



# **MINUTES**

**Ordinary Council meeting  
Monday, 18 March 2024**

**Order of Business**

<b>1</b>	<b>Opening karakia</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Public forum</b> .....	<b>3</b>
3.1	Aaron Collier and Dwayne Roper, Zariba Holdings and Classic Group, Tauranga - Speaking to the City Centre Public Transport Facilities .....	3
3.2	Simon Clark - Colliers, Tauranga - Speaking to the City Centre Public Transport Facilities .....	5
<b>4</b>	<b>Acceptance of late items</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Confidential business to be transferred into the open</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Change to the order of business</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Confirmation of minutes</b> .....	<b>6</b>
7.1	Minutes of the Council meeting held on 26 February 2024.....	6
<b>8</b>	<b>Declaration of conflicts of interest</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Deputations, presentations, petitions</b> .....	<b>6</b>
	Nil	
<b>10</b>	<b>Recommendations from other committees</b> .....	<b>6</b>
10.1	Wastewater Management Review Committee.....	6
10.2	Strategy, Finance and Risk Committee recommendation 19 February 2024 - approval of unbudgeted loan funded operating expenditure for Kennan Road Business Case and Wairoa Bridge Cycleway contribution to safety works .....	7
<b>11</b>	<b>Business</b> .....	<b>8</b>
11.1	City Centre Public Transport Facilities.....	8
11.2	2024-2034 Long-term Plan - Other topics.....	10
11.3	Transportation Projects Waka Kotahi Funding Considerations .....	11
11.4	Transport Resolutions Report No.50 .....	13
11.5	Revocation of Speed Limit Bylaw (2009) .....	13
11.6	Parking Management Plan Update.....	13
11.7	Waiari Kaitiaki Advisory Group Representatives.....	14
11.8	Update to 2024/25 Development Contribution Charges.....	15
11.9	Executive Report.....	15
<b>12</b>	<b>Discussion of late items</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Public excluded session</b> .....	<b>18</b>
13.1	Public Excluded Minutes of the Council meeting held on 26 February 2024.....	18
13.2	Spaces and Places - Construction Project Partner Procurement Strategy.....	19
13.3	Direct appoint Rolco to a programme of concrete pavement works. ....	19
<b>14</b>	<b>Closing karakia</b> .....	<b>19</b>

**MINUTES OF TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL  
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD AT THE BAY OF PLENTY REGIONAL COUNCIL CHAMBERS,  
REGIONAL HOUSE, 1 ELIZABETH STREET, TAURANGA  
ON MONDAY, 18 MARCH 2024 AT 9.30AM**

**PRESENT:** Commission Chair Anne Tolley (Chairperson), Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston, Commissioner Stephen Selwood, Commissioner Bill Wasley

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Marty Grenfell (Chief Executive), Nic Johansson (Head of Transport), Christine Jones (General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance), Alastair McNeill (General Manager: Corporate Services), Sarah Omundsen (General Manager: Regulatory and Compliance), Gareth Wallis (General Manager: City Development & Partnerships), Alison Law (Acting General Manager: Community Services), Shawn Geard (City Centre Transport Advisor), Tom McEntyre (Principal Investment Advisor: Transport), Josh Logan (Team Leader: Corporate Planning), Kelvin Hill (Manager: Water Infrastructure Outcomes); Reece Wilkinson (Parking Strategy Manager), Ben Corbett (Team Leader: Growth Funding), Anahera Dinsdale (Acting Team Leader: Governance Services), Caroline Irvin (Governance Advisor), Aimee Aranas (Governance Advisor), Janie Storey (Governance Advisor)

## **1 OPENING KARAKIA**

Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston opened the meeting with a karakia.

## **2 APOLOGIES**

Nil

## **3 PUBLIC FORUM**

### **3.1 Aaron Collier and Dwayne Roper, Zariba Holdings and Classic Group, Tauranga - Speaking to the City Centre Public Transport Facilities**

**External** Aaron Collier, Classic Group  
Dwayne Roper, Zariba Holdings

#### **Key points**

- Mr Collier noted that he had been involved with the CBD including what was going on in and around the city core and had been a planner in the review processes.
- Zariba and the Classic Group jointly owned 134-142 Durham Street, for which both parties planned a redevelopment on the site, giving them a significant interest in the CBD.
- They were long term developers with a strong interest in what was going on and were disappointed that they had heard about the bus stops third hand. Also disappointing was that as land owners they had not been consulted.
- A key consideration of the proposed development was making sure that these had good active frontages and an interaction with public spaces.
- They had first heard about the super stop third hand, and had then initiated consultation with Council staff, which was disappointing. A street meeting and subsequent engagement had been held with staff.

