



# **MINUTES**

**Ordinary Council meeting  
Monday, 19 August 2024**

**Order of Business**

<b>1</b>	<b>Opening karakia</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Public forum</b> .....	<b>3</b>
	3.1 Nigel Tutt, Priority One - Te Manawataki o Te Papa .....	3
	3.2 Puhirake Ihaka, Otamataha Trust - Te Manawataki o Te Papa .....	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Acceptance of late items</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Confidential business to be transferred into the open</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Change to the order of business</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Confirmation of minutes</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	Nil	
<b>8</b>	<b>Declaration of conflicts of interest</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Deputations, presentations, petitions</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	Nil	
<b>10</b>	<b>Recommendations from other committees</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	Nil	
<b>11</b>	<b>Business</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	11.1 Briefing to Incoming Council - Update .....	5
	11.2 Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financial (IFF) Resubmission and Library / Community Hub Contract .....	7
<b>12</b>	<b>Discussion of late items</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Public excluded session</b> .....	<b>13</b>
	Confidential Attachment 4 11.2 - Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financial (IFF) Resubmission and Library / Community Hub Contract.....	13
	Confidential Attachment 4 11.2 - Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financial (IFF) Resubmission and Library / Community Hub Contract.....	13
<b>14</b>	<b>Closing karakia</b> .....	<b>14</b>

**MINUTES OF TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL  
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD AT THE BAY OF PLENTY REGIONAL COUNCIL CHAMBERS,  
REGIONAL HOUSE, 1 ELIZABETH STREET, TAURANGA  
ON MONDAY, 19 AUGUST 2024 AT 9.30AM**

**PRESENT:** Mayor Mahé Drysdale (Chairperson), Deputy Mayor Jen Scoular, Cr Glen Crowther, Cr Rick Curach, Cr Steve Morris, Cr Marten Rozeboom, Cr Kevin Schuler, Cr Rod Taylor

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Marty Grenfell (Chief Executive), Paul Davidson (Chief Financial Officer), Barbara Dempsey (General Manager: Community Services), Nic Johansson (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), Mike Naude (Director of Civic Development), Coral Hair (Manager: Democracy & Governance Services), Anahera Dinsdale (Acting Team Leader: Governance Services) and Aimee Aranas (Governance Advisor)

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE:** Cr Mikaere Sydney

**EXTERNAL:** Nigel Tutt (Priority One) and Puhirake Ihaka (Otamataha Trust)

## 1 OPENING KARAKIA

Puhirake Ihaka opened the meeting with a karakia.

## 2 APOLOGIES

### APOLOGY

#### RESOLUTION CO17/24/1

Moved: Cr Steve Morris

Seconded: Cr Kevin Schuler

That the apology for absence received from Cr Hautapu Baker be accepted.

**CARRIED**

## 3 PUBLIC FORUM

### 3.1 Nigel Tutt, Priority One - Te Manawataki o Te Papa

- It was acknowledged that the decisions around this contract were difficult, in particular at such an early stage in the new Council's tenure.
- Developers had a lot of confidence in where Tauranga's Central Business District (CBD) was

heading which was important in terms of their decisions to further invest in the city.

- Council could be viewed as an unreliable business partner in the future if it were to delay or cancel investments/developments with its partnered business entities. This was seen as a high risk.
- If the work being done at Te Manawataki o Te Papa (TMoTP) was reduced, it would send a signal to the many businesses that had made the decision to return to the CBD that it was not the place to be.
- Retail was the last sector to return to the CBD and there needed to be developments to support this to increase foot traffic which would allow the sector to thrive.
- Priority One shared the vision for the future of the city and was here to help.

### **In response to questions**

- Foot traffic was generally difficult to quantify, however more office workers in the CBD and visitors to TMoTP would increase this.

