

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE NELSON CITY COUNCIL TO HEAR AND CONSIDER SUBMISSIONS TO THE PROPOSALS FOR TRAFALGAR PARK HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC HOUSE, TRAFALGAR STREET, NELSON ON TUESDAY 21 OCTOBER 2008 COMMENCING AT 9AM**

---

**PRESENT:** His Worship the Mayor K Marshall (Chairperson), Councillors I Barker, A Boswijk, G Collingwood, M Cotton, M Holmes, A Miccio, P Rainey, R Reese, D Shaw and G Thomas

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Chief Executive (V Altmants), Divisional Manager Community Services (S Coleman), Manager Community Projects (A Petheram), Administration Adviser (A Rose)

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies were received and accepted from Councillors D Henigan and A McAlpine

---

**1.0 HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE PROPOSALS FOR TRAFALGAR PARK**

His Worship the Mayor welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that Council would first hear those submitters who wished to be heard and after that consider all the submissions.

**1.1 Tim Bayley, Submission Number 8346, page 864**

Mr Bayley presented his submission and tabled further information. He said he believed that Trafalgar Park does need to be upgraded, but thought that any upgrade must be approached slowly and cautiously and that the work should be done as the community can afford it. He urged Council not be rushed into this upgrade just because of the Rugby World Cup.

He asked Council to look at the upgrading of the playing surface and, in particular, investigate the way similar upgrading had been done at Greymouth Rugby Park, which work he said had been a lot cheaper than the sum that appeared in the Council's estimate for this work.

**1.2 Hugh Briggs, Submission Number 8158, page 636**

Mr Briggs presented his submission and tabled additional material, which he spoke to. He said that City should retain Trafalgar Park and its role should be an entertainment venue for outdoor events, both major concerts and smaller local festivals and not just a high quality rugby ground. Mr Briggs said he supported a carefully staged upgrade to Option 4.

**1.3 Robert Burdon, Submission Number 8408, page 954**

Mr Burdon presented his submission, saying he was a 69 year old pensioner and was concerned at the effect of such projects on future rate levels. He said he supported Option 2 and keeping the present cycle track.

**1.4 Jim Cable, Submission Number 7990, page 441**

Mr Cable presented his submission, saying he had deep concerns about the cost of the proposed options and he urged Council to consider the burden that these costs will be inflicting on the Nelson ratepayers. He said he was opposed to all the

proposals to upgrade Trafalgar Park, emphasising that he felt ratepayers were finding it hard to meet the current charges and cannot afford what Council presently deems acceptable for the city. He said he did not see that an upgrade would have any financial benefits for the ordinary ratepayer and asked Council to reflect more deeply on the real needs of the city.

**1.5 Nelson Cricket Association, Submission Number 8412, page 963**

Mr Jock Sutherland and Mr Gordon Davidson presented the submission on behalf of the Nelson Cricket Association. They said they approved of the upgrade, but did not want it to cause any delay to work on Saxton Field.

**1.6 Mike Gane, Submission Number 8409, page 508**

Mr Gane said he supported Option 2, and said he would be very concerned if the cycle track was lost from Trafalgar Park. He said that Trafalgar Park was the only place in the country where tandem racing took place and he tabled various letters from around the country supporting the retention of the cycle track at Trafalgar Park.

**1.7 Robert Kerr, Submission Number 8130, page 1009**

Mr Kerr presented his submission in the form of a poem, which he tabled and read. He said he was in favour of a modest upgrade but thought Options 3 and 4 were too ambitious at this time.

Attendance: The meeting adjourned from 10.20am to 10.45am.

**1.8 Peter Heppell, Submission Number 8066, page 526**

Mr Heppell presented his submission. He said he was in favour of Option 2 but was concerned that the \$7 million option did not include all sporting codes. He reminded the Councillors that they had been voted into office to represent all the ratepayers, not just the business community and warned of an impending rates revolt if the Council didn't listen to its ratepayers.

**1.9 Ron MacKay, Submission Numbers 8282 and 8324, pages 791 and 842**

Mr MacKay said that Trafalgar Park should be upgraded, but did not support spending \$7 million in a hurry. He pointed out that he believed there were other more urgent priorities that needed attention first, such as the Maitai pipeline and the Bells Island pipeline.

**1.10 John Duncan, Submission Number 7729, page 139**

Mr Duncan spoke against spending any money on Trafalgar Park, and warned that ratepayers could not afford annual rate rises of 10% or more for extended periods.

**1.11 Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce, Submission Number 7935, page 376**

Ms Dot Kettle and Mr Paul Rosanowski presented the submission on behalf of the Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce. They said that the Chamber supported Option 4 to develop the park into a multi-faceted facility that could run various events. They emphasised that Trafalgar Park should remain the major event venue for the region.

In answer to a question, Mr Rosanowski said that the Chamber of Commerce presently had 465 members. Over 50% of these members were located within the Nelson City Council area.

Attendance: The meeting adjourned from 11.25am to 11.40am.

