

Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday 10 March 2021

Time 4:01pm – 5:32pm

Venue Ngake – Room 16.09, Tahiwī, 113 The Terrace, Wellington

Members present

Chair Ella Flavell

Members Anastasia Reid, Brad Olsen, Ella Flavell (Chair), Jackson Lacy, John Sibanda, Laura Jackson (Deputy Chair), Tim Rutherford, Tony Huang

Liaison Councillors Cr Tamatha Paul, Cr Jill Day

Staff Meredith Blackler (Chief People & Culture Officer), Clare Lundon (Senior Engagement Specialist), Sean Johnson (Democracy Advisor), Felix Laing (Engagement Specialist), Amy Jackman (Advisor Planning and Reporting), Renaee Clark (Senior Advisor – Tira Poutama)

Minutes

1. Meeting Procedures

4:01pm

1.1. The meeting opened at 4:01pm. Apologies were received from the following members:

- Raihaan, Shelly, Watene – for absence.

No issues were raised with the minutes of the previous meeting.

1.2. No conflicts of interest were declared.

1.3. Youth Council members shared what was on top for them this week.

1.4. It was noted that a number of young people from Wellington who were interested in Youth Council had been invited to attend and participate in this meeting.

2. Discussion

4:07pm

2.2. Climate Change in Aotearoa, *presented by Kelly Ngan*

Kelly gave an overview of the Climate Change Commission's recently released report Climate Change in Aotearoa.

Youth Councillors and members of the public split into groups to discuss the report and provide feedback. The following feedback was given:

- Subsidise EV's
- Stronger and larger incentives / sanctions
- Need more ambitious targets – more pressure
- EVs lead to negative impact due to required resources (batteries etc.)
- Practicality in goals

Wellington City Youth Council

Te Rūnanga Taiohi o te Kaunihera o Pōneke

- We should echo the thoughts of SS4C in a formal submission
- The most effective way to change consumers' habits is changing the rules and regulations – so important to have hard stances
- Go hard early to prevent worse consequences later
- Country does not meet 'budgets' (can Council meet ours?)
- 'Team of 5 million'

A working group of Brad, Jackson, Tim, and Tony was formed to write a submission on the report. Submissions close on 28 March 2021.

2.1. LTP consultation, *presented by Clare Lundon*

Felix Laing gave an overview to the group of what a Long-term Plan is, noting that it is essentially a 10-year budget for the city.

Youth Councillors and members of the public split into groups and completed a two stage workshop on the LTP. In the first stage they responded with feedback on the seven key questions planned for the LTP engagement process. In the second stage, they were given a limited number of tokens to 'spend' on the projects they thought were most important.

The results from this workshop are appended to the end of these minutes.

At the end of the workshop, members of the public who had attended the meeting were thanked for their participation in the previous items and left the meeting.

(John arrived at 4:50pm)

2.3. Youth Council leadership election, *presented by Sean Johnson*

The yearly leadership election for Youth Council was conducted. Youth Council endorsed a new process for conducting leadership elections. The new process was written to be consistent across all the advisory groups. It is appended to the end of these minutes.

Tim Rutherford was selected as the member to assist the liaison officer with counting and verifying the votes.

Youth Councillors debated on whether a chair and deputy chair, or co-chairs model should be used for the subsequent election. The vote on this was tied and so the current leadership model of chair and deputy chair was retained.

One nomination for chair, from Laura Jackson, was received and Laura was elected as chair.

One nomination for deputy chair, from Ella Flavell, was received and Ella was elected as deputy chair.

Youth Councillors congratulated the new chair and deputy chair.

