



MINUTES

**Ordinary Council meeting
Monday, 29 April 2024**

Order of Business

1	Opening karakia	4
2	Apologies	4
3	Public forum	4
4.1	Glen Crowther, Sustainable Bay of Plenty - Durham Street Bus Facility.....	4
4.2	Aaron Collier and Daniel Watkins Zariba Holdings/Classic Group, Morne Hugo and Mark Apeldoorn, Boffa Miskell - Durham Street Bus Facility	5
14.3	Frances Devantier, Guideline Property - 162 Durham Street	6
4	Acceptance of late items	7
4.1	Acceptance of late item	7
5	Confidential business to be transferred into the open	7
6	Change to the order of business	7
7	Confirmation of minutes	7
7.1	Minutes of the Council meeting held on 8 April 2024	7
8	Receipt of minutes for information	8
	Nil	
9	Declaration of conflicts of interest	8
10	Deputations, presentations, petitions	8
10.1	Petition - Rainbow Crossing/Art Request - Jan Tinetti MP, Ben Hurley, Gordy Lockhart	8
11	Recommendations from other committees	9
	Nil	
12	Business	9
12.1	Durham Street Bus Facility	9
12.2	Connecting Mount Maunganui Indicative Business Case	11
12.3	Arterial Route Review - Recommended Congestion Easing Improvements	13
12.4	Tauranga Local Water Done Well - Update.....	15
12.5	Street Use and Public Places Bylaw Resolutions Report.....	17
12.6	Mount Maunganui Airshed Health Risk Assessment - Outcomes of Review	17
12.7	Te Tumu Urban Growth Area and Wairākei Town Centre Transport Business Case.....	18
12.8	Fast-Track Approvals Bill - Project Applications.....	20
12.9	Pōteriwahi - Approval for Fast-track Approvals Bill application, Development and Divestment.....	21
12.10	Executive Report	22
13	Discussion of late items	24
14	Public excluded session	24
14.1	Public Excluded minutes of the Council meeting held on 8 April 2024	24
14.2	CCO Board Appointments for the Tauranga Art Gallery Trust - April 2024	25

14.3	Harington Street carpark - Variation of Encumbrance.....	25
14.4	Memorial Park Aquatic Centre Procurement Update	25
14.5	Confidential Attachment 1 - 12.9 - Pōteriwahi - Approval for Fast-track Approvals Bill application, Development and Divestment	25
14.6	Harington Street carpark proceedings	25
15	Closing karakia	26

**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, 29 APRIL 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), Paul Davidson (Chief Financial Officer), Barbara Dempsey (General Manager: Community Services), Nic Johansson (Head of Transport), Stephen Burton (Acting General Manager: Infrastructure), 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), Shawn Gerd (City Centre Transport Advisor), Tom McEntyre (Principal Investment Advisor: Transport), Neil Mason (Programme Director: Major Projects), Rhulani Mothelesi (Senior Traffic & Safety Engineer), Anna Somerville (Manager: Network Safety & Sustainability), Cathy Davidson (Manager: Directorate Services), Vicky Grant-Ussher (Policy Analyst), Carl Lucca (Team Leader: Urban Communities), Sarah Dove (Principal Strategic Transport Planner), Andrew Mead (Manager: City Planning & Growth), Robyn Scrimshaw (Senior Urban Planner), Anahera Dinsdale (Acting Team Leader: Governance Services), 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

4.1 Glen Crowther, Sustainable Bay of Plenty - Durham Street Bus Facility

External Glen Crowther, Sustainable Bay of Plenty

Key points

- The submitter noted that he had been a public transport stakeholder for decades, works in Durham Street, uses the buses and had been involved in the drawn out stakeholder engagement.
- The selected routes were not what the Regional Council or the initial consultant wanted.
- The only reason the Regional Council supported the route was that an access arcade would be built between Grey and Durham Streets which was not part of Council's final proposal.
- All options discussed were described as sub-optimal at the workshops and other forums which included the Inclusive Accessibility Forum and other user groups.

- Council staff had done well to justify what was proposed but the submitter considered that they did not support it either.
- Option 1 was the best of the bad bunch of the four options put forward.
- The fundamental issue was that no property owners in the CBD want bus stops by their properties when there had been other options proposed.
- It was more about delivering a public transport system that got more people on buses, with Tauriko and Cameron Road works being based on that. This would not happen if Council put a suboptimal CBD bus interchange in place.
- Need to pay more attention to what bus users and private property owners want.
- Given that every bus service would continue to be in CBD with 35% of the users being transfers and 57% had accessibility issues. 62% of the youth that boarded there had experienced security and safety issues with some people, including teenage girls, not using buses because of these.
- Need to listen carefully to general feedback, bus user surveys, non-bus users and the social media posts.
- Should be three options on the table – an off street bus interchange, bus routes that access Red Square by Willow or Grey Streets, or option 1 of the report but with toilets, shelter and an accessway between the two streets.
- If Council had to choose one from the options, the submitter suggested choosing option 1a which was a hybrid between options 1 and 2 putting it in front of Mercury NZ's premises as there was no public access in and out of their building. It did not need to be by their doorway or in front of the parking building which would cause people to cross the carpark entrance.

4.2 Aaron Collier and Daniel Watkins Zariba Holdings/Classic Group, Morne Hugo and Mark Apeldoorn, Boffa Miskell - Durham Street Bus Facility

External Aaron Collier, Zariba Holdings/Classic Group
Daniel Watkins, Classic Collective
Morne Hugo, Urban Design Director, Boffa Miskell
Mark Apeldoorn, Director, Boffa Miskell

Key points

- Mr Collier noted that the group owned two sites at 134 and 142 Durham Street.
- Fully participated in the workshop on 5 April 2024 which had discussed two key issues, one of which was the location of bus stops. They supported the Council resolution of pepper potting and working through a series of options to minimise the impact of the stops.
- Agree with paragraph 3 (f) of the staff report around the importance of that for the building owners.
- A further issue was the form and function of stops and shelter related issues as a lot of the interference and social issues would occur there. This was a critical design issue raised by the land owners.
- The submitter noted that he had provided a map with the optimal locations but this was not being considered in the staff report which had tweaked some of the locations of the stops and did not involve more than a 1 minute walking distance from what had been proposed.
- Considered that option 2 was worse than the original proposal, blocking legal access to their site crossing and they were unsure how it would work.
- Key issues at the Council meeting were the design, cost and timing around what was required now, in five years, and what was required beyond that, and the submitter considered that this had not been addressed.
- Cross sections provided at the recent workshop showing the shelters with dialogue and discussion with only a 1.6m gap between the shelters and the buildings. They were unsure how this would work with active frontages, entries, exits and two way pedestrian flow within that space. It was described as a narrow alleyway type effect, which was inappropriate in a streetscape and did not interact well with the building frontages and pedestrian movements.