- The group were opposed to a super stop as there were a number of social, economic, urban design and traffic issues that they considered had not been taken into account.
- Information had been requested on the technical assessments being put forward to provide to their urban designers and transport teams to have a look, but they were still waiting for this. Despite those requests there had been very limited information provided.
- As land owners they were not included in any initial consultation with groups and they felt that they should have been included.
- Mr Collier suggested two solutions. One was to leave the bus stop where it was in option 2 of the report or consider option 1(a) but pepper pot the spots and make them smaller like those throughout the civic core.
- This would still provide connectivity and linkages and reduce their concerns around social issues with a large super stop being located outside an active frontage such as that planned with their new building.
- This would also provide the benefit of putting stops around the university or carparking buildings to provide links between east and west. There was not much of a link adjacent to the proposed site apart from a small alleyway and service lane to Grey Street.
- The group were supportive of bus stops, but request that the super stop proposal be given more thought and planning.
- It was suggested that a conceptual plan be run past the Council's Urban Design Panel and landholders.

#### **In response to questions**

- The group had owned one property for 15 years and the other for 5 years.
- In response to a query as to whether the owners were aware of the road strengthening at a cost of \$10.5M to take buses a few years ago, Mr Roper advised that they just thought it was part of the upgrade and only knew it was for bus stops at the recent on-street meeting.
- In answer to a question as to their involvement with the length of time the works took and the cost, Mr Roper advised that there had been issues with the site over the 12 month work period, and did not have a sewage connection after the works were completed. However, they were unaware that a super bus stop was being planned in the street.
- Commissioner Tolley advised that there would be a 90m bus stop on each side to allow for 3 buses which would also take away 18 carparks. Council would be concerned if the areas that had been strengthened were to be dug up again and queried whether the land owners would be willing to pay for the gardens to be dug up and re-laid as bus stops. Mr Roper advised it was staff, not them that had proposed option 1(a) to spread the stops along Durham Street and noted that they would be contributing to the Council in the form of development contributions.
- Mr Collier noted that the \$3.5M quoted in the report was a big cost to replace some gardens and concrete, with staff indicating that the costings were loose and high end estimates. More accurate costings needed to be obtained.
- In response to a query as to whether there was a design solution possible to create something in keeping with the proposed development and a compromise solution that would work for both parties, Mr Collier said that he had seen little in terms of design and conceptual plans. He likened it to a developer applying for a consent where he would need to provide a lot of information to do anything, and asked why the Commissioners did not have the same amount of information when making a decision. They were always happy to work collaboratively with the Council, to ensure that there were no social impacts on the activities adjacent to it and the possible future hotel site. Engagement would be welcome, but rather than having everything in one area of 90 metres, having stops broken up in smaller stops would be their preference.
- There was already one stop adjacent to the site and it was working well.

#### **Discussion points raised**

- Commissioners noted that they too were disappointed that early informative discussions were not held with land owners

### 3.2 Simon Clark - Colliers, Tauranga - Speaking to the City Centre Public Transport Facilities

**External** Simon Clark, Colliers

#### Key points

- Mr Clark noted that he had an interest in 153-159 Durham Street, which had a bus stop located across the road.
- They were currently in the advanced stage of designing a 5 story office building with retail on the ground floor of their site and had done the Geotech investigations. They were in the costing and preliminary design stage at present. The ground floor would also include a central foyer and shared amenity spaces for the office tenants.
- Mr Clark was disappointed that he had not been properly consulted, and Council seemed to be in a rush to get everything done and Mr Clark had not been given time to provide feedback.
- The current plan for compressed stops gave no regard for the street scape. While he had no problem with bus stops on Durham Street, he did have a problem if the bus stops were to be compressed as his development needed to integrate its foyers, parking, entrances and retail frontage. Half of the ground floor would be offices or public amenity for the tenants, but putting three stops on each side would cause clashes with people entering the building as the planned bus stop would be at his front of door. Council had to look at an expanded area on Durham Street as Colliers were spending \$25M on a building in that location.
- This part of Durham Street was unique in the CBD, it had good geotech ground conditions and putting bus stops in front of some of the best and easily developed land did not make sense. There were geotech conditions in other areas that developers were unable to make viable, but this was a medium rise area that was prime location for picking up the older style buildings that were ready for redevelopment.
- Council were putting stumbling blocks in front of the developers as there were not many areas that an office building could be built. In building they also wanted to get the integration correct with the streetscaping as that would also help to make it work.
- Mr Clark asked that the Council looked at condensing the bus stops as his development would not be viable if tenants were concerned with safety and having people directly in front of the building. No matter what was said, there were still serious safety concerns.
- No one had it right, and the best solutions was to broaden it over a wider area with more bus stops to dissipate the congregation. That was what he was looking for.

