AGENDA
EXTRAORDINARY SPORT AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
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32 THE SQUARE, PALMERSTON NORTH
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Duncan McCann (Deputy Chairperson)
Grant Smith (The Mayor)
Brent Barrett
Adrian Broad
Vaughan Dennison
Lew Findlay QSM
Jim Jefferies
Lorna Johnson
Bruno Petrenas
Aleisha Rutherford

Agenda items, if not attached, can be viewed at:
pncc.govt.nz | Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square
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Heather Shotter
Chief Executive, Palmerston North City Council
MEETING NOTICE

Pursuant to Clause 21 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, I hereby requisition an extraordinary meeting of the Council to be held at 1.00pm on Monday, 26 August 2019 in the Council Chamber, first floor, Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square, Palmerston North, to consider the business stated below.

CHAIRPERSON

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Apologies

2. Notification of Additional Items

Pursuant to Sections 46A(7) and 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to receive the Chairperson’s explanation that specified item(s), which do not appear on the Agenda of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded, will be discussed.
Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7) must be approved by resolution with an explanation as to why they cannot be delayed until a future meeting.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7A) may be received or referred to a subsequent meeting for further discussion. No resolution, decision or recommendation can be made in respect of a minor item.

3. **Declarations of Interest (if any)**

Members are reminded of their duty to give a general notice of any interest of items to be considered on this agenda and the need to declare these interests.

4. **Public Comment**

To receive comments from members of the public on matters specified on this Agenda or, if time permits, on other Committee matters.

*(NOTE: If the Committee wishes to consider or discuss any issue raised that is not specified on the Agenda, other than to receive the comment made or refer it to the Chief Executive, then a resolution will need to be made in accordance with clause 2 above.)*

5. **Submissions - Ashhurst Function Centre Proposal 2019**

6. **Confirmation of Minutes**

“That the minutes of the Sport and Recreation Committee meeting of 10 June 2019 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.”

7. **Ashhurst Domain Function Centre Proposal - Summary of Submissions**

Memorandum, presented by Kathy Dever-Tod, Parks and Reserves Manager.

8. **Rangitāne Park - Lease area increase for Menzshed Manawatu to allow a building extension**

Report, presented by Kathy Dever-Tod, Parks and Reserves Manager.
9. **Exclusion of Public**

To be moved:

“That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting listed in the table below.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for passing this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as stated in the above table.

Also that the persons listed below be permitted to remain after the public has been excluded for the reasons stated.

Chief Executive (Heather Shotter), Chief Financial Officer (Grant Elliott), Chief Infrastructure Officer (Tom Williams), General Manager – Strategy and Planning (Sheryl Bryant), General Manager - Community (Debbie Duncan), Chief Customer and Operating Officer (Chris Dyhrberg), General Manager - Marketing and Communications (Sacha Haskell), Sandra King (Executive Officer) because of their knowledge and ability to provide the meeting with advice on matters both from an organisation-wide context (being members of the Council’s Executive Leadership Team) and also from their specific role within the Council.

Legal Counsel (John Annabell), because of his knowledge and ability to provide the meeting with legal and procedural advice.

Democracy Administrators (Carly Chang, Natalya Kushnirenko, and Penny Odell), because of their knowledge and ability to provide the meeting with procedural advice and record the proceedings of the meeting.

[Add Council Officers], because of their knowledge and ability to assist the meeting in speaking to their report and answering questions, noting that such officer will be present at the meeting only for the item that relate to their respective report.
[Add Third Parties], because of their knowledge and ability to assist the meeting in speaking to their report/s [or other matters as specified] and answering questions, noting that such person/s will be present at the meeting only for the items that relate to their respective report/s [or matters as specified].
ITEM 5

SUBMISSION FROM CONSULTATION

TO:  
Sport and Recreation Committee

MEETING DATE:  
26 August 2019

TITLE:  
Submissions - Ashhurst Function Centre Proposal 2019

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO SPORT AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

1. That the Sport and Recreation Committee hear submissions from presenters who indicated their wish to be heard in support of their submission.

2. That the Committee note the Procedure for Hearing of Submissions, as described in the procedure sheet.

SUBMITTERS WISHING TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF THEIR SUBMISSION

| 19. | Myles Stilwell |
| 24. | Jo Erkens   |
| 26. | Anne Strafford |

SUBMITTERS NOT WISHING TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF THEIR SUBMISSION

<p>| 1   | Gary Tanner |
| 2   | Emma Hopkins |
| 3   | Carl Baker |
| 4   | Erin Philipp |
| 5   | Terri Standish |
| 6   | Agnieszka Witkowski |
| 7   | Dale Joy Rosvall |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Toni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clare Crawshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tim Gibbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kahu Ranginui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stuart Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>New Zealand Motor Caravan Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Daniel Sproull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Trevor Mulligan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Graeme &amp; Lorraine Fairless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>John Muirhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bill Kirkland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Garry Moar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Llyonne Barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kim Linton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Margaret Fitzgerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kev Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Russell Geange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Diane Codd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Maria Vartelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Teresa Fisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Brenda Wallis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENTS

1. Procedure Sheet
2. Submissions
PROCEDURE SHEET

HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

Presenting your submission
You have indicated a wish to present your submission in person before a committee of Councillors. You may speak to your submission yourself or, if you wish, arrange for some other person or persons to speak on your behalf.

We would like this meeting to be relatively informal. We recommend that you speak to the main points of your submission and then answer any questions. It is not necessary to read your submission as Committee members have a copy and will have already read it.

Questions are for clarifying matters raised in submissions. Questions may only be asked by Committee members, unless the Chairperson gives permission.

Time Allocation
10 minutes (including question time) will be allocated for the hearing of each submission. If more than one person speaks to a submission, the time that is allocated to that submission will be shared between the speakers.

Who will be there?
The Sport and Recreation Committee will hear the submissions. The Committee comprises all elected members – as identified on the frontispiece of the Agenda.

There will also be other people there who are presenting their submission. The Hearing is open to the media and the public.

Agenda
An Agenda for the meeting at which you will be speaking will be available on the PNCC Website. The Agenda lists the submissions in the order they will be considered by the Committee, although there may be some variation to this.

Venue
The meeting will be held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, The Square, Palmerston North.

The Council Chamber will be set out with tables arranged appropriately. You will be invited to sit at the table with the Councillors when called.

Tikanga Maori
You may speak to your submission in Maori if you wish. If you intend to do so, please contact us no later than four days before the date of the meeting (refer to the “Further Information” section below). This is to enable arrangements to be made for a certified interpreter to attend the meeting. You may bring your own interpreter if you wish.
Visual Aids
A whiteboard, and computer with PowerPoint will be available for your use. If you require any other equipment, please contact the Officer named below no later than 10.00am on 22 August 2019 and we will try and supply it for you.

Final Consideration of Submissions
Final consideration of submissions will be at the ordinary meeting of the Sport and Recreation Committee on Monday, 16 September 2019. The media and public can attend these meetings, but it will not be possible for you to speak further to your submission, or participate in the Committee or Council deliberations.

Changes to this Procedure
The Committee may, in its sole discretion, vary the procedure set out above if circumstances indicate that some other procedure would be more appropriate.

Further Information
If you have any questions about the procedure outlined above please contact Penny Odell, Committee Administrator, phone 06 356-8199 or email penny.odell@pncc.govt.nz.
I do not want a Wedding Venue at the Ashhurst Domain.
1. There is nothing at the proposed site that would be considered an attraction for a Wedding Venue unless looking at Windmills is high on the agenda.
2. The proposed site is right at the edge of the terrace cliff line and London to a brick some drunk will fall over. And empty beer bottles will be hurled over and into the bush below.
3. Parking for the venue will impinge hugely on the area and people using the area recreationally, as it was always intended, will be forced away off the established walking paths.
4. At some stage there will be a clash with those from the Pony Club as large numbers of people try to park and move around the area.
5. The present sewerage systems will not cope and upgrading will involve the removal of established trees.
6. This Domain was set aside for public recreation and not commercial use and if the venue goes ahead how are the public to benefit.
7. Several attempts have been made to establish a cafe in the building and all have failed so what happens to upgraded infrastructure if the Wedding Venue also fails and who pays for it’s removal or maintenance?
8. The Domain is used by a large number of people to walk dogs, both on and off the leash. It is inevitable that at some stage there will be a clash, what happens then... the banning of dogs?

There are no doubt a number of other reasons that I object, most strongly, to this proposed wedding venue but the underlying principle is that the Domain was ALWAYS intended for the public and should ALWAYS remain so. If the people wishing to establish this venue are so sure it will be a success then they should go and buy some suitable land elsewhere.