## **3.2 Puhirake Ihaka, Otamataha Trust - Te Manawataki o Te Papa**

- Otamataha Trust was a whenua Māori trust consisting of two hapū, Ngāti Tapu and Ngāi Tamarāwaho, who historically and traditionally held the mana whenua of this area for the last 600 to 700 years.
- The relationship with Tauranga City Council (TCC) started around 24 years ago when the 'Tangata Whenua Collective' was established between all tangata whenua and TCC, within TCC's rohe.
- Mana whenua believed the important CBD relationships, in terms of how issues were dealt with, had greatly improved.
- Discussions began with the Commissioners three and a half years ago and the concept of rebuilding the CBD was considered. Mana whenua were invited to put their stamp on the project as a whole, in terms of the kaupapa and the concept that it should help and benefit not only tangata whenua but the community as a whole.
- The project was given the name 'Te Manawataki o Te Papa', which meant the 'beating heart of Te Papa' as it was felt the heart was the centre and the beginning and everything should come from that place.
- Mana whenua participation included offering cultural advice in terms of features of buildings, their design and use. Entwined within this was the objective to ensure that not only tangata whenua Māori, but the entire Tauranga Moana community, was part of this concept. It was believed that this objective had been achieved to date in terms of making it a beating heart of new civic centre/precinct for the city for everyone.
- The history of the city from a Māori and non-Māori point of view had been honoured and blended together in terms of design features.
- Mana whenua were proud to be associated with this project and believed it to be a resounding success to date.

### **In response to questions**

- Mana whenua had learned to be patient, have endurance and be flexible when dealing with central and local Government. It was felt that even if the project was to be stalled or redesigned, mana whenua would still hold its place and have a part to play regardless of the plan.
- The Trust was half share co-owners of the property and held it very dear because of their emotional attachment to it.

## **4 ACCEPTANCE OF LATE ITEMS**

Nil

## 5 CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS TO BE TRANSFERRED INTO THE OPEN

### RESOLUTION CO17/24/2

Moved: Cr Steve Morris  
Seconded: Cr Glen Crowther

That the Council:

Transfers confidential attachments 1 and 2 to item 11.1 "Briefing to Incoming Council – update" into the open with immediate effect:

1. Attachment 1 – 'Project Funding Updates Council Report to Council 11 July 2024'; and
2. Attachment 2 – 'Council Resolutions 11 July 2024'.

**CARRIED**

## 6 CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS

Nil

## 7 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Nil

## 8 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil

## 9 DEPUTATIONS, PRESENTATIONS, PETITIONS

Nil

## 10 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

Nil

## 11 BUSINESS

### 11.1 Briefing to Incoming Council - Update

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

#### Key points

- The report provided an update on matters that the previous Council thought were of strategic importance that needed to be handed over to the incoming Council, and an update on the two matters of significance that unexpectedly arose since the previous report was provided: the Te Manawataki o Te Papa (TMoTP) funding levy and Cameron Road Stage 2 (CRS2).
- There was a separate report on the agenda relating to TMoTP financing.
- CRS2 was an urban transformation project that aligned very strongly with the Government's housing growth strategy and needed to be completed to ensure full benefits of use in conjunction with Stage 1. If this project did not proceed the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund (IAF) funding of \$68 million, provided by the Government as a grant, would be forfeited.

- When staff were advised that the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) Board did not support the CRS2 business case, as it did not fully align with the Government Policy Statement (GPS), an action plan was developed which has been implemented.
- Council was trying to achieve two things: step one to get the business case for CRS2 approved by the NZTA Board and step two to secure funding through the funding streams that the Government has to enable the project to proceed.

### **In response to questions**

- Some of the benefits of Stage 2 were starting to be unlocked with the bus and cycle lanes being used more and improvements at intersections enabling buses to go through quickly.
- In terms of the total corridor, the cycleway needed to be completed to provide a consistently safe route for cycling, especially for schools and hospital workers. People did not feel safe and were therefore not using this method of transport. The bus route needed to be completed entirely so that it had priority all along the corridor.
- The cost/benefit ratio came from the NZTA investment framework that stipulated that for NZTA to invest in a project, it had to have a cost/benefit ratio above 1. NZTA looked at specific parts of benefits such as travel time, congestion and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions which were then calculated into benefits. It did not include broader benefits such as better business access and future developments.
- It was thought there would be no clear decision on CRS2 by the end of the year as staff would be working on the updated business case. Due to this, the Council could be certain that the National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) would be exclusive of CRS2. There could however be variations to the NLTF within its three years of implementation.
- There had been no indication that cost/benefit ratios would be pushed up by the Government. The Minister of Housing supported transport corridors that delivered in a manner that supported housing intensity. The CRS2 corridor strongly supported housing intensity.
- Non-specific transport related cost/benefits were things such as future development and access to businesses and these were not calculated in NZTA's cost/benefit 'as per the manual' but were nevertheless benefits to the city. Council measured these non-specific transport related cost/benefits as it was important and beneficial to look at both.
- Any impact on the Long Term Plan (LTP) depended on what the ramifications of a change in the funding plan might be. In terms of the project itself, there would be no significant change to levels of service, so no change would need to be made to the LTP. However, if the funding mix was altered significantly, it could potentially trigger the need to consult or look at changes in funding.
- It was acknowledged that Council could have done better in terms of the delivery of Cameron Road Stage 1. A review of the entire process was undertaken by Tucker and Dallow. One of their recommendations was that Council establish a dedicated 'Major Projects Unit'. This had been established and a joint delivery set up for the five major transport projects across the city to deliver at a level that historically Council had not had the capability to do. This was the biggest transport project ever managed and as such was not 'business as usual'. The focus team was overseen by a panel of three senior transport experts who had been involved in large scale transport projects across the country, adding value to the way these projects were delivered.
- A breakdown of the costs to ratepayers for Cameron Road Stage 1 could be provided to Councillors.
- The business case was deferred twice to the NZTA Board at their direction.
- Council had entered into a variation of its funding from the particular branch at Kāinga Ora that dealt with this funding, to extend contract milestones for delivery to September 2024. The day after this variation was signed with Kāinga Ora, notification was received from NZTA that the business case had not been approved. The next step was to engage further with Kāinga Ora and look at other funding sources where benefits to Kāinga Ora would be delivered.

