

HUTT CITY COUNCIL

EASTBOURNE COMMUNITY BOARD

Minutes of a meeting held in the East Harbour Women's Club, 145 Muritai Road,
Eastbourne on

Tuesday 4 April 2017 commencing at 7.15pm

PRESENT:

Mr R Ashe	Mr M Gibbons
Ms V Horrocks (Chair)	Ms L Knight (Deputy Chair)
Cr T Lewis	Cr M Lulich
Ms A Sutherland	

APOLOGIES:

There were no apologies.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr B Kibblewhite, Chief Financial Officer
Mr C Cottrill, Reserves Assets Manager, Parks and Gardens
(part meeting)
Ms S Haniel, Committee Advisor

PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaking under public comment, **Mr P Sprey** thanked the Board for the recent traffic improvements in Ferry Road. He said that his vision for the Eastbourne Bays was for permanent solutions to road drainage and culverts, and for underground power and phone services.

In response to a question from a member, Mr Sprey said that he would email the Board a summary of his vision.

The remainder of the public comments are recorded under the item to which they relate.

3. PRESENTATIONS

a) Presentation by Local Councillor from Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)

There was no presentation.

b) Presentations by Residents' Associations and other Community Groups

There were no presentations.

4. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED: (Ms Horrocks/ Ms Knight)

Minute No. ECB 17201

"That the minutes of the meeting of the Eastbourne Community Board held on Tuesday, 7 February 2017, be confirmed as a true and correct record."

6. CHAIR'S REPORT (17/420)

Report No. ECB2017/2/64 by the Chair

The Chair elaborated on the report.

Ms Knight gave an update on the progress of the blue tsunami lines.

Mr Ashe said that the shared path was making slow progress. He requested a report on the project for the Board's next meeting in June 2017.

RESOLVED: (Ms Horrocks/ Ms Knight)

Minute No. ECB 17202

"That the Board notes the report."

7. **PROPOSED MINI RAMP** (17/508)

Memorandum dated 15 March 2017 by the Reserves Assets Manager, Parks and Gardens

Speaking under public comment, **Mr E Cowley** said that he supported the skate ramp in principle, however did not support the site. He further said that the ramp would be noisy, the proposed site was concrete with concrete walls around it and there were no other skate ramps in the near region which compared to the proposed site. He added that he preferred the CL Bishop Park site which had grass and would be a destination because it had other facilities, including shops.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms R Hainsworth** said that noise echoes in the proposed site. She further said that CL Bishop Park would be quieter because there was a grass surface. She added that CL Bishop Park had better visibility for overlooking any disputes or accidents, compared to the proposed site.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms B Sullivan** said that she supported a skate ramp but did not support the proposal. She further said that there had been insufficient information given to the affected neighbours. She said that the proposal was at odds with the Board's Statement of Basic Principles, points three and six, which were concerned with a resident's right to quiet enjoyment of surroundings, and issues of dignity, safety and well-being, and raised issues under section 16 of the Resource Management Act. She said that the proposal was for a ramp of percussive materials, sited in what was in effect an amphitheatre, next to a church. She said that her objection was to the loud, repetitive noise of the wheels and skateboards hitting the hard surface. She requested that the Board consult more widely and provide information on all the options.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms V Flaus** said that she lived opposite the proposed site. She added that she supported people skating, however she was concerned about the consultation process and that she had not been given information to consider all of the location options.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms R Palmer** said that a skate ramp would be a good asset for the community, however, Days Bay park would be better. She added that the hard surface of the proposed site had safety issues. She added that the proposed site had no other facilities for children or parents, such as seating or shops.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr G Palmer** said that the Board had rejected a similar proposal in 2001 because it would have interfered too much with the lives of the people who lived near the park.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms M Martin** said that she agreed with Mr and Ms Palmer. She added that during the skate ramp trial in 2001, the noise of clanking of skateboards on the ramp had gone on for hours and upset her. She further said that the noise could go for 12 hours on the weekend and she could not enjoy the peace of her home. She said that CL Bishop Park would be a better site with more facilities. She noted that in the survey only 24 percent of respondents had opted for the proposed site.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr D Chin** said that he lived near the proposed site and supported the proposal. He added that on the weekends he did not see people using

the site.

