
Hearings Committee

OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the Hearings Committee held in the Council Chambers, 126-148 Oxford Street, Levin, on Friday 15 June 2018 at 10.00 am.

PRESENT

Chairperson Cr Jo Mason
Members Cr Ross Brannigan
Cr Bernie Wanden

IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs N Brady	(Group Manager – Customer & Regulatory Services)
Mrs C Pollock	(Project Coordination Lead)
Mrs K J Corkill	(Meeting Secretary)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

<u>Submitters</u>	<u>Submission</u> <u>No</u>	
	11	Mr Tony Hunt, Foxton Historical Society
	12	Mr Paul Smith, Aspire Church
	13	Mrs Sophie & Mr Maurice Campbell, Te Aro Trading Co Ltd
	18	Ms Rochelle Cheesman, Shannanigans Shopping Complex
	19	Mr Paul King on behalf of Christine Moriarty, Horowhenua District Ratepayers & Residents Association
	21	Ms Linda Fletcher & Ms Debbie Kaye, Levin RSA
	22	Ms Veronica Harrod
	23	Mr Charlie Pedersen,
	26 & 27	Mr Brendan Cottle
	28	Mr Richard Crombie, Crombie Automotive

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE

There were six members of the public in attendance at the commencement of the meeting.

1 Apologies

There were no apologies.

2 Public Participation

As this meeting was to hear and consider submissions there was no opportunity for public participation.

3 Late Items

There were no late items.

4 Declarations of Interest

To dispel any perception of bias, Cr Wanden declared he was a tenant in a building in the affected area in Levin.

Prefacing her comments by saying she would act in a fair and reasonable manner, Cr Mason placed on record an issue of bias that had been raised by Anne Hunt which had arisen from past Court proceedings at which she had been a witness and Mrs Hunt had been in support of the person charged. Cr Mason said she had stepped aside from a previous hearing but legal advice obtained supported the fact that there were no overlapping interests and she therefore had no conflict.

5 Confirmation of Minutes

MOVED by Cr Brannigan, seconded Cr Mason:

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Hearings Committee held on Tuesday, 28 November 2017, be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

6 Announcements

The Chair noted that the attendance of some submitters had not been able to be confirmed and some had sent their apologies so there may be some changes to the speaking schedule and these would be noted as the hearing progressed. She introduced the Hearings Panel and Council staff and outlined the process for the meeting which would see a break for lunch at approximately 12.30 pm, with the Panel reconvening at 1.30 pm to deliberate.

7 Reports

6.1 Priority Buildings - Earthquake-prone Buildings

Purpose

To provide the platform for the Hearings Committee (Committee) to hear and consider submissions received on the Statement of Proposal – Priority Buildings - Earthquake-prone Buildings and make a subsequent recommendation to Council in respect of the Statement of Proposal.

MOVED by Cr Wanden, seconded Cr Brannigan:

THAT Report 18/310 Priority Buildings - Earthquake-prone Buildings be received.

THAT this decision is recognised as not significant in terms of S76 of the Local Government Act.

THAT late submissions be received and included in the consultation.

CARRIED

The Chair commented that this would not be an easy decision for the Panel as New Zealand was a country of earthquakes, some severe, which were part of New Zealand's makeup. However the Panel was required to make some recommendations to full Council around a Policy for the district. Whilst there was no recommendation in the Report, there were some options for consideration.

Requesting that the report be taken as read, Mrs Pollock summarised the purpose of the report and the consultation, which was to give effect to the legislation but also to allow the community to have its say as required by legislation.

The Chair confirmed that Members had read all the submissions received.

Submission 11 – Tony Hunt, Foxton Historical Society – Saying he was representing the Foxton Historical Society and also members of the community, Mr Hunt noted that the Society had been preserving Foxton's history for 50 years and for 40 of the had had the 90 year old Court House in which to exhibit's its collection.

In 2008 the Society had presented to Council a list of buildings and sites that it felt were worth of inclusion in its heritage plans. Some work had been done on the list over the last 2-3 years but there had been no direct communication regarding progress.