The meeting closed at 5:32 pm

Wellington City Youth Council

Te Rūnanga Taiohi o te Kaunihera o Pōneke

Decision 1 – Investment in three waters infrastructure

Option 1	Option 2 (preferred option)	Option 3
Maintain current funding level <p>This would see a continuation of the existing level of funding for three waters renewals. This includes keeping the \$3.2m operational expenditure increase agreed as part of the 2020/21 budget, which is a 10.8% opex increase over the 2018 LTP. It also includes an 18% capex increase over the 2018 LTP.</p> <p>We think this option means Wellington's three waters network would continue to decline, and we do not believe this is what most Wellingtonians want.</p> <p>The impact of this option on our network is outlined below:</p> <p>Drinking Water: Under this option, we anticipate an increasing number of leaks and bursts, and that the percentage of water lost will continue to rise. This in turn would mean a requirement to construct more water storage somewhere in the region, at a cost in the hundreds of millions.</p> <p>Wastewater: We can expect to see more pipe failures if this option is progressed.</p> <p>Stormwater: Under Option 1 we will not meet our legal obligations for stormwater. We also expect more failures such as the 'sinkhole' that occurred in Jervois Quay in February 2021.</p> <p>Growth: Option 1 also does not accommodate growth, and we would not be able to develop parts of the city because there is not enough capacity in our drinking water or wastewater networks.</p>	Enhanced investment <p>This option entails a substantial increase in the level of three waters investment, including a 21.7% operational expenditure and 33% capital expenditure increase above what was in the previous LTP.</p> <p>We do not think this option will fix all of our problems, but we think this will reverse some of the trends and set us on a more favourable path towards higher performance and quality in our network.</p> <p>We think it is affordable and provides a pragmatic first step towards improving our network.</p> <p>The impact of this option on our network is outlined below:</p> <p>Drinking water: This option includes investigations into our infrastructure so we can better understand what needs replacing; an increase in maintenance and renewals meaning fewer leaks; \$30m to complete Ōmāroa reservoir; and \$8m for resilience work. Water meters are not included, so we will still not be able to accurately measure water losses, and the region is still likely to need an additional storage lake, although this could be deferred a little.</p> <p>Wastewater: This option includes the repairs of pipes identified through the investigations into the network, which reduces the risks of leaks. Alongside this, we propose \$40m to renew pipes, mainly in Taranaki, Wakefield, Victoria and Dixon streets and Kent Terrace, and install a new pump station in Taranaki St. Work is also planned in Stebbings Valley and Karori.</p> <p>We anticipate that under this option the quality of some of our streams and the marine environment may not worsen, but the problem is decades in the making and it will take some time to reverse.</p> <p>Stormwater: Based on asset inspections already completed, we propose to focus pipe renewal on the central city, including Hunter St and Jervois Quay. There is \$18m planned for upgrades to reduce flooding risks in Tawa and we will address stormwater quality issues through our review of the District Plan.</p> <p>Growth: We have identified \$3.5m over 10 years for growth investment across all three waters, and will target these upgrades in the central city, and Stebbings Valley. Any additional funding for growth in other areas would be added in time for 2024 LTP, following Spatial Plan development.</p>	Accelerated investment <p>This option would mean double the increase in investment over Option 2 – \$8.9% operational expenditure and 216% capital expenditure increase over the 2018 LTP.</p> <p>It aims to accelerate work programmes in all parts of the network. However, it is not our preferred option because we do not yet have sufficient information to properly cost and direct our investment, and our growth plan is not yet at the stage where we can use it for infrastructure planning.</p> <p>We think more work is required to gather this data before such a sizeable investment is made.</p> <p>There is substantial uncertainty regarding the ability to deliver such a large programme of work.</p> <p>The impact of this option on our network is outlined below:</p> <p>Drinking Water: This option also includes investigations into our network. We would then be able to minimise water leaks through extensive pipe renewals – eventually this would see a reduction in maintenance and leaks and burst pipes would be rare. All connections would be metered at a cost of around \$50m, and water conservation would be part of our culture. We would also have a detailed understanding of the carbon footprint of our three waters network. We should be able to defer construction of a new storage lake.</p> <p>Wastewater: After our investigations, we would be able to invest to largely eliminate sewage pollution, starting with catchments around the central city, Karori and Ōwhio Bay, then widening into other catchments. We think the waterways and coastal environment would be close to where we would like them to be by the end of the work programme. We would see few breaks and if there was a discharge this would be swiftly managed.</p> <p>Stormwater: Through improved pipes and planning regulations, we would be able to better manage stormwater. Where practical, this would incorporate natural green and open spaces that use vegetation, soils, and other elements and practices to help deal with environmental challenges such as stormwater runoff and climate adaptation. This would supplement hard infrastructure, while providing increased biodiversity, flood protection, and more green and open spaces throughout the city.</p> <p>Growth: Once we fully understand where the city is to grow, and have analysed the network, we would have investment plan to enable this growth investment to occur.</p>
Opex Cost: \$328m over 10 years Rates impact: Capex Cost: \$498m Debt level impact: Within limit	Opex Cost: \$1.8b over 10 years Rates impact: Part of the 5.77% average increase across 10 years Capex Cost: \$841m Debt level impact: Within limit	Opex Cost: \$2.3b over 10 years Rates impact: Capex Cost: \$1.4b Debt level impact: Over limit

