

**Taihape Leisure Hub Public Meeting Monday 1<sup>st</sup> December**  
**Taihape Town Hall Supper Rooms**  
**Notes from the meeting**

**Attendance List:**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Mr	Alan Thomas	Northern Wanganui Rugby Sub Union, Pirates Rugby Club, Taihape Cricket Club Association, Taihape Golf Club
Mr	Alastair Booth	Taihape Horse Trials
Mr	Alfred Simi	Taihape Netball Association
Mr	Allan Cherry	Athletic Club
Ms	Andrea Lindsay	Taihape Fitness Centre
Mr	Andy Watson	Rangitikei District Council Deputy Mayor
Mr	Angus Gordon	Taihape Musicians Club
Mr	Barry Thomas	Utiku Old Boys Rugby Football Club
Ms	Bernice Frost	Taihape Dressage Group
Mr	Bernie Sakey	Taihape Croquet Club
Mr	Boyce Davey	Taihape Area School
Mr	Brendan Mickleson	Taihape Rotary Club
Mr	Brian Sage	Taihape Community Development Trust
Mr	Chalky Leary	Rangitikei District Council Mayor
Mr	Colin Mower	Taihape Working Men's Club
Mr	Colin Thomas	Ruby Union
Mr	Danny Mickleson	Otaihape Club
Mr	Dave Sargison	Taihape Rugby Club
Mr	David Gordon	Utiku Old Boys Rugby Football Club
Ms	Denise Servante	Rangitikei District Council
Mrs	Diane Mickleson	Otaihape Club
Cr	Don Brown	Rangitikei District Council
Mr	Don Tantrum	Friends of Mt Stewart
Cr	Ed Cherry	Taihape Croquet Club, Rangitikei District Council
Mrs	Eva George	Taihape Community Development Trust
Mr	Frank Tong	Utiku Old Boys Rugby Football Club
Mr	Gavin Jensen	Taihape Working Men's Club
Mr	Geoff Duff	Taihape Agricultural & Pastoral Assn (A&P)
Mr	Graeme Pointon	Rangitikei District Council
Mr	Hugh Stewart	Friends of Mt Stewart, Rangitikei Forest and Bird
Mrs	Jan Byford	Keep Taihape Beautiful, Taihape District Council
Mr	Jason Fellingham	Taihape Area School
Ms	Jenny Pearce	Taihape Horse Trials, Taihape Agriculture and Pastoral Assn (A&P), Taoroa Pony Club
Mr	Jim Howard	Rangitikei Environment Group
Mrs	Jo Kelly	Utiku Old Boys Rugby Football Club
Mr	John Booth	Taihape Community Development Trust

Title	Name	Organisation
Mrs	Leah Collings	Otaihape Club
Mr	Leon Cherry	Taihape Working Men's Club
Mr	Les Clarke	Taihape Community Development Trust
Ms	Mandy Lovell	Badminton Club, Taihape Fitness Centre, Taihape Community Development Trust
Mrs	Marian Cleaver	Contract Bridge
Mr	Marty Crafar	Taihape Tennis Club
Mr	Merv Tapp	Taihape Squash Club
Mrs	Michelle Fannin	Taihape Community Board
Mr	Mike Swann	ProArch (Architect)
Mr	Peter Stratton	Taihape Junior Rugby Club
Mr	Phil Shaw	Otaihape Club
Mr	Richard Aslett	Taihape Community Board
Mrs	Robin Sage	Taihape Art Society
Ms	Sarah James	Rangitikei District Council
Mr	Sean Kelly	Utiku Old Boys Rugby Football Club
Mr	Terry Karatau	Taihape Community Development Trust
Mr	Tim Gilbertson	Department of Conservation
Mrs	Toni George	Taihape Community Development Trust
Mr	Trevor Dyke	Deerstalkers Assoc. / Search & Rescue, Taihape Community Development Trust

*1. Introduction and welcomes from the Chairman of Taihape Community Development Trust, John Booth.*

*2. Outline of key recommendations from Opus International feasibility report from Policy Analyst at Rangitikei District Council, Denise Servante.*

- The report was commissioned by TCDT in response to consultation with local groups which identified the need to upgrade existing sports facilities.
- Opus International Consultants were contracted to produce a feasibility study – they undertook extensive consultation with local interest groups and stakeholders, hopefully all the groups present have had the chance to input.
- Opus impressed by the ability of groups in this community to work together and the report indicates a degree of consensus around the key recommendations.
- There is a sense that the report has confirmed and consolidated the initial brief from the Community Development Trust and indicated what the next steps should be.
- This meeting is intended to cement that consensus and agree a programme of work that will move the project forward.

