

**The unconfirmed minutes are subject to confirmation at the Community Board meeting to be held on 13 February 2018.**

**HUTT CITY COUNCIL**

**EASTBOURNE COMMUNITY BOARD**

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

**Tuesday 7 November 2017 commencing at 7.15pm**

---

**PRESENT:**

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

**APOLOGIES:**

There were no apologies.

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mr B Kibblewhite, General Manager Corporate Services  
Mr B Hodgins, Divisional Manager Parks and Gardens (part meeting)  
Mr D Bentley, Senior Environmental Health Officer (part meeting)  
Ms S Haniel, Committee Advisor

**PUBLIC BUSINESS**

**1. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies.

Members noted the apologies from; Cr Lamason, Greater Wellington Regional Council; Roger Thompson; and Samantha Bachelor.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Comments are recorded under the item to which they relate.

**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS**

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

### **PRECEDENCE OF BUSINESS**

**RESOLVED:** (Ms Horrocks/Ms Knight)

**Minute No. ECB 17501**

*"That, in terms of Standing Order 10.4, precedence be accorded to item 7 dealing with the Mini Skate Ramp."*

The items are recorded in the order in which they were listed on the order papers.

### **4. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** (Ms Knight/Cr Lewis)

**Minute No. ECB 17502**

*"That the minutes of the meeting of the Eastbourne Community Board held on Tuesday, 5 September 2017, be confirmed as a true and correct record."*

### **5. REPORTS REFERRED FOR BOARD INPUT BEFORE BEING CONSIDERED BY STANDING COMMITTEE OR SUBCOMMITTEE OF COUNCIL**

#### **a) Days Bay Reserves Declaration and Classification (17/1670)**

Report No. ECB2017/5/261 by the Asset Planner

The Divisional Manager Parks and Gardens elaborated on the report.

**RESOLVED:** (Mr Ashe/Cr Lewis)

**Minute No. ECB 17503**

*"That the Committee endorses the recommendations contained in the report, and adds that it supports all seven areas A, B, C (including area C2), D, E, F and G, as reserve areas."*

b) **Cheviot Road - Proposed No Stopping At All Times Restriction** (17/1662)

Report No. ECB2017/5/262 by the Contractor

The Divisional Manager Parks and Gardens elaborated on the report.

**RESOLVED:** (Mr Ashe/Ms Horrocks)

**Minute No. ECB 17504**

*"That the recommendation contained in the report be endorsed."*

6. **CHAIR'S REPORT** (17/1638)

Report No. ECB2017/5/143 by the Chair

The Chair elaborated on the report. She highlighted that the Dog Control Bylaw signs in Days Bay needed to be replaced by correct signage. She requested that officers progress the issue so that correct information was available to the public.

In response to questions from members, the Divisional Manager Parks and Gardens, said that Council's Heritage Architect would be involved in the design for the repair of the wharves. Eastbourne's Historical Society and Heritage New Zealand would also be involved in the process.

Members noted that the Eastern Bays Shared Path had received final approval, and that the cycleway between Woburn and Seaview had not been approved in this funding round. Mr Ashe said that cycleways needed to join communities in order to get the usage benefits. The General Manager Corporate Services said that he would send the southern beltway routes to the Board.

**RESOLVED:** (Ms Horrocks/Ms Sutherland)

**Minute No. ECB 17505**

*"That the Board notes the report."*

7. **MINI SKATE RAMP** (17/1612)

