

Out of scope

-----Original Message-----

From: David Durie [mailto:xxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx]

Sent: 9 August 2023 3:53 PM

To: Donna Jennings [mailto:xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx]

Subject: RE: s9(2)(a) Official Information Act request

CAUTION: External email. Do not click or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If unsure use the Report Phishing button.

Will very likely go to Kāinga Ora, so suggest starting to work on it now. Im still awaiting the formal confirmation though.

Will aim to come back in the next couple of days.

David

From: Donna Jennings

Sent: Wednesday, 9 August 2023 1:54 PM

To: David Durie

Subject: FW: s9(2)(a) Official Information Act request

Hi David

This one looks like it has been sent to Megan Woods MP address – should this one be transferred to Kāinga Ora?

Donna

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Tuesday, 8 August 2023 9:27 AM

To: xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx

Cc: Renee Regal xxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx; Graeme Broderick

xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx; xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx

Subject: Official Information Act request

CAUTION: External email. Do not click or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If unsure use the Report Phishing button.

Please provide the following information:

1. Kainga Ora's conflict of interest policy as it pertains to staff, and third-party contractors.
2. Details of any conflicts of interest - perceived or actual - declared by staff or third-party

contractors in relation to the proposed Kainga Ora-RDC-Ngati Rangi development at Teitei Drive, Ohakune.

3. The date(s) that any conflicts of interest - perceived or actual - were declared by staff or third-party contractors in relation to the proposed Kainga Ora-RDC-Ngati Rangi development at Teitei Drive, Ohakune.

4. Details of how any conflicts of interest - perceived or actual - declared by staff or third-party contractors in relation to the proposed Kainga Ora-RDC-Ngati Rangi development at Teitei Drive, Ohakune, were resolved.

s9(2)(a)

www.govt.nz - your guide to finding and using New Zealand government services

Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of Kāinga Ora. This message and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be legally privileged, and are solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivery to the intended recipient, you have received this message in error.

Please:

(1) reply promptly to that effect, and remove this email, any attachment and the reply from your system;

(2) do not use, disclose or act on this email in any other way. Thank you.

Out of scope

-----Original Message-----

From: Housing Admin [mailto:xxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx]

Sent: 31 July 2023 1:54 PM

To: GRU Jobs [mailto:xxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx]

CC: EXT - David Durie [mailto:xxxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx]

Subject: MW-PH-1190: Kainga Ora Ohakune more focused on empire-building than getting needy people into homes

CAUTION: External email. Do not click or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If unsure use the Report Phishing button.

Hi Kāinga Ora

Can you draft a ministerial response to this one please – due back into the office 28 August please.

Thanks team

Caitlin!

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Friday, 28 July 2023 7:19 PM

To: Megan Woods (MIN)

Subject: Kainga Ora Ohakune more focused on empire-building than getting needy people into homes

Importance: High

Hi Megan,

I am writing to you as a representative of over 120 property owners neighboring the proposed TeiTei Drive development.

Home owners, businesses and the Carrot Park its proposed to neighbour are all shocked that KO is not looking at spreading the load of public housing using existing stock available publicly.

You can read about some of this at the article

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/300930814/large-intensive-kinga-ora-housing-proposal-for-ohakune>

We had a meeting with KO representatives who voiced that “KO has a standard requirement and set standard” for purchasing existing homes.

Renee said “I haven’t looked at them in depth, but I’ve skimmed them” and we queried why KO wasn’t buying existing sections that were build ready at \$150k+

I really question why KO is building intensified state houses in one area where the population of Ohakune is around 1000 people.

Job opportunities only exist during the winter season when there is up to 11,000 visitors staying in the town.

Renee stated there was 72 people waiting for houses in Ohakune, which we pointed out is incorrect, there are 72 individuals or families in the whole Ruapehu district.

We are very concerned that people will be displaced from other areas into Ohakune where there are no jobs, no GP, not very many things for kids to do (which leads to crime).

I have a recording of this hour long call and that lack of knowledge the staff have of this town and the people waiting on the MSD waitlist.

What seems clear is that Kainga Ora is more focused on empire-building “to meet government targets” than getting needy people into homes that already exist!

It would be great to talk to you about this project and the huge negative impact this will have on Ohakune and its tourism.

