

Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council

Me Heke Ki Pōneke

Ordinary Meeting of Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee Rārangi Take | Agenda

9:30 am Rātū, 17 Hakihea 2024

9:30 am Tuesday, 17 December 2024

Ngake (16.09), Level 16, Tahiwī

113 The Terrace

Pōneke | Wellington



KŌRAU TŌTŌPŪ | LONG-TERM PLAN, FINANCE, AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE 17 DECEMBER 2024

Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council
Me Heke Ki Pōneke

MEMBERSHIP

Mayor Whanau
Deputy Mayor Foon
Councillor Abdurahman
Councillor Apanowicz (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Brown
Councillor Calvert
Councillor Chung
Councillor Free
Pouiwi Hohaia
Pouiwi Kelly
Councillor Matthews (Chair)
Councillor McNulty
Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Pannett
Councillor Randle
Councillor Rogers
Councillor Wi Neera
Councillor Young

Have your say!

You can make a short presentation to the Councillors, Committee members, Subcommittee members or Community Board members at this meeting. Please let us know by noon the working day before the meeting. You can do this either by phoning 04-499-4444, emailing public.participation@wcc.govt.nz, or writing to Democracy Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, giving your name, phone number, and the issue you would like to talk about. All Council and committee meetings are livestreamed on our YouTube page. This includes any public participation at the meeting.

AREA OF FOCUS

The Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee has responsibility for:

- 1) Long-term planning and annual planning.
- 2) Financial and non-financial performance oversight in relation to the long-term plan and annual plan.
- 3) Financial oversight.
- 4) Procurement policy.
- 5) Non-strategic asset investment and divestment as provided for through the long-term plan (recommending to Council where matters are not provided for in the long-term plan).
- 6) Council-controlled Organisation oversight and performance.
- 7) Council-controlled Organisation director review and appointments.
- 8) WellingtonNZ oversight and performance.
- 9) Approve asset management plans.

To read the full delegations of this committee, please visit wellington.govt.nz/meetings.

Quorum: 9 members

TABLE OF CONTENTS

17 DECEMBER 2024

| Business | Page No. |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Meeting Conduct | 7 |
| 1.1 Karakia | 7 |
| 1.2 Apologies | 7 |
| 1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations | 7 |
| 1.4 Confirmation of Minutes | 7 |
| 1.5 Items not on the Agenda | 7 |
| 1.6 Public Participation | 8 |
| 2. General Business | 9 |
| A.1 Council submission for the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi Bill – <i>to be published separately</i> | |
| 2.1 LTP Amendment Options, Draft Budget, and 2025/26 Annual Plan Draft Budget Variances | 9 |
| 2.2 Decision register updates and upcoming reports | 35 |

1. Meeting Conduct

1.1 Karakia

The Chairperson will open the hui with a karakia.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Whakataka te hau ki te uru, | Cease oh winds of the west |
| Whakataka te hau ki te tonga. | and of the south |
| Kia mākinakina ki uta, | Let the bracing breezes flow, |
| Kia mātaratara ki tai. | over the land and the sea. |
| E hī ake ana te atākura. | Let the red-tipped dawn come |
| He tio, he huka, he hauhū. | with a sharpened edge, a touch of frost, |
| Tihei Mauri Ora! | a promise of a glorious day |

At the appropriate time, the following karakia will be read to close the hui.

| | |
|---|--|
| Unuhia, unuhia, unuhia ki te uru tapu nui | Draw on, draw on |
| Kia wātea, kia māmā, te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua | Draw on the supreme sacredness To clear, to free the heart, the body and the spirit of mankind |
| I te ara takatū | |
| Koia rā e Rongo, whakairia ake ki runga | Oh Rongo, above (symbol of peace) |
| Kia wātea, kia wātea | Let this all be done in unity |
| Āe rā, kua wātea! | |

1.2 Apologies

The Chairperson invites notice from members of apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the hui, where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

1.4 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2024 will be put to the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee for confirmation.

1.5 Items not on the Agenda

The Chairperson will give notice of items not on the agenda as follows.

Matters Requiring Urgent Attention as Determined by Resolution of the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee.

The Chairperson shall state to the hui:

1. The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
2. The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent hui.

The item may be allowed onto the agenda by resolution of the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee.

Minor Matters relating to the General Business of the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee.

The Chairperson shall state to the hui that the item will be discussed, but no resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer it to a subsequent hui of the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee for further discussion.

1.6 Public Participation

A maximum of 60 minutes is set aside for public participation at the commencement of any hui of the Council or committee that is open to the public. Under Standing Order 31.2 a written, oral, or electronic application to address the hui setting forth the subject, is required to be lodged with the Chief Executive by 12.00 noon of the working day prior to the hui concerned, and subsequently approved by the Chairperson.

Requests for public participation can be sent by email to public.participation@wcc.govt.nz, by post to Democracy Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, or by phone at 04 499 4444 and asking to speak to Democracy Services.

2. General Business

LTP AMENDMENT OPTIONS, DRAFT BUDGET, AND 2025/26 ANNUAL PLAN DRAFT BUDGET VARIANCES

Kōrero taunaki | Summary of considerations

Purpose

1. This omnibus report to the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee (the Committee) covers the 2025/26 Annual Plan, the 2025 LTP Amendment and a range of report backs requested by Committee. The report seeks agreement on, or notes the following key matters:
 - a) the 2025/26 Annual Plan budget variances and items for consultation. This includes any outstanding decisions outlined in this paper, indicative rate settings, and other financial variances.
 - b) the proposed options (and preferred options) for the 2024-34 Long term Plan (LTP) amendment Consultation Document covering the issues of under-insurance and lack of asset diversification.
 - c) commence work on the sale of a small number ground-leases to support options for the LTP amendment.
 - d) key components of the draft LTP amendment budget to support the Consultation Document.
2. The above matters require a decision in December 2024 to allow time to create the necessary consultation material and supporting information for Committee's consideration in February 2025, and the subsequent audit process.

Strategic alignment

3. The LTP includes a wide range of investments to achieve the outcomes and priorities set by the Council in consultation with the community.
4. Some of the options outlined in the paper include a reduced and rephased capital programme to generate debt headroom and respond to the reduced revenue from the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) over the next three years.
5. Overall, the impact on the delivery of priorities and outcomes is modest over the ten years of the LTP, but the impact in transport is more material due to the reductions in NZTA funding over the next three years. This means some priorities and outcomes will take longer to achieve than originally envisaged.

Relevant previous decisions

6. At the 30 May 2024 Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee agreed the following:

-
- Agree not to include the additional parking revenue from the suburban parking proposal in the LTP. Officers were also tasked to investigate and report back in time for the 2025/26 Annual Plan process on options for suburban parking where demand for parking is high – in accordance with the parking policy; and
 - Requested officers to report back in time for the 2025-2026 Annual Plan on options for further investment in areas with BIDs.
7. At the 10 October Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council meeting the Council agreed to:
- Commence a process to amend the 2024-34 LTP with Council's objective being 'No Sale' of any of its shareholding in Wellington International Airport Limited.
8. At the 29 October Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee meeting the following was agreed or noted:
- Noted that the Council's Water Services Delivery Plan options and the impact of reduced NZTA funding will also be included in the 2025/26 Annual Plan / LTP amendment process.
 - Agreed that officers reinstate work on a 'disaster resilience fund' and this work runs alongside the LTP amendment process, noting the purpose of the fund is to provide a form of self-insurance in the event of a disaster.
 - Agreed that a form of 'disaster resilience fund' is included in the LTP amendment as part of the options for consultation for amending the financial strategy.
 - Agreed that a key consideration of a 'disaster resilience fund' should be to minimise overheads and management costs.
9. At the 26 November Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee meeting it was agreed that:
- elements of a prudent financial strategy to be included in this LTP amendment include:
 - a) reduce the debt to revenue ratio of 225% to allow debt capacity of \$1b (up to Council's debt to revenue covenant) within the LTP. This capacity is reserved for any and all unexpected events including underinsurance risk;
 - b) remove the allocation of insurance headroom within the debt to revenue ratio;
 - c) maintain the limit on rates increases at 5-8% on average over the 10- year period; and
 - d) note the Council still has the airport on its balance sheet and would retain the option to sell some or all of its shares as further proceeds toward disaster recovery in a major event.

Significance

10. An amendment to the LTP requires a Consultation Document (CD) to be prepared, an audit and report from the Auditor-General, and consultation with the community using the Special Consultative Procedure before a final decision can be made. This paper is seeking agreement to options and budget components and is **rated high significance** in accordance with schedule 1 of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

Financial considerations

Nil Budgetary provision in Annual Plan / Long-term Plan Unbudgeted \$X

11. The financial considerations are included in the body of the report.

Risk

Low Medium High Extreme

12. All risk are outlined in the body of the paper.

| | |
|------------|--|
| Authors | Matthew Deng, Senior Advisor Kirralee Mahoney, Principal Advisor Financial Planning Baz Kaufman, Manager Strategy and Research Raina Kereama, Manager Financial Planning and Policy |
| Authoriser | Andrea Reeves, Chief Strategy and Finance Officer |

Taunakitanga | Officers' Recommendations

Officers recommend the following motion:

That the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee:

1. **Receive** the information.