Report No. ECB2017/5/263 by the Divisional Manager, Parks and Gardens

The Chair said that there had been some division in the community over the issue of the mini skate ramp and asked that everyone present showed kindness and respect to everyone else, whether or not people agreed with the view. She also said the time for public comment would be extended to ensure everyone who wanted to speak would be heard.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms R Palmer** said that she was not against the skate ramp but against the proposed site. Bishop Park had better facilities and there was more for people to do there. The project would be expensive and needed to be used by more people than those that would use it at the San Antonio site. The proposed site was one of the few hard surfaces available and should not be dug up for the skate ramp. If the skate ramp did not work out, then it would have to be dug up which would be expensive. The proposed design would make some parts of the area shut off and not visible.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms M Mills, representing local residents**, said that she supported the skate ramp, however, it needed to be in a location where residents were not upset. The San Antonio site echoed and trees would not mitigate the sound. She suggested Bishops Park, by the sea as an alternative site. She said she had spoken to Father Madden, and the Principal of San Antonio School, and they were not happy with the proposed site. They raised issues with vandalism and theft.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms W Pharazyn** advised that she had found the process divisive and stressful. The proposed site was across the road from her house and skateboards echoed loudly. Older people were more sensitive to the noise and she had considered selling her house and leaving Eastbourne because of the proposal.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms M Martin** said that the San Antonio site was not the right site because it was too close to neighbours in a very quiet residential area. The site had an amphitheatre effect and there was no evidence that trees would mitigate the sound. She said that Bishop's Park would be the best site.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr I Caddis** said that there was division in the community about the skate ramp. He considered that this meeting was a repeat of previous public meetings, where the Board had visited all of the proposed sites and that San Antonio was the best site. He urged the Board to consider options with an open mind.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr G Blair** said that he lived closest to the proposed skate ramp site, that he cared about his neighbours and believed the proposed site was the right one. He advised that the area was under-utilised and that it should be beautified with trees and grass in order for the children to use it. He added that there was a flying fox next to the San Antonio site which made loud noises when the flying fox hit the end of it. He considered that the flying fox made more noise than what a skate ramp would make.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr M Woodnorth** said that the San Antonio site was

currently a slab of concrete with nothing else there, and that he occasionally used his skateboard there. He considered that the design looked nice and would be an asset to the community. Furthermore, he did not mind where the proposed skate ramp was located, but it did matter what the neighbours wanted. He asked the Board to try to manage everyone's issues.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr T Kelly** said that he would be affected by the noise that came from the proposed skate ramp and it would be difficult to ameliorate the noise with trees. He urged the Board to commission an acoustics expert who could provide professional advice.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr J Mallett** said that he supported having a skate ramp built, however, the location was the issue, and it could be built somewhere else. He said that people used the San Antonio site all the time because it was one of the only flat concrete areas in Eastbourne. Therefore, the noise would always be there. He supported a mini ramp. He asked that the Board move the proposed site and get the skate ramp built.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr D Chin** said that he lived close to the proposed site. He argued that the skate ramp would be great for the community and improve use in a site that was under-utilised.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms V Saunderson** said that she supported the San Antonio site because it was a natural meeting place, it would be a great asset, and Bishop Park would be a long trip for the children.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms J McDougall** said that a skate ramp was a great idea because children could develop their skills and camaraderie with each other. Her concerns were that they were at home all day. The noise would not be so bad for people who were out all day and came home in the evening. The area was used a lot already, and the sound echoed. She said that the Board needed to consider their Basic Principles and the concerns being expressed. She said that another site would be better.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr D McDougall** said that if the proposed skate ramp went ahead, some people, including himself would be "sacrificial lambs. He queried how the Board had proposed an inappropriate site. He noted that none of the Board members lived near the San Antonio site or near the other sites. Some of the other sites would be large enough to expand a skate board area for the older children. He sang "Oh Flower of Scotland."

**RESOLVED:** (Ms Horrocks/Cr Lewis) **Minute No. ECB 17506**

*"That Standing Order 15.2 be temporarily suspended to allow public comment on item 7 dealing with the Mini Skate Ramp."*

Speaking under public comment, **Mr D McIlroy, Barrister & Solicitor representing a Group of Eastbourne Residents who oppose the Mini Skate Ramp Proposal**, said that the issue was not whether to have a ramp, but where to build it. He argued that the Board had a statutory responsibility under the Resource Management Act 1991, s.16 to avoid any unreasonable noise. Furthermore, he believed the proposal would breach principles 3 and 6 under the Board's Statement of Basic Principles. 3 and 6.

He further said that an acoustical professional such as Marshall Day needed to be

engaged to assess the proposal. If Marshall Day had assessed the site, it would have found the proposed site to be unsuitable. Mr McIlroy elaborated on emails from Marshall Day.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms V Garrett** said that she used to live in Okura, where there was a skate park with a beautiful bowl, and other facilities such as trees to climb, and a beach. All of her children could find activities that they liked to do and she spent many nights there with her picnic blanket. She encouraged the Board to select a site where families could keep all of their children happy.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr T Bamford** said that the location of the proposed skate ramp may not be the best location. He asked the Board to consider the neighbours responses, the Resource Management Act, central government policy documents, and Council's District Plan. He said that sound was an issue and that the Board consider the context of their decision making.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr B Heffernan** said that he had walked past two people skating on the San Antonio site and he did not hear a noise until he was right outside the courts. He considered that skateboarding was not a crime, but that it was something that he enjoyed. He reassured residents that if a chain was across the area, and people were skateboarding when they should not be, then young people would be embarrassed and stop their skateboarding if asked to.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr S Cobb** said that the proposed skate ramp was consistent with Council's Leisure and Well-Being Strategy, which encouraged children to participate in physical activity. He was impressed by the proponent's consultation with people in the area. He advised that the proposed site was a concrete area which was a scarce resource in the area, and the proposal should be more ambitious than what it was. He said the Local Government Act requires that the community boards promote recreational facilities and opportunities in its area with a view to ensure maximum usage. He asked the Board to report back to Council

