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Papakura Local Board

17 June 2020

As Controller of Auckland’s civil defence response to COVID 19, I wish, through the Local Board, to express my immense thanks to the many Papakura community organisations, their staff and volunteers who stepped outside their own bubble to generously supported those in need.

Whilst there are too many of you for me to name individually, I know from speaking to our team on the Welfare Desk that your hard work made a massive difference. It allowed us to focus our welfare work on the many others in desperate need who didn’t have local networks to support them.

I applaud you all for your leadership and your creative response to work with the constraints imposed on us, especially during the very difficult Alert Levels 4 and 3. The crucial work you managed to do whilst working under the restrictions of these levels, from compiling and providing food parcels, personal protective equipment or toiletries for those in need, reaching out to those like our elderly who were at greater risk to help them get food or their medicines or actively disseminating critical health information ensured many more in Papakura or across Auckland better cope with the immense challenges brought on by COVID19.

I know many of you continue to delivery support but I hope you all take time to rest, and reflect and connect with your loved ones. The range of initiatives that have grown from this response, including the wonderful Papakura Community volunteers group, is something you can take pride in. It continues the proud Papakura tradition of your community building a stronger, caring and disaster resilient Papakura. I really look forward to supporting you with this work in partnership with the Local Board.

Best wishes,

Kate Crawford
General Manager
Auckland Emergency Management
The name Shiloh stands for peace, abundance and a sense of belonging

The Shiloh Creative Life Centre Charitable Trust was established March 2018 by a number of us living and working in South Auckland, who share a passion for being our better-selves and contributing what we have and know how to rebuild communities of care and connection to manifest change in our world.

The Shiloh Creative Life Centre is a community of people who come together to discover self-reliance, self-worth, self-empowerment and self-love in a caring place of creativity, learning, healing and personal development.
why shiloh?

- It is a vision Dee Petit has held for 11 years
- Connection and a sense of belonging for people
- Holistic approach to well-being
- One hub that embraces creativity, education, community and wellness
- A contribution of service in our community
- Bringing together professional practitioners, providers and carers from a range of holistic wellness backgrounds in medicine, therapy, horticulture, arts and education who want to contribute to Shiloh’s vision
We worked with MIT Students to research wellbeing

Our research findings demonstrate the following factors are important to New Zealanders well-being:

- Holistic approach to mental, physical, family & spiritual wellness
- A strong sense of belonging
- Connection to one another as a community
- Creativity & The Arts

These are the foundations of Shiloh’s approach to assist people with the ability to lead fulfilling, purposeful, balanced and meaningful lives as desired in the New Zealand Governments well-being budget.
Why Shiloh in South Auckland?

- High proportions of mental health issues
- The downstream impacts on physical health, family life, friendships and our ability to provide for ourselves and others.
- A large youth population in South Auckland suffering from bullying, suicide, family violence and lack of identity and connection
- Growing metropolitan urban centre with a population needing more places to be together as a community for support & connection
Vision & Mission

Vision
Enriching lives to create a unified community that enhances individuals with their wellness, education and creativity

Mission
A community centre that is seen to be the heart of the community, strengthening the lives of individuals and families.

The Heart of the Community
Education Objective

An educational space where individuals can participate in programs which enhance personal growth, universal knowledge & spiritual awareness

- Back 2 Basics Program
- Permaculture Classes
- Personal Growth Seminars
- Homeopathic First Aid Course
- BOWTECH ® Therapy Course
- Massage Therapy Course
- Meditation & Maori Mindfulness
- Building Apprenticeship Programs
Creativity Objective

Dedicated to creative therapies & art projects that promote freedom of personal artistic expression

The Open Art Studio integrates creative art courses, open studio days & community projects

Youth Tribe & BeYOUtiful ART Collective Project

painting, music, drumming, drama, writing, singing, sewing, fibre art, wood-working, yoga, meditation, dance, & movement
Community Objective

A safe community hub to gather where people have the opportunities to enrich their lives through creative expression, mental wellness, spiritual growth and cohesive families

- Community Garden
- Weekly Koha Kitchen Dinners
- Open Mic Nights
- Men & Women’s Support Groups
- Dad’s & Lads Fishing Programs
Well-Being Objective

Holistic wellness clinic and programs which nurture the mind, body and soul

- Homeopathic doctor
- Naturopaths
- Ayurveda practitioner
- O-Zone Therapist
- Shiatsu Practitioner
- Massage Therapist
- Art Therapy
- Counselling and Family Therapy

Attachment A  Item 8.1
Board of Trustees

Trustees
- Denise “Dee” Petit – Life Coach. Teacher. Facilitator - Chairperson
- Morris Tuffery - BSC(HONS) ND, Rhom - Treasure
- Christine Burch- Counsellor & Family Therapist – Co-Secretary
- Anita Vlasic Manaia - Art therapist - BASW, MAAT(clinical) - Co-Secretary

Advisory Board
- Brigitte Lauper Tisch - MA (Media Studies), Filmmaker, Teacher
- Stephanie Bosanac – Realtor for RE/MAX Real Estate – Jackson, MI-USA
- Mark Sinclair – Partner @ Beker Findley Allan Accountants – Taupo NZ
Shiloh Community Garden

Our community garden project aims to:

- Educate families on organic gardening, food forest and urban farming
- Improve dietary habits through fresh garden to table education
- Encourage & educate the preservation of food methods
- Assist in mental and physical health activity
- Connection to mother earth
- Social interaction with members of the community
- Embrace social ties and build a greater sense of belonging for individuals
This programme aims to teach complex bodily functions in an easy to understand manner, connecting health to specific areas and outcomes.

Teaching simple cost effective nutritious rich ways of cooking that fits into a busy modern family lifestyles and eating habits from garden to table education.

The goal is to provide educational and practical knowledge that is easy to implement.
Vision

To encourage, build trust, and inspire creative expression in the development and unfolding of individual personal identity, values and goals in our teenage participants.

We want to give our youth much needed extra support to flourish and shine with a sense of dignity, respect, love, happiness and self-worth.

Female & Male Students 14+
True North Star Youth Art Project @ Uxbridge Hub 2018
Our Vision
To help young women find confidence within and to teach them tools and strategies to help them to be their BeYOUtiful self-inside and out.

Our Mission
We support and encourage young women to be their authentic self.
To inspire and gain self-confidence, self-worth and self-care through self-love.
To Be YOU and love you.
Established in 2018
Collaborate Creative Art Project with Community and Local Artist

Artists from diverse cultural backgrounds living in Auckland collaborate to teach a wide range of original practices to inspire, uplift, create and connect with one's soul and the vast community in South Auckland region.
Dads & Lads Fishing Program

Dad's and Lad's principal aim is to teach men and their boys how to fish, using simple and inexpensive methods.

This programme will encourage the boys and their fathers or male caregivers to spend time learning together and enjoying each other's company each week.

Principal teacher: Bill Hohepa
What we want to achieve

1 year – establish foundations

- Leasing property
- Establishing Community Garden Project
- Open Holistic Wellness Clinic
- Seed funding to support core programs to eventually become self-sustaining

5 year goal

- Trust owns property & land
- Strong stakeholder & community relationships
- Strong fundraising community
- Building Apprenticeship Program & accredited courses
- Flourishing community co-op
- Thriving eco-friendly sustainable programs
- Self-reliant, self-resilience, self-sustaining
How can we collaborate?  
What does the trust require moving forward?

The trustees are looking for support with the following:

• A building to house the art studio, wellness clinic & education hub with land to establish the community garden
• Connected to government agencies who need holistic well-being support for their clients
• Financial support and endorsement by the Papakura Local Board
An afternoon with Shiloh

August 28, 2020
Hawkins Theatre
4-9pm

an introduction to Shiloh Creative Life Centre
Creative & interactive afternoon with local talented artist, wellness practitioners and workshop facilitators introducing the services and programs we offer through the Shiloh Creative Life Centre.
Followed by a FREE MOVIE NIGHT sponsored by ....
Connecting families and community together
May 2020
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Executive Summary

In 2008, farmland was purchased by the former Papakura City Council to futureproof sports field provision in the area, alleviate pressure on other grounds and provide quality surfaces that are not prone to flooding. Opāheke Sports Park received $3.6 million in investment from Auckland Council to develop the greenfield site, which is to accommodate eight football fields, supporting amenities, parking and road infrastructure.

To implement the recommendations drawn from the Papakura Sports Needs Assessment, an encumbrance fund of $1.67 million has been allocated to the development of clubrooms on the park.

The position assessment report, as part of a wider feasibility study and business case has been commissioned to:

1. Analyse the strategic context and alignment.
2. Undertake demographic assessment.
3. Code engagement – determine willingness to use Opāheke Sports Park, and if so, their service requirements.
4. Determine whether community need warrants undertaking a feasibility study on the viability of developing clubrooms.

The Papakura Local Board area is forecast for significant population growth with an additional 30,000 plus residents in the area by 2051. Given Papakura/Druy’s accessibility to the southern motorway it is anticipated there will be non-resident demand making the area suitable for regional opportunities. By 2043 it is anticipated there will be an additional 13,000 people in the Papakura Local Board area playing sport.

