

**Date:** Wednesday 23 April 2025  
**Time:** 1.00pm  
**Meeting Room:** Waiheke Local Board office  
**Venue:** 10 Belgium Street  
Ostend  
Waiheke

---

## **Waiheke Local Board OPEN ATTACHMENTS**

### **ATTACHMENTS UNDER SEPARATE COVER**

---

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>Public feedback on proposal to amend dog policy and bylaw</b>	
A.	Summary of public feedback to the proposed changes to the dog policy and bylaw	3
B.	Public feedback from people in Waiheke Local Board area	91





# Dog policy and bylaw review 2025

**Summary of feedback received during  
Auckland Council's public consultation  
from 20 January to 23 February 2025**

Analysis by Auckland Insights | Democracy and Engagement





# Dog policy and bylaw review 2025 (including regional parks)

## Te take mō te pūrongo

### Purpose of the report

This report summarises feedback received during the consultation period of 20 January to 23 February 2025 on the dog policy and bylaw (including regional park access rules).

It does not provide advice or recommendations based on the feedback received.

## Whakarāpopototanga matua

### Executive summary

**TOTAL SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED: 7,101**

### Overview of the consultation

During the consultation period of 20 January to 23 February 2025, we consulted the public on the dog policy and bylaw (including regional park access rules), and a local dog access rules review.

Our dog policy helps us:

- keep dogs a positive part of the life of Aucklanders
- minimises the problems that dogs can cause
- ensures the welfare of dogs.

Our bylaw implements the policy.

In this review, we proposed:

- set a limit on the number of dogs a person can walk at one time in council-controlled public places
- clarify and update dog access rules for 14 regional parks
- clarify and update dog access rules for 64 local parks and beaches
- remove outdated or repeated information
- improve the layout and make the wording clearer.

This report focuses on feedback received on the **policy and bylaw, including regional parks access rules only**. 5,186 individuals and 30 organisations (5,207 in total) provided feedback.

**Submissions received on the dog policy and bylaw: 4,046**

**Submissions received for regional access rules: 3,084**

A high-level summary of results includes:

- Submitters **did not support our proposal on walking multiple dogs** in question one (66 per cent of individuals and 14 of 20 organisations opposed the proposal)
  - 53 per cent of individuals opposed to the proposal preferred no change
  - Seven of the 14 organisations preferred another alternative, including the the Professional Dog Walkers Association (PDWA) petition noted below.
- At least two thirds of individual submitters **supported most of our proposals to reorganize, simply or clarify the policy and bylaw content** under question two
  - The one exception was the proposal to update dog access rules for Tūpuna Maunga (ancestral mountains), where 49 per cent support the proposal and 26 per cent opposed it, with the remaining 25 per cent unsure.
- **A majority of submitters were opposed to all our proposed changes to dog access at regional parks**, though some more than others, i.e. submitters were:
  - Strongly opposed (at least 70 per cent opposed) to the changes proposed at Long Bay, Pākiri and Te Ārai Regional Parks
  - More balanced in their feedback for Muriwai, Tāwharanui and Wenderholm Regional Parks (around 40-45 per cent support and opposed).

Further detail on each proposal can be found in the body of the report, including common themes from comments provided by submitters.

### Submissions of note

In response the question 1 (our proposal on walking multiple dogs), the **Professional Dog Walkers Association (PDWA)** submitted a petition run through change.org which received **3,456 signatures**.

PDWA and their members strongly support the introduction of a license for professional dog walkers and a limit of twelve dogs applying to licensed professional dog walkers. A copy of their submission can be found in the attachment to their submission (#6903).

In response to our proposal to amend the access rules for Shakespear Regional Park, 266 submissions were received via a pro forma campaign initiated by **Dog Friends Auckland**. These submissions all used the following template as their response:

*I WISH TO SEE THE FOLLOWING CHANGE: I strongly request that on ARMY BAY beach and foreshore areas east of the boat ramp that DOGS ARE ALLOWED according to the time and season rule for the rest of ARMY BAY.*

*Reason: The cliffs to the east of the boat ramp provide a natural access barrier to the Sanctuary beyond the perimeter fencing. There is no need to ban dogs from this area to keep them out of the sanctuary area.*

*I WISH TO SEE THE FOLLOWING CHANGE: I strongly request that on OKOROMAI BAY beach east of the TREELINE EMBANKMENT DOGS ARE ALLOWED according to the time and season rule for the rest of Okoromai Bay.*

*Reason: The proposal isn't fixing a known issue, but a 'possible' risk of dogs straying into the open Sanctuary.*

### Who we heard from

A detailed breakdown of providers of feedback that provided demographic information when submitting feedback is provided in **Attachment One**. Some key points to note include:

- Around two thirds of submitters (66 per cent) were between the ages of 35 and 64 years
- 80 per cent were of European ethnicity, while eight per cent identified as Asian, six per cent identified as Māori, and two per cent identified as Pasifika
- Regarding location, submitters that identified as being from Ōrākei received a significant portion of all submissions (21 per cent), while submitters from the Rodney and Hibiscus and Bays local boards also made up a large portion (10 and eight per cent respectively).

### Local board breakdowns

Data tables detailing responses by local board (for individuals) can be found in **Attachment Two**.

## Urupare

### Feedback

The following breakdown of feedback received summarises ‘top line’ responses from individuals and organisations, and includes common themes identified from comments made by individual submitters.

It does not include common themes from comments made in submissions from organisations because the number of comments from organisations was too low to report common themes.


### Question 1 - Walking multiple dogs

We are proposing to set a limit on the number of dogs that a person may walk in a council-controlled public place at one time. The proposed number of dogs a person has in their possession in a council-controlled public place must not exceed the following limits:

- Maximum 6 dogs (both on-leash or off-leash)
- Maximum 6 dogs on-leash
- Maximum 3 dogs off-leash.

#### 1.1 What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 3,670 responses (52% of all submitters)




Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	1,186	6
Do not support	2,397	14*
I don't know	66	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,649</b>	<b>21</b>

\* Note: one submission, from the Professional Dog Walkers Association (PDWA) includes a petition with 3,456 signatures.

### 1.2 If you do not support the proposed change, would you support one of the alternative options presented to decision-makers in December 2024?

Single select question | 2,396 responses of the 2,412 that selected 'do not support'



- No change to current rules (no limit on the number of dogs and all dogs must be under control at all times)
- Maximum four dogs, with no more than two off-leash
- Maximum four dogs, with no more than two off-leash unless licence obtained
- Maximum eight dogs, with no more than four off-leash
- Other (please explain below)

Response	Individuals	Organisations
No change to current rules (no limit)	1,269	4
Max four dogs, with no more than two off-leash	146	0
Max four dogs, with no more than two off-leash unless licensed	113	2
Max eight dogs, with no more than four off-leash	100	1
Other	754	7*
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,382</b>	<b>14</b>

\* Note: one submission, from the Professional Dog Walkers Association (PDWA) includes a petition with 3,456 signatures.

### 1.3 Tell us why

Open text question | 3,114 responses (85% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 2,135 individuals who **did not support** the proposal and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

39%

**Financial concern for dog walkers**

People were concerned limited the number of dogs a person can walk will impact the financial viability of some professional dog walkers.

823 comments (39 per cent of all comments from those that did not support)





**Freedom for qualified walkers**

People thought professionally qualified dog walkers should have more freedom to walk larger packs of dogs.

649 comments



**Dog walkers license**

People thought a dog walker license should be introduced for qualified professional dog walkers.

638 comments

Other common themes included:

- 514 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 476 expressed the importance of dogs having socialisation with other dogs (and people)
- 442 suggested irresponsible dog owners cause the issues and shouldn't be allowed to ruin it for everyone else
- 374 thought it is too difficult to walk many dogs at once
- 371 discussed the benefits of pack walking for dogs
- 345 suggested we need to regulate dog walkers
- 337 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise.

Of the 755 individuals who **did not support** the proposal and selected **other** in the follow up question, almost all provided comments. The most common themes from those comments were:

- 364 thought a dog walker license should be introduced for qualified professional dog walkers
- 257 thought professionally qualified dog walkers should have more freedom to walk larger packs of dogs
- 250 were concerned limited the number of dogs a person can walk will impact the financial viability of some professional dog walkers
- 182 suggested we need to regulate dog walkers.