Speaking under public comment, **Mr Fairbold** said that the acoustics had been properly investigated, other areas for the skate ramp had been investigated, and the Board had properly done its due process.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms S Deiderich** said that it was not true that San Antonio School did not support the proposed skate ramp. Furthermore, the Principal, who was on maternity leave, supported the proposal, as did the School Board. She added that the Church supported the proposal and that the skate ramp would be locked during Church services and funerals.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr M Hayes, representing the Skate Park Committee** said that the proposed skate ramp would be a fantastic community asset. All of the sites had been assessed. Furthermore, adding in a basketball court would be a project they could take forward.

The Divisional Manager, Parks and Gardens elaborated on the report. The proposal had been before the Board for 12 months and officers had assessed the San Antonio site and its suitability as directed by the Board. Officers had not assessed any other sites, however, there may be other sites that could be suitable. Officers had undertaken noise testing and the proposal would comply with the largest 'residential activity area' noise rules contained within Council's District Plan. The proposed landscaping plan would marginally mitigate

the noise. The skate ramp would be concrete and could be locked with a chain across it when necessary, and these measures would mitigate noise. The San Antonio site was a Council reserve, and as such, activities on it generate noise which was allowable under Council's District Plan. Council wants to encourage its reserve sites to be used as much as possible, and the proposed skate ramp would assist in getting children away from computer screens to do activities that would be healthy and challenging.

In response to questions from members, the Divisional Manager Parks and Gardens said that if the proposal went ahead, it would be built in the winter months of 2018. If further noise mitigation was required, acoustic panels could be attached to the adjacent Eastbourne Community Hall walls.

The Senior Environmental Health Officer said that his qualifications were a Bachelor of Applied Science (Environmental Health), which included an Acoustics Course. He was a previous member of the Acoustical Society of New Zealand, and has been employed at Council for 19 years, presenting evidence at Resource Management Act hearings regarding noise issues.

In response to questions from members, the Senior Environmental Health Officer said that Recreational Areas under Council's District Plan did not have noise limits. Officers had measured the noise of the proposed skate ramp at 48-50dBA, which was not an unreasonable level of noise when compared to World Health Organisation (daytime) guidelines.

Members noted the noise mitigation measures which would reduce the effects of the proposed skate ramp on the neighbouring sites. They further noted that San Antonio School and the Church supported the proposal and were not opposed as some submitters had maintained.

Mr Gibbons said that he supported the proposed skate ramp, and was concerned for both the elderly and the youth.

Ms Sutherland said that both the School and Church supported the proposal and she would not support the proposal without the support of those bodies.

Mr Ashe said that there was a demand for this facility and it would be a shared asset for the community. The Board had done due diligence and he supported the proposal. However, he asked the community to keep the Board informed about the noise levels and any complaints because it was important for the Board to continue to address those issues.

Cr Lulich said that he had been impressed by the high standard of submissions for and against the proposal. The noise would be below the limits set out in Council's District Plan, and mitigation measures included controls of when the skate ramp could be used. Officers had given assurances about the proposal and it was good to support young people.

Ms Knight said that the Board had been given assurances by officers and she supported the development of under-utilised recreational areas.

Cr Lewis said that the Board had listened to the community and needed to balance up the

submissions and the way the space would be used. Youth congregated at the San Antonio site more than at Bishop Park. The San Antonio site would focus more on local children and Bishop Park was more regionally focussed. Petone Recreation Ground had a wooden skate ramp which built 15 years ago which had opposition at the time, but now was part of the park. She supported the proposed skate park which would be lower in height than the Petone skate ramp, and made of concrete, not wood.

The Chair read out the Board's Statement of Basic Principles and said that the Board also had to take into account the Local Government Act which promoted recreational facilities and opportunities in its area with a view to ensuring maximum usage.