**Discussion points raised**

- Council wanted to deliver value for money and align with the new Government Policy Statement on land transport.
- The Infrastructure Acceleration Fund funding of \$68m was important as it helped deliver value for money.

**RESOLUTION CO17/24/3**

Moved: Cr Glen Crowther

Seconded: Cr Marten Rozeboom

That the Council:

- Receives the report "Briefing to Incoming Council - Update".
- Formally receives the "Briefing to Incoming Council" prepared and adopted by the previous Council.
- Notes that Attachments 1 and 2 were transferred into the open section at the start of the meeting.
- Notes the Action Plan to continue to seek endorsement of a business case and ultimately secure funding for Cameron Road Stage 2, (as outlined in paragraph 16 of the 'Briefing to Incoming Council – Update' report).
- Note that a further report will be presented to Council on an endorsement or otherwise of the business case for Cameron Road Stage 2.

**CARRIED**

## **11.2 Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financial (IFF) Resubmission and Library / Community Hub Contract**

**Staff** Marty Grenfell, Chief Executive  
Christine Jones, General Manager: Strategy, Growth & Governance  
Paul Davidson, Chief Financial Officer

- Tabled Item 1: PowerPoint Presentation: What is the 'Infrastructure Funding and Financial Model' (IFF)
- Revised wording to recommendations: d, j, l and m of this report (in red).
- Tabled Item 2: Attachment 5 (to be tabled in the public excluded section of the meeting): 'Theoretical Termination Cost Advice' from Rider Levett Bucknall (RLB).

**Key points**

- IFF was a legislative financing tool that came under the Infrastructure Financing and Funding Act 2020, was an off-balance sheet debt that was a levy paid by the benefiting/city wide residents and appeared as a separate line item on rates bills.
- It was facilitated through Crown Infrastructure Partners and had a higher borrowing rate as it was not funded through the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) and used to maintain an investment programme with our constrained balance sheet that provided certainty and transparency for ratepayers over 30 years.
- Current IFF transactions included transport residential and commercial and Te Manawataki o Te Papa.
- Recent changes included an announcement from the Government on 8 August 2024 regarding the ability of the LGFA to lend directly to waters entities with immediate effect and a bespoke lending arrangement for growth councils by application which would increase the limit from 280% to up to 350% of debt to revenue ratio.
- In the current year the debt on the balance sheet was \$54M with rating impact of borrowing for Te Manawataki o Te Papa (TMOTP) at \$1.5M to find funding for.

- In 2026 the IFF levy was removed and could be replaced with a targeted rate or changes to the capital programme are used to fund it.
- To note was that the recommendations had been updated due to new information received since the agenda was published. The recommendations had been updated (in red) to reflect that Council would not proceed with the IFF levy at this point in time, which provided flexibility in the event there were potential implications on credit ratings for TCC and LGFA and what that would mean for borrowing costs. This could then be brought back to Council.
- Breaches of limits were not forecast until the end of the calendar year. If the shareholder vote at LGFA was not favourable then this would come back with options at that point in time.
- There was a need for a decision on the Chief Executive delegation to be made today as the contractor was unable to continue on site after this week without the contract being signed.

