

Urban development

The appeal of a city, and the quality of life it provides, are directly related to its urban form and design.

A well-planned city is attractive and easy to get around. It has a distinctive character and 'feel'. It values and preserves its heritage. And it offers a good range of places to live and work, and plenty of things to see and do.

Wellington's urban environment is shaped by its landscape – the harbour, hills, Town Belt and coastline. It is a compact, vibrant city, with a distinct heart and good access to transport. But it will only hold on to these positive traits if future development is carefully managed.

Our built environment work includes enhancing the waterfront and city and suburban centres, developing public spaces such as urban parks and squares, looking after heritage sites, assessing and issuing building and resource consents, ensuring earthquake-prone buildings are strengthened, and planning for the city's future growth and development.

THE OUTCOMES WE'RE SEEKING

Our long-term aims are to make Wellington:

- More liveable – it will be a great place to live, offering a variety of places to live, work and play in a high quality public environment
- More sustainable – its buildings and urban design/layout will use land and other resources efficiently and sustainably
- Better connected – the city will be easy to get around, pedestrian friendly, and offer quality transport options with a focus on walking, cycling and passenger transport
- More prosperous – urban design will contribute to economic development through good transport linkages and a flexible approach to land use planning
- More compact – with a contained urban form and more intensive development focused on the city centre, key suburban centres and major transport corridors
- Safer – with well designed buildings and public spaces enhancing safety
- Have a stronger 'sense of place' – as a memorable, beautiful city that celebrates its capital city status, distinctive landforms and heritage, and buildings/landmarks of high quality.

STATE OF THE CITY

The vast majority of Wellingtonians see the city as a great place to live.

Overall, 93% of Wellingtonians say the city is a great place to live. Though that's a slight drop from previous years (96% in 2006 and 2005) it's still a great result.

The vast majority also believe the city offers a variety of places to live (91%), work (79%) and play (93%).

However, population growth and changing lifestyles are creating pressures.

Wellington's population grew by almost 15,000 between 2001 and 2006, with another 19,000 expected over the next 20 years. Though most people live in suburban neighbourhoods, growth in the central city's population has been rapid, and so has growth in the number of people living close to neighbourhood shops.

	Total population 2006	Population growth 2001-06	Number of buildings 2006	Growth in building numbers 2002-06
Central city	8547	46%	1805	0.4%
Inner residential	25,227	7%	10,353	2.2%
Suburban centre	2,295	35%	2106	7.6%
Outer residential	108,402	10%	73,350	6.6%
Growth spine ¹ (estimate)	22,293	22%	9659	8.3%

¹ The growth spine is where more intensive urban development will be encouraged. It stretches from Kilbirnie and Newtown through the city centre into Johnsonville.

Population growth, along with a trend towards smaller households, means the number of homes in the city is increasing and will continue to increase over the next couple of decades. Since land is limited, demand for high-density/infill housing is increasing. In future, growth will either take place through further increases in building density, or through development of available land around northern suburbs such as Johnsonville.

Wellington is already a compact city – almost half of Wellington homes (48.9%) are within 100m of a bus stop, an increase from 44.4% in 2005. A lot of growth in building density has taken place in suburban centres and outer residential areas.

We aim to manage growth so it benefits the city and doesn't compromise character areas.

This means focusing growth in areas where the benefits are the greatest and the harm minimised – areas that are close to places of work, shops, and transport routes. While most residents (86%) are proud of the way the city looks and feels, there are some issues we need to respond to. Fewer Wellingtonians see heritage as contributing to the character of their local neighbourhood (down from 86% to 72% in two years) and the city as a whole (from 93% to 86%). And fewer New Zealanders see Wellington as an attractive destination (from 80% to 75% over two years).

Comment [BS1]: Deleted repetition that had been inserted

As you'll see in the following pages, we're addressing these issues through a range of measures aimed at protecting heritage and character, and focusing growth in appropriate areas. We're also working to enhance public spaces and raise overall building design standards.

We monitor the value of commercial consents to gauge how well the building industry is performing.