The Chair pointed out that the proposed ramp would be only 1.2 metres high and not attractive to older skate boarders. The proposal for the site was supported by community organizations: the Eastbourne Lions had donated towards the proposal; the Board had received a letter from the San Antonio School Board of Trustees Chair who had expressed support from both the Board and Principal of the skate ramp as per the plans submitted, and the school's interest in working with Council on the development of the school grounds if the proposal went ahead; the Youth Trust had written a letter of support; and the Chair of the San Antonio Church Committee discussed the proposal with the congregation and reported that they supported the proposal and thought it would be an asset for Eastbourne's young people.

The Chair further said that she had met with residents who were concerned about the echo and reverberation, but had been reassured by the officers' report, and after observing how quiet skaters were on concrete ramps compared to wooden ramps. She asked that an advisory group of young users be established and that the Church have the opportunity to contribute regarding the noise controls. She added that it was important to ensure that people were not disturbed or had their peace ruined.

**RESOLVED:** (Ms Knight/Mr Ashe)

**Minute No. ECB 17507**

*"That the Board supports the building of a mini skate ramp on the San Antonio site, which is the sealed area at HW Short Recreation Reserve."*

8. **SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2018** (17/1575)

Memorandum dated 13 October 2017 by the Senior Committee Advisor

The Committee Advisor elaborated on the report.

**RESOLVED:** (Ms Horrocks/Mr Gibbons)

**Minute No. ECB 17508**

*"That the Board:*

- (i) *approves the meeting dates for 2018 in respect of its own meetings subject to the following date change:*

*'that the Eastbourne Community Board's cycle 1 meeting be on Tuesday 13 February 2018';*

- (ii) *notes that the Chair will set dates for informal meetings of the Board as the need arises; and*

- (iii) *delegates authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Board Chair to alter the date, time or venue of a meeting, or cancel a meeting, should circumstances require this."*

9. **COMMITTEE ADVISOR'S REPORT** (17/1637)

Report No. ECB2017/5/20 by the Committee Advisor

The Chair elaborated on the report.

Members discussed the option of the Board having its own Facebook page, and said that they would investigate this further.

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Lewis/Mr Gibbons)

**Minute No. ECB 17509**

*"That the Board:*

- (i) *agrees that the venue for its meetings be the East Harbour Women's Clubrooms;*

- (ii) *agrees that the start times for its meetings be 7.15pm;*

- (iii) *approves catering for its 2018 meetings as necessary;*

- (iv) *approves advertising for its 2018 meetings; and*

- (v) *agrees to hold a tour of its community, the date to be confirmed."*

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

a) **Eastbourne and Bays Community Trust** (17/1576)

Mr Gibbons said that 75% of the display stands were made for the Heritage Trail. Members of the Historical Society had been researching all of the photos. For the electric vehicle charging stations, officers had been researching appropriate locations to install them in Eastbourne.

b) **Vibrant Village** (17/1579)

Mr Gibbons said that the Heritage Trail had been discussed under item 10 a), Eastbourne and Bays Community Trust.

c) **Okiwi Trust** (17/1586)

Ms Sutherland said that there was nothing new to report.

d) **Educating Residents Around Trapping (ERAT) Steering Group** (17/1583)

Ms Sutherland said that the Group had met in October 2017. The project was going well and they had hundreds of tracking tunnels out with Council support.

e) **Eastern Bays Marine Drive Steering Group** (17/1587)

The Chair noted that the shared path had been discussed under item 6. Chair's Report.

f) **Days Bay Wharf Steering Group** (17/1580)

The Chair noted that the wharves had been discussed under item 6, Chair's Report.

g) **Community Response Group** (17/1582)

Ms Knight said that they had new earthquake flyers and there could be an event in February 2018 to practice walking the "blue lines".

h) **Keep Hutt City Beautiful** (17/1584)

Ms Horrocks said that there was nothing new to report.

i) **Plastic Bag Free Eastbourne** (17/1585)

Ms Horrocks said that boomerang bags would be implemented, and supermarkets would stop having single use bags.

j) **Muritai School Hall Management Committee** (17/1578)

Ms Knight said that there was nothing to report.

k) **Eastbourne Youth Workers' Trust** (17/1577)

Ms Knight said that there was nothing further to report.

- 1) Eastbourne Childcare Community Group (17/1581)

Ms Knight said that there was nothing to report.

#### 11. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

There being no further business the Chair declared the meeting closed at 9.25 pm.

Ms V Horrocks  
CHAIR

**CONFIRMED as a true and correct record**  
**Dated this 13th day of February 2018**