Of the 923 individuals who **supported** the proposal and provided a comment, the most common themes were:



**Difficult to walk many dogs**

People thought it is too difficult to walk many dogs at once.

556 comments (60 per cent of all comments from those that supported)



**Concern for public safety**

People were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety.

432 comments

Other themes included:

- 180 thought we limit the number of dogs allowed off-leash to less than 3 dogs
- 157 thought we limit the number of dogs allowed on-leash to less than 6 dogs
- 120 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 119 thought we need to regulate the dog walking industry
- 108 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 103 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 223 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 74 per cent did not support the proposal and 24 per cent supported the proposal.

Of the 166 Māori individuals that did not support the proposal, 58 per cent preferred no change to the current rules and 32 per cent selected 'other' as their response.

#### Petition

As part of their organisation submissions, the **Professional Dog Walkers Association (PDWA)** submitted a petition run through change.org which received **3,456 signatures** between 18 January and 21 February 2025.

PDWA and their members strongly support the introduction of a license for professional dog walkers and a limit of twelve dogs applying to licensed professional dog walkers.

A copy of their submission, the details of the petition and comments left by 145 of the signatories can be found in their attachment (submission #6903).

**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

To improve our approach to dog management and the bylaw rules, we are proposing to reorganise, simplify and clarify the policy and bylaw content.

**What do you think of the following proposed changes?**

Submitters were given the opportunity to provide feedback on 10 proposed changes.


They were also given an opportunity to provide any other feedback on the proposed policy and bylaw changes.

The feedback provided on these proposals is summarised on the following pages.

<b>Proposed change</b>	<b>Page</b>
Restructure the policy to more clearly show its goal, focus areas, council actions, and rules	10
Clarify rule that all dogs classified as menacing must be neutered	11
Clarify who can provide behavioural assessments in relation to menacing dog classifications	13
Clarify what areas in Auckland require a license to keep multiple dogs on a property	14
Clarify how dog access rules are set	16
Clarify Auckland-wide dog access rules	18
Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	20
Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules (for example, outdated landmarks)	21
Update dog access rules for Tūpuna Maunga (ancestral mountains)	23
Remove outdated or duplicate bylaw content	25
Other feedback on the proposed policy and bylaw	26

## 2.1 Restructure the policy to more clearly show its goal, focus areas, council actions, and rules

Single select question | 1,794 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities
Support	1,260	7	1
Do not support	296	1	0
I don't know	227	2	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,783</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

### Tell us why

Open text question | 454 responses (25% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 251 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 89 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 85 thought the rules do need to be clarified
- 82 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 54 thought we need to provide better signage about dog access rules.

Of the 151 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 45 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 43 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 41 thought we should keep the policy/rules as they are now

Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights, Democracy and Engagement

- 32 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 32 thought the rules do need to be clarified.


**Feedback from Māori individuals**

Of the 104 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 59 per cent supported the proposal and 16 per cent did not support the proposal, while 13 per cent selected ‘I don’t know’.

In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

**2.2 Clarify rule that all dogs classified as menacing must be neutered**

Single select question | 1,805 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	1,461	7
Do not support	226	1
I don't know	107	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,794</b>	<b>10</b>

**Tell us why**

Open text question | 470 responses (26% of all responses to this question)

**Feedback from individuals**

Of the 310 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 115 were concerned about aggressive dogs
- 101 thought dangerous dogs should be neutered
- 68 thought all dogs should be neutered, often to help control the number of stray dogs
- 63 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 52 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety

- 37 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 35 thought professional breeders should be exempt from this proposal
- 35 thought dangerous dog breeds should be banned in New Zealand
- 33 were concerned with the number of stray dogs and the threat they often pose.

Of the 132 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:


- 48 thought the term "menacing" need to be defined, and sometimes felt it wasn't applied appropriately
- 47 thought dogs should not be considered menacing purely on their breed, but rather each dog should be considered on an individual basis
- 32 thought dangerous dogs should be neutered
- 32 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 29 thought individual circumstances should be taken into account to ensure equitable decisions are made
- 26 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 105 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 70 per cent supported the proposal and 24 per cent did not support the proposal, while seven per cent selected 'I don't know'.

### 2.3 Clarify who can provide behavioural assessments in relation to menacing dog classifications

Single select question | 1,798 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	1,484	7
Do not support	109	0
I don't know	194	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,787</b>	<b>10</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 283 responses (16% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 220 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 150 wanted to ensure assessors are qualified professionals
- 28 were concerned about aggressive dogs
- 27 thought dogs should not be considered menacing purely on their breed, but rather each dog should be considered on an individual basis
- 26 thought more than one assessor should be involved to ensure fair decisions are made
- 25 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 21 thought the rules do need to be clarified.

Of the 41 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:


- 15 wanted to ensure assessors are qualified professionals
- 14 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 11 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- 10 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems.

### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 105 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 79 per cent supported the proposal and 10 per cent did not support the proposal, while 10 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

## 2.4 Clarify what areas in Auckland require a license to keep multiple dogs on a property

Single select question | 1,792 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	1,318	4
Do not support	310	2
I don't know	153	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,781</b>	<b>10</b>

### Tell us why

Open text question | 377 responses (21% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 210 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 101 thought anyone should be required to obtain a license to own a dog
- 37 thought the number of dogs kept on a property should be limited to ensure they are cared for appropriately
- 35 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 33 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 28 thought rural properties should have an exemption from this proposal
- 27 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce.



Of the 134 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:


- 56 thought anyone should be required to obtain a license to own a dog
- 37 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 27 thought individual circumstances should be taken into account to ensure equitable decisions are made
- 19 thought the proposal is not fair to dog owners
- 19 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 17 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 16 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems.

#### **Feedback from Māori individuals**

Of the 105 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 67 per cent supported the proposal and 23 per cent did not support the proposal, while 10 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

## 2.5 Clarify how dog access rules are set

Single select question | 1,785 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities
Support	1,338	9	1
Do not support	232	0	0
I don't know	204	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,774</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

### Tell us why

Open text question | 304 responses (17% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 176 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 51 thought the rules do need to be clarified
- 48 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- 33 discussed issues related to how we communicate and/or engage with the public
- 27 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 22 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 19 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 19 thought dog rules needed to be appropriate to each area
- 19 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety.

Of the 93 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 35 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems
- 27 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority

- 23 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 21 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 17 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise
- 17 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 16 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 14 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 14 thought the rules do need to be clarified
- 14 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response.

#### **Feedback from Māori individuals**

Of the 105 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 65 per cent supported the proposal and 19 per cent did not support the proposal, while 16 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

## 2.6 Clarify Auckland-wide dog access rules

Single select question | 1,789 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities
Support	1,355	8	1
Do not support	297	1	0
I don't know	126	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,778</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

### Tell us why

Open text question | 425 responses (24% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 263 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 91 thought the rules do need to be clarified
- 68 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 48 thought we need to provide better signage about dog access rules
- 47 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- 39 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 35 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 33 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 32 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 31 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces.

Of the 137 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 40 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 39 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 33 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems
- 32 thought we should keep the policy/rules as they are now
- 30 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 21 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 20 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs.


#### **Feedback from Māori individuals**

Of the 103 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 70 per cent supported the proposal and 24 per cent did not support the proposal, while six per cent selected 'I don't know'.

In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

## 2.7 Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules

Single select question | 1,770 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities
Support	1,186	7	1
Do not support	214	1	0
I don't know	359	2	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,759</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

### Tell us why

Open text question | 162 responses (9% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 76 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 36 thought the rules do need to be clarified
- 19 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- 8 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 8 discussed issues related to how we communicate and/or engage with the public.

Of the 55 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 20 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems
- 20 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 17 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- 12 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs

- 11 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 10 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 10 thought we should keep the policy/rules as they are now.

**Feedback from Māori individuals**

Of the 102 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 67 per cent supported the proposal and 18 per cent did not support the proposal, while 16 per cent selected ‘I don’t know’.