2025/26 Annual Plan budget and variances

2. **Note** that there are a number of budget variances that have emerged since the LTP budget was adopted in June 2024 as a result of inflationary pressures or further information.
3. **Note** the draft forecast rates increase as outlined in the body of the report, and that more detail on the budget including mitigations will be provided at the 13 February 2025 Committee meeting.
4. **Agree** to the new parklet fee structure – charging a flat fee plus a square metre charge.
5. **Note** that the following matters will be brought to Committee for consideration alongside the consultation material in February 2025:
 - a) Wellington Water Ltd increased investment request for the 2025/26 year.
 - b) Update to the Rating Policy regarding Short Term Accommodation providers.
 - c) Update on asset revaluations impacting the 2025/26 Annual Plan.
 - d) Councillor request for information on impact and options for fully funding operating costs.
 - e) Fees and user charges.

Investment in Business Improvement Districts

6. **Note** that, due to significant financial constraints including those arising from amendments to the LTP, reallocation of funding for further investment in Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) is not anticipated to achieve the intended impact or align with Council priorities at this time.
7. **Agree** to continue supporting BIDs within existing policy frameworks, encouraging their self-sustainability and fostering collaboration with BID representatives to ensure a balanced approach to suburban and central city investment in future planning cycles.

Suburban Parking

8. **Note** that:
 - a) the committee requested officers to investigate and report back on options for suburban parking where demand for parking is high in accordance with the parking policy and this is outlined in the body of the report;
 - b) no additional revenue has been forecasted in the current draft budget from any options; and
 - c) if the Committee makes a decision to introduce suburban parking charging, this will be included in the draft budget for the February Committee meeting.

LTP Amendment options – under insurance and lack of diversification

9. **Agree** the options, and preferred option, for the Consultation Document being:
 - a) Option 1 (Council preferred): Self-insurance using large/maximum debt headroom plus a small investment fund.
 - b) Option 2 (Not Council preferred): Self-insurance using a combination of debt headroom and a medium investment fund.
 - c) Option 3 (Status quo, Not Council preferred): Self-insurance using a large/maximum investment fund plus existing debt headroom.
10. **Note** that these options will be worked up into detail necessary to meet legislative requirements and brought back to committee on 13 February 2025 for confirmation.
11. **Note** that all options include an assumed sale of a small set of ground leases and that there are 'live' opportunities to sell nine ground leases in the short term.
12. **Agree** that officers initiate negotiations to sell nine ground leases to provide initial capitalisation of a disaster resilience fund.
13. **Agree** to recommend to Council that the ground leases be sold, subject to officers achieving a total sales value of at least \$68m, the combined valuation on the sites.
14. **Note** officers will commence negotiation on these sites in the new year and expect to bring a recommendation to Council to execute the sales in March 2025.
15. **Note** that officers are considering whether the proposed transport project changes for City Streets and Bike Network Plan need to be included as consultation items and will advise further in February.
16. **Note** that advice will be brought back to committee in February on options to use the sale of carbon credits to part fund a Disaster Resilience Fund.
17. **Note** that aside from the capital projects resolved by the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee meeting of 26 November 2024 to stop or be rephased, the remaining projects in Council's capital programme are progressing.

LTP options – water reform and water meters

18. **Note** that the Local Water Done Well reform consultation options agreed at committee on 11 December are intended to be consulted on as part of the LTP Amendment consultation process.
19. **Note** that the budget will be updated by February to reflect the preferred water reform option.

LTP budget

20. **Note** the updated LTP capital budget programme as Attachment 1 reflects the decision of the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee of 26 November 2024.
21. **Note** the draft forecast rates increase as outlined in the body of the report, and that more detail on the budget including mitigations will be provided at the 13 February 2025 Committee meeting.

Whakarāpopoto | Executive Summary

13. This paper also outlines the known Annual Plan budget variances to what was published in the 2024 LTP (outside of the LTP amendment process). The Annual Plan and LTP Amendment are being delivered concurrently and 'at pace' and consequently additional variances may emerge, and these will be addressed at the February Committee meeting.
14. The Council has also been developing the LTP Amendment following the Notice of Motion (NoM) vote on removing the sale of Wellington International Airport Limited (WIAL) shares from the 2024 LTP on 10 October 2024.
15. In response to significant financial risks, including underinsurance and a lack of asset diversification, a preferred approach has been developed. The LTP amendment consultation under the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) process requires consideration of the options available to Council to mitigate the risks. Officers recommend that options include the position in the current LTP (ie status quo) which proposed the establishment of a large, diversified investment fund, with the proceeds of the sale of the Council's Wellington International Airport Limited shareholding.
16. With the Council's decision to cease work on the sale of the airport shares, the Council has indicated that its proposed preferred option is to increase debt headroom to provide a greater level of capacity to respond to a significant event, and to create a small, diversified investment fund - a Disaster Resilience Fund (DRF). A reduction of the capital programme from the 2024-34 LTP is the most effective way to increase the debt headroom. It is proposed that the DRF be created through using other funds, such as selling ground lease properties. This paper seeks the Committee's agreement to begin negotiations on nine ground leases with an expected value of at least \$68m.
17. On 26 November 2024 the Committee agreed reductions to the capital programme, including transport budgets affected by decreased NZTA's National Land transport programme funding, for consultation. These adjustments inform the draft amended LTP budget for the upcoming years and the 2025/26 Annual Plan.

Takenga mai | Background

Annual Plan process

18. Under section 95 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA), the Council is required to prepare and adopt an Annual Plan for each financial year, except in a year when the LTP is adopted.
19. The purpose of the Annual Plan is to set the annual budget, including the rates for the year. It also identifies any significant changes from the current financial statements and funding impact statement in the LTP for that year.
20. This paper provides an outline of the draft budget of the 2025/26 Annual Plan, covering year 2 of the 2024-34 LTP.
21. There will be significant changes to the capex for 2025/26, due to the impact of the LTP amendment preferred option. These changes have been reflected in the draft 2025/26 Annual Plan budget.

22. Additionally for the 2025/26 Annual Plan, we have identified a number of items which will require consultation. Further details are outlined in this report.

Financial risk and capital expenditure review (LTP amendment)

23. At the 10 October Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council meeting, a Notice of Motion was put forward and agreed upon to commence the process to remove the sale of Wellington International Airport Limited shares from the 2024-34 LTP. While the Council has indicated that its preferred option is no longer to sell the airport shares, the Council still needs to address the significant underlying financial risks, including a large underinsurance risk and a lack of diversification in its assets.
24. To mitigate these financial risks, an amendment to the LTP is required, including a change to the Council's financial strategy. This change essentially shifts the Council's previous reliance on a large (approx. \$500m) investment fund as a primary part of the financial strategy, to self-insuring by increasing the capacity (debt headroom) to borrow funds as the key tool. The increased headroom is achieved via a reduction in the capital programme outlined in the 2024-34 LTP. At the Committee meeting on 26 November, several changes to the capital programme were agreed upon to consult with the community. These included decisions to remove, rephase, or rescope elements of the programme to increase debt headroom.
25. Based on the outcomes of the meeting, we have calculated the debt headroom and prepared the draft forecasted capex for years 2 to 10 of the current LTP.
26. A full set of details and options to address the financial risk is outlined in this paper (see options section).

Disaster resilience fund

27. On 29 October 2024, the Committee agreed to reinstate work on a disaster resilience fund, which had ceased following the Notice of Motion. With the decision not to progress with the airport sale, the fund would have a smaller starting value of approximately \$60-\$70m and would sit alongside the increased debt headroom as part of the Council's overall financial strategy. The fund was expected to be capitalised with a targeted set of ground lease sales, which were also previously proposed to be sold to add to the fund under the Council's previous preferred option, and noted in the previous consultation document. There are live opportunities for sale on nine current sites and officers are seeking agreement to initiate negotiation, with a view to selling these leases.

Special consultative procedure process

28. Section 83 of the LGA outlines the structure and legal requirements of the special consultative procedure (SCP) for engaging with the community on key decisions. The SCP applies in the following situations:
- A significant amendment is made to the LTP;
 - A new or significantly amended policy, bylaw, or plan is proposed; and/or
 - Any decision is deemed by the council to require formal community consultation due to its significance.

Kōrerorero | Discussion

Annual Plan – budget

29. The Annual Plan contains the budget and rates setting for year two of the LTP.
30. The purpose of the Annual Plan is to establish the annual budget, including setting the rates for the year. It also highlights any significant changes from the financial statements and funding impact statement outlined in the current LTP for that year.
31. The starting point for the development of the 2025/26 Annual Plan budget (the baseline budget) is year two of the 2024-34 LTP (as adopted by Council on 27 June 2024). Year two included a forecast rates increase after growth of 12.8% (including the sludge levy increase of 1.4%), and a debt to revenue ratio of 250% (this includes the insurance headroom of \$272m).

Inflation and mitigation

32. Officers have reviewed the final Local Government Cost Adjustors and inflation rates for 2025/26. These are higher than the inflation rates used in the preparation of the LTP budgets.
33. Officers have determined that in most cases it is possible to absorb the inflationary pressure as a one off for 2025/26, except where not increasing budgets would create significant cost pressures, including where:
 - a. The cost pressure is confirmed and material (i.e. a signed contract with increased costs over budget); and
 - b. Be a significant pressure of more than 10% of the total Business Unit budget; or
 - c. The cost pressure cannot be absorbed by the Business Unit without having a negative impact on levels of service.

Cost pressures and budget variances

34. The following cost pressures have arisen following the adoption of the 2024-34 Long-Term Plan and have been included in the draft budget.
 - a. Depreciation expense due to change in asset revaluation for pump stations \$11m
 - b. Inflationary pressures \$5m-\$8m
35. Further work will be undertaken to look at how these costs can be mitigated and will be updated for the February 2025 committee meeting for Committee decision.