#### Discussion points raised

- Commissioner Tolley noted that Wellington CBD managed similar stops in their city centre.
- Understood that geotechnically this was a good area of the city to build in.
- Commissioners struggle with the practicality of huge buses in a small CBD that were mostly empty and were struggling to find the room for what the Bay of Plenty Regional Council had indicated that they required. A temporary stop had been created in Durham Street North while staff were working through the issues to find somewhere more suitable for the buses to stop.
- It was requested that staff work with the developers and to share design concepts so they could determine if there was a way the area could be shared and provide the design concepts to the Urban Design Team in an attempt to find a solution.
- While there had been some very serious social issues with bus stops in the past, these had been in areas where the surrounding environment allowed people to congregate there. This was not the case in Durham Street, where instances were rare, with more everyday people using the seating now. The anti-social behaviour perception would change over time, especially as more people used public transport.
- Commissioners thanked the developers for attending the meeting and noted that they shared their disappointment that they were not involved earlier in the process.

- There had been a lot of money spent by the ratepayers on Durham Street and Commissioners had been very clear with staff all the way through that Council would not dig up any roading and street scaping that had been put down in the last five years.

#### 4 ACCEPTANCE OF LATE ITEMS

Nil

#### 5 CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS TO BE TRANSFERRED INTO THE OPEN

Nil

#### 6 CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS

Nil

#### 7 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

##### 7.1 Minutes of the Council meeting held on 26 February 2024

##### RESOLUTION CO5/24/1

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 26 February 2024 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

**CARRIED**

#### 8 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil

#### 9 DEPUTATIONS, PRESENTATIONS, PETITIONS

Nil

#### 10 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

##### 10.1 Wastewater Management Review Committee

**Staff** Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance  
Coral Hair, Manager: Democracy & Governance Services

##### Discussion points raised

- Commissioners acknowledged the work of the tangata whenua representatives and the assistance from Council staff with the Wastewater Management Review Committee Program Business Case.
- There had been a pause at the end of 2023 to allow time for each of the parties to work through the issues. The Committee were now in agreement with the proposed wording in the Program Business Case.
- There was still a lot of work to do within the space, and this would enable them to move forward.

- The outcome would set a platform for business cases into the future on how to plan and provide for wastewater in the city as it sets objectives and clarity to the incoming Council in a way that affects mana whenua.

### RESOLUTION CO5/24/2

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Recommendation from Wastewater Management Review Committee 6 March 2024".
- (b) Accepts the recommendation of the Wastewater Management Review Committee of 6 March 2024 and
  - (i) endorses the outputs of the Wastewater Programme Business Case as set out in Attachment 1.
  - (ii) continues the Programme Business Case process; and;
  - (iii) approves the subsequent stages of the Programme Business Case commences, starting with the long list option identification in March 2024, including engagement.

**CARRIED**

### 10.2 Strategy, Finance and Risk Committee recommendation 19 February 2024 - approval of unbudgeted loan funded operating expenditure for Kennan Road Business Case and Wairoa Bridge Cycleway contribution to safety works

**Staff** Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance

### RESOLUTION CO5/24/3

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Strategy, Finance and Risk Committee recommendation 19 February 2024 - approval of unbudgeted loan funded operating expenditure for Kennan Road Business Case and Wairoa Bridge Cycleway contribution to safety works".
- (b) Accepts the recommendation of the Strategy, Finance and Risk Committee recommendation SFR1/24/7 of 19 February 2024 and approves unbudgeted loan-funded operating expenditure and associated rates-funded debt retirement over a five year period for
  - (i) \$379k for Keenan Road Business case
  - (ii) Wairoa Bridge Cycleway contribution to safety works \$1.1m.

**CARRIED**

## 11 BUSINESS

### 11.1 City Centre Public Transport Facilities

**Staff** Nic Johansson, Head of Transport  
Shawn Geard, City Centre Transport Advisor  
Tom McEntyre, Infrastructure Funding Specialist

Presentation attached

#### Key points

- Maps with bus stops exclusive and inclusive of Durham Street were shown.
- The report included feedback from the land owners following a recent meeting with them.
- Staff were going through the business case process with NZTA and the Council project process as it related to the city centre public transport infrastructure to find a working compromise with the Bay of Plenty Regional Council which also encourages and promotes the essential developments and investments in the CBD.
- All options required compromise and with new information to hand from the developers, the recommendation was to adapt in order that the best compromise decision could be found for the greatest good and the longest term for the betterment of the city as a whole.
- The current interim stop at Durham Street North did not allow for public transport growth and was not considered a suitable location.
- Durham Street South had significant development opportunities as noted by the submitters in the public forum. Their alternative option had potential to minimise the impact on vital city centre development and would be given further consideration and investigation.

