

Trinity South Christchurch Incorporated

Special General Meeting, 13th November 2023, Archer Village

1. Welcome

Dave Clancey (DC) opened the meeting with prayer.

2. Attendance and apologies

Attendance:

Rev. Dave Clancey (Chair), Rev. David Thompson, David Wong (DW), Mackenzie Shewan (Minutes), Lynley Shewan, David Fenton, Grace Phillips, Luke Phillips, Rich Burrridge (RB), John McKie (JM), Jill McKie, Tim Wilson (TW), Megan Wilson, Maria Thompson, Ann Burrridge, Rosemary Knowles, Paul McAven, Nikki McAven, Janet Lockyer, Grace Phillips, Luke Phillips, Matthew Phillips, Glenda Bly, Joy Penno, Colin Penno, Thomas Penno, Wayne Wright, Barry Williams, Denise Williams, Morgan Brown, Aimee Gray, Liz Cousins, Sarah Anthony, Ross Anthony, Selwyn Manning, Mary Manning, Karen Winder, Martin Winder, Margaret Coulthard, Graeme White, Rosemary White, Anita Leeson, Rachel Fountain, Paul Lubbers, Mandy Lubbers, Mary Logan, Bruce Logan, James O'Connell, Janie Phillips, Ivan Phillips, Jamie Hunt, Mike Weller, Michael Batstone, Colin Templeton, Linda Howe, John Simpson, John McGowan, Wayne Radford, Edna Radford, Rob Vosslander, Abbey Davison, Pam Walters, Bill Pascoe, Elizabeth Pascoe, Matthew Burlton, Heather Burlton, Josh Winder, Nick Cook, Paul Horne, Kyla Horne, Chris Field, Charlotte de Lacey, Ta Karati, Andrew Smith, Charlene Smith, Rachael Winder, Abin George, Ron Brand, Anne Brand, John O'Connell, Anita O'Connell, Finn Wescombe, Eleanor Van Voorthuizen, Sam Butcher, Francis Ho, Amanda Clancey, Thomas McAven,

Apologies

Roy Gearry, Denise Gearry, Ray Spring, Lois Spring, Geraldine Maffey, Katherine Fitch, David Fitch, Richard Holland, Alison Holland, Rose Simpson, Kay McGowan, Colleen Wright, Andy Cousins, Alexis O'Connell, Judith Anthony, Shirly Fenton, Andy Vosslander, Alison Cook, Jasmine Butcher, Mabel Ho, Claire Burrridge, Elsa George

3. Reflections from Dave

What do you think God is doing? Why is this opportunity appearing now? DC wants to assure us that he believes that the Lord knows exactly what he is doing, and he is aware of, and in control of everything. We have been praying for a long time that God would provide us with a building, so this opportunity is from the Lord, as is every opportunity. However, we need to use the wisdom and means he has given us to weigh up if this is a good choice. This is not "more special" because of the unusualness of the timing. DC reflects of a passage from 1 Samuel where Saul is pursuing David. Just because something seems divinely appointed doesn't mean that an idea should be used, holding to the scriptures is far more important. We know that God knows what he is doing, but we don't necessarily know what he is doing right now. We may be able to reflect on things as hindsight though.

Secondly, no matter what we decide, we still own a building on Colombo Street, with consented plans, which we will be able to move into in some time, even if we decide not to go with St Saviours, or go for it, but don't get it. DC wants to thank Rich Burrridge, Ross Anthony, and John McKie for their trust here, and for Rich especially because of his journey with 253.

4. General discussion

Is it to earthquake code? Yes, DC has chatted to a structural engineer, the earthquake damage that was incurred has been repaired and signed off on. The entire site can be used and is to code. In 2017 the building standards changed, and will likely be changed again, and St Saviours hasn't been reassessed since. DC thinks that there are likely parts of the building that wouldn't meet the new code. However, the building can continue to be used for a significant period of time.

253 Colombo Street was 68MPS, what is St Saviours? The vast majority of the building is nearly at 100%. The MBS goes to the lowest figure for any part, which at SS is the wall between the auditorium and the toilets, and the west gable in the hall, so the whole building is marked 38%, but everything else is 70%+ (apart from the tower, which is about 50%).
Are there risks that those levels might change (is there a timeframe on bringing them up to code)? RB spoke to the council this afternoon so ask if a building at 34% is at risk of being deemed unusable any time in the near future, and it seems the answer is no.

