

# **Foxton Community Board OPEN MINUTES**

Minutes of a meeting of the Foxton Community Board held in the Ngārongo lwikātea Room, Te Awahou Nieuwe Stroom, 22 Harbour Street, Foxton, on Monday 7 May 2018 at 6.00 pm.

**PRESENT** 

Chairperson **Deputy Chairperson** 

Members

Mr D J Roache Ms P R Metcalf Mr D A Allan

Cr N G Gimblett

Mr J F Girling Ms J M Lundie

Miss M Davenport

(Student Appointee)

(from 6.05 pm)

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr D M Clapperton Mrs K J Corkill

(Chief Executive) (Meeting Secretary)

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE** 

Mayor M Feyen (to 6.41 pm)

**MEDIA IN ATTENDANCE** 

Ms A Collis ("Chronicle")

## **PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE**

There were 14 members of the public in attendance at the commencement of the meeting.



## 1 Apologies

An apology for lateness was recorded for Cr Gimblett.

MOVED by Cr Roache, seconded Cr Girling:

THAT the apology for lateness from Cr Gimblett be accepted.

**CARRIED** 

# 2 Public Participation

Kathryn Lane Methodist Presbyterian Church, Avenue Road

Dave Thomson 7.1 Monitoring Report

<u>18/50 – Nash Parade/Bond Street Improvement</u> Late Item – Lighting of Foxton Boat Ramp

7.2 Chief Executive's Report

3.1 - Greensand Filter Installation, Foxton Beach

3.4 - Hartley Street Stormwater Drainage - Progress Report

Paul Matthews, Jim 7.1 Monitoring Report

White & Stephanie Todd <u>18/100 – CE's Report - Foxton Horse Drawn Tram Options</u>

#### 3 Late Items

The Chair advised that a request had been made to seek the Board's views in relation to the Foxton East Drainage Scheme and it was proposed that this be discussed as a late item. The Community Board had made a submission to Horizons Regional Council's Long Term Plan in relation to the Drainage Scheme. However, at a recent meeting the Board had been told that clarity was needed with regard to the funding model for the scheme (which was partly funded by HDC, but was administered by the Regional Council) so that the Board's submission could be appropriately considered.

MOVED by Mr Allan, seconded Cr Gimblett:

THAT the Foxton East Drainage Scheme be considered as a late item by the Foxton Community Board.

**CARRIED** 

Cr Gimblett noted that the matter in relation to the Foxton Pools that he had requested be considered as a late item he would address when the Monitoring Report was worked through.

Mrs Lane's request to address the Board on behalf of the Foxton Shannon Cooperating Parish was discussed as she was not speaking in relation to an Agenda item which was the recognised protocol for public participation. Upon the clarification that Mrs Lane was not seeking anything other than written Board support for the replacement of the roof of the Methodist Presbyterian Church at the top end of Avenue Road, it was agreed that she could address the meeting.

Tendering an apology from Kelvin Lane who had been unable to attend, Mrs Lane thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. She gave a background to the Church which she said was 105 years old and the original tiles for the building had been brought out as ballast. Over the years the tiles had become broken underneath and a project was being undertaken to replace the Church's roof which would make it weatherproof and would also assist with earthquake strengthening. She noted that despite the age of the Church, it was not recognised by Heritage New Zealand as an historic building, but was the next level down.



The building was used a lot during the week; however it was looking very dismal. The intention was to take the tiles off and reroof it with long run roofing iron. Several quotes had been received for the work.

The Parish did have the money in an investment account to undertake the project, but a letter of support was being sought from the Community Board to access those funds.

MOVED by Mr Allan, seconded Ms Metcalf:

THAT the Foxton Community Board sends a letter of support to the Foxton Shannon Cooperating Parish supporting the reroofing of the Methodist Presbyterian Church in Avenue Road, Foxton, noting the historical significance of the building, its regular use and its value to the community.

**CARRIED** 

His Worship the Mayor also agreed to provide a letter of support.

#### 4 Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 5 Confirmation of Minutes

MOVED by Mr Girling, seconded Ms Metcalf:

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Foxton Community Board held on Monday, 26 March 2018, be confirmed as a true and correct record.

**CARRIED** 

#### 6 Announcements

For the record, Mr Clapperton advised that Te Awahou Nieuwe Stroom was a finalist in the 2018 Western Architecture Awards which would be announced later in the week and it was also a finalist in the prestigious Service IQ NZ Museums Awards, Museums Aotearoa in the Museum Project of the Year category with the awards night for that being 20 May in Christchurch. He said it was very positive that this facility was being recognised by its peers in the architectural industry.

# New Zealand Police

Mr Roache said an email had been received from Sergeant Fraser congratulating the Board on the Pump Track which was providing a very positive outlet for young people in the area.