#### In response to questions

- In response to a comment that the process of developing a business case with NZTA was happening in isolation from land owners and users on the street or whether it was a Council process, it was noted that the NZTA business case methodology lent itself to finding technical solutions early in the process. It was described as three lenses where a technical solution may be good for an engineering, planning or data modelling perspective, but have completely different outcomes for the community or may not be feasible at a political level with NZTA or the Minister depending on the size and scale. There were times that there was an awkward juggling act to find the ultimate compromise for the three parties and the greater good for longer term.
- In relation to the suitability of having stops at Durham Street North and spreading the stops to the north and the south of the street, it was noted that it was too far from a bus interchange perspective due to the intersections and had less shelter from bad weather.
- In response to a comment that if the stop was near the Spring Street corner it would just be a matter of crossing the road to change buses, it was noted that commuters would have a veranda the entire length and then the perceived separation of having to cross the road for that one stop not three.
- In relation to a query as to what was occurring in Dive Crescent being what was needed now or when the new super service comes through when Stage 1 was at least two years away and may not be used for the next 5-6 years, it was noted that yes it would still make public transport more attractive now. If this information had been available when doing the Durham Street upgrade they may have landed on something more along the proposed lines. Staff wanted to be able to provide certainty to everyone and have locations agreed to and to develop around rather than having additional developments, builds and streetscape occurring than in three years' time, trying to shoehorn them into a location as that would not work.
- In relation to a question as to whether there would only be one stop of either side of Dive Crescent, it was noted that a time frame was left off the recommendation for that area based on the proviso that nothing more would not be done until there was an established need.



- Commissioner Tolley noted that the Bay of Plenty Regional Council technical staff should be included in discussions as they were the ones pushing these stops and were a partner with Council having to fund infrastructure. There had been a lot of discussions at the Tauranga Public Transport Joint Committee about the effect on the city and had been told that Council were not going to design the city around bus stops.
- In relation to a query as to whether there had been any conversations with the university and owners of 116 and 122 Durham Street about the impact on them, it was noted that this was raised in the recent land holder engagement session, but they had not had the opportunity to discuss it with them as yet.
- This was also why the cost element was loose at present with sufficient funding being provided for architectural elements in Durham Street would cost in the vicinity of \$10M. If Council were to go for this option, the next step would be the wider stakeholder engagement. The stops had been moved as far away from the University and Mercury Energy's open frontages as possible.
- The entire length of road had been reinforced and in the southern area the current bays were reinforced. In the more spread out system, it would mean installing concrete bays where the planting and stormwater treatment were located. The Durham Street North pavement was failing and had sunk significantly and if that was to be used for much longer as an interim location it would need a new city centre type shelter installed as the current one was in need of an upgrade.
- Commissioners noted it was important to understand the volume of people using the area as a bus transfer and if it was a small number of transfers the need for that may have been overstated. There was also a need to understand how far was reasonable for someone to walk from one stop to another, especially for those people disadvantaged in their travelling ability. It was noted that currently the bus service was used by people travelling into the city centre and now there was a desire to allow people to travel more widely across the city in future on a public transport network, the demand for which was desired to increase over time. There was no data as to how much this happened at present.
- In response to a question as to what was needed now and whether Durham Street North could be designated for future development if and when a through system and interchange developed, it was noted that an alternative in a Durham Street location was needed to get buses off Grey Street.
- The next element at the very least if Durham Street North was kept in operation, would be a significant upgrade and work through with the Bay of Plenty Regional Council on that future. Durham Street South would need the current two stops, split into two individual stops and 1-2 stops on the south side that did not currently exist.
- If Council dealt with the stops around Willow, Harrington and Hamilton Streets and Dive Crescent and deferred consideration of the Durham and Elizabeth Streets stops, pending engagement with the property owners around the location and the design being practical to give some certainty to the stops and what was occurring in the northern part of the city centre. It was noted that this was possible and a practical and pragmatic solution to give certainty to move to those areas into the future and allowed staff to consider the most optimal solutions for the whole of Durham Street and recognise the development opportunities.
- It was noted that NZTA/Waka Kotahi had been involved with each step throughout the last two years and they would now include Bay of Plenty Regional Council who had provided good input into the recent landowners meeting.
- Included was to be an interregional stop on Spring Street or Elizabeth Street depending on the location of city bus stops.

#### **Discussion points raised**

- Changes to recommendations in the report were made to take into account the comments made.

