negative impact on local businesses.

In response to a question from a member, Mike Fisher questioned the reliance on Marketview data, highlighting the visible parking vacancies and feedback from businesses as signs of a downturn. Karen Yung mentioned that some businesses had collected impact data, but it had not been fully shared. She stressed the importance of making broader comparisons at the suburb level.

Speaking under public comment, **Patrick McKibbin, Chief Executive and Mark Skelly, President of the Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce** (the Chamber), spoke to the Chamber's feedback on the Annual Plan. They addressed the financial pressures on local businesses and urged Council to reconsider proposed rates increases for commercial ratepayers. They emphasised that businesses contributed significantly to the rates base but utilised fewer Council services, advocating for a more equitable approach in finalising the Annual Plan. They also noted that Hutt City's fees were among the highest compared to other councils.

In response to questions from members, Patrick McKibbin acknowledged the complexity of identifying service cuts to reduce rates, highlighting that businesses contributed significantly to services like libraries and pools, despite rarely using them. He confirmed that the Chamber's membership had increased over the past year, indicating a growing interest in collaboration and strong representation.

Speaking under public comment, **Nik Zangaouropoulos, Chair of the Jackson Street Programme**, spoke to the JSP's feedback on the Annual Plan. He called for better engagement with Council and supported a review of the rates differential and licensing fees to ease pressure on compliant hospitality businesses. He noted that paid parking had a negative impact on Jackson Street, leading to increased vacancies and decreased business activity. He urged Council to consider a free parking period using local data, rather than relying solely on Marketview figures.

In response to a question from a member, Nik Zangaouropoulos stated that data collected by several Jackson Street shops indicated a collective revenue loss of around \$1M. He suggested this loss significantly outweighed the net parking revenue. He urged for discussions to find ways to ease the burden on businesses without decreasing Council revenue.

Speaking under public comment, **Karen Arraj-Fisher** spoke to her feedback on the Annual Plan. She expressed strong opposition to the paid parking on Jackson Street and the proposed 50c increase, citing its negative impact on local businesses. She believed the Marketview data was incomplete and urged members to consult business owners directly. She suggested offering the first hour free via the PayMyPark app.

In response to a question from a member, Karen Arraj-Fisher said Council would decide about a free hour of parking in areas like Hutt Central. However, she emphasised that Petone's situation was different, and a free hour could significantly benefit that area, despite previous data from other areas suggesting otherwise.

Speaking under public comment, **John Donnelly** spoke to his presentation, which can be viewed here: [The Effects of Paid Parking on Customers](#)

Cr Brown left the meeting at 10.33am.

The Group Chief Financial Officer elaborated on the report and shared a presentation that can be viewed here: [Progressing Decisions on the Final Annual Plan 2025-26](#)

Cr Brown rejoined the meeting at 10.38am.

Cr Shaw left the meeting at 10.38am and rejoined the meeting at 10.42am.

### **PRECEDENCE OF BUSINESS**

**RESOLVED:** (Mayor Barry/Cr Dyer)

**Minute No. LTPAP 25203**

*"That the Subcommittee, in accordance with Standing Order 10.4, accords precedence to the following items: 5b) Annual Plan 2025-26 Development Contributions Change; 5d) Ava Pedestrian Footbridge; 5e) Speed Limit Reversal; 5f) Petone Wharf options within \$12M Long Term Plan budget cap; and 5c) Water Services Updated Investment Advice."*

The items are recorded in the order that they appear on the agenda.

a) Progressing Decisions on the Final Annual Plan 2025-26

Te Ngaengae Pool staffing increase

In response to a question from a member, the Director Neighbourhoods and Communities confirmed that staffing needs at Te Ngaengae Pool exceeded initial forecasts. She stated that the budget would be adjusted to support both Te Ngaengae and Huia Pools, with extra funding allocated based on the operational experience of Te Ngaengae Pool.

Development Stimulus Incentives

In response to a question from a member, the Chief Executive advised that the carryover of the development stimulus package was due to the timing of previously approved incentives. She confirmed that no new incentives had been introduced.

