



AGENDA

Ordinary Council meeting Monday, 13 May 2024

I hereby give notice that an Ordinary meeting of Council will be held on:

Date: Monday, 13 May 2024

Time: 9am

**Location: Bay of Plenty Regional Council Chambers
Regional House
1 Elizabeth Street
Tauranga**

Please note that this meeting will be livestreamed and the recording will be publicly available on Tauranga City Council's website: www.tauranga.govt.nz.

**Marty Grenfell
Chief Executive**

Terms of reference – Council

Membership

Chairperson	Commission Chair Anne Tolley
Members	Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston Commissioner Stephen Selwood Commissioner Bill Wasley
Quorum	<u>Half</u> of the members physically present, where the number of members (including vacancies) is <u>even</u> ; and a <u>majority</u> of the members physically present, where the number of members (including vacancies) is <u>odd</u> .
Meeting frequency	As required

Role

- To ensure the effective and efficient governance of the City.
- To enable leadership of the City including advocacy and facilitation on behalf of the community.

Scope

- Oversee the work of all committees and subcommittees.
- Exercise all non-delegable and non-delegated functions and powers of the Council.
- The powers Council is legally prohibited from delegating include:
 - Power to make a rate.
 - Power to make a bylaw.
 - Power to borrow money, or purchase or dispose of assets, other than in accordance with the long-term plan.
 - Power to adopt a long-term plan, annual plan, or annual report
 - Power to appoint a chief executive.
 - Power to adopt policies required to be adopted and consulted on under the Local Government Act 2002 in association with the long-term plan or developed for the purpose of the local governance statement.
 - All final decisions required to be made by resolution of the territorial authority/Council pursuant to relevant legislation (for example: the approval of the City Plan or City Plan changes as per section 34A Resource Management Act 1991).
- Council has chosen not to delegate the following:
 - Power to compulsorily acquire land under the Public Works Act 1981.
- Make those decisions which are required by legislation to be made by resolution of the local authority.
- Authorise all expenditure not delegated to officers, Committees or other subordinate decision-making bodies of Council.
- Make appointments of members to the CCO Boards of Directors/Trustees and representatives of Council to external organisations.
- Consider any matters referred from any of the Standing or Special Committees, Joint Committees, Chief Executive or General Managers.

Procedural matters

- Delegation of Council powers to Council's committees and other subordinate decision-making bodies.
- Adoption of Standing Orders.
- Receipt of Joint Committee minutes.
- Approval of Special Orders.
- Employment of Chief Executive.
- Other Delegations of Council's powers, duties and responsibilities.

Regulatory matters

Administration, monitoring and enforcement of all regulatory matters that have not otherwise been delegated or that are referred to Council for determination (by a committee, subordinate decision-making body, Chief Executive or relevant General Manager).

Order of Business

1	Opening karakia.....	7
2	Apologies	7
3	Public forum.....	7
4	Acceptance of late items	7
5	Confidential business to be transferred into the open	7
6	Change to the order of business	7
7	Confirmation of minutes.....	8
7.1	Minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 April 2024	8
7.2	Minutes of the Council meeting held on 29 April 2024	24
8	Declaration of conflicts of interest.....	54
9	Deputations, presentations, petitions.....	54
	Nil	
10	Recommendations from other committees.....	54
	Nil	
11	Business.....	55
11.1	Civic Whare Guidelines	55
11.2	City Centre Development Incentive Fund 2023/2024	58
11.3	Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Project Update	63
11.4	Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw Controls	69
11.5	Transport Resolutions Report No.51	75
11.6	Draft GPS Alignment and LCLR project delivery	90
11.7	Connecting Mount Maunganui IBC Update report (VOS Committee Outcomes and Impact).....	93
11.8	Final Council-Controlled Organisations' Statements of Intent for 2024-2027	96
12	Discussion of late items	102
13	Public excluded session.....	103
13.1	Public Excluded Minutes of the Council meeting held on 29 April 2024	103
13.2	Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Procurement Update	103
13.3	Appointment of Hearings Panel for Variation 1 (Tauriko West) to Proposed Plan Change 33, Proposed Plan Change 34 (Belk Road Rural Residential) and Proposed Plan Change 35 (Tauriko Business Estate Stage 4)	103
13.4	Development Feasibility and Optioneering for Residual Papamoa East Interchange Land.....	104
13.5	Airport Precinct Close out Report	104
13.6	Exemption from Open Competition	104
13.7	Cameron Road Stage 2 - Procurement and Programme Progression	104
14	Closing karakia	105

- 1 OPENING KARAKIA**
- 2 APOLOGIES**
- 3 PUBLIC FORUM**
- 4 ACCEPTANCE OF LATE ITEMS**
- 5 CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS TO BE TRANSFERRED INTO THE OPEN**
- 6 CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

7 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

7.1 Minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 April 2024

File Number: A15919046

Author: Caroline Irvin, Governance Advisor

Authoriser: Anahera Dinsdale, Acting Team Leader: Governance Services

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 April 2024 be confirmed as a true and correct record, subject to the following correction/s:

(a)

ATTACHMENTS

1. Minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 April 2024



MINUTES

**Ordinary Council meeting
Monday, 22 April 2024**

Order of Business

1	Opening karakia.....	3
2	Apologies	3
3	Public forum.....	3
4	Acceptance of late items	3
5	Confidential business to be transferred into the open	4
6	Change to the order of business	4
7	Confirmation of minutes.....	4
7.1	Minutes of the Council meeting held on 4 March 2024	4
8	Declaration of conflicts of interest.....	4
9	Deputations, presentations, petitions.....	4
	Nil	
10	Recommendations from other committees.....	4
	Nil	
11	Business.....	4
11.1	Adopt Tauranga City Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034.....	4
11.2	Adopt Tauranga City Council Development Contributions Policy 2024/25	7
11.3	Rates Resolution 2024/2025.....	7
11.4	Dog Registration Fees 2024/2025	13
12	Discussion of late items	14
13	Public excluded session.....	14
	Nil	
14	Closing karakia	14

**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, 22 APRIL 2024 AT 9.30AM**

PRESENT: Commission Chair Anne Tolley, 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), Christine Jones (General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance), Alastair McNeill (General Manager: Corporate Services), Josh Logan (Team Leader: Corporate Planning), Sarah Holmes (Corporate Planner), Kathryn Sharplin (Manager: Finance), Tracey Hughes (Financial Insights & Reporting Manager), Ben Corbett (Team Leader: Growth Funding), Jim Taylor (Manager: Rating Policy and Revenue), Nigel McGlone (Manager: Environmental Regulation), Brent Lincoln (Team Leader: Animal Services), Anahera Dinsdale (Acting Team Leader: Governance Services), Caroline Irvine (Governance Advisor), Aimee Aranas (Governance Advisor)

EXTERNAL: Anton Labuschagne (Audit NZ), Leon Pieterse (Audit NZ),

1 OPENING KARAKIA

Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston opened the meeting with a karakia.

2 APOLOGIES

Nil

3 PUBLIC FORUM

Nil

4 ACCEPTANCE OF LATE ITEMS

That the Council:

Accepts the following late tabled documents for consideration at the meeting:

- Tabled Document for Item 11.1 – Letter from Audit NZ
- Tabled Document for Item 11.1 – Changes from OAG

The above items were not included in the original agenda because they were not available at the time the agenda was issued, and discussion cannot be delayed until the next scheduled meeting of the Committee because decisions are required in regard to these items.

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 4 March 2024****RESOLUTION CO8/24/1**

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 4 March 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

Nil

11 BUSINESS**11.1 Adopt Tauranga City Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034****Staff**

Paul Davidson, Chief Financial Officer

Josh Logan, Team Leader: Corporate Planning

Sarah Holmes, Corporate Planner

Kathryn Sharplin, Manager: Finance

Tracey Hughes, Financial Insights & Reporting Manager

Key points

- A brief overview of the recommendations to the report was provided.
- As part of the deliberations to the Long Term Plan (LTP), it was approved to move to a 2.7% Industrial rating differential. In future years, Council would move to a split of rating which was 20% Industrial, 15% Commercial and 65% Residential.
- Due to the general revaluation which recently took place, the Council's rating for industrial revaluation moved up which meant at 2.6 times differential, Council achieved the long term aim of 20%.
- The current Long Term Plan included the refurbishment of Baycourt. The current renewal programme needed to align with future annual plans to ensure the programme was consistent with the Long-Term Plan budget.

- Staff suggested an additional resolution (e) to recognise that the LTP included the Infrastructure Funding and Financial (IFF) levy for Te Manawataki o Te Papa. This was currently in the approval process before going to finance over the coming months.
- The Rating tables included the IFF Levy for the Transport System Plan.
- In the past years, delegation was given to the Chief Executive to bring forward capital projects as Council was moving towards debt limits with Three Waters being included in the Long Term Plan.
- Staff confirmed that Three Waters was included in the LTP which was \$2.1B of Capex.
- It was noted that the debt to revenue was high which lead to the average being very high.

Discussion points raised

- Commission Chair advised that paragraph 12 of the User Fees and Charges report needed to mention that the costs were attributed to those who benefit from the service. Many of those services had a wider community benefit and the costs were allocated between both the individual and the wider community benefit.

RESOLUTION CO8/24/2

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Adopt Tauranga City Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034".
- (b) Agrees to amend the industrial rating differential to 2.6 times to remain within the total rates funding share of 20%.
- (c) Adopts the Schedule of User Fees and Charges for 2024/25 (**Attachment 1**) with the 2024-2034 Long-term Plan.
- (d) Agrees Baycourt renewals (\$6.3m) will be aligned in future annual plans to ensure that the renewals budgets are optimised in light of the planned works for the theatre.
- (e) Notes that the IFF Levy for TMOTP is included within the LTP and shown in the financial strategy. This is based on the IFF levy being approved and finalised consistent with what was consulted previously.
- (f) Approves the 2024-2034 Long-term Plan as set out in **Attachment 2**.

CARRIED

11.1 Continued - Adopt Tauranga City Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034

External Anton Labuschagne, Audit NZ
Leon Pieterse, Audit NZ

Key points

- Audit NZ noted they completed the audit efficiently.
- The audit report provided was an unqualified audit opinion, that meant the LTP provided a reasonable basis for decision making by Council in future as well as accountability of Council to the community.
- The information and assumptions underlying the forecast information were reasonable. Audit NZ also referred to the complete list of disclosures as required by the Local Government (Financial Reporting and Prudence) Regulations 2014.
- The Audit NZ report included three matters of interest which were not qualifications but for interest purposes. These were referred to as the minimal debt head room in future, the uncertainty over the capital deliverability and the external funding for the proposed Stadium and the Civic Precinct.

- It was noted that during October/November 2023 when the Long Term Plan was adopted, there was a lot of uncertainty around three waters and staff worked to cover off any risks. The final Long-Term Plan went much more smoothly because of this.

In response to questions

- The prudence calculation was a calculation required by regulations that included revenue additional to what the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) considered normal revenue. Development Contributions were not covered in the LGFA calculation at this point.
- The number quoted in the prudence calculations was shown against the debt limits.
- Council worked within recognised levels of prudence.

Discussion points raised

- It was noted that there was still uncertainty around Three Waters.
- With three waters included in the LTP, Council tracked close to debt limits.
- Appreciation to staff who worked on Long-Term Plan.
- The three matters identified by Audit NZ were also the concerns of Commissioners.
- Council had ramped up its capital delivery and the capital programme had not been completed yet, based on reasonable risk to complete over the next 10 years.
- The capital program was necessary to keep the city moving forward.
- The minimal debt head room was common amongst many other Councils, particularly the Metro councils throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand.
- Council was close to LGFA funding line throughout 2024/34 LTP and it was noted this was getting better over time.
- The debt to revenue prudence calculation included in the Audit NZ report was a considerably lower percentage of revenue.
- Appreciation and acknowledgement shown to Audit NZ for their extensive work and the relationship with Tauranga City Council.

In closing

- Commission Chair spoke to the seriousness of intervention the Government of the day took to appoint Commissioners indicated that Tauranga was in a dire state and overwhelmed with the massive growth that had occurred over a short time.
- The 2024/34 LTP continued the direction that the 2021/31 LTP Amendment had set.
- The LTP created a platform for the incoming Council which set a clear plan and solid governance as a result of these decisions made.
- The Commissioners provided an overview of the many projects and tough decisions made to get to this point which was done with the help of the business community, the residential community and rate payers.
- Commission Chair Tolley thanked her fellow colleagues and reflected on their journey as Commissioners.
- Commissioners paid tribute to Chief Executive Marty Grenfell for his leadership.

RESOLUTION CO8/24/3

Moved: Commission Chair Anne Tolley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (g) Receives the audit report relating to the 2024-2034 Long-term Plan, pursuant to section 94(1) of the Local Government Act 2002.
- (h) Adopts the Audited 2024-2034 Long-term Plan pursuant to section 93 of the Local Government Act 2002.
- (i) Approves borrowing of \$385m for the 2024/25 financial year in line with the approved LTP debt levels.
- (j) Delegates to the Chief Executive authority to bring forward capital project budgets within the LTP subject to moving out equivalent project value so that total borrowing remains within the limits set in the LTP, as confirmed by the CFO/Manager Finance.
- (k) Authorises the Chief Executive to make any necessary minor drafting or presentation amendments to the 2024-2034 Long-term Plan before going to print.