In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

**2.8 Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules (for example, outdated landmarks)**

Single select question | 1,775 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities
Support	1,412	10	1
Do not support	152	0	0
I don't know	200	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,764</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

**Tell us why**

Open text question | 113 responses (6% of all responses to this question)

**Feedback from individuals**

Of the 67 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 30 thought the rules should be reviewed and updated more regularly
- 17 thought the rules do need to be clarified

- 16 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- Nine thought we need to provide better signage about dog access rules
- Eight thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce.

Of the 34 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 16 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- 15 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- Seven thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- Seven did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals


Of the 103 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 73 per cent supported the proposal and 11 per cent did not support the proposal, while 17 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.



## 2.9 Update dog access rules for Tūpuna Maunga (ancestral mountains)

Single select question | 1,779 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities
Support	859	7	1
Do not support	468	2	0
I don't know	441	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,768</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

### Tell us why

Open text question | 321 responses (18% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 119 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 47 thought everyone should be allowed access to our maunga
- 28 thought dogs should be kept on a lead at all times in public
- 24 thought dogs should be allowed to access our maunga with their families
- 21 thought dogs should be banned from accessing our maunga
- 15 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce.

Of the 138 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 65 thought everyone should be allowed access to our maunga
- 58 thought dogs should be allowed to access our maunga with their families
- 31 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 28 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 22 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs

Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights, Democracy and Engagement

23

- 17 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- 15 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 103 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 47 per cent supported the proposal and 28 per cent did not support the proposal, while 25 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

## 2.10 Remove outdated or duplicate bylaw content

Single select question | 1,773 responses (25% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities
Support	1,426	9	1
Do not support	127	0	0
I don't know	209	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,762</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

### Tell us why

Open text question | 92 responses (5% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 43 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 21 thought the rules do need to be clarified
- Eight expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- Seven thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response.

Of the 27 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 14 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 14 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- 14 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems
- 10 thought the rules do need to be clarified.

### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 103 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 75 per cent supported the proposal and nine per cent did not support the proposal, while 17 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

### 2.11 Do you have any further comments on the proposed policy and bylaw changes?

Open text question | 814 responses (11% of all submitters)

### Feedback from individuals

Of the 809 individuals that provided comments, the most common themes were:

- 259 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 213 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 212 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 198 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 121 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 115 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 110 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 99 thought the rules do need to be clarified
- 96 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 89 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 87 thought they needed more information to understand the rules and/or provide an informed response
- 82 expressed cost concerns, whether relating to the price of implementing these policies, dog registrations, or a perception of council wasting money.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

Below is a list of the 14 Regional Parks we are proposing to amend or clarify the dog access rules.

Submitters were given the opportunity to provide feedback on 14 Regional Parks we are proposing to amend or clarify the dog access rules.

They were also given an opportunity to provide any other feedback regarding dog access at regional parks.

The feedback provided on these proposals is summarised on the following pages.


<b>Regional park</b>	<b>Page</b>
Ambury Regional Park	28
Auckland Botanic Gardens	30
Hunua Ranges Regional Park	33
Long Bay Regional Park	35
Mahurangi Regional Park	37
Muriwai Regional Park	40
Pākiri Regional Park	42
Shakespear Regional Park	44
Tāpapakanga Regional Park	46
Tāwharanui Regional Park	48
Te Ārai Regional Park	50
Waitawa Regional Park	52
Wenderholm Regional Park	54
Whakanewha Regional Park	56
Feedback on other regional parks	57
Other regional park feedback	57

### 3.1 Ambury Regional Park

We are proposing to clarify the current rules (no change to dog access).

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 709 responses (10% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	261	1
Do not support	386	2
I don't know	50	0
Other	26	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,950</b>	<b>3</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 390 responses (55% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 386 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 82 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 73 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 72 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 44 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise
- 41 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 39 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 35 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners

- 33 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 33 thought we should keep the rules as they are now.

Of the 261 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 34 thought the rules need to be clarified
- 30 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 30 were concerned with how dogs can disrupt wildlife
- 15 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 13 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals


Of the 52 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 60 per cent did not support the proposal and 37 per cent supported the proposal, while four per cent selected 'I don't know'.

### 3.2 Auckland Botanic Gardens

We are proposing to change the off-leash rule at the Auckland Botanic Gardens and to prohibit dogs from all waterways and busy community areas.

#### What do you think of this proposed change?


Single select question | 1,308 responses (18% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	449	1
Do not support	807	2
I don't know	49	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,305</b>	<b>3</b>

#### If you do not support the proposed change, would you support one of the alternative options presented to decision-makers in December 2024?

Single select question | 795 responses of the 809 that selected 'do not support'





Response	Individuals	Organisations
No change to current rules (no limit)	542	1
Only change the off-leash area to on-leash at all times	52	0
Only change the off-leash area to north of the rose gardens before 10am and after 5pm (on-leash between 10am and 5pm)	77	0
Other	122	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>793</b>	<b>2</b>

### Tell us why

Open text question | 700 responses (54% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 523 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 195 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 175 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 126 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 117 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 113 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 112 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise
- 110 thought we should keep the rules as they are now
- 94 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 65 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems
- 64 expressed the importance of dogs having socialisation with other dogs (and people)
- 63 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners.

Of the 121 individuals who **did not support** the proposal and selected **other** in the follow up question, almost all provided comments. The most common themes from those comments were:

- 40 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 36 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 29 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 29 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs.

Of the 155 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights, Democracy and Engagement

- 38 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 29 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 23 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 23 thought the rules need to be clarified.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals


Of the 74 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 61 per cent did not support the proposal and 35 per cent supported the proposal, while four per cent selected 'I don't know'.

### 3.3 Hunua Ranges Regional Park

We are proposing to prohibit dogs from tracks and roads that connect to the Kohukohunui track, the Kokako Management Area and Piggott’s Habitat and from single-use mountain bike tracks (currently on-leash).

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 811 responses (11% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	226	0
Do not support	455	2
I don't know	55	0
Other	33	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>2</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 400 responses (49% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 271 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 100 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 64 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 62 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 55 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 47 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 43 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 37 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise.

Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights, Democracy and Engagement

Of the 78 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 23 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 14 thought dogs should be banned from the area.

#### **Feedback from Māori individuals**


Of the 55 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 53 per cent did not support the proposal and 36 per cent supported the proposal, while 11 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

### 3.4 Long Bay Regional Park

We are proposing to amend the summer daytime rule for the beach south of Vaughan Stream from on-leash to prohibited and clarify rules in other areas, including access to beach from southernmost carpark and prohibited tracks and bays.

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 1,090 responses (15% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entity
Support	278	0	1
Do not support	757	1	0
I don't know	18	0	0
Other	35	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,088</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 688 responses (63% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 514 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 174 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 122 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 117 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 111 thought we should keep the rules as they are now
- 110 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away

- 95 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 85 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise
- 84 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 82 thought the area should be made an on-leash area.

Of the 134 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 49 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 29 thought dogs are a nuisance to other park users.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 61 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 72 per cent did not support the proposal and 21 per cent supported the proposal, while five per cent selected 'I don't know' and two per cent selected 'other'.


In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

### 3.5 Mahurangi Regional Park

We are proposing to prohibit dogs on Cudlip Point Loop Track (currently on-leash), allow dogs on-leash at all times at Scott Point (currently on-leash time and season) and clarify rules in other areas (including dogs prohibited at Mahurangi Regional Park (East) and heritage grounds at Scott Point.

#### A. What do you think of the proposed change to Mahurangi Regional Park West?


Single select question | 597 responses (8% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entity
Support	168	0	1
Do not support	359	1	0
I don't know	43	0	0
Other	25	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

#### B. What do you think of the proposed change to Mahurangi Regional Park East?

Single select question | 571 responses (8% of all submitters)




Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights, Democracy and Engagement

Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entity
Support	152	0	1
Do not support	353	1	0
I don't know	45	0	0
Other	19	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

**C. What do you think of the proposed change to Mahurangi Regional Park Scott Point?**

Single select question | 554 responses (8% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entity
Support	159	0	1
Do not support	339	1	0
I don't know	36	0	0
Other	18	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

**Tell us why**

Open text question | 187 responses (31% of all responses to this question)

**Feedback from individuals**

Of the 133 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 68 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 48 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 48 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners



- 35 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 29 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise
- 28 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 26 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners.