G. Tanner.
From: Submission
Subject: FW: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre feedback

Your contact details

Name
Emma Hopkins

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
No

Withhold my contact details
False

Your feedback

I am...
an Ashhurst resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
supportive

Why?
Looks like a great addition to Ashhurst and the domain. Good luck with your venture!

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
From: Submission
Subject: FW: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre feedback

Your contact details

Name
Carl Baker

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
No

Withhold my contact details
True

Your feedback

I am...
a Palmerston North resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
supportive

Why?
Ashhurst Domain already has multiple reasons to visit (great play area, sports fields, lookouts, forest walk, river access etc) but it sorely needs a cafe area. Having a pop-up cafe and wedding/private function site is ideal for Ashhurst Domain and Ashhurst in general. It would attract more visitors from out of town and, once the new Te Ahu a Turanga road is complete, it will serve as a perfect start/finish site for Gorge walks and cycle tracks.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
From: Submission
Subject: FW: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre feedback

Your contact details

Name
Erin Philipp

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission before Council?
No

Withhold my contact details
False

Your feedback

I am...
a Palmerston North resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
supportive

Why?
It would provide a much needed space for events in an underused area.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
I think it’s a great idea.
Merle Lavin

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre feedback

Your contact details

Name
Terri Standish

Your feedback

I am...
a campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
opposed

Why?
The proposed use of the venue will negatively impact the family friendly campground. Noise and drunk people that can not possibly be contained will affect the campers and the campgrounds reputation. Don’t be naive and believe that finishing at midnight (which is the middle of the night for families with children) will prevent drunkenness and potential wandering. People will just hit the alcohol earlier and harder. Events such as markets are of course a different story and would be not opposed. Weddings and other gatherings at night are not appropriate near the campground. At any time of year.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
The proposed hours of operation will easily be altered in the future, making more of an impact to the camp ground.
Your contact details
Name
Agnieszka Wiłkowski

Your feedback
I am...
a Palmerston North resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
supportive

Why?
Great idea, there aren't enough wedding venues in the area so it will keep wedding vendors in employment, also great to have a venue in that location that will be well presented and taken care of.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
Your contact details

Name
Dale Joy Rosvall

Your feedback

I am...
a Palmerston North resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
opposed

Why?
For one thing, I don’t think the style of the new function centre suits this area. It looks out of place. It’s a beautiful area, and to be able to sit outside and look out towards the wetlands and the windmills was amazing when it was a little café and when the old house was there as well. This one is so large, stands out too much. I don’t like the idea of any gum trees being taken down. If one is at the site, all you can hear are the native birds up in those trees, so many of them. It’s one of the most beautiful places I know. I go out there 3 times a week for my walks. A few weeks ago there was a huge sports day out there for schools, I know this happens regularly, I presume a new function centre such as the proposed one would change things a bit. Re the campground, I can see that noise will be a huge problem for the scores of campers who go there for the peace and quiet, and beauty.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
I would love to see a function centre more like the old house which got burnt down. That was such a popular place to go, the house suited the vicinity, such a shame that someone torched it. I also loved the café that Lori and Craig had there, was so sorry that they had to give it up - and that nobody else came forward to carry it on. They had plenty of custom from the sports events, from the camping grounds, walkers, playground, pony club, canine centre further up, clubs etc, and Craig used to take a caravan to the sportsfields and sell coffee etc there in the weekends. Wonderful to go and sit outside at those tables, drink coffee and have lunch etc with the continuous singing and talking of the birds in the trees.
Merle Lavin

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre feedback

Your contact details

Name
Toni

Your feedback

I am...
an Ashhurst resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
neutral

Why?
This is a really good concept with fantastic potential but from a business perspective the earlier closing time restrictions (11pm) on public holidays/weekends would be a major negative. They are the most popular weekends people get married, have birthday parties or any other event. 12pm closing is reasonable from a customer view but 11 is too early. Reconsider this for everybody’s sake ☺

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
That the trees cut down be used for the outdoor furniture of some sort around the venue, park or furniture for around Ashhurst village ☺ Have a sheltered (windproof) firepit with seating around it, fire always creates a nice warm ambiance; Containers sound fantastic for the bar areas; Bbq area with pizza oven, fantastic for summer catering;
Your contact details

Name
Clare Crawshaw

Your feedback

I am...
a Palmerston North resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
supportive

Why?
Good for the area

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
The building design is extremely dull. Surely something better could be dreamed up.
From: Submission
Subject: FW: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre feedback

Your contact details
Name
Tim Gibbes

Your feedback
I am...
a Palmerston North resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
opposed

Why?
Restaurants at Ashhurst Domain have proved unsuccessful over several decades. Cutting down 6 gum trees to house a doubtful project is not a good idea. Would suggest that most visitors to Ashhurst Domain are not party revellers, mainly day picnics, campers, outdoor walkers enjoying nature. As a glass house or perhaps transparent plastic covering may not be a satisfactory water & windproof covering & would also expose the occupants to "outsiders" especially during night time hours. Being open just 2 nights per week for the main core business for limited hours would be an economic disaster. From experience of being booking officer for Kelvin Grove Community Centre, Friday nights do not seem at all popular for hirers. Doubtful the other opening hours of the week would support the cost of the lease. Sorry a project & lessee doomed for disaster.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
From: Submission
Subject: FW: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your contact details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahu Rangimui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Palmerston North resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more hospitality areas around public domains to increase the community feel to the district. The domain and reserve are great assets to the community. With investment the utilisation will increase so will public interaction. Further developments could be a public running path around the domain. Better parking and, exercise areas. In addition to food truck/stall infrastructure and services to provide versatility to support community events out there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submission Form
Ashhurst Function Centre Proposal 2019

Please return before 4pm, Friday 9 August

Your details:

Name: Stuart Dawson
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?

☐ Yes  ☑ No

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publicly available, including being placed on our website.
You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.

☐ Yes  ☑ No

Your feedback:

I am... (Please select which best describes you)

☐ An Ashhurst resident  ☐ A Palmerston North resident
☑ From out of town  ☐ A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?

☐ Neutral  ☑ Supportive  ☐ Opposed

Why?

The Domain area has been utilised with success in the past. The venue is supreme and should be used. Any persons keen to do this must be encouraged.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Your contact details

Name
James Imlach on behalf of the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association

Your feedback

I am...
a campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
nuetral

Why?
Palmerston North is an official Motorhome Friendly Town. Therefore, there is an expectation from motorhomers that they will continue to enjoy the use of the city's overnight parking areas without undue disturbance. While the NZMCA appreciates the proposal has benefits for the applicant and local community, it appears the application is light on, and somewhat dismissive of, the significant adverse noise effects on those camping on site, along with potential options for mitigation. If the Council is minded to approve the application within the scope of the Reserves Act, at the very least we would expect a thorough AEE in the resource consent application, with particular focus on the effects on motorhomers camping nearby.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
As noted in the June 2019 Sport and Recreation Committee Report, the campground is an increasingly popular facility that provides visitors with a quiet and peaceful place to park overnight while visiting Palmerston North. Retaining this level of amenity is important to our members. The campgrounds increased usage over the past few years could, at least in part, be attributed to the NZMCA steadily promoting the city through the Motorhome Friendly Town scheme. It must not be overlooked that more motorhomers visiting Palmerston North not only increases patronage at the Domain campground, but increases the amount of time and money spent in local businesses too, including attractions, retail shops, cafes, restaurants, and a wide range of recreational activities. Therefore, visitors may form the impression that the campground no longer offers the peaceful amenity the seek when parking overnight, which could have a detrimental economic effect on the campground and local businesses too. The applicant, Marshall Day and the Council all acknowledge that the proposal will have a significant adverse effect on visitors using the nearby campground. Significant effects in resource management terms can be deemed to be more than major, and therefore requires extremely careful consideration by the decision-maker. Irrespective of the permitted noise limits within the district plan, the applicant needs to appreciate that many of our members and users of the Domain campground are of the older generation and therefore
tend to want to go to sleep a lot earlier than 10pm or 12am in the morning. Sleep disturbance will not only have a physical effect on these visitors, which may lead to exhausted drivers vacating the site the following day, but it also significantly affects their continued enjoyment of the area and impression of the city. The Marshall Day report suggests that there are no practicable mitigation options available to the applicant to address the significant adverse noise effects. With respect, we do not entirely agree with this position. While, after further investigation, it may not be appropriate or cost-effective to construct any physical structures that may alleviate noise effects on the campground, the applicant could review the hours of operation taking into account the types of visitors to the Domain campground, their preferred sleeping hours of sleep, and why they enjoy visiting the site. The applicant could also consider review provisions within the lease and/or volunteered consent consent that enables the Council to review hours of operation each year, depending on the effects experienced by campers. In our view, suggesting that there is nothing else that can be done, and therefore the Council should simply accept the benefits of the proposal are greater than the effects on campground users, is unsatisfactory. Finally, we suggest the Council carefully considers the potential long-term consequences on the city if the proposal is approved "as is", noting the applicant is applying for a 25 year lease. The NZMCA's membership continues to grow at a very steady rate and with our efforts actively promoting Palmerston North to motorhomers, the Council can expect more and more visitors to the city as time goes on. If these visitors decide they no longer want to stay at the Domain campground due to the significant adverse noise effects, they, like most other people, will inevitably make alternative arrangements, which may well include freedom camping, increasing pressure on public infrastructure outside of the Domain.
Your details:
Name: Daniel Sproull
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Needed

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publicly available, including being placed on our website. You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)
☑ An Ashhurst resident
☐ A Palmerston North resident
☐ From out of town
☐ A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?