The Court House had been included on that list but the only action taken had been to remove it from use which meant that the Society had been very much in limbo and was only able to operate its Archives section which was in a separate specially constructed building.

The Court House was in an area containing many features of the town's history, including the Manawatu/Horowhenua's oldest building (St Andrews Church) and the 130 year old Manawatu Herald Office. It was in an historical precinct and much had been done by citizens to present it to the public, such as upgrading Ihakara Gardens.

With the Society's submission setting out the reasons why the Court House should not be on the priority list and the challenges that faced the Society, Mr Hunt requested that the future of the Court House be reconsidered. He said it was a truly great heritage building and should be made available to the citizens for development as the Museum of Foxton History.

Mrs Pollock responded in the affirmative to a query from Cr Wanden as to whether it was possible within the legislation to withdraw single buildings from a designated area. She said that it was also possible to limit where a designated area extended to. However, they would still be looking for a consistent approach overall.

In terms of the Courthouse Building restoration and strengthening, Mr Hunt

said the Society did not have plans or a timeline as they could prove to be a waste of time. However, once they had some idea of the timeframe, they could look at doing something. With regard to possible future dual use of the building, Mr Hunt said at the moment the space was full and the museum was not being used.

Submission 12 – Paul Smith, Aspire Church – Mr Smith spoke in support of retaining halls for community engagement and speaking particularly in relation to the Levin Memorial Hall, asked that consideration be given to some strategic possibilities for the building, especially as Levin was growing. He spoke against disposing of what he termed a valuable asset that could be utilised by the community, particularly as the cost of replacing it in the future would be considerably more than refurbishing it now. The building also had significant history and had stood for 60 years despite the earthquakes that had occurred. Mr Smith noted that Aspire Church currently used it for its services and the Church was growing. He sought a favourable response from Council to retain and upgrade what was a valuable meeting space.

As a point of clarification, Cr Mason noted that the Levin Memorial Hall had been consulted on as part of the LTP and the decision had been made to defer any outcome on the future ownership of the Hall for at least 12 months until the completion of the Levin Town Centre Strategy. What the Hearings Committee was considering today was if there were some earthquake-prone building priority areas in Levin, Foxton and Shannon; it was not about disposing of buildings.

Submission 13 – Sophie and Maurice Campbell, Te Aro Trading Co Ltd – As owners of 216 Oxford Street, Levin, (where Clarks Clothing was situated), which had been established by Mr Campbell's great-grandfather in 1894, Mrs Campbell said that while they were aware of their legal obligation as building owners to comply with the Act, Council also had a role to play. It was suggested that Council should offer assistance to building owners to facilitate compliance. This could include creating guidelines on the re-build style, reducing building consent fees and helping with the building consent process. A rates holiday could be implemented during the re-build process as it would not be possible to rent out a building during that process. Mrs Campbell provided some information from the Wellington City Council website which set out what WCC did to assist affected building owners.

Mrs Campbell suggested that Council could promote a theme for re-building/strengthening which could be different for each town.

As well as the building upgrade process, there was also another part to the consultation which was in relation to access routes after an earthquake. Mrs Campbell said they were surprised that areas were excluded on the map even though they were on the state highways and access was still needed for emergency services.

In summation, it was suggested that Council think positively and encourage and assist the restructuring/strengthening of buildings by providing owners with the incentive to carry out the work. If the by-pass around Levin did not happen then Levin would be the first town out of Wellington which could be beneficial and could create demand for retail space on Oxford Street.

The huge dilemma with regard to the cost for building owners and tenants was acknowledged.

Mrs Campbell said that talking with building owners in Oxford Street was what had prompted them to look at what options there could be to assist with the financial impact.

Mr Campbell added that there was also a lot of talk about the town centre rebuild which had not helped. Also when there was finally a decision made about the road that would help as if you were a building owner and were confident of tenants that would assist with investing money to fix any

problems. Some building owners had seen their buildings as a retirement investment but that had now changed with what could be significant cost. Responding to the issue raised with regard to access routes, Mrs Pollock explained how that had been addressed in terms of the legislation. An exercise had been carried out and where there was an alternative route for emergency services where there were no unreinforced masonry buildings then strategic routes of significance were not consulted on.