**RESOLUTION CO5/24/4**

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "City Centre Public Transport Facilities".
- (b) Adopts the city centre bus facility locations,
  - (i) Civic Centre split stops – a set of four stops consisting of one stop in each of these locations:
    - (1) West side of Willow Street, north of Harrington Street
    - (2) North side of Harrington Street, west of The Strand
    - (3) South side of Hamilton Street, west of The Strand
    - (4) South side of Hamilton Street, west of Willow Street.
- (c) Dive Crescent one stop each way, signalling that was designated as the future super stop when needed.

**CARRIED**

**RESOLUTION CO5/24/5**

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (d) engages with property owners/developers and tenants regarding the design, location and cost of bus stops on Durham Street, Elizabeth Street and Spring Street and report back within six weeks. This is to include:
  - (i) potential distributed placement (pepper potting) along Durham Street,
  - (ii) the implications of retaining the existing Durham Street North bus stops,
  - (iii) what is required now, for the next 5 years, and then beyond that.

**CARRIED**

**Attachments**

- 1 Tabled - Durham St and City Centre bus facilities

**11.2 2024-2034 Long-term Plan - Other topics**

**Staff** Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance  
Gareth Wallis, General Manager, City Development & Partnerships  
Josh Logan, Team Leader: Corporate Planning

**Key points**

- The report brings together items that were brought up in the submissions that were not consultation questions and provides the Council's answer to those.
- As the submissions had been made in November, staff were looking to have the responses ready to be sent out as soon as the LTP 2024-34 was adopted in April 2024.

**In response to questions**

- In response to a query regarding the depreciation of BayPark stadium not being included until it was understood what the liability was for, it was noted that the renewals funding for the next 10

years was only for the main stand and not the north stand offices or the facilities that support the wider operation of the site or the speedway part section. Staff were quite conservative on how the facility was rated until a decision was made on the future of the stadium. It was requested that this be made very clear in the LTP submission responses.

### RESOLUTION CO5/24/6

Moved: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

Seconded: Commissioner Bill Wasley

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "2024-2034 Long-term Plan - Other topics".
- (b) Approves staff comments on submissions relating to other topics in **Attachment 1**.
- (c) Authorises the Chief Executive and General Managers to make amendments to Council's proposed response comments to each submission point in **Attachment 1**, to refine wording and style prior to responses being sent to submitters no later than one month after the adoption of the LTP.

**CARRIED**

### 11.3 Transportation Projects Waka Kotahi Funding Considerations

**Staff** Nic Johansson, Head of Transport  
Kelvin Hill, Manager: Water Infrastructure Outcomes  
Tom McEntyre, Infrastructure Funding Specialist

Tabled information

#### Key points

- The report was to consider the risk appetite for Council to maintain momentum on projects that were underway while waiting for the National LTP to be decided on later this year by NZTA/Waka Kotahi in light of the government policy statement shifts.
- Two schedules were tabled, one of which was colour coded with the green projects committed to taking a risk from a funding perspective already, the orange were projects proposing to maintain momentum on and the pink being the ones that were too high a risk for funding after the business cases had been developed.
- The second schedule noted where the money would come from to fund the risk component of those projects that would move forward. While there was a mix, they would either be pushed out or a revisit of the contingencies to find enough funding to maintain the momentum.

#### In response to questions

- In response to a query as to the difference between the city centre transport hub and city centre transport development, it was noted that the transport hub was considered in item 11.1 and the others were transport works outside of the public transport elements. The figures noted were what was currently in the LTP which looked after all of the divestment of Dive Crescent and the like and staff were looking at how this could be streamlined.
- The proposed to progress column was the risk component and the dollar value to maintain the momentum on until the business case was approved or otherwise.
- It was noted that with the Arataki project that Council would spend the \$4.6M Council budget which was the agreed sum. The projects were communicated with the transport agency staff in the TMOLTP and those amounts were unable to be changed.
- It was noted that Arataki projects was still live as a co-funding line between Council and NZTA and would be taken out as there was no obstacle to removing Council's share of the funding. However, the \$4.5M in the solution was not viable to be sufficient on Farm Street due to the undergrounding of services that had now arisen. There were alternative sources of funding being investigated to get a viable solution.