☐ Neutral ☐ Supportive ☑ Opposed

Why?

fantastic Idea but Wrong place!!
With 36years of being invloled in the Ashhurst Domain I know exactly what is going to result - Vandalism, upset campers, ripped up grass etc - It's an issue.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?

Ask to do a joint venture with Tom Shannon on neighbouring land where the venue could be more secure when not in use, Tom has already used a similar area for weddings etc, perfect opportunity to tie in with Wintec Welle!!!
Your contact details
Name
Trevor Mulligan

Your feedback
I am...
from out of town

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
supportive

Why?
While technically not an Ashhurst resident we live with in 6km and treat Ashhurst as our town and take a keen interest in what’s happening. The proposal for a function centre provides sufficient benefits to outweigh the minor disadvantages. Function centre use times, sensibly limit what appears to be potentially minor noise annoyance.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
Merle Lavin

From: Submission
Subject: FW: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre feedback

Your contact details

Name
Graeme & Lorraine FAIRLESS

Your feedback

I am...
an Ashhurst resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
supportive

Why?
We regularly use the Domain walkways for cycling, camping with grandchildren, cemetery visits & would love to see this proposal happen. We celebrated our joint birthdays when the original cafe was open, family celebrations in cemetery etc & of course the opportunity to meet for coffee

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
Your contact details

Name
John Muirhead

Your feedback

I am...

an Ashhurst resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
opposed

Why?

I am astonished that such a proposal should be made for a Reserve developed for its natural environment and character, and intended for "outdoor and recreational use" and as an educational resource. Apart from the opportunity to offset some costs of running the Domain, I cannot see why the PNCC would allow the property to be compromised by a business with such impacts as are described here: the erection of a quite substantial commercial building (with containers), extensive hours of trading, the consumption of alcohol, the likelihood of serious noise issues from entertainers. I note that the business proposed to be established in the Domain does not meet the criterion of being "essential" for the people who currently use it; rather it will be "creating the users...for a specific activity" Why should such a transformation be contemplated, for the particular benefit of two business owners, and perhaps the Council itself? There looks to be a lot of downside for current users. The new development would be adjacent to an increasingly popular and successful camping ground, a bustling picnic and playground, and not far from a quiet, historic local cemetery. It also directly impacts on one part of the many walking tracks enjoyed by locals and visitors. The proposers suggest that the facility might be used for community events, but I note also that they will be able to charge for third party use; ie this is another potential revenue stream. It is interesting that the "proportion of community and corporate activity has not been assessed." The proposal itself does not seem to me to provide a sufficiently detailed business plan. There is no need for such a development in Ashhurst. There is already a community events centre in Ashhurst: the Village Valley facility, which can be hired cheaply for such activities. My son's 21st birthday took place there. There is a well-supported wedding venue in a garden of international significance about 4 kms along the Napier Road from the Domain. I think it spurious to suggest that this development might bring commercial advantages to Ashhurst. It seems to me more likely to turn off the campers and picnickers who support local businesses when they come to enjoy what the proposers themselves describe as "a beautiful retreat in the Manawatu." A small cafe in the Domain would be an asset; but this is a far cry from that. Why would the PNCC choose to commercialise a natural reserve popular with the public, for at least fifteen years, for the private benefit of the
proposers? Why should the proposers not buy or rent a privately-owned site, as any other business person would do?

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
Your contact details

Name
Bill Kirkland

Your feedback

I am...
an Ashhurst resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
supportive

Why?
Great concept and business opportunity that adds to the increasing attraction of the local area.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
From: Submission
Subject: FW: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre feedback

Your contact details

Name
Myles Stilwell

Your feedback

I am...
an Ashhurst resident

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
supportive

Why?
The loss of the earlier restaurant/cafe was a great loss to the Domain, and the subsequent small cafe didn't quite fill the gap. This proposal looks like an excellent move to meet what will inevitably become an increasingly popular destination as the cycleway along the river to PN is completed (hopefully!) and the higher profile coming to the area with the new roadway across the gorge. I would very much like to see this project go ahead.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
**Your contact details**

**Name**
Garry

**Address**
Moar

**Your feedback**

I am...
from out of town

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in the Ashhurst Domain?
opposed

Why?
Because I dont agree with this type of venue in a public space that includes a cemetery a campground a sports field and playground. Dont agree with it being open beyond the domains existing hours due to potential for vandalism and nuisance factors.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
Submission Ashhurst Function Centre Proposal 2019.

Lysonne Barber

I request that my personal details remain private

I am an Ashhurst Resident and regular user of the Domain.

I am opposed to the Centre Proposal.

Reasons
lack of benefit to the Domain or Village is far outweighed by the impacts to the fauna of the Domain, other users of the Domain, and residents surrounding the Domain.

I feel that there is some misrepresentation regarding the proposal.

Misrepresentation

The developer has provided an artists representation of the proposed development that includes the trees they intend to remove. While I understand the reasons why they wish to remove some trees, but I query how many will be removed overall. There needs to be full clarification of the impacts.

I also feel that the title ‘café’ is misleading.
The primary nature is private functions, and I see that taking priority over any possible cafe use. The busiest times of the previous cafes were the weekends— which is also the target dates for functions such as weddings.

Impacts on others

The developer has said that the function centre will bring business to Ashhurst. I see no reason how this will happen as my knowledge regarding weddings shows that location is not the main factor in choosing hairdressers, florists etc. I also cannot see why people would leave the domain area to go into Ashhurst proper when the target market is catered for there where everything is provided at the function centre.

The area of the proposed function centre has one of the best views. The public could enjoy these views without impinging on the businesses themselves. The nature of the private functions intended this would not be possible as it would be highly likely that those hiring the centre would view that as an invasion of privacy. Locking the public out of this space is unacceptable.

The parking situation I also believe would be difficult. I have been to the Domain on regular occasions where the proposed parking area have been completely filled and this also includes the parking off Cambridge Avenue including the overflow.
in the field adjacent to the sportsfield. The parking problem will just increase. The parking has no relationship to the Pony Club which was the only group mentioned in the proposal. They are not the only users. The parallel parking is a bad use of space. When that location is used for parking at the moment, people park diagonally.

The proposal also mentions noise. The noise assessment states that noise levels would preclude the use of a live band to remain within the noise levels mandated by the District Plan. In that respect, other alternatives are likely to be intrusive as well. This will be highly disturbing to those using the campground which is heavily used over the summer months. The Domain camping ground is one of the few that allow dogs—which makes it extremely valuable.

Why should the public be affected for a private company to make money? The noise is also concerning given how late the venue plan on being.

There is also no mention as to how the development will affect the wildlife in the domain which should be of primary importance. Noise is one issue, however light pollution will have a massive effect. As someone who has walked through the Domain on many occasions at night I am aware of how light is shared. Currently two locations provide light pollution in the Domain—the campground and sportsfield. The sportsfield lights
are extremely intrusive but are only on for short periods of time and are turned off at a relatively early hour. The campground lights are not very intrusive due to the surrounding trees which keep the light pollution to a minimum.

The location of the proposed venue is in an extremely open location, right next to the wetlands. As the structure is glass the light pollution will be significant. It will also be a problem due to the extended hours that the venue plans to be open. Dark spaces are becoming rarer and rarer due to human interference. The Domain is a wonderful dark space that should not be lost.

