
MINUTES for a meeting of the Raglan Community Board held via audio visual conference on **WEDNESDAY 27 OCTOBER 2021** commencing at **5.30pm**.

Present:

Mrs G Parson (Chairperson)
Mr S Bains
Mr D Amoore
Mr T Oosten
Mr C Rayner
Cr LR Thomson

Attending:

Mr J Lawson
Mr M Haines
Ms S Roberts (Whaingaroa Environment Centre)
Ms N Tuao (Soundsplash)
Mr B Ruawai (Soundsplash)

Mr T Whittaker (Chief Operating Officer)
Ms A Diaz (Chief Financial Officer)
Mr R MacCulloch (General Manager Service Delivery)
Ms J Dolan (Economic and Community Development Manager)
Mr R Ashley (Community Assets Manager)
Ms M May (Community Connections Manager)
Mr S Toka (Iwi and Community Partnerships Manager)
Mr C Ahu (Open Spaces Team Leader)
Mrs G Kanawa (Democracy Team Leader)
Mr J Brown (Senior Community & Engagement Advisor)
Ms L van dem Bemd (Community Led Development Advisor)
Ms N Armstrong (Iwi and Community Partnerships Advisor)
Mr M Horsfield (Democracy Advisor)

APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

There were no apologies.

CONFIRMATION OF STATUS OF AGENDA ITEMS

Resolved: (Cr Thomson/Mr Bains)

THAT the agenda for a meeting of the Raglan Community Board held on Wednesday 27 October 2021 be confirmed and all items therein be considered in open meeting;

AND THAT all reports be received.

CARRIED

RCB2110/01

DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolved: (Cr Thomson/Mrs Parsons)

THAT the minutes for a meeting of the Raglan Community Board held on Wednesday 15 September 2021 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

RCB2110/02

PUBLIC FORUM

The following matters were discussed:

- Mr Lawson – Airfield fence alignment and pedestrian access. Question raised how Council moved forward with the plans for the airfield fence without a formal meeting. Noted that an LGOIMA request had been made.

REPORTS

Discretionary Fund Report Agenda Item 6.1

The report was received [*RCB2110/01 refers*] and the following discussion was held.

TABLED ITEM.

- There had been a review of discretionary funding over the last 18 months.
- The review was designed to distribute money more effectively and empower the Community Board.
- The Strategy & Finance Committee had already approved the discretionary funding review in October 2021.
- The Finance and Democracy team would continue to assist Community Boards with funding applications, such as accountability requirements.
- The new funding process would allow for match funding initiatives and where Council can leverage funding. Previously match funding was unavailable. Match funding will compliment discretionary funding.
- There was support to see funding applications align with Blueprint, Community Aspiration and Raglan Naturally plans. The board can still consider all applications within the funding criteria.
- Funds would need to be spent on an annual basis to secure match funding. The aim was that there would not be any carry over funds available.
- The Board could appoint either the chair or a Board member as the funding representative. The representative would receive funding applications and vet them to ensure they had all the necessary information, then forward to the Democracy Team for inclusion on the next agenda.

A decision would then be considered at a meeting and resolved. The Board representative would then contact the applicant and advise of the outcome and request an invoice be sent to the Democracy Team.

The Finance Team would process the invoice and send the accountability form to the applicant.

- The new process would allow applications to be considered more quickly. Applications would no longer have to wait for funding rounds.
- The allocations for discretionary funding for Community Boards had yet to be determined.
- The alignment was now moved towards community blueprints and aspirations. However the board could consider all applications within the funding criteria.

- Applications could be made through the Raglan Community Board webpage.

Whaingaroa Environment Centre – Maui Dolphin Day Agenda Item 6.2

The report was received [*RCB2110/01 refers*] and the following discussion was held.