Papakura has a high proportion of Maori in comparison to the Auckland Region. Ethnic population projections forecast Indian and Pacific Island communities to be the fastest growing over the next 20 years. Growth in traditional field sports popular with Maori and Pacific Island communities such as rugby, softball, touch and rugby league, and the growth of emerging sports such as Kabaddi and Kilikiti, is anticipated. Football and cricket will likely remain popular in the area.

The following conclusions were drawn from the analysis and consultation:

- The development is strategically aligned with Council, Local Board and code sector strategies and plans. This is further enhanced through the allocation of $1.67 million as part of an encumbrance fund from the Papakura Local Board.

- The Opāheke Sport Park has already undertaken development with two sand carpeted fields (total provision of eight fields) with floodlighting in place, as well as one grass cricket wicket and two artificial wickets. Additionally, changing rooms and toilets are currently under construction.

- The Papakura Local Board area has a net surplus of sports fields not taking into account Opāheke Sports Park. Papakura is therefore in the favourable position to accommodate sport and active recreation growth brought about by population growth alone.

- Projected demand is evident by the adjacent greenfield residential area at Bellfield Estate – which is developing over 500 houses across 22 hectares. The Auckland Unitary Plan and subsequent concept plans outline the intention to integrate the site with Opāheke Sports Park.

- Opāheke Sports Park, whilst underutilised now, is likely to become sought-after in the future, as demand for facilities continues to increase. The Park can cater for new users to come into the area as well as providing an opportunity for emerging sports to grow.

- A range of summer and winter users have signalled their interest in domiciling and/or using the Park. This will require careful scheduling and configuration of fields, particularly during the summer to accommodate prospective users. Although this is likely to occur in stages as
emerging codes evolve and grow, and the value proposition of the Park entices others to relocate at time.

- The site has the potential to perform local, sub-regional and regional roles due to its large real estate, projected population growth in the surrounding areas and proximity to the southern motorway. Therefore, suitable supporting infrastructure is required to maximise its potential.

- The initial core users and likely anchor tenants identified include United Cricket and Counties Manukau Rugby League. Having large anchor users will be critical for sourcing the remaining capex levels (outside of the encumbrance fund) and for establishing a sustainable model for a clubroom facility.

- To maximise the above point, Council and the Papakura Local Board should actively work alongside the Auckland Football Federation to encourage the Southern Performance Hub to be based out of Opāheke Sports Park.

- A range of emerging sports that attract low participant groups should be supported by the Council to operate out of the Park – particularly kiklit and kabaddi who have expressed their interest.

- The suggested clubroom facility specifications outlined by the respective groups were similar in nature and could be complementary (with considered scheduling). However, to ensure the facility development is affordable, the scope and scale of the clubroom facility needs further testing during a feasibility study.

- It is likely further developments of the playing fields will be required to effectively attract and accommodate users to the park.

- The site has the potential as an attractive multi-sport hub, and although there will be early adopters, other users will come on board in time. Therefore the initial users will need to be flexible in their allocation and use of the facilities to accommodate other groups in order to realise the full potential of the site.

The following recommendations are provided in response to the identified conclusions:

1. **Strong interest from user groups** - undertake a feasibility study to determine the viability of clubrooms positioned on Opāheke Sports Park to meet prospective user needs.

2. **Take a balanced approach** – the feasibility study should pay particular attention to the scale and scope of development to ensure the project does not overcapitalise, resulting in excessive capex funding required and/or unsustainable operational costs.

3. **Flexible design** - focus should be placed on accommodating the core needs of the anchor tenants, as timelines for other groups are unknown and pose a risk. The design should concentrate on maximising flexible spaces that can be repurposed or reconfigured to cater for other groups as they come online.

4. **Observations** - Auckland Council, Papakura Local Board and CLM Counties Manukau should keep a watching brief on the current situation surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic and potential implications on organisations’ viability and their associated facilities. Opāheke Sports Park may be a possible vehicle to support revitalisation and participation outcomes moving forward.

5. **Wider park development** - An accompanying piece of work is required by Auckland Council to ensure the playing fields and other required infrastructure are addressed and/or conceptually planned to meet code needs.
**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Opāheke Sports Park on Opāheke Road is a new sports field complex situated in a semi-rural area between Papakura and Drury. The sports park has a significant footprint with capacity for eight winter sports fields and up to five cricket wickets. The park is in the early stages of development with two of the eight sports fields developed with training floodlights. One grass cricket wicket and two artificial cricket wickets have also been developed and team changing facilities and toilets are currently under construction.

The Papakura Local Board has an encumbrance fund to invest in clubroom facilities. Clubrooms are key to supporting and servicing club and sports activities. The off-field social environment is a key part of a thriving club as well as providing a base for sport administration, teaching and learning. A challenge for clubroom investment at this stage of the parks’ development is the progressive entry of user groups. New users will come to the park over a number of years, yet investment is required sooner rather than later to ensure the park is ‘game ready’ for new users to build their presence and to meet community needs. Building now will also help to guard against rising inflationary costs and budget devaluation.

**1.1 PURPOSE**

This report identifies sport clubs/organisations that are best placed to use and/or be domiciled at Opāheke Sports Park and confirms their needs to operate effectively at the park. In addition, other potential user groups of clubrooms and the sport facilities are identified to allow the Papakura Local Board and Auckland Council to make provision for these users as and when they locate to Opāheke Sports Park.

The report will inform the subsequent stages of feasibility study and business case to support investment decision-making process of Papakura Local Board, while meeting objectives outlined in the Papakura Local Board Plan (2017).

**1.2 METHODOLOGY**

In developing this report the following approach was undertaken:

- A review of relevant strategies and plans.
- Interviews with Auckland Council parks and planning staff.
- Interviews with regional sporting bodies.
- Email, phone and face-to-face meetings with local clubs and organisations.
## 2.0 STRATEGIC CONTEXT

This section outlines the strategic context for considering the proposed clubroom development at Opāheke Sports Park, referencing Auckland Council and sport and active recreation strategies and plans.

**SUMMARY POINTS**
- The development is highly prioritised by the Papakura Local Board.
- The park is recommended in the draft Auckland Regional Rugby League Facility Network Plan as the site best positioned to accommodate the ‘Home of League’ for the Counties Manukau Zone.
- Strongly aligns with Auckland Council strategies and plans by providing fit-for-purpose facilities that encourage partnerships, services low-participation communities, enables multi-use, attracts high levels of participation, with strong population growth forecasted, highly accessible, and the ability to reach sub-regional or regional status for certain sports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT</th>
<th>PAPAKURA LOCAL BOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAPUKARA LOCAL BOARD PLAN (2017)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Plans are strategic documents developed every three years to set the direction for the respective Local Boards. Reflecting community priorities and preferences, Local Board plans guide localised activity, funding and investment decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANT FINDINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continue to invest in the development of Bruce Pulman Park, and the Opāheke and Hingaia sportgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Progressively upgrade and improve the overall standard of existing parks, sport and recreation facilities to meet the needs of all age groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure new and existing facilities can be utilised as multi-purpose community hubs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PAPUKARA SPORTS NEEDS ASSESSMENT (2018)** | |
| The needs assessment was developed to help inform future planning within the district, including the development and use of Pulman Park, Opāheke and Hingaia sports grounds. A specific outcome of the assessment was to determine whether a multi-purpose sports facility is required at Opāheke Sports Park. |
| **RELEVANT FINDINGS** | |
| - Potential for the initial core users of Opāheke sports fields to be rugby and cricket. |
| - Outcome could free up other sport parks for other users. |
| - Potential to meet the projected future needs of summer football and touch. |
| - Potential to consider other summer sports such as AFL, kiklki and kabaddi if future demand warrants. |
| - Will support the development of a multisport hub of sporting clubs and activity within the sports park. |

| **AUCKLAND COUNCIL** | |
| **COMMUNITY FACILITIES NETWORK PLAN (2015)** | |
| The purpose of the Community Facilities Network Plan is to guide council’s investment in the provision of community facilities for the next 20 years. The overall vision for community facilities: “Vibrant, welcoming places at the heart of where and how people connect and participate.” |
### Strategic Alignment

The council has defined four objectives to meet their vision and outcomes:

- Integrate and coordinate planning across all types of community facilities.
- Maintain, improve and optimise existing community facilities.
- Develop fit-for-purpose, integrated and connected community facilities.
- Leverage and support partnerships.

### Relevant Findings

- There are no specific actions for Opāheke Sports Park in the Community Facilities Network Plan – Action Plan.
- Although not stated in the network plan, the clubroom development does meet the objectives of leveraging and supporting partnerships and developing fit-for-purpose community facilities.

### Auckland Council Facility Partnership Policy (2019)

This policy outlines Auckland Council’s approach to facility partnerships by providing a shared understanding, strategic decision-making and sustainability of facility partnerships. Facility partnerships are where Auckland Council invests in community facilities owned and operated by others so Aucklanders can access more of the quality facilities they need, faster and more effectively.