- Upgrade of Durham Street was not originally planned correctly and given the constraints, the submitters view was the planning responses were to provide an off-street facility.
- In relation to the staff options, the submitter considered option 3 created the least impact, utilised some of the existing parking spaces and areas of open frontage where there were carparks and had four stops not six.
- Mr Hugo noted that the main concern was the practicality of a narrow corridor in front of a number of future redevelopment sites.
- There would be social issues and people standing around the bus stops and blocking it further. From a practical point of view it did not work and none of options where people were clustered functioned at all.
- Mr Apeldoorn reiterated that as indicated earlier, the outcome was to deliver a stepped change transport use and investing in infrastructure. He had grave concerns whether it would practically be achieved with any of the options and considered it needed to be revisited again and for Council to take another careful look at it.

14.3 Frances Devantier, Guideline Property - 162 Durham Street

External Frances Devantier, Guideline Property

Key points

- Ms Devantier noted that she strongly voiced an objection as an owner of 162 Durham Street.
- Expressed disappointment at the effort made to consult with the significant change proposed on the street.
- The lack of notice left little opportunity to adequately prepare with the agenda only being circulated on Anzac Day.
- Understanding from a previous Council meeting was that studies would be undertaken to assess safety implications and the commercial impact on retail businesses, but regrettably she had not seen any studies or plans of the proposed shelters.
- As proprietors of four active shop fronts, the prospect of installing bus stops with shelters posed a significant threat to the viability of those businesses.
- Cannot ignore the disastrous consequences that the current stops have brought to the northern end of Durham Street and noted she had grave concerns and was resolute in her determination to prevent the implementation of the stops by her premises.
- The safety of vehicles exiting the driveway was compromised due to visibility up and down the street.
- Safety risks with the proximity of the proposed stops to the pedestrian crossing and roundabout on the corner of Elizabeth and Durham Streets given the narrowness of the street.
- Loss of valuable on-street parking spaces exacerbated the existing challenges faced by shop owners, despite assurances from Council of excess parking in nearby buildings. The reality on the street contradicts those claims.
- Continuous removal of street parking in the CBD was a consistent source of frustration for local businesses with no tangible alternatives being provided.
- There were inherent safety challenges, a fact acknowledged by Council itself, and it was perplexing why Council persisted that this was the only viable location for the bus stops.
- The lack of foresight and planning with gardens being installed in front of the university, despite the longstanding knowledge of the envisaged bus stops in that location.
- Logically if Durham Street was the only option, the university would seem the most suitable location.
- The argument of removing the gardens as being wasteful was simply untenable and the proposed course of action eroded parking availability, undermined CBD retail, and pushed forward a concept that was unsafe and lacking in thorough investment and consultation.
- It was Council's duty to represent owners interests and uphold the commercial viability of local businesses and as a representative of business, they categorically reject the proposal and refuse to be coerced into submission.

In response to questions

- The submitter noted that she had attended the first stakeholder meeting but was not able to attend the most recent ones, nor had she seen any designs or information from those meetings, despite requesting it.
- In response to a query as to where the most appropriate places for the bus stops would be, the submitter noted she would have liked to have seen different options. After talking to tenants, she noted that possibly Cameron Road which was slightly out of town would be more appropriate.
- When Durham Street was being developed, they were told that there would not be any stops outside their building.
- While she did not use the buses, her daughter did at times to go to Pāpāmoa and there were not a lot of people using the service.
- With stops on either side of the street, there was potential to have four buses across a narrow street at once.

4 ACCEPTANCE OF LATE ITEMS**4.1 Acceptance of late item****RESOLUTION CO9/24/1**

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council accepts the following late item for consideration at the meeting:

- Harington Street carpark proceedings (public excluded)

The above item was not included in the original agenda because it was not available at the time the agenda was issued, and discussion cannot be delayed until the next scheduled meeting of the Council because a decision is required in regard to this item .

CARRIED

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 8 April 2024****RESOLUTION CO9/24/2**

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 8 April 2024 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

8 RECEIPT OF MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

Nil

9 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Commissioner Rolleston noted that in relation to Items 12.8 – Fast-track Approvals Bill, Project Applications and 12.9 – Pōteriwahi - Approval for Fast-track Approvals Bill application, Development and Divestment, that he was still actively involved in supporting the Crown on the development of proposals and would refrain from participating in those items.

10 DEPUTATIONS, PRESENTATIONS, PETITIONS

10.1 Petition - Rainbow Crossing/Art Request - Jan Tinetti MP, Ben Hurley, Gordy Lockhart

External Jan Tinetti MP
Ben Hurley
Gordy Lockhart

Key points

- Mr Hurley noted that as a Bay of Plenty resident he proudly represented those who identify with the sign of the rainbow. The sign reaches a broad spectrum of society representing pride, tolerance, inclusiveness and community.
- As a student of history he noted that those within great civilisations had always built monuments to pay homage to the innovation and progression of that time. The Greeks, Romans and Māori all built monuments which endured in stories and whakapapa as they most accurately reflect the times in which they were built.
- Humanity had progressed for the better because of these times and the monuments were testament to that.
- We had been through the age of enlightenment, the space age, the industrial revolution and were now at the age of inclusivity.
- History was dominated by oppression, bigotry and inequality and while things were changing it was far from over to right the wrongs of the past, but there were gains to be proud of with people like Gordy Lockhart.
- The times we live in may be looked as one where great strides were taken and where all citizens of Aotearoa New Zealand felt safe, free and accepted.
- While we don't build great buildings anymore, a rainbow pedestrian crossing could be a monument and testament of the age of inclusiveness that future generations could recognise and build upon.
- It was much cheaper and meant so much more than just lines on the ground to the community, a rainbow crossing was better than a mural and had an everyday practical use that could honour the present.
- Ms Tinetti, MP, noted that it was important to the city, noting that as a previous Principal of Merivale School she had a pupil enrolled that had been excluded from other schools. Several years ago that pupil came to her as a young women having transitioned and thanked Ms Tinetti for seeing her for what she was, supporting her and having her back.
- That was what the rainbow crossing could represent in Tauranga, and as a city stand up strong to see, support and have the back of the rainbow community at all times.
- This was not something that was woke or virtue signalling, it was something of meaning that could make a difference within the community.
- That was the city that she wanted to live in and be part of and the city that had the back of all of the communities.
- Mr Lockhart noted that the crossing element was critically important and instead of being just a piece of art, the crossing says that we as society would stop for inclusivity.