Water charges would mean low-income families and large families. Prefer current model with ratepayers for water systems

Metering for water a good idea, will inherently bring water conservation into culture

Prefer 2
Don't like charging for water, metering does u't seem necessary

Option 2 w metering

More ambitious wastewater plans - Option 3's plan but in option 2

ability to see where the water is going is valuable
③

Wellington City Youth Council

Te Rūnanga Taiohi o te Kaunihera o Pōneke

Decision 2 – Wastewater laterals

Option 1	Option 2 (preferred option)
No change Retain status quo policy settings where households are responsible for renewal and maintenance of the wastewater laterals in the road corridor to the main. This is inconsistent with other Councils in New Zealand and can be problematic, as property owners are often not aware they are responsible, the issues are out of their control or they are not able to undertake the repairs.	Take ownership Change the Council's policy to be consistent in the region and New Zealand. This would result in the Council taking responsibility for the section of the wastewater lateral beneath the legal road to the property boundary. This will create efficiencies in maintenance by allowing us to plan their renewal alongside wastewater mains.
Opex Cost: No change Rates impact: None	Opex Cost: \$4.4m (over 10 years) Rates impact: Part of the 5.77% average increase across 10 years
Capex Cost: No change Debt level impact: None	Capex Cost: \$23m (over 10 years) Debt level impact: Within limit

No Tokens

1 Token

Option 2.
needing more data
around who causes
the issue.

Option 2
Supporting WCC
being made
w/ the rest of
NZ.

Need active
change - option
1 doesn't give
this



Wellington City Youth Council

Te Rūnanga Taiohi o te Kaunihera o Pōneke

Decision 3 – Cycleways

Option 1	Option 2
Finish started projects <p>This option includes finishing the eastern connections route, including Miramar and Evans Bay in the first three years of the plan. It also includes \$250,000 each year for minor improvements and tactical urbanism (see note) projects to encourage people to shift to cycling as a main form of transport.</p> <p>This is a significant reduction in funding for the cycleways programme.</p> <p>Projects included in this option are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finish Evans Bay from Carlton Gore Rd to Cobham Dr (Years 1-3) Finish the Miramar Cutting cycleway (Year 1) Funding for Island Bay upgrade is not included in this option <p>Opex Cost: None Rates impact: None Capex Cost: \$30m (in 10 years) Debt level impact: Within limit</p>	Medium investment <p>This medium investment is still a reduced programme.</p> <p>In this option, we would complete what we have started as per Option 1, plus there is \$500,000 allocated each year for minor improvements and tactical urbanism (see note) projects to encourage people to shift to cycling as a main form of transport.</p> <p>Projects included in this option are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finish Evans Bay Stage 1 from Carlton Gore Rd to Cobham Dr (Years 1-3) Finish the Miramar Cutting cycleway (Year 1) Funding for Island Bay upgrade is included in this option – \$6m in years 4-6 <p>Opex Cost: None Rates impact: None Capex Cost: \$30m (in 10 years) Debt level impact: Within limit</p>
Option 3 (preferred option)	Option 4
High investment <p>This option prioritises our full programme of work and aims to complete \$120m of that programme during the next decade, including \$1m per year for minor improvements and tactical urbanism projects (see note) to encourage people to shift to cycling as a main form of transport.</p> <p>This option is a significant increase in funding over what was allocated in the 2018 Long-term Plan.</p> <p>It includes \$82m for new cycleways projects that will be prioritised in years 3 and 4. These routes would include the cycleways outlined below and be based on current rough order costs and benefit/cost ratios.</p> <p>What we progress and when as part of this option will depend on which routes are delivered as part of Let's Get Wellington Moving (LGWM), which is likely to be the Newtown Connections route, and any further Councillor decisions related to cycleways.</p> <p>The prioritised projects expected to be included in this option are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finish Evans Bay Stage 1 from Carlton Gore Rd to Cobham Dr (Years 1-3) Finish the Miramar Cutting cycleway (Year 1) Funding for Island Bay upgrade is included in this option – \$6m in Years 4-10 as part of the \$82m for new cycleways New Cycleways projects – \$82m for Years 3-10: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastern Corridor: Park Road; Miramar Ave to Ira St; Hobart St to Miro St; Broadway to Seatoun; Childers Toe to Queens Dr; Coultts St to Trangi Rd; and Rongotai to Lyall Bay Northern Connections: Tawa to Johnsonville; Kaiwharaxhara to Ngāio; Kenya St; and Johnsonville to Ngāio Southern Connections: Brooklyn to City; and Brooklyn to Ōwhiro Bay Western Connections: Highbury to City <p>Lower priority routes including around the south coast, and Northern Connections into Newlands, Paparangi, and Gairloch to Victoria may not be able to be delivered within this budget.</p> <p>Opex Cost: None Rates impact: None Capex Cost: \$120m Debt level impact: Within limit</p>	Accelerated full programme <p>This option includes our full \$226m programme of work and aims to complete that full programme during the next decade, including \$1m per year for minor improvements and tactical urbanism projects (see note) to encourage people to shift to cycling as a main form of transport.</p> <p>New cycleways projects will be prioritised in year 1 and delivery would begin from year 2. These routes would include the cycleways outlined below and in Option 3. The order will be based on current rough order costs and benefit/cost ratios.</p> <p>However, there is substantial uncertainty regarding the affordability of this option and the ability of the sector to deliver such a large programme of work.</p> <p>Projects included in this option are:</p> <p>All of the projects outlined in Option 3, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for Island Bay upgrade is included in this option – \$14m in years 1-3 More Northern Connections: Johnsonville to Newlands; Newlands to Paparangi; Paparangi to Johnsonville; and Churton Park to Paparangi More Western Connections: Ngāio to Karori; and Thorndon to Northland Coastal routes: Ōwhiro Bay to Lyall Bay; Lyall Bay to Seatoun; and Shelly Bay to Seatoun <p>What we progress and when as part of this option will depend on which routes are delivered as part of Let's Get Wellington Moving (LGWM), which is likely to be the Newtown Connections route, and any further Councillor decisions related to cycleways.</p> <p>Opex Cost: None Rates impact: None Capex Cost: \$226m Debt level impact: Over limit</p>