Does the church have existing use rights? Yes

It seems like it is a turn key solution (we could settle and walk in the next day), there may be issues with the cost of insurance and if there are small areas of the building that bring down the overall percentage of current code, it may well be appropriate to look at some repairs to help improve the overall rating of the building, and therefore decrease insurance costs.

Would we be able to get a mortgage on it? We aren't sure. As a church we have struggled to get a mortgage for other ventures. No one has been lining up to give us money, so we haven't dug into it in any great detail here. Internal loans from parishioners may be more prudent going forward.

As far as we are aware is it a deadline sale (closing on the 6th Dec). Can we only go in if we have finance arranged? We aren't sure, we need to ask some people, and think through some pros and cons of different options.

A request for clarification of our financial situation was made.

DW went over his graphic. We have \$1.1 million in funds available, \$400k pledged before the end of the tax year, and then another \$450k thereafter. Then we have the two big orange numbers, which \$750k in sales from 253 (we hope it is a conservative estimate) the RV of 253 is over \$1 million, the big green area is what we think we will have to pay. We'd hope to be bidding about \$3 million. There is a big range of how much we could be short by (\$250k to \$750k).

Do those figures include the money set aside for a vicarage? Yes

If we had to borrow money, can we afford to service a loan? Would decrease in rent, reduced staffing, and some other things be enough to service a loan? We aren't sure. We probably won't be saving massive amounts due to extra insurance and maintenance so serving a commercial loan will be difficult. It is also likely that reduced staffing will only be the case for a year (or so), so it isn't a long-term solution.

Is St Saviours currently insured? It is insured, all 3 buildings, but the church and hall don't

have natural disaster insurance on them (a standard decision by CPT), but both the vicarage and 196 do.

Is there an opportunity to rent out the office as income? It is possible, there are several different options about how we could think through our choices, and the vestry and wardens are thinking through it.

Does the roof still leak and have the toilets been done up? The main foyer has stopped leaking, but there does seem to be some other leaking issues (on the edge of the tower) but they appear solvable, and it does appear that there are possible some other leaks. We know that there are still problems with it, but we have lived with them before, and the major ones seem to have been dealt with.

Will there be chattels with the building (kitchen equipment and such)? We need to ask some questions about that, including two large communion tables and a font which currently can't be found on site. The agent believes all the chattels will be going with it, but we haven't seen that in writing. When we get to the level of detail that is in a tender document we will know by then.

Has an ongoing monthly maintenance/running bill for St Saviours vs 253 been calculated? No, because we aren't sure how we would start doing that at the moment. Generally, we don't do planned maintenance very well, so it would be something wise to be budgeting for.

From DC's PoV is 8 Roxburgh Street suitable for ministry, and is it suitable for a family of 6? DC believes so, it has good separation between family space and private space. It is a very different kettle of fish to Indira Lane, because they have different purposes, but the Clancey family were very happy living there, and it was a great place for their boys to grow up. Amanda noted that it is 4 bedrooms plus the study, so should be able to fit the Ballinger family.

Neither of these costs include fitout, how would we manage seating, sound systems, etc.? We probably have 80 chairs already, RB says sound stuff won't be a problem, and there are enough of the "church cups" to set us up.

If we were to purchase St Saviours, how can we make it more welcoming for newcomers? That discussion needs to be had, including our reflections as people who were once welcomed there. However, in the past, the building has been one of our best evangelists thus far.

There is no guarantee that an insurer will cover a building for a new owner, is prearranging insurance an option so there are no unpleasant surprises? It is now, we will consider it.

The current value of the property is mostly in the land, so we could insure to demolish and have most of our value left, due to the land.

Is the vicarage insulated? Yes. Are the kitchen and bathroom up to modern standards? Amandas understanding is that the kitchen was renovated around 2004 and still worked well when they were there, they had a new vanity put in the bathroom when they were there, there was an older bath (but it was functional).

Has anyone been approached to see if there is interest in selling 253? The car yard owner next door had a valuation of \$1,100 to \$1,300 per square metre last week, which would give

us a valuation of \$800,000 to \$1 million. The block next door to him went up and was sold very quickly, so we aren't too concerned about sale.

