

Laura Bowman

From: Official Information
Sent: Wednesday, 7 December 2022 1:43 pm
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Official Information
Subject: Final Response (Part 2) - LGOIMA 286468 - [REDACTED] 7(2)(a) - peer review information of Mr Richard Knott's report

Importance: High

Kia Ora,

I refer to your **information request below**, Hamilton City Council is able to provide the following response.

Please note some parts of your response required the provision of additional documentation in the way of reports and correspondence. The relevant material can be found in the following OneDrive link:  [LGOIMA 286468 - 7\(2\)\(a\) peer review information of Mr Richard Knott's report](#)

We have had to withhold some information from the documents which we are releasing in response to your request. We have applied digital black redactions over the withheld information and have supplied the code to identify the section of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) which we are relying on. We have withheld information on the basis that it is necessary to protect the Privacy of natural persons per s 7(2)(a) LGOIMA

1. *Who within the Hamilton City Council did the QA/QC peer review of Mr Richard Knott's report that is presented as Appendix 9 Historical Heritage in Plan Change 9?*

Council contracted Richard Knott to produce a Historic Heritage Area assessment over a 5 month period. This included 462.25 hours, of which 154.5 hours were spent physically reviewing the sites. The following Council staff reviewed the report from a readability and structure perspective (not a technical heritage expert peer review).

- Alice Morris, Principal Planner
- Katherine Hu, Senior Planner
- Paul Bowman, Team Leader, City Planning
- Mark Roberts, Team Leader, City Planning

2. *Who within the Hamilton City Council did the QA/QC peer review of Ms Carolyn Hills two reports prepared as part of the previous historical heritage review undertaken by the Hamilton City Council a decade ago and cited continuously by Mr Knott in his report?*

The Historic Heritage Area assessment criteria used in Mr Knott's report referenced Carolyn Hill's 2020 Hamilton City Special Character Study. That study was reviewed by Alice Morris, Principal Planner, from a readability and structure perspective (not a technical heritage expert peer review).

3. *If either of the three QA/QC peer reviews was done by an external consultant, who was it done by and how much were they paid?*

Council engaged [REDACTED] from WSP to undertake a review of Richard Knott's draft methodology and assessment criteria. This was undertaken as part of a WSP contract for various work as part of Plan Change 9 and this task and fee was not itemised specifically. Invoice attached in OneDrive link above.

Council also engaged 7(2)(a) Archifact – Architecture & Conservation to undertake a technical, desktop-only, peer review of Richard Knott's draft report. That desktop review noted 7(2)(a) was "generally supportive of the ranking and scoring approach promoted for HHAs". This draft report was provided to Mr Knott, who reviewed his recommendation, which remained unchanged. The fee for this service was \$4300 plus GST.

4. *Please provide all correspondence (emails, file notes, records of telephone conversations, letters etc) between the peer reviewers and Mr Knott pertaining to the peer review of Mr Knott's report, particularly all correspondence to do with edits, rewording or changes that the Council required.*

Please see OneDrive link above for the requested correspondence

5. *In Plan Change 9 there is reference to dates such as pre-1930's early existence of a service town (both ends of Oxford Street East and West HHA's, or 1930-1950's railway workers suburbs etc). What is the information source (titles, other reports, plans, consents etc) used by the HCC to impose these dates?*

Richard Knott's report.

6. *Since Oxford Street did not become part of the city until 1949, can the Council please confirm what if any records (land titles, building consents, plans of houses etc) that are held by the Council for properties in Oxford Street that definitively prove that present domestic dwellings were in existence pre-1930's. I understand from my own research that many earlier Council records were disposed of or destroyed in a fire (Waikato District Council records). If the Council has no records can the Council please provide the reason for this lack of documentation?*

Council have searched the Council property files for all properties on Oxford Street and can confirm that there are no pre-1930's documents for any of the properties. The earliest held is a drainage plan for 1949. As this information does not exist, we are refusing this part of the request per s17(e) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

7. *I understand that the real estate website Oneroof, purports to use Council information to base its indicated age of buildings. In terms of Oxford Street, they seem to believe (presumably) from Council sources that the buildings were built in the 1920's to 1930's. What is the actual source of the Council's information (or records if they exist) that makes Oneroof believe this is correct, when land titles clearly show this is not the case? Is this belief that the buildings were in existence due to the Council's reliance on a subdivision plan dated 1921 for the Oxford Street and Marshall Street area? A subdivision plan is simply that, it does not record when any buildings were constructed, who owned them and the fact that the earliest aerial photograph shows most of Oxford Street was not yet built at around 1943 to 1945 confirms that the subdivision plan is largely irrelevant to dating buildings and hence determining historical heritage.*

This is not a request for specific information held by Hamilton City Council. As this information does not exist, we are refusing this part of the request per s17(e) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

8. *Can the Council please provide a definitive written typology (a description of the many architectural features present within a particular type of building that distinguishes it from others) for a railway cottage/house as defined in either Carolyn Hill's two reports or a "novel" typology made up by Mr Knott. Since typology is a factor in the classification of housing it is necessary to have a valid and correct description of the typology used to classify buildings. Since there is an error (as admitted by Council staff) in Ms Hill's reports there is not a correct written typology presented in her reports, however, Mr Knott cites her typologies in his report continuously. We have been seeking this since before submission closed and still have no answer from Council.*

Carolyn Hill's report has been updated to correct an identified error. A copy of this updated report is attached in OneDrive link above. Other aspects of this request do not relate to specific information held by Hamilton City Council.

Council also wanted to note Plan Change 9 is currently progressing through a legal process set out in the Resource Management Act 1991. As part of this process, Hamilton City Council has received numerous submissions and further submissions on the proposed HHAs, both for and against them. Council expects all issues raised in the submissions to be resolved at the hearing in May 2023, which is the appropriate forum for these matters to be tested.

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision. Information about how to make a complaint is available at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or freephone 0800 802 602.

Kind Regards,

Laura | Official Information Coordinator
Governance & Assurance Team | People and Organisational Performance
Email: officialinformation@hcc.govt.nz



Hamilton City Council | Private Bag 3010 | Hamilton 3240 | Hamilton City Council