We decided to prioritise other areas of investment

1 M Token

2 Tokens

3 Tokens

4 Tokens

caption 37
This but give churton Park a cycle way (bc i live there)

Wellington City Youth Council

Te Rūnanga Taiohi o te Kaunihera o Pōneke

Decision 4 – Te Atakura First to Zero (climate change)

Option 1	Option 2	Option 3 (preferred option)
Low level of funding <p>This is a low funding option that is significantly below what is needed for the Te Atakura initiatives. It will mean a significant reduction in the scope of all planned initiatives, including no new money for Home Energy Saver, no Business Energy Saver, and no Climate Lab.</p> <p>This level of funding also means we only meet half the planned emissions reductions. It will threaten our ability to investigate new actions and adapt to climate change impacts that are already arising.</p>	Medium investment with savings <p>This is a medium level of funding, with only a small reduction from the full amount needed.</p> <p>This will still have an impact on the programme including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrifying the Council fleet over 10 years rather than 5 • Lower levels of funding for community engagement and initiative development; and • Business Energy Saver delayed to Year 2. 	Fully fund the programme <p>This option provides full funding for the Te Atakura action plan.</p> <p>This means we will be able to work toward reducing our emissions by the full amount planned for this decade. We will also be able to investigate new actions needed and respond to the climate change impacts that we are already seeing in the city.</p> <p>More on our plan is available at https://wellington.govt.nz/environment-and-sustainability/climate-change/zero-carbon-capital</p>
Opex Cost: \$7m Rates impact: 1 Token	Opex Cost: \$16.9m Rates impact: 2 Tokens	Opex Cost: \$18.6m Rates impact: 3 Tokens Part of the 5.77% average increase across 10 years
Capex Cost: \$6.1m Debt level impact: Within limit	Capex Cost: \$6.3m Debt level impact: Within limit	Capex Cost: \$8.4m Debt level impact: Within limit