- Maui Dolphin day had run for 17 years. Events had been both in-person and online.
- The event relied heavily on grants, predominately from Lions. However due to COVID there were limited funding opportunities.
- The event focused on the Maui dolphin, marine education and engagement with schools and educating the community.
- The event had been free, and relied heavily on volunteers.
- The funding request to the Board was \$5000 for the cost of the day. Total cost of the event was \$8000.
- The event was a large drawcard for Raglan and was well attended.

Resolved: (Cr Thomson/Mr Rayner)

THAT the Raglan Community Board approves funding from their Discretionary Fund to Whaingaroa Environment Centre for the amount of \$5,000.00 (including GST) towards the cost of name of the Maui Dolphin Day project.

CARRIED

RCB2110/03

Independent Review of Raglan Airfield Agenda Item 6.3

The report was received [*RCB2110/01 refers*] and the following discussion was held.

- Strong desire for a good outcome for the Community, however the process needed to be worked through with the Community and Board.
- At the September 2021 Board meeting, the draft report was presented. The Board had asked at that meeting that Council work with Iwi regarding legal ownership. The Board also asked for additional information to be included in the report regarding temporary closures of the airfield and the process to close the airfield.
- Board supports the safety recommendations as set out in the report, apart from the fourth recommendation which references the installation of the fence. Board does not feel that the risk is high enough to need fencing. There had been behavioural changes with the established safety improvements.

- Board requested the costings for the safety improvements for the airfield. This included the operational cost of the airfield, implementing the recommendations of the report and the ongoing costs of the oversight of the airfield. This would allow the community to analyse the benefits against the costs. Noted by the Chair that if the risks were currently too high to public safety, that the airfield be closed until the costs for the airfield were provided. Staff do not have the cost for the implementation of the safety improvements recommended currently.

ACTION: The Raglan Community Board requests that the operational costs for the Raglan Airfield be made available to the board.

ACTION: The Raglan Community Board requests that the forecast cost for implementing the safety recommendations (including fencing) that are stated in the Mike Haines report for the Raglan Airfield September 2021.

ACTION: That the operational costs for the Raglan Airfield, and the forecast cost for the implementation of the safety recommendations as stated in the Mike Haines report for Raglan Airfield September 2021 be considered by Council.

- The Council did investigate closing the airfield temporary to mitigate the safety risk, but Mr Haines noted this could cause an increase to the safety risk as the planning to inform pilots that the airfield was not operational had not been undertaken.
- Noted that under the current alert level lockdown now would be a good time to shut the airfield, especially as the fence may take some time to be built. Mr Haines noted that airfields around the country were still busy during the lockdown period.
- Initially the consultation to implement safety improvements to the airfield had been poor, but it had been improved during the year. It takes time to work through the issue with the Community Board and the public but there was an eventual need to make decisions.
- Board supports Council to continually work formally through Board meeting reports to ensure transparency.
- Board does not support Council's decision to not consult with the public on the safety improvements.

ACTION: The Raglan Community Board requests the minutes for the meeting that Council approved the implementation of the recommendations in the Mike Haines Raglan Airfield report.

- The Board wants to work with the Community and receive constructive feedback regarding the airfield moving forward.
- Noted that there had been strong public opposition to a fence constructed being constructed at the airfield, as the space was regularly used by the public.

- Mr Haines noted that the airfield should be fenced, as planes were difficult to manoeuvre when landing. There were very few airfields that were not fenced, and those that aren't had other factors that restrict access.

There was awareness of a possible change of use to the airfield, but there were significant health and safety issues and Mr Haines noted that the fence would be necessary for the airfield. It is the best way to mitigate any safety issues on the airfield. It is a physical barrier that is more effective than lines along the airfield, as it restricts inadvertent access.