CARRIED

11.2 Adopt Tauranga City Council Development Contributions Policy 2024/25

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

Key points

- This was the final Development Contributions (DC's) Policy for adoption.
- The policy overall saw a mix of rises and falls and was currently sitting around 5% at almost all catchments.
- The citywide contribution was the payment made when receiving building consent. This was reactive to the community infrastructure planning.
- Some projects were removed from DC's due to less growth funding in those areas.
- It was noted that the city was growing hugely with big discussions to be had in future, in particular around waters funding and DC's would play a valuable part in the funding aspect.
- In terms of other projects, there were new catchments like Tauriko West and extension to the Tauriko Business Estate.
- Staff also noted some refinement to existing catchments like the Te Papa Infill Catchment.

RESOLUTION CO8/24/4

Moved: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

Seconded: Commissioner Bill Wasley

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Adopt Tauranga City Council Development Contributions Policy 2024/25".
- (b) Adopts the Development Contributions Policy 2024/25.
- (c) Notes the reduction in citywide development contributions for the community infrastructure activity to reflect Tauranga City Council's Long-Term Plan 2024-34, being: reinstatement of funding for the city centre library, extending the period over which the BayPark Arena Extension is funded and reducing the Memorial Park Aquatics Centre cost estimate.
- (d) Delegates to the General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance the authority to rectify any minor errors or omissions that are identified in the 2024/25 Development Contributions Policy prior to final publication.

CARRIED

11.3 Rates Resolution 2024/2025

Staff Paul Davidson, Chief Financial Officer
Jim Taylor, Manager: Rating Policy and Revenue
Kathryn Sharplin, Manager: Finance

Key points

- The Rates for the LTP 2024/34 did not include the IFF levy for other transport and system plans.

Discussion points raised

- The rates were long, complicated and hard to understand but staff had done a great job.
- \$3.54 per cubic metre of water compared to buying bottled water from store was a pretty good price for water.
- It was noted that it was under estimated how affordable rates in Tauranga were compared to other councils, including benefit to the community.

RESOLUTION CO8/24/5

Moved: Commissioner Bill Wasley

Seconded: Commissioner Stephen Selwood

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Rates Resolution 2024/2025".
- (b) Sets the following rates under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Funding Impact Statement in the Long Term Plan for the 2024/2025 rating year, on rating units in the city for the financial year commencing on 1 July 2024 and ending on 30 June 2025.

The rates and charges specified are inclusive of Goods and Services Tax at the prevailing rate.

I. General Rate

A general rate set under section 13(2) (b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 at:

- A rate of \$ 0.00237022 in the dollar of capital value on all residential rateable rating units in the city.
- A rate of \$ 0.00497745 in the dollar of capital value on all commercial rateable rating units in the city.
- A rate of \$ 0.00616256 in the dollar of capital value on all industrial rateable rating units in the city.

("residential", "commercial" and "industrial" are as defined in the Funding Impact Statement).

II. Uniform Annual General Charge

A uniform annual general charge set under section 15(1)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 at:

- A rate of \$298.00 per separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit.

III. Economic Development Rate

A targeted rate for economic development in the city, set under section 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 at:

- A rate of \$ 0.00035791 in the dollar of capital value on every commercial and industrial rateable rating unit (as defined in the Funding Impact Statement).

IV. Stormwater Rate

A targeted rate for stormwater infrastructure investment, set under section 16(3)(a) and 16(4) (b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 at:

- A rate of \$ 0.00000665 in the dollar of capital value on all residential rateable rating units in the city.
- A rate of \$ 0.00001064 in the dollar of capital value on all commercial or industrial rateable rating units in the city.

V. Resilience Rate

A targeted rate for resilience infrastructure investment in Water, Wastewater, Stormwater, Transportation and Emergency Management, set under section 16(3)(a) and 16(4) (b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 at:

- A rate of \$ 0.00001472 in the dollar of capital value on all residential rateable rating units in the city.
- A rate of \$ 0.00002356 in the dollar of capital value on all commercial or industrial rateable rating units in the city.

VI. Urban Growth Rates

Targeted rates for debt retirement for urban growth projects, set under section 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, at:

Three uniform targeted rates set on every rating unit at:

- A rate of \$107.39 on each rateable rating unit located within an area of “Full benefit” as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.
- A rate of \$71.59 on each rateable rating unit located within an area of “Wide benefit” as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.
- A rate of \$35.80 on each rateable rating unit located within the city outside of the areas of “Full benefit” and “Wide benefit” as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.

VII. Waste Collection Rate

Uniform targeted rates for the kerbside waste collection services, set under section 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, on all rating units in the city as a fixed amount per separately used or inhabited part (SUIP) of a rating unit that is provided with the residential waste collection service as follows:

- A rate of \$210 per low waste service capacity provided per residential SUIP.
- A rate of \$245 per standard waste service capacity provided per residential SUIP.
- A rate of \$350 per high waste service capacity provided per residential SUIP.

VIII. Garden Waste Rate (optional)

Uniform targeted rates for garden waste collection services, set under section 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, on all rating units in the city used for residential purposes and that will be provided with the garden waste collection service, at:

- A rate of \$110 for each garden waste bin (two weekly collection).
- A rate of \$80 for each garden waste bin (four weekly collection).

IX. Wastewater Rate

A differential targeted rate for wastewater, set under sections 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 at:

- A rate of \$719.12 for each water closet or urinal in a connected rating unit in the city.
- A rate of \$359.56 per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit for any serviceable rating units in the city.

("separately used or inhabited part of a", "connected" and "serviceable" rating units, are defined in the Funding Impact Statement).

A rating unit used primarily as a residence for 1 household will not be treated as having more than 1 water closet or urinal.

X. Water Supply Rates

Volumetric rate

A targeted rate for metered water supply set under section 19(2)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 at

- A rate of \$3.54 per cubic metre of water supplied.

Base rate

A differential targeted rate per connection on every rating unit in the city, which is provided with a metered water supply service, set under sections 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(b) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, calculated on the basis of the nature of the connection size as follows:

Meter Size	Amount
20mm	\$38.48
25mm	\$72.80
32mm	\$72.80
40mm	\$300.56
50mm	\$594.88
80mm	\$1,188.72
100mm	\$1,463.28
150mm	\$1,463.28
200mm	\$1,463.28
250mm	\$1,463.28

XI. Water Supply Rate (unmetered)

A uniform targeted rate on every rating unit in the city which is provided with and connected to an unmetered water supply service, set under sections 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, at:

- A rate of \$920.40 for each separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.

XII. Pool inspection Rate

A uniform targeted rate set under sections 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 at

- A rate of \$107.00 for each rating unit on councils register of pool fence and barrier inspections.

XIII. Mainstreet Rates

Targeted rates for Mainstreet organisations, set under section 16(3)(b) and

16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, at:

- A rate of \$0.00038877 in the dollar of capital value for every commercial and industrial rating unit in the Tauranga Mainstreet rating area as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.
- A rate of \$0.00060547 in the dollar of capital value for every commercial and industrial rating unit in the Mt Maunganui Mainstreet rating area as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.
- A rate of \$0.00152185 in the dollar of capital value for every commercial and industrial rating unit in the Greerton Mainstreet rating area as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.
- A rate of \$0.00034148 in the dollar of capital value for every commercial and industrial rating unit in the Papamoa Mainstreet area as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.

XI. Special Services Rates

'The Lakes' Targeted Rate

A uniform targeted rate for additional levels of service in relation to maintenance and renewal of street gardens, street trees, footpaths, and the removal of litter from ponds provided to 'The Lakes' subdivision, located at Pyes Pa, set under section 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, at:

- A rate of \$105.26 per rating unit located within 'The Lakes' subdivision as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.

'The Coast Papamoa' Targeted Rate

A uniform targeted rate for additional levels of service in relation to maintenance and renewal of street trees and footpaths provided to 'The Coast Papamoa' subdivision, located at Papamoa, set under section 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, at:

- A rate of \$36.00 per rating unit located within 'The Coast Papamoa' subdivision as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.

'The Excelsa' Targeted Rate

A uniform targeted rate for additional levels of service in relation to maintenance and renewal of street gardens, street trees and up lights under trees provided to 'The Excelsa' subdivision, located at Papamoa, set under section 16(3)(b) and 16(4)(a) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, at:

- A rate of \$53.07 per rating unit located within 'The Excelsa' subdivision as defined in the Funding Impact Statement.

- (c) That all rates (except the water supply volumetric rate set under section 19 and the water supply base rate for metered connections under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002) be payable in two equal instalments due on:

- 31 August 2024 and
- 28 February 2025

- (d) That all metered water rates will, except as to high users, be invoiced on a quarterly basis dependant on when the water meters are read, in accordance with the table below headed "Due dates and penalty dates for rates for metered water supply". The

due dates will also be specified on the invoice. Rating units, which are considered high users of water (namely having an average consumption more than 5m³ per day) will be invoiced monthly, and these rates will be due on the first Thursday after 23 days following the date of the invoice.

- (e) That the Council authorises the addition of penalties to rates that are not paid by the due date, as follows, in accordance with sections 57 and 58 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, and delegates authority to the Manager Finance to apply penalties in accordance with this regime:

- (i) a charge of 10% on so much of any rates instalment after 1 July 2024 which is unpaid after the relevant due date (except for the volumetric rate under section 19 and the water supply base rate for metered connections under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002) will be applied on:

Instalment due date	Penalty Date
31 August 2024	11 September 2024
28 February 2025	11 March 2025

- (ii) a charge of 10% on so much of any of the volumetric rate under section 19 and the water supply base rate for metered connections under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 invoiced after 1 July 2024 and which is unpaid after the due date will be applied on whichever is the next consecutive date following the due date of the invoice to which the penalty applies, being:

Water Penalty Date
26 October 2024
1 February 2025
2 May 2025
25 July 2025

Due dates and penalty dates for rates for metered water supply and connection

Week	Area	Q1 Due date	Q2 Due date	Q3 Due date	Q4 Due date
1	Mt Maunganui North/ Ind, Omanu, Matapihi,	10-Aug-24	02-Nov-24	15-Feb-25	09-May-25
2	Arataki, Te Maunga, Papamoa West	17-Aug-24	09-Nov-24	22-Feb-25	16-May-25
3	Papamoa West / East	24-Aug-24	16-Nov-24	28-Feb-25	23-May-25
4	Papamoa East / South,	31-Aug-24	24-Nov-24	07-Mar-25	30-May-25
5	Papamoa East, Kairua, Welcome Bay, Hairini	07-Sep-24	30-Nov-24	14-Mar-25	06-Jun-25
6	Hairini / Ohauti, Poike, Pyes Pa, Maungatapu.	14-Sep-24	07-Dec-24	21-Mar-25	13-Jun-25
7	Greerton, Yatton Park, Gate Pa, Avenues	21-Sep-24	14-Dec-24	28-Mar-25	20-Jun-25

8	Tauranga Central/South, TeReti/Judea, SulphurPt	28-Sep-24	11-Jan-25	04-Apr-25	27-Jun-25
9	Brookfield, Bellevue, Otumoetai	05-Oct-24	11-Jan-25	11-Apr-25	04-Jul-25
10	Otumoetai, Matua	12-Oct-24	18-Jan-25	18-Apr-25	11-Jul-25
11	The Lakes, Bethlehem	19-Oct-24	25-Jan-25	25-Apr-25	18-Jul-25
All (including high users)	Penalty Added Date	26-Oct-24	1-Feb-25	2-May-25	25-Jul-25

- (f) Where a ratepayer makes any payment that is less than the amount now payable, the Council, will apply the payment firstly to any rates outstanding from previous rating years and then proportionately across all current year rates due.

CARRIED

11.4 Dog Registration Fees 2024/2025

Staff Nigel McGlone, Manager: Environmental Regulation
Brent Lincoln, Team Leader: Animal Services

Key points

- The Dog registration fees must be set separately to the DC's and LTP.
- The proposed increase was from \$100 to \$125.00 per dog per year. With a penalty fee of \$187.50 for late payment.
- The registration fee was from 1 July 2024 with a month's grace period in place. Enforcement would be taken from 31 July.
- This was a significant increase for some families.

In response to questions

- The rate funding allocated to the Animal Control activity in TCC was 10%. It was noted that across the country, other Councils were rate funding this activity anywhere from around 0-60%. This impacted what fee Council charged for registrations.
- Staff were of the understanding that Western Bay of Plenty District Council would be increasing their rates contribution during the LTP this year.

Discussion points raised

- Concern was raised by Commissioners regarding the fee increase. 25% increase was high particularly for many families who own dogs. This could cause extra stress on families already in difficult times.
- There was wider community benefit by having dogs registered.
- It was noted that the comparison table in the report comparing TCC to other Council fees was a great reference.
- Tauranga City Council was comparable to Hamilton City Council and it was agreed that \$125 was a comfortable space to be in.

RESOLUTION CO8/24/6

Moved: Commissioner Stephen Selwood
 Seconded: Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the Dog Registration Fees 2024/25 report.
- (b) Increase the current dog registration standard fee to \$125.00 per dog.
- (c) Set the penalty for dogs that are not registered by 31 July at 50% of the standard fee.

CARRIED

12 DISCUSSION OF LATE ITEMS

The late items were discussed in the business section of the meeting.

13 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION

Nil

14 CLOSING KARAKIA

Commissioner Shadrach Rolleston closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 10:32am.

