From: Jennifer McCormack
To: Alan Munro; Alex Maehe; ben.muriwai@police.govt.nz; Debbie Nowell; Faye Mathews; Greg Dunn; Jo Harrison; Joy Maehe; Lathum Douglas-Albert; louise@limelimited.co.nz; Peter Lansdaal; Lynette Parish
Cc: David Vincent
Subject: Joint venture events centre meeting 4.7.18 ***Please see below for attachment***
Date: Thursday, 5 July 2018 12:06:54 p.m.
Attachments: Joint venture events centre meeting 4.7.18.docx

FYI

Minutes of Meeting held 4 July 2018 between Matamata Futures, MPDC, Board and Consultant Michele Frey XYST.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

4 July 2018 Meeting with Moe/ MPDC/ Futures

Wednesday, 4 July 2018
11:00 AM

Present: Michele Frey XYST, Mark Naudē Parks and Facilities MPDC, Frank Healey Matamata Futures Trust, Alan Candy Matamata Futures Trust, David Vincent MOE, Peter Lansdaal, Alan Munro Matamata College
Apologies: Bruce Magan

Purpose of Meeting: To discuss potential synergies between Futures Trust Facility development and / School Gym.

Meeting introductions.

Background to Futures Trust:

- 9yrs ago approx, benefactor made a donation to the Futures Trust Stadium concept.
- This donation was held in the Matamata College account for some years.
- At that time there was a desire to facilitate a joint venture project, much like the topic of this meeting.
- Because no progress was made for some time, the College had to progress their upgrade works separately.
- 2 x investigative reports have been completed by Futures Trust – and these peer reviewed by Sport NZ.
- Council has now allowed for $2M in Long Term Plan.
- Council has raised the idea of the College as a possible option to be considered again.
  There have been numerous discussions over the years regarding the location with options including; Matamata Domain, Bedford Park, Swap Park, Headon Stadium (extension), Matamata College.
  Project working group has been established. Further research/ planning to be conduted, re suitability, location etc.
- Ancillary features - required by Futures. Access by the community is important. Little harder when facility tucked away at the back of the school. Haven't focused on the detail, 2 court basic. Future proofed.

Background to Matamata College:

- Reviewed current school facilities, Lucas facility is good for teaching facility but as a sports facility it is not up to standard.
- Bradley Gym refurb was below par the ceiling tiles were not fit for purposes but contractor replaced up to 3 times and then walked away from it.
- Building report on suitability of the Bradley Gym was included in last 5YA / 10YPP.
- Bradley Gym did not pass the first Earthquake testing but then the requirements changed.
- Methodology of seismic testing changed. Is the assessment worth revisiting.
- Ideally would like to keep the Lucas Gym and could replace the Bradley Gym
- Discussed impact on rugby and athletic fields - room to reconfigure.
- Access and parking - from the front entrance across the lawn and new parking in old S block or council owned reserve on College street could provide access to a new parking facility on the field.

Ministry of Education Perspective:

- MOE seeing benefits of the synergy of joint projects through other examples happening in the region.
- Community involvement important.
- Particularly important that the Council is involved, in terms of longevity of ownership model.
- Thames is a good example. Permanent council presence in the building.
- As long as the Board are happy with the management of the access managing people in and out of the school then the Ministry are happy. Keeping public use separate from the school during school time.
- Challenge comes from use of Ministry funding.
- Unlikely to stand in the way of demolition if it was a cost neutral option.
- Ministry issue would be how much money would be asked of from the Ministry.
- Ownership percentage is what the on-going funding is based on.
- Observation - limited funding available from Ministry. Sensible ownership model - can't pass the maintenance cost onto the Board.
- Operational costs – might be partially covered by the school if using facility - contribution of the cleaning, security etc.
- Who pays the cyclical maintenance, painting of the building, annual washdown - could see that the Board would be able to contribute.
- Insurance - if ministry owned any of the building then that portion would be insurance by the ministry's building replacement. (self funded).
- Is there a model for ground lease from the Ministry? Yes there is? Commercial Gym use could be seen to cross the line of land use for education.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

- Getting funding for building replacement needs a business case that says that replacement is 75% of the costs of refurbishment.
- With current school role, the College is currently entitled to 741m2 of gym floor space
- No Alternation to Designation required

Were to from here:

- Positive about a Futures Trust, College partnership – to be included in site SWOT analysis as a site option.
- SWOT analysis and further work now needs to be done by Futures Trust Working Group. – College option will consider facility but not funded by MOE
- No funding from Ministry for capital investment. Small contribution from current 5YA maybe apply to demolition costs, school lease costs, licence to occupied can be assigned and there is some secure longevity.
- Likelihood of use by the college for other site options. Not high in school time, some teams might use after school.

Other comments:

- School catchment area – **look at Transport Entitlement Zone**
- Kaahui Ako - Community of Learning. Schools involved would also have access to the facility. **Michele also keen to get some information about this.**
- Centenary alumni could provide access to further funds. Noted.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982