#### **1.12 Tasman Rugby Union Inc., Submission Number 7935, page 367**

Mr Peter Barr presented the submission on behalf of the Tasman Rugby Union Inc. He said that the Tasman Rugby Union was in favour of Option 4 and fully support that Trafalgar Park should be a multi-user facility. He said it was the Tasman Rugby Union's belief that the Park needs development, and because it is at the gateway of Nelson it also needs some cosmetic work to make it more attractive.

Mr Barr said whatever the outcome in the future for the Tasman Makos, Trafalgar Park needs development and upgrading, and there were three priorities that he wished to draw to the Council's attention.

Firstly, the reconstruction of playing surface which he said was the worst in the country.

Secondly, he said the lighting needs to be upgraded to 1,500 lux.

And thirdly, there needs to be a new scoreboard and media facilities.

He said that the Tasman Rugby Union did not support the demolition of the old Eastern Stand, if it is not required to be replaced. He said that the Tasman Rugby Union would prefer a more intimate ground, but urged Council not to rip up the cycling track without a new track first being made available elsewhere. He said it was not an option for the region to delay the upgrading of the Park.

In answer to a question, he said it was not an option for rugby to move to Saxton Field.

#### **1.13 Bill Sayer, Submission Number 8393, page 926**

Mr Sayer presented his submission and made a Powerpoint presentation which pointed out the likely impact of predicted climate change on Nelson in general and Trafalgar Park in particular. He said a lot could be done with \$7 million to protect the city against climate change rather than just spending it solely to upgrade Trafalgar Park.

#### **1.14 Stewarts Cycle City Ltd, Submission Number 8285, page 797**

Mr Michael Watson presented the submission on behalf of Stewarts Cycle City Ltd, urging the Council not to remove the cycle track at Trafalgar Park until another one has been built and is in use elsewhere. He said the cycle track was used at all times of the day by a wide age group. He also pointed out that it is a very safe environment for young people to learn to ride.

He also urged Council to be lateral in their thinking, and suggested that \$400,000 could pay for a chair lift to Fringe Hill and two purpose downhill tracks from Fringe Hill could be built into a world class facility for another \$500,000. He said that's

where Council's investment should be placed, as that would bring many, many visitors to Nelson to use the facility.

**1.15 Maurice Alach, Submission Number 8413, page 972**

Mr Alach presented his submission and said there should be no further development of Trafalgar Park. He said in the past he had urged Council to spend money to create grass strips between the footpath and the carriageway in areas such as The Wood, Brook Street, Vanguard Street, Tipahi Street, Waimea Road, Rocks Road, Vincent Street, Kawhai Street, etc. but this had been turned down as too expensive.

He said he objected to any proposal that sought to remove the cycle track at Trafalgar Park and he objected to the proposed increase in rates.

Attendance: The meeting adjourned for luncheon from 12.30pm to 1.00pm.

**1.16 Cycling Nelson, Submission Number 7793, page 212**

Mr Jim Mathews, Averil West, Chris Milldon and Rob Ford presented the submission on behalf of Cycling Nelson, and they tabled a proposal for a cycling facility at Saxton Field. They said that their group supported Option 2 but they confirmed that the Nelson cycling community, including formal and informal cycling users of the Trafalgar Park cycle track were very happy with the existing facilities. Should an upgrade of Trafalgar Park take place in the near future they thought it would be inevitable that the existing cycle track would have to be removed. The proposal that they tabled represented Cycling Nelson's preference for replacing the existing Trafalgar Park cycle track in a timely fashion and they said that it was supported by the Bike Nelson Group of Cycling Clubs.

In answer to a question, Mr Milldon said that Cycling Nelson could come up with \$100,000 as its contribution towards the new facility.

**1.17 Dan McGuire and Alf Newman, Submission Numbers 7614 and 8405, pages 12 and 943**

These two submitters combined their submissions and that of the Nelson Greypower Association Inc., and tabled additional material and highlighted passages in the Nelson Greypower submission. Mr Newman questioned Council's processes and said that the upgrading proposal should be put into the Annual Plan process so it could be considered along with the other priorities. Mr Newman stated that he had difficulty understanding the statement of proposal. He said there was need for more details.

Mr Newman also questioned whether Council had any authority to make a bid to World Cup Rugby 2011.

**1.18 John Atkins, Submission Number 8264, page 766**

Mr Atkins spoke to his submission, and said his preferred option was Option 1, although he was not opposed to remedial work happening at the Park. He was concerned with the timing and the fact that Nelson City Council appeared to be going alone without Tasman District Council's support.

**1.19 Trish Witt, Submission Number 8442, page 1027**

Ms Witt, assisted by Mrs Daphne Stephens presented the submission which consisted of a petition signed by 1286 signatures. The petition supported Option 1.

There was some discussion whether each signature on the submission represented a separate submission and why the submission appeared to contain two petitions, each with difference wording.