Submission 17 – Anne-Marie Hunt – apology received.

Submission 18 – Rochelle Cheesman – Shannanigans Shopping Complex – Saying that whilst there was no argument that the buildings in the Shannon CBD were earthquake-prone, Mrs Cheesman gave her reasons as to why it should be not be designated as a priority area. She said that even though there was significant traffic that flowed passed the CBD, all but three of the buildings were on one level and there would be no risk of debris having an impact on traffic flows and the safety of vehicles. The roads were wide and there were definitely a lot of other routes for emergency vehicles. Pedestrians would also have alternatives without changing their route.

Mrs Cheesman said that every day people took risks and it was about assessing the risk. One took a risk getting into a car and it was not about when one had an accident, but if, and it was the same with regard to earthquakes.

Financially, Mrs Cheesman said she could not afford to rebuild in seven years. Retail was very low in Shannon at the moment and no one could afford rent increases.

Even if Shannon was not established as a priority area and with the building still needing to be strengthened, Mrs Cheesman was asked what she saw as the solution long term.

Mrs Cheesman said that if the road did go through that would help, but at present that was uncertain. Having more time would assist.

With regard to people being notified if they were entering into an affected zone or building, Mrs Pollock said that Council was looking at priority buildings as part of its wider earthquake-prone buildings project. With regard to affected buildings, Council would request engineering statements and would then issue earthquake-prone building notices which would be provided to building owners to display in their windows. The notice would be A3 size and the percentage of the new building standard would determine the colour of the poster. Earthquake-prone buildings would also appear on the Earthquake-prone Building Register.

Cr Brannigan queried, with the recent downturn in business in Shannon, if Council decided that Shannon was not a priority area, whether the extra time would assist in building the area up again.

Mrs Cheesman expressed confidence that the retail sector in Shannon could build up again, but it did need time.

Submission 19 – Paul King – Horowhenua Ratepayers & Residents Association –

speaking on behalf of Christine Moriarty – Mr King suggested the grouping of all the submissions into 'agree/disagree or no view' was an over-simplistic way of looking at this issue with many submitters agreeing to some of the Proposal but not all, yet were pigeon-holed into a yes or no statistic.

Mr King said that this proposal would force Levin business owners into demolishing heritage buildings in the area. It was understood that the introduction of new earthquake codes was necessary but how it was implemented should be decided by the people – owners and users. There was a need to keep 'our Heritage' for the future residents of Horowhenua. The priority building proposal was short-sighted and heritage building owners and users should be supported to help retain the character of Levin.

Mr King queried what the rush was to prioritise old buildings, stadiums and community halls in the region. He said that HDRRA believed that the buildings should be left to the community to decide on when or if they were a priority to be fixed up or pulled down. The process should not be rushed and the community's safety and towns' character should be the driving force behind the process, not town planners and developers. Many of the buildings had been built by the community for the community's needs and that should not be forgotten.

Mr King continued that what was proposed would affect the ratepayers of the Horowhenua, many of whom were on low and/or fixed incomes. The draft plan as proposed would continue to raise rates significantly over the next five years and continual rates rises were decreasing the quality of life for fixed income ratepayers. If Council felt that Levin needed to prioritise buildings, this should be led by community submissions, not town planners.

Whilst Council had to keep its eye on population growth, Mr King said that Council should always be focussing on the needs of the current population. All new development should be covered and paid for by developers, not ratepayers.

He concluded by saying that HDRRA opposed the proposal in its current form. Each building had differing heritage values and earthquake risk factors. Now the expressway may not go ahead, the character and history of those buildings, which was helping to bring the new influx of residents to the Horowhenua, needed to be retained, not demolished.