### Relevant Findings

- Invest strategically on outcomes – as identified in aforementioned strategies and plans.
- Invest to help achieve equity for all Aucklanders – the proposed development can address a growth area of Auckland and provide facilities for under-represented communities and emerging sports in the region.
- Maximise value – the fields and supporting clubrooms will be multi-use and flexible to maximise participation and delivery outcomes.
- Sustainability – This should be explored during the feasibility study and business case stages, with emphasis placed on maximising revenue streams through domiciled and casual users.

### Auckland Council Sport Investment Plan (2019)

The investment plan has been developed to provide a structured approach to deliver better outcomes for all Aucklanders through the vehicle of sport and active recreation. Participation is targeted into three broad categories:

1. Enabling participation of low-participant communities – investment targeting sedentary population groups and/or communities with low participation rates.
2. Increasing participation in emerging sports with high growth potential.
3. Sustaining or increasing participation in high-participation sports.

### Relevant Findings

- Although the Sport Investment Plan does not prioritise investment in incidental infrastructure (clubroom and administration facilities), the development of combined multi-use infrastructure on the park will enable the fields to service sub-regional and regional activity for certain sports. In addition, the infrastructure will help attract high participation sports (allowing for expansion) and accommodate new or emerging codes, particularly those focused on communities with low participation rates.

### Auckland Sport Sector

### Draft Auckland Regional Rugby League Facilities Network Plan (2019)

The holistic regional plan was developed to address two key outcomes:

- Identifying the future club priorities in terms of field and clubroom requirements.
- Providing direction and recommendations to progress a home of rugby league for the Akarana and Counties Manukau zones and Auckland Rugby League.
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

RELEVANT FINDINGS

- The greatest level of field supply is forecasted in Papakura and Waiheke.
- The findings from the assessment identified the most suitable site for the ‘Home of League’ for Counties Manukau is the Opāheke Sports Park.
- Potential NZTA road realignment through portion of Prince Edward Park.

AUCKLAND SPORT AND RECREATION STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN (REFRESHED 2017)

Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan sets out a 10-year strategic direction for sport and recreation, with actions to guide the future planning and delivery of recreation and sport in Auckland. The shared vision is Aucklanders more active, more often with four priority areas around participation, infrastructure, sector development and excellence in sport.

RELEVANT FINDINGS

- Providing fit-for-purpose facilities that meet and service geographic and participation needs.
- Maximise facility partnerships with the Papakura Local Board, local and regional sport and active recreation groups - create efficient and sustainable operations.

AKTIVE - DRURY AND DISTRICTS RUGBY CLUB INSIGHTS AND PLANNING REPORT (2019)

RELEVANT FINDINGS

- Consideration given to the ongoing suitability of Drury Domain as the club’s base, given it is a single field facility. Relocating to a larger sports park with several fields may be more suitable for the long-term future of the club.
- Given the current sport field provision across the Papakura Local Board, access to other sport parks may be an option, however, there is likely to be increasing demand from other high participation field-based sports such as football and league and the increased growth in sports such as lacrosse, Kia-O-Rahi, kikikite and ultimate frisbee.

2.1 FIELD SUPPLY AND DEMAND ANALYSIS

As outlined in Table 2.2, the Papakura Local Board area has good provision of sports fields with the network supply exceeding demand by over 2000 minutes per week. However, the condition of facilities needs improving and there is a general shortage of lights for winter training.

Table 2.2 – Papakura club field and supply analysis – Auckland Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Club Name</th>
<th>Mins U6-U10</th>
<th>Mins &gt;11</th>
<th>Total Mins</th>
<th>Unit Capacity</th>
<th>Floodlit Capacity</th>
<th>Total Capacity Mins</th>
<th>% Floodlit Clubs Needs</th>
<th>% Total Club Needs</th>
<th>Surplus/Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Drury United Association Football Club</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Franklin United Football Club</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Papakura City Association Football Club</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>5,226</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>1,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League</td>
<td>Papakura Rugby League</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>Ardmore Marist Rugby Club</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>176%</td>
<td>1,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>Drury Rugby Club</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>155%</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>Papakura Rugby Club</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>151%</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

3.1 SUMMARY

Based on the location of the Opāheke Sports Park site the following catchment populations used in this section are briefly described here:

1. The ‘Local Opāheke Area’ - a local user catchment area within 2-3km.
2. The ‘Wider Opāheke Catchment’ - a wider area incorporating the whole Papakura Local Board Area plus significant future population growth areas in Franklin.
3. The ‘Greater Auckland Region’ - a larger population setting for comparison with these more local population catchments – to better define any unique features.

Figure 3.1 below illustrates the approximate scope of the local catchment areas.

Figure 3.1 - Approximate Local ‘Catchment Population’ Areas

---

1 The following list summarises the Statistical Area 2 (SA2) units included and the nearest corresponding Auckland MSM population projection zones.
   - Local Opāheke Area
     - Opāheke (545); Rosehill (547); Drury (550); Papakura Industrial (544)
   - Wider Opāheke Catchment
     - The Papakura Local Board Area comprising the Local Opāheke Area (above) along with Takinini North (534); Takinini Industrial (528); Conifer Grove West (527); Conifer Grove East (530); Takinini West (529); Takinini South (531); Takinini Central (538); Takinini South East (537); Papakura West (539); Papakura North (536); Papakura Central (539); Papakura North East (532); Papakura East (536); Pahurehure (546); Papakura Massey Central (540); Papakura Kelvin (541/542); Red Hill (543); Karaka Lakes (549); Hingaia (548); and Drury Rural (551/553-556) from the Franklin Local Board Area.
SUMMARY POINTS

- There are over 400,000 residents in the South Auckland area, including over 60,000 around Papakura (Wider Opāheke Catchment) and over 8,000 around 2km of the Opāheke Sports Park site.

- Localised population growth rates around the Local Opāheke Area are currently low, although they are much higher across the Wider Opāheke Catchment.

- Future growth hotspots appear strongest in the Drury and the Drury Rural areas of Franklin.

- The Local Opāheke Area and Wider Opāheke Catchment have similar age-profiles, but both are relatively ‘younger’ than the Greater Auckland Region overall.

- The areas all have progressively aging populations, with the highest rate of population increase in the older age groups.

- For younger and specific playing-age projections (5-35 years), Papakura has higher projected growth rates which are well above the Greater Auckland Region average, and are exceeded only by those in Franklin (neighbouring areas of which are included in the Wider Opāheke Catchment).

- Ethnic diversity is relatively high in Papakura, with Maori residents particularly prominent in Papakura, and Asian residents relatively under-represented compared with the Auckland Region.

- Projections suggest increasing diversity over coming years with higher rates of growth among the Asian and Pacific proportions in Papakura.

- Overall, the Local Opāheke Area and Wider Opāheke Catchment have relatively low proportions of overseas-born residents, which are notably lower than for most nearby areas (except Franklin).

- Socio-economic indices highlight relative socio-economic deprivation across the Papakura Local Board Area, suggesting a lower financial capacity to engage in recreation activities.

3.2 OVERALL POPULATION NUMBERS AND TRENDS

POPULATION GROWTH

Table 3.1 shows over the last decade the population of the Local Opāheke Area increased at lower rates compared with Greater Auckland, but the Wider Opāheke Catchment grew at higher rates.

Table 3.1 - Population Numbers and Recent Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Change 2006-2018</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Opāheke Area</td>
<td>7,305</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Opāheke Catchment</td>
<td>44,043</td>
<td>48,288</td>
<td>60,399</td>
<td>16,356</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Auckland</td>
<td>1,304,958</td>
<td>1,415,550</td>
<td>1,571,718</td>
<td>266,760</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2018

PROJECTED POPULATION

Projected future population growth for the relevant catchment areas are summarised in Table 3.2 using the latest Auckland Council population projections2. While there is marked growth forecasted for the Local Opāheke Area, the rate of growth is noticeably higher in the Wider Opāheke and Greater Auckland Catchments. Comparatively, the relative growth of the Wider Opāheke Catchment is double that of the Greater Auckland Region.

---

2 From Auckland Council’s Macro Strategic Model (MSM) population projection (Scenario 1 Modified, Version 11.5, 2019) which refines standard Statistics NZ projections by incorporating local planning and strategy factors to reflect likely localised population growth more accurately. These are used for the Council’s Long-Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy, subject to change from any future changes in planning decisions and directions.
Table 3.2 - Projected Population Numbers and Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2041</th>
<th>2051</th>
<th>change 2021-2051</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Opāheke Area</td>
<td>9,692</td>
<td>10,692</td>
<td>11,604</td>
<td>11,932</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Opāheke Catchment</td>
<td>67,031</td>
<td>90,907</td>
<td>109,966</td>
<td>120,908</td>
<td>53,877</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Auckland</td>
<td>1,770,704</td>
<td>2,023,728</td>
<td>2,240,367</td>
<td>2,434,568</td>
<td>663,864</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Auckland Council Macro Strategic Model (MSM) (Scenario I Modified, Version 11.5, 2019)

Looking more specifically at projected growth in and around the Papakura Local Board Area, Figure 3.2 shows the planned locations of Future Urban Areas, Business Area and New Centres from the Auckland Plan 2050. The central location of Opāheke Sports Park (red dot) relative to the predominantly southwards planned growth areas is indicated. This would suggest the southern parts of the Local Opāheke Catchment will grow more significantly than the northern parts of the catchment.