Ms Witt said that the process appeared to be vague, misleading and rushed and the work was of low priority compared to the replacement of the Maitai water pipeline and the sewerage pipe across to Bell's Island.

**1.20 Raymond Hill, Submission Number 8123, page 593**

Mr Hill said he did not agree with any upgrade to Trafalgar Park unless the Tasman Rugby Union was also going to contribute significantly to that upgrade. He also questioned why the existing grandstand on the eastern side should be demolished; arguing that all it really needed was a good tidy up.

**1.21 Nelson Bays Under 13 Rugby, Submission Numbers 7606 and 7869, pages 3 and 298**

Mr Grant Hunt presented the submission on behalf of Nelson Bays Under 13 Rugby as well as himself. He said that both submissions supported Option 4. He also pointed out that the outside of the park where it runs along Trafalgar Street needs a good tidying up as this was the gateway to the city and it looked extremely shabby.

He was concerned that most of the opposition appeared to be from an older generation struggling to pay rates. Mr Hunt said, however, that if the community doesn't start developing these assets now, it will just become more expensive in future years.

Attendance: The meeting adjourned for afternoon tea from 2.25pm to 2.40pm. During this time, Councillor Shaw left the meeting.

**1.22 Nelson Marlborough District Health Board, Submission Number 8425, page 998**

Ms Di Smith and Mr Richard Butler presented the submission on behalf of the Nelson Marlborough District Health Board, which supported Option 1. In answer to a question, Mr Butler said that it was not clear from the proposal whether the casual informal recreation presently carried out at the Park would continue or whether it would just turn into a spectator venue.

**1.23 Fashion Island, Submission Number 7683, page 89**

Ms Nicola Dolan presented the submission on behalf of Fashion Island. She said her company's preference was for Option 3 which she said could be staged over five, seven or ten years. She said it was important that the development of Trafalgar Park provide a facility that could host events over the next 20 to 30 years because every time there is an event in the city everybody benefits, including the CBD retailers.

In answer to a question from Councillor Holmes as to whether retailers will be prepared to pay a levy on their rates to help fund the Park, Ms Dolan said that she

thought the national chain stores would have no problems, but the owner operators would. In answer to another question, Ms Dolan said that the process she used to gauge the views of her tenants was by talking to them.

**1.24 Paul McLeod, Submission Number 7625, page 29**

Mr McLeod said he disagreed with the proposed investment in Trafalgar Park and said some more consideration should be given to how Trafalgar Park and the area surrounding could be used in the future. If Council chose to go with Option 1 then it would have to consider what uses Trafalgar Park could be put to, and he believed that the whole area has to be looked at again with “new eyes”.

Extension of Time.

Resolved

***THAT** in accordance with the standing orders the meeting continue beyond six hours.*

His Worship the Mayor/Holmes

Carried

**1.25 Graham Peat, Submission Number 7693, page 99**

Mr Peat presented his submission, saying that he did not want to see an expensive redevelopment of Trafalgar Park and therefore was supporting Option 1. He said there was no guarantee of the upgrade being financially successful and those in favour of such a redevelopment should be asked to raise the money.

**1.26 Colin Aitken, Submission Number 7823, page 245**

Mr Aitken presented his submission, saying that he supported a limited development of Trafalgar Park. He was concerned that for a complete Rugby World upgrade Council would be providing extra facilities that would never be used beyond the Rugby World Cup.

He also urged the Council to leave the Eastern Stand, unless it was absolutely necessary to demolish it. He explained to Council the recent history of Trafalgar Park, saying that if two of the parties had not pulled out Council would now have had almost all the facilities it is looking for.

He advocated a sand base for the pitch but also suggested that more research be done on the Park drainage because he believed that it has been blocked or squashed. He said there was need for more toilets on the western side.

**1.27 Ross Wylie, Submission Number 8353, page 872**

Mr Wylie presented his submission, saying he did not support Council’s preferred development option, Option 4. He said he thought it would be irresponsible for the Council to go it alone on the proposal without a mandate from the majority of ratepayers. Trafalgar Park should be regarded as a regional sports ground and the cost of upgrade and maintenance should be spread amongst the community of Nelson City and Tasman District. Mr Wylie added that he would support basic improvements to the Park such as sports lighting and upgrading to the ground drainage.

**1.28 Nelson Bays Football, Submission Number 8092, page 552**

Mr John Sauer and Mr Murray Leaning presented the submission on behalf of Nelson Bays Football. They said the Nelson Bays Football supported Option 4 because it would like to use Trafalgar Park for some major football games. It was pointed out that currently the only venue in the Nelson/Tasman regions where floodlit football could be played was the Wakefield Domain. The submitters said that football was the largest participation sport in the district with over 3,000 players and they said that it needed a ground with at least 3,500 seats.

The Mayor advised that was the last submission to be heard that day and the meeting adjourned at 3.50pm until 9.00am the following day.

CONFIRMED AS A CORRECT RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

\_\_\_\_\_ CHAIRPERSON \_\_\_\_\_ DATE