Regards

s9(2)(a) the neighbouring property owners & businesses.

Out of scope

-----Original Message-----

From: Housing Admin [mailto:xxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxxx.xx]

Sent: 1 August 2023 9:29 AM

To: GRU Jobs [mailto:xxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxxx.xx]

CC: EXT - David Durie [mailto:xxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxxx.xx]

Subject: MW-PH-1196: Teitei Drive - Kainga Ora development - Ohakune

CAUTION: External email. Do not click or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If unsure use the Report Phishing button.

Mōrena Kāinga Ora team

Can we please get a draft ministerial response to this one too – can we ensure that this response, and the ministerial letter for **s9(2)(a)** commissioned yesterday (MW-PH-1190) are reflective of each other.

Can we also get this Ministerial response for the 28 August so we can put these out together? But, let me know if you need the additional days.

Thank you!

Caitlin

From: **s9(2)(a)**

Sent: Monday, 31 July 2023 4:19 PM

To: Megan Woods (MIN)

Cc: Rt Hon Chris Hipkins

Subject: Teitei Drive - Kainga Ora development - Ohakune

Dear minister,

I am a semi-permanent resident of Ohakune.

A few weeks ago I received a letter from Kainga Ora stating that they and Ruapehu District Council (RDC) were to lodge a resource consent for a 130-plus dwelling subdivision in Ohakune (they lodged a week after the letter was dated). At the time, this was the only communication we had received from KO... No consultation, no assessment to see whether neighbours would be affected parties, a done deal.

It has become clear that Kainga Ora, your charge, and RDC have done a backroom deal and deliberately kept it not just from those neighbours directly affected, but the entire wider community.

While I accept that everyone deserves the basic right of a roof over their head, what about the basic tenet of open democracy - transparency. Indeed, recent media highlights that Kainga Ora clearly has a record of secrecy and keeping its plans from the community.

Given KO falls within your ministerial responsibilities, I ask whether you think this is an acceptable way for a government agency to behave? And if not, what do you plan to do about an evident toxic and undemocratic culture of secrecy within KO.

Aside from the way your agency has treated local residents, KO has failed to define a problem . I asked what figures they are basing their assessment of the need for housing in Ohakune, and KO's Community Engagement manager Renee Regal responded that a total of "72 individuals and families" across the whole Ruapehu District required housing.

Even if those 72 individuals and families were all located in Ohakune (which they are not), they could be housed with existing stock in Ohakune, nearby Rangitaua and Raetihi.

Further, there are already six large subdivisions - build-ready - in Ohakune alone. Discussions with KO reveal they aren't prepared to consider existing options, even though there are housing and build options immediately available, instead of people having to wait until late 2025 (KO's build completion timeframe).

Kaingaora Ora seems more interested in hitting government build targets than actually meeting the need of people requiring housing.

I haven't even touched on the failings in their resource consent, or the fact both RDC and Kainga Ora have overlooked significant environmental considerations which will be offensive to the tikanga of local iwi, Ngati Rangī.

I ask that you instruct Kainga Ora to give pause to this project until proper due diligence and public consultation has taken place.

Sincerely,

s9(2)(a)

Out of scope

-----Original Message-----

From: Housing Admin [mailto:xxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxxx.xx]

Sent: 31 July 2023 2:51 PM

To: GRU Jobs [mailto:xxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxxx.xx]

CC: EXT - David Durie [mailto:xxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxxx.xx]

Subject: MW-PH-1184: Kainga Ora Ohakune more focused on empire-building than getting needy people into homes

CAUTION: External email. Do not click or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If unsure use the Report Phishing button.

Hey Kāinga Ora

Follow up email from the correspondent – please see below and letter attached from a s9(2)(a)

Sent with high importance due to the content in the email. Please let me know if it is possible to get a ministerial response within a shorter time period, but I acknowledge that the standard process is 20 days.

Thank you
Caitlin

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Monday, 31 July 2023 2:13 PM

To: Housing Admin

Cc: s9(2)(a) ; s9(2)(a)

Subject: Re: MW-PH-1184: Kainga Ora Ohakune more focused on empire-building than getting needy people into homes

Importance: High

Thank you for your acknowledgment and receipt of my concern.