Figure 3.2: Planned Future Urban Growth Areas (Auckland Plan 2050)

LOCALISED PROJECTIONS

Tables 3.3 and 3.4 summarise growth areas in the Local Opāheke Area and the Wider Opāheke Catchment using the Auckland Council Macro Strategic Model (MSM) zones. These are arranged by descending numeric order. To aid interpretation, these tables list the approximate corresponding Statistics Areas (SA2s) defined by Statistics New Zealand (named local reference). Appendix A provides an indicative summary map of these MSM areas.

---

### Table 3.3 - Projected Local Ōpāheke Area Population (by localised MSM zones)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSM Zone</th>
<th>Corresponding SA2 Areas</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2041</th>
<th>2051</th>
<th>Change 2021-2051</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Drury</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Ōpāheke</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>3,081</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Papakura Industrial</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Rosehill</td>
<td>3,886</td>
<td>3,721</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>-76</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Ōpāheke Area: 9,492 10,692 11,604 11,932 2,440 26

Source: Auckland Council Macro Strategic Model (MSM) [Scenario I Modified; Version 11.5, 2019] & Statistics NZ

Table 3.4 highlights the southern focus of population growth in the Local Ōpāheke Area (relative to Ōpāheke Sports Park) with virtually all occurring in the Drury area.

This pattern is amplified significantly in the Wider Ōpāheke Catchment with MSM zones in the 'Drury Rural' Statistical Area of the Franklin Local Board Area dominating. Only four sites in the top-10 MSM growth areas are located in the Papakura Local Board Area.

### Table 4.4 - Projected Wider Ōpāheke Catchment Population (by localised MSM zones)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSM Zone</th>
<th>Corresponding SA2 Areas</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2041</th>
<th>2051</th>
<th>Change 2021-2051</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>5,473</td>
<td>7,018</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>6,753</td>
<td>7,757</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>4,575</td>
<td>5,866</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>1,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>4,713</td>
<td>13,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3,335</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>2,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Karaka Lakes</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>9,743</td>
<td>9,092</td>
<td>8,740</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,632</td>
<td>4,686</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>Takini South East</td>
<td>3,194</td>
<td>5,161</td>
<td>6,598</td>
<td>7,442</td>
<td>4,249</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Hingaio</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>7,461</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Papakura Central/Papakura West</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>6,290</td>
<td>6,987</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Drury</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Takini Industrial</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>Papakura Massey Central</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>5,242</td>
<td>5,295</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>Papakura East</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Ōpāheke</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>3,081</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Takini North</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>Takini Central</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Conifer Grove East</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Papakura North</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Conifer Grove West</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Drury Rural (Franklin)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the localised projections around the Papakura Local Board Area highlight the most significant projected population growth hotspots occur in the southern areas, adjacent to areas of the Franklin Local Board. Opāheke Sports Park will service population growth experienced in its immediate surrounds, and as overflow fields to service the adjacent growth areas (particularly in Franklin). Furthermore, should Opāheke Sports Park take on sub-regional or regional status for some sports, the site is well placed to service a wider growth catchment area.

### 3.3 AGE GROUPS

Comparing median ages with the Greater Auckland population, the Local Opāheke Area population is ‘younger’ (Figure 3.3 and Table 3.5). By contrast the Wider Opāheke Catchment population are ‘older’. Both the Local and Wider Opāheke populations have notably lower proportions of older [60+ years] residents.

Figure 3.3 - Age-Group Distribution
OVERALL AGE-GROUP PROJECTIONS

All age groups are projected to increase over 25 years between 2018 and 2043. Table 3.6 and Figure 3.4 illustrate the generally aging pattern projected for the Papakura Local Board Area. While all age groups are projected to increase, the proportion of those aged 65+ years is projected to increase the most (by 107%). This represents an increase in the relative population proportion from 12% to 17%.

While the older age groups are projected to increase the most, the projected increases in younger age groups are notably higher in the Papakura Area (increasing by 35%) compared to the Auckland Region (increasing by 17%). Given this, an ongoing emphasis on youth and family services will need to be considered, although increasing provision for older age groups will also be required over time.

Figure 3.4 - Projected Population by Age-Group – Papakura Local Board

---

Table 3.5 – Age-Group Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>0-9 Yrs</th>
<th>10-19 Yrs</th>
<th>20-29 Yrs</th>
<th>30-39 Yrs</th>
<th>40-49 Yrs</th>
<th>50-59 Yrs</th>
<th>60-69 Yrs</th>
<th>70+ Yrs</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Med Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Opāheke Area</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>8,343</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Opāheke Catchment</td>
<td>9,936</td>
<td>8,121</td>
<td>9,681</td>
<td>9,231</td>
<td>7,254</td>
<td>7,032</td>
<td>4,857</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>60,402</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Region</td>
<td>212,190</td>
<td>205,341</td>
<td>253,824</td>
<td>232,900</td>
<td>209,856</td>
<td>192,537</td>
<td>137,892</td>
<td>127,098</td>
<td>1,571,718</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2018

Table 3.6 - Projected Population Growth by Age-Group – Papakura Local Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>Change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14 Yrs</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-39 Yrs</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>27,300</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-64 Yrs</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Yrs+</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>81,300</td>
<td>27,300</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Subnational population projections by age (2013 base, medium series)

---

Note that projections of future population by age group are not provided by the Auckland Council ART Model, so Statistics NZ data are used with the closest corresponding projection series being applied. Note that these are currently only available at the Local Board Level (new 2018-based projections and more specifically relative to new geographical [SA2] boundaries were not yet released at time of reporting).
PLAYING-AGE GROUP PROJECTIONS

Of specific relevance to Papakura sports participation are the projections for ‘playing age-group’. Here the playing ages for most sport participation is assumed as 5-35 years. Table 3.7 shows the respective projected ‘playing age-group’ population growth and numbers. Of significance, is the higher growth rates in the Papakura Area compared with the Auckland Region.

Table 3.7 - Projected population growth by ‘Playing Age-Group’ (5-35 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>Change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papakura Local Board</td>
<td>26,270</td>
<td>34,160</td>
<td>7,890</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Region</td>
<td>763,830</td>
<td>832,720</td>
<td>68,890</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Subnational population projections (2013 base, medium series)

Looking forward for the next 30 years, the projected growth increases in playing age-group populations for South Auckland Local Board Areas are as follows:

- 40% Franklin (~12,000)
- 30% Papakura (~8,000)
- 7% Mangere-Otahuhu (~3,000)
- 4% Howick (~2,500)
- 0% Otara-Papatoetoe (~200)
- 14% Manurewa (~7,000)

This reinforces solid growth in playing age-group population in the Wider Opāheke Area (including Papakura Local Board and adjacent growth areas in Franklin).

3.4 ETHNIC DIVERSITY

Table 3.8 and Figure 3.5 show the respective ethnic breakdowns of the Local Opāheke Area, Wider Opāheke Catchment and the Auckland Region. The Local Opāheke Area distinctly differs from the Auckland Region by having relatively higher proportions of those identifying as European or Māori, and lower levels of Asian people. The Wider Opāheke Catchment is similar apart from having slightly lower proportions of European people.

Figure 3.6 provides further breakdown of the ethnic groups residing in the Papakura Local Board. Although the proportion of those identifying as Asian is lower compared to the Auckland Region, there is variation between specific ethnicities. Notably, the proportion of Chinese is far lower in the Papakura Local Board, and conversely there is a higher Indian representation.

Table 3.8 - Ethnic Composition of the Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>MELAA*</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Opāheke Area</td>
<td>5,016</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Opāheke Catchment</td>
<td>28,638</td>
<td>15,438</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>13,497</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>57,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Region</td>
<td>851,583</td>
<td>181,194</td>
<td>243,966</td>
<td>442,674</td>
<td>35,838</td>
<td>6,561</td>
<td>1,571,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Middle Eastern, Latin American, African
Source: Statistics NZ Census 2013

5 2018 census projections of this data subset have not been released.
Figure 3.5 - Ethnic Composition of the Population

- Local Opaheke Area
- Wider Opaheke Catchment
- Auckland Region

% citing ethnic identity

European  | 54 | 28 | 23 | 1
Māori    | 50 | 27 | 16 | 1
Pacific  | 12 | 17 | 17 | MELAA*
Asian    | 1  | 2  | 2  | Other ethnicity

Figure 3.6 – Papakura Local Board Ethnic Composition (2018 Census)

- Papakura
- Auckland

0%    5%    10%    15%    20%    25%    30%    35%    40%    45%    50%
Filipino | 2% 2% | 4% 4% | 11%| 4% | 3% | 4% | 8% | 8% | 10|
Tongan   | 4% 4% | 4% 14%| Cook Islands | Maori | 14% | 12% | Indian | Maori | New Zealand | European |
Chinese  | 11%| 4% | 3% | 4% | 8% | 8% | 10%| 12%| 27% |
Samoa    | 8% | 8% | 10%| 14%| 12%| 27%| 45%| 47%| 45% |

Note that total % will exceed 100% as more than one ethnic identity association can be specified in the Census.
Table 3.9 shows the percentage change in ethnic group proportions in the respective areas between the 2013 and 2018 Censuses. Of note, is the significant growth within the Asian population within the Local Opāheke Area (additional 700, 110% growth) and the Wider Opāheke Catchment (additional 8,000, 148% growth).