Option 3 seems the most effective with a relatively low cost difference

Wellington City Youth Council

Te Rūnanga Taiohi o te Kaunihera o Pōneke

Decision 5 – Te Ngākau Civic Precinct – Council office buildings

Option 1 (preferred option)	Option 2
<p>Demolish and site developed through a long-term ground lease</p> <p>In this option the MOB and CAB buildings would be demolished and new buildings developed in their place, through the sale of a long-term ground lease and private funding to develop the replacement building. The opportunity for the National School of Music to be housed within any new MOB building would be pursued.</p> <p>This option enables the Council to avoid significant costs involved in strengthening the existing buildings.</p> <p>Because both buildings are demolished in this option, it will provide greater scope as a community to reimagine Te Ngākau Civic Precinct and see this area restored without further Council borrowings at a time when there are greater priorities for Council investment.</p> <p>MOB is considered a significant asset and a contributory building to the Heritage Civic Precinct. Permission to demolish and for a replacement to be built would require a resource consent.</p> <p>Under this option Council would retain ownership of the land, control the design brief for any replacement buildings, but not own or fund the replacement buildings.</p> <p>Opex Cost: \$750k for resource consent, with revenue of \$7m from the sale of MOB ground lease; \$7m from the sale of CAB ground lease</p> <p>Rates impact: Part of the 5.77% average increase across 10 years</p> <p>Capex Cost: Demolish MOB \$5.5m; Demolish CAB \$5.0m</p> <p>Debt level impact: Within limit</p>	<p>Proceed with base build proposal for public purposes</p> <p>Remediate MOB in its current form and for it to be a part of the National Music Centre. Retain and strengthen CAB.</p> <p>The design work required to strengthen and upgrade MOB has been completed and the cost is expected to be \$84m. The strengthened building would not result in a fully resilient building (67% NBS at best) as it is constrained by limitations within the existing building.</p> <p>It would possibly be completed quicker than alternate options that involve a replacement building and would retain the building's heritage value.</p> <p>In this option we would also retain and strengthen CAB, the strengthened building would not result in a fully resilient building (50% NBS) as it is constrained by limitations within the existing building. The cost is estimated to be \$48m.</p> <p>Both buildings would be funded through an increase in Council borrowings with an offsetting revenue stream from the ability to re-let the finished space as offices. The development risk for both would remain with Council.</p> <p>The increase in borrowings would take Council beyond its debt limit and would require a breach of the limit, the limit to be increased or other capital investment to be reduced.</p> <p>Opex Cost: MOB \$1.5m to \$3.8m p.a. Opex Revenue – CAB \$1.5m - \$2.0m</p> <p>Rates impact:</p> <p>Capex Cost: Estimated \$84m for MOB, Estimated \$48m for CAB</p> <p>Debt level impact: Over limit</p>
Option 3	Option 4
<p>Retain and seek to repurpose</p> <p>This option would see MOB strengthened and upgraded to a lesser standard to be fit for use as lower end office space. CAB would be strengthened in the same manner as envisaged under option 2.</p> <p>This option does not vary greatly from Option 2 but would prevent MOB from being available for the National School of Music. Under this option the strengthening costs are lower but there is a greater requirement for fit-out, which under Option 2 was being met by the National School of Music. The extent of the fit-out requirement of MOB will determine the repurposing cost.</p> <p>However, MOB would not be as resilient as in Option 2 and would require ratepayer funding as the expected lower rent would not be sufficient to fully fund the costs associated with the upgrade. The development risk would still be significant and would remain with Council.</p> <p>It is likely both buildings would be able to be completed more quickly than alternative options that involve replacement a building and this option would retain the MOB building's heritage value.</p> <p>The increase in borrowings would take Council beyond its debt limit and would require a breach of the limit, the limit to be increased or other capital investment to be reduced.</p> <p>Opex Cost: MOB \$0.7m - \$4.3m per annum for 35 years (if able to be leased) CAB lease revenue \$1.5m</p> <p>Rates impact:</p> <p>Capex Cost: Estimated \$70m - \$90m for MOB, Estimated \$48m for CAB.</p> <p>Debt level impact: Over limit</p>	<p>Sell to support development</p> <p>This option would seek to sell MOB and CAB 'as is'. The new owners would then become responsible for the strengthening and upgrade of the two buildings. Development risk would pass with the building to the new owner. Council would retain ownership of the land.</p> <p>Given the challenges and costs to strengthen these buildings there is no certainty that there would be a buyer or of the sale value, it may actually require Council to incentivise any sale.</p> <p>Importantly, when considering the wider Te Ngākau Civic Square perspective, this option would also result in Council losing control of significant sites in the square and introduces risks to the overall future of the area.</p> <p>As Council would have no control of the buildings, there is no guarantee that any refurbishment will be done in a timely manner, be of good quality, that the use will be appropriate for the area, or that the buildings will be strengthened to a resilient level.</p> <p>Because this option is a sale of the buildings, it relieves Council of the cost and associated borrowings, transfers the development risk and potentially does not result in any rates impact unless incentives are required to facilitate any sale.</p> <p>Opex Cost: None</p> <p>Rates impact: None</p> <p>Capex Cost: None</p> <p>Debt level impact: None</p>

Option 1

Don't demolish buildings in isolation to library. i.e. Demolish at same time to minimise overall disruption.