Network Resilience Eastern Hutt Road project

In response to questions from members, the Director Economy and Development advised that the highest-priority site on Eastern Hutt Road was not at imminent risk. He mentioned pending funding decisions from NZTA Waka Kotahi and suggested rephrasing the programme if funding was not approved. He explained that construction would start on the priority site first, with additional works dependent on the availability of funding. He highlighted that completion this year was unlikely, though it would begin before the Te Wai Takamori o Te Awa Kairangi RiverLink works.

Fees and charges - Petone Parking

Cr Edwards opposed the proposed 50c parking fee increase, citing a lack of budget impact information. He recommended deferring the decision to the Subcommittee meeting on 4 June 2025 for further advice.

Cr Parkin queried the feasibility of offering the first 30 minutes or one-hour period of free parking in Petone. He welcomed guidance from officers on the timing of any consultation or review.

Cr Briggs highlighted the need to identify transport projects that could be rephased or delayed if forecasted parking revenue were to decline. He stated that this understanding was crucial for understanding the broader impact.

Cr Mitchell highlighted the absence of a full report on Petone parking performance. He asked that data possibly held by the Petone Community Board be included in the next update.

Cr Stallinger supported the need for clearer data and suggested a summary of the retail spending included or excluded in the current

figures to inform future decision-making.

The Director Economy and Development confirmed that further clarification would be provided, noting the retail data excluded cash, online and invoiced sales. He advised that changing parking fees or offering free periods would impact rates.

Mayor Barry asked for an analysis on how declining parking revenue could impact transport spending, aiming to explore alternatives to increasing rates and ensure Council considered all options.

The Chief Executive recalled the extensive debate on parking and suggested that broader issues could be revisited through a future Long Term Plan amendment.

Mayor Barry confirmed the report would focus on the proposed 50c parking fee increase and its potential impact on rates and transport services, considering both citywide and Jackson Street-specific scenarios.

Cr Stallinger supported the recommendations, despite concerns raised earlier. He indicated he may vote differently on the final decision and would explain his reasons at that time.

Cr Edwards urged members to state their reasons if they opposed the proposed rates clearly increase in June 2025. He cautioned against politically motivated votes that did not provide alternatives or sought additional information.

Cr Barratt reiterated her long-standing opposition to the proposed rates increase.

Cr Dyer opposed the 12.6% rates increase, calling it unaffordable and advocating for further investigation of a lower, single-digit alternative.

Cr Briggs supported Cr Edwards' comments and encouraged members to consider the community's needs when making decisions based on the realities of the Annual Plan.

Cr Brown acknowledged the financial hardships faced by both businesses and residents.

**RECOMMENDED:** (By Division) (Mayor Barry/Cr Briggs)

**Minute No. LTPAP 25204**

*“That the Subcommittee recommends that Council:*

- (1) *notes that the public engagement on the draft Annual Plan 2025-26 took place from 27 March to 27 April 2025;*
- (2) *notes the summary of engagement feedback in Section J of the report, along with Appendix 4 attached to the report, which presents the results and analysis of the public engagement process;*
- (3) *agrees to the budget matters as detailed in Tables 2, 3 and 4 of the report and provides direction to officers in the preparation of the final Annual Plan 2025-26;*
- (4) *notes the higher projected debt levels with low debt headroom associated with the higher capital investment programme as detailed in Section F of the report;*
- (5) *notes the changes to the balanced operating budget target as defined in our Financial Strategy and changes to the prudence benchmark per the legislative requirements of the Local Government Act and Financial Reporting and Prudence Regulations 2014 as detailed in Section F of the report;*
- (6) *notes that there have been cost savings and budget reprioritisations approved to date to balance rising costs where possible, and that these are reflected in the rates revenue settings for 2025-26;*
- (7) *notes the latest projected rates revenue increase of 12.6% plus a 0.9% growth assumption for 2025-26 as set detailed in Section G of the report, and notes that it is subject to final Council decisions at the 4 June 2025 meeting;*
- (8) *notes the rates revenue increases to be included in the final Annual Plan 2025-26 and future years as detailed below, and subject to further information to be provided for final Council decisions at the 4 June 2025 meeting;*