Table 3.9: Percentage Change in Ethnic Identities (2013-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>MELAA</th>
<th>All pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Opāheke Area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Opāheke Catchment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Region</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2018

PROJECTED ETHNIC DIVERSITY

Projections for the next 20 years indicate the current high diversity in Papakura Area will continue in line with current trends. Tables 3.10 and Figure 3.6 outline the projections for the Papakura Area. Most notable, is the ongoing high growth in the Asian and Pacific population proportions. The proportion of people identifying as European is projected to decline from 56% in 2018 to 45% in 2038.

Table 3.10: Projected Ethnic Group numbers – Papakura

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>Change 2013-2038</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9,480</td>
<td>18,950</td>
<td>9,470</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>9,180</td>
<td>18,850</td>
<td>9,670</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54,100</td>
<td>75,700</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Subnational population projections (2018 base, medium series)

Figure 3.7 - Projected Ethnic Group numbers – Papakura

RESIDENTS BORN OVERSEAS

Data from the 2018 census show the Local Opāheke Area had a lower proportion of overseas born residents (25%) compared to both the Wider Opāheke Catchment (31%) and the Auckland Region (42%). Among other Local Board Areas only Franklin had a lower proportion of overseas-born residents (21%).

---

7 Projected ethnicities are only available at Local Board Area Level from a 2013 census base (2018 Census-based projections have not yet been released)
3.5 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXTS

Key summary indicators of overall socio-economic conditions in an area are provided by socio-economic indexes. Figure 3.8 summarise socio-economic features for the Local and Wider Opāheke areas around Opāheke Sports Park (red dot). On the left is from the Deprivation Index, created by the University of Otago, and on the right from the New Zealand Index of Multiple Deprivation. Both use different combinations of official data relating to income, home ownership, crime, health, education, employment, housing and access to various services.

The figures collate the index scores according to statistical areas around the Papakura area. The key features are the relatively higher levels of deprivation across most of the Papakura Local Board Area. More rural areas to the South in Franklin tend to currently have lower deprivation levels, although this may change depending on the quality of new residential developments in the southern areas.

Figure 3.8 - Deprivation Indices - around the Papakura Local Board Area

3.6 HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

The Auckland Unitary Plan details the Opāheke precinct which comprises 27 hectares of land. The purpose of the precinct is to provide for comprehensive and integrated development of the site, making efficient use of land resources and infrastructure, and increasing the supply of housing in the Papakura Area.

The development of the precinct will be integrated with Opāheke Sports Park through the alignment of proposed roads, pedestrian linkages, and the enhancement of specified green corridors.

Now titled Bellfield Estate, the greenfield site will accommodate over 500 homes across 22 hectares – with stage one currently underway. Information from the Bellfield Estate master plan is attached in Appendix B.

Demand for sport and recreation provision is likely to be high with the integrated nature of the housing development with Opāheke Sports Park, and the strong likelihood of families and age cohorts most aligned to active participation attracted to the development.

---


OPĀHEKE SPORTS PARK | POSITION ASSESSMENT REPORT
4.0 ENGAGEMENT

A range of sports clubs/organisations and key stakeholders were engaged to inform the needs assessment component of this report.

SUMMARY POINTS

• 14 sport and active recreation codes were approached as part of the assessment.

• United Cricket already play on Opāheke Sports Park and have expressed their interest in domicilling on the park.

• Counties Manukau Rugby League have reconfirmed their support of the findings in the Draft Auckland Regional Rugby League Facility Network Plan for Opāheke Sports Park to be the ‘Home of League’ for Counties Manukau.

• Drury Rugby Club had been previously earmarked for the site; however, this position has since changed. Although a range of stakeholders have expressed their desire for it to occur.

• However, Ardmore Marist have indicated desire to explore Opāheke Sports Park as its future home.

• Other sports with some interest, although considered more medium to long-term prospects include American football, Australian football, football (in the form of a performance hub), kabaddi, kiklki, rugby as a flow-over site and softball.

• Numerous sports who expressed interest in using Opāheke Sports Park have conflicting needs with others (i.e. playing field requirements and overlapping seasons).

4.1 SPORT CLUBS AND REGIONAL/NATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Table 4.1 outlines those who were engaged and notes relating to their interest in using Opāheke Sports Park.

Table 4.1 – Engagement undertaken for Opāheke Sports Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs/sports</th>
<th>Engaged</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Football</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ American Football Assn.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• Papakura Sports Needs Assessment identified the Papakura Kings Club was looking for a home ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NZAFA confirmed Papakura Kings have not participated in the local competition for the past 12 months and are not part of the current season competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Papakura Kings confirmed a period of inactivity due to a reorganisation of the club. The club is in a rebuild phase and their players have been playing in other teams during this phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In 2020 the club will have 1x colts and 1x junior team, with potential to add 1x senior team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The club believes a home venue at Opāheke Sports Park will help re-establish and grow the club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian Football</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland AFL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• AFL is actively investing to grow the game in Auckland. Promoting the sport to 5,000 South Auckland school aged children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The intention is to create a new club in the Papakura area to provide a local competition with the Manurewa based club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would like a home for AFL at Opāheke if a new club is successfully established. However, the size of the field required means cricket cannot be played on the western side of the park. In addition, the timing of the season (October to December) clashes with cricket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs/sports</td>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseball</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Baseball</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>• CLM confirmed baseball successfully operate out of Karaka and have no desire to establish a group at Opāheke Sports Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blokart</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blokart</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• Require hard surface. Opāheke not suitable as a sports field park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cricket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Cricket Club (Druy)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• Very keen to make Opāheke Sports Park their home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The club has already commenced playing matches on the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura Cricket Club</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• The club is happy with their current location. CLM are currently facilitating discussions between the club and netball for shared use of the netball clubrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Manukau Cricket</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• Supports United Cricket moving to Opāheke Sports Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Football</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Football Federation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• Currently initiating a centralisation plan for the 8 southern clubs. Plan will look at a shared services model and establish a Southern Representative programme. There could be interest, pending on the outcome, to use Opāheke as the southern region performance hub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hockey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Manukau Hockey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• CM Hockey have no plans to develop a new turf, however, it is noted it has been some time since the 2011 regional facilities plan was written and is due to be updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabaddi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabaddi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• The temple at Takanini has recently developed a turf facility for playing a number of sports but not particularly suitable for Kabaddi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• An outdoor circle Kabaddi field at Opāheke would help Kabaddi develop in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There are eight kabaddi clubs in Auckland with Kabaddi typically being played on Council facilities without bookings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kilikiti</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilikiti</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• Council has experienced issues with Kilikiti being played on grounds without bookings. This can be attributed to communication issues and the non-traditional structure of the sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kilikiti would like a permanent home with regular bookings for training and playing the sport. This would eliminate booking frustrations on both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opāheke is seen by the sport as a good location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lacrosse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse Auckland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>• No response received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs/sports</td>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rugby                        |         | **Drury Rugby Club**<br>Yes<br>• Papakura Sports Needs Assessment recommended the club move from Drury Sports Complex to allow greater football use.  
• The club’s preference is to remain at their traditional home at Drury Domain. They would like Drury Domain reconfigured to accommodate two fields with one field developed with an artificial turf surface.  
• They would like to retain one field at Drury Sports Complex. As population and demand grows, they may utilise Opāheke Sports Park in some capacity. |
|                              |         | **Papakura Rugby Club**<br>Yes<br>• Papakura Sports Needs Assessment highlighted a desire by the club to move to Opāheke Sports Park. However, subsequently the club confirmed they are happy with current arrangements and recently signed a new lease at Massey Park with Auckland Council.  
• The club would like to utilise Opāheke in the future if demand requires it. |
|                              |         | **Ardmore Marist Rugby**<br>Yes<br>• The club has a desire for Opāheke to be the potential future home for the club. They believe relocating to Opāheke will future proof the club against falling membership numbers and provide financial security for the club. |
|                              |         | **ACTIVE/NZ Rugby**<br>Yes<br>• Provided insights for Papakura and Drury Rugby clubs. Supports Papakura remaining at Massey Park with options to play at Opāheke in the future if needed and Drury Rugby Club moving to Opāheke Sports Park.  
• A question at the Papakura Local Board workshop in February 2020 questioned whether a new rugby club would be established in Papakura, NZ and Auckland Rugby have confirmed there are no plans for a new club. |
|                              |         | **Counties Manukau Rugby**<br>Yes<br>• Will support club decision-making. Confirmed there is some desire for Counties Rugby to centralise, most likely at Massey Park. |
| Rugby League                 |         | **Counties Manukau Rugby League**<br>Yes<br>• Draft 2019 Auckland Rugby League Regional Facilities Network Plan identifies Opāheke Sports Park as the most suitable site for the requirements of the Counties Manukau ‘Home of League’.  
• Meeting with Kassey King confirmed the sports’ interest to be based at Opāheke Sports Park. |
|                              |         | **Papakura Sea Eagles Rugby League Club**<br>Yes<br>• Club is happy with current location and facilities are in good condition at Prince Edward Park.  
• Potential for NZTA realignment through part of Prince Edward park which could negatively impact the club in the future. |
| Softball                     |         | **Counties Manukau Softball**<br>Yes<br>• OK for playing diamonds between Prince Edward Park, Ray Small Park and Mountford Park, however, there are issues with training facilities. With 120 junior and senior teams it is proving difficult to find training facilities for all teams. Two training facilities for softball at Opāheke would be of great benefit to the clubs. |
| Touch                        |         | **Auckland Touch**<br>Yes<br>• Touch modules mostly delivered by local clubs. If Drury Rugby Club relocate to Opāheke, then they would likely deliver modules. Touch tournaments book fields as required. |
4.2 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL USER GROUPS

Based on the engagement undertaken in Section 4.1, the groups have been categorised into three to illustrate their level of interest in Opāheke Sports Park (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 – Categorisation of Opāheke Sports Park user groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups that would or could be based at the clubrooms</td>
<td>Park user groups who may wish to use clubrooms from time-to-time</td>
<td>Will not be based at Opāheke Sports Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• United Cricket Club (training and competition)</td>
<td>• Counties Manukau Softball (training)</td>
<td>• Papakura Rugby Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Counties Manukau Zone of NZ Rugby League (club-based training and competition; representative level – ‘Home of League’)</td>
<td>• Drury Rugby Club if</td>
<td>• Drury Rugby Club (including Touch) as its clubrooms are at Drury Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Auckland Football Federation – southern hub (high performance)</td>
<td>i) satellite field used at Drury Sports Complex is relocated to Opāheke Sports Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Auckland Australian Football League (AFL) – new club in Papakura.</td>
<td>ii) games, if they are scheduled at the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ardmore Marist Rugby Club</td>
<td>• Kikiki - training and games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kabaddi – tournaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• American Football - if the club is still operating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 STAKEHOLDERS

A range of stakeholders were engaged to gain insight on Opāheke Sports Park, the wider network of fields and the local and regional sport and active recreation landscape.

- Paul Dabbs – Auckland Council - Principal Strategic Advisor, Community Facilities
- Martin Devoy – Auckland Council - Senior Parks Lead
- Selwyn Mathews – Auckland Council - Operational Management & Maintenance - Community Facilities
- Jamie Archibald – CLM – Spaces and Places Manager

The information and insight sought from key stakeholders has been used to inform the following sections of the report.
5.0 OPĀHEKE SPORTS PARK PLANNING

Using data and insight from the previous sections, preliminary planning can be undertaken to determine the site’s ability to meet code specifications and requirements (including the potential mix of users), ability to meet participation outcomes, and deliver a viable and sustainable model. The following section examines these components.

SUMMARY POINTS

• Aside from AFL, all other codes outlining their interest in using Opāheke Sports Park can be accommodated within the park’s playing field capacity (with suitable field configuration and scheduling).
• Other facilities such as artificial turfs and indoor training facilities were noted by user groups.
• Four sports park users require social spaces at varying capacity levels (accommodating 50 to 150 people).
• United Cricket, Counties Manukau Rugby League and Auckland Football outlined their desire for administration spaces – expressing an interest in being domiciled on the park.
• All three require a meeting room with capacity of 20 people.
• Catering facilities are also desirable on the site.
• The remaining users primarily require toilets and changing rooms – with no other supporting infrastructure.
• Likely to be an oversupply of fields during winter, although overflow from other fields may reduce available hours. Conversely in summer, there is high anticipated demand which will require considered configuration and scheduling.
• Balance needs to be struck between not overcapitalising the project (making it not viable) and catering for user needs to maximise use of the park.
• The park is well located to service a local and sub-regional catchment area, which is further enhanced with the provision of an 8-field park and supporting amenities.
• The size of the park lends itself to both high participation sports and emerging sports. Furthermore, during winter, the park can support overflow from other parks (either reaching capacity levels or are undergoing renewals) – while still accommodating anchor users.
• Regardless of the ownership model of a clubroom facility, user groups will need to drive revenue streams to meet operational costs.

5.1 SPORT SPECIFICATIONS

The sports engaged during the consultation phase detailed their needs for both on-field and clubroom facilities. The respective sports expressed their willingness to share facilities and operate within a multi-sport facility environment.

Table 5.1 – Code specifications outlined by the prospective user groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club/Sport</th>
<th>Fields</th>
<th>Ancillary / Clubroom Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Cricket Club</td>
<td>2x premier grass wickets</td>
<td>Toilet and change facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2x artificial wickets</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3x lane nets</td>
<td>Admin workstation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social space for 80 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting room for 20 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catering facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club/Sport</th>
<th>Fields</th>
<th>Ancillary / Clubroom Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties League</td>
<td>3 x training fields with lights</td>
<td>• 4 x team change facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau</td>
<td>Artificial turf training area</td>
<td>• Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>Indoor training facility</td>
<td>• Social space for 150 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cooking/catering facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Office/admin space for 2 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting room for 20 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Terraced seating for 500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Football Federation</td>
<td>3 fields with lights Artificial training surface</td>
<td>• Admin workstation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Toilet and change facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social space for 50 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting room for 20 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Terraced seating for 500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>2 x training fields Back stop nets and line markings</td>
<td>• Toilet and change facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klikiti</td>
<td>1 x Klikiti pitch</td>
<td>• Change and toilet facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Catering facilities (self-catering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>1 x AFL pitch AFL size = 2.5 rugby field</td>
<td>• Change rooms for 22 person teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social space for 50 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting room for 20 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabaddi</td>
<td>2 x Kabaddi pitches for event use 1 pitch approximately half rugby field</td>
<td>• Toilet and Change facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 OVERLAY ON OPÄHEKE SPORTS PARK

Using the code specifications outlined in Section 5.1, on-field/sport requirements have been overlaid on the park configuration to determine whether the respective codes can be accommodated. This high-level assessment will help inform whether their off-field requirements should be further explored as a likely user of the park.

The following indicative site configurations were developed for summer and winter activity.

#### SUMMER USE

- The biggest challenge involves accommodating AFL due to the size of the oval required which will encroach on the cricket wickets. AFL’s playing season overlaps with cricket and AFL is unable to play if there are artificial cricket wickets within the playing area. It may therefore not be possible to accommodate AFL at this facility and an alternative venue for AFL may need to be found - should a new club establish themselves in the Papakura catchment.

- All other users have the ability, through space allocation and/or scheduling, to play their sport on Opäheke Sports Park with minimal disruption.

- In addition to the fields, cricket require 3 x lanced nets which can be positioned adjacent to the carpark – minimising encroachment on the surrounding playing spaces.
**Figure 5.1 – Indicative summer sport overlay on Opāheke Sports Park**

**WINTER USE**

- Opāheke Sports Park has capacity for 8 playing fields suitable for rugby, rugby league and football. There is sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the identified users for the winter codes.

- The current allocation of winter sports fields does not include space for terraced seating for 500, which is identified by both rugby league and football as desired.
5.3 USER GROUP PLAYING SEASON

Table 5.2 outlines the playing seasons of the prospective user groups for Opāheke Sports Park. As there are various interested groups, there is a range of complementary and conflicting seasonal activity.

- Summer use comprises the following codes: AFL, cricket, kabaddi, kilikiti and softball (and football).
- Winter use comprises the following codes: rugby league (and football).
- Football have indicated use would be all-year round with their programme delivery.

Table 5.2 – Playing seasons of the prospective user groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>USER GROUP</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>July - December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>United Cricket Club</td>
<td>October - March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Auckland Football Federation</td>
<td>All year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabaddi</td>
<td>Kabaddi</td>
<td>Summer season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilikiti</td>
<td>Kilikiti</td>
<td>October - March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>Ardmore Marist Rugby Club</td>
<td>March - July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>Counties ‘Home of League’</td>
<td>Winter Season and shoulder season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Counties Softball</td>
<td>October - March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 SWOT ANALYSIS

Figure 5.1 – SWOT Analysis for the Opāheke Sports Park Clubroom Development

STRENGTHS
- Park size (8 fields)
- 2x sand fields and lights
- New changing facilities
- 3km from Drury
- 2.5km from Papakura
- Large parking area
- Budget for investment ($1.67m)
- Strong strategic alignment
- Located in a population growth area

WEAKNESSES
- Current lack of field users
- Excess field supply in Papakura
- Field layout
- Current condition of fields
- No public transport
- No current anchor tenant

OPPORTUNITIES
- Attract new user groups
- Ability to support growth sports
- Space to develop enhanced amenities.
- Future proof for population growth
- Local Board budget attracts other investment
- Opportunity for minority sports to grow (particularly those supporting low partcipant communities)

THREATS
- Lack of users
- Cost of maintaining the asset
- Park could deteriorate without users
- Devaluation of Local Board budget
- Scale of the project is not viable.
- Budget constraints/existing funding climate

STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES
The SWOT analysis identified seed funding for the project through the Local Board encumbrance fund has been allocated ($1.67 million) which provides opportunities for leveraging funding through other sources.

The site is well located to service the emerging and forecasted population growth with housing developments under construction, and more planned, adjacent to its positioning on Opāheke Road (i.e. Bellfield Estate which comprises over 500 houses over 22 hectares). Its positioning also reaches a wider catchment area with Drury and Papakura in close proximity and located a short distance from the southern motorway (lending itself to fulfilling sub-regional or regional functions where required).

The scale of the real estate (8 football fields) provides compelling development opportunities for accommodating emerging and high participation sports (either domiciled on the site or solely to access the fields) at various levels. This is further reinforced by the various organisations who have indicated their interest in using the park in the short, medium or long-term.

WEAKNESSES AND THREATS
There are many variables that could derail future development. One of the most prominent being the scale of development to meet code needs. Should all needs be met immediately, it is likely the project will be over-capitalised, and the level of funding required unattainable. The scale of development
needs to be balanced with servicing the core code requirements (on and off-field) that will encourage their use of the park.

Delays in undertaking the development will result in inflation and potential escalation costs, while devaluing the encumbrance fund that has been allocated towards the project.

Regardless of the ownership model of a clubroom facility, the potential operational costs to run and maintain would need to be covered – therefore user groups need to generate sustainable revenue to cover those costs. This would need to be further explored during feasibility analysis.

5.5 PROSPECTIVE TIMING

Based on earlier sections of this report, Table 5.3 categorises likely stages that prospective users could use Opāheke Sports Park.

The table does not include clubs who have signalled their desire to remain on their existing sites, or AFL where the field configuration and season overlaps with cricket. Given cricket’s large participation base and the fact they already play matches on the park, combined with an AFL club has not been established in the area, priority should be placed on accommodating cricket in the first instance.

With field provision for rugby league accommodated, only the off-field requirements need to be addressed to gain their commitment to domicile at the Park.

Cricket and football are complementary in their delivery as they have minimal cross-over in playing seasons, and with their large membership bases, have greater opportunities for developing a sustainable operational model (as core anchor users).

Developments should focus on meeting the core requirements of cricket and rugby league and providing flexibility of spaces to enable reconfiguration and repurposing as other codes are brought online. The requirements outlined by the remaining codes are similar in nature, with most issues envisaged relating to scheduling rather than the clubroom building’s layout and configuration.

A watching brief should be kept on the strategic direction of Auckland Football Federation’s Southern Performance Hub. Given the likelihood they could be based at the Park and service a large membership base, not only will it maximise use and enhance the Parks’ status in the network, it may assist in securing capex funding and optimising the operational model.

Table 5.3 – Prospective timing of using Opāheke Sports Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROSPECTIVE TIMING</th>
<th>SHORT</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Cricket Club</td>
<td>Counties Manukau Softball</td>
<td>Drury Rugby Club (satellite)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties League</td>
<td>Manukau Rugby</td>
<td>Klinik</td>
<td>American Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kabaddi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ardmore Marist Rugby Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continue to monitor direction of Auckland Football Federation – establishing the Southern Performance Hub.

The Park may also have scheduled training and matches as a flow-over site (where required) i.e. rugby.
### 6.0 RISK ASSESSMENT

Table 6.1 identifies risks which may already be present or could arise during the course of developing facilities at Opāheke Sports Park.

Table 6.1 – Risk assessment and mitigation for the proposed development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Type</th>
<th>Identified Risks</th>
<th>Risk Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Financial        | Local Board budget devalues year-on-year if not invested.                        | Development of new clubrooms based on best practice design principles.  
                  |  
                  | Resident clubs/sports unable to contribute financially to facilities.            | Include budget in Council LTP and create a detailed funding plan to source remaining capital funds.                                           |
| Operational      | Competition for field and clubroom space.                                        | Park planning to allocate spaces.  
                  |  
                  | Management of clubrooms                                                        | Regularly review supply and demand and allocate space accordingly.  
                  |  
                  | Neither Local Board nor community group want own clubrooms                      | Collaborative schedule – on and off-field.                                                                                                   |
| Governance       | Lack of leadership capability                                                    | Consider different booking approaches to provide an efficient system. This could include existing or bespoke to meet the Park and group needs.  
                  | Code conflicts                                                                   | Identify the most practical model and enter discussions for its effective implementation.                                                     |
| Reputational     | Other clubs/sports express inequity of facilities across the Region. E.g. clubs  | Undertake a robust process for agreeing a collaborative working model. Will need to be tailored to fit the unique circumstances.                 |
                  | get access to a brand-new facility at Opāheke while other clubs struggle to    | Continue developing other parks as per Local Board Plan and Sports Needs Assessment.  
                  | maintain their own aging facilities.                                             | Emphasis to be placed on a partnership approach with the sport groups to meet the total capex level.                                        |
CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be made from the position assessment of Opāheke Sports Park:

- The development is strategically aligned with Council, Local Board and code sector strategies and plans. This is further enhanced through the allocation of $1.67 million as part of an encumbrance fund from the Papakura Local Board.

- The Opāheke Sports Park has already undertaken development with two sand carpeted fields (total provision of eight fields) with floodlighting in place, as well as one grass cricket wicket and two artificial wickets. Additionally, changing rooms and toilets are currently under construction.

- The Papakura Local Board area has a net surplus of sports fields not taking into account Opāheke Sports Park. Papakura is therefore in the favourable position to accommodate sport and active recreation growth brought about by population growth alone.

- Projected demand is evident by the adjacent greenfield residential area at Bellfield Estate - which is developing over 500 houses across 22 hectares. The Auckland Unitary Plan and subsequent concept plans outline the intention to integrate the site with Opāheke Sports Park.

- Opāheke Sports Park, whilst underutilised now, is likely to become sought-after in the future, as demand for facilities continues to increase. The Park can cater for new users to come into the area as well as providing an opportunity for emerging sports to grow.

- A range of summer and winter users have signalled their interest in domiciling and/or using the Park. This will require careful scheduling and configuration of fields particularly during the summer to accommodate prospective users. Although this is likely to occur in stages as emerging codes evolve and grow, and the value proposition of the Park entices others to relocate in time.

- The site has the potential to perform local, sub-regional and regional roles due to its large real estate, projected population growth in the surrounding areas and proximity to the southern motorway. Therefore, suitable supporting infrastructure is required to maximise its potential.

- The initial core users, and likely anchor tenants identified include United Cricket and Counties Manukau Rugby League. Having large anchor users will be critical for sourcing the remaining capex levels (outside of the encumbrance fund) and for establishing a sustainable model for a clubroom facility.

- To maximise the above point, Council and the Papakura Local Board should actively work alongside the Auckland Football Federation to encourage the Southern Performance Hub to be based out of Opāheke Sports Park.

- A range of emerging sports that attract low participant groups should be supported by the Council to operate out of the Park – particularly kikikiti and kabaddi who have expressed their interest.

- The suggested clubroom facility specifications outlined by the respective groups were similar in nature and could be complementary (with considered scheduling). However, to ensure the facility development is affordable, the scope and scale of the clubroom facility needs further testing during a feasibility study.

- It is likely further developments of the playing fields will be required to effectively attract and accommodate users to the park.

- The site has the potential as an attractive multi-sport hub, and although there will be early adopters, other users will come on board in time. Thereby the initial users will need to be flexible in their allocation and use of the facilities to accommodate other groups in order to realise the full potential of the site.
8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations can be drawn from the conclusions outlined in the previous section:

1. **Strong interest from user groups** - undertake a feasibility study to determine the viability of clubrooms positioned on Opāheke Sports Park to meet prospective user needs.

2. **Take a balanced approach** – the feasibility study should pay particular attention to the scale and scope of development to ensure the project does not overcapitalise, resulting in excessive capex funding required and/or unsustainable operational costs.

3. **Flexible design** - focus should be placed on accommodating the core needs of the anchor tenants, as timelines for other groups are unknown and pose a risk. The design should concentrate on maximising flexible spaces that can be repurposed or reconfigured to cater for other groups as they come online.

4. **Observations** - Auckland Council, Papakura Local Board and CLM Counties Manukau should keep a watching brief on the current situation surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic and potential implications on organisations' viability and their associated facilities. Opāheke Sports Park may be a possible vehicle to support revitalisation and participation outcomes moving forward.

5. **Wider park development** - An accompanying piece of work is required by Auckland Council to ensure the playing fields and other required infrastructure are addressed and/or conceptually planned to meet code needs.
Auckland Council Macro Strategic Model (MSM) population projection zones covering the Papakura Local Board Area and significant adjacent areas (particularly in Franklin). This graphical representation can assist interpretations of Tables 3.3 and 3.4.

MSM Zones are here superimposed upon a base map of anticipated future growth areas from Auckland Council.

10.0 APPENDIX B

Appendix B – Bellfield Estate Stage 1 Site Plan

Key:
- Type A: 3 Bed. 2 Bath
- Type B: 4 Bed. 3 Bath
- Type C: 2 Bed. 2 Bath
- Type D: 3 Bed. 1 Bath

Legend:
- Unit number
- Unit type

Stage 1 site plan
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Extra-ordinary item - Innovating Streets application funding allocation

File No.: CP2020/08466

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To allocate locally driven initiatives capital expenditure funding to the Innovating Streets ‘Broadway Papakura – shared space’ project application.

Whakarāpopotanga matua
Executive summary
2. Local boards have been asked for proposals to be considered by the Planning Committee and submitted to Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency for funding as part of its Innovating Streets programme.
3. The projects should aim to create more people friendly areas within towns and cities. Local boards have an opportunity, through the Innovating Streets programme, to attain funding to pilot and test temporary changes to spaces, predominantly in the road corridor, prior to major capital investment.
4. The Papakura Local Board and the Papakura Business Association have proposed a project to develop a single level flexible space at Broadway that reduces traffic speed and creates a safe environment for pedestrians and cyclists that can be reconfigured with movable planters for activations and events. The project has been endorsed by the Papakura Commercial Projects Group made up of board members, council staff, CCOs including Auckland Transport and the Papakura Business Association.
5. The total cost of the project is estimated to be $250,000. A condition of the funding is that the local board funds 10% of the cost. This report seeks approval from the Papakura Local Board to allocate up to $25,000 for the project from its locally driven initiatives capital budget.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Papakura Local Board:
a) allocate $25,000 from the Papakura Local Board locally driven initiatives capital expenditure budget as the board’s 10 per cent contribution towards the $250,000 ‘Broadway Papakura – shared space’ innovating streets project.

Horopaki
Context
6. The government’s Innovating Streets for People pilot fund of more than $7 million was initiated to help councils create more people-friendly spaces in towns and cities.
7. The pilot uses tactical urbanism to make quick progress by testing and trialing projects to help demonstrate their value to the community.
8. The pilot fund will provide councils with a 90% funding assistance rate as well as capability building support for successful applicants, including participation in a community of practice.
9. Proposed projects need to strategically align with both the Innovating Streets programme objectives, and council’s strategies and plans. They must also be able to demonstrate the value of using tactical urbanism to advance a future permanent change and explain how they will move to permanent changes.

10. Only councils or road controlling authorities are permitted to apply to the fund.

11. The Papakura Business Association, the Papakura Commercial Projects Group and the Papakura Local Board support the ‘Broadway Papakura - shared space’ project as an Innovating Streets project to trial prior to the development of the Papakura town square.

12. The closing date for submitting an application is 3 July 2020.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

13. Papakura is zoned a metropolitan centre in the Auckland Council Unitary Plan. To support the revitalisation of the town centre, the Papakura Local Board developed the “Papakura Metropolitan Centre Framework for Action”, which was adopted on 26 September 2018.

14. Historically, the Papakura town centre developed and grew around Great South Road, the main street. Significant volumes of through traffic use Great South Road.

15. The long-term aim is to reduce the car dominated environment of Great South Road and create a town square at the Broadway / Great South Road intersection for activations and events to help with revitalising the town centre.

16. Broadway is a two-way street intersecting Great South Road and connects east-west traffic movements from Elliott Street to O’Shannessy Street.

Safer Communities Programme

17. The Papakura Local Board and Auckland Transport (AT), with the support of the Papakura Commercial Projects Group is working together on a proposal to reduce through-traffic from Great South Road and maximise safety in the east-west traffic movements which includes Broadway. Implementation of this work will be funded through the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) Safer Communities programme.

18. AT consulted on the Safer Communities programme from October to December 2017. The feedback provided AT with some strong areas of focus to help make Papakura safer for walking. This includes the Papakura town centre. AT is currently assessing potential improvements to make the most difference within the budget available. The following is being assessed as part of this programme:

- footpath upgrades
- pedestrian crossings
- intersection improvements
- slower traffic speeds
- improved walking connections
- town centre traffic bypass.

Innovating streets proposal

19. The board’s vision for Broadway is to develop a one level flexible space that reduces traffic speed, and to create a safe environment for pedestrians and cyclists that can be reconfigured with movable planters for activations and events.

20. The proposal is an interim measure to create a slow speed environment through Broadway by reducing the space for vehicles through the use of moveable planter boxes and by delineating the space with road markings on the road. These changes along with the installation of a “ceiling” of fairy style lighting overhead will send a clear message to motorists that it is a space where traffic should move slowly.

21. The project includes:
• MMA road markings for traffic calming, and footpath to reduce and redefine the area for vehicles
• erect a ceiling of fairy style overhead lighting across the street
• moveable planters placed to delineate the space for cars and to soften the overall appearance of the street
• market umbrellas
• tables and chairs and artificial grass for activations and events
• traffic management plans for events
• storage facility for artificial grass, tables, chairs etc when not in use
• tear drop flags promoting #LivePapakura and #ShopLocal
• banner for across the street
• Facebook and Instagram promotions
• advertising of activations and space
• event coordinator to activate the space and the plan
• lifting equipment.

22. This project will test the viability of the location and act as a proof of concept for the permanent solution.

23. The project is costed at $250,000 which includes a 15 per cent contingency.

24. If this project is successful, the innovating streets pilot would fund 90 per cent of the project.

25. The local board has indicated a willingness to fund the remaining 10 per cent from the local board locally driven initiatives capital budget. However, this needs a formal resolution of the board.

26. Options for consideration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | Proceed with the ‘Papakura Broadway – shared space’ project and provide 10 per cent funding from the local board locally driven capital budget. **Recommended option** | • This is a temporary, relatively cost-effective approach to test the location prior to implementing a permanent solution.  
• The project is community led.  
• If successful, the project is 90 per cent funded by central government.  
• The project contributes to revitalizing the town centre post COVID.  
• The project signals to the community and local businesses the | • This project has a tight timeframe and must be implemented prior to June 2021.  
• Potential short-term disruption to local businesses and traffic.  
• Uncertainty about the board’s overall capital funding budgets in the future due to the economic effects of Covid-19. |
### Attachment A

#### Item 27.1

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Await the roll out of the Safer Communities project to fund the permanent change to Broadway.</td>
<td>Funding uncertainty due to the economic impact of Covid-19. &lt;br&gt; The length of time it will take for the permanent solution to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>No draw down on the local board locally driven initiative capital fund. &lt;br&gt; No disruption to businesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Tauākī whakaawae whānau**  
Climate impact statement

27. The ‘Broadway Papakura – shared space’ project aims to encourage active modes of transport. This would reduce the number of vehicles, thereby reducing carbon emissions.

**Ngā whakaawae me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**  
Council group impacts and views

28. AT and the Papakura Business Association will need to work collaboratively to ensure this project is successfully completed.

29. Discussions are underway with AT staff to ensure they are aware of the proposal and seek assistance with expediting the AT component of the project.

30. If this project is successful in attaining funding, the Business Association will appoint a project manager to progress the project.

**Ngā whakaawae ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**  
Local impacts and local board views

31. The local board has indicated a desire to support this project by funding the 10 per cent from the locally driven initiative capital budget.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
32. Papakura Local Board area has the highest Māori population per capita in Auckland.
33. The local board will be consulting with the community and iwi on supporting Māori outcomes and aspirations in Papakura as part of the development of its Local Board Plan 2020.
34. Due to the short timeframes to submit a proposal, consultation or engagement with Māori was not possible for developing the proposal.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
35. The Innovating Streets programme will fund 90 per cent of this project. This report seeks allocation of the local board’s funding for the remaining 10 per cent from the local board locally driven initiatives capital budget.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
36. If the project does not get accepted there is an option to break this project into smaller projects to deliver over a number of years.
37. If the board is unwilling to allocate the 10% share of funding for the proposal, the proposal cannot be progressed as it would not meet the application criteria.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
38. Council’s Planning Committee will be making the decision on which projects will be forwarded to NZTA on 1 July 2020.
39. Innovating Streets round two applications close on 3 July 2020.
40. An expert advisory group of NZTA staff will review applications and recommend which projects to fund.
41. The NZTA Senior Manager responsible for the Walking and Cycling Activity Class will make the final decision about which projects to fund, taking into account recommendations from the expert advisory panel and in consultation with appropriate NZTA Planning and Investment staff.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.
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