- It was a meeting place where all come together and celebrate the diversity of the communities, not specifically the rainbow community, but the entire community, with every one of the social identities being represented in the rainbow in 2024.
- A rainbow would brighten up the CBD with the many things that were happening within the next five years, thereby improving it and making it fantastic
- Tourism was a major aspect of the city and rainbow crossings were known worldwide to attract tourism and he wanted to see Tauranga City Council adopt a symbol of diversity that was the rainbow crossing.

In response to questions

- 905 signatures had been submitted as of this morning.

Discussion points raised

- The process for petition was noted with staff being requested to produce a report. The last decision making meeting for the Commissioners was 20 May 2024, and if it was not provided to that meeting it would be an issue for the incoming Council to decide.
- The petitioners were thanked for attending the meeting.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/3

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the petition and refers it to staff for a report back to Council.

CARRIED

11 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

Nil

12 BUSINESS

12.1 Durham Street Bus Facility

Staff Nic Johansson, Head of Transport
Shawn Geard, City Centre Transport Advisor
Tom McEntyre, Principal Investment Advisor: Transport

Key points

- Conducted a number of workshops with developers and stakeholder groups with appreciation noted for their input. The amended option was a compromise on shop frontages and uses the street to create a hub for the city and provide for the evolution of the city centre.
- Efforts were being made to secure an area opposite the fire station for use as off street parking for the local buses.
- The options improved the street for all users, including pedestrians and cyclists, and preserved the spaces and access for the critical structures to be built.
- The eastern side of Durham Street was limited with the two stops proposed being as a result of the public forums held.
- Option 2 provided a solution for all requirements in the area.
- Correction to recommendation (c) (ii) noted to be Elizabeth Street (Between Grey Street and Durham Street)

In response to questions

- The space of the building line and shelter on the footpath allowed pedestrians to travel along the footpath with a 1.6m structure with a roof and sides. At busy times the space was likely to

overflow as the street corridor was overly narrow leaving a 2m maximum gap for pedestrians to get by. Having people sitting against the shop frontages was less attractive.

- A detailed design would be provided to the directly affected stakeholders showing how it would look.
- The through bus system was not scheduled to be implemented until 2027. It was expected that an operational temporary facility would be in place in quarter 3 of the year.
- While securing a space for the idling buses was outside the scope of the report, staff were currently in negotiations with Fire and Emergency for a property on Cameron Road for an interim period until the Bay of Plenty Regional Council took over. The space would accommodate 8-10 buses. This would allow more space for on-street parking along Durham Street and remove the layby function of public transport operations from the city centre streets network while still remaining close to it.
- The layover area was not big enough for the 4-5 inter-regional buses each day as they were longer vehicles. While they were not so frequent, they spent a bigger amount of time at a stop.
- Mercury NZ and the landowner of that building had been vocal about not having a stop at their frontage, and while there had not been consideration given at this point on that option, it added another stakeholder that does not want it. They considered that there was a health and safety perspective as they regularly had angry customers who try and come into the premises and they did not want any additional health and safety concerns with a bus stop.
- In response to a query as to how much consultation had been undertaken in 2017 when the corridor was upgraded, it was noted that there was not a lot of information to hand apart from a communications plan and approved collateral noting a potential route for buses between Durham and Grey Street as an option with nothing agreed to.
- Boundary to boundary the footpath width was the same, however there were different arrangements with the width of current stop shelters, with some being obtrusive resulting in the space being more constrained.
- Some adjustments were made to properties by bus stops.
- The advantage to previous options for Durham Street was that it used the length between Elizabeth and Spring Streets dissipating the volume pressure of people using the narrow width of space. The previous option condensed the volume into a shorter length of space and had resulted in frequent cross street actions. This would relieve the pressure, discourage loitering and allow for the elderly and less abled people to sit while not providing space for someone to lie down.
- Staff would work with the Bay of Plenty Regional Council on reducing the amount of time for the bus stays and to look at alternative layover provisions.

Discussion points raised

- It was noted that the temporary stop at the northern end of Durham Street had reduced the number of issues faced in Willow Street. Making an interchange a place where people want to gather would result in social issues and moving it up to a more linear layout reduced the desire for people to hang around
- Additional resolutions were added - (d) to include it being conditional on the provision of an off-road layover space for buses until the through service was implemented; and (e) for staff to work with stakeholders on the design and pavement location of the shelters.
- Commissioners noted that they were willing to consider stops outside Mercury NZ but wanted compensation if it resulted in losing more garden space as they had lost 25% of the gardens outside the university and carpark building.
- It was noted that over time buses would transition from diesel to electric.
- Appreciation was given to staff for their patience and while the issue had not been resolved, they now had a decision to work towards.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/4

Moved: Commission Chair Anne Tolley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Durham Street Bus Facility"; and
- (b) Adopts for implementation Option 2 for the Durham Street Bus Facility:
 - (i) Option 2: Durham Street (Elizabeth Street to Spring Street), and
- (c) Adopts the following option for implementation for the inter-regional bus stop:
 - (i) Elizabeth Street (between Grey Street and Durham Street) and continue to work on alternative layover options; and
- (d) Notes that the implementation be conditional on the provision of off-road layover spaces for buses until the through service was implemented; and
- (e) Requests that staff work collaboratively with stakeholders on the design and pavement location of the shelters.