In regards to that, I would like to quote a children's book:

I am the lorax. I speak for the trees. I speak for the trees for the trees have no tongues.

Unless someone like you cares a whole awful lot, Nothing is going to get better. It's not.

Unless we protect the wild places, we will lose them. Financial benefits should not outweigh the need to protect our wild spaces, including dark spaces. The Domain is a highly accessible place to see nature. This development will not enhance the area.
Please return before 4pm, Friday 9 August

Your details:
Name: Kim Linton
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?
- [ ] Yes  [X] No

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publicly available, including being placed on our website.
You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.
- [X] Yes  [ ] No

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)
- [X] An Ashhurst resident  [ ] A Palmerston North resident
- [ ] From out of town  [ ] A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?
- [ ] Neutral  [ ] Supportive  [X] Opposed

Why?
The Domain campground is well known to be a quiet tranquil get away for visitors. The noise & crowds will change that. There is no real accommodation in Ashhurst so drink driving will be an issue. The Domain gates are closed at night for a reason! This is to stop vehicles & trailers from entering. Security at night!! Privacy for campers!!

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?

Re build the cafe instead. There is nothing in Ashhurst that would match a venue like that.
Submission Form
Ashhurst Function Centre Proposal 2019

Please return before 4pm, Friday 9 August

Your details:
Name: Margaret Fitzgerald
Address: ____________________________________________
Phone: ____________________________
Email: ____________________________

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?
○ Yes  ○ No

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publicly available, including being placed on our website. You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.
✓ Yes  ○ No

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)
○ An Ashhurst resident  ○ A Palmerston North resident
✓ From out of town  ○ A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?
○ Neutral  ○ Supportive  ○ Opposed

Why?
Secrecy for campsites and cemetery

Even now a barrier can be used after hours, disturbance (This happens now in the winter with of July)

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
Your camp and cemetery are very peaceful and if you have events and the atmosphere is very on there is a risk of noise, and damage to the grounds and cemetery by creepy (incoherent) patrons.
SUBMISSION TO THE PROPOSED ASHURST DOMAIN FUNCTION CENTRE

This is in addition to my earlier submission on this subject.

Having looked for the first time at the drawing made by the architect working for the operator, this nearly knocked me of my chair.

BACKGROUND INFO
This Coffee shop building was in the late 1990 transferred from closer to the camping ground to this location. This building was, I was informed, a former Ashhurst post office. This was renovated, at that time, for a person who was of "interest" to the Council. Because of a motorbike accident he was left paralysed. The Council wanted to offer an incentive to this person which he accepted. The building was relocated and upgraded to a coffee/lunch shop with limited toilets because this was only for people visiting the area or were using the playgrounds/picnic area. Other toilet blocks are located closer to the playgrounds and picnic area. Unfortunately the person in charge at that time got another accident which killed him. At that point this should have been stopped however the Council gave permission to his daughters to continue. They, the daughters, were unsuccessful and the business was sold. Again the Council should not have allowed this because the earlier reason for this building was no longer there. In the meanwhile the building was allowed to be altered into a "semi-restaurant" style lunch bar. Also this failed and the result we can see today.

This area, The Domain, is a recreational reserve and we should not allow commercial enterprise to take over. If we look at the sizes of the buildings this will distract from what the area is, a recreational venue for everybody to enjoy in peace and quietness. When there is a so-called function on, the noise generated will make it impossible for recreational users to enjoy this environment. Also parking for car numbers of more than 100 vehicles has to be considered. This will make it impossible to nearly impossible for others, the recreational users, to park their cars and to enjoy this area. They, the recreational user, may leave disappointed by the changes to a reserve they always enjoyed.

This will be also a distraction for people playing, soccer, rugby, cricket and other games with the noise of the music which may overpower the refs whistle.

When the pony club are having a club day or training the noise will upset the horses.

Also at the back of this property, approx. 20 meters down is a wetland area of about 2hectare. In this area are and in the trees around the venue area (as proposed) are birds nesting with are protected. Also the gumtrees which will be taken down for this project are a joy for the Tui's and Bellbirds.
After the function or during the function people are leaving who may have consumed alcohol or other drinks with are stronger than a cola. This makes it very difficult because people start driving after they consumed alcoholic drinks (DUI).

The local Fire Brigade which are all volunteers will be not impressed if they have to get out of bed and clean up the mess on the road after a possible crash from visitors to this party.

Campers who now enjoy the facilities of the Ashhurst Domain Camping ground will soon turn their back on this beautiful place because of the noise.

Please keep the area as what is now, a space to relax and enjoy the walks and a place for children to enjoy and everybody to remember. I walk there on many occasions and the tranquility of the area and sound of the birds is an enjoyment.

Therefore I am against granting anybody a licence for this or similar type of operations in the Ashhurst Domain.

I would like to speak in support of my submission.

Joe Erkens
Please return before 4pm, Friday 9 August

Your details:
Name: KEV SMITH
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?

☐ Yes  ☑ No

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publicly available, including being placed on our website. You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.

☑ Yes  ☐ No

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)

☐ An Ashhurst resident  ☑ A Palmerston North resident
☐ From out of town  ☐ A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?

☐ Neutral  ☐ Supportive  ☑ Opposed

Why?
Ashhurst Domain is a lovely peaceful park full of bad life, people walking, kids playing, many walkers and even has a well used campground. I don’t think that adding this function centre will improve the place. It is more likely to alter the dynamics of the park in a bad way.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
It will be introducing noise and alcohol to the peaceful area which can only be negative.
The main gates are always closed at night which keeps out undesirables, I think this would change with the proposal put forward. It’s a big NO from me.

P.S. I have spent a lot of time at the Domain over the last 13 years so I have a good understanding of the perfect park that it is.
Your details:
Name: (Mrs) Anne Stafford
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No  

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publicly available, including being placed on our website.
You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.

[ ] Yes  [ ] No  

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)

[ ] An Ashhurst resident  [ ] A Palmerston North resident
[ ] From out of town  [ ] A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?

Neutral  [ ] Supportive  [ ] Opposed

Why?
1. Noise at the campground will reverse the recent increase in number of campers.
2. Extra noise and light at night - has enough research been done on the effect on fauna?
3. Litter - the tenants required to remove litter for 100 metres on all sides, except downtown - who will remove it from there?

The proposed Glasshouse Cafe and function Centre - the "Cafe" does not seem to benefit local residents or campers - picnic goers - by enabling us to buy a cup of coffee and a muffin or ice cream.

1 July 2019
Submission Form
Ashhurst Function Centre Proposal 2019

Your details:
Name: Russell Geange
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publically available, including being placed on our website. You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)
☐ An Ashhurst resident • ☐ A Palmerston North resident
☐ From out of town • ☐ A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?
☐ Neutral • ☐ Supportive ☐ Opposed

Why?
I have been running at the Ashhurst domain for many years, last week on a still night I could hear the roo pook in the gums they want to cut down. I don’t go running at the domain to listen to party noise & music.

The area of the proposed venue is the best view. People park there for a driving break. You’re not going to enjoy sitting on the nearby viewing seat when there is a function on.

1 July 2019
The noise measuring device for the campground was located at the furthest away point within the campground, not where the actual campers are. It is suggested that people will stay at campground after function. I'm not sure how many people would plan on sleeping in a tent after a wedding. My wife is also concerned about the security of cemetery with people drinking. The applicant says that the domain is underutilized. It is only underutilized in a commercial sense, which is not the purpose of the domain. The nearby Greenhugh garden on Napier Rd. opened a similar smaller permanent structure venue last year. I don't see any benefits of proposal to domain users.
Your details:
Name: Diane Gold
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?
Yes  No

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publically available, including being placed on our website. You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.

Yes  No

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)

An Ashhurst resident  A Palmerston North resident
From out of town  A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?

Neutral  Supportive  Opposed

Why?

It is a fantastic use of the space and will encourage more visitors to Ashhurst and end their space for the community to use and be proud of.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?


1 July 2019
Your details:
Name: Jessica
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?
Yes [ ]
No [x]

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publically available, including being placed on our website. You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.
Yes [ ]
No [x]

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)
- An Ashhurst resident [x]
- A Palmerston North resident
- From out of town
- A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?
- Neutral
- Supportive [ ]
- Opposed [x]

Why?
- Sad to see more trees removed — people go there for the scenery and environment.
- Noise factor is an issue where the noise will effect me — I don’t want to come home after work to loud music & it will take away the enjoyment of the domain — not just me but also other locals.
- I love being away from the move parks — nights will be peace and quiet and I want to go to bed when I choose, not have to wait until music stops to be able to sleep. I also think it will be sad as the current environment is great & it will lose this enjoyment to make it more commercial. Especially for campers & people there to enjoy the surroundings, not buildings.