# Horowhenua District Council Update

Cr Gimblett commented:

- contractors had been working in the Foxton Cemetery to ensure there would be no repeat of the flooding that had occurred last year;
- Council was undertaking a Representation Review and one of the most significant decisions was the possible disbanding of the Foxton Community Board. The community's view on this would be canvassed as part of the consultation process and he believed there was a meeting scheduled at Foxton Beach on Sunday 20 May at the Primary School Hall;
- there was another meeting to be held next Sunday (13<sup>th</sup>) at Foxton Beach, also at the Primary School Hall, to seek feedback from the Foxton Beach community on the use of funds from the Foxton Beach Freeholding Account for the Foxton and Beach Bowling Club upgrade;



- there had been some road sealing around the township, which was just about complete;
- another issue, although not strictly an HDC matter, was the proposed Stormwater Drainage issues for Foxton which was part of the HRC LTP. That was still open for consultation and Cr Gimblett urged those who had a concern to get in touch with Horizons.

#### Chairperson's Update

Mr Roache advised he had attended the ANZAC Service and also the Dawn Parade on behalf of the RSA. He had also been going to announce the two up-coming meetings at the Beach with regard to the Foxton and Beach Bowling Club and the Representation Review. These would also be publicly announced. He said he did go and have a look at the cemetery; however there was no one there when he went earlier in the day.

## 6 Reports

## 6.1 Monitoring Report to 7 May 2018

#### **Purpose**

To present to Foxton Community Board the updated monitoring report covering requested actions from previous meetings of the Community Board.

MOVED by Ms Metcalf, seconded Mr Girling:

THAT Report 18/208 Monitoring Report to 7 May 2018 be received.

THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

**CARRIED** 

## **Public Participation**

Ms Metcalf raised a point of order, which was upheld by the Chair, when <u>Mr Dave Thomson</u> commenced his comments by saying it was not helpful to have verbal reports as it did not give the opportunity for a response as his remarks should have been in relation to Monitoring Report items.

Speaking to Item 18/50 – Nash Parade/Bond Street Improvement Project, Mr Thomson said he was a bit concerned as he had not seen a plan and did not know where it was going to go. There were a couple of families that were having difficulty negotiating the area as on one part of the road there were no run ups which made it difficult for wheelchairs and prams. He assumed there was going be a ramp. Whilst saying it appeared that a good job was being done, Mr Thomson reiterated that he had not seen a plan.

Mr Clapperton responded that whilst he understood the desire for people to express their view or comment on detailed design plans, it could cause a dilemma for engineers and officers trying to take into account all the differing views.

## Page 8 14/32 – Sand Dune Management – Surf Club Car Park

Speaking from a personal viewpoint and seeking to get Board engagement, Cr Gimblett said he was aware that funding had been sought through the LTP for a resource consent to lower the front dunes. Firstly, it was highly unlikely that a resource consent would be obtained, and secondly, it was a costly process. Also asked for via the LTP were funds to have the rear dunes lowered.

The reason given for wanting to lower the front dune was to provide a view over the beach, particularly for those with mobility issues. However it was a major project and Cr Gimblett proposed what appeared to him to be a



simpler and more cost effective solution which involved lowering the dune, putting it at the back of the carpark which would provide a good view to the beach.

#### Raised in response:

- there was space in front of the Surf Club which could accommodate three to four cars which gave a really good view of the beach;
- this issue was an historical one and had been raised again because of the previous powerful public response. It related to the point of difference between Foxton Beach and other beaches which was an uninterrupted view of the beach. The question was where did the public sit now?
- whilst Cr Gimblett's suggestion was practical around the rear of the carpark, it did involve what was a very significant landmark in the community;
- it still sat as a non-complying activity under the One Plan and there could potentially be an expensive fight to have that changed;
- the pros and cons needed to be weighed up and the community's views needed to be sought;
- this was regarded by Horizons as a unique feature which is why the dunes were included in the One Plan with the view expressed that moving or lowering the dunes would have an adverse/deleterious effect and would affect the sea wall;
- the public had asked for it and there was also a letter from the Surf Club so a way forward should be explored;
- an initial step could be a meeting with the Regional Council and Officers.

Mr Clapperton noted that the immediate issue was access at the beach. Council Officers were working to address that which may include some management around the back dune and there was a resource consent if sand needed to be shifted. The goal was to complete that before the weather set in as it was becoming a safety issue which should be addressed first before anything else was undertaken.

## Page 9 16/16 - Kings Canal and Purcell Street Stormwater Catchment

This was raised and discussed as a 'late item' due to time constraints (the hearing of HRC submissions being 21-24 May) particularly in relation to how the rate was levied, with a desire expressed that it should be levied on the whole of the Horowhenua District rather than on Foxton ratepayers which, it was suggested, was unfair. 1,100 ratepayers would be expected to fund just over \$1m based on information provided by Ms Metcalf, i.e.