The value of these consents dipped to \$215.3 million in 2007 after peaking at \$363.7m the year before. In 2005 the figure was \$302m. Higher values tend to indicate more prosperous times, but fluctuation is to be expected as very large projects (such as the new Wellington Hospital) do not occur every year.

Some residents are concerned about the city's streetscapes, particularly graffiti and vandalism.

In our February 2007 resident survey, about half of Wellington residents expressed concern about safety and security-related aspects of the urban environment – 59% were concerned about graffiti, 51% about areas of the city that are poorly lit, and 47% about vandalism.

We're addressing these issues through a newly established anti-graffiti team; initiatives to improve public safety, and better lighting and urban design.

THREE-YEAR PRIORITIES

For the period 2006-09, we've identified the following priorities for our urban development work. The priorities are important stepping stones towards the outcomes referred to above:

- we will improve the way infill development is managed in residential areas
- we will work to improve the quality of the city's urban design
- we will set in place a 50-year plan for the 'growth spine'.

LOOKING AHEAD

As explained in the following pages, progress has been made on our three-year priorities – for example, policies have been developed to support the 'growth spine' strategy and improve management of heritage areas and infill housing. While residents are positive about the city's urban design, our February 2007

survey showed a small dip in satisfaction. This may reflect the pressures of growth and changing land use described above. Our approach to urban development is aimed at addressing these pressures. Other challenges include responding to the significant demands on our building consents and licensing services, and managing urban development projects at a time of limited capacity and rising costs in the construction sector.

Urban planning and policy

We aim to preserve the city's character and encourage high quality, sustainable development.

Wellington has so much going for it – its rugged natural environment, its compact size, the character and colour of its buildings, and the fact that it has a vibrant heart in the city centre.

To preserve these things as the city grows takes planning. Growth needs to occur in smart ways – ways that make efficient use of land and transport, and don't compromise the qualities that make Wellington special. In our urban planning work, we're aiming for a city that's compact, liveable, sustainable, prosperous, and retains a strong 'sense of place'.

WHAT WE DID

We took steps to ensure that urban development is focused in areas where it will bring the most benefits.

One of our key urban planning aims is to focus development along a 'growth spine' from Johnsonville in the north through the city to Newtown and Kilbirnie. This approach recognises a trend towards living in higher density housing closer to shops, places of work and transport hubs. It will help to ensure the city's land and other resources are used wisely and protect the character and heritage of suburban areas.

As part of this approach, during the year we sought public views on infill housing (i.e. 'backyard' housing developments in suburban areas). Our draft policy proposed that infill should be encouraged in areas of the city best able to cope with it, and tightly controlled or not allowed in other areas.

We also made a submission to a select committee inquiry into the affordability of housing in New Zealand.

We reviewed rules for development in the central city and sought public input.

The review aimed to retain the city centre as a vibrant area mixing retail, entertainment, office space and apartment living, while also enhancing the urban environment and better protecting heritage areas. We proposed stronger provisions to encourage high quality building design, tougher height restrictions in heritage areas, and changes to allow the effects of wind to be better managed. We also proposed to protect views and sunlight in public spaces, and control port and rail land to the north of the city which will ensure developments in those areas enhance the viability of the central city. More than 300 people visited roadshows held in city centre parks to explain the proposals, and 90 submissions were made on proposed changes to the District Plan to implement our proposals.

We completed a draft plan for the 'Capital Precinct' which aims to enhance the Parliament precinct and recognition of the city's role as the capital. The draft plan will go out for consultation during 2007/08.

Our planning work also focused on the northern area of the city.

The northern area of the city, centred on Johnsonville, is expected to grow significantly over the next two decades. We have a long-term framework to help guide that growth. During 2006/07, we asked for input on a 20-year strategy for growth around Johnsonville, aimed at developing it as the city's second largest centre after the CBD.

The strategy set out to enhance housing options, public transport, public spaces, building design and community facilities around Johnsonville's central area, and attract more businesses and jobs. Early in 2007, we also sought input on plans for an upgrade of the Johnsonville town centre, along with plans for a new neighbourhood centre for Churton Park.

We took steps to protect heritage areas and buildings.