Proposed budget and rate increase

36. The draft budget for the 2025/26 Annual Plan has been updated to reflect known cost pressures and the impact from changes to the capital programme agreed on 26 November 2024. The impact of this has resulted in a draft forecast rates increase of 15.9% (including sludge levy increase of 1.4%).
37. As outlined above, further work will be undertaken to look at how these costs can be mitigated and will be updated for the February 2025 committee meeting with the intention of reducing the rates increase down to the Year 2 increase per the 2024-34 LTP of 12.8% (including sludge levy increase of 1.4%).

Fees and user charges

38. Existing fees and user charges are mainly expected to grow with inflation. Some business units will see new fees or fee increases above inflation to reflect market changes. We will report back a complete list of user fees at the February 2025 committee meeting. This inflationary increase is reflected in the draft budget; however any additional fee increases are not.

Rating Differential

39. Rates are calculated using a differential rating system that is based on land use. The current differential applied to commercial rating units is 3.70, while it is 5.00 for vacant properties and derelict buildings.
40. Adjustments to the rating differential as a result of the 2025/26 revaluation will be considered at the February 2025 meeting.

Proposed budget and rate increase

41. The draft budget for the 2025/26 Annual Plan has been updated to reflect known cost pressures and the impact from changes to the capital programme agreed on 26 November 2024. The impact of this has resulted in a draft forecast rates increase of 15.9% (including sludge levy increase of 1.4%).
42. As outlined above, further work will be undertaken to look at how these costs can be mitigated and will be updated for the February 2025 committee meeting with the intention of reducing the rates increase down to the Year 2 increase per the 2024-34 LTP of 12.8% (including sludge levy increase of 1.4%).

New Parklet fees structure

43. On 12 September 2024, the Kōrau Tūāpapa | Environment and Infrastructure Committee requested that officers undertake further analysis of the parklet fee structure and present options, along with a recommendation, to the Council for a decision. The Committee noted that the options presented would pertain only to the fee structure, while the fee rates would be consulted on and decided through the 2025/26 Annual Plan.
44. This resolution requires consultation on the proposed fees as part of the 2025/26 Annual Plan. The actual proposed fees will be provided at the February 2025 committee meeting, following approval of the new structure for consultation.
45. There are two possible fee structures for processing parklets that align with our Bylaws and the requirements of the LGA:
 - a. Charging a flat fee; or
 - b. Charging a flat fee plus a square metre charge.
46. Currently, parklets are charged a flat fee of \$238.00. However, other pavement permission fees follow the two-tier approach of a flat fee plus a square metre charge.
47. Officers recommend that parklets adopt the same fee structure as other pavement provisions i.e. charging a flat fee plus a square metre charge. This approach ensures consistency with other pavement provisions and, better reflects the actual costs of processing parklet applications which are not fully covered by the administration fee.

48. To ensure equitable treatment to all business owners and to mitigate revenue loss to Council, officers propose that parklets be “rented” at the same square metre rate as that used for footpath permissions. This rental would be capped at the square metre size of an average parking space (approximately 10.5 square metres), depending on the number of parking spaces utilised.
49. These fees are not yet reflected in the draft budget but will be included in the Annual Plan budget for consultation.

Annual Plan – other matters

Short term accommodation providers

50. Officers propose a range of operational changes to the current rating policy to ensure that short-term accommodation providers are rated differently to residential properties, starting in 2026.
51. A draft revised rating policy for consultation will be provided for consultation as part of the 2025/26 Annual Plan at the 13 February 2025 committee meeting.

2024 Rating revaluation

52. A rating valuation is a three-yearly assessment of a property's value in relation to current market values, commonly called ‘revaluation’. We use independent valuers, Quotable Value (QV), to assess the value of all properties as of 1 September 2024. These updated values will be used to calculate rates starting from 1 July 2025.
53. In 2024, the value of most homes in Wellington is lower than during the peak of 2021.
54. The rating valuations do not change the total amount of rates collected; rather they are used to determine how the "rates pie" is distributed across the city, based on updated property values.
55. The impact on an individual property's rates depends on how their property's value changes compared to the citywide average. If a property's value decreases more than average, its rates might decrease, and vice versa.
56. The Officer of the Valuer General are currently finalising the 2024 rating valuations and this is expected to be completed ahead of February, when we will provide information and further advice on impacts.

Debt Funded operating expenses

57. The options and impact of fully funding operating costs will be included in the February 2025 report for consideration. Any change from the status quo in how we currently fund depreciation will increase rates further.

Business Improvement Districts

58. On 30 May 2024 the Kōrau Tōtōpū |Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee resolved for Officers to report back in time for the 2025/26 Annual Plan on options for further investment in areas with Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) to support more effective economic development.

59. Officers have reviewed a range of financial and non-financial options for supporting BIDS. Given the significant financial constraints facing the Council, including those arising from amendments to the Long-term Plan, reallocation of funding or other resources as initially anticipated is now not considered likely to further support the BIDS or align with the current financial constraints. The preferred approach is to focus on higher priority areas impacted by the recent budget adjustments, ensuring that available resources are directed towards these areas.
60. Options considered include:
- a. **Financial Support:** Includes grants, matching funds, and project-specific funding to enhance beautification, marketing, and safety. Event sponsorship and business development grants to stimulate growth and engagement were also explored.
 - b. **Non-Financial Support:** Focused on in-kind contributions, such as subsidised office space, council expertise, and operational resources to strengthen BID activities without direct financial outlay.
 - c. **Strategic Initiatives:** This included improving suburban centres, expanding BID boundaries to include more businesses, and aligning BID activities with the wider goals for city growth and development.
 - d. **Operational Enhancements:** review BID performance, involve BIDs more directly in Council decision-making, and encourage BIDs to share resources and ideas.
61. It is important to highlight that a central tenet of the BID model is self-sustainability. Encouragingly, several BIDs are already demonstrating resilience by increasing targeted rates of their members to address funding needs. This proactive approach reflects the BIDs supporting their initiatives independently and aligns with the principle of leveraging local business and commercial property owner contributions to drive economic development.
62. Officers will continue to work closely with BID representatives to support their goals within existing policy frameworks, while acknowledging the need for a balanced long-term approach to suburban and central city investment in future planning cycles.

Suburban Parking

63. In May 2024 LTP deliberation, the committee agreed 'not to include the additional parking revenue from the suburban parking proposal in the LTP, and task officers to investigate and report back in time for the 2025/26 annual plan process on options for suburban parking where demand for parking is high and in accordance with the parking policy'.
64. As part of the engagement on the 2024/34 LTP we assumed that there would be a 50 percent reduction in occupancy if paid parking were to be introduced. Officers have now completed surveys of suburban parking across Wellington and there are no suburban centres where occupancy is consistently over 85 percent. Average occupancy over the 12 surveyed suburban centres over the Monday–Friday 8.00 a.m.–6.00 p.m. period is 59.5 percent. No suburban centre had an average occupancy over 65 percent across this period. Five of the nine suburban centres had at least one observed occupancy over 85 percent in the week that they were surveyed.

-
65. Applying this information to the Council’s Parking Policy (August 2020) would mean that the demand threshold would not trigger the introduction of charges for parking in these suburban centres. However, the Parking Policy does not prevent the introduction of charges as a parking management tool below the 85 percent threshold where justified for other reasons.
66. It is open to Council to consult upon introducing parking charges in suburban centres as part of the annual plan should it wish to do so, as an important source of revenue to relieve some of the pressure on other income sources. Any parking charges should still relate to the delivery of parking services whether direct or indirect. There would still need to be a Traffic Resolution process, including consultation on any proposed Traffic Resolution, to introduce parking charges. The Traffic Resolution process would also assess the consistency of the specific proposal with the Parking Policy as a whole.
67. The table below sets out the annual revenue that could be expected from the largest nine of the surveyed suburban centres at a range of hourly charges. Berhampore, Karori and Kelburn suburban centres were also surveyed but they are not included in the table because the number of qualifying parking spaces in these suburban centres is so low that parking charges would not be practicable (Kelburn: two qualifying spaces, Berhampore: six spaces; Karori: nine spaces).
68. Figures in the table are in thousands of dollars and are rounded to the nearest \$1000, which produces small rounding errors compared to the actual totals for the suburban centres set out in the final row. “Status” refers to the nature of the relevant suburban centre in the 2024 District Plan. The parking spaces tabulated are not all of the parking spaces in the relevant suburb, but only those where conversion to a chargeable parking space is feasible without a wider restructuring of parking arrangements; this means that parking spaces that are marked out and are subject to an existing time restriction of one hour or more are included, but unrestricted spaces and spaces restricted to stays of less than one hour are not included. The conservative expected annual revenue is calculated on the basis of:
- (i) the surveyed occupancy in the relevant suburb reducing by 50% as a result of the introduction of parking charges;
 - (ii) charging being instituted between 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m., i.e., for 10 hours per day (compared to 8.00 a.m–8.00 p.m. in the central city);
 - (iii) charging being instituted from Monday to Friday, but not on weekends or on public holidays, i.e., for 248 days per year (compared to 353 in the central city); and
 - (iv) average compliance with the charges being 80%. The expected revenue is for parking charges only and does not include any income from parking enforcement.

| Suburban centre | Status | Spaces | \$2.00/h | \$3.00/h | \$4.00/h | \$5.00/h |
|-----------------|--------------|------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Johnsonville | metropolitan | 21 | 23 | 34 | 46 | 57 |
| Miramar | local | 23 | 27 | 41 | 55 | 68 |
| Rongotai | mixed use | 32 | 38 | 57 | 76 | 95 |
| Khandallah | local | 33 | 39 | 59 | 79 | 98 |
| Island Bay | local | 39 | 46 | 70 | 93 | 116 |
| Newlands | local | 60 | 76 | 114 | 152 | 190 |
| Tawa | local | 108 | 126 | 190 | 253 | 316 |
| Newtown | local | 111 | 132 | 198 | 264 | 330 |
| Kilbirnie | metropolitan | 154 | 183 | 275 | 367 | 458 |
| Total | | 581 | \$692 | \$1,038 | \$1,384 | \$1,730 |

69. This expected revenue is conservative as it assumes that parking patterns would halve as users unwilling to pay would look to park elsewhere, park at a time when fees don't apply, reduce the time in which they stay or choose not to pay. These factors are affected by the fee charged, at \$2.00/hr we may see very little change but at \$5.00/hr we might see a dramatic reduction in the occupancy meaning that we would likely fall well short of achieving the expected revenue.
70. The cost to progress each centre through the traffic resolution process, including planning, design, consultation and engagement would be funded from within the existing parking programme budget. If approved the cost of implementation (signs and payment machines) would need to be budgeted for in the 2026/27 Annual Plan.