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

7.2 Minutes of the Council meeting held on 29 April 2024

File Number: A15918629

Author: Caroline Irvin, Governance Advisor

Authoriser: Anahera Dinsdale, Acting Team Leader: Governance Services

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 29 April 2024 be confirmed as a true and correct record, subject to the following correction/s:

(a)

ATTACHMENTS

1. Minutes of the Council meeting held on 29 April 2024



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	Pōterīwhi - 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 - Pōteriwhi - Approval for Fast-track Approvals Bill application, Development and Divestment	25
14.6	Harington Street carpark proceedings	25
15	Closing karakia	26

UNCONFIRMED

**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 Gead (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 it if 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 Pōterīwhi (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 Pōteriwhi - 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 Pōteriwhi 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

UNCONFIRMED

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	<p>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, 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>	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
14.2 - CCO Board Appointments for the Tauranga Art Gallery Trust - April 2024	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	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
14.3 - Harington Street carpark - Variation of Encumbrance	s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	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
14.4 - Memorial Park Aquatic Centre Procurement Update	<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,</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

	commercial activities 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)	
Confidential Attachment 1 - 12.9 - Pōteriwhi - Approval for Fast-track Approvals Bill application, Development and Divestment	s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	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
Harington Street carpark proceedings	S7(2)(g) – The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege.	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

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

8 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

9 DEPUTATIONS, PRESENTATIONS, PETITIONS

Nil

10 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

Nil

11 BUSINESS

11.1 Civic Whare Guidelines

File Number: A15888554

Author: Carlo Ellis, **Manager: Strategic Māori Engagement**

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

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To seek endorsement for the proposed utilisation guidelines for the Civic Whare.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Civic Whare Guidelines".
- (b) Endorses the proposed guidelines (**attachment 1**) to be utilised to guide planning for and use of the Civic Whare once completed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Civic Whare Guidelines set out parameters to ensure the Civic Whare is able to be utilised to carry out the Tauranga City Council civic functions and also does not encroach on the special place marae have in carrying out cultural activities for tangata whenua.

BACKGROUND

3. The Civic Whare is a facility within the Te Manawataki o Te Papa Civic Precinct. It celebrates the culture and heritage of Tauranga Moana and is a multipurpose facility that will primarily function as a formal community meeting house (e.g., Council meetings) and a venue for significant decision-making.
4. The Civic Whare has been designed to create an open and accessible facility for the civic functions of Tauranga City.
5. The facility is designed to be a welcoming place for all who contribute to the progressive future of Tauranga City. The benefits are that it seeks to encompass the essence and character of the site itself which has a long-standing history for Tangata Whenua and in the establishment of Tauranga City. As such it draws its design from both the environment and local marae and wharehau, embracing the functions and structure of local government in service of the entire community.
6. The facility is being co-designed with Tangata Whenua who have purposefully intended for it not to replace the full function and formalities of any of our revered marae that have stood in Tauranga Moana for hundreds of years, but instead to create a new space reflective of its heritage, for Council and Tangata Whenua to host both civic functions and appropriate cultural protocols together as City leaders.

CIVIC WHARE GUIDELINES

7. The guidelines set out the intended functions for the Civic Whare, tikanga and operating protocols – refer attachment 1.

STRATEGIC / STATUTORY CONTEXT

8. The endorsement of these guidelines will support clear understanding of functions thereby uplifting the strategic partnership between Council and tangata whenua by avoiding misunderstandings and/or conflicts.

OPTIONS ANALYSIS

9. The options analysis is:
 - (a) Endorse the guidelines as proposed;
 - (b) Provide edits to the guidelines and endorse an edited version;
 - (c) Leave the Civic Whare without guidelines and rely on staff to create processes.

CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT

10. Informal engagement has occurred with various kaumatua, and this input together with guidance through an initial workshop discussion with Peri Kohu have been incorporated into the guidelines.
11. These guidelines should be discussed with Te Rangapū Mana Whenua o Tauranga Moana to seek feedback and endorsement across Tauranga Moana with special regard to the feedback of the hapū that express mana whenua to this particular site.

SIGNIFICANCE

12. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
13. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
 - (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
 - (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the matter
 - (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.
14. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the matter is of low significance.

ENGAGEMENT

15. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the matter is of low significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

NEXT STEPS

16. Present the endorsed guidelines to Te Rangapū Mana Whenua o Tauranga Moana for feedback and endorsement.

ATTACHMENTS

1. **Civic Whare Guidelines - A15914194**  

CIVIC WHARE GUIDELINES

1. The whare tikanga will be guided by the TCC Kaumātua Forum and the Tangata Whenua / TCC Joint Standing Committee to monitor the appropriate utilisation of the facility and ensure its use is reflecting the partnership approach to civic matters in Tauranga.
2. The facility operations will be managed by Tauranga City Council, including all bookings, maintenance, operational functions, management and administration.
3. Priority for bookings will be given to civic functions as required by the Local Government Act and related legislation. This includes Council meetings, Council Committee meetings, other business of Tauranga City Council and its partners. It may also be considered a suitable space for welcoming national and international dignitaries, or hosting civic ceremonies such as Citizenship Ceremonies.
4. In recognition of the partnership approach fundamental to Te Manawataki o Te Papa and the establishment of the Civic Whare, priority will then be given to tangata whenua events appropriate to the venue and facility. Examples may include hui and/or wānanga of national or regional significance such as the Iwi Chairs Forum currently being hosted at Tauranga Racecourse.
5. Outside of these core civic functions, processes will be established to encourage efficient utilisation of the facilities by the community of Tauranga.
6. Where a function or event is run by Council, then Council processes shall be applied in accordance with relevant legislation, standing orders and associated rules and guidelines. For example, a female Mayor is supported to perform all of the functions expected of a mayor in carrying out Council meetings.
7. Where a function or event is tangata whenua-led, then tikanga shall be followed, as guided by those providing leadership of the event. For example, any pōhiri process would follow proper tikanga, as guided by the kaumātua and kaupapa Māori advisors present.
8. Where a mix of leadership is required, Council and mana whenua will simply work together to agree on suitable processes.
9. It is not intended that the Civic Whare will take-on the full function of a traditional wharenui at a marae. Therefore there are no cultural restrictions placed upon the site - i.e., footwear can be worn inside, the consumption of food on site is permitted. Cultural observances such as the separation of food in formal cultural events will be guided by kaumātua and kaupapa Māori advisors.
10. There is no intention to hold tangihanga, any other significant cultural function, or overnight stays that would usually be held at a marae.

11.2 City Centre Development Incentive Fund 2023/2024

File Number: A15835080

Author: Lisa Gilmour, City Partnership Specialist

Authoriser: Gareth Wallis, General Manager: City Development & Partnerships

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To report to Council on the progress made and activities funded by the City Centre Development and Incentive Fund between 1 October 2023 and 30 April 2024.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "City Centre Development Incentive Fund 2023/2024".
- (b) Delegates to the Chief Executive, the authority to negotiate the details of \$200,000 of financial support from the City Centre Development Incentive Fund, over three years, to ensure the delivery of a key city centre student accommodation development.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Council approved the re-purposing of the City Centre Development Incentive Fund [the Fund] on 3 April 2023 to enable a broader range of initiatives that will support the ongoing growth and development of the city centre.
3. This report provides a seven-month update on progress against the objectives of the Fund, as agreed in the 3 April 2023 report, and follows the previous update provided in October 2023.
4. To date this financial year, \$439,419 of the Fund has been used to enable a wide range of initiatives that will support the growth and development of the city centre in the short-, medium-, and longer-term.
5. A balance of \$375,000 remains in the Fund to support further initiatives through to 30 June 2024. A further sum of \$500,000 per year has been budgeted within the Long-term Plan from 1 July 2024.

BACKGROUND

6. The Fund was originally approved by Council to facilitate an increase in the supply of residential accommodation in the city centre, by supporting feasibility assessments of possible residential accommodation developments.
7. The Fund was allocated \$500,000 per annum (for three years) as part of the 2021-2031 Long-term Plan. A surplus of \$314,500 was carried forward as at 30 June 2023, increasing the budget in the current financial year to a total of \$814,500.
8. To recap, on 3 April 2023, recognising that the decline in prosperity of the city centre is unlikely to be rectified by focusing on one particular solution, the scope of the Fund was broadened to enable a wider range of initiatives that will support the ongoing growth, development, and prosperity of the city centre. This wider range of initiatives was approved by Council specifically to:
 - (a) attract and incentivise the development of residential and in particular, student accommodation;

- (b) support short- to medium-term tactical parking interventions that will increase the availability of car parking;
 - (c) generate initiatives that will support city centre businesses that are severely impacted by the current period of construction disruption; and
 - (d) support increased activation and vibrancy.
9. Staff subsequently worked on a transparent and equitable process for the implementation and distribution of the Fund, and continue to develop tools to allow us to report, where possible, on the Return on Investment for this Fund.

Stakeholder engagement and events

10. Proactive stakeholder engagement has continued over the last seven months with a further twenty speaking engagements and multiple individual one-to-one visits with business and property owners, where an update on city centre developments was presented and feedback received.
11. City centre walking tours have been piloted and invitations extended to business groups and their networks. These have been very well received.
12. Staff continue to gather community feedback to understand any concerns, listen to any ideas, and measure community support for a wide variety of issues and opportunities.

Projects undertaken in last Seven months

13. The following initiatives have been undertaken, in collaboration with our city partners, over the last seven months:

\$79,430	A new City Safety and Engagement Advisor role has been established to have an on-the-ground presence in the city centre, to help build relationships, and to support city centre individuals, businesses and other key partners with issues and/or opportunities that have been identified.
\$31,005	Delivery of a secure public bike parking facility in Grey Street as a response to demand from city centre businesses and cycling groups, and in alignment with modal shift initiatives. This is a collaboration between TCC's City Development and Partnerships and Transportation teams, and day- to-day operations are managed by a private operator.
\$50,510	Lease to occupy a vacant shopfront in a highly visible location in Red Square to showcase developments in the city centre and provide a space that the public, businesses, and interested parties can come to if they need information on city centre development matters. Also, a hub/meeting point for city centre walking tours to build the excitement for the city centre transformation and a space for i-Site staff to join the City Development and Partnerships team in a shared services delivery model.
\$19,500	Funding for Downtown Tauranga in support of a marketing initiative called Neatplaces, which showcases some hidden gems in the city centre to a nationwide audience.
\$10,125	Support for city centre parking to enable additional programming for the Pay My Park App. This will allow the creation of coupon codes for prepaid parking to allow businesses to support staff and customer attraction.
\$15,650	Contribution to the National Jazz Festival to support re-visit and upgrade a previous business model utilising city centre venues in place of stages.
\$6,000	Support for the Flavours of Plenty Festival to activate key city centre venues and spaces creating 'festival routes' through the city centre. This helps send the message that, even though the city centre is going through a period of disruption and transformation, it is still open for business.

\$14,695	Signage to assist in directing foot traffic to construction affected businesses.
\$21,000	Support for stakeholder lead activations such as Downtown Tauranga scavenger hunt in the school holidays and Christmas decorations.
\$12,500	Support for the Daybreak Festival of Innovation to activate a number of city centre venues and hospitality businesses. A collaboration between Downtown Tauranga and Priority One resulted in the development of a voucher system to outsource lunches and offer attendees dining options at a large number of city centre cafes and restaurants.
\$21,139	Project Management work to identify vacant spaces for possible activation.
\$11,122	Development of a vacant window strategy utilising different artistic mediums to create a sense of wonder and excitement. Ideally these windows will encourage people to come into the city centre and create a point of interest.
\$9,675	Security for city centre summer lights activation.
\$137,068	A primarily summer programme of activations and events, such as Little Big Markets, Night Owl Cinema and Pilates/yoga on the waterfront, to activate and vitalise the city centre.
\$439,419	TOTAL SPEND 2023/24 (to date)

14. This list of initiatives has been developed in response to feedback from city centre businesses and stakeholders, in order to support them through the period of disruption and to increase foot traffic. Some direct feedback has been received:

"It's been a really hard year for local businesses and this activation will support increased vibrancy and ambience, more foot traffic and in turn, support an economic boost to the city centre as we lead up to Christmas," says Downtown Tauranga's new manager Genevieve Whitson.

Downtown Tauranga Christmas Decorations and Grotto (taken from Sunlive Article).

"Julie Hammon, owner of Hammon Diamond Jeweller said the response to her and other retailers' safety and crime concerns had been "amazing". "Paul in particular has been so supportive and encouraging to us retailers who often felt quite vulnerable, especially, dealing with some of our downtown city dwellers."

Response to City Safety and Engagement Advisor (taken from BoP Times Article).

Projects currently underway and continuing into FY 2024/25

15. Feasibility studies for city centre accommodation developments. Note – an option for funding a feasibility study for some city centre student accommodation requires consideration and a resolution as per point 23 below.
16. A retail strategy developed in collaboration with partners including Priority One and Downtown Tauranga.
17. Support for temporary car parking initiatives, including a potential bus layover location.
18. More vacant shopfront work to activate vacant spaces.
19. Art and lighting initiatives to increase vibrancy in the city centre.
20. Capability building workshops and business support – a collaboration between Tauranga Business Chamber and Downtown Tauranga. Recent comments from a Downtown Tauranga newsletter include:

"Great facilitator, great atmosphere and no pressure learning environment"

"Effort put in by both coordinator and presenter to make the session personal to where I'm at with my business."

21. Note: support for hospitality businesses in the city centre through Licence to Occupy relief will continue into 2024/25 but will be funded elsewhere and not from the Fund.

STRATEGIC / STATUTORY CONTEXT

22. The Fund enables increased alignment with Te Rapunga Ora ki Te Papa – City Centre Action and Investment Plan. This is seen through an improved ability to streamline projects that could quickly contribute to the strategy's vision of creating a great place to live, work, learn and play.