We proposed to protect 50 heritage buildings and objects by listing them in the District Plan. We also adopted changes to protect the character of Newtown, Berhampore and Mount Cook. More than 80% of the homes in these three suburbs were built before 1919. Ranging from workers' cottages to grand villas, they're a big part of the suburbs' colour and character. The rule changes will mean resource consents are needed for demolition or substantial renovation of these homes.

We consulted on a revised Subdivision Design Guide and revised Code of Practice for Land Development to ensure the quality and sustainability of future land development and subdivisions. We consulted on changes to District Plan rules covering subdivision/development of the northern area of the city (with specific rules for development of Lincolnshire Farm near Grenada Village), noise from the port, and non-airport activities at Wellington Airport.

Our planning work was recognised by the New Zealand Planning Institute.

For the third year in a row, we received the New Zealand Planning Institute's Nancy Northcroft Planning Practice Award. This year's award recognised the planning process and practice associated with the development of our seven overarching strategies – for urban development, transport, the environment, economic development, cultural well-being, social and recreation, and governance.

HOW WE PERFORMED

URBAN PLANNING AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT (1.1.1)	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	TARGET	COMMENTS
1. Residents (%) who agree the city is developing in a way that takes in to account its unique urban character and natural environment. <i>(Source: WCC Resident Satisfaction Survey)</i>	-	-	70%	85%	There is a notable gap between our target and resident perceptions with regard to the way the city is developing. This is the first year we have surveyed residents on this and we will monitor trends over coming years to assess our progress.
2. Planning Policy (District Plan) team – % of scheduled work programme completed on time. <i>(Source: WCC Planning Policy)</i>	-	-	100%	95%	The District Plan team completed all of its scheduled projects.
SMART GROWTH (1.2.1)	PERFORMANCE – COMMENTS				
Implementation of 'growth spine' framework – achievement of key milestones and monitoring of growth. <i>(Source: WCC Urban Design)</i>	We consulted on a draft Town Centre Plan for Johnsonville. The final plan is expected by the end of 2007. Detailed planning for the development of further growth node areas has been undertaken though progress is slightly slower than we had hoped. Plans for Adelaide Road and the Eastern suburbs will now be delivered in 2008/09.				

WHAT IT COST

OPERATING EXPENDITURE (\$000)	2007			2006
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual
Urban planning and policy (1.1.1)				
Expenditure	1,965	1,941	(24)	1,784
Revenue	(125)	(79)	46	(14)
Net expenditure	1,840	1,862	22	1,770
Smart growth (1.2.1)				
Expenditure	228	220	(8)	317
Revenue	-	-	-	(2)
Net expenditure	228	220	(8)	315
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE (\$000)				
Urban planning and policy (1.1.1)				
Actual cost	211	211	-	1,888
Budget to carry forward to 2007/08 ¹	-	1,365	1,365	1,576

¹ Capital works on the Northern Growth project have encountered delays as a result of poor summer weather.

Development control and facilitation

Land development and subdivisions should be sustainable and in keeping with the city's character.

All cities control development work according to the provisions of the Resource Management Act and District Plan. These controls are required by law, and they're necessary to ensure resources are used sustainably, to protect public health and safety, and to protect future users of land and buildings. They're also needed to protect urban character and to preserve the city's heritage, for example by protecting trees and other heritage assets.

Overall, we want the city to become more sustainable, safe, and prosperous, and to retain its compactness and unique 'sense of place'.

WHAT WE DID

We assessed development proposals against the rules and guidelines contained in the District Plan.

We assess resource consent applications against the District Plan, issue resource consents, and monitor compliance, to ensure land and other resources are managed sustainably. The year saw some high profile consents progressed.

A panel of independent commissioners granted a resource consent for the proposed Marine Education Centre on the south coast. This was appealed to the Environment Court. A resource consent was also granted for Victoria University to build three new student accommodation buildings in Fairlie Terrace, Kelburn.

The Environment Court in May 2007 upheld decisions by the Wellington City Council and Greater Wellington Regional Council to grant resource consents for Project West Wind, Meridian Energy's proposed wind farm at Makara. The court decision allows Meridian to go ahead with 66 of the 70 wind turbines it proposed for the farm, which will meet much of the region's electricity needs.