Rates revenue increase (after growth of 0.9%)	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034
Draft Annual Plan 2025-26	12.8%	12.9%	12.9%	12.7%	12.3%	7.8%	7.8%	7.8%	7.8%
Final Annual Plan 2025-26	12.6%	12.9%	12.9%	12.7%	12.3%	7.8%	7.8%	7.8%	7.8%

- (9) *approves the targeted rates for Wastewater and Water Supply as detailed in Section G of the report to be included in the final Annual Plan 2025-26;*

- (10) *approves the targeted rates for Refuse, Recycling and Green Waste as detailed in Section G of the report to be included in the final Annual Plan 2025-26;*
- (11) *approves the proposed fees and charges schedule for inclusion in the final Annual plan, refer to Appendix 2 attached to the report, subject to an additional report on the proposed \$0.50 charge to paid parking being provided at the next Subcommittee meeting on 4 June 2025 ;*
- (12) *delegates the power to the Annual Plan Working Group (the Mayor and Committee Chairs) to progress decisions ahead of final recommendations for Council consideration on 4 June 2025; and*
- (13) *notes the direction and guidance provided to officers ahead of preparation of the final Annual Plan 2025-26 reports and advice to be considered at the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan Subcommittee on 4 June 2025."*

The motion was declared CARRIED by division with the voting as follows:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
Mayor Barry	Cr Barratt
Cr Briggs	Cr Dyer
Cr Brown	
Cr Edwards	
Cr Mitchell	
Cr Morgan	
Cr Parkin	
Cr Shaw	
Cr Stallinger	
Cr Tupou	
Total: 10	Total: 2



b) Annual Plan 2025-26 Development Contributions Change

Speaking under public comment, **Sam Faisandier from the Faisandier Group** expressed concern about the declining feasibility of development in Lower Hutt. He urged Council to review its development contributions approach and engage more closely with developers.

In response to questions from members, Sam Faisandier acknowledged a shortage of single-level dwellings but noted their development was not financially viable. He argued for strategic Council investment to support development in more viable areas.

Speaking under public comment, **Sam Godwin from Cuttriss** noted a decline in development activity in Lower Hutt, citing Council's 2024 increase in development contributions. He stated that with only 166 resource consents lodged this financial year, he suggested pausing further increases and reassessing the development contributions relief approach adopted in June 2024. He questioned the equity of full development contributions, as developers had already mitigated the impacts of infrastructure, and suggested an incentive-based approach to encourage housing development and meet growth targets.

Speaking under public comment, **James Beban from Urban Edge Planning Limited** supported keeping development contributions at their current levels. He noted that the combination of development contributions and separate reserve contributions in Lower Hutt resulted in higher costs. He warned that any increase could drive development to other regions.

In response to a question from a member, James Beban recognised a general slowdown in development across the region. However, he noted that areas like Upper Hutt were still experiencing growth, thanks to lower costs and increased profitability. He also noted that development in Porirua had significantly declined due to higher development contributions.

Dwayne Fletcher from Vale Consulting (via audio-visual link) elaborated on the report.

Dwayne Fletcher confirmed a 10% decrease in building consents year-on-year to December 2024, with Lower Hutt being more affected. He noted that no other councils had adjusted development contributions in response. He confirmed the central government's plans to introduce flexible development levies by July 2026, with Lower Hutt's Water Services Entity set to manage water-related contributions at that time.

In response to questions from members, Dwayne Fletcher outlined three options for Council to support developments with public benefits: amending the development contributions (DC) policy (which was impractical within a year), negotiating development agreements, or

granting discretionary remissions for infrastructure needs. He noted that most councils did not offer DC discounts for on-site stormwater or wastewater systems, as these were considered complementary to public infrastructure. He also mentioned that Hutt City charged reserve contributions separately, in contrast to Wellington City Council, which included them in its DC charges.

Mayor Barry and Crs Stallinger, Mitchell, Barratt, Dyer, Brown, and Tupou supported pausing the proposed development contribution increase, citing shared concerns about developer challenges and the impact on housing development and affordability.

Cr Morgan opposed the recommendation and favoured option 3, proceeding with the increase in development contributions. She acknowledged the challenges faced by developers but questioned the fairness of pausing the increase, considering that other local businesses were also experiencing pressure.