Responding to Mr King's comments about this process being driven by Council, it was clarified that this was actually being driven by Central Government and the Building (Earthquake-prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016. As part of that legislation Council had to consult with the community to determine areas in the CBDs of Foxton, Shannon and Levin that needed to be looked at in terms of seismic risk. The legislation determined the timeframe and it was not about demolishing heritage buildings. It was building owners who would have the responsibility to strengthen (or not) their buildings.

With this being Government legislation that would not go away and with previous submitters having talked about having a team approach with Council, Mr King was requested to think about what assistance he thought could be provided to building owners and whether HDRRA would be prepared to work together to achieve the best outcome for everyone.

Submission 20 – Charles Rudd – apology received.

Submission 21 – Linda Fletcher & Debbie Kaye – Levin RSA – The importance of the Levin Memorial Hall to the community was stressed in terms of location, size and versatility, with Ms Fletcher also saying its historical significance could not be ignored.

Responding to a query about use of the hall going forward, Ms Fletcher said she would like to see it retained as a Memorial Hall for the community. It was now slightly outdated, but it could be brought up to date.

With the main goal being for the hall to be declared a priority building, Ms Fletcher was asked whether the intention was that it stayed in Council ownership or would they be supportive of other options if they should arise in the future. Ms Fletcher said as long as it stayed as a hall they would support that.

The meeting took a recess (11.24-11.34 am).

Submission 22 – Veronica Harrod – In her verbal submission, Ms Harrod suggested that Council had a conflict of interest between its ability to administer the Building Act and the independence of decisions made about earthquake

priority areas and buildings in those areas and inferred that Council could not be trusted to make decisions in the best interests of the community or building owners.

Cr Brannigan raised a point of order (Standing Order 25.2 (c)) in relation to the relevance of Ms Harrod's comments as the meeting was about earthquake-prone buildings and her comments were outside that scope.

Ms Harrod said it was her contention that the matters she raised were interrelated.

The Chair gave Ms Harrod the opportunity to continue but to direct her comments to earthquake-prone buildings.

A further point of order was raised with regard to the relevance of Ms Harrod's further discourse which was upheld by the Chair and Ms Harrod's participation concluded.

Cr Wanden placed on record his objection to some of Ms Harrod's comments which impugned the integrity of both Councillors and Officers.

Ms Harrod was also directed to page 6 of the Agenda which set out the conduct of the meeting when it came to people speaking.

Submission 23 – Charlie Pedersen, Timped Holdings –

- (I) Noting that his grandchildren were fifth generation Foxtonians, Mr Pedersen spoke first in relation to the BNZ building and the cost that would be involved in upgrading it. He said that the BNZ building, and the Church next door, had never been considered as being in the footpath traffic area of Foxton or the shopping precinct. There had never been a requirement to have an awning or verandah, even before it became residential.

With regard to earthquake assessments, the original one done by OPUS gave it less than 5%; after a second look it was close to 20% and with a little work it could get up to 33%.

Speaking to the building's construction, Mr Pederson said it was quintuple woven brick rather than stacked brick and it also had strips of reinforcing in it. When OPUS first looked at it the assumption was it was a simple brick building. It was then scanned and more information on its construction was provided which brought it up to 20%. It was a very strong building and had gone through the 1935 earthquake unscathed, unlike other buildings in Foxton.

Responding to a comment that it highlighted the fact that there were a large number of significant buildings and whether there had been anything done to strengthen the façade, Mr Pedersen said that the front/façade was tied in to the whole building and was completely different from those buildings in Christchurch that had had issues.

Mrs Pollock advised that residential buildings were currently with officers. They were gathering information and would get advice on what that might look like going forward.

Responding a query in relation to whether or not the building was in a high traffic area, Mr Pedersen said they had lived there now for 2½ years and while there was heavy traffic on the other side of the road, particularly now with Te Awahou Nieuwe Stroom, outside the BNZ building it was not much more than normal suburban traffic.

- (II) Speaking in relation to the other buildings he owned in Main Street, Mr Pedersen said he paid the rates, insurance and electricity for his tenants so that was something they did not have to worry about and rent was received once a week. He would have to rethink that if this was brought in as a priority area. Rates paid to HDC for the year was \$30,000.