Wellington City Youth Council

Te Rūnanga Taiohi o te Kaunihera o Pōneke

Decision 7 – Sludge and waste minimisation

Option 1	Option 2
No change in current practice <p>The cheapest course of action would be to keep pumping raw wastewater across the city and disposing of it in the landfill. This is a feasible and affordable choice.</p> <p>The key issues with current practice are that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not meet the Council's environmental objectives; • large volumes of sludge would continue to be moved (pumped) across the City in a vulnerable 8km pipeline; and • the current practice would still need to be changed within about decade. <p>Opex Cost: No change Rates impact: None Capex Cost: No change Debt level impact: None</p>	Invest in technology at Southern Landfill <p>We could invest in better infrastructure at the Southern Landfill. For example, we could install a thermal drier (estimated additional total expenditure around \$86-95m) and this would go some way to reducing the volume of sludge to be disposed.</p> <p>However, while this option reduces some of the sludge volume to landfill, there remains a significant residual (remaining) volume of sludge to be disposed of at the landfill. In addition, the pumping of sewage across the city would continue.</p> <p>Overall, this option would result in incremental improvement, but continue to expose the city to the vulnerability of the 8km pipeline.</p> <p>Opex Cost: None Rates impact: None Capex Cost: \$86m to \$95m Debt level impact: Within limit</p>
Option 3	Option 4 (preferred option)
Sludge minimisation through Council funding <p>Invest in the existing wastewater treatment plant site at Moa Point.</p> <p>For example, we could build a digester (large tank system that reduces sludge volume, produces energy and treats the sludge so it is safe to dispose) and a dryer at Moa Point to further reduce volume and produce a product that could potentially be diverted from the landfill for beneficial re-use.</p> <p>This would mean the sludge would not need to be pumped to the Southern Landfill and would help the city meet its environmental objectives. This would be a long-term, strategic investment that would leapfrog short-term options and better reflect our aspirations on carbon and waste reduction.</p> <p>Investing in sludge minimisation better aligns our infrastructure with our ambition and stated objectives, however this comes at a significant cost.</p> <p>Opex Cost: None Rates impact: None Capex Cost: \$163m in first 10 years and \$54m in out years Debt level impact: Over limit</p>	Sludge minimisation through alternate funding <p>This is a similar option to Option 3. This is our preferred option, because the cost of the sludge minimisation programme would exceed our debt-to-income cap.</p> <p>This option proposes that the Sludge programme is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • completed by a 'Special Purpose Vehicle' and delivered without Council ownership; and • funded through the new Infrastructure Funding and Financing Act. <p>Risks: Should the alternative funding not be possible then there would be no funding allowance for this work in the Long-term Plan budget. This means that either the project could not proceed, further prioritisation of Council spending would be necessary, or an alternative Public Private Partnership (PPP) would need to be considered.</p> <p>Opex Cost: None Rates impact: None Capex Cost: Same as Option 3, but through alternate funding, so no cost to Council. Debt level impact: None</p>

Option 4,
3 as backup

Prefer Option 4.
As it achieves what
Option 3 does but
more financially
feasible. Would have to be
priority for 3, otherwise 2.