CARRIED

12.2 Connecting Mount Maunganui Indicative Business Case

Staff Nic Johansson, Head of Transport
Tom McEntyre, Principal Investment Advisor: Transport
Neil Mason, Programme Director: Major Projects

Key points

- The report was provided prior to the NZTA's Values, Outcome and Standards Committee (VOS) meeting which subsequently made a decision which had quite an effect on what was previously proposed.
- The brief would now be an update only as NZTA representatives had met with Commissioners and the Executive team the previous week to provide a brief on elements of that decision.
- Pending further work between Council, NZTA, stakeholders and partners on the project, a decision was no longer needed on the recommendations until the Indicative Business Case (IBC) was finalised in line with the terms of reference issued by the VOS Committee to the Waka Kotahi project team.
- The VOS Committee would not endorse the IBC in its current form until additional work had been undertaken. The decision was based primarily on the low benefit to cost ratio (BCR) of the current option which currently sat at a range of between 0.3 and 0.6.
- The affordability of the proposed recommended option applied to all partners, including Council and NZTA.
- There was a need to consider a phased approach to provide the NZTA Board to better manage risk. This would address Council's concerns around the affordability and detail and issues around staging that had been raised by the VOS Committee. Council was happy with the Horizon plan as it sat currently with the IBC.
- It would also consider wider network impacts during the delivery and implementation phase of the recommended option.
- The VOS Committee would outline specific conditional considerations before the IBC was resubmitted to NZTA. Staff would work with the NZTA team on every step to get it to the point of resubmission.
- NZTA Project Manager had advised that it was likely that the changes could be done within the existing budget for the IBC phase, but the detailed cost and time implications would be better understood and shared with partners following further analysis and receipt of the detailed instructions from the VOS Committee which had not yet been received.
- Staff recommended that a subsequent report to Council would be required if the recommended option in the current report was substantially amended through the IBC updates. As yet there was no timeline as to how this would occur, but was unlikely to be before the 20 May 2024 meeting.

In response to questions

- NZTA were advising the IBC was not acceptable as it does not meet the requirements, so they wanted to pause and relook at it. For Council it was a critical project, one of the five major transport projects which would unlock economic development and growth and relieve congestion for a large majority of the population.
- The new draft Government Policy Statement (GPS) allowed the opportunity to review the IBC and achieve greater alignment with it for land transport with a positive impact on through put, freight and the economic drivers.
- NZTA had signalled affordability as a component from feedback given as there was always a desire to get all of the outcomes for less of a monetary input. However the longer it takes, the more the costs would go up, which were already significant amounts for both NZTA and Council for the state highway component and local road aspects within the business case.
- In relation to the construction of a flyover to the port, if that specific component was removed to alleviate congestion by trying to improve the efficiency of the current junction, all of the benefits incurred would also be removed.
- Staff agreed with Horizons and the way in which they had been presented and if space was not created, there would be insufficient room to build a super structure under Horizon 4 and 5. The fastest way to achieve that was to follow the process and believe that it was an assurance that there was no cheaper alternative and the study did actually identify a best cost solution.
- No timeline had been provided by NZTA as to how long the review and resubmission would take.
- In response to a query as to whether the Council could take the lead in conducting the review and presenting to NZTA what was essential to meet needs as a repackage, it was noted that this was unknown and not an option that had been considered since the outcome had been released. Council would be with NZTA every step of the review which would be provided to Council and the VOS committee for approval before being submitted to NZTA.
- Commissioner Tolley noted that they had lost confidence in NZTA who were not listening to Council, their consultation processes were long and endless and they did not want to wait another 12 months as the city did not have the luxury of that time. In response to a query as to whether Council had the resources to take control, it was noted that Council would have to have an agreement with NZTA, but could provide them with options with a change of lead or introduce some independence to that in an attempt to find a path that did not follow an ideology and was independent of who was in government, providing an option which speaks to both. A business cases could be driven by ideology supported in order to get the funding and follow too strongly that path. Obtaining independent advice on how to pitch it on a middle ground to promote the benefits in a more neutral way as both organisations could use some support in finding something like that. The oversight group was an advisor on the delivery component.
- Staff had talked to NZTA about having a more strategic input into the oversight group, pitched more at the delivery aspect but would need to look beyond that and cast the net wider.
- Commissioner Tolley offered to speak directly with the Chair of NZTA and the Minister of Transport on the proposal. Tauranga had a letter of best endeavours signed off by three Crown Ministers for an IFF levy that indicated that they were different from every other council around the country with a deal with NZTA to fund \$175m worth of investment from ratepayers into the transport system into city. Tauranga was special and should be demanding that it be treated as special.
- It was an expensive project and would always be number one, it was supported by the draft GPS and may be just a review of the language. Staff had not seen the recommendations or requirements from VOS, but believed it was a double check to ensure that there was not a cheaper alternative that had been missed.
- Staff support the Horizons approach which offered a good solution, affordability was questionable and needed to be well supported and well-presented and should not take too long to see that it aligned with all that was wanted to be achieved. Once the recommendations had been received staff would look at those and ensure that they were testing the boundaries and accelerating them. It seemed a straightforward process which now needed finance and NZTA to be in the same place as the Council.

Discussion points raised

- Commissioners noted the issue as getting the mix of a critical piece of infrastructure, such as the Tauranga port getting freight in and out of it safely, and matching it with the needs of the population which used Hewletts Road and Totara Street to get into the city.
- How much of the report was focused on active mode and would that endanger the project, as there seemed to be no emphasis on the critical national importance of the freight movement in and out of the port and this must be reflected in the business case.
- It was noted that following extensive consultation it had been agreed that the flyover was settled as the cheapest option to achieve what was needed. Commissioners noted that it was the number one project from an economic perspective and they wanted to get the review done as quickly as possible and get on with the work as it was wasting time and becoming more expensive.
- Commissioner Selwood noted that being able to focus on economics was beneficial as it was the primary purpose of the project and Council should be able to confidently answer those questions. Council did not have the revenue streams to fund the investment required in the first instance, and it was suggested that the prospect of road charging and pricing on the network would enable use of the corridors more efficiently and raise the revenue streams to enable investment of a better transport system for Tauranga.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/5

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Connecting Mount Maunganui Indicative Business Case"; and
- (b) Reports back to the 13 May 2024 Council meeting in terms of the NZTA Values and Standards Committee (VOS) recommendations, timelines and assurance that the economic benefits had been included in the Indicative Business Case.