He noted the costs that would be involved in upgrading the properties which could mean a reluctant decision could be reached to demolish the buildings and wait for an economic improvement in Foxton before

rebuilding. The reason for that was that some of the building they owned did not warrant strengthening as the way they were built would make it too expensive and they would not be fit for purpose. In some cases it would be substantially cheaper to build a new building. They did have plans to redevelop with one level of shops and a second level with accommodation but that would probably mean a decade of empty sections. These buildings represented just over 2/3 of the street frontage on the western side of Main Street. They would take all but one of those down if the priority designation went ahead.

Mr Pedersen said it was an economic imperative; they did not want to own buildings that could injure/kill someone. However it was an anathema that earthquake-prone strengthening was not tax deductible.

With his comments having highlighted the challenges facing building owners, though with his being greater than most, Mr Pedersen was asked if the buildings were not included in the priority area and he had 15 years to do any strengthening would that affect his thinking.

Mr Pedersen said that it probably would not. If it related to the buildings he had in Palmerston North and Wellington, yes, as the costs were the same but the returns did not stack up. If the buildings were not included in a priority area then they would probably set a programme and take the buildings down one or two at a time and rebuild straight away. However, seven years was too little time and it would be difficult to get things done as everyone was in the same boat.

In terms of what areas he thought Council should be endeavouring to influence central government on for assistance to affected parties, such as tax issues, Mr Pedersen said this legislation was first mooted 15 years ago and the Government at the time was lobbied to no effect. He was not sure what else could be done and he did not believe enough thought had been given to the timeframe.

If the priority buildings designation did not apply to Foxton, Mr Pedersen was asked if there was anything he could do to mitigate risk for the general public.

Mr Pedersen said they did not want to own buildings that would hurt anyone. They had had the buildings looked at and the recommendation had been to take down the brick facades and replace them with lightweight timber as the risk was only the facades not the actual double brick construction. It would be quite easy to fix but if they were going to have to demolish the buildings in the few years' time, why bother. The BNZ building was quite different.

Submissions 26 & 27 – Brendan Cottle – Mr Cottle provided a background to his ownership of a number of buildings in Shannon. He did note that he had tried to sell some of the buildings, but the sales had fallen over because of the earthquake ratings. Speaking about his buildings and his vision to get the town going again to restore vibrancy, Mr Cottle agreed that if Shannon was not included in the priority buildings part of the legislation it would provide time for options to be explored.

Submission 28 – Richard Crombie, Crombie Automotive – Mr Crombie said like the rest of building owners in New Zealand, he did not want anyone to be harmed and the Government did need to do something; however he felt the timeframe was not correct. His building had been built in 1937 and he had been there for 20 years. Mr Crombie suggested that Councils, Central Government and building owners should get together and have meetings with people who knew what they were talking about. He suggested this could cost livelihoods throughout New Zealand. He could not sell his building

because of its 10% rating and to fix it was going to cost \$15,000, which he was not prepared to pay. He could not sell it, he could not insure it. He did have a neighbour who wanted to buy it but could not raise the money because of the earthquake rating; however if the building was not included in the priority area it would give him options.

Mr Crombie said he was aware of the MBIE guidelines which stipulated that he was his responsibility to have an engineering assessment on the building within a year. He had not done anything as yet as central government kept changing the goal posts.

The meeting broke for lunch at 12.45 pm and reconvened to deliberate at 1.54 pm.

Prior to the Panel working through the Report, the Chair queried if there were any matters heard from the submitters that needed to be brought to the attention of the Hearings Committee.

Mrs Pollock noted that while a lot had been covered in the report in terms of the legislation, the oral submissions had provided a different aspect particularly in terms of life safety and people's livelihoods. She suggested that any decision made should provide a balance between both.