### **In response to questions**

- The outgoing Council had to complete a Long Term Plan (LTP) earlier than other councils and this had to include the assumption that three waters was included. An LTP with a capital programme within the debt levels with water included was prepared, knowing it was likely there would be some solution that would exclude three waters with some sort of debt arrangement.
- Some different approaches were taken within the LTP, one example being growth, where a series of principles were adopted around land that was already zoned for residential or business land, but no infrastructure was in place, that infrastructure was included in the LTP.
- Some projects were removed from the LTP to remove expenditure, such as Te Tumu, as the land acquisition was not secure and a plan change had not been progressed so zoning time frames and infrastructure requirements were not known.
- It was important to note that with three waters out, the decision on including capital expenditure would come back to the Council. Noting that even with greater balance sheet capacity, the ability to pay for any expenditure was a factor to consider.
- \$151M would require a consultation process to introduce a targeted rate but would probably not trigger an amendment to the LTP.
- Costs were higher under the IFF and lower under the LGFA due to lower borrowing costs and there would be an interest saving that would be passed onto the ratepayers, likely to drop by 1%.
- The Commission used IFF for transport and TMO TP funding because at the time, the balance sheet issues meant there was no capacity to fund these projects within the debt to revenue limits.

### **Discussion points raised**

- It was acknowledged this was a big decision for the new Council so early on in its term and that these were projects inherited from the Commissioners.
- There were significant risks to ratepayers if this project was paused or changed.
- The decision making around the IFF was forced due to a lack of headroom on the balance sheet. It was felt this was not a good way to make decisions.
- While IFF as a tool did have a place, improvements to the IFF model to make it easier and cheaper to use had been provided to the Government.
- Council needed to be prudent with its debt and affordability to enable better options. A debt was a debt whether a levy or debt on balance sheet.
- Recent Government announcements had provided some breathing space for Council which provided an opportunity to make good decisions.
- The LGFA funding was a better solution than the IFF levy which locked in potentially higher interest rates over a long period of time.
- Council needed to invest in and revitalise its Central Business District and enable confidence in Council that it did what it said it was going to do.

### **Further questions of clarification**

The Chief Executive provided the following responses:



- The most accurate and detailed information available to elected members was that provided by RLB in Tabled Item 2: Attachment 5 (in the public excluded section of the meeting).
- There were commercial, legal and contractual sensitivities to any decision that Council made today, including negotiating information in the event that Council found itself in a dispute.
- The amount and cost delay was significant and the public should have some indication of this figure. A high level broad brush dollar figure and cost delay or deferral could be provided, however that decision would not be made today.
- Preliminary discussions on deferring, delaying or cancelling their contracts were had with contractors Willis Bond and LG McGuinness however, at that stage, this was speculation, and it was unlikely these contractors would be able to put a number on costs.
- Council had a policy that addressed the process around how contingencies and escalation costs were spent. The Chief Executive would bring this policy to Council for change and endorsement.

The Director of Civic Development provided the following responses:

- RLB was Council's quantity surveyor for the entire project and had worked with Willis Bond and LG McGuinness reviewing their tenders and understood where things were at with the Letters of Instruction. As such, they were the best company to provide assurance that the figures in confidential Tabled Item 1 were accurate and correct.
- To note and be aware of was that there were a number of exclusions in the attachments and potential financial impact of those should Council not proceed with the contracts.

The Chief Financial Officer provided the following responses:

- Council had more than enough asset sales to cover the amount of external fundings. The combination of money from water reform, TECT, parking and airport activities and asset sales exceeded the amount of \$150M external funding that was required.
- Whether to dispose of parking buildings went out for separate consultation, the result of which was a decision to hold onto the parking buildings. Money generated through parking activity was based on forecast growth in city centre numbers and parking rates which meant this money would be coming into Council.

#### **Further discussion points raised**

- From a transparency and value perspective, there were benefits to move out of IFF into the LGFA. A cheaper funding method was positive.
- Decisions made today were about adding value for the people of Tauranga and progressing a project people had been consulted on.
- This was a key milestone for the TMoTP project and it was time for the incoming Council to understand the funding, financing and project costs, which were considered uncertain at the time the decisions were made by the previous Council.
- An amendment was proposed to understand the funding in place for various projects in the Long Term Plan 2024-34 and to provide transparency around the funding of TMoTP and other major projects, including debt figures.
- The amendment asked staff for an issues and options paper on a potential 2024-34 Long Term Plan Amendment process.
- Concern was expressed with the additional cost to ratepayers for this project.
- There was an opportunity cost to prioritising the TMoTP project that would mean funding would not be available for other projects in the city.
- The Council had the option to delay the TMoTP project.
- Substantial sunk costs, that would be non-recoverable if the Council was to stop this project, was a major factor to be considered when making the decision.
- The Council needed to consider the reputational damage to the Council if the TMoTP project was delayed or cancelled.
- Confident that the project as it stood now was currently on time and on budget and approval today would see this continue.