Please find additional professional advice that has come to attention; possible breaches of the acts.

I request you place this project and resource consent on hold while this is investigated and community consultation is held, rather than us being told what is taking place.

The ombudsmen has been requested to investigate the matter more thoroughly under reference: 597937

Regards

s9(2)(a)

From: Housing Admin xxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxxx.xx >

Date: Monday, 31 July 2023 at 1:59 PM

To: s9(2)(a)

Subject: MW-PH-1184: Kainga Ora Ohakune more focused on empire-building than getting needy people into homes

Dear s9(2)(a)

On behalf of Hon Dr Megan Woods, thank you for your email of 28 July 2023 regarding your concerns on the TeiTei development in Ohakune.

Please note that your correspondence is with the Minister for her consideration. You can expect to hear from her in due course.

Kind Regards,



Office of Hon Dr Megan Woods

Minister of Housing | Minister for Infrastructure | Minister of Energy and Resources | Minister for Building and Construction | Associate Minister of Finance | Member for Wigram

Email: xxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxxx.xx Website:

www.Beehive.govt.nz

Private Bag 18041, Parliament Buildings, Wellington 6160, New Zealand

From: s9(2)(a)

Sent: Friday, 28 July 2023 7:19 PM

To: Megan Woods (MIN) x.xxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxxx.xx >

Subject: Kainga Ora Ohakune more focused on empire-building than getting needy people into homes

Importance: High

Hi Megan,

I am writing to you as a representative of over 120 property owners neighboring the proposed TeiTei Drive development.

Home owners, businesses and the Carrot Park its proposed to neighbour are all shocked that KO is not looking at spreading the load of public housing using existing stock available publicly.

You can read about some of this at the article

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/300930814/large-intensive-kinga-ora-housing-proposal-for-ohakune>

We had a meeting with KO representatives who voiced that “KO has a standard requirement and set standard” for purchasing existing homes.

Renee said “I haven’t looked at them in depth, but I’ve skimmed them” and we queried why KO wasn’t buying existing sections that were build ready at \$150k+

I really question why KO is building intensified state houses in one area where the population of Ohakune is around 1000 people.

Job opportunities only exist during the winter season when there is up to 11,000 visitors staying in the town.

Renee stated there was 72 people waiting for houses in Ohakune, which we pointed out is incorrect, there are 72 individuals or families in the whole Ruapehu district.

We are very concerned that people will be displaced from other areas into Ohakune where there are no jobs, no GP, not very many things for kids to do (which leads to crime).

I have a recording of this hour long call and that lack of knowledge the staff have of this town and the people waiting on the MSD waitlist.

What seems clear is that Kainga Ora is more focused on empire-building “to meet government targets” than getting needy people into homes that already exist!

It would be great to talk to you about this project and the huge negative impact this will have on Ohakune and its tourism.

Regards

s9(2)(a) & the neighbouring property owners & businesses.

s9(2)(a) [Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

*The Chief Executive
Ruapehu District Council
Private Bag
TAUMARUNUI
Attention: Warrick Zander*

30 July 2023

-
1. Further to the previous emails to you last week I now set out why I consider that the RC Application for the Tei Tei Road subdivision is deficient as to its assessment of effects and also deficient as to the coverage in the specialist reports – several of which are cursory at best.
 2. The Council reviewer of the application is under an obligation to ensure that full information is available (both to the reviewer and the public) and given the clear breaches of the district plan - hence a Non-complying Activity (as identified by the applicant's planner) - there is an obligation to advertise, especially as RDC - being a party to the RC Application and recipient of Government moneys to provide infrastructure to give effect the proposed development - cannot be party to the decision-making process.
 3. I do not accept the proposition put forward by the applicants planners that the matter can proceed non-notified, such decision must be made by an independent consultant or Commissioner, preferably one who is to process the Application for a decision and is satisfied that he/she/they have all relevant information. Otherwise the whole process could be exposed to judicial review.
 4. Given the date that the application was made the time limits for initial review have expired unless Council or its reviewer have extended time or issued S.92 notices. Please advise as to these time limits.