Of the 36 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common theme was:

- 11 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 43 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, their responses to the three parts of the Mahurangi Regional Park proposal were:

- A. Mauhrangi Regional Park West - 63 per cent did not support the proposal and 26 per cent supported the proposal, while nine per cent selected 'I don't know' and two per cent selected 'other'
- B. Mauhrangi Regional Park East - 60 per cent did not support the proposal and 25 per cent supported the proposal, while 13 per cent selected 'I don't know' and three per cent selected 'other'
- C. Mauhrangi Regional Park Scott Point - 62 per cent did not support the proposal and 26 per cent supported the proposal, while 10 per cent selected 'I don't know' and three per cent selected 'other'


In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of all parts to this proposal.

### 3.6 Muriwai Regional Park

We are proposing to clarify the current rules (no change to dog access).

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 954 responses (13% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	438	0
Do not support	446	1
I don't know	45	0
Other	24	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>1</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 395 responses (41% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 241 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 71 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 51 thought we should keep the rules as they are now
- 48 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 43 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 43 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise
- 41 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 41 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 35 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems.

Of the 119 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 32 thought the rules need to be clarified
- 24 were concerned with how dogs can disrupt wildlife.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals


Of the 58 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 55 per cent did not support the proposal and 40 per cent supported the proposal, while five per cent selected 'I don't know'.

### 3.7 Pākiri Regional Park

We are proposing to prohibit dogs on the associated beach (currently off-leash).

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 586 responses (8% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entity
Support	87	3	1
Do not support	469	2	0
I don't know	12	0	0
Other	12	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 335 responses (57xx% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 285 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 102 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 86 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 71 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 71 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 69 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 63 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise

- 60 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs.

Of the 37 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 12 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 12 were concerned with how dogs can disrupt wildlife
- 11 thought dogs should be banned from the area.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 48 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 81 per cent did not support the proposal and 17 per cent supported the proposal, while two per cent selected 'I don't know'.


In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

### 3.8 Shakepear Regional Park

We are proposing to apply an on-leash time and season rule to the open grass areas between Army Bay and Okoramai Bay (currently off-leash) and clarify rules in other areas (such as boundary of Army Bay and Okoramai Bay beaches, on-leash tracks and prohibited areas).

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 1,187 responses (17% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	358	3	1	0
Do not support	464	3	0	266
I don't know	55	0	0	0
Other	37	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>914</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>266</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 399 responses (34% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 258 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 67 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 65 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 61 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 55 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away

- 50 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise
- 47 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 44 thought the rules need to be clarified
- 41 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces.

Of the 90 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 27 thought the rules need to be clarified
- 19 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 17 thought dogs should be kept on a lead at all times in public
- 17 were concerned with how dogs can disrupt wildlife.

### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 54 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 30 per cent supported the proposal and 61 per cent did not support the proposal, while seven per cent selected 'I don't know' and two per cent selected 'other'.

In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

### Pro forma campaign

266 submissions were received via a pro forma campaign initiated by **Dog Friends Auckland**.

These submissions all used the following template as their response:

*I WISH TO SEE THE FOLLOWING CHANGE: I strongly request that on ARMY BAY beach and foreshore areas east of the boat ramp that DOGS ARE ALLOWED according to the time and season rule for the rest of ARMY BAY.*

*Reason: The cliffs to the east of the boat ramp provide a natural access barrier to the Sanctuary beyond the perimeter fencing. There is no need to ban dogs from this area to keep them out of the sanctuary area.*

*I WISH TO SEE THE FOLLOWING CHANGE: I strongly request that on OKOROMAI BAY beach east of the TREELINE EMBANKMENT DOGS ARE ALLOWED according to the time and season rule for the rest of Okoromai Bay.*


*Reason: The proposal isn't fixing a known issue, but a 'possible' risk of dogs straying into the open Sanctuary.*

### 3.9 Tāpapakanga Regional Park

We are proposing to provide off-leash access on the beach and on-leash access on areas between the beach and car park at any time (currently prohibited during lambing season) and clarify rules in other areas (such as prohibited at camping areas and bach, and during lambing).

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 448 responses (6% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	154	0
Do not support	245	1
I don't know	29	0
Other	19	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>1</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 182 responses (41% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 124 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 35 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 29 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 27 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems
- 25 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 23 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 23 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 21 thought we should keep the rules as they are now.



Of the 31 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- six thought the rules need to be clarified
- six were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals


Of the 42 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 50 per cent did not support the proposal and 29 per cent supported the proposal, while 14 per cent selected 'I don't know' and seven per cent selected 'other'.

### 3.10 Tāwharanui Regional Park

We are proposing to clarify the current rules (no change to dog access).

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 697 responses (10% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities
Support	300	0	1
Do not support	314	1	0
I don't know	56	0	0
Other	25	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 291 responses (47% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 163 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 55 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 49 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 44 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 28 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 27 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 23 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs.

Of the 97 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 26 thought dogs should be banned from the area
- 23 were concerned with how dogs can disrupt wildlife
- 15 thought the rules need to be clarified.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 53 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 47 per cent did not support the proposal and 43 per cent supported the proposal, while six per cent selected 'I don't know' and four per cent selected 'other'.


In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

### 3.11 Te Ārai Regional Park

We are proposing to prohibit dogs on Forestry Beach (Te Ārai Beach South to Pākiri Beach) and associated coastal tracks and to clarify access to off-leash area at the disused quarry.

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 883 responses (12% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	160	1	1	0
Do not support	654	4	0	11
I don't know	61	0	0	0
Other	21	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>866</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 549 responses (62% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 484 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 269 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 202 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 181 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 168 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise

Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights, Democracy and Engagement

- 168 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 157 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 156 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs.

Of the 46 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 12 thought the rules need to be clarified
- 11 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 10 were concerned with how dogs can disrupt wildlife.

### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 65 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 80 per cent did not support the proposal and 15 per cent supported the proposal, while three per cent selected 'I don't know' and two per cent selected 'other'.

In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

### Pro forma campaign

11 submissions were received via a pro forma campaign.

These submissions all used the following template as their response:

*I WISH TO SEE THE FOLLOWING CHANGE: That dogs have OFF LEASH AT ALL TIMES access to/from Forestry Beach and foreshore areas (Te Arai Beach South to Pakiri Beach) and any dunes, grassed areas, paths and tracks & campgrounds (for example coastal tracks), and on any roads and parking areas used in accessing Forestry Beach and its associated foreshore and coastal tracks as above.*

*REASON: Along the 24.5 km coastline from Goat Island to Te Arai Point council are proposing to remove all dog access. As part of this review Pakiri Beach, adjacent to the regional park, is also being proposed to move to PROHIBITED from the current OFF LEASH).*

*I believe that retaining dog access to Forestry Beach would be the best location and option for dog access along this coastline. It would future proof the growing needs from the local population of dog owners and for visitors with dogs. It would give dog owners somewhere they are allowed rather than ignoring the rules. The proposed area for dog access that council have put forward is miniscule and not suitable to be called a dog exercise area for now, let alone for future growth.*

*Forestry Beach would be the best location to retain dog access along this coastline as it has the Te Arai Links golf course and a 60 home subdivision alongside it. Helicopters are ferrying golfers to and from this course, often over the beach, which is open to the public and not club members only (as Tara Iti is).*


*Forestry Beach is only 25 mins drive from the Wayby Valley Road turnoff from SH1. With the planned extension of the Northern Motorway to go to Wellsford it will make Forestry Beach a more popular option for day trippers.*

### 3.12 Waitawa Regional Park

We are proposing to change the eastern part of Matakaitai Beach from off-leash to on-leash (western part of beach to remain off-leash), change Waitawa Beach from off-leash to on-leash, prohibit dogs on single use mountain bike tracks and clarify other areas where dogs are prohibited (such as farm paddocks during lambing season, campground and bach).

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 475 responses (7% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	142	0
Do not support	289	1
I don't know	29	1
Other	13	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>2</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 210 responses (44% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 155 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 59 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 45 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 34 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 29 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 29 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 24 expressed the importance of dogs having off-leash exercise.

Of the 38 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 7 were concerned with the threat dogs pose to public safety
- 7 thought dogs should be banned from the area.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals


Of the 40 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 58 per cent did not support the proposal and 35 per cent supported the proposal, while eight per cent selected 'I don't know'.