- The proposed fence was designed for inadvertent access, which meant that the fence would not be a security fence like at airports. 'Farm like' fences were used on similar airfields but it was up to the operator (Council) to decide what the fence should be. There was no standard of fencing at airfields.
- Mr Rayner noted that there was fencing at the airfield, with signage and a two step gate system and that this would stop inadvertent access. Mr Haines noted that the gate was open, and that the airfield did not include the entirety of the reserve. Approximately, 1/3-1/2 of the reserve was airfield. The land itself was not the airfield, but the operational area and there was no barrier for this area. The fence should go where the operational airfield is located. There was also no delineation of where the runway began and finished.
- Raised what the public would do if a fence was constructed and feedback was that behaviour would change, and that the public were already going around the perimeter of the red line surrounding the operational airfield area. More education and signs would improve safety without the costs of a fence.
- Question raised regarding the possibility that the fence would narrow the airstrip on the western side, as there had been incidents with aircraft hitting the existing fence. Consultant noted that the fence would not narrow the airstrip, and by building a fence it would make it clearer to where the runway was located and it would improve the landing perspective for pilots.
- The fence proposed would surround the runway. Commonly, for airfields this size, the strip is 30 metres wide.
- Council was very keen to engage with the Community Board where the fence should be and the size for aircraft area, as well as the importance of greenspace area and access to the beach.
- Staff had operational and health and safety oversight. However, if there was investment or changes to a significant or strategic asset the political process begins, as public consultation had to be undertaken.
- When Council receives a report from a specialist noting safety concerns, there is urgency for Council to act and implement improvement. Council may be liable for serious charges for health and safety infringements.

- The Chair noted that it was not clear to the Board what steps would be undertaken once the Mike Haines Raglan Airfield report was received.
- The Mike Haines Raglan Airfield report had been shared with the flying fraternity and local flying clubs.
- Question raised regarding how long the marker boards and delineation marking would take to be implemented, without the fence. Noted that it would take some months before aeronautical information for pilots would be updated and for the marker boards to be constructed.

Resolved: (Mr Rayner/Mr Bains)

THAT the Raglan Community Board:

- a) is opposed to the building of a fence on the Raglan Aerodrome, and requests that Waikato District Council suspend all work in relation to any fence on the Raglan Aerodrome,**
- b) supports the remaining health and safety improvements to the Raglan Aerodrome as outlined in the Mikes Haines report review of the Raglan Aerodrome September 2021, and**
- c) requests Council consider the permanent closure of the airfield as an alternative to building a fence.**

CARRIED

RCB2110/04

Mr Amoore voted against the above resolution [*Resolution No. RCB2110/04*] and requested his dissenting vote be recorded.

Cr Thomson abstained from voting.

Raglan Camp Board Membership Nomination
Agenda Item 6.4

The report was received [*RCB2110/01 refers*] and no discussion was held.

Resolved: (Cr Thomson/Mrs Parson)

THAT the Raglan Community Board appoint Mr Chris Rayner as their representative on the Raglan Holiday Park Papahua Board.

CARRIED

RCB2110/05

Raglan Works, Actions & Issues Report: Status of Items October 2021

Agenda Item 6.5

The report was received [RCB2110/01 refers] and the following discussion was held.

- Manu Bay Breakwater – Was on hold due to COVID levels.
- Inter Raglan Bus Service – Council staff would provide a report to Council regarding the approval of the bus service during the current Long Term Plan period without NZTA funding.
- Civil Defence – Aim to get a start on the an updated Raglan Civil defence plan at the beginning of 2022.
- Camera Licensing Trust – Mr Bains and Cr Thomson were working on the project. Cr Thomson had been in touch with the Police, who were expected to speak to the Raglan Business Chamber hui but this meeting had been delayed due to the COVID lockdown.
- Soundsplash – Event organisers had submitted their new consent application for the festival which Council had received. Soundsplash was also seeking land owner approval for the event. Consent application applies to capacity limits, sound limits, monitoring and liquor licensing. Soundsplash and Council were working together to improve processes going forward.

The decisions being made for Soundsplash would set the standard for similar large events in the district. Council was looking at a capacity study using Soundsplash as a case study, to drive the understanding of the impacts on the reserve, Council assets and the community.