LTP amendment – Under Insurance and lack of asset diversification

71. In 2023, the Council commissioned KPMG to undertake an independent review of its balance sheet which identified significant issues with the Council's long-term financial resilience and risk – in particular, a significant insurance risk associated with underinsurance and a lack of diversification in its investment portfolio. This review followed previous work in 2021 by EY and PwC. The review strongly recommended that the Council take action to address these risks, noting the Council's exposure, through the extent of its underinsurance, would be an unacceptable risk for most governing bodies.
72. The 2024-34 LTP (and now the LTP amendment) needs to address these two identified risks to the Council's balance sheet:
- a. We do not have sufficient insurance to respond to future financial and natural hazard risks – the value of this underinsurance is currently estimated to be between \$1.8-2.6 billion, far more than the \$272m debt headroom the Council had previously held in the 2021-31 LTP to cover these risks. The Council's uninsured, or accepted, risk has grown considerably since 2021. The costs of insurance are expected to continue to rise and the availability of obtaining insurance to continue to be challenging. This means the Council needs to consider new solutions to address this problem.

- b. There is a lack of diversification in the Council's investment portfolio with 93% of the Council's portfolio held in airport shares and ground leases. This means that all of the Council's portfolio is exposed to the same kinds of risks (i.e., all our eggs are in one basket) – not just the risk of a sudden and unforeseen catastrophe, but also longer-term climate and market risks. This means the Council could face significant financial losses if one or more of these was to eventuate and/or it is more difficult to release capital, if required, when such an event occurred.
73. The Council's financial strategy needs to address these two identified risks to the Council's balance sheet in order to meet the LGA's requirement for prudent financial management.
74. With such a large underinsurance exposure, the Council essentially needs to self-insure to a greater extent than it has done in the past. It can do that through two primary mechanisms – a self-insurance fund which is established to invest to grow and provide funds in the event of a natural disaster, or holding additional debt headroom (created through cuts to the capital programme) which can be drawn down in the event of a natural disaster, or a combination of those two things.
75. The options proposed for consultation (paragraphs 99-114 below) combine these two mechanisms in different ways to provide the Council with additional available funds for a natural disaster, and a more diversified investment portfolio.
76. Under the current LTP (the status quo), the Council's preferred option establishes a large (approximately \$500m) fund from the sale of the airport shares and combines this with the existing headroom available between its self-imposed 225% debt to revenue ratio and the 280% LGFA covenant limit (a further approximately \$500m). With the intention not to sell the airport shares, the Council will need to determine a new preferred option for the LTP amendment consultation.
77. Underpinning, or accompanying, any of the options discussed below, is the Council's ongoing work on its insurance roadmap, which is being progressed with oversight by the Audit and Risk Committee. The focus of this work is to better understand the Council's insurance risk exposure and to explore options to reduce the size of the underinsurance gap, or constrain its growth, over time. In practice this work has the following workstreams:
- a. Continuing to refine and improve the modelling and understanding of the Council's insurance risks.
 - b. Using modelling outputs, making more informed insurance purchasing decisions (e.g., asset selection).
 - c. Exploring other tools to transfer insurance risk to the private market (e.g., catastrophe bonds and a captive insurer).

Addressing the above issues will require a number of solutions and active management over time as the understanding of risk or risk appetite changes, or as new solutions open up or current solutions become less viable.

Initial capitalisation of the Disaster Resilience Fund

78. For all of the consultation options (discussed in paragraphs 99-114), the Council is proposing to establish a Disaster Resilience Fund. Officers have identified a small set of nine ground leases that are recommended for immediate sale to capitalise the fund.
79. If the Council agreed to proceed with a small fund following consultation, these ground leases would be the primary source of capitalisation for the fund (and give the fund a starting balance of approximately \$60m-\$70m). If the Council proceeded with a medium or large fund following consultation, the fund would be capitalised with these ground leases plus a full or partial sale of the airport shares (and give the fund a starting balance of approximately \$250m or \$500m).
80. The nine ground leases are recommended for sale for the following reasons:
 - a. The leases identified have likely buyers and/or have already been subject to offers, meaning they could be easily sold in a timeframe to enable establishment of the disaster fund;
 - b. The sale provides opportunities for owners to freehold the properties to enable further development and increase property value;
 - c. The nine sites are not considered to have longer-term strategic value from a city development perspective;
 - d. The timing of the sale is considered optimal in terms of the point in the lease renewal cycle; and
 - e. The sale of ground leases (as opposed to other assets, except the airport) makes some impact on the current lack of diversification in the Council's investment portfolio.
81. Across the nine sites, officers expect the Council to achieve a sale value of between \$60-\$70m. This paper seeks the Committee's agreement to negotiate sales on these sites and progress to sell, subject to achieving a combined sale value of at least \$68m, which is the combined valuation across the sites.
82. Officers expect negotiation on the sites could be completed relatively quickly next year. Based on that, a final decision to sell would be brought to the Council in March. This decision would also seek the Council's explicit agreement that the proceeds of sale would not be directed towards debt repayment, as typically required by the Council's liability management policy, but would be used to capitalise the disaster resilience fund.

LTP Amendment – Water reform

83. The Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee is deciding on 11 December the preferred option and other consultation items for water reform.
84. The water reform options are intended to be included in the LTP Amendment and consultation material will be presented to Committee on 13 February for consideration.

LTP Amendment – Budget

Rates

85. The budget has been updated to reflect the decisions made on 26 November including the resulting impact on operating costs. The rates forecast has been update for any other known cost pressures arising (e.g. known cost pressures). While the working assumption was that all cost pressure should by absorbed, this was not always achievable as noted in paragraph 40. Below is the updated year on year rates increase including the sludge levy. Further analysis will be done to understand material movements. The average rates increase over the 10-year period remains at 8%.

Rates increase including Sludge Levy

| Year | 2024-34 | |
|---------|---------|-----------|
| | LTP | Amendment |
| 2025/26 | 12.8% | 15.9% |
| 2026/27 | 11.4% | 7.8% |
| 2027/28 | 9.9% | 9.3% |
| 2028/29 | 5.4% | 9.6% |
| 2029/30 | 4.6% | 4.7% |
| 2030/31 | 5.3% | 5.3% |
| 2031/32 | 4.0% | 4.4% |
| 2032/33 | 4.1% | 3.0% |
| 2033/34 | 4.8% | 4.3% |

Debt

86. The budget has been updated to reflect the decisions made on 26 November on capital expenditure and the resulting impact on the Council’s borrowings. Below is the updated debt/revenue ratio. Based on a debt to revenue ratio of 200%, the Council will reach \$1b debt headroom capacity by year seven (2031/32).

Debt/Revenue ratio

| Year | 2024-34 LTP | Amendment |
|---------|-------------|-----------|
| 2025/26 | 221% | 226% |
| 2026/27 | 213% | 228% |
| 2027/28 | 216% | 224% |
| 2028/29 | 216% | 209% |
| 2029/30 | 214% | 204% |
| 2030/31 | 211% | 200% |
| 2031/32 | 210% | 196% |
| 2032/33 | 200% | 184% |
| 2033/34 | 190% | 172% |

87. The main driver for the debt/revenue ratio being higher in the first few years is due to the reduced revenue from NZTA.

88. It should be noted that the savings totals in Attachment One of the 26 November Committee paper represented a gross impact to Council. They did not always explicitly state the net impact to Council. For example, the impact of less NZTA funding. The net impact to Council has been reflected in the above.

Capex reductions and NLTP revenue loss

89. Through the LTP amendment process, a number of capital expenditure budgets have changed, either through rephrasing the programme to outer years, rescoping the capital programme, or removing the programme completely. This includes changes to budgets relating to the planned capital programme originally set to commence in 2025/26. These changes have been developed concurrently with the Annual Plan.
90. In September 2024, NZTA (aligned with government's transport strategies) confirmed the reduction and adjustment of National Land Transport Programme (NLT) funding to Council. The focus of these changes was addressing economic and infrastructure priorities.
91. The funding is lower than was assumed in the 2024-34 LTP. This amounts to lost revenue of approximately \$68m over years 1 to 3 of the LTP. The committee agreed to reductions to the capital programme at its 26 November meeting to ensure there is no material impact on our overall debt to revenue ratio over the ten years of the LTP.
92. The agreed changes are now reflected in the draft LTP amendment budget and will be available during consultation for community feedback. Consideration is being given as to whether the City Streets or the Bike Network Plan will be consulted on separately (with options). Officers will provide advice on this to the committee on 13 February 2025.