- Commissioner Tolley noted that a decision had been made that \$4.6M was available to spend to get better facilities, and whatever that would cover as that was all that would be spent with a requirement to come back to the Commissioners if more was required. It was noted that the project could get to a point if the underground work was essential to seek other ways of getting the balance of the works and street scaping underway.
- In answer to a query about the use of the IFF funding for the 14 projects going through the NZTA processes, it was noted that the IFF funding would be able to be used regardless of whether the NZTA funding was approved.
- The earliest NZTA would confirm funding was 31 August 2024 due to the delayed release of the Government Policy Statement (GPS) document. This would provide certainty of the 3 year trunch of the National Land Transport Plan funding. Staff had been working off an interim GPS since the central government elections in 2023 resulting in an extended period of ambiguity and uncertainty of committed funding. NZTA had confirmed subsidy of 51%, but the ranking order would not be known until the decision was released. Staff were confident the top 5 on the list would be funded as they had a high degree of alignment with the draft policy. There was an obligation to make it clear that the extended time lines had a high degree of alignment and risk with the costs and continuation between now and 31 August 2024.
- In relation to the safe network funding which may not be approved, it was noted that NZTA had different outcomes with the new GPS with a reset of physical interventions rather than policing. The risk also depended on where the projects were in the phases and if physical construction was commenced, the project would have to be taken to completion but if it was still at the design or business case stage it could be dropped at any time.
- There was still \$250M government funding allocated to walking and cycling and Council were competing for some of that. At present projects within Area B were at the top of the list and submitted to NZTA and if successful walking and cycling in active mode shift would be progressed over the next three years.
- In relation to a comment from NZTA that Council were not ruthless enough in going after the government money, it was noted that this had changed in the past triennium with the introduction of the IFF, IAF and HIF. There were good threads of information in the GPS which were included in the Council submission to the statement indicating that the Minister proposes to expedite the business case process as it was expensive to provide. It was the opportunity and time costs that Council suffer from and losing the element of urgency to make the most of opportunities put in front of Councils. Council processes had changed to get a better draw down of funding to the greatest extent that they could. The Minster did note on his recent visit that he understood the timeline of the GPS release that some Councils would incur burden on and they wanted to expediate the process as a whole from three years to ten to give certainty to the market and to local government.
- Commissioners and the incoming Council would be updated as information come to hand on the level of risk up until the announcement of the National Land Transport Plan.

### Discussion points raised

- Commissioner Tolley noted that the park and ride trial from Tara Road was frustrating and the only reason Council were going through a business case was because the Bay of Plenty Regional Council could not prioritise funding and the proposal needed NZTA funding.

### RESOLUTION CO5/24/7

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Transportation Projects Waka Kotahi Funding Considerations".
- (b) That approval of up to \$4M of local shared funding can be budgeted to progress the four identified priority projects, providing this amount is offset elsewhere within the capital program.

- (c) That delegation be given to General Manger Infrastructure to manage this capital budget process.

**CARRIED**

### Attachments

- 1 Tabled - Transportation Projects WK Funding Consideration - pdf

### 11.4 Transport Resolutions Report No.50

**Staff** Nic Johansson, Head of Transport

#### RESOLUTION CO5/24/8

Moved: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

Seconded: Commissioner Bill Wasley

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Transport Resolutions Report No.50".
- (b) Resolves to adopt the proposed traffic and parking controls as per Appendix A relating to minor changes for general safety, operational or amenity purposes, to become effective on or after 19 March 2024 subject to appropriate signs and road markings being installed.

**CARRIED**

### 11.5 Revocation of Speed Limit Bylaw (2009)

**Staff** Nic Johansson, Head of Transport

#### RESOLUTION CO5/24/9

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Revocation of Speed Limit Bylaw (2009)".
- (b) Resolves to approve revocation of the Speed Limit Bylaw (2009).

**CARRIED**

### 11.6 Parking Management Plan Update

**Staff** Nic Johansson, Head of Transport  
Reece Wilkinson, Parking Strategy Manager

#### In response to questions

- In response to parking in the Mt Maunganui CBD, the LTP feedback requested the current timed parking limits be enforced and managed rather than meters being installed.
- The Regulatory team had earmarked some areas for new signs which would be installed prior to the compliance with the time limits.
- It was noted that by the end of 2024, there would be a further 360 carparks in the Tauranga city centre and the availability of these would be included on the screens noting the vacant parking spaces.

- The aggregate resource cost of \$18M was a mix of maintenance cost of \$345 per annum per household for parking at Mount Maunganui and the opportunity cost of not being able to use that land for anything else. It was less in the Tauranga city centre as due to paid parking. . It was requested that the maintenance cost be added into the plan to reinforce that there was no such thing as free parking.
- Enforcement was not included in the maintenance costs and should also be recognised. It was hoped that NZTA would reconsider the amount Councils were able to charge as enforcement fines as there were some people who preferred to pay through fines, which in some cities was cheaper than parking costs.
- Commissioners noted that with the extension of the city centre parking, Council needed to think about where workers on average to mid-range salaries that work in the central city were able to park so that they were not charged out of the ability to come to work. There was an expected increase of office workers which would also increase pressure of parking spaces on the city fringe.