We also took action to deal with those who breach the law and harm the city's environment.

In 2006, after a prosecution taken by the Council, a company was fined \$25,000 in the District Court for breaches of the Resource Management Act. This and other court decisions in recent years have helped to deter breaches of the Act. During 2006/07, there were fewer significant cases of non-compliance and, where non-compliance was detected, officers were largely successful in achieving voluntary compliance.

HOW WE PERFORMED

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND FACILITATION (1.3.1)	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	TARGET	COMMENTS
1. Resource consents - non-notified (%) issued within statutory time-frames (20 working days). <i>(Source: WCC Planning Group)</i>	86%	81%	89%	100%	This has been another challenging year with several large projects, most notably the appeal of the Westwind – Meridian Makara Wind Farm. These complex projects draw staff away from processing applications. Nevertheless, we processed a greater number of consents within the 20 day period than last year. We remain under our target.
2. Applications for certification of sub-division plans (%) that are processed within statutory time-frames (10 working days). <i>(Source: WCC Planning Group)</i>	-	-	52%	100%	There has been a notable increase in the number of applications for certification of sub-division plans, which has contributed to a considerable number of applications not being issued within statutory timeframes. We expect process improvements currently being implemented to have a positive impact on our ability to process more applications within statutory time-frames.

WHAT IT COST

OPERATING EXPENDITURE (\$000)	2007			2006
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual
Development control and facilitation (1.3.1)				
Expenditure	5,153	5,231	78	5,587
Revenue	(1,780)	(1,848)	(68)	(1,591)
Net expenditure	3,373	3,383	10	3,996

Building control and facilitation

Building work should be safe and sustainable, and enhance the city's character.

All cities control building work according to the provisions of the Building Act and codes. These controls are required by law, and they're necessary to protect public health and safety, and to protect future users of land and buildings. They're also needed to protect urban character, for example by ensuring height restrictions for building in suburban areas, and to preserve the city's heritage.

Overall, we want the city to become more sustainable, safer, and prosperous, and to retain its compactness and unique 'sense of place'.

WHAT WE DID

We controlled building work to ensure it complied with all legal requirements.

We assess building consent applications to ensure proposed work will comply with the Building Code, and we issue building consents and monitor compliance. Wellington is one of the busiest cities in the country for building work – each year we deal with several thousand consent applications.

During 2006/07, we:

- worked with major developers to resolve complex issues relating to building consents for Wellington Hospital, Wellington Airport, and significant redevelopments for government departments
- issued 3557 building consents
- continued to work towards accreditation as a building consent authority, as required under the Building Act 2004 – we are confident of receiving accreditation before 30 June 2008, the date at which new rules come into force requiring building consents to be considered and issued by accredited authorities.

In addition, the Department of Building and Housing conducted a technical review of our building control operations. These reviews are carried out on local authorities with the aim of improving performance and ensuring compliance with building laws. The department concluded that our building control operations are meeting our statutory obligations.

We worked to respond to weathertight homes claims.

Along with other councils throughout New Zealand, we have obligations under the Weathertight Homes Resolution Services Act. At the end of the year, the Weathertight Homes Resolution Service had 270 active claims involving Wellington city homes (out of more than 3000 nationwide), an increase of just over 30 from July 2006.

HOW WE PERFORMED

BUILDING CONTROL AND FACILITATION (1.4.2)	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	TARGET	COMMENTS
1. Building consents (%) issued within statutory time-frames (20 working days) <i>(Source: WCC BCLS)</i>	Small works 99%; Under \$500k 100%, Over \$500k 82%	Small works 100%; Under \$500k 95%, Over \$500k 90%	Small works 100%; Under \$500k 79%, Over \$500k 76%	<i>All categories 100%</i>	This has been another busy year processing building consents and issuing code of compliance certificates. For those consents that were not issued within statutory timeframes, most were within a working day of the prescribed time requirement.
2. Code of compliances (%) issued within statutory timeframes (20 working days), once advised by the owner that work is complete. <i>(Source: WCC BCLS)</i>	-	-	91%	<i>100%</i>	The national building boom means we continue to experience difficulty in finding staff with experience in building control. This has resulted in our team either carrying vacancies or replacing experienced staff with entry level staff who require higher levels of training and supervision. Both factors have contributed to reduced performance for the year.