Cr Brown left the meeting at 11.14am and rejoined at 11.16am.

**RECOMMENDED:** (Mayor Barry/Cr Stallinger) **Minute No. LTPAP 25205**

*"That the Subcommittee recommends that Council:*

- (1) approves option 1, which would freeze the Development Contributions increase on the Valley Floor for one year;*
- (2) agrees to fund the estimated revenue loss of \$1.5M for 2025-26 from debt serviced by rates from Water services and Transport; and*
- (3) notes that the proposed new Wellington regional water services organisation will have autonomy to set its own development contribution charges for Water Services from 1 July 2026."*

Cr Morgan requested her dissenting vote be recorded against the above matter.

c) Water Services Updated Investment Advice

Julie Alexander, Chief Strategy and Planning Officer and Sukhin Erai, Senior Advisor, Investment Planning from Wellington Water Limited were in attendance for the item.

The Strategic Advisor elaborated on the report.

In response to a question from a member, the Strategic Advisor noted that programme changes and budget adjustments were routine and would continue during the December 2025 half-yearly review. He clarified that the 9km renewal rate pertained only to water pipes, with the entire three waters network renewing 25-30km annually. He noted that funding for pipe renewals was being redirected to priority reservoir projects. He also noted that the 40% cost increase for the Eastern Hills Reservoir was attributed to outdated budgeting and the cancellation of a cost-sharing agreement with Porirua.

The meeting moved into the public excluded part of the meeting at 12.20pm and returned to the public part of the meeting at 12.25pm.

**RECOMMENDED:** (Mayor Barry/Cr Edwards) **Minute No. LTPAP 25206**

*"That the Subcommittee recommends Council:*

- (1) notes the updated advice from Wellington Water Limited (WWL) attached as Appendix 1 to the report;*
- (2) agrees to make changes to the investment programme to accommodate increases in budget estimates to the Eastern Hills Reservoir of \$32M;*
- (3) agrees to bring forward investment in a new reservoir for Wainuiomata of \$39.5M to enable future growth;*
- (4) agrees to the other changes WWL has proposed to the investment programme as outlined in paragraphs 6 - 8 of the officer's report;*
- (5) notes that while the impact of these changes is not expected to be experienced until after the likely transfer of water assets to the proposed new regional Water Organisation, WWL has been asked to recommend off-setting changes to the investment plan to ensure the 10 year LTP investment profile stays within the agreed investment envelope and borrowing limits;*
- (6) notes that officers have established an internal project team to manage the transition of water services assets and services to a new regional Water Organisation, subject to a Council decision on 27 June 2025 on the preferred model, and that budget provision would be required to fund aspects of the project work;*
- (7) agrees, subject to Council adopting the preferred regional water services delivery model, to include in budgets \$0.4M in 2025-26 and \$0.2M in 2026-27 to fund the HCC water reform transition project, with funding being sourced from a projected underspend in water services operating costs for 2024-25; and*
- (8) agrees, subject to Council adopting the preferred regional water services delivery model, to increase the approved provisional sum of \$3M (Council's share of the regional cost to establish a new regional Water Organisation) to \$4.3M in 2025-26 noting that this will be debt funded, and that the debt will be transferred to the new regional Water Organisation."*

The meeting adjourned at 12.26pm and resumed at 1.04pm.

## d) Ava Pedestrian Footbridge

The Head of Transport elaborated on the report.

In response to a question from a member, the Head of Transport advised that while detailed designs for the replacement pedestrian bridge at Ava Rail Bridge had not been developed, the plan was for the new structure to meet current accessibility standards. He said that it was likely to accommodate a shared path, which would enhance safety for pedestrians, cyclists and wheelchair users.

In response to a question from a member, the Director Economy and Development advised that a standalone bridge was more expensive than the proposed clip-on option, which would be permanent. He added that final alignment decisions would depend on NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi's Cross Valley Link project.

Mayor Barry drew the members' attention to the new part (4) included in his Chair's recommendation.