OPTIONS ANALYSIS

23. Tauranga has a shortage of student accommodation, which is impacting the growth of the University of Waikato campus.
24. The delivery of student accommodation at scale within the city centre aligns with council's goal of encouraging residential development in this area, and the overall revitalisation of the city centre. Supporting the delivery of student accommodation in the city centre also clearly aligns with the re-defined purpose of the Fund.
25. This issue was discussed during Long-term Plan deliberations (in public excluded) and it was agreed that Council would commit to supporting a confidential city centre student accommodation development to a maximum of \$200,000 over three years.
26. This development is planned to deliver 120 beds in a prime city centre location, similar in nature to the existing Selwyn Street student accommodation, but with larger rooms.
27. Council's commitment to supporting this project at a yet-to-be-determined and appropriate time, ensures financial security and enables it to confidently move forward to the next stage of development.
28. It is recommended that authority is delegated to the Chief Executive to negotiate the finer details of council's commitment (via the Fund) to this important city centre project.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

29. The financial considerations are outlined in paragraph 13 of the report.
30. \$439,419 of the Fund was disbursed in the reporting period.
31. A balance of ~\$375,000 remains in the Fund to support further initiatives through to 30 June 2024.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / RISKS

32. There are no legal implications/risks with this matter.

CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT

33. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the matter is of low significance, officers are of the opinion that no further consultation/engagement is required.

SIGNIFICANCE

34. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
35. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
- (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region;

- (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the matter; and
- (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.

36. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the matter is of low significance.

NEXT STEPS

- 37. The City Partnerships team will continue to collaborate with city centre property and business owners to understand and support their concerns, and consider how the Fund can be best utilised to support the ongoing needs of the city centre.
- 38. The team continues to work closely with city partners Priority One, Tauranga Business Chamber, and Mainstreet Tauranga, to align with this work and ensure that there are positive outcomes for our community that will improve vibrancy and increase foot traffic in the city centre.
- 39. Further updates will be provided to Council every six months.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

11.3 Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Project Update

File Number: A15740166

Author: Mike Naude, Director of Civic Developments
Graeme Frith, Team Leader: Legal & Business Support

Authoriser: Marty Grenfell, Chief Executive

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To provide a progress update of the Memorial Park Aquatic Facility project including updated business case, enhanced concept design and provide detail on the design stages to commence construction.
2. To seek Council approval to proceed to construction of the Memorial Park Aquatic Facility, subject to approval of each design stage by the Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited Board.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Project Update";
- (b) Receives the Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Design Update & Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Business Case 7 May 2024 attached to this report;
- (c) Notes the enhanced design contained in the Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Design Update; and
- (d) Endorses the Memorial Park Facility project to:
 - (i) progress the three design stages (Preliminary/Developed/Detailed) and then construction, providing that the project is delivered within the approved budget and;
 - (ii) to complete the ECI/PCSA then novated Design and Build contract, subject to the project be delivered within the approved budget at each design stage gate.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. This report follows a suite of reports presented to Council on 11 December 2023 for the development of Memorial Park and future provision of aquatic and indoor sport. This includes a proposed new aquatic centre on Memorial Park to replace the existing Memorial Pool and provide enhanced aquatic provision within the central city.
4. The following resolutions were approved as part of the Council meeting on 11 December 2023.
 - (a) Approves aquatic centre Option 2 of the attached Memorial Park Recreation Hub & Spatial Plan document at a total cost of \$122.25M to include three hydro slides, to progress to preliminary design including a revised cost estimate.
 - (b) Seeks a further report on completion of the preliminary designs and cost estimates that will include an update on findings from preconstruction investigations.
 - (c) Delegates to the Chief Executive authority to enter contracts on behalf of Council for delivery of the following packages of work:
 - (i) Geothermal Bore Drilling.

- (ii) Deconstruction of Existing Facilities.
- (iii) Geotechnical Ground Improvements.
- (iv) Procurement of long lead items.

subject to recommendation from the Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited.

5. The project team have developed an enhanced concept design that meets the project budget and outcomes and is attached to this report. Two industry experts have been engaged to complete a peer review to inform and refine the design. This enhanced design is now able to proceed to preliminary design.
6. The project team have completed detailed geotechnical ground investigations including cone penetration testing and deep bore holes to develop a comprehensive understanding of the ground conditions on-site.
7. Deconstruction of the QEYC facility is scheduled for late 2024 following the opening of the new indoor courts facility on Cameron Road. This allows for continuation of indoor court provision to the community.
8. The Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Business Case has been finalised and is attached to this report.
9. Geothermal bore design and specifications have been completed and tendered.
10. Long lead proprietary items which also require design input from manufactures, have also been documented and are ready for tender.
11. This report seeks approval for the project to now progress through preliminary design, developed design, and detailed design to construction, with ongoing governance from Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited Board.

BACKGROUND

12. A full overview of the background to the Memorial Park Aquatic Facility project was provided in the Overview Report – Memorial Park Recreation Programme presented to Council on 11 December 2023.
13. The need for enhanced aquatic provision has been formally identified following an aquatic provision needs assessment undertaken in 2017. Following this, several needs analysis and feasibility studies have been undertaken by Council and Bay Venues Limited (BVL), clearly identifying a need to not only replace but enhance the aquatic provision currently provided by the ageing Memorial Pools. The provision of further leisure and indoor pool space has been identified as a key need for the city.
14. Budget was included in Council's Long-Term Plan (LTP) 2018-28 for Bay Venues to redevelop Memorial Pool at a budget of \$30M from 2022 to 2023. The Council's final 2021-31 LTP included projects to redevelop the Memorial Park pool and indoor sports facility (\$52M for the Aquatics Facility and \$48M for the indoor sports facility).
15. A project team was set up in June 2023 to deliver concept plans for the delivery of a new Memorial Park Recreation Hub and a Memorial Park Spatial Plan. Poor ground conditions at Memorial Park led to the decision to move the current indoor court provision to a new facility on Cameron Road. On 11 December 2023 Council approved a new Memorial Park Aquatic Facility (\$122.25M), an enhanced indoor court facility on Cameron Road (\$25M) and upgrades to Memorial Park (\$6M).
16. The Memorial Park Aquatic Facility is set to be completed in the 2029 financial year in the 2024-2034 LTP.

BUSINESS CASE OVERVIEW

17. A final Business Case has been developed and attached to this report (**Appendix 1**). The Business Case incorporates the decision from 11 December 2023 and the enhanced design that has been developed since then.

18. The Business Case expands earlier work which indicated that there was a need and demand for an aquatic facility in Tauranga.
19. There is a clear strategic case outlined, with substantial population growth and intensification of the Te Papa area. Tauranga's facility network is not optimised and has provision gaps particularly to meet leisure needs. The population is also changing demographically with new community demands that current facilities do not meet.
20. The options assessment completed in concept design provided the advantages and disadvantage of each option. The selected option 2 with the additional 2 hydro slides (3 hydro slides in total) optimises visitor numbers across various sectors of the community. It is this combination that is used to inform overall user numbers and the diverse revenue streams, with some being advantageous including the fitness centre, Learn to Swim provision and multiple hydro slides.
21. The facility does not contribute sufficient profit to cover debt and interest payments nor a satisfactory contribution towards depreciation to fund replacements over time. This is not uncommon for Aquatic facilities.
22. Financial summary below has estimated the cost to council impact as \$12.5m per annum over the first 30 years of operation. This is primarily made up of:
 - i. Funding required to offset operational losses (~\$550k per annum).
 - ii. Funding required to cover debt repayments (\$7.8m).
 - iii. Funding required for depreciation to fund renewals over time (\$4.1m).

\$NZ000's	Aquatic	Fitness	Facility	Total
Capital Expenditure Requirement	122,240	-	-	122,240
<u>Year 1</u>				
Revenue	2,694	731	806	4,231
Expenditure	(2,709)	(593)	(1,662)	(4,964)
EBITDA	(15)	138	(856)	(733)
<u>Year 10</u>				
Revenue	3,447	1,356	964	5,767
Expenditure	(3,240)	(944)	(1,988)	(6,171)
EBITDA	207	413	(1,023)	(404)
Cumulative Free Cash Flow	(262,742)	13,291	(72,427)	(321,878)
Net Present Value	(140,071)	3,014	(19,335)	(156,393)
Year 1 ROA	(0.012%)	N/A	N/A	(0.012%)
IRR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Payback	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<u>Cost to Ratepayers</u>				
Operational Subsidy (EBITDA)	(194)	(428)	1,158	536
Depreciation (to fund renewals)	3,917	219	-	4,137
Debt Repayments (30 Years)	4,013	-	-	4,013
Interest (5.5%)	3,771	-	-	3,771
Estimated Funding Required (Average)	11,508	(209)	1,158	12,457
Rates (TCC LTP 2025 - General Rates)	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
% of Current Rates	3.5%	(0.1%)	0.4%	3.8%

Source: Deloitte Analysis

ENHANCED DESIGN

23. The project team have developed an enhanced design to further advance the concept design presented to Council on 11 December 2023. This design has been thoroughly reviewed by industry experts and refined to ensure it is on budget and meets all project outcomes. We are

now ready to progress preliminary design based on the updated design document attached to this report. This report seeks approval from the Council of the enhanced design (**Appendix 2**).

24. A number of value engineering measures have been taken to ensure the project is on budget without compromising the overall outcome. These measures include a simplified building form, slightly reduced floor area (5,356m²), more efficient car park design, and refined fitout.
25. To optimise operations and filtration systems, the pool plant room has reduced in size and located on a single level adjacent to the pools.
26. Three hydro slides have been incorporated within a rotated tower.
27. Reconfigured the main entry, incorporating the café within the building whilst maintaining external access to wider park users.
28. Further work to be completed in the next design stage to optimise the Learn to Swim provision, with appropriate pool depths and segregation from leisure users.

PROGRAMME UPDATE

29. Preliminary design has been delayed whilst consultant contracts have been updated to include novation clauses and geotechnical testing has occurred on site. Critical works have continued with geothermal and early procurement tender documents being finalised. Following confirmation of the main contractor procurement, a detailed programme will be reset. Completion of the facility is estimated in 2029 to align with the LTP 2024-2034.
30. The project will progress to preliminary design, developed design, and detailed design prior to construction. As part of each stage, an independent Quantity Surveyor will provide updated cost estimates to ensure that the project remains in budget and to allow the project team to input into value engineering options if required.

Geotechnical Update

31. Engeo geotechnical engineers completed a peer review of the Beca geotechnical solution for concept design. This challenged some of the soil classifications and parameters used which could lead to incorrect soil behaviour and conservative results. All engineers required further testing on site and analysis prior to proceeding with the design.
32. This further testing was completed on site early April with deeper bore hole testing completed early May. Results from this testing will be analysed during the next design stage and inform the foundation design. As this is a high-risk item for the project, our Quantity Surveyor BBD is working closely with specialist contractors to confirm pricing and programme implications of each solution.

Geothermal Update

33. The Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited Board recommended the project team procure a drilling contractor directly rather than through the main contractor. The project team have prepared tender documents which have been released to the market for pricing. Following selection, there will be a long lead time to procure specialist materials internationally and obtain a drilling Resource Consent. Drilling to 600m depth for both an abstraction and re-injection bores will take about 9 months. The drilling area is limited to a small area, and normal park and QEYC operations will be able to continue throughout this period.
34. On completion of drilling, testing will be completed including flow rates and temperature. Based on existing temperatures extracted by the current outdoor pool bore, the first pair of bores is estimated to yield energy sufficient to heat all pools in the aquatic facility.
35. Should there not be sufficient flow rates or Council chooses to have part/full redundancy, there is provision in budget for a second pair of bores. This will be assessed against a blended option with electric heat pumps. These typically are located externally in a service yard so are relatively easily added to the project at any stage or during the lifetime of the facility.

Early Procurement

36. The project team have prepared a pool and hydro slide tender package. These are long lead items and proprietary systems that need to be integrated into the design of the building. Once the main contractor procurement strategy has been agreed this can be released for tender.

Project Control Group (PCG)

37. To date the concept and enhanced designs to prepare for preliminary design stage has been directed by the Contractor PCG comprising representatives from the project team, Spaces and Places, BVL, Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) contractor, architects and specialist consultants. The PCG will continue to provide input through the life of the project. Governance of the project will be provided by the Contract Oversight Group (COG) Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited Board.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

38. The Council approved the Aquatic centre 'Option 2' at the 11 December 2023 Council meeting at a total cost of \$122.25M. The project has been further developed to fit within this budget.
39. The enhanced project design has been developed to fit within the \$122.25M budget approved by Council on 11 December 2023. However, final delivery of the project has since been moved out by one year to Financial Year 2029, which has resulted in an extra year's projected cost escalations being applied. This has increased the total project budget in the Long Term Plan to \$123.45M, as approved by the Council on 22 April 2024. However, the project is still being progressed within the original \$122.25M budget.
40. The updated budget is outlined in the attached design update document and encompasses the full project costs including ground works, the aquatic centre, fitness centre, outdoor pools and hydro slides, car parking and integrated cultural design. The project estimate is within the \$122.25M budget approved by Council on the 11 December 2023.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / RISKS

Key Project Risks

41. The project is yet to go through developed and detailed design phases in what is a large one-off project. The project team have developed a robust design framework including the input of independent industry experts to ensure the design if developed further to stay within the project budget and deliver on the project outcomes.
42. Further ground investigation works undertaken will inform final design methodology and inground foundation improvements and foundations. While a comprehensive testing and design process is being undertaken there are risks that further challenges may be encountered in the process of ground and geothermal works.
43. The project design includes assumptions regarding the level of project contingencies and cost escalation which equates 20% of the overall project cost. There is, however, always a risk that significant unplanned events may have an impact on overall and eventual project costs.
44. The project is being actively managed by the Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited Board. The board offers a high level of experience, skills and governance in managing and delivering highly complex projects such as this.

CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT

45. The Council has undertaken previous engagement with the community to understand community support for this project through the Long-Term Plans 2018-28 and 2021-31.

46. The project has been developed alongside Bay Venues and mana whenua as project design partners. Engagement has been undertaken with a number of user groups, reserve lease holders and key stakeholders over the course of the project development.
47. The project has been included in the 2024-2034 Long Term Plan. This formed a part of the public consultation process held in November/December 2023.