The feasibility study gives four key recommendations:

Recommendation 1: A “Leisure Hub” should be developed. This would be the recreation ‘heart’ of Taihape – a concentration of leisure infrastructure at Memorial Park.

- A wide array of clubs and organisations are active in Taihape and surrounding areas. Some are growing, some static and some in decline.
- There is a sense that a town like Taihape should be concentrating its facilities to develop a critical mass of multi-purpose, flexible-use space.
- advantages – it can reduce the burden of administration, maintenance, fundraising etc from individuals within individual clubs and it can ultimately provide better facilities for each group to access.
- No arranged or forced marriages between groups that bring about unacceptable compromises – win win is needed!

Recommendation 2: The project needs to urgently develop partnerships between the community and two key stakeholders: Rangitikei District Council and Taihape Area School.

- Use of Memorial Park requires the support of two key stakeholders and for very different reasons.
- Firstly, Rangitikei District Council is the “owner” of the land + some of the existing buildings on the site.
- Process of developing Management Plans for its parks and reserves: these are completed in consultation with the local community and stakeholders and, importantly, Council policy allows for implementation of the Plans to be delegated to a third party.
- Secondly, Taihape Area School is a new asset with a range of facilities that the School Trust Board has determined should be open for use by as many members and groups in the community as possible.
- The school management has signalled that it would welcome the opportunity to be viewed as one of the potential users of developed facilities at the Park.
- There would be opportunities to develop a Memorandum of Understanding over-shared booking systems for the use of facilities on both sites, shared maintenance of the facilities and so on.
- The report suggests that the proximity of the TAS would mean that any potential major funders would need to see the facilities co-exist and not duplicate or compete with each other.

Recommendation 3: The project should be led by Taihape Community Development Trust to meet the expressed demand for community assets that support community development in Taihape.

- Feasibility study looked at various project management options. The work was based in large part on the findings of a review of 8 “Sportville” projects carried out by SPARC and published in July 2008.
- Those that were succeeding were very successful, with healthy financial positions and demonstrable growth in participation by the constituent clubs that formed them.
- Governance is key! The club structures are more complex than traditional sporting clubs. They have multiple stakeholders, require an enlightened management approach and inclusive modern thinking around the Board table. It suggests starting with a project champion to reaffirm purpose, quell any concerns about loss of identity, amalgamations and reaffirm that founding entities will control the governance of new facilities for example, the appointment of Board members. The SPARC report recommends a governance structure recruited to a skill-set, that does not contain partisan or vested interests. Sports specific interests are moved one level down.

- The Opus report suggests that the Community Development Trust is the project champion that has demonstrated its ability to lead the project

Recommendation 4: The project should develop a funding plan for the phased delivery of individual projects that progressively contribute to the multi-purpose Leisure Hub Community Centre vision.

- Follows on from the other three recommendations as the next stage in the project.
- It requires that the aspirations of the community are developed into a phased and costed programme of works which the project governance body can take forward as a fundraising/partnership development programme. It needs to have buy-in from the Council (as part of its Memorial Park management plan), it needs to have buy in from the current and potential users of the facilities (to ensure that the facilities will meet their needs and that they will come and use them), it needs to have buy-in from potential external funders such as Community Trusts, the Lotteries Boards and so on.
- A first step for a brief for an architect to produce a master plan. 3 ideas later tonight.

First a focus on the first three recommendations.

- Recommendation 1: There seemed to be a degree of enthusiasm amongst some existing and potential users of Memorial Park for the idea of a Leisure Hub: this needs to be validated and the extent of shared needs and potential for cross-over established.
- Recommendation 2: Is the project able to proceed without the agreement and formal arrangement with these two stakeholders? RDC because it owns the asset that we are seeking to develop and TAS because of its proximity and the availability of its current facilities to supplement provision on the site. Are there any others that the Community needs to engage with as a prerequisite to move ahead?
- Recommendation 3: Finally, from an interested observer status it seems obvious that the project should continue to be driven by the Community Development Trust. Does the Trust have the confidence of other groups to take this lead role? Remember, this is a next step in the proposal – it is not suggested at this time that the Trust would ultimately be the governing body of the Leisure Hub. If not the Trust, who else would be a contender?

*3. Break Out Session 1: consideration of Recommendations 1, 2, 3. 3 groups: facilitators Eva George, Sarah James, Denise Servante. On hand for information: Graeme Pointon, Boyce Davey, John Booth.*

**Recommendation 1: That there should be a Taihape Leisure Hub centred on War Memorial Park.**

Table 1:

- Overall support in principle, but recognition that not everyone on board yet e.g. Bowling Club not interested (at this stage?).
- Project will require good relationship management/communication to get and keep all stakeholders on board.