WHAT IT COST

OPERATING EXPENDITURE (\$000)	2007			2006
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual
Building control and facilitation (1.4.2)				
Expenditure	10,187	10,865	678	10,158
Revenue	(6,071)	(6,391)	(320)	(5,774)
Net expenditure	4,116	4,474	358	4,384

Reduced operating expenditure is due to a number of vacancies not being filled in a tight labour market.

Earthquake risk mitigation

Wellington is built on an active faultline, which makes it earthquake-prone.

Each week, at least one shallow quake is recorded under the city, though most are so small they're not even noticeable. In 1855, the country's most powerful quake ever struck the city, raising the harbour by 1-2 metres and shifting Lambton Quay inland. A similar quake today could be devastating.

WHAT WE DID

We worked with owners of older buildings to assist with restoration and earthquake strengthening.

In line with our Earthquake-prone Buildings Policy, this work includes identifying and assessing earthquake-prone buildings, and can include financial and property management assistance, and/or requiring the owner to carry out strengthening work.

During 2006/07, we employed two consulting engineering firms to help identify earthquake-prone buildings. An initial pilot study was undertaken to test the robustness of the evaluations and ensure consistency of interpretation and application between the assessors. Evaluations started in the second half of the year. Approximately 40 percent of the buildings evaluated to date have been assessed as earthquake prone. Notification has been provided to the owners of these buildings.

We also funded scientists to determine the likely impact of a major earthquake on the city.

Wellington: It's Our Fault is a seven-year, \$3.5 million research project aimed at better understanding the region's vulnerability to large earthquakes. There are four main strands to the research – the likelihood and frequency of large earthquakes, the expected size, the physical effects, and the social and economic impacts.

The project is being led by government-owned research company GNS Science, in collaboration with a number of public and private sector organisations. Financial support is coming from the Earthquake Commission, ACC, Wellington City Council, and Greater Wellington.

Launching the project in December last year, the mayor said the project was a step forward in understanding better the risk to Wellington and Wellingtonians from earthquakes. "It's not a matter of if, but when, and the more we know about earthquakes and the impact a major earthquake would have on our city, the better prepared Wellington can be," she said.

GNS Science Chief Executive, Alex Malahoff, said the name of the project was an acknowledgement that earthquakes were a community-wide issue. He said the project would provide an unprecedented amount of information on Wellington's earthquake risk, which could then be used by engineers, planners, emergency managers and the insurance industry to better plan for and respond to a major earthquake.

Also see the Social and Recreation section of this report for information on our emergency management operations.

Breakout quote: "The better our understanding of the hazards we face, the better equipped we can become to deal with them." – Earthquake Commission general manager David Middleton, commenting at the launch of Wellington: It's Our Fault.

HOW WE PERFORMED

EARTHQUAKE RISK AND MITIGATION (1.4.1)	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	TARGET	COMMENTS
Buildings assessed during the year (approximately 3,800 potentially earthquake prone buildings have been identified for assessment over three years). <i>(Source: WCC BCLS)</i>	-	-	562 buildings (46%)	1,200 buildings (100%)	This was the first year of a three year project. We focused on recruiting staff and developing and implementing robust processes, particularly around engineering procedure and assessment through a consistent and common understanding of the Initial Evaluation Process (IEP) procedure. As a result, our target was not met. Real progress towards this performance measure did not commence until February 2007. We expect greater progress against our schedule over the next two years.

WHAT IT COST

OPERATING EXPENDITURE (\$000)	2007			2006
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual
Earthquake risk mitigation (1.4.1)				
Expenditure	427	463	36	50
Revenue	-	(4)	(4)	-
Net expenditure	427	459	32	50

Public spaces development

We want to enhance the city through sensitive, high-quality development of the waterfront and other public areas.