#### **Discussion points raised**

- Commissioners acknowledged the sensible and pragmatic report and noted their appreciation for the work done by staff.

#### **RESOLUTION CO5/24/10**

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Parking Management Plan Update".
- (b) Defers the implementation of the following parking projects until March 2025:
  - (i) Extension of paid parking area in the City Centre
  - (ii) Mount Maunganui Parking Management Plan
  - (iii) Or until requirements for an earlier review are met.
- (c) Notes that staff will report back to Council in March 2025 with updates on the current environment and recommendations on implementation of the Parking Strategy.

**CARRIED**

#### **11.7 Waiari Kaitiaki Advisory Group Representatives**

**Staff** Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance  
Anahera Dinsdale, Acting Team Leader: Governance Services

#### **RESOLUTION CO5/24/11**

Moved: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Waiāri Kaitiaki Advisory Group Representatives".
- (b) Endorses and appoints Raponi Wilson as the Tapuika iwi Authority representative and Luke Whare as the Te Kapu o Waitaha representative on the Waiāri Kaitiaki Advisory Group.

**CARRIED**

## 11.8 Update to 2024/25 Development Contribution Charges

**Staff** Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance  
Ben Corbett, Team Leader: Growth Funding

### Key points

- Following the LTP deliberations, the changes in the report reflect some of the decisions made primarily around the changes in the Te Papa catchment.

### Discussion points raised

- Commissioners noted that the Council had to constantly watch the costs as it was easy to pass those on.
- It was a continual challenge to get the costs right at the beginning of process, and the more that goes in at front end process, the better.

## RESOLUTION CO5/24/12

Moved: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Update to 2024/25 Development Contribution Charges".
- (b) Notes that the final development contributions charges are based on the decisions made through the Long-Term Plan 2024-34 and Development Contributions Policy 2024/25 deliberations process.

**CARRIED**

## 11.9 Executive Report

**Staff** Marty Grenfell, Chief Executive  
Nic Johansson, Head of Transport  
Alison Law, Acting General Manager: Community Services  
Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance  
Alastair McNeil, General Manager: Corporate Services  
Sarah Omundsen, General Manager: Regulatory and Compliance  
Gareth Wallis, General Manager: City Development & Partnerships

### Infrastructure

#### Key points

- The success of the water watchers programme was noted in the graphs as having a positive effect, even with the consistent supply of the past two summers. It was suggested that the information be provided to the Climate Change Control Group.

#### In response to questions

- A smart water plan was the process where high water users worked with Council on how to reduce their volume.
- In relation to a query, the exact cost ratio for the cost of concrete pavements which would last 40 years compared with asphalt that may need to be replaced three times in that period, it was noted that figure was not known. It did not mean that concrete was cheaper, but takes into consideration that over that time there would be less disruption with road closures and the like.
- Laying bitumen over concrete was used in Links Ave as noise was an issue and a better ride quality was needed and provided the look and feel of the black tar seal and much less noise.
- The sustainability and waste study for cruise boat waste was valuable as most cruise liners do not allow passengers to take any food or drink back on board and showed that there was a

cost to Council to manage that rubbish. The data collated noted a considerable volume of waste and would be provided to Commissioners.

### **Discussion points raised**

- The use of abbreviations and names such as Smartwater was confusing and it was requested that an explanation be given in future reports when using these.
- It was noted that the carbon reduction statistics made a worthy story with a certified and substantiated reduction in carbon emissions of 33% over a number of activities.
- Commendation was passed on to staff for the initiatives.

## **Community Services**

### **In response to questions**

- An Intern had been working over the summer to establish a basis for tree canopy cover throughout the city. Staff plan to increase the cover from 20% to 30%.

### **Discussion points raised**

- Acknowledgement of the purchase of the Waddle beach culture collection items as the culture of Mt Manganui was often overlooked.
- Information was requested on what was key to the city being recognised as a tree city.
- Acknowledgement was passed on to the Events team who had been very helpful and supportive leading up to and throughout the recent beach volleyball and surf lifesaving tournaments. Using the local kapa haka teams, especially for the international groups to promote the city and showcases the local culture and identity.
- Acknowledgement of the library staff for the amount of learning opportunities for children over the summer holiday period so they could keep up with their reading.

## **Chief Financial Officer**

### **Discussion points raised**

- It was requested that data be collated on whether other regional airports were at similar close to full capacity to Tauranga as Commissioners noted that it was disturbing to see the loading of flights at 90% . There were a lot of complaints about the ability to get a seat on a flight that suited users.
- It was suggested that a representative from Air NZ be invited to attend a future meeting to provide their data.