Have we thought about relinquishing 196 Colombo Street if it won't be useful for us? It would require subdivision, but there is potential for it, though that question hasn't been specifically answered.

There is an amount of \$94,000 in the category "pledges due September 2023", are we concerned that this hasn't been given yet?

Not really, DW has spoken with those people, and they are waiting to know that there is something happening before they fulfil their pledges.

Do we have specifics of the valuation? Is there a way to pitch a lower offer since we will likely be going up against developers? At this stage we seem to be the only faith-based organisation looking at this, however there a lot of developers, and it seems very unlikely that the Diocese would accept a lower offer from us solely because we are a faith base d organisation.

JM reflected on our building journey so far including the years we spent looking for a suitable building in a number of places. This led us to settle on 253 as the best and only likely option. We had previously approached CPT, and they had said they wouldn't sell to us, but recently things have changed, but this was only a short number of weeks ago, and so while TW and JM thought the boat might have sailed, they felt honour bound to actively explore that option. They met with the Bishop recently and they had had offers from "quasi-Christian" organisation(s), whom they felt uncomfortable selling to, but they would sell to us. The message that was given to the bishop is that we are serious contenders, and will be making a serious offer, if the church is willing to. There may not be that much difference between the cost of St Saviours and the cost of developing 253, despite best estimates of development costs. Our offer will be best accepted if it has the fewest conditions on it. JM also noted that if we had to service a mortgage on an open market, we may no longer be able to effectively fund ministry on that site.

Would a tender for the purchase of SS be conditional on the sale of 253? We are wrestling through that, comparing what gives us the most security vs the highest chance of our offer being accepted.

Is bridging finance from people in this room an option? We may need a reasonably long period of time to pay back any finance so would possibly be looking internally for that bridging solution.

With the due diligence material provided we get insurance certificates, the cost to rebuild the buildings (if they were new) would be \$9 million, but they are currently valued at \$1 million (it's mostly land value) so we are paying about 11%.

For the people who may be delaying their pledges for tax reasons, is there a legitimate way to make it such that pledges become "bridging loans"? It is possible and we may be required to think creatively. People need to know that if they let the church know that they have X amount of money available that they won't be asked next time a money situation comes up.

Is there any capacity left for more giving, i.e., have DW or the wardens been made aware of people who would like to give extra for St Saviours? TW is amazed at the generosity that got us to this point, especially given the speed of this process. We don't have any numbers to find out if people can add some more in light of this. JM has had some conversations where

people are possible open to giving some more for St Saviours compared to 253. This, however, is all anecdotal at this time.

Are there options for late settlement? Maybe, we don't know.

Do we need to keep this quiet so that extra interest isn't generated in the St Saviour's sale? DC thinks that seems wise, especially in regards to the potential sale of 253, since people may offer lower if they know we're desperate to sell.

What happens with the name of the church?

It may have to be deconsecrated and therefore lose its name so we could maybe rename it.

At this point DC assess the mood of the room in regards to the pursuit of submitting an offer, and it is, for the most part, positive.

5. The motion

"That this SGM supports that Parish Council actively pursuing the possible purchase of St Saviours, being mindful of ongoing financial obligations."

DC notes that the motion does not say "buy it no matter what" it says, "look carefully at it, and do the best you can".

After the PC has pursued it and found out what offer is possible and reasonable, will they go ahead or come back to the church before submitting it? The PC will likely go ahead if it is possible, due to the time pressure of the situation. The PC is seeking permission to go ahead and do what they believe to be best for the church.

What does Jay think about this? Jay is happy for us to proceed and was very surprised that we are able to be here, but he is keen for us to go for it. ACANZP has not been this positive about St John's Latimer Square or St Stephens so we are shocked but need to be mindful of other churches and their money too, and how our success or otherwise may affect them.

A request is made to fix the grammar of the motion. It becomes "That this SGM supports the Parish Council actively pursuing the possible purchase of St Saviours, being mindful of ongoing financial obligations."

If we absolutely needed to we could sell 196 Colombo Street and/or 8 Roxburgh street to put extra money in the pot for renovations.

Rob Vosslander moves the motion, JM seconds it.

The meeting prays.

The motion passes with one abstention.

6. Closing of the meeting

DC requests that we continue to pray, particularly for TW, JM, and the rest of the parish council as they make decisions. He also requests that we consider the potential of increasing our pledges or offering bridging finance.