
ORDINARY MEETING

OF

CITY STRATEGY COMMITTEE

MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS

Time: 9.38am
Date: Thursday, 20 September 2018
Venue: Committee Room 1
Ground Floor, Council Offices
101 Wakefield Street
Wellington

Business

Page No.

-
- 1. Attachment 1 Handout from Geraldine Murphy.**
Speaking on behalf of Inner City Wellington in relation to item 2.1 Priority Buildings.

INNER CITY WELLINGTON SUBMISSION ON PRIORITY BUILDINGS TO CITY STRATEGY COMMITTEE
20 September 2018

Submission to City Strategy Committee on Priority Buildings, 20 September 2018

We have concerns about several aspects of the paper.

We do not agree with the blanket approach proposed to the identification of the broader CBD area as a high traffic route (para 34)

- This is a disproportionate response to the remaining level of risk in the CBD given that WCC has been identifying potentially EQP buildings since 2006 and has clearly identified the likely priority buildings among those.
- Para 45 says there are approximately 100 buildings across both emergency and high traffic routes yet to be assessed, with 39 identified as potentially EQP. WCC clearly knows which buildings these are and can identify the routes concerned.
- We want:
 - to know how many of the approximately 139 are in the CBD, and
 - an assurance that these buildings fall within the profile categories that MBIE guidance states TAs should follow for identifying priority buildings
- There is no data in the paper or the Statement of Proposal to justify the inclusion of every street, footpath, service lane and laneway in the CBD as a high traffic route. How can Clrs make a determination of the level of risk without the data?
- The provision that enables WCC to use new engineering information needs to be referenced in the Statement of Proposal, and should have been in this paper. There needs to be more clarity for the public on how this provision is applied – what criteria is being used.
 - This information is in the EPB Methodology available on the MBIE website and should be included in the SoP to provide clarity.
 - The proposed use of this criteria to identify priority buildings on high traffic routes (ie, URM buildings with parts that may fall onto the road) is a stretch – especially when WCC must know all the URM buildings by now.
- Clrs should not be approving this broad brush approach when the information is available to target and given the knowledge that WCC has about the buildings within the profile categories in the CBD.
- The draft Statement of Proposal says 'WCC is proposing to identify much of the CBD ... as emergency or high traffic routes. This does not explain the blanket approach and there isn't an explanation of the grey area on the map, which raises questions about the openness of the engagement.
- A WCC officer stated that consultation will allow the community to have a say – but there is insufficient information to allow them to have an informed say – and it is Clrs who should be determining whether the approach is proportionate.

The reference to 'any building' on emergency transport routes (para 40) needs to state that these must align with the profile categories as set out in the EQPB Methodology and referenced in MBIE Guidance.

- Without this explicit reference we have no assurance that buildings beyond the profile categories won't be included in the assessment.
- The 'identify buildings at any time' criteria go beyond the profile categories and can be used on identified emergency routes – and this does not require the blanket approach to the CBD as the routes are clearly identified and agreed

INNER CITY WELLINGTON SUBMISSION ON PRIORITY BUILDINGS TO CITY STRATEGY COMMITTEE
20 September 2018

Statement of Proposal - Glossary

- The use of EQPB to include potentially EQPB is misleading and incorrect. For owners, there is a world of difference between the two states and the two states are recognised in legislation and should not be conflated for convenience.
- Potentially EQPB also have different processes – most importantly the owners have 12 mths to obtain an engineering assessment before they can be determined to be EQP and this applies to priority buildings. This is not even mentioned in the section 'What will be required from building owners' for either emergency or high traffic routes.

Other Council support

- This section reads as though it is available to all owners of EQPB, which is great if that is the case.
- There should be a recommendation to that effect in the paper that the WCC programme support currently provided to the URM façade and parapet building owners is also provided to all EQPB owners.
- Of immediate priority are the owners with less than 10 years before expiry – including priority and non-priority buildings.
- WCC has resisted supporting all owners. It is clear that a number of Body Corporates are clearly struggling to progress complex projects. It was reassuring to see that at least one professional, Will Broadmore, recognises that it is a daunting process for those without experience.
- It is up to WCC and the Government to sort out how the support is provided. But it's clear that it's needed.

We have a number of clarifications around language used in the SoP, which we'll provide to Clr Pannett.

Terminology around URM does not align with the Act or MBIE material

- Para 8(b) refers to 'any building with unreinforced masonry elements that could fall' – the Act and MBIE guidance says 'any part of an URM building that could fall...'.
• This is a critical difference as the reference to 'any building with URM elements' potentially expands the scope of buildings covered. The paper uses different phrases, which makes it confusing – and this is probably continued in the Statement of Proposal.
- The EPB Methodology Category refers to URM with streetscape characteristics including as a sub-point of one aspect 'including buildings of any construction with URM parapets that are not obviously concrete or other forms of construction'. The MBIE guidance does not say 'any building with URM ...'

Lender of last resort

- There must be a resolution that WCC will officially lobby the Government and Wellington Electorate MPs to call for a lender of last resort to share the support burden.
- ICW, Body Corporate Chairs' Group and several owners are actively lobbying Grant Robertson on this matter. We and Grant needs the public support of our elected members for this to get traction with the Government.