**RECOMMENDED:** (Mayor Barry/Cr Edwards) **Minute No. LTPAP 25207**

*"That the Subcommittee recommends Council:*

- (1) receives and notes this report;*
- (2) approves net funding of \$3M for a replacement clip-on footbridge to replace the existing Ava rail bridge footway;*
- (3) approves the rephasing and net reduction of \$3.2M for the Cross Valley Connections budget in 2027-28 to offset the cost of the Ava footbridge replacement; and*
- (4) asks officers to report back as soon as possible on a confirmed timeline for the project, with a focus on the best alignment with the maintenance work being undertaken by KiwiRail."*

e) Speed Limit Reversal

The Head of Transport elaborated on the report.

In response to a question from a member, the Head of Transport advised that officers were working with Council's Communications team to prepare information regarding the changes to speed limits, particularly around schools. He said that members would have the opportunity to review the draft communications before they were distributed.

The Director Economy and Development added that the public would be well informed before any changes took effect, and the changes would be introduced in stages, and the communications plan would utilise various channels.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Transport confirmed that the budget included funding to speed limit changes at schools not covered by last year's rollout. He advised that Jackson Street did not meet the exemption under the new rules. He stated that to maintain the 30km/h limit, a formal process must be followed under the 2024 rule, taking into account both environmental and safety factors. He said the cost of this process was still unknown.

Cr Mitchell supported the recommendations, acknowledging that while they were a legislative requirement, their use of ratepayer funds was not ideal.

Cr Dyer expressed his reluctant support for the recommendations, emphasising that they were mandated by law. He criticised the changes as yet another unfunded government mandate, pointing out that Council had already made significant investments in safety improvements.

Members discussed amending recommendations (3) and (4).

**RECOMMENDED:** (Mayor Barry/Cr Mitchell) **Minute No. LTPAP 25208**

*"That the Subcommittee recommends that Council:*

- (1) receives and notes the report;*
- (2) notes the Setting of Speed Limits 2024 – Speed Limit Changes around schools and Marine Drive was considered by the Infrastructure and Regulatory Committee at its meeting on 13 March 2025, report IARCC2025/1/40;*
- (3) reluctantly approves the unfunded mandate by central government requiring net funding of \$0.17M for the Speed Limit Reversals under the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2024; and*
- (4) approves the net reduction of \$0.17M for the Road Network Improvements budget in 2025-26 to offset the cost of the Speed Limit Reversals, noting, but for central government requirements, this money would be better spent on other safety improvements."*

f) Petone Wharf options within \$12M Long Term Plan budget cap

Speaking under public comment, **Pam Hanna and Sylvia Allan, from the Save Petone Wharf Group**, emphasised community support for repairing Petone Wharf, referencing strong public feedback since 2017, which favoured its refurbishment. She stated that survey results underscored its significance, and recent constructive engagement with Council officers and heritage experts was appreciated, advocating for ongoing collaboration.

Speaking under public comment, **John Roper** welcomed Council's decision to retain Petone Wharf and called for action to progress the project. He recommended using a repair and maintenance framework to reduce delays and expenses.

The Head of Parks and Reserves elaborated on the report.

In response to a question from a member, the Head of Parks and Reserves stated that a repair approach was ruled out due to consent requirements and potential delays. He mentioned that the tender process would begin soon, pending progress on these requirements. He stated that while a flexible tendering approach was supported, it appeared that full wharf remediation within the \$12M budget was unlikely. He noted that the tender process would remain open for proposals concerning the entire wharf.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Parks and Reserves indicated that officers were assessing whether the resource consent could allow flexibility in the remediation length. He mentioned that amendments might be needed if the project scope changed and that Heritage New Zealand would advise on materials, including the use of hardwood and possibly repurposing timber from the Point Howard Wharf.

The Director Neighbourhoods and Communities added that if the project remained within budget, it would not return to Council for approval, however, regular updates would be provided.

Mayor Barry thanked all parties involved, highlighting positive collaboration and alignment. He acknowledged the unpredictability of wharf project but was confident a good outcome could be achieved within the set budget.

Cr Edwards raised concerns about project risks, cost, and debt levels, contrasting the investment with deferred infrastructure priorities. However, he acknowledged strong community support and supported the recommendations.