Speaking under public comment **Mr G Drummond** said that he saw a lot of people making use of the park with skates and bikes and that the proposal would increase use across the site.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms R Attwell** expressed concern about the consultation process. She added that she was not on Facebook and therefore had not known about the proposal from the outset. She requested that for future consultations, an advertisement be placed in the Eastbourne Herald at the same time as the online information, which would get everyone involved from the beginning.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms S Diederich** apologised to anyone who had not been included in the process. She said that the consultation process had used such strategies as door knocking, online surveys and letter box drops.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms W Pharazyn** said that she lived directly opposite the tennis court and people used the courts all the time to play tennis. She further said that the tennis courts needed to be divided from a skateboard area and hedging could be used for this purpose. She added that the proposed site currently looked like a prison cell. She requested that the other proposed sites be similarly investigated with regard to improvements.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr M Hayes** said that plantings could reduce noise by breaking up the flat surface and could be part of a wider improvement process to result in a win-win solution. He added that the current proposal was different to the 2001 skate ramp trial. He further said that the initial survey in October 2016 was a preliminary survey to ascertain whether the community had any interest in a skate ramp. The proposal was for the skate ramp to be open from 8am to 8pm and he anticipated the use of the ramp would be limited by factors such as weather and children going to school.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms J Ponder** said that the proposed site was not the right area for the skate ramp. She further said that she remembered the noise from 2001 when the noise echoed around the area.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms P Madgwick** said that she remembered the previous skate ramp, that it had not been maintained and had been left to deteriorate. She further said that a skate ramp needed funding and a maintenance plan. She added that the wider possibilities for the skate ramp had not been explored.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr G Blair** said that he lived next door to the proposed site and he supported the proposal. He added that the area was underutilised apart from the tennis courts and a couple of kids kicking a ball around on the weekends. He reiterated that it looked like a prison cell and supported turning the area into something fantastic. He suggested safety measures such as using a sand or rubber base for the skate ramp.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr P Sprey** said that a pit ramp, ie a skate ramp built into the ground, would throw the noise vertically and not horizontally.

The Reserves Assets Manager, Parks and Gardens elaborated on the memorandum.

RESOLVED: (Mr Ashe/Cr Lewis)

Minute No. ECB 17203

"That the Board:

- (i) supports in principle the building of a mini skate ramp on the proposed H W Shortt Recreation Ground tennis court site;*
- (ii) requests officers to provide a full report, to be made available to the public on the other two proposed sites – CL Bishop Park and the North West Corner to the Cricket nets at the HW Shortt Recreation Ground;*
- (iii) requests officers to incorporate design measures to assist mitigation of noise from the mini skate ramp;*
- (iv) requests officers to monitor noise complaints and other complaints; and*
- (v) requests officers report back to the Board where necessary."*

8. 2017 COMMUNITY BOARDS' CONFERENCE (17/511)

Memorandum dated 17 March 2017 by the Senior Committee Advisor

The Chair elaborated on the report.

RESOLVED: (Ms Horrocks/ Ms Sutherland)

Minute No. ECB 17204

"That the Board:

- (i) notes the Community Boards' Conference will be held in the Methven from 11-13 May 2017 attached as Appendix 1 to the report;*
- (ii) notes the Training Policy for Community Boards and Community Committees' adopted by Council at its meeting held on 14 March 2017, attached as Appendix 2 to the report;*
- (iii) notes that the number of members being funded through the training budget to attend the conference is limited to one per Board;*
- (iv) notes the estimated cost of attending the conference per representative is approximately \$1,500.00; and*
- (v) agrees that Mr Murray Gibbons represents the Board at the 2017 New Zealand Community Boards' Conference."*

9. **COMMITTEE ADVISOR'S REPORT** (17/421)

Report No. ECB2017/2/6 by the Committee Advisor

The Chair elaborated on the report.

RESOLVED: (Ms Horrocks/ Mr Gibbons)

Minute No. ECB 17205

"That the Board:

- (i) *notes the updates in the report; and*
- (ii) *appoints Ms Horrocks as the Board's representative on the Keep Lower Hutt Beautiful Committee."*

10. **REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES ON LOCAL ORGANISATIONS**

a) **Eastbourne and Bays Community Trust** (17/422)

Mr Gibbons said that the Heritage Trail was making progress and would attract visitors to Eastbourne. He added that the Heritage Trail was part of the Vibrant Village project. He further said that the old cell block would be moved in the next few weeks to the Menzshed, where it would be refurbished.

b) **Eastbourne Youth Workers' Trust** (17/423)

Ms Knight said that the Trust supported the proposed mini ramp.

c) **Muritai School Hall Management Committee** (17/424)

Ms Knight said that there was nothing to report.

d) **Vibrant Village** (17/425)

Mr Gibbons said that he had reported on the Heritage Trail in his Eastbourne and Bays Community Trust report.

e) **Days Bay Wharf Steering Group** (17/426)

Mr Ashe said that there had been no activity since the last Board meeting.

f) **Centreport's Eastbourne Liaison Group** (17/427)

Mr Ashe said that the group was inactive.

g) **Eastbourne Childcare Community Group** (17/428)

Ms Knight said that the Group currently had a waiting list.

h) **Community Response Group** (17/429)

Ms Knight said that the blue tsunami lines were progressing.

i) **Educating Residents Around Trapping (ERAT) Steering Group** (17/430)

Ms Sutherland said that the Group had its inaugural meeting and the roll-out had been discussed.

11. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

There being no further business the Chair declared the meeting closed at 8.50 pm.

Ms V Horrocks
CHAIR

CONFIRMED as a true and correct record
Dated this 27th day of June 2017