## **Strategy, Growth & Governance**

### **Key points**

- The number of registered voters had increased so the election focus would be on letting people know that the election was on and encouraging them to vote. There would be voting bins placed in the local supermarkets.
- Te Rangapū Mana Whenua o Tauranga Moana had confirmed its priorities for the year.

### **Discussion points raised**

- Comment was made on the recent announcement by NZ Post to deliver mail by courier and how this would affect the use of postal voting for future local body elections. Representation would be made to the Minister of Local Government prior to the 2025 elections to change the way elections were run.

## **Corporate Services**

### **Key points**

- During the Commissioners term, there had been a 5% reduction of turnover of staff. The stability of Council gave a chance to improve community experiences and staff moral.



- Engagement survey participation for March 2024 were expected to be high, outlining what staff needed to be effective.
- Staff were more innovative with three dimensional views of the city and what could be beside you when in buildings.

### **Discussion points raised**

- The staff turnover results demonstrated what good governance looked like with stable consistent decision making and was reflected in what had been delivered and showing in staff turnover, moral and media impact scores.
- There had been a number of positive comments received on good governance for the organisation and the city.
- The smiley face which had been created by Julian at a Mt Maunganui roundabout could be seen from Mauao and had resulted in many positive comments.

### **Regulatory & Compliance**

#### **Key points**

- The impact of dealing with the backlog of consents was showing and staff were focusing on clearing these.
- Consents received in the past three months had a 96% rate of timeliness.
- The graph of new dwellings demand forecast against those consented was noted. With the lag of building consents a further drop of actual new builds on the ground would be seen.
- The requests for service were mostly complaints in relation to car park in wrong place, there had been a rise in those and freedom camping despite the infringement fines doubling.

### **Discussion points raised**

- Concern was raised at the new dwelling builds falling even further behind resulting in a shortfall of around 5,500 houses and it was suggested that this be brought to the notice of the Minister. This also had the implication of higher priced housing and would take central government, local government and private sector working together to increase the stock.
- Congratulations to the Animal Control team for the increased amount of dog registrations and working hard to ensure they were registered.
- It was noted how well the liquor licencing had been managed at two recent major events given the size of them.
- It was good to see the Engineering Concept Consultation and engaging with developers at an early stage in their process.
- The retirement village Waitaha development proposal would hopefully be worked through as it was a treaty settlement.

### **City Development & Partnerships**

#### **Key points**

- There was a wide variety of construction updates, including the completion of the rap piling at the Library and Community Hub and the commencement of the test piling on the Civic Whare, Exhibition and Museum site.
- The Childrens Day held on 8 March 2024 at the Te Manawataki o Te Papa site was supported by the city centre team and well attended with a number of families engaged in the process.
- The City Safety engagement role had the city centre businesses reaching out and positively impacting on the street safety. It was also attracting attention around the country.

### **In response to questions**

- It was noted that the cost estimate for the waterfront playground was due to be received and once it had been accepted the plans would be released.

### **Discussion points raised**

- It was suggested that the Police Minister be made aware of the City Safe engagement role and how it worked well in association with the local police.

- It was requested that the green shoots of the city centre development be included the signage of what was occurring around the city to give people a sense for what was coming.

**RESOLUTION CO5/24/13**

Moved: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

Seconded: Commissioner Bill Wasley

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Executive Report".

**CARRIED**

**12 DISCUSSION OF LATE ITEMS**

Nil

At 11.45 am the meeting adjourned.

At 11.54am the meeting reconvened.

**13 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION**

**Resolution to exclude the public**

**RESOLUTION CO5/24/14**

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
<p><b>13.1 - Public Excluded Minutes of the Council meeting held on 26 February 2024</b></p>	<p>s7(2)(b)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information</p> <p>s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</p>	<p>s48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7</p>

<p><b>13.2 - Spaces and Places - Construction Project Partner Procurement Strategy</b></p>	<p>s7(2)(b)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would disclose a trade secret</p> <p>s7(2)(b)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information</p> <p>s7(2)(g) - The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege</p> <p>s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities</p>	<p>s48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7</p>
<p><b>13.3 - Direct appoint Rolco to a programme of concrete pavement works.</b></p>	<p>s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</p>	<p>s48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7</p>

**CARRIED**

**14 CLOSING KARAKIA**

Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston closed the meeting with a karakia.

**The meeting closed at 12.08 pm.**

**The minutes of this meeting were confirmed as a true and correct record at the Ordinary Council meeting held on 8 April 2024.**

.....  
 Commission Chair Anne Tolley  
**CHAIRPERSON**