Table 2:

- Overall support in principle with exception of:

- Utiku Old Boys Rugby Club: their financial situation is good although the player numbers could be higher. Enjoy control over club and bar facilities. Did not feel that new facilities would bring player numbers up. Lighting is bad, Grandstand needs a refit, don't want loss of playing fields.
- Other points raised:
- Potential increase for foot traffic, tied to bar.
- Changing facilities – should cover after match facilities
- Existing fields OK for dressage, need stable yards (e.g. Hawara showgrounds)

Table 3:

- Natural place for a Leisure Hub.
- Benefits include well-placed, cost-effective, existing infrastructure already there, shared resources with TAS, one voice in terms of funding so a lot easier (e.g. RDC)
- Potential hazards are reluctance by groups to lose autonomy, need for clubs to retain ownership of their buildings, reassurance of ongoing use by the users.

**→ Overall: Agreement that those present are interested in pursuing a Leisure Hub (some groups need to formally report back to their membership before committing) – care needs to be taken to ensure that groups do not lose autonomy and the value of their assets/investment is protected.**

**Recommendation 2: That partnership arrangements are needed between the community and Rangitikei District Council and Taihape Area School as key founding stakeholders.**

Table 1:

- Some concern expressed that the flow of resources between the community and TAS needed to be open and fair. Recognised that a win-win situation is possible.
- Define community? Primarily existing users, but also potential users.
- Buy in from the community will require demonstrable benefits.

Table 2:

- Third stakeholder is the user groups

Table 3:

- Key stakeholders must include sports clubs:
- Rugby Union
- Squash
- Bowls – croquet
- Tennis/netball
- A and P association
- Ataihape Club
- Utiku Rugby Club

**→ Overall: Agreement that partnership arrangements are essential with RDC and TAS and that engagement and involvement of key user groups is also vital.**

**Recommendation 3: That the project should be led over the next stage by the Taihape Community Development Trust.**

Table 1:

- Trust is good as the lead agency.
- Ability to fundraise is crucial.
- Bring in additional stakeholders in a steering group.

Table 2:

- Logical that Trust Leads it and form closer relationship with main users:
- Rugby, netball, tennis, bowling, squash, A and P, croquet, show-jumpers.

Table 3:

- TCDT carry on with development with reassurance that their leadership will be professional and neutral.

**→ Overall: Agreement that Taihape Community Development Trust should lead the next phase of this project.**

*4. Presentation from Mike Swan, Proarch Architects demonstrating drawings outlining three different options for the development of the site.*

*5. Break Out Session 2: consideration of Drawings Option 1, 2, 3. 3 groups: facilitators Eva George, Sarah James, Denise Servante. On hand for information: Mike Swan.*

**Option 1: Add club facilities to existing club buildings, add TAS gym to the swimming pool, refurbish Grandstand, upgrade playing surfaces.**

Pluses	Minuses
Good for dressage	Gets rid of the Grandstand
Plenty of room for parking equestrian vehicles	Only one rugby ground
Easier not messing with anyone's facilities	No linkages
Keeps the Grandstand	Grandstand no use to A and P
Good for athletics (important for TAS?)	Rugby – can't upgrade current facilities
Clubs keep autonomy	Doesn't move on the "Hub" concept
Retain well-recognised surface	Fewest car parks
Should be cheaper	Major upgrade needed
Good with regards to sun/weather issues	No economies of scale
Ring road + set up is great	Better shower facilities at Grandstand
Keeps playground	
Interesting?	
Need multiple bar facilities	
Will it provide adequate facilities to allow Taihape to bid to host a team in the Rugby World Cup 2011?	
Each code needs to think about wind/sun	

**Option 2: New build a facility with squash courts and changing rooms on ground floor and first floor club/bar facilities, snooker room and views out over refurbished sports fields. Incorporate grandstand overlooking no.1 rugby field. Situate alongside the TAS gym and both attached to swimming pool. Single span “indoor equestrian centre”. Existing club buildings demolished.**