CARRIED

12.3 Arterial Route Review - Recommended Congestion Easing Improvements

Staff Nic Johansson, Head of Transport
Rhulani Mothelesi, Senior Traffic & Safety Engineer
Anna Somerville, Manager: Network Safety & Sustainability

Key points

- Significant work had been carried out since the previous report on the arterial corridors to consolidate these and support the city to move around while the major roading projects were underway.
- \$10m had been prioritised in the LTP, with twenty projects being identified at an investment cost of \$23M. If funding was provided from NZTA, 90% of the works identified could be completed.
- Preliminary conversations with NZTA indicated that they were well aligned with the GPS for low-cost low-risk projects below \$2M, with anything above that being added to with the local share as an option.
- Identified a number of improvements along the Fraser Street arterial while the enabling works at 15th Avenue and Turret Street were underway.
- The focus was on the Oropi Road corridor as that was where the traffic would be diverted to with the Welcome Bay project and the Cameron Road Stage 2 works.
- Included clear lanes through the peak times and further studies on the right suites to be implemented.

- A further improvement included the Tauriko Enabling Works project by creating additional alternative temporary routes along Gargan Road as well as improving the Wairoa Road and State Highway 29 connections.
- Installation of journey information signs along SH29 to indicate that the Toll Road may be a faster connection.

Discussion points raised

- Commissioners acknowledged the good standard of reporting with the information provided and the well-thought through alternative routes.
- Charts and regular reporting was requested showing the congestion points, including Hewlett Road to Mount Maunganui, which had a significant volume on a daily basis.
- It was noted that investment could relieve the corridors and optimise the network. Council needed to work with regional partners about public transport and include access to schools and the like. Encouragement of working from home also played a pivotal role in sustainability, along with park and ride facilities, ride sharing, the use of technology and the implementation of a ferry crossing.
- Council needed to be proactive in terms of how the disruptions were communicated to the community and how to best move around the city.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/6

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Arterial Route Review - Recommended Congestion Easing Improvements".
- (b) Prioritises the arterial improvement funding on:
 - (i) Decongesting the Fraser Street corridor as it is:
 - (1) A major transport corridor that currently carries 15,000 to 20,000 vehicles per day and experiences significant congestion during the morning and afternoon peak periods.
 - (2) Anticipated to be an alternative route while construction of two of the Top 5 TSP projects (15th Ave to Welcome Bay as well as Cameron Road Stage 2) is underway. The corridor is of significant importance as construction of both TSP projects is currently scheduled to overlap.
 - (ii) Improving traffic flow on diversion routes for the Tauriko Enabling Works project as construction of the project has already commenced. This includes creating additional diversion routes during construction to disperse traffic onto multiple routes.
- (c) Seeks to secure funding from the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) as high-level cost estimates indicate there will be significant expenditure over the \$10M allocated for the arterial improvements. Early discussions with NZTA indicate that the recommended improvements are well aligned with the draft Government Policy Statement on land transport (draft GPS 2024) priorities.
- (d) Considers seeking funding assistance up to the \$2M threshold and self-fund the balance for those improvements that are estimated to cost over \$2M to avoid going through the business case process in order to obtain funding approval from NZTA.
- (e) Authorises that more comprehensive investigations and designs be carried out this Financial Year (2024/25) to confirm the feasibility, scope, timing and costing of the recommended congestion easing improvements.

- (f) Authorises that maintenance be undertaken pro-actively on routes that are anticipated to be used as alternative/ rat running routes prior to installation of the recommended congestion easing improvements.

CARRIED

At 11.27am the meeting adjourned.

At 11.35am the meeting reconvened.

12.4 Tauranga Local Water Done Well - Update

Staff Stephen Burton, Acting General Manager Infrastructure
Cathy Davidson, Manager: Directorate Services

Key points

- Repeal of three waters legislation last year with two new pieces of legislation expected.
- One transition Bill would set out guidelines for establishing Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) and a requirement for one-off large water service delivery plans which would be the way in which councils provide information to the government on how they would deliver sustainable water services.
- The plans could be developed individually or jointly with the Minister of Local Government having to be advised by September 2024 which of these had been chosen. The plans need to be delivered within 12 months so would need to be submitted by 30 June 2025.
- The second piece of legislation containing information around consultation and decision making arrangements was expected before the end of this year for engagement in June 2025.
- Provisions allowed for information to be made on two options, either the status quo or one other option.
- Staff had started work to understand its own financial analysis by doing their own modelling, gathering the latest LTP data from the Western Bay of Plenty District Council and Hamilton City Council and running an extensive series of models for 2 waters and 3 waters, whether to go solo or join in with a partner. Conversations were being held with neighbouring authorities and with Hamilton City Council.

In response to questions

- The conversations that were occurring included stormwater as the economic benefits in the long term were better if stormwater was taken off the balance sheet. For completeness, it was also being modelled with two waters.

Discussion points raised

- Appreciation was passed on for a very thorough report, noting that the role of the Commission was to ensure that there was sufficient information and options on the table for the incoming Council to further develop a water plan.
- Three major concerns from the community, one included the retention of community ownership in any of the models, as assets had been paid for by the ratepayers.
- The community did not like co-governance. This was supported by Te Rangapū Mana Whenua o Tauranga Moana who were more interested in maintaining their rights and interests in their local rohe, and the quality and the use of the water at a local level rather than the distribution utility model. One of the threats from the previous legislation was that local iwi/hapū would lose a bit of control over their local resources and Council needed to ensure local iwi were front and centre to inform the model that Council would eventually settle on.
- There were also opportunities to work at a regional level to explore and discuss the issue, but not all councils were in same time scale with some further behind and less confident that their communities understood that it was now being driven locally. Council needed to continue to work with central government to make it as viable as possible for that separation otherwise the city did not have the capability of managing growth into the future.