Kōwhiringa | Options

LTP Amendment options: options to address insurance and asset diversification risks

93. Officers have considered a number of options for addressing the Council's identified financial risks. There are three options that officers recommend are included in the consultation document, including the status quo in the current LTP.
94. Under all three options, the Council is providing a total of approximately \$1B self-insurance via a combination of debt headroom and investment fund. And, as above, all options are supported by the insurance roadmap work programme.
- a. Option 1 (Council preferred): Self-insurance using large/maximum debt headroom plus a small investment fund
 - b. Option 2 (Not Council preferred): Self-insurance using a combination of debt headroom and a medium investment fund
 - c. Option 3 (Status quo, Not Council preferred): Self-insurance using a large/maximum investment fund plus existing debt headroom

Option 1: maximum headroom, small fund

95. Under option 1, the Council would reduce its current debt to revenue ratio from 225% to a new self-imposed limit to provide approximately \$1B debt headroom between the new limit and the 280% LGFA covenant limit. In order to achieve the \$1B headroom the debt to revenue ratio would need to be set at 200% based on the draft budget.
96. Based on the capital programme reductions made by Committee on 26 November, the \$1B headroom with a debt to revenue ratio of 200% is achieved in year 7 of the 2024 LTP (based on the draft budget).
97. Under this option, the Council would establish a small investment fund using the proceeds from a targeted list of ground lease sales, estimated at between \$60m-\$70m. The leases proposed for sale are those for which the Council already has purchase offers or those where a sale could be easily negotiated.
98. The fund could be further capitalised over time (e.g., through further ground lease sales, other asset sales, or windfall gains) to grow the fund; however these are not assumed at this point in time. The reason for focusing on the ground leases and airport shares in the options is because these assets form the Council's investment portfolio and therefore only options that consider these assets make an impact on the Council's diversification risk.
99. The Council was briefed on 3 December on key design issues and choices for the fund but does not need to make decisions on the fund's design for the LTP amendment consultation. These decisions can be made after consultation, when the Council has determined its preferred option on fund and headroom size – because fund size is a key driver of many of the relevant design decisions.

Option 2: medium fund, medium headroom

100. Under this option, the Council would retain its existing 225% debt to revenue ratio and would have the current debt headroom between 225% and 280% covenant limit (approximately \$500m) available for self-insurance purposes. In addition to this, this option would also retain the Council's existing \$272m "insurance" headroom allocation – meaning the Council has a total available headroom capacity of approximately \$750m. This level of headroom can be achieved with lesser cuts to the capital programme than option 1; approximately \$200m, compared to the approximately \$400m resolved by the Committee on 26 November.
101. As well as the allocation of headroom, under this option the Council would establish a medium sized investment fund of approximately \$250m, via a partial sale (50%) of its airport shareholding. Alternatively a fund of this size (\$200-\$250m) could be achieved by selling most of the ground lease portfolio (with a few key leases retained that have strong long-term strategic value for the city).

Option 3: large fund, existing headroom (status quo)

102. In the current LTP (status quo), the Council would retain its existing 225% debt to revenue ratio and existing headroom between 225% and the 280% covenant limit (approximately \$500m). This level of headroom can be achieved without cuts to the capital programme as it assumes the Council's current self-imposed limit remains in place along with the Council's current capital programme.

103. This current LTP (status quo) places heavy reliance on a large investment fund as the primary self-insurance mechanism; in this option the Council would sell its full airport shareholding and establish an approximately \$500m fund.
104. These options will be analysed further in the consultation document but table 1 provides a high-level summary of the options.
- a. All options make a meaningful contribution to the underinsurance risk, providing \$1b worth of self-insurance. However, option 3 (status quo and in the current LTP) is considered stronger than option 1 and 2 because a large fund will grow more quickly and to a larger scale to make a more meaningful contribution to this risk over time.
 - b. Options 2 and 3 make a contribution to managing the lack of diversification in the Council's investment portfolio; option 1 does not make a meaningful contribution to this risk due its primary reliance on headroom rather than a new investment fund
 - c. The impact on rates depends on the choices the Council makes on the design of the investment fund. All options could be designed to ensure there was no impact on rates, if the Council took a distribution from the fund that matched the current revenue received from the shares or ground leases.
 - d. The options impact capital spending in two ways – firstly in terms of a capital call from the airport and secondly in terms of the impact of the option on the Council's future broader capital programme. Options 1 and 2 would mean the Council could still be called on as an airport shareholder to contribute capital funding to support the airport's growth (and in that sense are less preferable to option 3 (status quo / current approach in LTP). Option 1 also creates a permanent, or at least long-term, constraint on the Council's capital programme, providing less flexibility than options 2 or 3 to meet future community or infrastructure spending needs.
 - e. All options provide liquidity for the Council in the event of a natural disaster.
 - f. All options are considered to meet the requirements for prudent financial management under the LGA.

Table 1: options analysis

| | Option 1: max headroom, small fund | Option 2: med headroom, med fund | Option 3: large fund, existing headroom (current approach in LTP /status quo) |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Address underinsurance | ✓ | ✓ | ✓✓ |
| Improve diversification | ✗ | ✓ | ✓✓ |
| Impact on income/rates | ? | ? | ? |
| Impact on asset value/growth | ✗ | ✓ | ✓✓ |
| Liquidity in disaster | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | ✓✓ |
| Impact on capital spending | ✗ | ✓ | ✓✓ |
| Prudent financial management | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | ✓✓ |

105. Officers' view remains that option 3 (as the current approach in the LTP/ status quo) is the most effective way to address the Council's identified financial risks; however as a result of the Council's Notice of Motion decision to seek to resolve the financial issues through an option that does not sell the airport shareholding, officers recommend that option 1 is identified as the Council's preferred option in the consultation document.

Options not recommended for consultation

106. Officers considered two further options but they are not recommended for inclusion in the consultation document.

- a. Option 4: large fund, increased headroom
- b. Option 5: do nothing

107. Officers considered an option (option 4) that was more aggressive (i.e., more risk averse) than the options recommended for consultation – this option combines the large fund of option 3 and the debt headroom requirements of option 1 and provides for approximately \$1.5B self-insurance (i.e., \$500m more in total than options 1-3). Under this option, the Council would sell its full shareholding in the airport to establish the fund and increase its headroom allowance to \$1B by cutting the capital programme in line with the Committee's resolutions on 26 November. While this option would make a more significant contribution to addressing the Council's underinsurance risk than any of options 1 to 3, it is not recommended for inclusion as a solution of approximately \$1B self-insurance in the current LTP has been assessed through the audit process as financially prudent and meeting the LGA requirements.

108. Option 5 is not recommended as it would leave the Council's insurance and diversification risks unmitigated. These risks have been consistently identified as requiring attention by external financial advisers (KPMG and EY) and the Council's rating agency (Standard and Poor's) and officers' view is that leaving these risks unaddressed through the LTP amendment would not meet the LGA's section 101 requirements for financial prudence.

Annual Plan options

Parklet fee structure

109. There are two possible fee structures options for processing parklets
- a. Charging a flat fee (status quo – no change to the current structure); or
 - b. Charging a flat fee plus a square metre charge (preferred option)).
110. The preferred option (b) ensures consistency with other pavement provisions and better reflects the actual costs of processing parklet applications, which are not fully covered by the administration fee. This process also aligns with our Bylaws and the requirements of the LGA.
111. While we are seeking for agreement to a change in fee structure, we will be coming back to committee with the proposed fees in February, which will also be included in the consultation document. If the committee choose to maintain current fee structure (status quo), then consultation will not be required.

Options for suburban parking

112. The options for paid suburban centre parking are:
- a. Do not pursue the introduction of parking charges in suburban centres because the occupancy rate of parks in these centres is not consistently over 85%, being the point at which the Parking Policy would trigger the use of parking charges as a parking management tool; or
 - b. Continue to consider the introduction of parking charges in some suburban centres, subject to a traffic resolution process, while being clear that this is primarily to increase parking revenue.
113. If the Committee wish to pursue parking charges, officers recommend that no revenue is budgeted for in the 2025/2026 Annual Plan and that officers be instructed to undertake a traffic resolution process to determine the quantum of paid parking, the days of week, times of day and the appropriate hourly fee for each suburban centre and bring these back for approval.
114. The committee has an option to direct offers to consult on all or some of the nine reported centres.

Whai whakaaro ki ngā whakataunga | Considerations for decision-making

Alignment with Council's strategies and policies

115. The 2024-34 LTP outlines a number of Council strategies and policies. The options outlined in the paper are to address the Council's underlying financial and balance sheet risks.
116. The Annual Plan for year 2 of the current 2024-34 LTP builds on the strategic foundation set in the LTP year 1, ensuring continued alignment with the Council's overarching strategies and policies.