SIGNIFICANCE

48. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
49. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
 - (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
 - (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the decision.
 - (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.
50. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the decision is of medium significance. This report seeks approval to progress the Memorial Park Aquatic Facility to construction. Whilst this is a significant approval stage in the delivery of a significant project, the decision to undertake the project has already been made through the LTP 2021-2031 and LTP 2024-2034. The decisions of this report have a strong and logical flow from the previous 11 December 2023 Council decision, and the budget implications have not changed.

NEXT STEPS

51. The project team will continue through the design stages of the Memorial Park Aquatic Facility to construction under the governance of the Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited Board.

ATTACHMENTS

1. **Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Business Case - Visitor Solutions Ltd - A15916894 (Separate Attachments 1)** 
2. **Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Design Update Report - HDT Architects - A15917787 (Separate Attachments 1)** 

11.4 Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw Controls

File Number: A15841626

Author: Matt Searle, Waste Planning Advisor
Cayley McLean, Team Leader: Waste Planning and Projects
Dan Smith, Manager: Sustainability & Waste

Authoriser: Wally Potts, Acting General Manager: Infrastructure

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. Clause 9 of the Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw 2022 states Council may make, amend or revoke controls to support the implementation of this Bylaw by a resolution of Council that is publicly notified. This report sets out the proposed controls recommended by staff to help better implement and enforce the Bylaw.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw Controls".
- (b) Pursuant to clause 9 of the Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw 2022, makes the controls specified in Attachment 1 to support the implementation of the Bylaw, to become effective on 1 June 2024.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw 2022¹ sets regulations² and enforcement mechanisms related to the management and minimisation of waste within Tauranga City.
3. Clause 9 of the Bylaw enables Council to make, amend or revoke controls to support the implementation of the Bylaw by resolution of Council that is publicly notified.
4. This report recommends that Council makes the controls set out in Attachment 1 to support the Bylaw in the following areas:
 - Collections from a public place
 - Waste management facilities
 - Multi-unit developments
 - Construction and demolition waste management plan
5. The proposed controls aim to improve the implementation and enforcement of the Bylaw in Tauranga. These measures encourage local stakeholders to adopt more efficient waste management practices and reduce waste generation. Further rationale regarding the controls in each area can also be found in Attachment 1.
6. It is proposed these controls become effective on 1 June 2024.

¹ Adopted on 5 September 2022 and came into force on 1 October 2022.

² No person may deposit, collect, transport, sort, store, process or dispose of waste other than in accordance with the Bylaw.

BACKGROUND

7. Council's Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw 2022 was adopted on 5 September 2022. The purpose of this Bylaw is to support the promotion and delivery of effective and efficient waste management and minimisation in Tauranga City as required under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 and to support the implementation of Council's Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP)
8. Under Section 9.1 of the bylaw Council may make, amend or revoke controls to support the implementation of this Bylaw. Since the Bylaw was implemented in 2022 there has been no resolution by council to make, amend or revoke controls relating to this bylaw.
9. The controls set out within Appendix 1 are proposed to be made to better implement and enforce the bylaw and encourage stakeholders residing and/or operating in Tauranga to practice better waste management and minimise the waste they generate.

STRATEGIC / STATUTORY CONTEXT

10. The controls will promote effective and efficient waste management and minimization in Tauranga City, as required by the Waste Minimisation Act 2008. They will also support the implementation of Council's Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) and uphold the goals set in the New Zealand Waste Strategy.

OPTIONS ANALYSIS

11. There are currently no controls that have been made by a resolution of Council with regards to the Waste Management and Minimisation 2022 Bylaw. Without implementing the controls in the areas highlighted in section 4 the wider issue regarding waste management and minimisation is not expected to see any advancement.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. Negligible – any costs associated with these controls can be accommodated within existing budgets.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / RISKS

13. The bylaw states council may make, amend or revoke controls to support the implementation of this Bylaw and that any of these must be made by a resolution of Council that is publicly notified.

CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT

14. Consultation is not required to make controls to support the implementation of this Bylaw. However, these must be made by a resolution of Council that is publicly notified.

SIGNIFICANCE

15. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
16. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
 - (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
 - (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the decision.
 - (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.

In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the decision is of low significance.

ENGAGEMENT

17. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of low significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

NEXT STEPS

18. Once resolved by Council, the controls will be published on Council's website as an Attachment to the Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw.

ATTACHMENTS

1. **Attachment 1 - Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Controls - A15882505** [↓](#) 

ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION CONTROLS

Control title	Detail of control	Rationale for control
COLLECTIONS FROM A PUBLIC PLACE	<p>1.1 The permitted times for residential waste, recycling or other diverted material collection services are Monday to Friday 7:00am – 6:00pm</p> <p>1.2 The occupier of every residential dwelling unit who would like a collection service must ensure that no later than 7:00am on collection day they place their approved receptacles at the kerbside nearest the dwelling or unit or in any other position determined by Council Officers.</p> <p>1.3 Where Council is unable to service the approved receptacles on the stipulated collection day, the occupier must remove the receptacles from the kerbside, by the end of the following day or follow direction determined by Council Officers.</p>	<p>1.1 This allows council to ensure all waste operators are servicing kerbside bins during the agreed time periods and on correct days and provides the option to enforce if not followed.</p> <p>1.2 This gives council more tools if residents are using non-approved receptacles.</p> <p>1.3 This allows council more flexibility if something occurs that impacts collections on the normal scheduled collection days.</p>
WASTE SEPARATION	<p>1.4 No waste, other than clean accepted materials shall be deposited in any approved receptacle for recycling/composting purposes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Mixed recycling bin: Only the following clean material shall be deposited in the approved recycling wheelie bin with the yellow lid: paper, cardboard, plastic bottles, trays and containers #1, #2 and #5 (rinsed, lids removed), metal tins and cans. b) Glass crate: Only the following clean materials shall be deposited in the approved glass crate: glass bottles and jars (rinsed, lids removed, not broken) c) Garden waste: Only the following plant material shall be deposited in the approved garden waste wheelie bin with the green lid: grass clippings, leaves, small branches and twigs, weeds, and flowers. d) Food Scraps: Only the following material shall be deposited in the approved food scraps bin: fruit and vegetables, bread, dairy, egg, seafood shells, coffee grounds, meat, fish and bones, and plain brown paper bag. <p>1.5 Council's contamination plan for kerbside collection service outlines the process where contamination is detected and outlines the enforcement actions that may be undertaken related to each collection service.</p> <p>1.6 Council officers may, at any time audit receptacles placed at kerbside to ensure the correct separation of rubbish, organic matter, and recyclable material into correct receptacles.</p>	<p>1.4 & 1.5 these controls are in line with the national standardisation of kerbside recycling and provides a detailed outline of what is accepted in each different bin type.</p> <p>1.6 This control is aimed to give council more tools to help minimise contamination to recycling, garden waste, glass crates and food scraps bins.</p>

PLACEMENT AND RETRIEVAL OF WASTE RECEPTACLES	<p>1.7 Rubbish, recycling, glass bottles and jars, food scraps, garden waste and any other diverted material may only be placed in or on a public place for collection pursuant to the Bylaw or the controls made under the Bylaw unless otherwise approved by Tauranga City Council.</p> <p>1.8 All receptacles and any uncollected material must be removed from the public place by the end of the day on the day following collection day, unless a Council Officer has instructed otherwise.</p> <p>1.9 All receptacles must be placed in a location that does not disrupt or obstruct pedestrians, wheelchair users and vehicular traffic at any time.</p>	<p>These controls are to give council more tools if residents or business are placing bins in the wrong location and/or leaving bins out on the kerbside for extended periods.</p>
RESTRICTIONS ON MATERIALS	<p>1.10 No person shall deposit or allow any of the following materials to be deposited in any approved receptacle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Any material capable of causing serious injury to any person. b) Flammable material or substances c) Liquids, acids, paints d) Hazardous substances e) Dead animals or offal f) Any batteries (such as lithium-ion & car batteries) g) Medical waste 	<p>These are aimed to reduce the risks on the collection staff and to protect the environment from spills/contamination.</p>
WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES	<p>1.11 The following materials can be accepted at Maleme Street and Te Maunga Transfer Stations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Domestic waste b) Commercial waste c) Recyclable material d) Organic matter e) Any other material the waste management facility operator or Authorised Officer notifies is acceptable for deposit at the facility <p>1.12 Te Maunga Transfer Station will open for use at the following times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monday – Friday: 7:30am – 5:00pm - Saturday and Sunday: 9:00am – 5:00pm - Public Holidays (excluding Good Friday, Christmas Day and New Year's Day): 9:00am – 5:00pm. - Closed on Good Friday, Christmas Day and New Year's Day - Extended weekend hours 28 October – 7 February: 8:30am – 5:00pm <p>1.13 Maleme Street Transfer Station will open for use at the following times (open to commercial account holders only):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monday – Friday: 7:30am – 5:00pm - Saturday: 9:00am – 3:00pm 	<p>1.11 These controls are to allow council to direct private waste operators to use the correct facility and to provide better opportunities to reduce waste to landfill and reuse/recycle more material.</p> <p>1.12 and 1.13 This sets out the level of service for access to Te Maunga and Maleme Street Transfer Station</p>

MULTI-UNIT DEVELOPMENTS	<p>1.14 Without limiting clause 15.2 of the Bylaw, an Authorised Officer may require any multi-unit development to submit a development waste management plan, in a form prescribed by Council supplied by the owner and/or manager to the satisfaction of Council, and the provisions of clause 15 of the Bylaw will apply.</p> <p>1.15 Council officers may specify the times, locations, receptacle types, weight restrictions and conditions applicable to any collection service from a multi-unit development.</p> <p>1.16 Council officers may audit at any time any multi-unit development's waste receptacles to ensure the correct separation of rubbish, organic matter, and recyclable material into correct receptacles.</p>	Control enables council officers to provide support during the development and planning stages of MUDs, ensuring that operational waste and community impact considerations are factored in
CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE	<p>1.17 Any person applying for a building consent for building work with an estimated value of \$1.5 million or higher must submit a construction site and demolition waste management plan to the Council for approval prior to the commencement of any building work.</p>	Control allows council officers to support construction and demolition companies to reduce their waste in a responsible manner.

11.5 Transport Resolutions Report No.51

File Number: A15645023

Author: Will Hyde, Senior Transportation Engineer
Ross Hudson, Manager: Strategic Planning and Partnerships, Spaces and Places

Authoriser: Nic Johansson, Head of Transport

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To obtain a resolution from the Council to introduce, amend or remove various traffic and parking controls in the Attachments to the Traffic and Parking Bylaw (2023) for general safety and operational reasons.
2. To approve decisions required to implement the decision through the Long Term Plan 2024-34 to charge for boat ramp use in areas adjacent to the Whareroa Reserve, Pilot Bay, and Marine Park boat ramps.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Transport Resolutions Report No.51".

General Updates

- (b) **Adopts** the proposed traffic and parking controls as per Attachment A relating to minor changes for general safety, operational or amenity purposes, to become effective on or after 14 May 2024 subject to appropriate signs and road markings being installed.

Boat Ramp Charging Fees

- (c) **Adopts** the bylaw controls in Attachment B to introduce charges for use of boat ramps via parking charges for trailers in areas adjacent to the Whareroa Reserve boat ramp, Pilot Bay boat ramp, and Marine Park boat ramps from 1 July 2024 in accordance with decisions made in the Long Term Plan 2024-34.
- (d) **Agrees** that the residents annual boat ramp parking pass be available (per trailer) for those who live, own property, or operate a business, club or organisation in Tauranga City Council boundaries.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

General updates

3. Attachment A sets out proposed changes for general safety and operational reasons. These are principally requests from the public or other stakeholders for numerous small changes to parking controls which traffic engineering staff have deemed to be appropriate.
4. Amendments include changes to the following Attachments to the Traffic & Parking Bylaw (2023):
 - (a) Attachment 3.1: Shared Pedestrian / Cycle Paths & Cycle Paths (in Road Reserve)
 - (b) Attachment 7.1: No Parking Behind Kerb
 - (c) Attachment 7.2: No Stopping At Any Time

- (d) Attachment 7.7 Mobility Parking
- (e) Attachment 7.9: Parking Time Restrictions
- (f) Attachment 7.15: Loading Zones
- (g) Attachment 7.16: Loading Zones with Time Restriction
- (h) Attachment 7.17: Loading Zones At All Times
- (i) Attachment 7.21: Passenger Service and Other Vehicle Stands (Stopping Places for Buses)

Boat Ramp Charging Fees

5. This report outlines decisions required to implement the decision through the Long Term Plan 2024-34 to charge for boat ramp use including:
 - Adopting bylaw controls under the Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 to charge for trailer parking in the areas next to the Whareroa Reserve, Pilot Bay, and Marine Park boat ramps as outlined in Attachment B.
 - Confirming the eligibility criteria for the annual boat ramp parking pass for residents.
 - Providing a delegation to the General Manager: Community Services to approve exemptions to the boat ramp parking pass fee where appropriate for the 2024/25 financial year.

BACKGROUND

6. The Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 includes Attachments which list various traffic and parking restrictions. Council can amend the Attachments by Council Resolution.
7. The Council regularly updates the Attachments to the Bylaw to reflect and support operational and safety needs on the road network. The proposed amendments in Attachment A are minor changes to parking or movement restrictions across the city which have arisen through requests from the public, transportation staff or other stakeholders; changes resulting from approved developments; plus other minor changes deemed necessary by the Network Safety and Sustainability team.
8. The Council through the 2024-34 Long Term Plan agreed to charge for trailer parking in the areas next to the Whareroa Reserve, Pilot Bay, and Marine Park boat ramps as a charging fee for the use of boat ramps. The fees were set at \$20 per day with an annual boat ramp parking pass being available for residents for \$200 annually. To enforce the payment of fees the Council must designate the area a paid parking area for trailers using the Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023.