This is also on behalf of my friends who are away — they only camp there for the surroundings & the quiet.
ITEM 5 - ATTACHMENT 2

Subission Form
Ashhurst Function Centre Proposal 2019

Your details:
Name: Maria Veltelma
Address: ____________________________
Phone: _____________________________
Email: ______________________________

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?
Yes ☐ No ❌

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publicly available, including being placed on our website. You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.
Yes ☐ No ❌

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)

An Ashhurst resident ☐ A Palmerston North resident ☐
From out of town ☐ A campground user ☐

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?

Neutral ☐ Supportive ☐ Opposed ☐

Why?
How will this function venue significantly benefit the naturally peaceful environment of the Domain & how does it positively benefit (financially or otherwise) the Ashhurst Community.
We must tolerate adverse sound levels for both residents & visitors to the campground, disturbance to wetlands wildlife, cattle & native birds.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?
• The planned removal of 6 mature trees with the possible further removal of more
• Live music may be precluded at the venue due to sound levels.
• Significant change to nature & campground
• Future application planned for extension of hours for all days
• Previous historic building burned to ground. Consider vandalism issues due to lightweight fabric membrane.
• Loss of enjoyment for campers & many other Domain users.
• Possible poor parking issues.
• “Sensitive management of stormwater” – means what??

1 July 2019
Please return before 4pm, Friday 9 August

Your details:
Name: 
Address: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?

☐ Yes  ☑ No

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publicly available, including being placed on our website. You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.

☑ Yes  ☐ No

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)

☐ An Ashhurst resident  ☐ A Palmerston North resident
☐ From out of town  ☑ A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?

☐ Neutral  ☐ Supportive  ☑ Opposed

Why?

My concern is the impact on the campground and the nearby wildlife (and) reserve. It would be great to see something similar in place, but not late into the evening (post 8pm is lost) as it would be very detrimental to the rangers. Any development would need to consider rabbit disposal, to avoid increase in rat/rod.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?

Any development needs to consider sound impact.

What happens when there are pony or dog events at the time of an afternoon function? It could seriously impact events.
ITEM 5 - ATTACHMENT 2

Submission Form
Ashhurst Function Centre Proposal 2019

Please return before 4pm, Friday 9 August

Your details:
Name: **BRENDA WALLIS**
Address: ________________________________________________
Phone: _____________________________________________
Email: _______________________________________________

Would you like to make a personal presentation in support of your submission to Council?

○ Yes  ○ No

Please be aware that all submissions will be made publicly available, including being placed on our website. You may request that your contact details (but not your name) remain confidential. If you want us to withhold your contact details, please let us know here.

○ Yes  ○ No

Your feedback:
I am... (Please select which best describes you)

☑ An Ashhurst resident  ○ A Palmerston North resident
○ From out of town  ○ A campground user

Are you neutral, supportive or opposed to the proposal for a function centre in Ashhurst Domain?

○ Neutral  ○ Supportive  ☐ Opposed

Why?  

See attached sheet.

Do you have any other feedback on this proposal?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

1 July 2019
I have lived in Ashhurst for 25 years and walked around the domain on a weekly basis. I feel it is a rich facility for Ashhurst residents and others to enjoy; the sporting grounds, the walking tracks with ability to exercise dogs, the children’s play area, the family barbeque area, the bird life, the native and other trees and plants. The horse riding facility.

It provides a quiet, rural, restful environment for walkers and campers to enjoy. A chance to escape from an urban setting of noise and traffic; a chance to enjoy peace and tranquility.

An event centre at the domain would destroy the whole ambience, spirit and purpose of the domain.

I object to the six large gum trees being removed; trees which encourage and feed towar and other native birds.

The weekend and evening noise would ruin the tranquility of the camping ground.

A café would provide a service for use of the domain but an Event Centre would not. It is a commercial venture that is using the beautiful scenic outlook for its own commercial gain and is not an amenity available for local regular users.

Brenda Wallis.
PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of the Sport and Recreation Committee Meeting Part I Public, held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square, Palmerston North on 10 June 2019, commencing at 9.02am

Members Present: Councillor Leonie Hapeta (in the Chair), The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Adrian Broad, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.


Apologies: Councillor Tangi Utikere (late arrival).

Councillor Tangi Utikere was present when the meeting resumed at 11.43am. He was not present for clause 11.

Councillor Aleisha Rutherford left the meeting at 2.40pm during consideration of clause 20. She was not present for clause 20.

31-19 Apologies

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Brent Barrett.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the Committee receive the apologies.

Clause 31-19 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

The meeting adjourned at 9.03am
The meeting resumed at 11.43am

When the meeting resumed Councillor Tangi Utikere was present
32-19  Deputation - Manawatu Mountain Bike Club

Peter Wells and Shane Telfer from the Manawatu Mountain Bike Club provided a deputation to the Committee regarding the Club’s activities.

The Club had approximately 1000 members and had raised $434,000 through various funding agencies enabling the creation of 27 kilometres of trail since 2012. The club wanted to incorporate all grades of mountain bike trails into the Park and currently had three contractors engaged on various projects with further plans to upgrade current trails.

Additional facilities, such as bike washes as shelters would also enhance the experience for riders. A shuttle ran from the low part of the park to the high part to assist those riders that only wished to complete downhill trails. The number of users of the park was currently unknown but the club was working on ways to collect that data.

Connectivity was extremely important and the club were continuing to develop signage and educate regarding biodiversity. The club had also requested a workshop with Council and other users to discuss how to better manage the road and access to the Park.

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Duncan McCann.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the Sport and Recreation Committee receive the deputation for information.

Clause 32-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

33-19  Confirmation of Minutes

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Duncan McCann.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the minutes of the Sport and Recreation Committee meeting of 13 May 2019 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Clause 33-19 above was carried 15 votes to 0, with 1 abstention, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim
Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Tangi Utikere.

Abstained:
Councillor Aleisha Rutherford.

The meeting adjourned at 12.05pm
The meeting resumed at 1.02pm

34-19 Deputation - Palmerston North Bowling Clubs

Grant Smith and representatives from Bowling Clubs of Palmerston North made a deputation to the Committee regarding a single site for bowling clubs.

Takaro, Northern and Terrace Bowling Clubs were looking to share a single site for their Bowls Clubs, however the clubs would each maintain their individual identity. The recommended location was to be at the current Northern Bowling Club site. Two other Bowling Clubs (Hokowhitu and Palmerston North) had withdrawn their support for the proposal.

The Bowling Clubs acknowledged the need to increase participation in the sport and to look at opportunities for the site to be utilised by other organisations or groups to ensure the facility was well used.

The Bowling Clubs were looking for a significant contribution from Council for stage 1 of their proposal and believed that the proposal would not go ahead without this assistance.

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Rachel Bowen.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the Sport and Recreation Committee receive the deputation for information.

Clause 34-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.
Bowling Club Merger Proposal
Memorandum, dated 28 May 2019 presented by the Parks and Reserves Manager, Kathy Dever-Tod

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke.

The COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That Council instruct the Chief Executive to use the Sports Facility Investment Process to complete the preliminary feasibility assessment for the proposed bowling club merger and report back to the appropriate Committee in November 2019.

Clause 35-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

Terrace End Bowling Club Site - Property Development Assessment
Memorandum, dated 13 May 2019 presented by the Property Manager, Bryce Hosking.

Moved Susan Baty, seconded Grant Smith.

The COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That Council receives the report titled ‘Terrace End Bowling Club Site – Property Development Assessment’ dated 13 May 2019, and it be considered in conjunction with the merger proposal being presented by Bowling Club representatives at the same Committee Meeting.

2. That it be noted that any proposal to dispose or develop the 17 Summerhays Street site would be subject to a consultation process under Section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Clause 36-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.
37-19 Potential Lease of 51 Amberley Avenue
Memorandum, dated 17 May 2019 presented by the Property Manager, Bryce Hosking.

Moved Tangi Utikere, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the report titled “Potential Lease of 51 Amberley Avenue” and dated 17 May 2019 be left to lie on the table.

Clause 37-19 above was carried 14 votes to 2, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

Against:
Councillors Susan Baty and Jim Jefferies.