Wellington City Youth Council

Te Rūnanga Taiohi o te Kaunihera o Pōneke

Decision 6 – Te Ngākau Civic Square: Central Library

Option 1 (preferred option) Strengthen now by temporarily exceeding debt limit	Option 2 Council to strengthen Central Library later	Option 3 Strengthen now by increasing rates further
<p>This option repairs the building's structural issues to the highest extent possible. It includes base isolating the building. Base isolation means the building would likely be safe to occupy during and after a significant earthquake.</p> <p>The building's heritage value will be retained, and it will integrate more with Te Ngākau Civic Precinct and the surrounding streets through additional entrances, views, landscaping and improved accessibility.</p> <p>Under this option, the full costs of this project will be met by Council. It will mean the rebuild will progress within the original timeframe and the building will reopen in 2025.</p> <p>However, there is not enough headroom in the budget in the early years of the LTP for this project. This means the Council's debt limit will be exceeded in the first four years of the plan.</p>	<p>This option will repair the building's structural issues in the same manner as in Option 1, however this option does not exceed the Council's debt limit.</p> <p>As in Option 1 the full costs of this project will fall to Council, but in this option the project would be delayed until a period of the Long-term Plan when there is sufficient headroom, and therefore borrowing capacity, for the project to go ahead. This means Council would remain under its debt limit with this option.</p> <p>The period in this Long-term Plan where there is sufficient headroom will be in the latter parts of the plan. (Can we put a date on it?)</p>	<p>This option will repair the building's structural issues in the same manner as in Option 1, does not include a partnership approach, and allows for the remediation to happen as per the original timeframe (open 2025).</p> <p>However, this option does include an extra 3% rates increase above the 13.53% in year 1.</p> <p>The increase in rates will allow the Council to rapidly pay down more of the additional debt that it has taken on because of the temporary loss of the dividend from the Wellington International Airport Limited due to Covid-19 impacts.</p> <p>The additional borrowing headroom can then be used to fund the Central Library remediation and ensures the debt to income ratio of 225% is not breached.</p>
<p>Opex Cost: None</p> <p>Rates impact: None</p> <p>Capex Cost: \$178.7m</p> <p>Debt level impact: Over limit</p>	<p>Opex Cost: None</p> <p>Rates impact: None</p> <p>Capex Cost: \$178.7m</p> <p>Debt level impact: Within limit but delayed</p>	<p>Opex Cost: None</p> <p>Rates impact: 3% more on Y1</p> <p>Capex Cost: \$178.7m</p> <p>Debt level impact: Within limit and on time</p>

Option 1:
The library is a key landmark that is integral to cityscape. It is better to go over limit in order to restore the building.

Option 2
Not increasing rates or debt.
Waiting is the best option.

Process for Conducting Advisory Group Leadership Elections

Purpose

1. This document outlines how to run an election for chair and deputy chair, or co-chairs, of Wellington City Council's advisory groups.

Overview

2. The advisory groups hold yearly leadership elections for the position of chair and deputy chair, or co-chairs.
3. The Council liaison officers are responsible for running the election.
4. The advisory groups will first determine by vote which leadership model they wish to use (chair and deputy chair, or co-chairs).
5. Members will self-nominate for a position.
6. Candidates will be able to speak to the meeting for one minute.
7. The candidates with the highest number of votes will be elected.

Timing of leadership elections

8. Each advisory group elects their leadership election at a different time. The timing of elections may be changed with the agreement of the group and its liaison officers.
9. AAG holds their leadership election yearly in the second meeting of the calendar year.
10. ERG holds their leadership election yearly in the second meeting of the calendar year.
11. PAG holds their leadership election three yearly in the second meeting of the fiscal year.
12. Youth Council holds their leadership election yearly in the first meeting in March or the second Youth Council meeting of the calendar year, whichever comes later.
13. Sometimes a vacancy may arise in the position of chair, deputy chair, or co-chair. In such a case an additional leadership election should be held as soon as is practicable.
14. The leadership election will be a substantive item on the agenda for the relevant meeting and will be scheduled for approximately 30 minutes.

Pre-meeting Tasks

15. The liaison officers will announce the upcoming leadership election at the meeting prior to the meeting where the election is to be held.
16. The liaison officers will circulate this document to members.
17. Nominations may be received before the meeting and will be noted by the liaison officers.

Status of current leadership

18. Members holding leadership positions will continue to hold those positions until the conclusion of the meeting in which a leadership election is held at which point the newly elected leaders will assume their roles.
19. In the case of an additional election to fill a vacancy in the chair or deputy chair position, the remaining incumbent may run for the vacancy. If they are successful, then another election will be held for the position they vacated.
20. Any member, including current leadership, may run for any position.

Explanation of election process

21. The election process will follow this format:
 - a. Determination of leadership model.
 - b. Election of chair and deputy chair, or co-chairs.
22. The liaison officers will explain the election process to members.

Determination of leadership model

23. Prior to any election, one member will be selected by the group to assist in counting and verifying the votes.
24. At every regular leadership election, the advisory group will determine a leadership model to be used.
25. At an additional leadership election, if only one position is vacant then the election will use the current leadership model. If both positions are vacant, then there will be a vote on the leadership model the same as in a regular election.
26. The advisory group may choose to use one of the following two leadership models:
 - a. One chair and one deputy chair, or
 - b. Two co-chairs.
27. The leadership model must be determined before the election of chair, deputy chair, or co-chairs.