### 3.13 Wenderholm Regional Park

We are proposing to clarify the current rules (no change to dog access).

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 769 responses (11% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities
Support	320	2	1
Do not support	337	1	0
I don't know	70	1	0
Other	37	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 283 responses (37% all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 173 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 44 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 40 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 40 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 32 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems
- 30 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 29 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away



- 25 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners.

Of the 65 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 15 thought the rules need to be clarified
- 12 were concerned with how dogs can disrupt wildlife.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 46 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 54 per cent did not support the proposal and 33 per cent supported the proposal, while 11 per cent selected 'I don't know' and two per cent selected 'other'.


In addition, the Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust submitted in support of the proposal.

### 3.14 Whakanewha Regional Park

We are proposing to provide on-leash access on tracks from Omiha (Rocky Bay) to the on-leash area of the Park.

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 429 responses (6% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	148	0
Do not support	217	1
I don't know	45	0
Other	18	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>1</b>

#### Tell us why

Open text question | 158 responses (37% of all responses to this question)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 98 individuals who **did not support** and provided a comment, the most common themes were:

- 36 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 26 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 23 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 21 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away
- 21 did not think the proposal would be effective, or it would only exacerbate the problems
- 20 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority.

Of the 39 individuals who **supported** and provided a comment, the most common theme was:

- 13 were concerned with how dogs can disrupt wildlife.

#### Feedback from Māori individuals

Of the 37 individuals that identified themselves as of Māori ethnicity, 49 per cent did not support the proposal and 35 per cent supported the proposal, while 16 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

### 3.15 Would you like to comment on dog access rules at regional parks or beaches in Auckland that you think council should change?

Submitters were given the opportunity to provide feedback on parks not listed for review.

Feedback from this section is not covered in this report but will be covered in the advice report from the policy team.

### 3.16 Do you have any further comments about dog access rules at Regional Parks?

Open text question | 814 responses (11% of all submitters)

#### Feedback from individuals

Of the 809 individuals that provided comments, the most common themes were:


- 261 thought we need to provide a balance between general public and dog needs
- 229 discussed general issues related to responsible dog ownership, for example dogs that are well trained and controlled by their owners
- 215 wanted council to provide more dog-friendly spaces
- 190 thought we need to do a better job enforcing dog rules or discussed how difficult these rules are to enforce
- 183 expressed a general dissatisfaction with council or a belief that council is overstepping their authority
- 175 thought it is only the irresponsible dog owners that cause issues, and those owners should be targeted rather than restricting responsible dog owners
- 156 thought our proposals are too restrictive and/or too people-friendly
- 140 thought dog rules needed to be appropriate to each area
- 130 wanted council to provide more on-leash areas
- 129 wanted council to provide more off-leash areas and/or were concerned with the lack of off-leash areas and do not want to see any off-leash areas taken away.

## ATTACHMENT ONE: Who we heard from

The tables below indicate the demographic profile of those that answered the demographic questions.


Item 16

AGE	Male	Female	Other	Total	%
< 15	5	8	0	14	0%
15 - 24	48	120	6	179	3%
25 - 34	234	705	10	971	16%
35 - 44	359	847	3	1235	21%
45 - 54	427	1078	1	1525	26%
55 - 64	351	798	1	1163	19%
65 - 74	236	411	0	659	11%
75 +	98	126	0	228	4%
<b>Total submitters providing data</b>				<b>5,974</b>	<b>100%</b>



Attachment A

ETHNICITY	#	%
<b>European</b>	<b>4,978</b>	<b>89%</b>
Pākehā/NZ European	4,734	84%
Other European	244	4%
<b>Māori</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>Pasifika</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>2%</b>
Samoan	57	1%
Tongan	21	< 1%
Other Pasifika	54	1%
<b>Asian</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>9%</b>
Chinese	237	4%
Southeast Asian	84	2%
Indian	118	1%
Other Asian	39	< 1%
<b>Middle Eastern/Latin American/African</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Other (incl. Kiwi/New Zealander)</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Total submitters providing data</b>	<b>5,622</b>	<b>NA</b>




\* Note: submitters were able to select multiple ethnicities

Feedback was received via:

- Our online feedback form (92 per cent)
- Our paper feedback form (less than one per cent)
- Email (four per cent)
- Other, i.e. pro forma campaigns and some verbal feedback (four per cent).

Most feedback came via individuals (95 per cent) but we also received 35 submissions from organisations.

RESIDENT LOCAL BOARD	#	%
Albert-Eden	434	6%
Aotea / Great Barrier	26	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	195	3%
Franklin Local Board	392	6%
Henderson-Massey	240	3%
Hibiscus and Bays	733	10%
Howick	221	3%
Kaipātiki	370	5%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	103	1%
Manurewa	116	2%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	308	4%
Ōrākei	1466	21%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	39	1%
Papakura	88	1%
Puketāpapa	277	4%
Rodney	602	8%
Upper Harbour	216	3%
Waiheke	171	2%
Waitākere Ranges	216	3%
Waitematā	288	4%
Whau	138	2%
Other (Not supplied, outside Auckland or regional organisation)	462	7%



Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights, Democracy and Engagement

## ATTACHMENT TWO: Local Board breakdowns

### Question 1 – Walking multiple dogs

We are proposing to set a limit on the number of dogs that a person may walk in a council-controlled public place at one time. The proposed number of dogs a person has in their possession in a council-controlled public place must not exceed the following limits:

- Maximum 6 dogs (both on-leash or off-leash)
- Maximum 6 dogs on-leash
- Maximum 3 dogs off-leash.

#### 1.1 What do you think of this proposed change?

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	270	26%	72%	2%
Aotea/Great Barrier	6	83%	17%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	145	21%	78%	1%
Franklin	285	58%	41%	2%
Henderson-Massey	193	22%	74%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	300	41%	57%	2%
Howick	170	45%	55%	1%
Kaipātiki	281	25%	74%	1%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	69	29%	71%	0%
Manurewa	75	32%	65%	3%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	150	31%	68%	1%
Ōrākei	450	31%	67%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	25	32%	68%	0%
Papakura	61	33%	64%	3%
Puketāpapa	97	39%	59%	2%
Rodney	271	37%	62%	1%
Upper Harbour	162	28%	72%	1%
Waiheke	50	66%	32%	2%
Waitākere Ranges	162	25%	71%	4%
Waitematā	214	14%	85%	0%
Whau	92	28%	71%	1%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 1 – Walking multiple dogs**

**1.2 If you do not support the proposed change, would you support one of the alternative options presented to decision-makers in December 2024?**

Local Board	Total responses	No change (no limit)	Max 4 – with max 2 off-leash	Max 4 – with max 2 off-leash (except with license)	Max 8 – with max 4 off-leash	Other
Albert-Eden	194	54%	4%	3%	3%	37%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	111	57%	5%	3%	4%	32%
Franklin	115	20%	20%	14%	7%	39%
Henderson-Massey	142	59%	3%	5%	5%	28%
Hibiscus and Bays	171	45%	9%	6%	2%	37%
Howick	93	45%	10%	11%	3%	31%
Kaipātiki	206	61%	4%	1%	6%	28%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	49	61%	4%	6%	4%	24%
Manurewa	49	39%	8%	10%	4%	39%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	101	56%	4%	5%	5%	30%
Ōrākei	300	64%	6%	2%	5%	23%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	17	47%	6%	0%	12%	35%
Papakura	39	51%	21%	0%	0%	28%
Puketāpapa	57	51%	2%	5%	5%	37%
Rodney	168	54%	7%	3%	7%	30%
Upper Harbour	116	49%	6%	4%	5%	35%
Waiheke	16	50%	6%	13%	0%	31%
Waitākere Ranges	114	50%	5%	6%	4%	34%
Waitematā	182	61%	4%	6%	1%	29%
Whau	64	50%	3%	8%	3%	36%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

**2.1 Restructure the policy to more clearly show its goal, focus areas, council actions, and rules**

Item 16

Attachment A

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	121	68%	16%	17%
Aotea/Great Barrier	8	88%	0%	13%
Devonport-Takapuna	61	67%	16%	16%
Franklin	128	79%	11%	10%
Henderson-Massey	83	65%	24%	11%
Hibiscus and Bays	174	79%	11%	9%
Howick	83	80%	10%	11%
Kaipātiki	113	70%	14%	16%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	34	71%	18%	12%
Manurewa	54	81%	11%	7%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	85	75%	11%	14%
Ōrākei	238	62%	27%	11%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	68%	21%	11%
Papakura	39	74%	8%	18%
Puketāpapa	63	65%	21%	14%
Rodney	141	68%	18%	14%
Upper Harbour	71	68%	13%	20%
Waiheke	26	85%	8%	8%
Waitākere Ranges	72	67%	19%	14%
Waitematā	71	73%	14%	13%
Whau	42	71%	19%	10%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.