Crs Mitchell, Brown and Briggs supported the recommendations as a reflection of Council's commitment under the Long Term Plan. They highlighted strong community advocacy, the importance of clear budget constraints and the value of retaining the wharf where possible.

Cr Brown left the meeting at 12.00pm.

Cr Tupou commended the sustained community voice and Council's efforts to address their concerns.

Cr Brown rejoined the meeting at 12.02pm.

Cr Stallinger supported the recommendations, acknowledging that the project was not his top priority due to other pressing needs.

Cr Dyer acknowledged the risks involved but praised the pragmatic shift made by both Council and community groups.



**RECOMMENDED:** (By Division) (Mayor Barry/Cr Morgan)

**Minute No. LTPAP 25209**

*"That the Subcommittee recommends that Council:*

- (1) receives and notes this report;*
- (2) receives and notes the report from Independent Advisor Adam Thornton attached as Appendix 3 to the report*
- (3) notes the Matrix attached as Appendix 2 to the report which analyses advantages and disadvantages of each option;*
- (4) notes the feedback from the Petone Community Board, the Pito One Steering Group and Save the Wharf Campaign regarding the repair/remediation of the wharf attached as Appendix 4 to the report;*
- (5) notes that as the cost assessment of the options discussed does not represent a confirmed project cost and has not yet been subject to the P95 QRA contingency rate required by the Council decision of 17 May 2024, there is an ongoing risk that the physical works exceed the indicative prices in the report;*
- (6) notes the financial information on Council's previous wharf projects outlined in paragraphs 12-13 of the officer's report;*
- (7) notes the increased risk relating to liquefaction outlined in paragraph 42 (f) of the officer's report;*
- (8) notes that in the Registration of Interest (ROI), there were no responses from anyone offering significantly different technology to the approach used for the other Council wharves in recent years;*
- (9) notes feedback from the public speakers at the meeting;*
- (10) notes that Petone Community Board, the Pito One Steering Group and Save the Wharf Campaign support option b 'repair/remediation of reduced wharf';*
- (11) approves option b) 'repair/remediation of reduced wharf' to be progressed;*
- (12) agrees to the intention to retain as much of the wharf as possible and to avoid delays where possible;*
- (13) notes the update provided by officers on the pre-consent lodgement meeting on 12 May 2025 attended by officers from Hutt City Council, Greater Wellington Regional Council, Heritage NZ and representatives of Save the Wharf; and*
- (14) notes the positive outcome of the meeting with general agreement on the preferable way forward, which officers will now progress while continuing to work closely with the community."*

The motion was declared CARRIED by division with the voting as follows:

For

Against

Mayor Barry

Cr Barratt

Cr Briggs	
Cr Brown	
Cr Dyer	
Cr Edwards	
Cr Mitchell	
Cr Morgan	
Cr Parkin	
Cr Shaw	
Cr Stallinger	
Cr Tupou	
Total: 12	Total: 0

The meeting adjourned at 12.06pm and resumed at 12.13pm, and addressed item 5c)  
Water Services Updated Investment Advice.

## 6. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

## 7. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

**RESOLVED:** (Mayor Barry/Cr Briggs)

**Minute No. LTPAP 25210**

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

### *8. Water Services Updated Investment Programme and 9. Public Excluded - Detailed Information to Support Budget Decisions*

*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:*

<i>(A)</i>	<i>(B)</i>	<i>(C)</i>
<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>Water Services Updated Investment Programme.</i>	<i>The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities (s7(2)(h)).</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>
<i>Public Excluded - Detailed Information to Support Budget Decisions.</i>	<i>The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities (s7(2)(h)). The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) (s7(2)(i)).</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.*

*That Julie Alexander and Sukhin Erai from Wellington Water Limited be permitted to remain after the public section of the meeting, as they had knowledge of the Water Services updated investment programme that will assist the subcommittee in relation to the item."*

The Chair declared the public excluded part of the meeting closed at 12.25pm. There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 1.43pm.

C Barry  
**MAYOR**

**CONFIRMED as a true and correct record**  
**Dated this 31st day of July 2025**