Foxton Proposed Stormwater Drainage Scheme cost \$3m, split as follows:

HDC 40\$ \$1.2m HRD 60% \$1.8m

Total cost of Project	\$3,000,000	Proposed spreading of cost
HDC	40%	Rated over whole district
HRC	60%	
Of HRC 60%	20% \$360,000	General rate over the whole
		district
	20% \$360,000	Rated over the exacerbators
	60% \$1,080,000	Targeted Foxton Town Rate

How to achieve what was considered to be a fairer distribution of the rates impact was discussed in detail, including having the exacerbators paying more as they were causing the problem. Issues noted were the



misunderstanding of harmonisation when it came to rates distribution and difficulties if harmonisation of this rate was sought which would involve HRC changing its Revenue and Financing Policy. How that could be achieved would be challenging.

Mr Clapperton stressed that Board Members needed to be very clear what they were asking for. He suggested it might be helpful to get some clarity around the split and why it had been structured the way it had been. He was also not sure how this was being funded and whether it was not paying for the total capital cost, but paying for interest and servicing costs.

It was raised that the costing did not include pumps and people who were having to pay for it were questioning it as they did not believe the methodology would solve the whole problem.

As a way forward, it was:

Moved: Mr Allan Seconded: Ms Metcalf

That the Foxton Community Board urges Horizons Regional Council to enable the Horowhenua District Council to use its harmonisation mechanism to pay for the Foxton Township share of the Foxton Stormwater Scheme.

On being put there were two for the motion (Messrs Allan and Roache); two against (Mr Girling and Ms Metcalf), with Ms Lundie abstaining. Wishing to retain his independence should this come to the Council table, Cr Gimblett also abstained.

Having heard the reasons given by Members for their stance in relation to the motion which included the fact that the motion did not address the percentage split as while Foxton was getting some benefit, it was not causing the problem, the Chair used his casting vote against the motion. The motion was, therefore, lost.

To accommodate the view that the exacerbator should be paying more it was:

#### MOVED by Ms Metcalf, seconded Mr Girling:

THAT the Foxton Community Board urges Horizons Regional Council to change the ratio of how the Foxton Stormwater Rate is being charged out between the exacerbator and the Foxton Township with the exacerbator to pay a higher share and with the Foxton portion of the rate to be harmonised over the whole of the Horowhenua District.

The resolution was **CARRIED**, with the five Board Members voting in favour, and with Cr Gimblett again abstaining.

Mr Clapperton suggested another way of achieving the desired outcome could be proposing to Horizons that the HDC share could be changed to 60% and have HRC pay the remainder which could be rated over the whole district. Whether that could be done needed to be queried and it would require Council's support to increase the amount from \$1.2m to \$1.8m, which was not huge in terms of the bigger picture. If there was agreement from Horizons to share the \$1.2m as a general rate over the whole district that would shift the amount up to \$600,000 and the exacerbator portion up to \$600,000. It would be a 50/50 split with no Foxton Targeted Rate component.

The CE was requested to contact Horizons Regional Council to explore whether this could be a possibility.

# Page 10 Increasing parking capacity in Thomas Place

Mr Clapperton advised that this would come out of the Roading budget.



## Page 12 18/50 - Nash Parade/Bond Street Improvement Project

Ms Lundie said she had been approached by a resident who had had a car full of shopping but who could not get into her house as the road closure had not been communicated.

With it recorded that the contract price was within budget, she also queried if any money would be coming back to the Freeholding Fund.

Mr Clapperton responded that the amount would be less than initially indicated, perhaps \$80,000 of which the Freeholding Fund's contribution would be 46%.

#### 17/614 – Foxton and Beach Bowling Club

Public consultation – 13 May 2018, 2.00 pm – Foxton Beach School

#### <u>17/154 – Foxton Pool</u>

With this being consulted on as part of the LTP, Cr Gimblett said it had come to his notice that PNCC did not fund its pool. It was run by a Trust and perhaps that was a model that might work for Foxton. It had been his understanding that such an arrangement was not an option, but with the Board looking for areas where it could have more operational and fiscal delegation he queried if Members had the appetite to investigate setting up a community trust to run the pool in Foxton independent of Council to create efficiencies and get better use out of the facility.

Qualified support was expressed to robustly explore the practicality of such a project. Getting an analysis of the PNCC situation could assist. With Levin currently heavily subsidising the Foxton Pools whether or not it would be fiscally sustainable, particularly in the long term, was raised. It was suggested this be included as a Monitoring Report item with it noted that the Board would consider a Trust model to run the Foxton Pools so it could be followed up later.

Mr Clapperton queried whether it was intended that the Community Board would explore the option of setting up a community Trust or would the Board be seeking Council Officers to investigate this as these were two different things. If it was something that Council investigated there would be a cost in time and money and it would need to be budgeted for. Information could be provided on the cost of running the pool.