The waterfront is Wellington's heart. It's a festival venue, a place where people gather to relax, an area of colour and charm. Sensitive development of this key area enhances people's enjoyment of the city and contributes to our sense of what makes Wellington unique.

Attractive, well-designed parks and public spaces in the city and suburbs are also crucial to people's enjoyment of the city. They encourage people to get together, support shops and cafes, and make the city more attractive for Wellingtonians and visitors alike. They also provide important connections between businesses, making the city a more stimulating place to work. Heritage buildings – along with other heritage assets such as monuments, historic trees and archaeological sites – also add to the city's character.

Our goals are to retain the city's character, make it more liveable and provide an even stronger 'sense of place' through continual improvement of public areas.

WHAT WE DID

Work to enhance the waterfront continued throughout the year.

The waterfront is managed by a Council-controlled organisation, Wellington Waterfront Ltd. Development takes place with Council funding in line with a guiding policy, the Wellington Waterfront Framework. Public space developments during 2006/07 included approval of a design brief for Frank Kitts Park, work to enhance the Kumutoto public space area (with trees, planters, plazas, promenades, boardwalks and a new bridge), levelling of the grassy mound at Taranaki Wharf and landscaping of the area, and sealing of the Waitangi Park temporary car parking area.

Waitangi Park won a top architecture award

The New Zealand Institute of Architects recognised the outstanding success of Waitangi Park by awarding a 2007 Supreme Award to the park's designers Athfield Architects and Wraight Associates. The park was one of only three Supreme Award winners, and the only urban design project to win an award.

Award judges commented: "The varied demands of powhiri, skateboard bowls, kids' playgrounds, sports fields and cleaning stormwater runoff among others underpin a project that offers a delightful experience for active users, passive observers and daily commuters. The park confidently mixes the robust and the gentle, visual and aural, contemporary and historic to create a sequence of spaces that are at once intimate and particular while adding to the greater identity of a major new city facility."

Breakout quote: "After controversial beginnings, the park is now an integral piece of Wellington's waterfront landscape that has been embraced by the whole city." – NZ Institute of Architects award judges.

Waterfront buildings were redeveloped to enhance the waterfront environment and attract people.

The Council granted a 125-year lease on the Overseas Passenger Terminal wharf and terminal building to Willis Bond & Co. The \$32 million deal will see the wharf strengthened and repiled. The building will accommodate apartments on the upper levels and a range of other uses – including a fishing wharf and accommodation for an artist in residence – at wharf-level. Progress was also made on several other waterfront buildings:

- Chaffers Dock was completed, and the promenade in front of the building was resealed with new seating and lighting installed.
- The St John's Heineken Hotel was opened in the Wellington Free Ambulance Building.
- Exterior refurbishment and structural upgrade of Shed 13 started and was nearing completion at the end of July 2007.
- Progress continued on the construction of Site 7 – the Meridian Energy building, which is regarded as the 'greenest' commercial building in New Zealand.
- A shortlist of six designers was selected for concept designs for sites 8 to 10 in the Kumutoto precinct.

The Greater Wellington Regional Council granted a resource consent for the Hilton Hotel on the Queen's Wharf outer-T, and an appeal was lodged with the Environment Court. As the proposal is wholly within the coastal marine area, Greater Wellington was the sole consenting authority – no resource consent was required from us. Nevertheless, the independent commissioners appointed by Greater Wellington considered our District Plan rules before making their decision.

We redeveloped street environments, urban parks and other public areas to make these areas safe, lively and attractive.

The \$2.5 million Greening of the Quays project was completed on time and budget. The project involved planting more than 50 pohutukawa trees and native shrubs in a newly created median strip along Jervois and Customhouse Quays.

A transformation of Cog Park in Evan's Bay got under way and is due for completion during 2007. This work included the removal of a 17-tonne steel cog that was used for more than a century to haul ships up a patent slip for cleaning and repairs – the cog is being repaired and relocated. The new park will include a lawn area, a new coastal track and planting of native grasses and coastal plants as well as pohutukawa, ngaio and kowhai among existing trees.