38-19 Rangitāne Park - Consultation on the proposal to extend the lease area of Menzshed Manawatu to allow extension of the building they occupy
Report, dated 2 May 2019 presented by the Parks and Reserves Manager, Kathy Dever-Tod

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

The COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That Council approve community consultation on the proposal to extend the lease area and term for Menzshed Manawatu on Rangitāne Park.

2. That Council note the consultation will meet requirements of Section 54 of the Reserves Act 1977 which requires the opportunity for people to object and be heard on proposed leases on reserve land.

3. That Council note the land areas affected by the proposed lease extension for the Menzshed Manawatu is described as part of Lot 94 DP 44172, part of Lot 96 DP 44172 and part of Part Section 361 Town of Palmerston North. The lease area is shown in the draft proposed amended lease contained in Appendix One of the report titled “Rangitāne Park - Request for permission to consult on the proposal to extend the lease area of Menzshed Manawatu to allow extension of the building they occupy” dated 2 May 2019.

4. That the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Sport and Recreation Committee be given delegated authority to approve minor amendments to the draft Deed of Variation of Lease.

Clause 38-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian
39-19  **Ashhurst Domain - Proposal to lease area for a function venue**  
Report, dated 20 May 2019 presented by the Parks and Reserves Manager, Kathy Dever-Tod

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Grant Smith.

The COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That Council approve community consultation on the proposal for a lease for a function venue at the Ashhurst Domain, meeting the requirements of Section 54 of the Reserves Act 1977.

2. That Council note the recreation reserve on which the lease is proposed is part of Lot 1 DP 55676, the lease area and the draft lease are contained in Attachment Six of the report titled “Ashhurst Domain – Proposal to lease area for a function venue” dated 20 May 2019.

Clause 39-19 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

40-19  **Committee Work Schedule**

Councillor Aleisha Rutherford left the meeting at 2.40pm

Moved Karen Naylor, seconded Bruno Petrenas.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That a report outlining the changes to the CET Arena Masterplan be provided to the Sport and Recreation September 2019 Committee.

Clause 40.1 above was carried 8 votes to 6, with 1 abstention, the voting being as follows:

For:
Councillors Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Karen Naylor and Bruno Petrenas.

Against:
The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson and Tangi Utikere.

Abstained:
Councillor Duncan McCann.

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Duncan McCann.
2. That the Sport and Recreation Committee receive its Work Schedule dated June 2019.

Clause 40.2 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For: The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Adrian Broad, Gabrielle Bundy-Cooke, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Jim Jefferies, Lorna Johnson, Duncan McCann, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Tangi Utikere.

The public part of the meeting finished at 2.42pm

Confirmed 9 September 2019

Chairperson
MEMORANDUM

TO: Sport and Recreation Committee
MEETING DATE: 26 August 2019
TITLE: Ashhurst Domain Function Centre Proposal - Summary of Submissions
PRESENTED BY: Kathy Dever-Tod, Parks and Reserves Manager
APPROVED BY: Tom Williams, Chief Infrastructure Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That Council note the summary of submissions received on the proposal to lease an area of the Ashhurst Domain for a function centre.

1. ISSUE

1.1 Council has received a proposal to lease a portion of the Ashhurst Domain for a function centre.

1.2 The proposal was considered at the 10 June 2019 Sport and Recreation Committee. Council decided it wished to hear community views and public consultation was undertaken from 29 June 2019 to 9 August 2019.

1.3 This memorandum summarises the submissions received.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Council received a deputation to the Sport and Recreation Committee on the 11 March 2019. The Committee recommended, and Council resolved:

1-19 Ashhurst Domain - Function Venue Proposal

The COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That Council agree to progress to the assessment stage under the Reserves and Resource Management Acts for Ashhurst Domain function venue proposal.
2.2 Council received a report on the proposal at the 10 June 2019 Sport and Recreation Committee meeting. The Committee recommended, and Council resolved:

**2-19 Ashhurst Domain - Proposal to lease area for a function venue**

Report, dated 20 May 2019 presented by the Parks and Reserves Manager, Kathy Dever-Tod

Moved Leonie Hapeta, seconded Grant Smith.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That Council approve community consultation on the proposal for a lease for a function venue at the Ashhurst Domain, meeting the requirements of Section 54 of the Reserves Act 1977.

2. That Council note the recreation reserve on which the lease is proposed is part of Lot 1 DP 55676, the lease area and the draft lease are contained in Attachment Six of the report titled “Ashhurst Domain – Proposal to lease area for a function venue” dated 20 May 2019.

3. **CONSULTATION PROCESS**

3.1 The consultation period ran from 29 June to 9 August 2019. The process included:

- A public notice published on 29 June and 3 August 2019 (exceeding requirements of the Reserves Act 1977).

- Social Media post on Councils Facebook page, the Ashhurst Library page shared to the Ashhurst Chat page. The Ashurst Library posted 4 times reaching between 460 and 1,068 people per post. The Palmerston North City Council posted 2 times reaching between 5,535 and 2,411 people.

- Signs were installed on the site and at the entrance to the campground.

- A poster in the Ashhurst Domain Office notice board.

- An information stand and submission box were set up at the Ashhurst Library.

- Information and submission forms were provided at the Customer Service Centre of the Civic Administration Building.

- The Ashhurst Domain staff provided information and submission forms to campers during the consultation period.
• Consultation information was emailed to the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association, Manawatu Cricket, Central Football and the Ashhurst-Pohangina Branch of the Manawatu Pony Club. Follow up phone calls were made. A phone call to the Manawatu Canine Centre.

• A site visit was conducted with representatives of the Ashhurst-Pohangina Branch of the Manawatu Pony Club.

• Two public drop in sessions were held at the Ashhurst Library, one on Tuesday 16 July from 4 till 6 pm and the other on Saturday 20 July from 11.30 am till 1.30 pm.

4. SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

4.1 Thirty-two submissions were received, eighteen opposed to the proposal, twelve in support and two were neutral.

![Function Centre proposal - submission breakdown](image)

*Figure One: Proportion of submitters supporting and opposing the proposal*

4.2 The submissions were fairly evenly split between Ashhurst resident and submitters with other places of residence. Numbers and proportions are shown in Figure Two.
4.3 Ashhurst residents and campground users were more opposed to the proposal than submitters from Palmerston North or out of town. Figure Three provides information on the submitter’s stances by place of residence.

**Figure Two: Residence of submitters**

**Figure Three: Proportions by residence**
4.4 The most common reasons for objections are set out in Figure Four.

**Function Centre proposal - reasons for objection points raised**
(raised by 3 or more submitters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on campground</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree removal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not fit park environment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism/nuisance/security</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on fauna</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/behaviour</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not serve the park users/public...</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clash with pony club/K9 centre</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carparking effects/conflicts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of business failure too high/cost...</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be on private land</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure Four: Common reason for objection*

4.5 Other points raised by one or two submitters were objections to:

- Operating hours being outside normal park hours
- Effects on walking paths
- Light pollution
- Effect on views
- Safety vs the terrace
- Sewage system capacity
- Conflict with dog walking
- Effect on cemetery
- Effect on the playground
- Effect on the sportsfield
- Existence of community facility (Village Valley Centre)
- Lack of benefit to the Ashhurst economy

4.6 A number of submitters opposed to the proposal supported the idea of a traditional/standard café in the Ashhurst Domain.
4.7 One neutral submission was focused on effects on the campground and the risk of the reduction in satisfaction and use. The other suggested longer hours were required for the business and enhancements could be made to the park.

4.8 Submissions in support included 4 submissions noting the benefits of the development of café/hospitality facilities in the domain.

4.9 Other point raised by one or two submitters supporting the proposal were:

- It was an underused area
- Event opportunities
- Business opportunities
- An asset to the domain
- Keeping wedding business local
- More visitors to Ashhurst.

4.10 Social media commentary from the Palmerston North City Council facebook page is provided in Appendix One.

5. **SPORTSFIELD, PONY CLUB AND CANINE CENTRE USERS**

5.1 Information was sent to Manawatu Cricket, Central Football, and the Ashhurst-Pohangina branch of the Manawatu Pony Club. A Manawatu Canine Centre representative was spoken with on the phone. Follow up phone calls were made to Manawatu Cricket and Central Football.

5.2 None of these groups considered that there would be any issues of note for them. In particular the issues of parking and noise were raised with them. All the groups felt that any issues arising would be sporadic and manageable at the worst.