Engagement and Consultation

117. The proposed amendment to the 2024-34 LTP responds to two financial risks – underinsurance and a lack of asset diversification – faced by the Council. In doing so there are material impacts on strategic assets (Wellington International Airport Limited Shares) held by the Council and, the Financial and Infrastructure Strategies in the 2024-34 LTP. As indicated above the proposed amendments are assessed as high significance in relation to the Council’s Significance and Engagement policy.
118. Public consultation is required to amend an LTP and we are required to use the Special Consultative Procedure of the LGA 2002. These requirements include consulting with the community the proposed amendment, its implications and any alternatives to this amendment that the local authority wishes to discuss with the community. In addition, the LGA requires that Council must not make a decision to transfer ownership or control of a strategic asset (such as the airport shares) unless an analysis of the reasonably practicable options for that decision is included in the consultation document. The Consultation document must also undergo an external audit. Given the statutory obligations and current context, officers recommend that the full share sale should continue to be included in the consultation document as it reflects the current approach in the LTP / status quo.
119. The proposed consultation programme will provide an opportunity for the community to present their views to the Council on the proposals in the CD.
120. Officers will bring a draft CD and proposed community consultation programme to the 13 February 2025 meeting of this Committee for approval.
121. Also, under Section 95A of the LGA, we may be required to consult with the community if there are significant or material differences between the proposed Annual Plan and the content of the LTP for that financial year.
122. We have outlined in this paper some potential significant changes to the Annual Plan on the outcome of decisions. If these changes are agreed, we will include the decisions in the consultation document and bring to this Committee in February 2025 for approval.

Māori Impact Statement

123. The notice of motion has negatively impacted Council’s relationship with our Tā kai Here partners. It is therefore particularly important that the amendment process continues to seek to positively uphold the partnership.
124. On November 26, Mayor Whanau tabled a letter of apology that was sent to our Tā kai Here partners on the 17 October following the notice of motion.

125. The delivery of Council's Tūpiki Ora Māori Strategy may be affected by the LTP amendment. The proposed changes to the capital programme could impact the implementation of certain strategies and action plans. In particular, a number of the proposed capital programme changes include elements that enable Council to deliver on the LTP priority *'celebrate and make visible te ao Māori across our city'*
126. While the quantity of capital programmes and projects will be reduced and deferred, the quality standards we have set for ourselves, our partners and our communities in bringing te ao Māori to life through cultural expression and design should be upheld in the remaining capital work programme.
127. The LTP amendment could also further impact the Tākai Here partnership agreement. The potential impact of the LTP amendments includes:
 - a. agreed timelines and deliverables;
 - b. limit resources available to support the commitments under the Takai Here partnership; or
 - c. potential misalignment with the partnership's objectives, requiring renegotiation or adaptation of agreements.

Financial implications

128. The draft budget includes:
 - a. Recommended budget adjustments as part of the Annual Plan process;
 - b. The updated capital programme;
 - c. The depreciation and interest implications of the amended capital programme; and
 - d. Updated debt to revenue ratio calculations
129. Further financial implications will be included in the budget for consideration as part of the consultation document on 13 February 2025.

Legal considerations

130. Council has a statutory requirement to manage its revenues, expenses, assets, liabilities, investments, and general financial dealings prudently and in a manner that promotes the current and future interests of the community. This is the key obligation underpinning the proposed financial strategy of this Long-term Plan amendment.
131. For an LTP amendment, the content of the consultation document must be that which Council considers (on reasonable grounds) will achieve the purpose set out in section 93B of the LGA and must include the proposed amendment, its rationale and implications and any alternatives that the Council may wish to discuss with its communities. This consideration is subject to audit opinion. Under section 93B, the purpose of the consultation document is to identify and explain the important issues and choices facing the Council, the consequences of those choices and to inform the discussions with the community on these issues.

132. The sale of 100% of the airport shares is “the status quo”, as it is the position in our current LTP. This option also continues to satisfy both of Council’s stated objectives (being to address the lack of diversification of our assets and underinsurance). While it is acknowledged this may no longer be the preferred option of the Council, officers recommend that it be included in the consultation document as the status quo / current LTP option and in order to ensure that the community is provided sufficient information about the choices facing Council and their consequences.

Risks and mitigations

133. All risk and mitigation are outlined in the body of the paper and attachment.

Disability and accessibility impact

134. Projects that aim to improve the city’s accessibility for people with disabilities or meet accessibility requirements may be impacted by changes to the capital programme.

Climate Change impact and considerations

135. Projects that will help meet our emission reduction target may be impact by capital programme changes.

Communications Plan

136. A full communication plan will be developed to be used across the LTP amendment and Annual Plan process, including key messaging, information on what is in and out of scope, updates to a public website, and information on consultation and oral hearings.

Health and Safety Impact considered

137. The health and safety implications of any changes to the LTP and Annual plan will be considered as part of future reports.

Ngā mahinga e whai ake nei | Next actions

138. Next report will be presented on 13 February 2025 with the following items:

- a. A draft consultation budget be presented to Committee for audit approval on 13 February 2025.
- b. A draft consultation document will be presented to committee for audit on 13 February 2025, with adoption for consultation by committee on 12 March 2025.