5. I note also that the Regional Council applications have apparently not been filed and it is my view they should be before any further steps are taken.
6. If not already done, I consider a s92 Request must be made immediately requiring further information regarding, but not limited to:
 - a) The effects on downstream catchments and infrastructure for stormwater and sewer from the maximum number of dwellings that the whole site could (ie. all stages) accommodate.
 - b) The effects on the current water infrastructure including detention ponds, water courses, public drains and other areas of the 3 waters regime.
 - c) The effects on the upstream public drains feeding this development area – e.g. has Horizons being advised and if so have they had input? - this includes from the Stormwater drain Line 8 to the current RDC outfall at the detention pond on the Winstones/Snowmass boundary (being Waterway A in the Application), there being no design for such new open drain to demonstrate that there will not be any adverse effects to the upstream catchment eg. Rocky Mountain Chalets, as a result of backflow as a consequence of this development,
 - d) The effects on housing, providing a suitable house site and installation of services as a consequence of the actual subterrain conditions which, whilst appearing to have been addressed by the Geotechnical Reports, have consequences (as to construction noise, costs -internal and external of the property) far greater than stated in the AEE Assessments.
 - e) Why the current pedestrian accessway s9(2)(a), a major success) cannot remain. I see, for a number of reasons, an unnecessary and maybe dangerous conflict with the current users of the status quo (largely families with small children and cyclists etc) with the proposed rerouting through the new residential streets.
 - f) Proof of demand for this type (size of section) subdivision and duplex accommodation - noting this is a requirement placed upon Council by the Local Government Act and or its partner by its own legislation and the GPS-HUD issued in 2021 by the two ministers involved
 - g) To obtain the consent of the owners (Winstones?) to rerouting the public drain - referred as Waterway A - through this property.
 - h) It would appear as if the Transport/Traffic report is based on complying sized lots Isthmus Site Plan, not that lodged with the Application. This

must be addressed. Has NZTA/Waka Kotahi been advised and have they given consent to the effects of the additional traffic from the whole development at the intersection or do they require some upgrading?

- i) There needs to be clarity as to what works the developer is financially responsible for and what on-going costs the ratepayers will bear, in particular the rerouting of the Public Drain through Winstones, the Sanitary sewer rising main etc. and what is the agreement as to what and where the "shovel-ready" Government contribution is to be spent.
7. Notwithstanding the "deficient" RC Application the application must be Publicly Notified pursuant to s95A, if for no other reason, that the above matters now brought before you, will have adverse effects greater than minor unless addressed fully in a transparent manner.
 8. I record there are also issues with Kainga Ora involvement under their legislation and the GPS-HUD – the proposal has not been properly assessed as required.
 9. It is noted that the Council is an applicant and recipient of the Government "shovel-ready" monies has a requirement to consult with the community under the Local Government Act.
 10. I record that the RDC Code of Conduct requires the Mayor and Councilors to comply with the LGA to act in the Public Interest, make decisions in an open and transparent manner and not withhold information from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons to do so.
 11. It is considered that to now hold "Community outreach sessions" this coming week "as the beginning of public consultation" when RDC has already entered into some form of formal agreement - refer the Applicants in the resource consent application - to "transfer' a council asset to a third party without prior public consultation is contrary to the provisions of the Act and in breach of the aforesaid Code. The Council leaves itself open to review of its actions.
 12. As the property is a "ratepayer's" asset they (the ratepayers and residents) are entitled to know what are the terms of the agreement between the parties as to development costs, future ownership and purchase price etc. such that they can determine whether such agreement is in the best interests of their community and identify any shortcomings as now being experienced with other "shovel-ready" projects

For example: Tauranga City Council's Cameron Road upgrading Stage 1 - where the initial budget cost approved by the EMs for the works was \$40m, the Government provided \$45m, the now cost (not yet completed) is \$97.5m. The shovel ready project that RDC proposed was several years ago now and clearly could suffer the same blow-out.

13. In the meantime I note you have not responded as to a possible site meeting. I can only reiterate your responsibility as an officer of the Council to act on the information made available by myself.

14. Time to address the above, due to time constraints in legislation, is now of the essence. I consider it negligent for RDC to not act to immediately suspend the processing of the RC Application to address the concerns and issues I have expressed in my telecom to you, here and the below emails.

s9(2)(a)