Pluses	Minuses
Proximity to pool Flexible option: Rugby and bowls can stay where they are but can be incorporated in the future if needed. A and P shed good idea 4 rugby fields may be too many, could be dedicated to soccer/hockey/athletics track? New courts are good (provided reflective glass) Maybe have rugby spectator at A and P show (mixing of clubs)	One facility – needs to be able to meet peak demand needs Ring road to access back fields and park near bush area. Do we need so many netball courts and rugby fields? Expensive without potential to make enough economies of scale? Car park too far away Expensive to surface new fields Facilities too far away from (and not enough for) 4 fields Bad weather will affect rugby
Interesting?	
Need crèche	
How can lockdown for ticketed events be achieved?	
Where’s the athletics track? Cricket?	
How can groups maintain their asset-base/revenue streams e.g. income from bar sales	
Potential loss of autonomy (own club) and hence voluntary input	
Need showers at new indoor equestrian centre	
Ideas for design brief?	
Keep the big picture	
Need access to all areas (ring road)	
Include athletics requirements	
Flexibility – particularly to manage demand at peak times and to give each club its autonomy	
Take into account sun and wind	
Design must help clubs with administration and maintenance	
Future proofed (physical building) and “Sport Partnership “ (only one body that needs to engage with e.g. funders)	
Don’t shift dirt for the sake of it (keep costs down).	

**Option 3: New build a facility with squash courts and changing rooms on ground floor and first floor club/bar facilities, snooker room and views out over refurbished sports fields. Incorporate grandstand overlooking no.1 rugby field. Situate freestanding from the swimming pool which has the relocated TAS gym attached. Single span “indoor equestrian centre”. Existing club buildings demolished.**

Pluses	Minuses
More space Heaps of car parks Demolish existing buildings Future proofed (can be added onto) Maximum flexibility Gives maximum viewing over fields and courts. Probably best but hardest to get agreement on from clubs Bowls good in middle Share running of facility	Surface new fields needs to be of same quality as existing fields Ring road with parking behind A&P. Facility for dog trials behind A&P is lost Sun in west will blind spectators watching tennis/bowls/croquet. Need to have East to west + reflective windows. Surface of A&P shed needs to be different quality for different users. How flexible will this be? Not enough room for A&P Too much parking
Interesting?	
Where's the athletics track? Cricket?	
Can clubs keep their autonomy with loss of building?	
Ideas for design brief?	
Athletics field included	
A solution for tennis (change tennis and rugby field around)	
Levels fields	
Appropriate surface	
More tweaking	

*6. Wrap up session led by John Booth.*

Suggestion is that a Steering Group needs to be formed to take the project forward/implement recommendation 4. The group should be task focussed, time limited (6 months max) and report back in June 2009. It should contain key user groups and stakeholders. The tasks needed to implement Recommendation 4 were likely to involve:

- Members represent their groups to the committee and vice versa
- Committee manages contract with Architect to design Master Plan
- Master Plan must be a Phased Program
- Identify funders and develop relationships with them
- Community Facilities Fund has deadline March 2009.
- Committee to report back to community before then.

Nominations to Steering Group:

Utiku Old Boys Rugby Football Club	Sean Kelly
Taihape Rugby Club	Dave Sargison
Taihape Squash Club	Merv Tapp
Taihape Netball Association	Alfred Simi
Taihape Tennis Club	Marty Crafar
Taihape Agricultural & Pastoral Assn (A&P)	Geoff Duff
Taihape Horse Trials	Jenny Pearce
Otaihape Club	Danny Mickleson
Taihape Area School	Boyce Davey
Rangitikei District Council	Denise Servante
Taihape Community Board	Michelle Fannin
Taihape Community Development Trust	Eva George
Taihape Working mens Club	Colin Mower
ProArch (Architect)	Mike Swann

All subject to confirmation by the group concerned. In discussion:

Danny Mickleson outlined the decision by the Otaihape Club to sell its existing building and the Club's preferred option to invest in a facility at Memorial Park. It would expect such a facility to meet its needs but also to be available for wider community use. The Club needed to know by mid-March whether the War Memorial Park/Leisure Hub was an option.

Jim Howard outlined requirements from DOC for the bush area to be fenced to keep grazing stock away from the area to be regenerated through natural re-growth and some planting. This needs to be factored in to the planning.

Composition of the Steering Group: query around whether place on the Steering Group for e.g. Working Men's Club and the Musicians. Consensus at the meeting that the process followed by the Steering Group, to be inclusive, to communicate well and to seek out knowledge/experience as necessary was of most importance.

Finally, an inaugural meeting of the Steering Group would be held at the TAS new school foyer on Monday 15<sup>th</sup> December at 6.30 pm. Business would be to elect a Chairperson and establish a Terms of Reference.

***These minutes and further information are available from the Taihape website:***  
***[http://www.taihape.co.nz/information.php?info\\_id=35](http://www.taihape.co.nz/information.php?info_id=35)***