

---

Minutes for a hearing of the Policy & Regulatory Committee (to hear and consider submissions and make recommendations on the proposed High Pedestrian Traffic Areas) held via Audio Visual Conference on **MONDAY, 30 MAY 2022** commencing at **11.30am.**

**Present:**

Cr JD Sedgwick (Chairperson)  
His Worship the Mayor, Mr AM Sanson  
Cr A Bech  
Cr C Eyre  
Cr JM Gibb  
Cr SL Henderson  
Cr SD Lynch  
Cr RC McGuire  
Cr F McNally  
Cr E Patterson  
Cr NMD Smith  
Cr LR Thomson  
Cr CT Woolerton

**Attending:**

Mr R MacCulloch (General Manager Service Delivery)  
Mrs S O’Gorman (General Manager Customer Service)  
Ms B Clarke (Corporate Planner)  
Ms M Russo (Planning & Policy Team Leader)  
Ms G Shaw (Democracy Advisor)

## **APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**Resolved: (Crs Thomson/Smith)**

**THAT the Policy & Regulatory Committee accepts apologies from Cr Church, for non-attendance.**

**CARRIED**

**P&RH2205/01**

## **CONFIRMATION OF STATUS OF AGENDA ITEMS**

**Resolved: (Crs Gibb/McInally)**

**THAT the agenda for the Policy & Regulatory Committee hearings and deliberations of the Earthquake Prone Buildings and High Pedestrian Traffic Area, held on Monday, 30 May 2022 be confirmed and all items therein be considered in open meeting.**

**CARRIED**

**P&RH2205/02**

## **DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

There were no disclosures of interest.

## **REPORTS**

**Hearings Report on Proposed High Pedestrian Traffic Areas**  
Agenda Item 4.1

The report was received [*P&RH220/02 refers*]. The Corporate Planner provided an overview of the report and process for the hearings and deliberations. The following discussion was held:

- The public consultation period on the proposed areas was open from 13 April to 13 May 2022. The statement of proposal, a copy of the proposed areas and submission forms were made available at Council offices, libraries and on the Council website.
- An online submission tool was also made available for those wanting to provide feedback online.
- In total, 18 submissions were received. Out of these submissions, one indicated they wanted to speak in support of their submission at the hearing.
- Noted there may have been confusion regarding consultation (and thus what was able to be submitted on) as the identified unreinforced masonry buildings were not publicly available.

## Hearings – Verbal Submissions

The following submissions were presented, and submitters responded to questions:

### **Shayne Ohagan (Submission ID 4006)**

- Mr Ohagan sought further clarity regarding Council’s definition of unreinforced masonry construction.
- Building owners should be informed if Council considered their building/s to contain unreinforced masonry.
- Queried what data had been collected to identify high pedestrian traffic areas.
- Staff confirmed buildings were assessed in accordance with MBIE’s definitions and methodology.
- One Councillor noted the Committee was available to receive, and listen to, submissions – not to answer questions.
- If a building was not situated in an identified high pedestrian traffic area, it did not become a high priority building.
- An unreinforced masonry building located in a high pedestrian traffic area was considered high priority.
- Staff confirmed the submitter had been provided with an extensive information package (including MBIE guidance of high pedestrian traffic areas) prior to the hearing.
- Queried what data Council had collected to determine the volume of pedestrian traffic on identified roads and how that data compared to other streets in Ngaruawahia. Confirmed staff would provide follow up information.
- Had Council considered the effect (to the town centre) of demolishing building/s on the corner of Jesmond Street and Great South Road? Chair established this was outside the scope of consultation.
- Has Council considered demolishing (e.g., corner of Desmond and Great South Rd) – how that would affected the town centre? That is out of the scope of this consultation. There would be consultation if those iconic buildings were demolished.
- Cr Patterson confirmed his intention to hold a discussion with Mr Ohagan regarding questions and comments around sites in the ward.
- Staff confirmed Mr Ohagan would receive information regarding data collection methodology, MBIE definitions.
- Mr Ohagan felt there was a distinct lack of information provided to the public.

## **DELIBERATIONS**

### Deliberations Report for Earthquake Prone Buildings and Proposed High Pedestrian Traffic Areas Agenda Item 4.2

The report was received [*P&RH2205/02 refers*]. The Corporate Planner provided an overview of the report and process for the deliberations. The following discussion was held:

#### Ngaruawahia

- Several suggestions from the community were received during the consultation regarding where they thought the high pedestrian areas were for Ngaruawahia, Huntly and Te Kauwhata.
- The suggested amendments to the proposed areas were generally minor. These were included in the report and Attachment I for the Committee's deliberations and direction.
- The following matter was noted for Council deliberations: "Extending the high pedestrian area in Ngaruawahia to include the portion of Galileo Street starting at Newcastle Street to Community House on the corner and link back to the remainder of Martin Street."
- Several submissions recommended including this portion, noting it was a high traffic area and key businesses are located on this route.
- Staff noted whilst there is sufficient pedestrian and vehicular traffic along this route, there are no buildings containing URM located along this route and buildings are sufficiently set back from footpaths that the threat to public safety is minimal.
- Staff proposed no changes to include this area as it did not meet the criteria for classification of a High Pedestrian Traffic area.
- Noted there was some misunderstanding regarding the policy.

#### Huntly

- The following matters were noted for Council deliberations: "Inclusion of Onslow Street in Huntly's High Pedestrian Traffic areas"
- Committee agreed there were no buildings on Onslow Street that would meet URM criteria.
- The following matters were noted for Council deliberations: "Inclusion of Hakanoa Street in Huntly's High Pedestrian Traffic areas."
- Old Huntly Fire Station, located at 7 Hakanoa St, had been identified as the only URM building located on this thoroughfare.
- Staff proposed amending the area in Huntly to include 75m on either side of the property in either direction, noting it is a URM building.
- Better to err on the side of caution and have additional space on either side of URM buildings, which is why 75m either side had been recommended.