# <u>Late Item – Lighting of Foxton Beach Boat Launching Ramp and Surrounding Wharf Area</u>

Whilst saying he had no issue in terms of health and safety, <u>Mr Dave Thomson</u> expressed a concern about taking \$10,000 out of the Freeholding Account without having heard from representatives of the rescue people or the Boating Club and having some idea of cost.

Mr Clapperton responded that Cr Brannigan had provided information from the Boating Club and Coast Guard and also the estimated cost which had been provided to the Board. The cost would be under the \$10,000 estimate.

#### Page 13 Horse Drawn Tram Options

Jim White, Paul Matthews and Stephanie Todd from the Foxton Horse Drawn Tram Society spoke in response to the three options that had been proposed at the previous FCB meeting with the third option (exit out passed the Whare Manaaki building to Harbour Street) being preferred with Mr Matthews giving the reasons why and an explanation as to why the other two options were not favoured. It was noted that some work would need to be done to remodel the exit to avoid clipping the Whare Manaaki building with some road smoothing also needed as it reached Harbour Street.

A copy of the Society's comments is attached to the official minutes.

Mr Roache said he had been to the Society's monthly meeting and had



walked over the three sites and discussed the pros and cons of the options proposed, with Option 1c identified as the preferred option. A meeting had been held with Sean Hester and he had been happy with the explanation given and would come back to the Board with some costings.

#### 6.2 Chief Executive's Report to 7 May 2018

#### **Purpose**

To present to the Foxton Community Board, for information, issues relating to the Foxton Community Board area.

MOVED by Mr Allan, seconded Ms Metcalf:

THAT Report 18/209 Chief Executive's Report to 7 May 2018 be received.

THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

**CARRIED** 

#### **Public Participation**

Noting the installation of the Greensand Filter, <u>Mr Dave Thomson</u> raised the issue of drinking water at the Beach saying that a lot of people had been complaining about it on Neighbourly. He had sent an email to Council engineers and had been advised that contact would be made with those people.

He was informed by Mr Clapperton that the filter should be commissioned by the end of June. It did take some time and adjustments could be required.

In relation to Hartley Street Stormwater Drainage project, he also wanted to ensure that there had been communication with neighbours.

#### 3.6 MAVTech

Mr Clapperton provided an update in relation to the MAVTech building which had been identified in the LTP as one of the buildings that was being considered by the community and Council in terms of its future use. Feedback received from a meeting held with the Trust 3-4 weeks ago was that there was a strong desire to consider how that facility could be structured so that it became sustainable.

A feasibility study on how the facility could be utilised going forward was proposed, not just for movies and static displays but how people could be attracted to it. The same organisation that had developed the exhibition space for Te Awahou Nieuwe Stroom would be used to see if they could come up with some ideas on how it could be made sustainable, which it currently was not. Consultation would then be held with the community.

It was a tall order but Mr Clapperton said he was prepared to provide support to the Trust to see if the facility could be made sustainable going forward and there was still the earthquake-prone issue which could cost something in the order of \$250,000.00.

It was noted that the cost of demolition would not be much less than the cost of strengthening.

Declaring an interest as she was on the MAVTech Trust, Ms Metcalf said the Trust would be doing its own fund raising. The Trust was also very much aware that the displays needed to be interactive.

Speaking in support of what was proposed, Mr Roache also declared an interest as he was a Trustee. He said the Trust had been a great asset but it did need direction.

Mr Clapperton said it was important to understand, with TANS now completed, there was a different dynamic around the town and that opportunity needed to be exploited. The Museum building was probably an opportunity as well and that needed to be explored.



## 3.7 Foxton Beach Freeholding Account

Cr Gimblett queried how information on the Freeholding Account could be better publicised, suggesting there could be something included in the "Community Connection" once or twice a year.

He further queried what was happening in terms of the Forbes Road subdivision extension and where that sat at the moment.

Mr Clapperton said different options were being looked at. A company had been identified that was prepared to work with Council on the development of that area. Unfortunately that company had become overloaded and was no longer able to do it in the time frame Council wanted. Other ways of taking it forward were being explored and Council was also cognisant of other development taking place and not doing it in isolation. There needed to be a master plan, particularly around stormwater. A report on this would be brought to the Board in the near future.

## 6.3 Resource Consenting (Planning) Matters Considered Under Delegated Authority

# **Purpose**

To present details of decisions made under delegated authority in respect of Resource Consenting (Planning) Matters.

MOVED by Mr Allan, seconded Cr Gimblett:

THAT Report 18/210 Resource Consenting (Planning) Matters Considered Under Delegated Authority be received.

THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.

**CARRIED** 

8.08 pm	There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed.
	CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE FOXTON COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON
	<u>DATE</u> :
	CHAIRPERSON: