# AVCC Minutes 21 February 2018

Apologies: Heather, Hilary, Chris

Minute-taker: Madeleine in Heather’s absence

Present: Rachel, Luke, Roland, Nicole, Jay, Nadine, Daniela, Tom

### Minutes:

The minutes from the December meeting were deferred again to the March meeting.

The minutes from the January meeting were discussed and approved with three minor amendments.

**Roles:**

The committee discussed how to manage the Secretary and Treasurer roles as Heather is in Tonga with VSA until the end of the committee term, and Chris is unable to attend meetings to present the financial reports.

Secretary: It was decided that we would rotate responsibility for taking minutes, and forward the [secretary@arovalley.org.nz](mailto:secretary@arovalley.org.nz) email address to the co-chairs.

Treasurer: Chris will continue to produce the reports and help Joy get up to speed, and Rachel has offered to help Joy with the end-of-year accounts.

**Action: Joy to test login details for secretary email address and set up forward to co-chairs**

**Action: Luke to follow up with Chris about the end-of-year filing**

**Action: Rachel pointed out that we need to make sure we have up to date filings with the Registrar of Charities**

**Action: Committee and staff to look at setting up a Handbook/Calendar of things that need to be done each year**

### Staff report – Lexi and Joy

Lexi reported on progress with the Community Fridge project. Lexi and the Newtown coordinator have been interviewing possible fridge coordinators. Roland queried if this was a contract role or an on-going role. Lexi confirmed that it was a contract role, and the committee confirmed that it had delegated signing approval to Lexi for contract roles (as per staff for the school holiday programme and Xmas tree sales).

**Action: Lexi to send contract to Roland, Luke, Nicole**

Planning for Fair 10th March – this will run largely as usual, except for the addition of a barn dance at 5pm. This will extend the fair, which is otherwise over quite early, but will mean stallholders need to stay until 6pm if they need vehicle access to the site. The traffic management plan will need to be amended accordingly.

**Action: Joy and Lexi to locate 20+ road cones for deployment on Friday night**

**Action: Roland and Daniella to prepare notices, notify WCC and set out**

Postponement – this will be Lexi’s decision, but needs to be signed off by one co-chair by 6am. Messages will need to be posted to Facebook and left on the office line answerphone.

Lexi talked about how she has used the Fair as a platform to get more collaboration happening e.g. Zeal youth group will do a stage; conversation with Victoria University around waste-free, Wild Aro (predator free) etc.

**Action: committee to help out at Fair as per sign-up sheet**

### Emergency Management

Joy and Lexi are working with Ashley from WREMO to organise a workshop, which will involve all those who are likely to volunteer to help with an emergency response. Options for a workshop in April include Wednesday 4th evening, Saturday 7th evening or Saturday 14th afternoon.

The committee formally agreed that the Emergency Hub should move from Te Aro School to the Aro Valley Community Centre.

### Site development

The site development subcommittee brought along draft plans for discussion. It was noted that a landscape architect (Mark Newdick) had been appointed separately.

Roland queried the plans and explained his expectation that there would have been more options for the community to choose among, for example, plans with and without the Bunker (1930’s tennis pavillion).

Another query was whether we could ask for the redevelopment budget to be adjusted based on the consumer price index, but the subcommittee felt opening this conversation with the WCC would significantly delay the project.

The subcommittee explained three of the major ideas that had been rejected as not feasible or not cost-effective:

1. Moving the Hall to the driveway. This was scoped and costed after Martin’s query. Due to the width of the site at that point, it would only be possible if it was an entirely new build structure, costed at $1.6 million with exclusions.

2. Moving the Hall to the basketball court. This was scoped and costed after Martin’s query. This option proved too expensive also, at $1.45 million with exclusions.

3. Restoring the Bunker as part of the community centre.

Demo tennis pavillion = $100K

Repair roof, seismic strengthen only = $300K - $400K

Repair roof + upgrade to storage = $350K - $450K

Repair + upgrade for occupation = $450K - $550K

New build storage space $2,500/m2, $250K for 100m2

Roland pointed out that part of the Aro Valley Community Council’s constitution is protecting the built heritage of the area. Brent queried the heritage value (built 1936) and whether the Bunker was ever part of the Valley, as the tennic club had had access from Palmer Street only. Tom suggested that the preservation of the actual building was only one of the ways to preserve built heritage.

Roland expressed a strong view, seconded by Madeleine, that we had moved too fast past the point at which the fate of the Bunker should have been discussed.

Nadine observed that she was underwhelmed by the proposed use of the space created by the demolition of the Bunker: a large walled, concrete courtyard, with a ‘dog jail’ effect due to the fencing.

Daniela asked if the Bunker had to be demolished for the proposed designs. Luke explained that it doesn’t and the current designs are outside the Bunker’s footprint. This is becuase shifting the Hall back would have costs (although it would improve traffic flow issues at the pinch point with the preschool fence). There could be some scope for moving some of the proposed meeting room additions from the front to the back of the design.

Madeleine asked if the Bunker was restored to use as a meeting room or storage, then that would reduce the cost of the rest of the design as less new building would be needed. Luke queried what the quality of the space would be. Roland noted that it had been a jewellery workshop in 1996... He asked whether there was potential for sponsorship or fundraising to restore the Bunker, citing the example of Jarvis & Lowndes funding the Brooklyn Hall fitout.

Other observations were that:

* free or coin-operated gas BBQs would be good
* an outdoor table tennis table could be included
* whether the implications of noise from a large open area at the back of the Hall (proximate to residents including Aston Towers) had been considered
* the drab colours of the proposed designs
* the possibility that a restored Bunker could inspire an art deco-inspired frontage for the Hall (rather than the extremely bland ‘architecture’ of the current designs)
* the proposed plans didn’t address problems with the pinch point, and these were raised by many during the consultation process
* the designs didn’t allow for the cost of the a/v fitout of the Hall
* there could be an opportunity to extend the solar panels and add batteries

Roland requested that we see more options, particularly the best option with the Bunker and the best option without. Daniela queried the timeline – Luke explained that the building consent needs to be lodged by the end of June.

Luke noted that there could be opportunities to add flexible-use storage space to the proposed courtyard, which might support bike fixing groups etc.

The subcommitte explained that the plan was to take the proposed designs to the community (with minor amendments and better presentation), along with explanations, a FAQ and some background. Ideally a display would be ready by the Fair, then an event organised the week after. This would offer a presentation by the architects and subcommittee, and Anne C would run an exercise to measure “consent if” from the community.

There continued to be significant frustration that options to maintain the Bunker were not part of the plan.

Rachel proposed that three things needed to be produced:

1. A communications plan that explains the development of the design and feasibility testing, and identification of the proposed option  
2. A version of the plan that communicates how all the community consultation has resulted in the design  
3. An alternate design option that retains the Bunker