5.3 The Pony Club, being the closest to the proposed function centre, was met onsite. Their representatives made the following comments:

- Their large event was on Waitangi Day.
- They were not concerned about noise.
- They would be happy to manage their access route if there were events on at the same time e.g. bring horse floats on from another access.
- Their activities were mostly on Sundays.
- The trees, while attractive, were a nuisance dropping bark/leaves that the club had to clean up. There is no concern with those trees proposed to be removed.
6. **NEXT STEPS**

6.1 Sport and Recreation Committee hear the two submitters who have requested they be heard at a special meeting of the committee on August 16th.

6.2 Officers prepare a report for the Sport and Recreation Committee meeting of 16 September 2019, which considers the results of the consultation process, in conjunction with other information on the proposal, and recommends whether Council should proceed with the lease or not.

7. **COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the decisions significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommendations contribute to Goal 2: A Creative and Exciting City

The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Creative and Liveable Strategy

The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in

The action is: Carry out recreation and reserves planning functions under the Reserves Act 1977 and LGA including the preparation of Reserve Management and Development Plans and Master Plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution to strategic direction</th>
<th>The recommendation supports Council’s reserve management functions under the Reserves Act 1977.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Active Community Plan 2018 includes the aim of increased and more visible use of all of city spaces and places (Page 9 Active Community plan 2018).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Social Media and Website statistics and comments **[link]**
Appendix One:

Ashhurst Domain Function Centre Proposal Consultation - social media and web results

18 July post

The post went into the feeds of 5,535 people, it received 50 likes and 2 loves.
Robin Wallace  Awesome venue. You can look over some lovely wetlands, picturesque pasture land and if you’re lucky, be entertained by the model aircraft club that flies from the lower river flat area.
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Teresa Stoltz  I love the Ashhurst Domain but unfortunately the lovely mature trees keep the play area damp and cool all year round.
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Gemma Lindegren  Great idea. It would be lovely venue
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Jeaninne Forsyth  This will be great for Ashhurst and surrounding area
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Helen Lake  A lovely idea
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Glenn Ryan  Great Idea. We need another nice venue in the Manawatu as we are pretty limited on options at the moment.
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Robyn Croker  Very nice
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Llyvonne Barber  Paperwork relating to the proposal is at the ashhurst library. It covers what trees will be removed, where the proposed extra parking will be, noise etc.
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Renee Taylor  Ye! That would be handy as!
Like · Reply · Message · 3w
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Renee Taylor Yeal That would be handy as!
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Sophie Cattle Bring back the cafe at the domain
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Michelle McEwen How will you address safety and security?
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Palmerston North City Council Hi Michelle, there is further information found on our website by clicking on the link in the post. If you have any concerns or further queries there is also an online form you can complete to have your view added to the public feedback submission on this proposal. Thanks - Megan
Like · Reply · Commented on by Palmerston North City Council · 3w

Brydie J Ward Nice
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Kawho Rangi Yeah its pretty nice view in there from the cliffs edge.
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Ana Marino Maybe after the heating temperature at splashhurst has been fixed.
Like · Reply · Message · 3w

Pete Lincoln Any proposed costs?
Like · Reply · Message · 3w
Drop in session event page

90 people clicked through to the webpage

Palmerston North City Council
Published by Danielle Mercer [7] · 11 July ·

We're considering a proposal to lease an area of the Ashhurst Domain for a function centre (under the Reserves Act 1977.)
The proposal is for a function centre on the top of the lookout, towards the pony club. The area was previously occupied by a café which burnt down.
Join us for a drop-in session at Ashhurst Library to discuss this proposal further... See more

SAT, 20 JUL
Proposed Ashhurst Domain function centre - Drop in session

You like Palmerston North City Council

2,411 People reached 114 Engagements

Boost Unavailable

19 4 comments
Website

175 people visited the page a total of 188 times, spending an average six minutes on the page.
REPORT

TO: Sport and Recreation Committee

MEETING DATE: 26 August 2019

TITLE: Rangitāne Park - Lease area increase for Menzshed Manawatu to allow a building extension

PRESENTED BY: Kathy Dever-Tod, Parks and Reserves Manager

APPROVED BY: Tom Williams, Chief Infrastructure Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO SPORT AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

1. That Council approve the Deed of Variation of Lease with Menzshed Manawatu as attached in Appendix One of the report titled “Rangitāne Park – lease area increase for Menzshed Manawatu to allow a building extension” and dated 5 August 2019 and;

2. That Council, having been satisfied that the functions and purposes of the Reserves Act have been considered, that the statutory processes have been met, and being satisfied that the decision is a reasonable one, exercise the delegated authority approved by the Minister of Conservation to grant consent for the lease variation.
## SUMMARY OF OPTIONS ANALYSIS FOR

**Problem or Opportunity**
The size and configuration of the Rangitāne Park pavilion are limiting the activities of the Menzshed Manawatu.

The Menzshed have requested that Council allow them to extend and reconfigure the existing pavilion and issue them with a longer-term lease, in recognition of the investment they will make in this Council owned building.

Council consulted the community on the proposed extension, meeting the requirements of Section 54, 119 and 120 of the Reserves Act, and did not receive any submissions or objections.

A decision on the proposed lease extension can now be made.

### OPTION 1:
**Approve the lease variation for a larger lease area and the extension of the building**

**Community Views**
The community were consulted from Saturday 30 June to Friday 2 August 2019. No submissions or objections were received.

**Benefits**
The increased lease area and building space will allow Menzshed to expand their activities and provide more opportunities for community recreation and projects that support other community activities.

**Risks**
No risks are identified.

**Financial**
No further costs to Council are expected.

There have been some internal council costs in creating the lease variation, the cost of public notices, setting up online communications and surveys as well as the cost of signs on site and letters to the neighbours.

### OPTION 2:
**Decline the lease variation for a larger lease area and the extension of the building**

**Community Views**
The community were consulted from Saturday 30 June to Friday 2 August 2019. No submissions or objections were received.

**Benefits**
The small garden areas, several flax bushes and small trees would not need to be removed.

**Risks**
Menzshed Manawatu will not be able to improve and expand their activities.

The Council may be perceived as not supporting the activities of the Menzshed Manawatu.

**Financial**
No further costs to Council are expected.
There have been some internal Council costs in creating the lease variation, the cost of public notices, setting up online communications and surveys as well as the cost of signs on site and letters to the neighbours.

The recommendations contribute to Goal 3: A Connected and Safe Community

The recommended option contributes to the outcomes of the Connected Community Strategy

The recommended option contributes to the achievement of action/actions in the Active Community Plan

The action is: Build capacity and capability in community organisations

Contribution to strategic direction: Supporting Menzshed Manawatu to expand the Rangitāne Park Pavilion enables them to better fulfil their purpose of providing an environment where people can meet, and socialise and recreate, while doing something purposeful. The modified building will assist them to continue to support many other community groups through the gifting of items they create.

The provision of a long-term lease will enable the Menzshed to secure external funding for the project, resulting in a greatly enhanced Council owned facility

**RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. **OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY**

1.1 The size and configuration of the Rangitāne Park pavilion are limiting the activities of the Menzshed Manawatu.

1.2 The Menzshed have requested that Council to allow them to extend and reconfigure the existing pavilion and issue them with a longer-term lease, in recognition of the investment they will make in this Council owned building.

1.3 Council has consulted the community on the proposal. No objections or submissions were received.

2. **BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS COUNCIL DECISIONS**

2.1 Menzshed Manawatu have leased the pavilion on Rangitāne Park since 2011.

2.2 The Council allowed the Menzshed to modify the building slightly when they first occupied it. Openings were cut between the changing rooms, bench seats were removed, and carpet was lifted. The lighting was enhanced, and security grilles were placed over the windows.
2.3 Menzshed Manawatu invited officers to visit the shed on 6th March 2019. Despite the orderliness of the property, it was apparent that the building is bursting at the seams. There were several projects currently underway for other community groups.

2.4 Large areas of the building are taken up with storage of donated timber, partially used tins of paint, and an array of hand tools, fastenings and fittings. The storage needs are greatly restricting the space available for the men and their activities.

2.5 Council received a deputation from Menzshed Manawatu and an officer report at its 8 April 2019 Sport and Recreation Committee meeting. The Committee recommendations, resolved by full Council on 29 April 2019, were:

1. That Council approve, in principle, the proposed extensions to the Rangitāne Park pavilion.
2. That Council notes that officers will work with Menzshed Manawatu to prepare a draft lease document, for consideration by the Council.

2.6 Council received a report at the Sport and Recreation Committee meeting on 10 June 2019 detailing:

- the proposal,
- Reserves Act considerations, and
- Rangitāne o Manawatū views.