Work got under way to upgrade the Mount Victoria summit area with a new viewing platform, and we worked with the government on a proposal to develop an iconic new Memorial Park surrounding the National War Memorial in Buckle Street.

We prepared a draft concept plan to revitalise Central Park in Brooklyn. The upgrade will start following public consultation on our plans. The work will be part funded from the Plimmers Bequest. We also sought public views on plans for an upgrade of the area around Aro Valley community centre.

We also provided grants to help with restoration of heritage buildings that contribute to the city's character.

The Council agreed to a new heritage fund of \$225,000. During the year, we assessed 11 applications for funding and made eight grants. Recipients included the historic Futuna Chapel in Karori, St Barnabas Church in Roseneath, Victoria House student hostel, the Tower Building on Customhouse Quay, St Christopher's Seatoun/Strathmore, and three historic houses.

An inventory of Wellington's heritage buildings went live on the Council's website www.Wellington.govt.nz.

HOW WE PERFORMED

PUBLIC SPACE AND CENTRE DEVELOPMENT (1.5.2)	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	TARGET	COMMENTS
1. Residents (%) who agree that the central city is lively and attractive. (Source: WCC Resident Satisfaction Survey)	90%	88%	85%	91%	The vast majority of residents continue to think the city centre is lively and attractive, though fewer residents feel as positive about their local suburban centres. Delays in some of our projects may have impacted on this result. Of the four major projects scheduled for the year only <i>Greening the Quays</i> was completed. The rest were rescheduled to allow for consultation and detailed planning. <i>West Courtenay</i> park and the <i>Golden Mile</i> upgrade are now set to be done in the coming year. The Cog Park redevelopment is in its final stages.
2. Residents (%) who agree that their local suburban centre is lively and attractive. (Source: WCC Resident Satisfaction Survey)	59%	64%	55%	62%	
3. Scheduled projects that are completed on time (measured as a percentage of all projects). (Source: WCC Public Space Design)	-	-	25%	75%	
HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT (1.5.3)	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	TARGET	COMMENTS
1. Listed items in the District Plan that are demolished or removed during the year. (Source: WCC Urban Design Policy)	-	-	No items	No items	We processed 20 resource consents for alterations and additions to heritage buildings. This equates to works being done on 4 percent of heritage buildings listed on the District plan.
2. Resource consents granted for heritage buildings in respect to additions and alterations, measured as a percentage of the total number of heritage buildings listed in the District Plan. (Source: WCC Urban Design Policy)	10%	5%	4%	NA	

WHAT IT COST

OPERATING EXPENDITURE (\$000)	2007			2006
	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual
Waterfront development (1.5.1)¹				
Expenditure	8,495	2,505	(5,990)	5,612
Revenue	(10,835)	(42)	10,793	(8,446)
Net expenditure	(2,340)	2,463	4,803	(2,834)
Public space and centre development (1.5.2)				
Expenditure	1,250	1,254	4	1,013
Revenue	(90)	(48)	42	1
Net expenditure	1,160	1,206	46	1,014
Heritage development (1.5.3)				
Expenditure	721	842	121	581
Revenue	(20)	(19)	1	(3)
Net expenditure	701	823	122	578
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE (\$000)				
Waterfront development (1.5.1)²				
Actual cost	7,250	3,675	(3,575)	4,481
Budget to carry forward to 2007/08	-	-	-	11,675
Public space and centre development (1.5.2)				
Actual cost	4,650	4,903	253	3,070
Budget to carry forward to 2007/08 ³	-	3,125	3,125	2,489
Heritage development (1.5.3)				
Actual cost	219	224	5	110
Budget to carry forward to 2007/08 ⁴	-	510	510	734

¹The net revenue variance primarily relates to unbudgeted movements in the revaluation of investment properties within the Wellington Waterfront project.

² Capital works on the Wellington Waterfront Project in the Kumototo Wharf area have been brought forward from 2007/08.

³ The Golden Mile and west Courtney Park projects have been rescheduled.

⁴ Earthquake strengthening of the former Chest Hospital have been rescheduled.