**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

**2.2 Clarify rule that all dogs classified as menacing must be neutered**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	122	80%	11%	8%
Aotea/Great Barrier	8	100%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	61	84%	13%	3%
Franklin	130	87%	10%	3%
Henderson-Massey	83	76%	16%	8%
Hibiscus and Bays	176	84%	11%	5%
Howick	83	87%	8%	5%
Kaipātiki	113	90%	7%	3%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	34	71%	15%	15%
Manurewa	54	87%	7%	6%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	85	84%	8%	8%
Ōrākei	239	79%	13%	7%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	79%	21%	0%
Papakura	40	83%	8%	10%
Puketāpapa	65	74%	20%	6%
Rodney	139	78%	17%	4%
Upper Harbour	71	86%	11%	3%
Waiheke	26	96%	4%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	72	74%	17%	10%
Waitematā	72	76%	17%	7%
Whau	43	79%	9%	12%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

**2.3 Clarify who can provide behavioural assessments in relation to menacing dog classifications**

Item 16

Attachment A

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	122	80%	7%	14%
Aotea/Great Barrier	8	100%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	60	85%	8%	7%
Franklin	130	92%	2%	6%
Henderson-Massey	83	73%	14%	12%
Hibiscus and Bays	175	89%	3%	7%
Howick	83	86%	2%	12%
Kaipātiki	112	86%	4%	10%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	34	91%	3%	6%
Manurewa	54	87%	2%	11%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	85	81%	6%	13%
Ōrākei	238	79%	6%	15%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	84%	5%	11%
Papakura	40	83%	3%	15%
Puketāpapa	65	71%	12%	17%
Rodney	139	79%	9%	12%
Upper Harbour	71	87%	6%	7%
Waiheke	25	96%	0%	4%
Waitākere Ranges	72	81%	8%	11%
Waitematā	71	86%	6%	8%
Whau	43	95%	0%	5%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

**2.4 Clarify what areas in Auckland require a license to keep multiple dogs on a property**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	122	70%	20%	10%
Aotea/Great Barrier	8	88%	0%	13%
Devonport-Takapuna	60	82%	15%	3%
Franklin	130	85%	8%	7%
Henderson-Massey	82	65%	28%	7%
Hibiscus and Bays	175	79%	13%	9%
Howick	83	82%	13%	5%
Kaipātiki	112	72%	21%	7%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	34	65%	24%	12%
Manurewa	54	83%	7%	9%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	85	81%	12%	7%
Ōrākei	238	75%	16%	10%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	84%	11%	5%
Papakura	39	64%	21%	15%
Puketāpapa	63	62%	22%	16%
Rodney	138	65%	28%	7%
Upper Harbour	71	70%	21%	8%
Waiheke	25	84%	12%	4%
Waitākere Ranges	71	75%	15%	10%
Waitematā	71	77%	15%	7%
Whau	43	72%	16%	12%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

**2.5 Clarify how dog access rules are set**

Item 16

Attachment A

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	122	75%	14%	11%
Aotea/Great Barrier	8	88%	0%	13%
Devonport-Takapuna	60	73%	10%	17%
Franklin	130	85%	8%	7%
Henderson-Massey	81	72%	23%	5%
Hibiscus and Bays	175	81%	10%	10%
Howick	83	88%	4%	8%
Kaipātiki	112	73%	12%	15%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	33	73%	15%	12%
Manurewa	54	83%	4%	13%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	85	78%	14%	8%
Ōrākei	236	71%	16%	13%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	84%	5%	11%
Papakura	39	82%	5%	13%
Puketāpapa	63	62%	24%	14%
Rodney	138	66%	17%	17%
Upper Harbour	71	79%	13%	8%
Waiheke	24	88%	4%	8%
Waitākere Ranges	70	73%	14%	13%
Waitematā	71	72%	15%	13%
Whau	43	81%	9%	9%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

## Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters

### 2.6 Clarify Auckland-wide dog access rules

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	122	73%	20%	7%
Aotea/Great Barrier	8	88%	0%	13%
Devonport-Takapuna	59	69%	22%	8%
Franklin	130	88%	8%	4%
Henderson-Massey	82	72%	23%	5%
Hibiscus and Bays	174	83%	14%	3%
Howick	83	82%	12%	6%
Kaipātiki	111	76%	16%	8%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	33	76%	18%	6%
Manurewa	54	78%	11%	11%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	84	75%	13%	12%
Ōrākei	236	69%	21%	10%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	89%	11%	0%
Papakura	39	85%	8%	8%
Puketāpapa	63	63%	25%	11%
Rodney	138	71%	22%	7%
Upper Harbour	71	75%	17%	8%
Waiheke	25	92%	4%	4%
Waitākere Ranges	72	81%	14%	6%
Waitematā	71	79%	15%	6%
Whau	43	88%	7%	5%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

**2.7 Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules**

Item 16

Attachment A

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	122	68%	13%	19%
Aotea/Great Barrier	8	63%	0%	38%
Devonport-Takapuna	59	68%	15%	17%
Franklin	127	73%	9%	18%
Henderson-Massey	82	66%	17%	17%
Hibiscus and Bays	174	72%	6%	22%
Howick	83	73%	4%	23%
Kaipātiki	111	68%	10%	23%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	34	68%	15%	18%
Manurewa	52	79%	6%	15%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	84	71%	12%	17%
Ōrākei	230	60%	17%	23%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	84%	5%	11%
Papakura	39	72%	5%	23%
Puketāpapa	63	56%	22%	22%
Rodney	138	63%	15%	22%
Upper Harbour	71	62%	13%	25%
Waiheke	24	92%	4%	4%
Waitākere Ranges	70	69%	13%	19%
Waitematā	70	63%	14%	23%
Whau	42	69%	12%	19%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

**2.8 Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules (for example, outdated landmarks)**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	121	79%	8%	12%
Aotea/Great Barrier	8	100%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	60	83%	5%	12%
Franklin	128	80%	9%	11%
Henderson-Massey	79	76%	14%	10%
Hibiscus and Bays	175	86%	6%	9%
Howick	83	83%	5%	12%
Kaipātiki	112	82%	8%	10%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	34	74%	12%	15%
Manurewa	53	87%	8%	6%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	84	85%	10%	6%
Ōrākei	233	73%	10%	18%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	84%	5%	11%
Papakura	39	82%	3%	15%
Puketāpapa	64	72%	11%	17%
Rodney	138	78%	9%	13%
Upper Harbour	71	85%	7%	8%
Waiheke	25	92%	4%	4%
Waitākere Ranges	70	81%	10%	9%
Waitematā	70	76%	13%	11%
Whau	42	88%	2%	10%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

**2.9 Update dog access rules for Tūpuna Maunga (ancestral mountains)**

Item 16

Attachment A

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	121	48%	32%	20%
Aotea/Great Barrier	7	43%	0%	57%
Devonport-Takapuna	60	58%	27%	15%
Franklin	130	57%	19%	24%
Henderson-Massey	79	49%	27%	24%
Hibiscus and Bays	174	49%	23%	28%
Howick	82	51%	23%	26%
Kaipātiki	112	47%	19%	34%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	34	56%	32%	12%
Manurewa	53	57%	21%	23%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	85	52%	29%	19%
Ōrākei	234	39%	33%	27%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	68%	11%	21%
Papakura	39	51%	15%	33%
Puketāpapa	64	47%	28%	25%
Rodney	135	41%	29%	30%
Upper Harbour	71	52%	21%	27%
Waiheke	24	75%	8%	17%
Waitākere Ranges	70	41%	37%	21%
Waitematā	71	56%	23%	21%
Whau	43	49%	30%	21%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.