- Private development of over \$1B in the CBD had come from the confidence that the developers had taken because the Council was reinvigorating areas of the CBD. Ultimately private money would fund the revitalisation of the CBD, with Council playing a contributing role.
- Changes were made to the wording of substantive resolution (j) to add the word “additional” to the operational budget \$1.54 million to service the additional debt borrowing and the following explanation was added “notes that the IFF levy charge previously commencing 1 July 2025 will not occur and result in a net saving to ratepayers”.
- An additional substantive resolution (m) was included that “Notes that the policy on the project contingency be reported back to Council for approval.”
- The substantive motion was taken in parts with (j) (renumbered to (q)) voted on separately. This related to the authorisation for the Chief Executive to enter the main construction contract with LT McGuinness Ltd for the Library and Community Hub.

### A MOTION WAS PROPOSED

Moved: Mayor Mahé Drysdale

Seconded: Councillor Taylor

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financial (IFF) Resubmission and Library / Community Hub Contract".

#### **Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financing (IFF) Levy**

- (b) Confirms that Council will not continue to use an IFF Levy as a financing and funding tool for Te Manawataki o Te Papa at this time.
- (c) Proceeds to secure approval through Local Government Funding Agency for increased debt covenants for Tauranga City Council.
- (d) Notes that in the absence of an approval for an increase in debt covenants by 30 November 2024, or further evaluation of the impacts on credit ratings impacts negatively on Councils borrowing costs, Council will receive a further report on potential financing and funding options within the borrowing limits that are current at that time.
- (e) Notes that the IFF levy which was planned to be introduced on 1 July 2025 will no longer occur.
- (f) Approves the transfer of previously off balance sheet borrowing of \$54 million to on balance sheet borrowing recognising that this will now be financed through the LGFA and not the IFF financing model.
- (g) Approves a 2024/25 additional operational budget of up to \$1.54 million being the amount of funding required to service additional debt borrowing based on the estimated cash flow and notes that the IFF levy charge previously commencing 1 July 2025 will not occur and result in a net saving to ratepayers.
- (h) Notes this overspend will be managed through other operational savings, however in the absence of these being fully achieved, this would be reported back to Council.
- (i) Confirms there will be sufficient funds available to fund the capital costs of Te Manawataki o Te Papa, noting that the Council has the option to achieve this by:
  - (i) Introduction of a rate (targeted or otherwise) commencing from 1 July 2025; and/or
  - (ii) Reprioritisation (including changes in scale and timing) of the capital programme from 1 July 2025 onwards.

**Construction contract**

- (j) Authorises the Chief Executive to enter the main construction contract with LT McGuiness Ltd for the Library and Community Hub in accordance with the parameters specified in confidential resolution (n).
- (k) Notes that the final Civic Whare, Exhibition and Museum (CWEM) contract will be presented to council towards the end of 2024, for consideration and approval or otherwise.

**Other**

- (l) Retains Attachments 4 and 5 in the public excluded section to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).
- (m) Attachments 4 and 5 can be transferred into the open on completion of the contract.

**AN AMENDMENT WAS PROPOSED**

Moved: Councillor Crowther

Seconded: Councillor Morris

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financial (IFF) Resubmission and Library / Community Hub Contract".
- (b) Notes the context of uncertain funding, financing and project costs, including but not limited to Te Manawataki o Te Papa and National Land Transport Funding for key Tauranga transport projects.
- (c) Requests staff to provide the 16 September Council meeting with updated 2024-34 Long Term Plan project budgets and a detailed financial report (including latest debt figures).
- (d) Requests staff to provide the 16 September Council meeting with an issues and options paper on a 2024-34 Long Term Plan amendment to be consulted on by 30 April, 2025.

**THE AMENDMENT WAS PUT AND CARRIED.****THE AMENDMENT WAS INCLUDED IN THE SUBSTANTIVE MOTION****THE SUBSTANTIVE MOTION WAS TAKEN IN TWO PARTS:****RESOLUTION CO17/24/4**

Moved: Mayor Mahé Drysdale

Seconded: Cr Rod Taylor

That the Council:

- (a) Receives the report "Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financial (IFF) Resubmission and Library / Community Hub Contract".
- (b) Notes the context of uncertain funding, financing and project costs, including but not limited to Te Manawataki o Te Papa and National Land Transport Funding for key Tauranga transport projects.
- (c) Requests staff to provide the 16 September Council meeting with updated 2024-34 Long Term Plan project budgets and a detailed financial report (including latest debt figures).