Requested to provide an interpretation in relation to high pedestrian and high vehicle areas as it applied both to large metropolitan areas and to a rural district the size of Horowhenua, Mrs Pollock said MBIE had given guidelines as included in the report when it came to high vehicle and pedestrian traffic. There were no official metrics to support that nor make comparisons. It came down to local knowledge. Levin had higher vehicle and pedestrian traffic than Foxton and Shannon.

It was noted that the other thing that impacted on this was the dynamics in town centres. The number of people in stores and walking in the street had decreased compared to what there was five years ago. If that trend continued there would be fewer people on the street and that would impact on community centres and coffee shops. It did give a clear message on where the Committee needed to focus.

Now having some background and with the submissions having been summarised in the report, the Chair said that the Committee now had to consider in 6.1 whether to work with one the four options outlined or consider something different again.

Cr Brannigan touched on the message received from a number of submitters around the role that this Council, or someone, needed to play in terms of a considered, cohesive approach. Property owners were trying to swim with the tide and were not getting their buildings assessed or getting appropriate advice because of the challenges and costs around that. The message for him was that Council could play a leading role. Yes, there would be a cost to the ratepayer, but what would the cost be if a number of shops and businesses were lost and property owners and businesses walked away. Cr Brannigan said he would like to have a recommendation within the decision around the role that Council could play and the resourcing of that which could include a sufficiently qualified person to lead Council's approach and lead some facilitation with property owners across the district moving forward. Whilst people's safety was the main concern, there was also the viability of this district's property and business owners. Council had a big role to play in that.

The submissions from those who did not speak were considered. With some submitters suggesting that the Levin priority area should be extended, the options when it came to expanding the designated area to include SH1 or individual buildings with verandahs where there may not necessarily be the density of traffic was queried in terms of the Policy on Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings and the Building Act, etc.

Mrs Pollock said there were provisions that allowed Councils to review that as part of the earthquake-prone process. Council also had an obligation to ensure the public was safe and that would play a part in the actions going forward.

With regard to the submission from Historic Places Manawatu-Horowhenua, Mrs Pollock said Council was in the MWLASS Group. Whanganui was quite far along in this process and what the consequences might be for some of their buildings was awaited. From all accounts heritage building owners had an obligation to keep the look and feel of their buildings and Council did have a Heritage Fund which could assist, but that fund was not specific to earthquake-prone buildings. It was planned to hold workshops for all earthquake-prone building owners which might assist owners to make contact with technical experts, collaborate and drawn on experiences from others.

Deliberations

Raised and discussed:

- there were completely different arguments for each of Levin, Shannon and Foxton in terms of priority areas and buildings collapsing.
- traffic flows in Shannon and Foxton were vastly different to Levin. Whilst there was SH57 traffic going through Shannon, there were plenty of other routes for emergency services to get through the town and there were not a lot of high buildings.
- when talking about economics, businesses in Shannon were already struggling and it would be unrealistic to have only 7½ years to deal with those buildings;
- the cost to the community needed to be balanced with any risk should there be a big earthquake.
- Foxton and Shannon did not fit into the priority building designation; however Levin was a completely different argument. It had density of both foot and vehicular traffic.
- the Work & Income and New World buildings in Foxton were considered and where they would come in terms of the threshold for concentration, with it noted the Work and Income building was a small office and the New World building was new and was up to code.
- the four options provided in 6.1 of the Report were considered with option 3 perhaps the most appropriate.
- whether or not the designated blue area in Levin was appropriate with some submitters having suggested that the area should be extended.
- considering the Levin CBD blue map area, when producing the report that goes to Council Officers to be requested to cover the implications of the Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings Policy and concerns raised about mitigating the risk of verandahs.
- considering the four options in the report (6.1), Option 3 was perhaps the most appropriate, leaving out Foxton and Shannon.
- in terms of Shannon and Foxton, considering the density of vehicular and foot traffic, it was suggested the critical mass point was not reached so the buildings did not need to be prioritised; however they would need strengthening at some stage even if the time was extended from 7½ to 15 years.
- Levin was a different proposition as it had State Highway 1 running through the town and there was a need to extend the area, as proposed by some submitters, and this could be facilitated by education to increase the public's understanding of what was proposed.
- it would be helpful to have Council lead the conversation in Levin around the options available to building owners and that could be part of the Levin Town Centre Strategy with the two running concurrently.