**Question 2 – General policy and bylaw matters**

**2.10 Remove outdated or duplicate bylaw content**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	120	78%	7%	16%
Aotea/Great Barrier	8	88%	0%	13%
Devonport-Takapuna	60	80%	7%	13%
Franklin	128	84%	5%	12%
Henderson-Massey	81	78%	12%	10%
Hibiscus and Bays	174	86%	6%	8%
Howick	83	88%	2%	10%
Kaipātiki	112	81%	7%	12%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	34	79%	9%	12%
Manurewa	53	89%	2%	9%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	85	86%	8%	6%
Ōrākei	231	75%	8%	17%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19	95%	0%	5%
Papakura	39	90%	0%	10%
Puketāpapa	64	72%	11%	17%
Rodney	138	80%	9%	11%
Upper Harbour	70	79%	6%	16%
Waiheke	25	92%	4%	4%
Waitākere Ranges	70	79%	7%	14%
Waitematā	70	80%	10%	10%
Whau	42	86%	2%	12%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.1 Ambury Regional Park**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	58	28%	62%	7%	3%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	8	38%	63%	0%	0%
Franklin	47	47%	47%	2%	4%
Henderson-Massey	36	33%	58%	8%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	20	40%	45%	5%	10%
Howick	33	42%	52%	3%	3%
Kaipātiki	39	31%	62%	5%	3%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	44	50%	45%	2%	2%
Manurewa	15	47%	33%	7%	13%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	47	43%	53%	2%	2%
Ōrākei	87	31%	64%	1%	3%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	50%	50%	0%	0%
Papakura	16	25%	63%	13%	0%
Puketāpapa	41	41%	49%	7%	2%
Rodney	40	25%	58%	8%	10%
Upper Harbour	25	32%	60%	4%	4%
Waiheke	6	50%	17%	33%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	36	42%	47%	3%	8%
Waitematā	40	43%	48%	8%	3%
Whau	21	48%	52%	0%	0%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

### Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks

#### 3.2(A) Auckland Botanic Gardens

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	88	38%	57%	6%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	0%	100%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	23	43%	57%	0%
Franklin	134	37%	58%	4%
Henderson-Massey	53	30%	70%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	56	45%	54%	2%
Howick	86	41%	59%	0%
Kaipātiki	62	42%	55%	3%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	35	46%	49%	6%
Manurewa	88	26%	72%	2%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	69	26%	70%	4%
Ōrākei	163	28%	67%	5%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	20	15%	80%	5%
Papakura	41	24%	68%	7%
Puketāpapa	49	33%	61%	6%
Rodney	55	38%	58%	4%
Upper Harbour	55	35%	60%	5%
Waiheke	11	64%	27%	9%
Waitākere Ranges	52	40%	56%	4%
Waitematā	61	39%	59%	2%
Whau	40	43%	55%	3%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.2(B) Auckland Botanic Gardens**

Item 16

Attachment A

Local Board	Total responses	No change	Only change the off-leash area to on-leash at all times	Only change the off-leash area to north of the rose gardens before 10am and after 5pm (on-leash between 10am and 5pm)	Other
Albert-Eden	49	78%	8%	6%	8%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	0%	0%	100%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	13	62%	15%	15%	8%
Franklin	74	72%	5%	8%	15%
Henderson-Massey	36	64%	11%	8%	17%
Hibiscus and Bays	30	57%	13%	7%	23%
Howick	51	75%	8%	8%	10%
Kaipātiki	33	73%	3%	9%	15%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	17	76%	6%	0%	18%
Manurewa	61	75%	3%	10%	11%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	48	67%	2%	10%	21%
Ōrākei	108	66%	6%	19%	9%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	15	40%	0%	7%	53%
Papakura	28	71%	4%	0%	25%
Puketāpapa	30	70%	3%	3%	23%
Rodney	32	66%	16%	6%	13%
Upper Harbour	33	67%	6%	18%	9%
Waiheke	3	33%	0%	0%	67%
Waitākere Ranges	29	55%	10%	10%	24%
Waitematā	35	69%	9%	9%	14%
Whau	22	55%	18%	9%	18%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

### Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks

#### 3.3 Hunua Ranges Regional Park

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	57	37%	56%	5%	2%
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	14	50%	50%	0%	0%
Franklin	127	42%	48%	6%	4%
Henderson-Massey	37	38%	54%	5%	3%
Hibiscus and Bays	31	39%	48%	6%	6%
Howick	55	38%	51%	4%	7%
Kaipātiki	37	27%	68%	5%	0%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	22	36%	55%	9%	0%
Manurewa	18	11%	50%	22%	17%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	37	30%	57%	11%	3%
Ōrākei	93	24%	70%	4%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	10	20%	70%	0%	10%
Papakura	26	31%	42%	23%	4%
Puketāpapa	30	23%	67%	3%	7%
Rodney	40	25%	60%	8%	8%
Upper Harbour	28	32%	61%	4%	4%
Waiheke	7	71%	14%	14%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	33	36%	52%	6%	6%
Waitematā	37	46%	46%	3%	5%
Whau	23	39%	35%	17%	9%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.4 Long Bay Regional Park**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	57	26%	70%	2%	2%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	43	30%	60%	2%	7%
Franklin	34	21%	76%	0%	3%
Henderson-Massey	44	20%	73%	2%	5%
Hibiscus and Bays	243	36%	58%	1%	5%
Howick	28	32%	61%	4%	4%
Kaipātiki	111	20%	78%	1%	1%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	19	26%	74%	0%	0%
Manurewa	8	13%	75%	0%	13%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	36	22%	75%	3%	0%
Ōrākei	106	18%	78%	3%	1%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
Papakura	7	0%	86%	14%	0%
Puketāpapa	30	30%	67%	0%	3%
Rodney	68	25%	69%	1%	4%
Upper Harbour	89	25%	71%	2%	2%
Waiheke	5	40%	40%	20%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	38	16%	76%	0%	8%
Waitematā	44	27%	70%	0%	2%
Whau	29	28%	66%	0%	7%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.5(A) Mahurangi Regional Park West**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	43	33%	58%	5%	5%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	16	31%	69%	0%	0%
Franklin	27	22%	70%	4%	4%
Henderson-Massey	28	14%	75%	7%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	57	44%	49%	4%	4%
Howick	19	42%	42%	11%	5%
Kaipātiki	38	32%	58%	8%	3%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	8	13%	88%	0%	0%
Manurewa	3	0%	67%	0%	33%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	19	26%	63%	11%	0%
Ōrākei	70	19%	76%	4%	1%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	4	25%	50%	0%	25%
Papakura	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
Puketāpapa	18	50%	33%	11%	6%
Rodney	93	27%	56%	13%	4%
Upper Harbour	26	27%	62%	12%	0%
Waiheke	5	20%	20%	40%	20%
Waitākere Ranges	30	23%	53%	7%	17%
Waitematā	28	39%	54%	4%	4%
Whau	17	35%	59%	0%	6%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.5(B) Mahurangi Regional Park East**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	40	33%	60%	5%	3%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	16	38%	63%	0%	0%
Franklin	26	23%	73%	4%	0%
Henderson-Massey	27	15%	74%	7%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	56	43%	50%	4%	4%
Howick	19	42%	47%	5%	5%
Kaipātiki	37	35%	54%	8%	3%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	8	13%	88%	0%	0%
Manurewa	3	0%	67%	0%	33%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	18	22%	67%	11%	0%
Ōrākei	68	16%	76%	6%	1%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	4	25%	50%	0%	25%
Papakura	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
Puketāpapa	17	41%	41%	12%	6%
Rodney	87	26%	59%	14%	1%
Upper Harbour	26	23%	62%	15%	0%
Waiheke	5	20%	20%	40%	20%
Waitākere Ranges	29	28%	52%	7%	14%
Waitematā	23	26%	65%	4%	4%
Whau	16	38%	50%	6%	6%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.