STRATEGIC / STATUTORY CONTEXT

9. The amendments achieve the vision and strategic transport priorities to help make our network safer and easier for people to get around the city.
10. User fees and charges for services can help ensure that those who benefit from these facilities pay their fair share.

OPTIONS ANALYSIS

General Updates

11. For the proposed changes related to general operations the reasons for each proposal are described in Appendix A. In each case the problem identified is expected to continue if the proposed amendment is not adopted.

Boat Ramp Charging Fees

12. The council proposed charging for parking alongside three locations with boat ramps in Tauranga in order to raise funds to put towards the maintenance of these facilities in the

2024-34 Long Term Plan. The council agreed to introduce boat ramp parking fees at areas alongside Whareroa Reserve, Pilot Bay, and Marine Park boat ramps. Attachment B provides the bylaw controls required to implement this decision. These bylaw controls are necessary to support enforcement of the fees.

13. Alongside the \$20 daily rate fee proposed, the council proposed an annual boat ramp parking pass be available for residents for \$200 annually. To implement this decision the Council needs to agree to a definition of who may qualify for these passes. Staff are proposing that an annual boat ramp parking pass be available (per trailer) for those who live, own property, or operate a business, club or organisation in Tauranga City Council boundaries.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

14. The signs and markings costs associated with general operational changes are minor and can be accommodated within existing project or operational budgets.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / RISKS

15. The bylaw amendment is needed to allow enforcement of changes deemed necessary for safety and amenity purposes. Council has an obligation to address known safety issues on the road network.
16. The bylaw controls in Attachment B are necessary to support enforcement of the boat ramp parking fee.

CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT

17. The amendments proposed in Appendix A have been assessed as being of a minor nature.
18. Consultation is generally not required for minor stopping and parking amendments, or other minor amendments required to support operational or safety improvements. Where consultation or engagement has been undertaken, details are provided in Appendix A.
19. The boat ramp charging fees were consulted on through the Long Term Plan 2024-34.

SIGNIFICANCE

20. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
21. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
 - (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
 - (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the decision.
 - (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.
22. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the decision is of low significance. This is because the proposed general updates are minor in nature, and the boat ramp fees are technical decisions needed to implement a previously agreed direction.

ENGAGEMENT

23. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of low significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

NEXT STEPS

24. All proposed amendments in Attachment A will become operational on or after 21 May 2024 when the appropriate signs and markings are put in place.
25. The proposed amendments in Attachment B will take effect from 1 July 2024.
26. Further work is being done to minimise impacts on adjacent parking areas, and how this can best be managed.
27. A communication strategy is also under development in order for charges to be well understood and to seek willing compliance from boat ramp users.
28. Following the confirmation of the eligibility for annual parking pass an online application process will be activated for those wanting to apply prior to 1 July 2024. The council will continue to engage with Whareroa Marae to better the understand the implications for the Whareroa community.

ATTACHMENTS

1. **Appendix A - T&P Bylaw Amendment 51 - A15912653** [!\[\]\(d328bb1c8b293dce97ce8ae48fe06a23_img.jpg\)](#) 
2. **Attachment B Boat Ramp Parking Resolutions - A15897681** [!\[\]\(6c3f3105811ec6ad9c7c82c1ac88875f_img.jpg\)](#) 

Attachment A: Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 - Proposed Resolutions No.51

Attachment 3.1: Shared Pedestrian / Cycle Paths & Cycle Paths (in Road Reserve)

Road Name	Road Portion	Direction	Use	Reason for implementing
Girven Road Both sides	Between Oceanbeach Road and Maranui Street	Both	Shared path	Part of project to upgrade the Oceanbeach Rd/ Girven Road/ Maranui Street intersections.
Maranui Street Both sides	From Girven Road south-eastwards for 4m	Both	Shared path	
Oceanbeach Road Both sides	From the west boundary of No.346 to the west boundary of No.373	Both	Shared path	
Waitaha Road Both sides	From the southern boundary to No.1 northwards to Welcome Bay Road.	Both	Shared path	Part of project to introduce a roundabout to the intersection of Welcome Bay and Waitaha Roads
Welcome Bay Road Both sides	100m centred on the roundabout at Waitaha Road.	Both	Shared path	

Attachment A: Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 - Proposed Resolutions No.51

Attachment 7.1: No Parking Behind Kerb

The following proposed amendments relate to general operational matters.

Location	Details (No Parking Behind Kerb)	Reason for implementing
Maru Street	From Vehicle Crossing No. 44 to the intersection with Hewletts Road.	Parked vehicles impeding safe pedestrian access along berm.
Doncaster Drive	Between No.32C and Opal Drive.	Minor extension of existing length of restriction.
Ruatahapari Way Both sides	From the western end of the boat ramp car park, eastwards to Totara Street. Only applies to trailers.	To support safe road use around the boat ramp.
Cross Road Both sides	From the (rail) level crossing to Kieth Allen Drive	To support safe road use around the boat ramp.
Kieth Allen Drive Both sides	From Cross Road to a point 600m north of the (rail) level crossing of Cross Road.	To support safe road use around the boat ramp.

Attachment 7.2: No Stopping at Any Time

The following proposed amendments relate to general operational matters.

Location	Details (No Stopping at any time)	Reason for implementing
Campbell Road Western side	Across, and extending 2m on either side, the shared vehicle crossings to No. 14 and No. 14B	Visibility issues at driveway.
Cross Road Both sides	From the southern access to the boat ramp car park to Kieth Allen Drive	To support safe road use around the boat ramp.
Epsom Road End of cul-de-sac	Across the end of the cul-de-sac	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Gloucester Road Western side	Across, and extending 1m on either side, the vehicle crossings to No. 32 and No. 34	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Gravatt Road	Outside 220 Gravatt Road between the vehicle crossings of 220 and 216D	Parking creates visibility issues at the intersection
Heath Street North-west side	From the common boundary of Nos.5 & 7 north-eastwards for 9m.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.

Attachment A: Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 - Proposed Resolutions No.51

Heath Street North-west side	From the common boundary of Nos.7 & 9 south-westwards for 6m.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Kaiora Drive	The entire length of the road	Existing lines not in bylaw.
Kieth Allen Drive Both sides	From a point 600m north of the (rail) level crossing of Cross Road, southwards to Cross Road.	To support safe road use around the boat ramp.
Macrae Avenue Northern side	Across, and extending 3m on either side, of the two vehicle crossings to No. 9	Parked vehicles are making access (for heavy vehicles) to properties difficult.
Manawa Road South side	From the western boundary of No.22 eastwards to the end of the road.	Existing lines not in bylaw.
Marine Parade South-West side	Commencing at the point 3m from the southern boundary of No. 136 westside and extending to 8m to north of it.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Maru Street North-East Side	Commencing from Northern Boundary No.13 to 5m southward of it.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Monowai Street South-east side	Commencing from intersection with Gloucester Road western Kerb of Monowai street and extending 40m south of Monowai Street.	Not enough visibility
Motiti Road North side	From 1m west of the vehicle crossing to No.53 to 1m east of the vehicle crossing to No.57	Visibility issues at pedestrian beach access
Motiti Road North side	The frontages of No.41 and No.43, and including 15 m northwards to the beach access parking area.	Visibility issues at pedestrian beach access
Motiti Road South side	Across, and for 6m on each side of, the beach access path between No.38 and No.42	Visibility issues at pedestrian beach access
Motiti Road South side	Fronting No.2 Motiti Road to a point 1m east of the vehicle crossing.	Preventing dangerous parking near the intersection with Taylor Road.
Motiti Road North side	From Taylor to the eastern boundary of No 1A.	Visibility issues at intersection.
Muricata Avenue North-eastern side	Across, and extending 2m on either side, the vehicle crossing to the Cutters Cove Resort Apartment basement parking exit	Visibility issues
Ninth Avenue Northern side	Commencing from the vehicle crossing to No. 7 westwards to the vehicle crossing to No. 13	Parking creating visibility issues on approach to the crest of a curve
Oceanbeach Road South side	From a point 9m southeast of the north-west boundary of No.358, south-eastwards for 34m	To enable safe sight lines at new pedestrian crossing.
Pakanga Grove	Outside 10 and between 62 and 64	Parking creating visibility issues at the bend
Topaz Drive	Outside 46 Topaz drive yellow lines on either of the speed table 6 m and on the speed table	Parking on speed table and in the vicinity creating visibility issues
Torino Road Both sides	The entire length of the road	Existing lines not in bylaw.

Attachment A: Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 - Proposed Resolutions No.51

Village Park Drive North-East side	Commencing from Eastern Boundary of No.2 to 3m west of it.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Wellesley Grove South side	Commencing on southern kerb from eastern edge of Vehicle Crossing No. 44 extending to east till the edge of vehicle crossing No.50.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Papamoa Beach Road North-east side	Commencing on northern kerb from eastern boundary of No.1135 to 13.8m towards west of it.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Papamoa Beach Road North-east side	Commencing on southern kerb of road from 10m away from western boundary of No.1152 and extending to 4m away from eastern boundary of No.1154.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Taylor Road North side	From the east boundary of No.2B westwards for 13m	Visibility issues at intersection.
Waikite Road North-east side	Commencing on northern boundary of No.136 southwards to the intersection with Holcombroke Lane	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Waikite Road North-west side	Commencing intersection with Gunbar Drive extending south to vehicle crossing to No.135.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Waitaha Road Both sides	From a point 8m south of the southern boundary of No.1, northwards to Welcome Bay Road.	Part of the Welcome Bay Road/Waitaha Road roundabout project.
Ranginui Road East Side	Commencing from 9m north of recessed kerb for the bus stop opposite No.16 and extending southwards to the Bus Stop.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Ranginui Road West Side	Commencing 2m south of the southern boundary of No.20 extending northwards to the vehicle crossing No. 20.	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.
Wayne Palace End of cul-de-sac	Around the end of cul-de-sac	Parked vehicles are making access to adjacent properties difficult.

Attachment A: Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 - Proposed Resolutions No.51

Attachment 7.7 Mobility Parking

Mobility Parking		Reason for implementing
Additions:		
Devon Street	One angle space adjacent to the existing mobility park at the Morland Fox Park	Requested by public via CCM. Addresses a shortfall of mobility parking in the vicinity.
Dive Crescent East side	The southern-most parking space	Requested by public via CCM. Addresses a shortfall of mobility parking in the vicinity.
Willow Street	Outside No.32	Requested by public via CCM. Addresses a shortfall of mobility parking in the vicinity.

Attachment 7.11 Parking Time Restrictions

Parking Time Restrictions: 5 minute parking		Reason for implementing
Additions:		
Maunganui Road East Side	Commencing at the northern boundary of Bain Street extending northwards for a distance of 27 metres (three parallel carparks).	Time reduced from 10 minutes at request of adjacent commercial properties. Consultation undertaken as part of Maunganui Rd upgrade project.

Parking Time Restrictions: 10 minute parking		Reason for implementing
Deletions:		
Maunganui Road East Side	Commencing at the northern boundary of Bain Street extending northwards for a distance of 27 metres (three parallel carparks).	Time reduced to five minutes at request of adjacent commercial properties. Consultation undertaken as part of Maunganui Rd upgrade project.

Parking Time Restrictions: 30 minute parking		Reason for implementing
Addition		
First Ave North side	From the west side of Cameron Rd to the end of the cul-de-sac.	Recently implemented, part of Cameron Rd project.

Attachment A: Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 - Proposed Resolutions No.51

Parking Time Restrictions: 120 minute parking		Reason for implementing
Addition		
Palm Springs Boulevard	Commencing from southern Boundary of Property No.1070 to 24m north of Palm Spring Boulevard towards the intersection.	To prevent all-day parking and enable parking turnover adjacent to commercial properties.
Rata Street	Commencing at western boundary of Maunganui Road and extending westwards to Vehicle Crossing No.2 ,17 angle spaces.	Changes made under Resource Consent for adjacent development.

Attachment 7.21: Passenger Service and Other Vehicle Stands (Stopping Places for Buses)

Passenger Service and Other Vehicle Stands (Stopping Places for Buses)		Reason for implementing
Additions:		
Hynds Road	Fronting No. 35	Relocation as part of Bus Stop upgrade project
Hynds Road	Fronting No. 38 and 40	Relocation as part of Bus Stop upgrade project
Deletions:		
Hynds Road	Fronting No.37	Relocation as part of Bus Stop upgrade project
Hynds Road	Fronting No. 38	Relocation as part of Bus Stop upgrade project
Carmichael Road		Bus stop no longer in use.

Attachment 7.15: Loading Zones

Loading Zone		Reason for implementing
Deletion:		
Tawa Street West side	The area marked at the northern end outside No.4 Tawa Street	Time limit being added to allow for turnover.

Attachment A: Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 - Proposed Resolutions No.51**Attachment 7.16: Loading Zones with Time Restriction**

Loading Zone		Reason for implementing
Deletion:		
The Strand West Side 12am to 9am 2pm to 4pm 5 minute lime restriction	For a distance of 8m, centred on the east-west centre-line of the Wharf Street pedestrian mall.	Limited hours are too restrictive for use by adjacent commercial users.

Attachment 7.17: Loading Zones at all Times

Loading Zone		Reason for implementing
Addition:		
The Strand West Side At all Times 5 minute lime restriction	For a distance of 8m, centred on the east-west centre-line of the Wharf Street pedestrian mall.	Limited hours are too restrictive for use by adjacent commercial users.
Tawa Street West side	The area marked at the northern end outside No.4 Tawa Street	Time limited to allow for turnover.