Attachments

Attachment 1. 9 year Capex activity reports

Page 33

| Strategy | Activity Group | Activity | Activity Name | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | 2029/30 | 2030/31 | 2031/32 | 2032/33 | 2033/34 | Total |
|---|----------------|--------------|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | | Draft Budget | Draft Budget | Draft Budget | Draft Budget | Draft Budget | Draft Budget | Draft Budget | Draft Budget | Draft Budget | |
| Governance | 1.1 | 2000 | Committee & Council Processes | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |
| Total 1 Governance | 1.1 | Total | | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |
| Environment and Infrastructure | 2.1 | 2001 | Property Purchases - Reserves | 5,009 | 1,000 | 4,898 | 0 | 4,771 | 4,862 | 15,740 | 7,696 | 7,026 | 51,000 |
| | | 2003 | Parks Infrastructure | 1,598 | 1,442 | 1,717 | 1,743 | 1,845 | 1,433 | 1,000 | 1,163 | 2,049 | 13,991 |
| | | 2004 | Parks Buildings | 1,169 | 976 | 976 | 1,068 | 1,227 | 1,053 | 1,000 | 1,100 | 1,116 | 9,685 |
| | | 2005 | Plimmer Bequest Project | 2,148 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,503 | 1,003 | 0 | 0 | 5,654 |
| | | 2006 | Botanic Garden | 3,241 | 1,301 | 520 | 3,501 | 2,429 | 821 | 2,696 | 4,350 | 2,665 | 21,543 |
| | | 2008 | Coastal | 2,232 | 851 | 510 | 856 | 853 | 827 | 594 | 826 | 840 | 8,189 |
| | | 2009 | Town Belt & Reserves | 933 | 1,249 | 1,674 | 1,467 | 4,337 | 4,214 | 4,488 | 6,569 | 5,571 | 30,503 |
| | | 2010 | Walkways renewals | 1,217 | 1,934 | 3,264 | 2,709 | 3,129 | 3,650 | 1,479 | 1,680 | 3,386 | 22,447 |
| | | 2067 | Wgtn Waterfront Development | 1,020 | 1,042 | 0 | 5,332 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,395 |
| | | 2068 | Waterfront Renewals | 4,346 | 3,502 | 2,453 | 3,376 | 3,089 | 2,124 | 1,740 | 1,763 | 2,002 | 24,594 |
| 2.1 Total | | Total | | 22,911 | 14,298 | 16,012 | 20,252 | 21,480 | 20,486 | 29,739 | 25,147 | 24,676 | 195,001 |
| 2.2 Total | 2.2 | 2011 | Southern Landfill Improvement | 24,327 | 35,840 | 28,987 | 11,160 | 5,059 | 5,439 | 6,951 | 7,181 | 7,521 | 132,467 |
| 2.2 Total | 2.2 | Total | | 24,327 | 35,840 | 28,987 | 11,160 | 5,059 | 5,439 | 6,951 | 7,181 | 7,521 | 132,467 |
| 2.3 Total | 2.3 | 2013 | Water - Network renewals | 12,199 | 19,944 | 16,394 | 13,769 | 17,746 | 12,021 | 23,886 | 22,801 | 24,577 | 163,337 |
| | | 2015 | Water - Water Meter upgrades | 0 | 0 | 2,527 | 13,093 | 33,485 | 43,189 | 42,011 | 9,322 | 0 | 143,627 |
| | | 2016 | Water - Network upgrades | 1,734 | 1,728 | 4,438 | 4,023 | 2,340 | 1,158 | 1,301 | 1,181 | 1,267 | 19,170 |
| | | 2019 | Water - Reservoir renewals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 987 | 4,443 |
| | | 2020 | Water - Reservoir upgrades | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,934 | 5,925 | 7,859 |
| 2.3 Total | | Total | | 13,933 | 21,672 | 23,359 | 30,885 | 53,571 | 56,368 | 67,198 | 36,205 | 36,211 | 339,403 |
| 2.4 Total | 2.4 | 2023 | Wastewater - Network renewals | 23,953 | 27,123 | 73,757 | 60,265 | 45,613 | 39,254 | 39,632 | 28,249 | 25,951 | 363,797 |
| | | 2024 | Wastewater - Network upgrades | 19,997 | 10,133 | 6,386 | 2,245 | 15,027 | 14,817 | 14,672 | 27,535 | 85,814 | 196,626 |
| | | 2146 | Sludge Minimisation | 151,017 | 17,229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169,246 |
| 2.4 Total | | Total | | 194,967 | 54,486 | 80,143 | 62,510 | 60,640 | 54,071 | 54,304 | 56,785 | 111,765 | 728,670 |
| 2.5 Total | 2.5 | 2028 | Stormwater - Network upgrades | 2,159 | 2,237 | 3,013 | 7,985 | 23,032 | 55,124 | 45,601 | 5,174 | 9,072 | 153,437 |
| | | 2029 | Stormwater - Network renewals | 1,591 | 11,087 | 4,801 | 3,562 | 3,609 | 2,731 | 7,806 | 12,289 | 4,014 | 51,488 |
| 2.5 Total | | Total | | 3,789 | 13,323 | 7,814 | 11,547 | 26,641 | 57,855 | 53,407 | 17,464 | 13,086 | 204,925 |
| 2.6 Total | 2.6 | 2033 | Zoo renewals | 1,342 | 1,406 | 1,823 | 1,901 | 1,913 | 1,957 | 2,159 | 2,204 | 2,251 | 16,956 |
| | | 2034 | Zoo upgrades | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 700 | 1,118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12,618 |
| | | 2135 | Zealandia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 1,300 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,700 |
| 2.6 Total | | Total | | 1,342 | 1,406 | 1,823 | 2,601 | 3,913 | 7,457 | 10,277 | 2,204 | 2,251 | 33,274 |
| Total 2 Environment and Infrastructure | | Total | | 261,270 | 141,025 | 158,139 | 138,955 | 171,305 | 201,676 | 221,876 | 143,985 | 195,510 | 1,633,740 |
| Economic Development | 3.1 | 2035 | Wellington Venues renewals | 2,889 | 2,181 | 5,753 | 6,077 | 4,595 | 1,169 | 2,970 | 7,143 | 4,083 | 36,858 |
| Total 3 Economic Development | 3.1 | Total | | 2,889 | 2,181 | 5,753 | 6,077 | 4,595 | 1,169 | 2,970 | 7,143 | 4,083 | 36,858 |
| Arts and cultural activities | 4.1 | 2038 | Gallery & Museum Upgrades | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13,836 | 5,755 | 967 | 20,557 |
| | | 2042 | Arts Installation | 77 | 78 | 80 | 82 | 83 | 85 | 86 | 88 | 89 | 747 |
| | | 2148 | Toi Poneke Art centre relocation to new building | 3,417 | 2,173 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,692 |
| 4.1 Total | | Total | | 3,494 | 2,252 | 181 | 82 | 83 | 85 | 13,922 | 5,842 | 1,056 | 26,996 |
| Total 4 Arts and cultural activities | | Total | | 3,494 | 2,252 | 181 | 82 | 83 | 85 | 13,922 | 5,842 | 1,056 | 26,996 |
| Recreation facilities and services | 5.1 | 2043 | Aquatic Facility upgrades | 6,015 | 3,013 | 4,964 | 3,753 | 3,878 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21,822 |
| | | 2044 | Aquatic Facility renewals | 3,438 | 1,459 | 2,347 | 2,237 | 2,208 | 1,398 | 2,340 | 2,784 | 2,622 | 20,833 |
| | | 2045 | Sportsfields upgrades | 6,711 | 6,361 | 538 | 545 | 560 | 587 | 574 | 622 | 608 | 17,105 |
| | | 2046 | Synthetic Turf Sportsfields renewals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 676 | 1,495 | 1,609 | 0 | 2,489 | 4,352 | 10,621 |
| | | 2047 | Synthetic Turf Sportsfields upgrades | 0 | 2,491 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,491 |
| | | 2048 | Recreation Centre Renewal | 695 | 2,849 | 67 | 487 | 268 | 51 | 258 | 284 | 8,455 | 13,396 |
| | | 2049 | ASB Sports Centre | 60 | 114 | 65 | 83 | 163 | 87 | 923 | 1,305 | 23 | 2,823 |
| | | 2050 | Basin Reserve | 136 | 184 | 314 | 690 | 2,883 | 969 | 1,668 | 406 | 304 | 7,554 |
| | | 2051 | Playgrounds renewals & upgrades | 7,525 | 1,878 | 3,196 | 2,080 | 1,852 | 1,759 | 2,082 | 2,700 | 2,002 | 25,075 |
| | | 2052 | Evans Bay Marina - Renewals | 175 | 1,063 | 175 | 2,069 | 215 | 71 | 49 | 78 | 167 | 4,062 |
| | | 2053 | Clyde Quay Marina - Upgrade | 100 | 456 | 28 | 638 | 32 | 7 | 444 | 47 | 37 | 1,790 |
| 5.1 Total | | Total | | 24,855 | 19,867 | 11,695 | 13,237 | 13,555 | 6,539 | 8,338 | 10,716 | 18,571 | 127,372 |
| 5.2 Total | 5.2 | 2054 | Library Materials Upgrade | 2,549 | 2,542 | 2,598 | 2,652 | 2,649 | 2,700 | 2,751 | 2,803 | 2,854 | 24,098 |
| | | 2055 | Library Computer and Systems Replacement | 876 | 642 | 373 | 381 | 444 | 452 | 610 | 481 | 489 | 4,748 |
| | | 2056 | Central Library - Upgrades and Renewals | 2,683 | 36 | 37 | 146 | 38 | 100 | 156 | 42 | 42 | 3,281 |
| | | 2057 | Branch Library - Upgrades | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,550 | 13,643 | 11,121 | 0 | 27,315 |
| | | 2058 | Branch Library - Renewals | 207 | 178 | 351 | 1,003 | 730 | 486 | 348 | 621 | 383 | 4,307 |
| | | 2060 | Housing renewals | 50,948 | 61,407 | 89,505 | 81,580 | 79,543 | 75,964 | 53,646 | 27,508 | 24,082 | 544,184 |
| | | 2061 | Community Centres and Halls - Upgrades and Renewals | 249 | 337 | 540 | 498 | 432 | 8,162 | 8,415 | 622 | 453 | 19,708 |
| | | 2062 | Burial & Cremations | 1,019 | 2,415 | 2,441 | 1,236 | 685 | 522 | 449 | 632 | 363 | 8,762 |
| | | 2063 | Public Convenience and pavilions | 643 | 2,067 | 1,882 | 2,330 | 1,243 | 802 | 807 | 1,266 | 888 | 11,909 |
| | | 2064 | Safety Initiatives | 122 | 124 | 127 | 130 | 132 | 135 | 145 | 147 | 150 | 1,213 |
| | | 2065 | Emergency Management renewals | 88 | 90 | 92 | 94 | 96 | 97 | 104 | 106 | 108 | 874 |
| | | 2151 | Te Awa Māpapa | 300 | 0 | 3,750 | 3,750 | 3,750 | 25,373 | 20,373 | 20,373 | 25,373 | 103,040 |
| 5.2 Total | | Total | | 59,583 | 69,840 | 101,696 | 89,801 | 89,742 | 117,344 | 101,446 | 65,721 | 55,165 | 754,458 |
| Total 5 Recreation facilities and services | | Total | | 84,538 | 89,707 | 113,391 | 107,038 | 103,297 | 123,883 | 109,784 | 76,438 | 73,736 | 881,910 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Urban Development | 6.1 | 2070 | Central City Framework | 6,200 | 1,667 | 6,630 | 714 | 899 | 742 | 358 | 5,684 | 371 | 23,264 |
| | | 2074 | Minor CBD Enhancements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 226 | 2,070 | 234 | 2,145 | 4,896 |
| | | 2147 | Subsurface Data Project Capex | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 |
| | 6.1 Total | | | 6,425 | 1,667 | 6,630 | 714 | 1,121 | 967 | 2,427 | 5,918 | 2,516 | 28,385 |
| | 6.2 | 2076 | Earthquake Risk Mitigation | 69,900 | 27,830 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98,030 |
| | 6.2 Total | | | 69,900 | 27,830 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98,030 |
| Total 6 Urban Development | | | | 76,325 | 29,497 | 6,930 | 714 | 1,121 | 967 | 2,427 | 5,918 | 2,516 | 126,415 |
| Transport | 7.1 | 2077 | Wall, Bridge & Tunnel Renewals | 12,776 | 13,058 | 8,511 | 8,937 | 9,992 | 10,190 | 16,505 | 9,417 | 9,595 | 100,750 |
| | | 2078 | Asphalt & Other Seal Renewals | 1,567 | 1,635 | 1,839 | 1,917 | 1,996 | 2,077 | 2,226 | 2,271 | 2,314 | 17,842 |
| | | 2079 | Chipseal Renewals | 4,758 | 4,964 | 5,585 | 5,822 | 6,062 | 6,307 | 6,761 | 6,896 | 7,026 | 54,182 |
| | | 2080 | Preseal Preparations | 5,647 | 5,776 | 5,909 | 6,035 | 6,160 | 6,168 | 6,288 | 6,410 | 6,531 | 54,925 |
| | | 2081 | Shape & Camber Correction | 1,831 | 1,909 | 2,146 | 2,237 | 2,329 | 2,422 | 2,596 | 2,648 | 2,698 | 20,816 |
| | | 2082 | Drainage Renewals | 1,048 | 1,072 | 1,096 | 1,120 | 1,144 | 1,167 | 1,190 | 1,214 | 1,237 | 10,288 |
| | | 2083 | Wall Upgrades | 8,808 | 9,399 | 4,610 | 2,887 | 1,691 | 1,724 | 1,759 | 1,793 | 1,827 | 34,488 |
| | | 2084 | Service Lanes & Road Boundary Upgrades | 61 | 62 | 64 | 65 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 71 | 72 | 599 |
| | | 2085 | Tunnel & Bridge Upgrades | 1,968 | 961 | 1,151 | 962 | 982 | 1,002 | 1,022 | 1,042 | 1,062 | 10,152 |
| | | 2086 | Kerb & Channels Renewals | 2,701 | 2,763 | 2,826 | 2,888 | 2,949 | 3,007 | 3,068 | 3,129 | 3,188 | 26,519 |
| | | 2087 | New Roads | 740 | 3,028 | 6,195 | 9,732 | 19,305 | 7,947 | 8,689 | 4,342 | 8,410 | 68,391 |
| | | 2088 | Emergency Route Walls Upgrades | 4,120 | 1,183 | 1,046 | 1,934 | 1,975 | 2,015 | 2,055 | 2,332 | 3,099 | 19,760 |
| | | 2089 | Roading Capacity Upgrades | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 2090 | Roading Rebuild | 2,745 | 2,808 | 2,872 | 2,935 | 2,997 | 3,057 | 3,118 | 3,180 | 3,240 | 26,951 |
| | | 2094 | Cycling Network Renewals | 10,203 | 8,457 | 5,762 | 5,149 | 2,878 | 4,492 | 4,833 | 2,379 | 589 | 44,742 |
| | | 2095 | Bus Priority Planning | 51 | 53 | 56 | 58 | 60 | 63 | 65 | 68 | 70 | 544 |
| | | 2096 | Footpaths Structures Renewals & Upgrades | 628 | 479 | 490 | 501 | 511 | 521 | 549 | 560 | 571 | 4,810 |
| | | 2097 | Footpaths Renewals | 3,758 | 3,846 | 3,937 | 4,023 | 4,107 | 4,189 | 4,491 | 4,581 | 4,667 | 37,600 |
| | | 2098 | Footpaths Upgrades | 3,950 | 4,228 | 992 | 1,294 | 1,034 | 1,336 | 1,075 | 1,389 | 1,116 | 16,403 |
| | | 2099 | Street Furniture Renewals | 202 | 207 | 212 | 217 | 221 | 226 | 244 | 249 | 254 | 2,033 |
| | | 2100 | Pedestrian Network Accessways | 268 | 274 | 281 | 287 | 293 | 299 | 322 | 329 | 335 | 2,688 |
| | | 2101 | Traffic & Street Signs Renewals | 1,062 | 1,086 | 1,111 | 1,135 | 1,159 | 1,182 | 1,205 | 1,229 | 1,253 | 10,421 |
| | | 2102 | Traffic Signals Renewals | 2,412 | 2,468 | 2,524 | 2,580 | 2,634 | 2,687 | 2,740 | 2,795 | 2,848 | 23,688 |
| | | 2103 | Street Lights Renewals & Upgrades | 1,004 | 1,065 | 1,155 | 1,183 | 1,210 | 1,236 | 997 | 1,019 | 1,040 | 9,909 |
| | | 2104 | Rural Road Upgrades | 70 | 53 | 56 | 58 | 61 | 63 | 66 | 68 | 71 | 567 |
| | | 2105 | Minor Works Upgrades | 3,445 | 2,773 | 2,825 | 3,078 | 3,293 | 3,358 | 3,424 | 3,491 | 3,556 | 29,243 |
| | | 2106 | Fences & Guardrails Renewals | 964 | 987 | 1,009 | 1,032 | 1,053 | 1,074 | 1,124 | 1,146 | 1,168 | 9,557 |
| | | 2107 | Speed Management Upgrades | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 |
| | | 2141 | LGWM - City Streets | 21,350 | 10,169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31,519 |
| | | 2142 | LGWM - Early Delivery | 20,927 | 28,140 | 32,393 | 15,997 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97,027 |
| | 7.1 Total | | | 122,562 | 112,914 | 96,654 | 83,365 | 76,163 | 67,877 | 78,463 | 64,047 | 67,838 | 769,923 |
| | 7.2 | 2108 | Parking Asset renewals | 786 | 1,451 | 1,043 | 788 | 1,035 | 876 | 1,865 | 2,304 | 1,539 | 12,087 |
| | | 2109 | Parking Upgrades | 747 | 768 | 806 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 2,659 |
| | 7.2 Total | | | 1,534 | 2,219 | 1,849 | 842 | 1,089 | 932 | 1,922 | 2,362 | 1,998 | 14,746 |
| Total 7 Transport | | | | 124,096 | 115,133 | 98,503 | 84,226 | 77,252 | 68,809 | 80,405 | 66,410 | 69,835 | 784,669 |
| Council | 10.1 | 2111 | Capital Replacement Fund | 4,251 | 4,344 | 4,436 | 4,524 | 4,610 | 4,698 | 5,014 | 5,104 | 5,196 | 42,177 |
| | | 2112 | Information Management | 3,293 | 2,745 | 1,781 | 2,116 | 1,049 | 759 | 772 | 1,109 | 1,129 | 14,753 |
| | | 2114 | ICT Infrastructure | 3,829 | 1,565 | 1,598 | 1,630 | 1,661 | 1,693 | 1,725 | 1,756 | 1,787 | 17,243 |
| | | 2117 | Unscheduled infrastructure renewals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 2118 | Health & Safety - Legislation Compliance | 342 | 349 | 357 | 364 | 371 | 378 | 399 | 406 | 413 | 3,378 |
| | | 2119 | Civic Property renewals | 11,007 | 1,510 | 2,469 | 3,632 | 1,487 | 805 | 3,436 | 2,436 | 3,946 | 30,728 |
| | | 2120 | Commercial Properties renewals | 2,615 | 1,022 | 2,698 | 6,751 | 3,655 | 1,100 | 2,231 | 3,161 | 2,592 | 25,824 |
| | | 2121 | Community & Childcare Facility renewals | 282 | 416 | 861 | 1,630 | 921 | 246 | 897 | 1,187 | 660 | 7,101 |
| | | 2126 | Business Unit Support | 8,274 | 4,278 | 4,368 | 4,455 | 4,540 | 4,626 | 4,714 | 4,799 | 4,885 | 44,941 |
| | | 2128 | Civic Campus Resilience and Improvements | 40,705 | 31,656 | 5,410 | 0 | 23,410 | 23,833 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125,014 |
| | | 2133 | Quarry Renewals & Upgrades | 6,439 | 5,961 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 71 | 86 | 88 | 89 | 12,937 |
| | | 2140 | Security | 752 | 786 | 821 | 838 | 854 | 870 | 1,240 | 1,663 | 918 | 8,742 |
| | 10.1 Total | | | 81,788 | 54,633 | 24,866 | 26,008 | 42,628 | 39,077 | 20,514 | 21,709 | 21,617 | 332,839 |
| Total 10 Council | | | | 81,788 | 54,633 | 24,866 | 26,008 | 42,628 | 39,077 | 20,514 | 21,709 | 21,617 | 332,839 |
| Grand Total | | | | 634,546 | 434,427 | 407,763 | 363,099 | 400,279 | 435,665 | 451,898 | 327,444 | 368,353 | |