**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.5(C) Mahurangi Regional Park Scott Point**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	40	35%	58%	5%	3%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	16	38%	63%	0%	0%
Franklin	25	24%	72%	4%	0%
Henderson-Massey	27	15%	74%	7%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	55	44%	49%	4%	4%
Howick	17	41%	41%	12%	6%
Kaipātiki	36	42%	50%	6%	3%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	14%	86%	0%	0%
Manurewa	3	0%	67%	0%	33%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	18	28%	61%	11%	0%
Ōrākei	65	17%	78%	3%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	4	25%	50%	0%	25%
Papakura	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
Puketāpapa	16	44%	38%	13%	6%
Rodney	85	29%	60%	11%	0%
Upper Harbour	25	28%	60%	12%	0%
Waiheke	4	25%	25%	25%	25%
Waitākere Ranges	29	31%	48%	7%	14%
Waitematā	22	23%	68%	5%	5%
Whau	16	38%	56%	0%	6%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.6 Muriwai Regional Park**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	74	43%	47%	7%	3%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	29	48%	52%	0%	0%
Franklin	32	44%	47%	6%	3%
Henderson-Massey	64	45%	52%	3%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	60	50%	45%	2%	3%
Howick	32	47%	41%	6%	6%
Kaipātiki	76	46%	46%	7%	1%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	17	41%	53%	0%	6%
Manurewa	10	40%	60%	0%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	39	46%	49%	5%	0%
Ōrākei	101	37%	59%	4%	0%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	7	29%	57%	0%	14%
Papakura	9	22%	67%	0%	11%
Puketāpapa	35	66%	29%	3%	3%
Rodney	118	51%	39%	4%	6%
Upper Harbour	54	57%	39%	4%	0%
Waiheke	5	20%	40%	40%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	59	47%	42%	7%	3%
Waitematā	50	46%	48%	4%	2%
Whau	34	50%	41%	6%	3%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

### Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks

#### 3.7 Pākiri Regional Park

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	42	21%	76%	0%	2%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	10	20%	80%	0%	0%
Franklin	22	14%	77%	9%	0%
Henderson-Massey	23	9%	83%	4%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	36	22%	78%	0%	0%
Howick	20	20%	70%	5%	5%
Kaipātiki	46	13%	85%	2%	0%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	0%	100%	0%	0%
Manurewa	4	25%	75%	0%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	19%	76%	5%	0%
Ōrākei	66	14%	83%	2%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	3	0%	67%	33%	0%
Papakura	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
Puketāpapa	19	37%	58%	0%	5%
Rodney	95	9%	86%	2%	2%
Upper Harbour	18	22%	78%	0%	0%
Waiheke	4	50%	25%	25%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	35	14%	80%	0%	6%
Waitematā	33	12%	85%	0%	3%
Whau	20	30%	70%	0%	0%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.8 Shakespear Regional Park**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	57	35%	56%	4%	5%
Aotea/Great Barrier	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	28	39%	50%	7%	4%
Franklin	28	29%	68%	0%	4%
Henderson-Massey	38	32%	63%	5%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	189	49%	41%	5%	5%
Howick	29	38%	55%	0%	7%
Kaipātiki	73	38%	52%	5%	4%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	9	22%	78%	0%	0%
Manurewa	8	38%	50%	0%	13%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	29	24%	59%	17%	0%
Ōrākei	102	32%	63%	4%	1%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	5	40%	60%	0%	0%
Papakura	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
Puketāpapa	31	45%	35%	16%	3%
Rodney	75	40%	44%	11%	5%
Upper Harbour	50	50%	36%	12%	2%
Waiheke	5	60%	40%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	39	38%	51%	5%	5%
Waitematā	40	43%	53%	0%	5%
Whau	27	44%	44%	4%	7%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.9 Tāpapakanga Regional Park**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	36	33%	64%	3%	0%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	8	25%	50%	13%	13%
Franklin	49	43%	47%	6%	4%
Henderson-Massey	24	33%	63%	4%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	16	31%	63%	0%	6%
Howick	21	57%	29%	5%	10%
Kaipātiki	27	41%	48%	7%	4%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	6	33%	50%	0%	17%
Manurewa	7	0%	43%	0%	57%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	20	40%	55%	5%	0%
Ōrākei	54	28%	67%	6%	0%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	3	33%	67%	0%	0%
Papakura	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
Puketāpapa	14	21%	57%	14%	7%
Rodney	32	31%	56%	9%	3%
Upper Harbour	16	31%	56%	13%	0%
Waiheke	4	25%	50%	25%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	26	42%	46%	4%	8%
Waitematā	26	38%	58%	0%	4%
Whau	17	29%	53%	12%	6%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.10 Tāwharanui Regional Park**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	54	46%	46%	6%	2%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	16	38%	50%	13%	0%
Franklin	31	39%	52%	10%	0%
Henderson-Massey	31	26%	61%	10%	3%
Hibiscus and Bays	70	59%	30%	6%	6%
Howick	25	52%	32%	4%	12%
Kaipātiki	50	40%	46%	8%	6%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	11	36%	55%	9%	0%
Manurewa	5	40%	40%	0%	20%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	30	47%	37%	13%	3%
Ōrākei	81	32%	59%	6%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	3	0%	67%	33%	0%
Papakura	8	25%	50%	13%	13%
Puketāpapa	19	58%	37%	5%	0%
Rodney	93	43%	47%	9%	1%
Upper Harbour	30	43%	50%	7%	0%
Waiheke	8	75%	0%	25%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	36	47%	36%	8%	8%
Waitematā	38	53%	42%	3%	3%
Whau	18	56%	28%	11%	6%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

### Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks

#### 3.11 Te Ārai Regional Park

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	44	27%	66%	5%	2%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	19	26%	58%	11%	5%
Franklin	31	23%	65%	6%	6%
Henderson-Massey	27	15%	81%	4%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	54	22%	78%	0%	0%
Howick	22	41%	50%	5%	5%
Kaipātiki	44	34%	52%	9%	5%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	9	22%	78%	0%	0%
Manurewa	4	0%	100%	0%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	26	23%	69%	8%	0%
Ōrākei	80	23%	74%	3%	1%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	3	33%	67%	0%	0%
Papakura	6	17%	83%	0%	0%
Puketāpapa	19	32%	53%	5%	11%
Rodney	257	6%	91%	2%	1%
Upper Harbour	31	32%	65%	3%	0%
Waiheke	6	50%	17%	17%	17%
Waitākere Ranges	35	29%	51%	6%	14%
Waitematā	39	28%	69%	0%	3%
Whau	22	45%	45%	9%	0%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.12 Waitawa Regional Park**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	36	36%	53%	11%	0%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	6	17%	67%	17%	0%
Franklin	67	39%	55%	1%	4%
Henderson-Massey	23	22%	74%	4%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	18	28%	72%	0%	0%
Howick	21	52%	43%	0%	5%
Kaipātiki	26	31%	58%	12%	0%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	8	50%	50%	0%	0%
Manurewa	7	14%	71%	0%	14%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	19	26%	53%	21%	0%
Ōrākei	54	24%	69%	6%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	5	20%	80%	0%	0%
Papakura	15	27%	67%	7%	0%
Puketāpapa	15	27%	53%	13%	7%
Rodney	31	26%	61%	13%	0%
Upper Harbour	15	20%	73%	7%	0%
Waiheke	3	67%	0%	33%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	25	36%	52%	0%	12%
Waitematā	28	32%	64%	0%	4%
Whau	15	33%	53%	7%	7%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.



**Question 3 – Dog access rules at Regional Parks**

**3.13 Wenderholm Regional Park**

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	I don't know	Other
Albert-Eden	53	51%	45%	4%	0%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	25	36%	48%	12%	4%
Franklin	31	35%	55%	6%	3%
Henderson-Massey	33	45%	48%	6%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	134	51%	35%	7%	6%
Howick	24	50%	29%	8%	13%
Kaipātiki	62	32%	50%	13%	5%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	10	50%	30%	20%	0%
Manurewa	6	33%	50%	0%	17%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	29%	57%	14%	0%
Ōrākei	77	29%	60%	8%	4%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	4	25%	50%	25%	0%
Papakura	7	14%	86%	0%	0%
Puketāpapa	21	52%	24%	10%	14%
Rodney	81	44%	37%	11%	7%
Upper Harbour	40	48%	40%	13%	0%
Waiheke	3	33%	33%	33%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	33	39%	36%	12%	12%
Waitematā	34	47%	44%	3%	6%
Whau	23	43%	43%	9%	4%

Note - this table only includes feedback from individuals only and where the local board of residence is known.

































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