2.7 The report requested permission to consult the community on the proposed lease variation and building extension. The adopted recommendations were:

1. That Council approve community consultation on the proposal to extend the lease area and term for Menzshed Manawatu on Rangitāne Park.
2. That Council note the consultation will meet requirements of Section 54 of the Reserves Act 1977 which requires the opportunity for people to object and be heard on proposed leases on reserve land.
3. That Council note the land areas affected by the proposed lease extension for the Menzshed Manawatu is described as part of Lot 94 DP 44172, part of Lot 96 DP 44172 and part of Part Section 361 Town of Palmerston North. The lease area is shown in the draft proposed amended lease contained in Appendix One of the report titled “Rangitāne Park - Request for permission to consult on the proposal to extend the lease area of Menzshed Manawatu to allow extension of the building they occupy” dated 2 May 2019.
4. That the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Sport and Recreation Committee be given delegated authority to approve minor amendments to the draft Deed of Variation of Lease.
3. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN:

3.1 Consultation on the proposal took place from 30 June 2019 to 2 August 2019 and consisted of:

- Two signs on site, one in front of the building on Racecourse Road and one at the neighbouring playground on Rangitāne Park.
- A letter drop to the properties on from 1 to 27 Racecourse Road and 1 and 15 Flemington Lane.
- A page on Councils website including an online survey form.

4. DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

4.1 Option One: Approve the lease variation for a larger lease area and the extension of the building

A full proposal description was given in the 10 June 2019 report.

The larger lease area will require removal of some garden areas. It will allow the Menzshed to expand their activities.

There were no objections or submissions on the proposal from the community including neighbouring properties.

Menzshed are a valued and active part of the community. They provide socialisation and recreation opportunities as well as making valued contributions to other community groups through their activities.

4.2 Option Two: Decline the lease variation for a larger lease area and the extension of the building

The Menzshed would continue to operate in the pavilion in its current form under Option Two.

This would restrict their activities to current size and scope, meaning the opportunity to grow would be lost.

5. EXERCISING MINISTER’S DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO SUPERVISE RESERVES ACT PROCESS

5.1 In 2013 the Minister of Conservation delegated administering bodies of the Reserves Act the ability to exercise the Minster’s function in ensuring that the functions, purposes and statutory processes required by the Reserves Act 1977 have been
complied with. Five primary considerations are required on order to exercise that delegated authority:

5.1.1 **Checking the status of the land and power to make decisions.**

Land status was covered in the 10 June 2019 report to the Sport and Recreation Committee. Two of three lots affected are reserves under the Reserves Act without official classification. Preparatory work for Reserve Management Planning will include a recommendation to formally classify them as recreation reserves. The third lot is a drainage reserve. All were derived from private ownership, not the Crown.

5.1.2 **Ensuring statutory processes have been followed.**

The statutory processes have been met including requirements of public notification (Section 119), and rights of objection and making submission (Section 120).

5.1.3 **Functions and purposes of the Reserves Act are taken into account.**

The 10 June 2019 report considered the purpose of recreation reserves and concluded that the Menzshed activities are recreation activities and are consistent with the purpose of recreation reserves.

Section 17(2) requirements were considered:

- the freedom of public access - Section 17(2)(a).
- the protection and management of flora and fauna to the extent compatible with the recreation purpose - Section 17(2)(b).
- The qualities that contribute to pleasantness and cohesion of the natural environment and enjoyment of the reserve - Section 17(2)(c)
- Soil, water and forest conservation (Section17(2)(d).

In all cases the assessment was that there were little or no effect, and where there were minor effects they were easily off-set.

5.1.4 **Objections or submissions from affected parties are considered and the decisions is considered reasonable on the basis of evidence.**

The consultation undertaken as per Section 3 of this report ensured the public had the opportunity to be heard.

No submissions or objections were received.

5.1.5 **Tangata Whenua views sought and considered** pursuant to section 4 of the Conservation Act 1987. The 10 June 2019 report noted the views of Rangitāne being wishing to see any garden losses offset elsewhere. Rangitāne were supportive of the work of Menzshed.
6. **CONCLUSION**

6.1 The proposal is consistent with the purposes of recreation reserves with a small impact on some trees and bushes. These impacts are considered acceptable in scale and easily mitigated.

6.2 No objections were received.

6.3 It is recommended that the lease variation and proposal to extend the building be approved.

7. **NEXT ACTIONS**

Sign off the Deed of Variation of Lease.

8. **OUTLINE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS**

The engagement process was covered in Section 3: Consultation Undertaken.

**COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the decisions significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Rangitane Park draft Deed of Lease variation May 2019 [Link](#)
DEED OF VARIATION OF LEASE

PARTIES
1. THE PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL ("the Landlord")
2. MENZSHED MANAWATU ("the Tenant")

BACKGROUND
A. By the Lease referred to in Clause 1.1 hereof the Premises referred to in Clause 1.1 hereof were leased by the Landlord to the Tenant, at the rental and on the terms and provisions contained in the Lease.
B. The Landlord and the Tenant are currently respectively the Landlord and the Tenant under the Lease.
C. The Landlord and the Tenant have agreed to variations of the provisions of the Lease and are completing this Deed to record the agreed variations.

THIS DEED WITNESSES

1. INTERPRETATION

1.1 In this Deed:
   (a) "the Lease" means the Deed of Lease dated 27 October 2011 between Palmerston North City Council as Landlord and Menzshed Manawatu as Tenant, and includes any assignment, variation, renewal, or extension of the Lease.
   (b) "Premises" means the premises located at Rangitane Park, Palmerston North as recorded in the Lease and leased pursuant to the Lease.

1.2 This Deed is supplemental to the Lease and the expressions and definitions used in this Deed bear the same meaning given to them in the Lease.

1.3 Where obligations bind more than one person those obligations shall bind those persons jointly and severally.

2. VARIATION OF LEASE

It is agreed between the Landlord and the Tenant that the Lease shall be varied in the following respects as from the date of this Deed:

(a) The plan attached to the Lease entitled "Rangitane Park Pavilion" shall be deleted and replaced with the plan marked "Plan 1" attached to this Deed.
(b) The description of the Premises in the First Schedule of the Lease shall be deleted and replaced with the following:

“That part of the Landlord’s land located at Rangitane Park, Palmerston North being part of Record of Titles WN26D/489 and WN15C/477 and Lot 96 Deposited Plan 41172, being approximately 346.5 square metres more or less and outlined in red on the plan marked “Plan 1” attached to this Lease.”

(c) The Rights of Renewal in the First Schedule shall be deleted and replaced with the following:

“Four (4) rights of renewal of five (5) years each.”

(d) The Renewal Dates in the First Schedule shall be deleted and replaced with the following:

“1st October 2016, 1st October 2021, 1st October 2026 and 1st October 2031.”

(e) The Final Expiry Date in the First Schedule shall be deleted and replaced with the following:

“30th September 2036.”

(f) The following additional clauses shall be added to the Lease:

54. The Tenant shall not remove or disturb any of the planting within or around the premises without the prior written consent of the Landlord.

55. On termination of the Lease under the termination clause of the Lease or by effluxion of time, surrender, breach of conditions, or otherwise, the premises, together with all improvements thereon, shall revert to the landlord without compensation payable to the Tenant.

56. This Lease is entered into pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 and the Local Government Act 2002 with it being acknowledged that part of the land leased is recreation reserve.

3. CONFIRMATION OF OTHER LEASE COVENANTS

The Tenant acknowledges and covenants with the Landlord that the Tenant shall:

(a) Hold the Premises on the same terms and provisions expressed or implied in the Lease subject to the variations set out in this Deed; and

(b) Duly and punctually perform and observe the covenants and provisions of the Lease as set out in the Lease but as varied by this Deed.
4. **COSTS**

In accordance with clause 5 of the Lease, the Tenant shall pay the Landlord’s costs of the negotiation and preparation of this Deed.

5. **COUNTERPARTS**

This Deed may be signed in any number of counterparts (including facsimile copies) and provided all of the signatories have executed a counterpart, the counterparts will together constitute a binding Deed.

**THIS DEED** was executed on this day of 2019.

THE COMMON SEAL of THE PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL was hereto affixed in the presence of:

________________________
Mayor

________________________
Legal Counsel

THE COMMON SEAL of MENZSHED MANAWATU was hereto affixed in the presence of:

________________________
Chairman

________________________
Trustee

AJM-132946-966.5-V1
DATED the day of 2019

THE PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL
Landlord

MENZSHED MANAWATU
Tenant

DEED OF VARIATION OF LEASE