- An addition was made to recommendation (d) to ensure that all models considered were future proofed to enable economies of scale to be achieved and allowing others to join in their own time to streamline the process.
- Commissioner Selwood noted that economies of scale were a benefit of water reform, but the other key benefit was the funding question where many councils were struggling as they depended on rates funding for investment which politicised the revenue streams. The electricity and telecommunications utility models depended on direct consumer prices as the revenue stream to fund the investment profile. He considered that there was not enough emphasis on that in the report, or how water would be funded into the future and how the CCO's would be funded. There were enormous difficulties if they had to go back to the shareholding owners to support the investment, whereas the Watercare model, which was a charge directly based on volumetric charging, was more effective. The principle of having a separated consumer charge funding the investment was a key benefit of water reform and should be included in the proposals and consideration of a CCO.
- Commission Tolley noted that the enabling of direct charging for water services should form part of the consideration, but Commissioners needed to be careful of the decision that the incoming Council should make. Information on this would be reflected in the briefing paper to the incoming Council as an option to consider when developing the modelling plan.
- It was noted that it was unlikely to achieve any balance sheet separation so would be included in the evaluation and would be included in the modelling criteria.
- In response to clarity being given to consumers on what they would be paying for if it was to be across multiple councils, it was noted that it was intended that the Metro councils helped out with the funding for smaller councils to ensure they were financially sustainable. The incoming Council would have a big consultative process when they decided upon a model for that reason, as there may be subsidisation of others that do not have the equity to fund what they need to be financially sustainable.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/7

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Tauranga Local Water Done Well - Update".
- (b) Endorses that:
 - (i) The range of models are developed, covering Tauranga City Council's(TCC) data alongside Hamilton City Council and Western Bay of Plenty District Council (WBOPDC).
 - (ii) The Water Services Delivery Plan is developed in accordance with new legislation.
 - (iii) Through the process of Water Services Delivery Plan development, utilise the opportunity to have conversations with other councils about joint arrangements for water services delivery.
- (c) That due to existing synergies, greater effort on the TCC / WBOPDC model is applied.
- (d) That all models considered are future proofed to enable economies of scale to be achieved, allowing others to join in their own time.
- (e) Notes the criticality of being able to charge for the full cost of the delivery of water services.

CARRIED

12.5 Street Use and Public Places Bylaw Resolutions Report

Staff Nic Johansson, Head of Transport
Vicky Grant-Ussher, Policy Analyst
Rhulani Mothelesi, Senior Traffic & Safety Engineer

Key points

- Bylaw controls put in place to ensure businesses obtain licences to occupy as part of the fees and charges.
- Some street footpath widths at the Mount did not allow a 2.5m gap, so the bylaw would be used to reduce it to 1.5m, reflecting the current state of dining to closely align with what was already in place.

In response to questions

- The controls also included signage such as sandwich boards and visual indicators would note where the areas started and finished so the licensees and regulators knew which areas needed to be kept clear.
- The NZTA recommended width was a guideline, but the 2.5m width was not able to be met in some of the older parts of the city.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/8

Moved: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

Seconded: Commissioner Bill Wasley

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Street Use and Public Places Bylaw Resolutions Report".
- (b) Adopts the proposed street use controls as per Attachment One and the associated maps to implement Long-term Plan decisions for zoned street dining as agreed through the Street Use Policy review.
- (c) Specifies a 1.5m pedestrian way width for Maunganui Road, Pacific Avenue, Prince Avenue, Banks Avenue and Salisbury Avenue under the Street Use and Public Places Bylaw to reflect current street use.

CARRIED

12.6 Mount Maunganui Airshed Health Risk Assessment - Outcomes of Review

Staff Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance
Carl Lucca, Team Leader: Urban Communities

In response to questions

- It was noted that much of this and the appropriate issues were dealt with in the spatial plans. Bay of Plenty Regional Council and TCC staff would be looking at these issues in conjunction with other plans such as Plan Change 38 - Business Land Framework. The Regional Council also had the Air Management Plan in progress, and Plan Change 13 with additional monitoring. There were also action plans moving forward to address the issues that were known to exist in terms of air quality.

Discussion points raised

- There was a critical need to find space for the emitters such as roading material manufacturers as Council did not want to lose them out of the area with restrictive conditions being put on them in the industrial area. If they had to move out of the area it could result in an increase in roading costs. Council may need to find a potential area for them to move to that was less restrictive, while enabling them to remain within the area.

- The information was evidence based with Toi Te Ora Public Health so that it could be used in subsequent actions and decision making providing a clear understanding of those matters.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/9

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Mount Maunganui Airshed Health Risk Assessment - Outcomes of Review".

CARRIED

12.7 Te Tumu Urban Growth Area and Wairākei Town Centre Transport Business Case

Staff Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance
Sarah Dove, Principal Strategic Transport Planner
Andrew Mead, Manager: City Planning & Growth

External Craig Richards – Technical Development Team Lead, Beca

Key points

- Four-five years ago it was anticipated that NZTA would provide 50% funding for roading in new greenfield areas, In 2020 Council was expecting similar outcomes to deliver corridors within Te Tumu with one bus lane and either two or four vehicle lanes. There would be limited access corridors with no driveways or sections off them to reinforce the focus on safety and movement. Developers would build separate local roads to be able to develop their land and build houses.
- NZTA policy and funding availability had changed substantively and would not fund these roads any more or possibly only a small portion for a better level of service, leaving the developer or Council having to build them.
- The outcomes were different to what they had started with, the business case did unlock some limited funding, it helped with the structure planning and rezoning processes required for Te Tumu and would assist with planning corridors consistent with NZTA's outcomes and to secure funding opportunities that may arise such as the City Deal.
- The transport corridors were in excess of \$400M, leaving a substantive funding gap to be bridged and brought into question that if there was a need to bring the development forward, this was yet another hurdle in addressing the broader housing and urban development challenges that it already had.
- The Wairākei area was the current growth area with the business case covering the key area for the corridors servicing The Sands town centre and surrounding streets with the cost estimate details for those components requesting \$10.4M from NZTA to support some infrastructure and property costs for the wider corridors. This was based on NZTA's subsidy guidance structure.
- The other components of the business case were interlinked and had to be done together with Te Tumu's two main corridors into the future growth area. The preferred concept options were based on population and modelling for those areas.
- Council was only seeking endorsement and intent with funding from NZTA at this time for the concepts. As there were no confirmed time frames, NZTA was not able to consider it in their funding at this stage.
- Through the business case process they had sought flexibility for the corridor width acquisition with minimums and maximums throughout the area. While the business case was developed under the previous GPS it was important to note that to effectively service greenfield areas multi-modal opportunities needed to be realised as to retrofit these at a later date would be costly.