Attachment B: Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 – Resolutions for Boat Ramp Parking

Attachment 7.32: Paid Trailer Parking Areas

Pursuant to Clause 13.1 and Clause 13.2 (a) and (m) of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2023 the following parking areas may be used for the purpose described subject to charges, and maximum parking time conditions described:

Paid Trailer Parking		Reason for implementing
Modifications:		
Marine Park Areas as outlined in yellow in Map A	Those parking trailers must pay a daily fee or hold an annual boat ramp parking pass. Maximum parking time allowed for the area are displayed on signs or parking machines.	The use of this area of Marine Park for parking trailers is subject to charges to implement the decisions made through the 2024-34 Long Term Plan.
Whareroa Reserve as outlined in yellow in Map B	Those parking trailers must pay a daily fee or annual boat ramp parking pass. Maximum parking time allowed for the area are displayed on signs or parking machines.	The use of this area of Whareroa Reserve for parking trailers is subject to charges to implement the decisions made through the 2024-34 Long Term Plan.
The Mall/Pilot Quay as outlined in yellow in Map C	Those parking trailers must pay a daily fee or hold an annual boat ramp parking pass. The location and maximum parking time allowed for the area are displayed on signs or parking machines. Note: Restricted to vehicle trailer combination all times (as set out in attachment 7.10 to the bylaw).	The use of this area for parking trailers is now subject to charges to implement the decisions made through the 2024-34 Long Term Plan.

Map A: Marine Park:



Map B: Whareroa Reserve



Map C: The Mall/Pilot Quay



11.6 Draft GPS Alignment and LCLR project delivery

File Number: A15897276

Author: Karen Hay, Team Leader: Active Modes

Authoriser: Nic Johansson, Head of Transport

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To provide an update on our response to the draft Government Policy Statement (GPS) 2024 for projects associated with the low cost low risk improvement programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Draft GPS Alignment and LCLR project delivery".

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The draft Government Policy Statement outlines its intention on The draft GPS prioritises economic growth and productivity, increased maintenance and resilience, safety, and value for money from transport expenditure. The GPS also signals that the land transport funding system is facing significant pressures due to rising demands and costs. In the shorter term it will be necessary to prioritise effectively and strengthen the focus on value for money.
3. Councils low-cost, low-risk improvement (LCLR) programmes support improvements for the community that include delivery of outcomes from spatial plans, safety improvements, walking and cycling, safety around schools, addressing high risk crash locations, public transport infrastructure improvements and some maintenance activities.
4. Staff acknowledge the intention of draft GPS and are responding to the potential change in approach, in particular relating to traffic calming measures such as raised pedestrian crossings, speed tables and speed humps.
5. Some challenges do exist where alternative interventions are not likely to mitigate the safety risk. These are considered isolated instances, where for example, visibility constraints exists. Such projects that have these safety challenges will be treated on a case by case basis.
6. Of the 179 projects within the LCLR programme around 32% of them incorporate traffic calming measures. Currently there are 11 projects planned for construction now, of which six had raised tables that were able to be removed. Five of these projects are either tendered or in construction where speed tables are not able to be removed.
7. 10 projects are in the process of being reassessed and are likely to require redesign.

BACKGROUND

8. The LCLR programme is prioritised within available funding to best meet government priorities and outcomes, while balancing this against community needs. The programme also at times, enables us to respond to reactive community concerns or emerging safety issues.
9. While it is acknowledged that the draft GPS is yet to be finalised, there are clear signals from government around future funding of activities and which projects could be funded and what the focus of those projects should be. These include:

- (a) The local road improvement activity class is signalling that the investment is for the purpose of investment in new local roads and improving the capacity of existing local roads, and end of life bridge and structures renewals. Funding of this activity class will no longer be used to make multimodal improvements and reduced funding for traffic calming such as speed humps.
- (b) For the safety activity class, the focus is also on increasing road safety through enforcement and behavioural change, not blanket speed limit changes.
- (c) The Government expects that investment from this activity class will not be made in traffic calming measures such as raised pedestrian crossings, raised platforms, speed humps, and in-lane bus stops on state highways and local roads.

OPTIONS ANALYSIS

- 10. Given the early signals from government around its expectation from Councils, staff are reassessing projects where measures such as raised pedestrian crossings, raised platforms, speed bumps are currently proposed.
- 11. We recognise the importance of managing productivity on arterial and other routes where alternative interventions are possible, and enforcement is likely. Opportunities exist to provide “self-explaining roads” that provides users better context of the intended function with reduced need for traffic calming such as speed humps.
- 12. An intervention toolkit is under development that can help manage safety risks which include:
 - (a) Horizontal deflection such as traffic islands or kerb build outs;
 - (b) Anti-skid surfacing;
 - (c) Flashing inground markers;
 - (d) Advanced warning signs etc.
- 13. There are however instances where significant safety risks exists and alternative measures are unlikely to mitigate those risks, for example, where visibility requirements cannot be achieved.
- 14. There is evidence that shows that children under the age of twelve are still developing cognitive skills and cannot easily gauge the speed of oncoming traffic and can be impulsive. They may step out on crossing with minimal time for drivers to respond. In specific scenarios such as outside schools, interventions such as having zebra crossings with speed tables can mitigate these risks. These however will still be assessed on an individual basis dependent on traffic volumes, speed of vehicles and limited to high risk locations.
- 15. All signalised crossings, usually on key arterial routes is proposed to be at grade.
- 16. Community expectations and requests from the schools to help manage the conflict may also be a factor for consideration.
- 17. In the meantime, where projects are approved for funding from NZTA based on speed tables being in place, and where construction activities are already progressed to a stage where it is too late to remove speed tables, these will need to be implemented with no changes being made. A relatively small number of projects fall into this category.
- 18. In lane bus stops are limited to a situation where no footpath space is available or where site constraints exist. An example is where the ability to install a bus stop, not in lane, will require the need to underground power lines at significant cost.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 19. Future funding of the low cost low risk programme in the next NLTP is yet to be determined. Council have submitted an updated programme to best align with draft GPS for consideration. This decision is likely to be in September 2024.

CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT

20. Staff have engaged with some other Councils around their intended response to the draft GPS. The proposed intervention toolkit is similar to what will be potentially considered elsewhere.

SIGNIFICANCE

21. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
22. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
 - (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
 - (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the .
 - (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.
23. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the matter is of low significance.
24. Given this report provides an update on progress in responding to the draft GPS, the matter is of low significance .

ENGAGEMENT

25. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the matter is of low significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council considering this matter.

NEXT STEPS

26. An alternative intervention toolkit to be finalised to support safety outcomes. Staff will collaborate with NZTA to ensure alignment.
27. Current projects in design will continue, but with a focus on pivoting to achieve GPS outcomes, likely to be in place in July 2024, noting some safety risks in some situations.
28. Projects not currently in design and not funded will progress once a decision on funding from the NLTP is made.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

11.7 Connecting Mount Maunganui IBC Update report (VOS Committee Outcomes and Impact)

File Number: A15915216

Author: Eric Signi, Senior Transport Planner
Chris Barton, Acting Programme Manager: Investments
Tom McEntyre, Principal Investment Advisor: Transport

Authoriser: Neil Mason, Programme Director: Major Projects

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. Provide an update on the Connecting Mount Manganui (CMM) transport project,
2. Provide a summary of the direction given by the NZTA VOS committee on the project Indicative Business Case (IBC)
3. Outline proposed next steps moving forward

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Connecting Mount Maunganui IBC Update report (VOS Committee Outcomes and Impact)".
- (b) Notes the recommendations from the NZTA VOS committee as outlined in this report.
- (c) Approves progressing with pre-implementation and implementation of Horizon 1 activities including the Te Maire Link to Newton Street and intersection optimisation at Maru Street and Aerodrome Road, subject to confirming NZTA co-funding of at least 51% FAR for delivery of these works

BACKGROUND

4. As previously reported to Council on 29 April 2024, the draft Connecting Mount Maunganui project IBC was completed on 4 April 2024.
5. In parallel with the report to Council, the NZTA project team submitted the IBC to the Value Outcome Standards (VOS) Committee, seeking endorsement of the IBC from the Committee to the NZTA Board for approval. The decision of the VOS Committee was that further work was required on the IBC prior to recommending to the board.
6. Following the TCC Council meeting on the 29 April 2024, it was requested from the TCC project team to provide the commission with a summary of the meeting held by NZTA VOS Committee and of the decisions it made with regards to CMM project IBC, as well as outline proposed next steps with project delivery.

DISCUSSION

IBC feedback from NZTA Value, Outcome & Standards (VOS) Committee

7. At the time of drafting this report the VOS committee minutes were unavailable, however below is a summary of the NZTA VOS Committee discussion received from NZTA.
8. The Committee noted the importance of the Connecting Mount Maunganui project in connection with the wider Tauranga network.
9. It was noted that the project is facing funding priority risks. The Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) in the IBC was 0.3-0.6 - with a level of investment of \$500-\$550m (P95 estimate). Concerns were raised around the low BCR, affordability, and deliverability.

10. The Committee expressed their desire to see a staged approach proposed to guide the future development of the CMM project and associated implementation phases. This includes consideration of whether certain elements can be delivered as standalone components with subsequent review, while acknowledging the long timeframe for delivery of the recommended programme and the associated uncertainties of the future.
11. The Committee recommended working closely with the assurance team to provide advice on the recommended approach.
12. The Committee suggested to provide the NZTA Board with options as per the above recommendations when the proposal is ready to take forward.
13. Should further work be required on the IBC, the Committee suggested that a modest CSA can be considered by the NZTA National Manager Programme and Standards.
14. The Committee advocated to assess the level of benefit that a lower cost balanced option could provide. This could be compared to the shortlisted options, to confirm the recommended option. They suggested the use of comparable incremental analysis.
15. Should the recommended option be confirmed as the optimal response, the Committee advised to:
 - (a) Undertake a staging assessment of the recommended programme with an affordability lens and identify triggers for each stage.
 - (b) Consider a right sized approach to the next phase of project development.
 - (c) Submit VOS paper seeking IBC endorsement and approval of the next phase(s) funding and pathway.
16. If an alternative programme is identified as recommended (different to the current recommended option), the committee directed that the IBC is updated, and that the new option is submitted for the VOS approval.

Early Implementation Opportunities

17. As outlined in the draft IBC, the first proposed stage of project implementation (Horizon 1) is to reduce congestion on Hewletts Road by:
 - (a) connecting Te Maire Street to Newton Street as an alternative route; and
 - (b) amending intersections at Maru Street and Aerodrome Road to limit turning movements and give more green time to SH2 through traffic.
18. For the Te Maire Street extension, land for this connection is already owned by Council. Works would involve an extension of the industrial road by approx. 140m including a new intersection at Newton Street. Currently all access to/from businesses on Maru Street, Macrae Ave, Te Maire St and Hutton PI needs to use the Maru Street / Hewletts Road intersection. This Te Maire St extension and Newton St connection would provide an alternative link which will reduce traffic flows on SH2 Hewletts Road.
19. Whilst NZTA progress the broader project Business Case it is intended that TCC will likely be responsible for delivery for this first component of works on the local road network.
20. Early estimates are that delivery of Horizon 1 activities will cost approx. \$3m-\$5m. NZTA co-funding for implementation of this first phase of works has not yet been confirmed. It is anticipated that NZTA funding approvals for pre-implementation and implementation of Horizon 1 activities will be sought in conjunction with the IBC approval, however alternative opportunities to expedite funding approvals will also be explored.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

21. In addition to funding in this 2023/24 FY for Councils cost-share of the Indicative Business Case, \$37.95m capital expenditure is currently budgeted in the draft 2024-34 LTP to progress Council share of next steps of the Connecting Mount Maunganui programme

including the proposed Detailed Business Case as well as implementation of early stages. Budgets are outlined below:

Project	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	...	32/33	33/34	Total (\$'000)
Connecting Mount Maunganui (123653)	\$2,050	\$5,513	\$4,971	\$4,948		\$10,188	\$10,286	\$37,956

Note/ these costs are for TCC cost share to the overall project – and are budgeted assuming external co-funding from NZTA at 51% Financial Assistance Rate

22. In addition to funding within the 2024-34 LTP period \$253m is forecast in the period from 2035 to 2039 to a total implementation estimate of \$291m for Council components of the project (noting that it is anticipated this will be co-funded at 51% FAR).
23. It is anticipated that the Detailed Business Case phase will confirm the implementation programme and associated financial phasing, which will be further reported to Council as developed.

NEXT STEPS

24. The VOS Committee acknowledged that there are substantial local interests in the CMM project and that it has the potential to be considered as part of a City Deal. This opportunity will be further explored as part of the IBC review and update.
25. The Committee also confirmed the following as the next steps for the NZTA project team, namely:
 - (a) Prepare a detailed scope of work to address these actions and instruct work to commence as soon as practical.
 - (b) Once scoped and priced by the consultant, confirm whether a Price Level Adjustment is necessary. It is anticipated that the additional work can be completed within the existing IBC budget.
 - (c) Once scoped and the consultant is engaged, confirm programme to complete the additional actions and resubmit a VOS paper.
26. This project is very well aligned with the draft GPS 2024, however, because of its current low BCR, funding prioritisation within the NLTP may prove to be challenging. NZTA have advised funding for the next project phase(s) cannot be confirmed until the 24/27 NLTP is released in late 2024.
27. Once the actions set out by VOS Committee are completed the IBC will be updated including reconfirming the recommended programme and submitting to VOS.
28. A report will be provided to Council on the updated IBC following VOS review, prior to seeking NZTA board approval (incl. funding approvals for next steps).