DECISION REGISTER UPDATES AND UPCOMING REPORTS

Kōrero taunaki | Summary of considerations

Purpose

1. This report provides an update on which previous decisions have been implemented and which are still outstanding. It also provides a list of items scheduled to be considered at the next two meetings (hui).

Strategic alignment

2. N/A. This report is considered at every ordinary meeting and assists in monitoring progress.

| | |
|------------|--|
| Author | Leteicha Lowry, Senior Democracy Advisor |
| Authoriser | Sean Johnson, Democracy Team Leader Andrea Reeves, Chief Strategy and Finance Officer |

Taunakitanga | Officers' Recommendations

Officers recommend the following motion:

That the Kōrau Tōtōpū | Long-term Plan, Finance, and Performance Committee:

1. Receive the information.

Whakarāpopoto | Executive Summary

Decision register updates

3. A full list of decisions, with a status and staff comments, is available at all times on the Council website. Decisions where work is still in progress, or was completed since the last version of this report can be viewed at this link:
<https://meetings.wellington.govt.nz/your-council/decision-register?UpdatedSinceLastMeeting=true&CommitteeName=K%C5%8Drau+T%C5%8Dt%C5%8Dp%C5%AB+%7C+Long-term+Plan%2C+Finance%2C+and+Performance+Committee%2BP%C5%ABroro+Tahua+%7C+Finance+and+Performance+Committee%2BP%C5%ABroro+Maherehere+%7C+Annual+Plan+%7C+Long-Term+Plan+Committee>
4. If members have questions about specific resolutions, the best place to ask is through the written Q&A process.
5. This body passed 53 resolutions at the last meeting. All are now complete.
6. 62 in progress resolutions were carried forward from previous reports:
 - 24 are now complete and 38 are still in progress.

Upcoming reports

7. The following items are scheduled to go to the next two hui:

-
8. Rāpare, 13 Hui-tanguru 2025 (Thursday, 13 February 2025):
 - 2024-34 LTP Quarterly 2 Performance Report (Chief Strategy and Finance Officer).
 - Te Toi Mahana Quarterly Report (Chief Infrastructure Officer).
 - CCO Q2 Reports (Chief Strategy and Finance Officer).
 9. Rāapa, 12 Poutū-te-rangi 2025 (Wednesday, 12 March 2025):
 - 2025-26 Annual Plan and LTP Amendment - Adoption of Consultation Document (Chief Strategy and Finance Officer).

Takenga mai | Background

10. The purpose of the decisions register is to ensure that all resolutions are being actioned over time. It does not take the place of performance monitoring or full updates. A resolution could be made to receive a full update report on an item, if desired.
11. Resolutions from relevant decision-making bodies in previous trienniums are also included.
12. Elected members can view public excluded clauses on the Council website: [Council meetings decision register](#).
13. The upcoming reports list is subject to change on a regular basis.

Attachments

Nil