- (d) Requests staff to provide the 16 September Council meeting with an issues and options paper on a 2024-34 Long Term Plan amendment to be consulted on by 30 April 2025.

### **Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financing (IFF) Levy**

- (e) Confirms that Council will not continue to use an IFF Levy as a financing and funding tool for Te Manawataki o Te Papa at this time.
- (f) Proceeds to secure approval through Local Government Funding Agency for increased debt covenants for Tauranga City Council.
- (g) Notes that in the absence of an approval for an increase in debt covenants by 30 November 2024, or further evaluation of the impacts on credit ratings impacts negatively on Council's borrowing costs, Council will receive a further report on potential financing and funding options within the borrowing limits that are current at that time.
- (h) Notes that the IFF levy which was planned to be introduced on 1 July 2025 will no longer occur.
- (i) Approves the transfer of previously off balance sheet borrowing of \$54 million to on balance sheet borrowing recognising that this will now be financed through the LGFA and not the IFF financing model.
- (j) Approves a 2024/25 additional operational budget of up to \$1.54 million being the amount of funding required to service additional debt borrowing based on the estimated cash flow and notes that the IFF levy charge previously commencing 1 July 2025 will not occur and result in a net saving to ratepayers.
- (k) Notes this overspend will be managed through other operational savings, however in the absence of these being fully achieved, this would be reported back to Council.
- (l) Confirms there will be sufficient funds available to fund the capital costs of Te Manawataki o Te Papa, noting that the Council has the option to achieve this by:
- (i) Introduction of a rate (targeted or otherwise) commencing from 1 July 2025; and/or
  - (ii) Reprioritisation (including changes in scale and timing) of the capital programme from 1 July 2025 onwards.

### **Construction contract**

- (m) Notes that the policy on the project contingency be reported back to Council for approval.
- (n) Notes that the final Civic Whare, Exhibition and Museum (CWEM) contract will be presented to council towards the end of 2024, for consideration and approval or otherwise.

### **Other**

- (o) Retains Attachments 4 and 5 in the public excluded section to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).
- (p) Attachments 4 and 5 can be transferred into the open on completion of the contract.

A division was called and recorded as follows:

**In Favour:** Mayor Mahé Drysdale, Deputy Mayor Jen Scoular, Crs Glen Crowther, Rick Curach, Steve Morris, Marten Rozeboom, Kevin Schuler and Rod Taylor

**Against:** Nil

**CARRIED**

**RESOLUTION CO17/24/5**

Moved: Mayor Mahé Drysdale  
 Seconded: Cr Rod Taylor

That the Council:

- (q) Authorises the Chief Executive to enter the main construction contract with LT McGuiness Ltd for the Library and Community Hub in accordance with the parameters specified in confidential resolution (n).

A division was called and recorded as follows:

In Favour: Mayor Mahé Drysdale, Deputy Mayor Jen Scoular, Crs Steve Morris, Marten Rozeboom, Kevin Schuler and Rod Taylor

Against: Cr Rick Curach

Abstained: Cr Glen Crowther

Amended by Council resolution CO19/24/3 dated 26 September.2024

**CARRIED**

**12 DISCUSSION OF LATE ITEMS**

Nil

**13 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION**

**Resolution to exclude the public**

**RESOLUTION CO17/24/6**

Moved: Cr Marten Rozeboom  
 Seconded: Cr Kevin Schuler

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
Confidential Attachment 4 - 11.2 - Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and Financial (IFF) Resubmission and Library / Community Hub Contract Confidential C1 Twenty Two (David Lambie) advice re Contract Delayed Consequences	s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, 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)	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
Confidential Attachment 5 - 11.2 - Te Manawataki o Te Papa Infrastructure Funding and	s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or	s48(1)(a) the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of

<p>Financial (IFF) Resubmission and Library / Community Hub Contract - Confidential Rider Levett Bucknall Theoretical Termination Cost Advice</p>	<p>disadvantage, 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)</p>	<p>the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7</p>
---	---	--

**CARRIED**

**14 CLOSING KARAKIA**

Mr Puhirake Ihaka closed the meeting with a karakia.

**The meeting closed at 1:08 pm.**

**The minutes of this meeting were confirmed as a true and correct record at the Ordinary Council meeting held on 16 September 2024.**

.....  
 Mayor Mahé Drysdale  
**CHAIRPERSON**