Debate and voting on leadership model

28. The liaison officers will call for members to speak for or against either option. If members wish to speak, then they must indicate this to the liaison officers who will keep a speaking list.
29. Members will write the leadership model they wish to vote for on a ballot handed out by the liaison officers.
30. Once voting has finished, the liaison officers will collect the votes. One liaison officer and the selected member will count and verify the votes in a separate room.
31. A liaison officer will announce the leadership model with the highest number of votes. No vote totals or margins will be announced.
32. If the vote is a tie, then a liaison officer will announce that the vote was tied, and the current leadership model will be retained.
33. The result of the vote will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.
34. The liaison officers will ensure the destruction of the ballots after the vote.

Election of chair, deputy chair, or co-chairs

35. If a chair and deputy chair leadership model is chosen, the following process will be followed:
 - a. Nominations for chair are received,
 - b. Candidates for chair address the meeting,
 - c. Voting for chair is conducted,
 - d. Nominations for deputy chair are received,
 - e. Candidates for deputy chair address the meeting,
 - f. Voting for deputy chair is conducted.
36. If a co-chairs leadership model is chosen, the following process will be followed:
 - a. Nominations for co-chairs are received,
 - b. Candidates for co-chair address the meeting,
 - c. Voting for co-chairs is conducted simultaneously.

Opening of nominations

37. Members seeking election to any position must self-nominate to run in that election.
38. The liaison officers will call for nominations at the meeting of the election. Nominations may also be received by the liaison officers at any point prior to calling for nominations.
39. The liaison officers will read a list of prior nominations received before calling for any more nominations.

Wellington City Youth Council

Te Rūnanga Taiohi o te Kaunihera o Pōneke

- 40. Nominations may be received from members who are not present at the meeting.
- 41. Nominations will be noted down and recorded in the minutes of the meeting.
- 42. If there is only one nomination then that candidate will be declared as the winner of the election.
- 43. A candidate who is unsuccessful in the election for chair may nominate themselves again for the position of deputy chair.

Candidates to address meeting

- 44. Before voting takes place, candidates may address the meeting for up to one minute.
- 45. If a member runs for both chair and deputy chair, they may speak for one minute before each vote.
- 46. Candidates who are absent from the meeting may address the meeting via audio or audio-visual link.

Voting to take place

- 47. Voting will take place in the meeting.
- 48. Voting will take place by secret ballot.
- 49. Only members present at the meeting may vote. This includes members present by audio or audio-visual link.
- 50. Members will write the name of the candidate they wish to vote for on a ballot handed out by the liaison officers.
- 51. The liaison officer will ensure that members attending by audio or audio-visual link are able to vote in a private manner.
- 52. If a co-chairs model is selected, then members shall have 2 votes.
- 53. Once voting has finished, the liaison officers will collect the votes. One liaison officer and the selected member will count and verify the votes in a separate room.

Announcement of the vote and follow-up procedures

- 54. For a chair and deputy chair model, the liaison officers will declare the candidate with the highest number of votes elected to the position. No vote totals, margins, or order of other candidates will be announced.
- 55. For the co-chairs model, the liaison officers will declare the two candidates with the highest number of votes elected to the positions. No vote totals, margins, or order of other candidates will be announced.
- 56. If the vote is tied, then the liaison officers will announce that the vote is tied, and the vote will be resolved by drawing a name out of a hat.
- 57. The result will be recorded in the minutes.
- 58. The liaison officer will ensure that ballots are destructed after the vote.

Additional election in the case of a vacancy

- 59. If a vacancy arises in the position of chair, deputy chair, or co-chair, then an additional election will be held to fill the vacancy as soon as practicable.
- 60. If the vacancy arises close to the time of a regular leadership election, then the advisory group may agree to wait until the regular leadership election to fill the vacancy. The group may also agree to hold the regular leadership election early to fill the vacancy.
- 61. If only one position is vacant then the election will use the current leadership model. If both positions are vacant, then there will be a vote on the leadership model the same as in a regular election.
- 62. An additional leadership election will use the same process as a regular leadership election.
- 63. In the case of an additional election to fill a vacancy in the chair or deputy chair position, the remaining incumbent may run for the vacancy. If they are successful, then another election will be held for the position they previously held.
- 64. The term of a chair, deputy chair, or co-chair will end at the next regular leadership election.