It was proposed that Wainui Reserve would be closed to the public for the Soundsplash weekend (Friday-Sunday). This would lead to increased health and safety and security around the event. Council was updating the bond process for commercial events, to take in consideration the true costs of events on assets. Beach access through Wainui Reserve was expected to be closed.

The reserve closure would allow faster pack in and out for the event and considered year by year, starting in 2022. Event organisers would need to know as soon as possible to assist with the layout plans for the event. Concern was raised that with the reserve closed, people may try and swim near the harbour entrance which was dangerous. Council would hold discussions with the Raglan Surf Life Saving Club regarding the potential implications of closing beach access.

ACTION: The Reserve Planner to provide clarity regarding reasons for the proposed closing of beach access through Wainui Reserve over the Soundsplash weekend.

Closing the reserve was a good idea to explore, but should be considered in 2023, not 2022 as it was important to get the processes right. The Splor festival is a similar event, and they close off the reserve and the campsite to allow exclusive use of the reserve for the festival.

ACTION: Staff to reevaluate the decision to close Wainui Reserve for Soundsplash and update the Board before the next meeting.

Soundsplash organisers were working with NZ Event Association regarding vaccination passports but guidance from the Government remains unclear.

- Papahua Stage 2 – There had been a productive Zoom meeting with Council, the Football Club and the Board to look at new options for the stage 2 path.
- Harbour Leases

ACTION: Can be removed from the Works & Issues Register.

- Year to Date Service Request Report – Can be removed from the register as Watercare would inform the board immediately should there be any wastewater overflows in the Community.

ACTION: Can be removed from the Works & Issues Register.

- Walkway from the Norfolk Pines and the Coastguard Building – The Medical Centre informed Cr Thomson that they had no records of any injuries from falling off the walkway.

First Quarter Service Request Report to 30 September 2021 Agenda Item 6.6

The report was received [RCB2110/01 refers] and no discussion was held.

Chairperson's Report Agenda Item 6.7

The report was received [RCB2110/01 refers] and the following discussion was held:

- The Chair and Mr Rayner would file an appeal for the representation review.

Raglan Naturally Report Agenda Item 6.8

The report was received [RCB2110/01 refers] and the following discussion was held:

- Mrs Parsons had been appointed the community coordinator for Raglan Naturally.

- Community Board funding will continue for this financial year. The carryovers for the previous years and this allocation of LTP will be allocated to the Community Boards

Community Board Funding

Tabled Item

- Recognise empowerment for Community Boards to make funding decisions with your funding
- Supportive of seed funding/community events
- Achieving maximum productivity with minimum waste or expense
- Needing to balance risk and opportunity carefully (in discussions of accountability requirements for funding recipients vs efficiency and trust)
- Not keen on 'rats and mice' funding commitments
- Supportive of match funding initiatives, where Council can leverage its funding commitment to attract additional investment
- Stronger demonstrated links to the Council vision for Liveable, Thriving and Connected Communities.

Principles for Community Board Funding

- Carry over is yours (underspend has been allocated to your community)
- 2021/2022 discretionary funding has been allocated to your community
- The sentiment is about empowering Boards to manage their funding with support from the Democracy and Finance Team
- We would like to see alignment to the Blueprint and Community aspirations programmes where possible or wider community events/projects
- Money needs to be spent on an annual basis to secure match funding and project delivery

Process for Discretionary Funding for the Community Boards/Committees 2021 -2022 financial year

- Board chair (funding representative) receives applications for funding
- The board chair (funding representative) is to vet the application and if supported in principle, forward application to Council democracy team for the application to be placed on the Community Board Agenda under its discretionary fund report



- Board considers applications and makes a decision to fund or not fund
- The decision is noted in the minutes
- Board Chair sends out communication of approval/non approval to the applicant (including payment and accountability requirements)



- Invoice from the applicant must be sent to Democracy
- Democracy attaches board resolution/codes etc and send to Finance



- Finance looks after the applicant from that point
- Applicant sends accountability to the Board