- Council should also be having discussions with LGNZ in terms of the impact this legislation was going to have on the economy of our communities and our future viability. There were some serious questions to be asked in relation to affordability going forward.
- a recommendation should also be made in relation to buildings that did have a verandah or façade that may not fall into a priority area.
- if the Committee went wider than the boundaries currently proposed, what would be the effects on businesses in those areas?

Responding to the matters raised, Mrs Pollock said that in terms of foot and vehicular traffic numbers, that would be a matter of Members using their local knowledge and common-sense. If the Levin area was extended, she would recommend that time be provided to further consult with those parties affected.

In thinking about some of the issues raised, Cr Mason said with the growth in Levin she thought the foot traffic was extending out beyond lights and there were high traffic flows up passed Stanley Street.

After discussion on how far Members thought would be appropriate to extend the area for Levin and what option(s) should be progressed, the Committee agreed to exclude Foxton and Shannon and would like some more information from Officers on what should happen if the Levin area was extended to the end of the Adventure Park and north to Devon Street.

Mrs Pollock requested guidance as to the level of consultation that should be undertaken if the area in Levin was extended to include Devon Street and towards the end of the Adventure Park. Should it be the same method that had been taken with the entire consultation, which was a targeted approach plus public notification or could it just be a targeted approach and bring back the results to the Hearings Committee.

The Committee Members indicated they would be comfortable with a targeted approach which would give building owners the opportunity to respond.

Mrs Pollock confirmed that responses could be received by email or letter and if people wanted to come and make an oral submission they would have that opportunity.

Mrs Brady further queried if Members would you like Officers to also do some thinking more of a proactive approach in terms of the recommendation to be made back to Council.

When looking at the issues, Members agreed they would like a measured approach, despite it meaning more work for officers so that getting it right for owners and in terms of building safety was ensured.

How 30 Queen Street should be dealt with was discussed, with submissions having been received that this should not be included in the area. Comfort was expressed with this area as designated. 30 Queen Street was a two storey building and there was high vehicular traffic there.

Clarification was sought on the block between Devon and Queen Street, which included Focal Point, with there being a huge amount of traffic coming in and out of the car park.

In terms of Council resourcing/facilitation and whether that had been captured adequately, Mrs Brady said that was something she and Mrs Pollock had spoken about and it was something they were keen to pursue, which included Council

applying to LGNZ and central government and identifying some of the other options where Council could have a voice. They would put further thought into bringing back more information.

Summing up and looking at the four options, Cr Mason noted that their preference was a for a combination of options 2 & 3, with Foxton and Shannon not forming part of the priority zone. Targeted consultation would be undertaken with owners in the identified extended area in Levin. The Committee's comfort was that there would be work done around verandahs, parapets and unreinforced masonry across the district. There was also additional work to be done through LGNZ on economic issues, in particular in relation to affordability, but also with regard to lack of taxation relief available to building owners. The meeting would adjourn to allow Officers to undertake the targeted consultation, with six weeks being the time agreed.

Mrs Pollock said she would provide a map showing the new area proposed and send to Committee Members for confirmation. She said she believed six weeks would be sufficient time to undertake the further consultation and affected parties would be advised of when the hearing would reconvene and they would have the opportunity to come and speak.

Mrs Brady noted that this was only one piece in a wider project. Officers had been providing information as to what this all meant for owners and they were starting to build some good relationships. There were also a number of owners who were not located in the Horowhenua, but she was confident that six weeks would be sufficient time to undertake what was required.

In terms of the ability to speak at the reconvened hearing, it was noted that would be available only for targeted submitters.

3.08 pm

The meeting adjourned at 3.08 pm to reconvene on a date to be advised.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD
AT A MEETING OF THE HEARINGS COMMITTEE
HELD ON

DATE:.....

CHAIRPERSON:.....