- There were future opportunities to review the concept designs as planning and costing work was being refined moving forward.

In response to questions

- Commissioners noted that even with the GPS change, it was important to pursue multi-modal shift and to purchase the land as this could limit choices later on.
- In relation to how much thought had been given to value capture and the cost of these corridors, it was noted that in Tauriko West all of the internal infrastructure within the growth area was built and funded by the developer directly rather than affecting ratepayers on the balance sheet. The business case was to secure third party external funding to make it easier and more cost effective to help developers to deliver as the full costs were challenging. This was also the value capture used for Te Tumu. Commissioners requested that this be quantified and made clear showing what it would look like and increase the transparency around the principle.
- Through the option development and testing, the key street design guidance had been utilised, with the local and NZTA's guidance being adamant and strong that future arterial roads would not have carparking on roads and would be for access for the movement of people predominately. A design had been created that was user friendly for vehicles, buses and with a separation for people walking and cycling with landscaping to enable it to take place. The speeds had not been set yet, but had inferred relevant design speeds through the process of typically 50kph maximum with variances based on land use with schools, active reserves and these were likely to be 30kph.
- Mr Richards noted that there would be pedestrian access to properties with a front gate on the arterial roads with smaller laneways for cars and garages.
- The diagram for the bus hub that should have been included in paragraph 21 was tabled.

Discussion points raised

- It was noted that it was important to have a concept overview of the combination of the initiatives and projects to be able to get an understanding of the total picture of what was occurring in the city.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/10

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Te Tumu Urban Growth Area and Wairakei Town Centre Transport Business Case" (the SSBC).
- (a) Approves submission of the SSBC to NZTA for Value, Outcome and Standards Committee (VOS) and Board assessment and, subsequently National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) funding subsidy. Noting that with respect to the Wairākei and Te Tumu 'components' of the SSBC, the recommendation will be that NZTA:

Approve:

- (i) The concept designs for the key transport corridors in Wairākei (serving The Sands town centre development) of The Boulevard, The Sands Avenue and Te Okuroa Drive, and the concept design for the bus hub on The Boulevard.
 - (ii) The cost estimates for these corridors and as such the requested funding subsidy.
- (b) Endorse the Te Tumu transport corridors form and function as included in the concept designs for Te Okuroa Drive and The Boulevard.
 - (c) Delegates authority to the General Manager: Strategy, Growth and Governance to approve updates to the SSBC on matters associated with corridor through multiple owned Māori land, and minor technical and/or editorial changes.

- (d) Continue to advocate for Crown / NZTA funding subsidy on arterial and collector transport corridors particularly in planned growth areas.

CARRIED

Attachments

- 1 Tabled Item - Item 12.7 figure 2 - Council 29 April 2024

Commissioner Rolleston did not take part in the discussion of the following two items.

12.8 Fast-Track Approvals Bill - Project Applications

Staff Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance
Andrew Mead, Manager: City Planning & Growth

Key points

- A submission had been made to the Bill including which projects Council may want to put forward when the Bill was enacted with consenting approval requirements.
- Four large projects had been identified with applications being worked on as they were due to be submitted on 3 May 2024. These included the Kaituna stormwater overflow to prevent flooding in the broader Pāpāmoa East catchment and was required for Te Tumu to commence.
- The Pāpāmoa East interchange surplus land project related to the development and divestment of surplus land that Council owned around the interchange, with housing as a component of that development, although housing was a non-complying activity given the current underlying zoning of the land.
- The Turret Road/15th Avenue upgrade which was connecting the people in Welcome Bay which had components of consenting around the harbour coastal marine area with bridge structures.
- The Pōteriwahi (Parau) farms sports field and housing project which was also inconsistent with the underlying zoning.

In response to questions

- In relation to the amount of focus on the projects being nationally and regionally significant and the affordability of these projects it was noted that there was a bigger focus on that as a significant component within the application document.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/11

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Fast-Track Approvals Bill - Project Applications".
- (b) Retrospectively endorses the TCC submission made on the Fast-Track Approvals Bill.
- (c) Approves the Kaituna Stormwater Overflow, Pāpāmoa East Interchange surplus land project and Turret Road/15th Ave Upgrades being submitted as an application for inclusion as Schedule 2A listed projects within the Fast-track Approvals legislation.
- (d) Notes that the Pōteriwahi (Parau Farms) project is addressed in a separate report, including the recommendation to also make an application for this project to be listed in Schedule 2A.
- (e) Delegates to the Chief Executive the authority to approve and lodge applications to have the projects listed as per resolution (c) above.

CARRIED

12.9 Pōteriwahi - Approval for Fast-track Approvals Bill application, Development and Divestment

Staff Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance
Andrew Mead, Manager: City Planning & Growth
Carl Lucca, Team Leader: Urban Communities
Robyn Scrimshaw, Senior Urban Planner

Key points

- An update on the progress in planning, to seek Council approval make the application for the Pōteriwahi project and seek direction on the divestment of housing land.
- The report outlined the programme to date, acknowledged the making of an application for the reasons provided, an outline of the objectives of the divestment of housing and to start the process for the divestment strategy.

Discussion points raised

- Commissioners noted their appreciation to Ngāti Kahu for their willingness to work with Council and were conscious of their desire to get the housing outcomes they wanted. Fast-track consenting would make it much easier through the divestment process to have some further conversations with them as to how Council could help them realise those aspirations.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/12

Moved: Commission Chair Anne Tolley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Pōteriwahi - Approval for Fast-track Approvals Bill application, Development and Divestment".
- (b) Approves Council submitting an application to include the Pōteriwahi Project (Parau Farms) as a Schedule 2A listed project within the Fast-track Approvals Bill.
- (c) Delegates to the Chief Executive the:
 - (i) approval and lodgement of an application to have the project listed in Schedule 2A of the Bill; and
 - (ii) preparation and lodgement of an application for approvals under the Fast Track Approval if the project becomes listed in that legislation.
- (d) Endorses staff continuing further due diligence and refinement of the concept plan based on the attached concept plan (including protection of the pa site, active and passive recreation / open space and housing) and development outcomes reported to date.
- (e) Approves the strategic divestment objectives/outcomes with respect to the potential disposal of the residential component of Pōteriwahi of:
 - (i) Enabling housing development at the earliest opportunity.
 - (ii) Delivering medium density residential development with a mix of housing typologies, and a mix of affordable and market housing.
 - (iii) Providing a range of housing tenure and ownership arrangements.
 - (iv) Maximising the financial return from the market housing to enable reinvestment into affordable housing outcomes and/or contributing to the infrastructure costs which will be incurred to deliver the recreation and open space outcomes on the Pōteriwahi site.