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

11.8 Final Council-Controlled Organisations' Statements of Intent for 2024-2027

File Number: A15865042

Author: Sanjana France, CCO Specialist

Authoriser: Gareth Wallis, General Manager: City Development & Partnerships

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the final Statements of Intent 2024 to 2027 for five of Tauranga City Council's seven council-controlled organisations: Bay Venues Limited, Tauranga Art Gallery Trust, Tourism Bay of Plenty, Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited and Te Manawataki o Te Papa Charitable Trust. These are required by the Local Government Act (2002).
2. This report also seeks approval for minor remuneration changes for the Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited Directors and Chair.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Final Council-Controlled Organisations' Statements of Intent for 2024-2027".
- (b) Receives and approves Bay Venues Limited's final Statement of Intent 2024 to 2027 (Attachment 1).
- (c) Receives and approves Tauranga Art Gallery Trust's final Statement of Intent 2024 to 2027 (Attachment 3).
- (d) Receives and approves Tourism Bay of Plenty's final Statement of Intent 2024 to 2027 (Attachment 5).
- (e) Notes that Western Bay of Plenty District Council, as joint shareholder, has already received and approved Tourism Bay of Plenty's final Statement of Intent 2024 to 2027 at their Council meeting on 4 April 2024.
- (f) Receives and approves Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited's final Statement of Intent 2024 to 2027 (Attachment 7).
- (g) Receives and approves Te Manawataki o Te Papa Charitable Trust's final Statement of Intent 2024 to 2027 (Attachment 9).
- (h) Approves a minor board member remuneration increase for the Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited's Directors and Chair.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. Bay Venues Limited (Bay Venues), Tauranga Art Gallery Trust (TAGT), Tourism Bay of Plenty (TBOP), Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited (TMOTPL), Te Manawataki o Te Papa Charitable Trust (Charitable Trust), Bay of Plenty Local Authority Shared Services Limited (BOPLASS), and the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) are council-controlled organisations and as such, are required to prepare a Statement of Intent (SOI) and provide a copy to their shareholder, Tauranga City Council (TCC), by 30 June each year.
4. In consideration of the upcoming local government elections in July 2024, the timeframes have been brought forward for the SOIs 2024-25 to 2026-27 for the five council-controlled organisations noted in the resolutions above, which are all attached to this report. Council requested the drafts were provided by 19 January 2024 and the final versions by 30 April 2024, rather than the standard legislative timeframes of 1 March and 30 June respectively.

5. BOPLASS and LGFA are also required by the Local Government Act (2002) to provide draft Statements of Intent to cover the next three financial years to their shareholders by 1 March each year. As TCC is one of several shareholder members of BOPLASS and LGFA, it is not expected that we provide them with Letters of Expectation, nor do we provide feedback to their draft SOIs, unless there are areas of significant concern. They will both provide their final SOIs by the standard 30 June deadline.
6. Draft SOIs for Bay Venues, TAGT, TBOP, TMOTPL, and the Charitable Trust were considered by Council on 12 February 2024 and feedback was provided to their boards.
7. After receiving and considering Council's feedback on their draft SOI, the boards of Bay Venues, TAGT, TBOP, TMOTPL, and the Charitable Trust have adopted their final SOIs.
8. An analysis of each council-controlled organisations' final SOI was undertaken. For Bay Venues, TAGT, TBOP and TMOTPL, this was done with reference to the shareholder feedback provided in February to assess whether Council's suggestions were considered further.
9. The final SOI for TBOP was also considered and accepted in full by their joint shareholder Western Bay of Plenty District Council at their Council Committee meeting on 4 April 2024.
10. All five council-controlled organisations' SOIs meet the statutory requirements as outlined in Schedule 8, Section 9 of the Local Government Act (2002).
11. A minor increase to TMOTPL board members' remuneration is also being sought, to reflect the increased scope of their governance roles since their original remuneration was set on 3 April 2023.

BACKGROUND

Consideration of SOI

12. In accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, council-controlled organisations are required to provide their final SOI to Council by 30 June each year, or 30 April as an exception this year. The SOI document is intended to cover the next three financial years.
13. Council considered the draft SOI for Bay Venues, TAGT, TBOP, BOPLASS, and LGFA at a Council meeting on 12 February 2024, and the shareholder's feedback was provided to each council-controlled organisations' board.
14. The council-controlled organisations are required to consider Council's comments on the draft SOI prior to submitting their final SOI each year.
15. TAGT, TBOP and TMOTPL met the requested 30 April 2024 deadline. Bay Venues' and the Charitable Trust's SOIs were received on 6 and 1 May 2024 respectively.
16. An overview of the key changes from the draft to final SOIs are outlined in paragraphs 17 to 29 below. The council-controlled organisations have all updated parts of their SOI to reflect the feedback from Council.

Bay Venues Limited (Bay Venues) SOI

17. Staff are satisfied that the Bay Venues Board have considered Council's shareholder feedback in their final SOI, noting:
 - Community engagement, diversity initiatives and storytelling: Bay Venues have updated their *Community Outcomes* section and have also noted in their **Strategic Focus Areas**:
 - *"We have a strong focus on the recreation needs of our community and encouraging participation for diverse groups.*
 - *We actively look for opportunities; targeting new events and attracting new and diverse community activities through a Community Led Development approach.*
 - *We proactively share stories from our facilities celebrating our diverse community."*

- Opportunities to increase accessibility: Bay Venues have included in their **Strategic Focus Areas**, *“we are committed to engaging with our community to ensure our facilities are inclusive and accessible and meet the needs of a diverse community.”* They also note in this section, *“we provide facilities for our community that are welcoming, accessible, and inclusive.”*
 - Co-branding and signage: Under their **Strategic Focus Areas**, Bay Venues note that they will *“recognise council funding of facilities through co-branding and will update signage over time.”*
18. In the **Our Key Projects and Initiatives** section, Bay Venues have noted that their key projects and initiatives change annually and their Financial Year 2026 and 2027 KPIs will be updated prior to each year.
19. Bay Venues’ final SOI is provided at Attachment 1, and a copy of Council’s shareholder feedback letter at Attachment 2.

Tauranga Art Gallery Trust (TAGT) SOI

20. Staff are satisfied that the TAGT Board have considered Council’s shareholder feedback in their final SOI, noting:
- TAGT have highlighted their partnership role with Council in the Te Manawataki o Te Papa civic development project, alongside the notable opportunities and financial investment involved. The **Nature and Scope of Activity** and **The Future and Beyond** sections of their SOI note their support of, and commitment to, the project, plus detail financial and operational arrangements.
 - TAGT’s objectives and budget have been revised to reflect the Art Gallery closure period through to approximately April 2025.
 - TAGT have responded to Council’s request to review the figures they have provided in their budgets.
 - The Social Return on Investment work and commentary around how it will inform future performance measures, has not been incorporated into TAGT’s final SOI.
21. TAGT’s final SOI is provided at Attachment 3, and a copy of Council’s shareholder feedback letter is provided at Attachment 4.

Tourism Bay of Plenty (TBOP) SOI

22. Staff are satisfied that the TBOP Board have considered Council’s shareholder feedback in their final SOI, noting:
- TBOP intend to retain the Flavours of Plenty Festival, *“as a key in-house marketing platform for local businesses to leverage and support sustainable partnerships.”* This is a slightly different approach to TCC’s shareholder feedback and TBOP notes they are keen to see the platform grow, so are seeking funding from multiple sources.
 - TBOP will measure the impact of the tourism industry across the four wellbeing areas (where data is available) and use the information to inform actions. This social licence research will include determining cruise value proposition and stakeholder perceptions as a key project.
 - TBOP have noted that they will elevate Māori cultural tourism offerings by:
 - Supporting new and existing Māori cultural operators and developments to provide authentic cultural experiences to visitors.
 - Incorporating cultural histories and stories into digital storytelling and wayfinding platforms managed by TBOP.
 - TBOP will continue to update their website with wayfinding and accessibility options, and encourage operators to look at universal design options to enhance accessible tourism offerings.
 - The Omanawa Falls Project is not specifically mentioned in their final SOI.

23. TBOP's final SOI is provided at Attachment 5, and a copy of Council's shareholder feedback letter is provided at Attachment 6.

Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited (TMOTPL) SOI

24. TMOTPL was established, registered as a company, had a board appointed, and began operations in early 2023. They have submitted their second final SOI, which outlines their intentions for governing the delivery of the Te Manawataki o Te Papa civic development project.
25. Staff are satisfied that the TMOTPL Board have considered Council's shareholder feedback in their final SOI, including:
- In the **Key Project Actions Section**, it is noted that *"TMOTPL will only undertake the responsibility of delivering additional projects (outside of the current programme of works), upon receiving instruction to proceed, provided at a Council meeting."*
 - The Governance to Governance forums are highlighted as pivotal opportunities to enhance collaborative and transparent relationships with Council in the **Key Project Actions Section**.
 - Social procurement is also highlighted in the **Key Project Actions Section**, where it is noted that TMOTPL will, *"provide local procurement opportunities where practical and commercially feasible, for local stakeholders including mana whenua."*
26. TMOTPL's final SOI is provided at Attachment 7, and a copy of Council's shareholder feedback letter is provided at Attachment 8.

Te Manawataki o Te Papa Charitable Trust (Charitable Trust) SOI

27. Te Manawataki o Te Papa Charitable Trust, the joint land ownership of Te Manawataki o Te Papa between Council and the Otamataha Trust, which was established in 2023, has submitted its second final SOI (Attachment 9).
28. The SOI remains very similar to the previous inaugural SOI as the Charitable Trust's direction and intentions remain the same.
29. The reference to a cultural advisor or liaison has been updated in the final SOI, in response to Council's shareholder feedback.

Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited (TMOTPL) board member remuneration

30. On 3 April 2023, Council approved remuneration for the Directors of Te Manawataki o Te Papa Limited of \$40,000 per annum and \$80,000 per annum for the Chair.
31. Over the past year, TMOTPL board members have all had a significantly increased scope from their original remit when remuneration was originally set.
32. It is requested that from 1 July 2024, the Directors' remuneration be increased to \$45,000 per annum, and the Chair's to \$90,000 per annum, to reflect the additional responsibilities and scope of work that have been added to their portfolio since inception.

STRATEGIC / STATUTORY CONTEXT

33. The SOI is a key governance and planning document. Engaging with each council-controlled organisation throughout the development of the annual SOI is one of the ways Council can influence the entity across its work programme.
34. The SOI development and feedback process is a key mechanism for Council to ensure alignment with its strategic community outcomes.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

35. Budgets for Bay Venues, TAGT and TBOP, including Tauranga City Council's contributions, are included in their final SOIs.
36. The increased remuneration for TMOTPL board members is outlined above.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / RISKS

37. The council-controlled organisations have met their legislative requirements outlined in Schedule 8, Section 9 of the Local Governance Act (2002).
38. Staff believe that there is no strong justification for Council to require additional changes to the SOIs that have been signed off by the boards as their final documents.

CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT

39. It is not required or expected to consult on a SOI or board member remuneration under the Local Government Act.

SIGNIFICANCE

40. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
41. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
 - (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
 - (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the decision; and
 - (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.
42. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the decision is of medium significance.

ENGAGEMENT










43. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of medium significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

Click here to view the [TCC Significance and Engagement Policy](#)

NEXT STEPS

44. Following approval from Council, a copy of the resolutions from this meeting will be provided to the five council-controlled organisations.
45. The approved SOIs will be made available to the public via the Tauranga City Council website.
46. The TMOTPL board members will be advised of the relevant changes to their remuneration.
47. BOPLASS and LGFA final SOIs will be presented to a later Council meeting, after they are received by 30 June, in line with the standard timeframes.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Bay Venues - Final Statement of Intent 2024 to 2027 - A15920120 (Separate Attachments 1) 
2. Bay Venues - Shareholder Feedback to the Draft Statement of Intent 2024-25 to 2026-27 - A15920392 (Separate Attachments 1) 
3. TAGT - Final Statement of Intent 2024-2027 - A15920127 (Separate Attachments 1) 
4. TAGT - Shareholder Feedback to the Draft Statement of Intent 2024-25 to 2026-27 - A15920418 (Separate Attachments 1) 
5. TBOP - Final Statement of Intent 2024-2027 - A15920128 (Separate Attachments 1) 
6. TBOP - Shareholder Feedback to the Draft SOI 2024-25 to 2026-27 - A15920382 (Separate Attachments 1) 
7. TMOTPL Final Statement of Intent 2024-2027 - A15920129 (Separate Attachments 1) 
8. TMOTPL - Shareholder Feedback to the Draft Statement of Intent 2024-25 to 2026-27 - A15920372 (Separate Attachments 1) 
9. 2024-27 TMOTP Charitable Trust - Final Statement of Intent - A15436131 (Separate Attachments 1) 

12 DISCUSSION OF LATE ITEMS

13 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION

Resolution to exclude the public

RECOMMENDATIONS

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
13.1 - Public Excluded Minutes of the Council meeting held on 29 April 2024	<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>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)(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, 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>	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
13.2 - Memorial Park Aquatic Facility Procurement Update	<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>	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
13.3 - Appointment of Hearings Panel for Variation 1 (Tauriko	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural	s48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of

West) to Proposed Plan Change 33, Proposed Plan Change 34 (Belk Road Rural Residential) and Proposed Plan Change 35 (Tauriko Business Estate Stage 4)	persons	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
13.4 - Development Feasibility and Optioneering for Residual Papamoa East Interchange Land	<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>	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
13.5 - Airport Precinct Close out Report	<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>	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
13.6 - Exemption from Open Competition	s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	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
13.7 - Cameron Road Stage 2 - Procurement and Programme Progression	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	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

14 CLOSING KARAKIA