- (f) Agrees that the potential divestment of the residential component of the Pōteriwahi land will likely be classified as *Strategic Disposal* under the Property Acquisitions and Disposal Policy, noting that the appropriate classification can only be confirmed upon completion of Mana Whenua engagement.
- (g) Approves Council progressing a divestment strategy for the residential land including seeking market expressions of interest subject to:
 - (i) Pōteriwahi being included in Schedule 2 of the Fast Track Approvals Act; and
 - (ii) The land being classified as a Strategic Disposal, with recommendations on selection of preferred purchaser to be reported to Council for decision making.
- (h) Notes that TCC will continue to seek engagement with tangata whenua on processes and workstreams associated with the project.
- (i) Notes Ngati Kahu hapū have signalled a desire to achieve some housing outcome for their hapū and that TCC will continue to work with them on ways that could be achieved alongside wider cultural considerations over the site.
- (d) **Attachment 1** can be transferred into the open after divestment process has been undertaken.

CARRIED

At 12.35pm the meeting adjourned.

At 1.01pm the meeting reconvened.

12.10 Executive Report

Staff Barbara Dempsey, General Manager: Community Services
Paul Davidson, Chief Financial Officer
Nic Johansson, Head of Transport
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

- Updated the five projects for Transport included in the report.

In response to questions

- In order to receive Environmental Enhancement funding, the local government funding performance or an intent of investment plan was needed to gain that discount.
- The NZ Green funding was one of the options being sought for Te Maunga.
- 17 bus shelters were currently on hold as a result of the current bus routes at those locations being in doubt and may need to be relocated.
- The recent water treatment plant audit had been highly successful and would be reported and shared in the near future.
- The Speed Management Plan feedback closes on 3 May 2024 with 670 responses being received to date. Of those 68% of the respondents were in favour of 30kph around schools and 49% in favour of a 30kph limit within the city centre. Staff would attempt to report back to the next Council meeting.

Community Services

Key points

- After only three weeks, 300 people had signed up to become Friends of the Museum.

In response to questions

- The Public Art Panel had made a connection with the Urban Design Panel.
- It was noted that the recent upgrade of Memorial Park showed what good maintenance of facilities meant and the importance of a regular maintenance programme. The Places and Spaces team were working hard to keep the gardens and other areas well maintained.

Discussion points raised

- It was noted that there was a carving at the State Highway 36 by the Pyes Pa roundabout that had not been maintained since being placed there.
- Commissioners noted their appreciation to the Event Team over the busy summer of events for their helpful and responsive attitude at the various events.

Chief Financial Office

Discussion points raised

- The Air NZ Board would be meeting with the Commissioners in the near future and they would be noting the 90% passenger loading as being the biggest problem for commuters. .

Strategy, Growth and Governance

Key points

- An advertising campaign to attract candidates for the upcoming elections had begun with nominations opening on 26 April 2024.
- The Electoral Officer would be holding a candidate evening on 30 April 2024 for potential candidates.
- The list of candidates would be updated daily on the Council website.

Corporate Services

Key points

- In process establishing a trail to test the effectiveness of smart bin technology to determine the level, weight and temperature of what goes into the bin.

In response to questions

- The job market had softened and Council were tracking 50% lower than other local authorities.

Regulatory and Compliance

Key points

- Building consent numbers were the lowest they had been in five years resulting in the housing supply being well below the forecast demand. This was a national trend with the low expected to continue until 2025 and then increase from 2028 onwards.
- The number of resource consent land use and subdivision consents had increased.
- Staff were reviewing the information and working with the legal team and the real estate community on what needed to be included in a LIM to make the process more efficient and user friendly.

In response to questions

- Information was already being provided through to the Council so there was no issue with the new government requirements to make consent information public. The timeliness of applications was improving so there should not be any concerns raised through that process.

City Development and Partnerships

Key points

- Foot traffic in the city centre had increased and the media impact score had increased to 3.7.

In response to questions

- It was interesting to hear from 25 downtown businesses and their questions. The group were positive and worked hard to change perceptions of what the Council was trying to achieve.
- In response to a query as to what the comparative statistics were with Hamilton and other similar cities it was noted that following a recent staff visit to Hamilton City Council there would be an exchange of data so that comparisons could be made.
- There had been asbestos issues with the Devonport Road car park which had been dealt with and the facility would be in use by 31 July 2024.

Discussion points raised

- Commissioners complimented the Manager Civic Development and Partnerships on the conversations being had throughout the city centre. The recent visit by two local MP’s had been a success leaving them buzzing on how much was happening within the city.
- Commissioners requested a site visit to Masonic Park and the construction sites before their term of office ended.

RESOLUTION CO9/24/13

Moved: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

Seconded: Commissioner Bill Wasley

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the "Executive Report".

CARRIED

13 DISCUSSION OF LATE ITEMS

Nil

14 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION

Resolution to exclude the public

RESOLUTION CO9/24/14

Moved: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

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
14.1 - Public Excluded minutes of the Council meeting held on 8 April 2024	s7(2)(c)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment,	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

	<p>where the making available of the information would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest</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>which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7</p>
<p>14.2 - CCO Board Appointments for the Tauranga Art Gallery Trust - April 2024</p>	<p>s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons</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>14.3 - Harington Street carpark - Variation of Encumbrance</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>14.4 - Memorial Park Aquatic Centre Procurement Update</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>Confidential Attachment 1 - 12.9 - Pōteriwhi - Approval for Fast-track Approvals Bill application, Development and Divestment</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>Harington Street carpark proceedings</p>	<p>S7(2)(g) – The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege.</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</p>

		which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

CARRIED

15 CLOSING KARAKIA

Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 2.02 pm .

The minutes of this meeting were confirmed as a true and correct record at the Ordinary Council meeting held on 13 May 2024.

.....
Commission Chair Anne Tolley
CHAIRPERSON