

**Date:** Wednesday 30 April 2025  
**Time:** 4:00 pm  
**Meeting Room:** Local Board Chambers  
**Venue:** 35 Coles Crescent  
Papakura  
Auckland

---

## Papakura Local Board

# OPEN MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS

---

### ITEM TABLE OF CONTENTS

### PAGE

11	<b>Annual Plan 2025/2026: Papakura Local Board consultation feedback and input</b>	
	A. Annual Plan 2025/2026 Papakura Local Board input	3



## Papakura Local Board feedback on Annual Plan 2025-2026 regional topics

### Overall direction

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
<p><b>The overall plan</b> This includes prioritising investment in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transport</li> <li>• water; and</li> <li>• fairer funding for local communities.</li> </ul> <p>An average 5.8 per cent rates increase</p>	<p><b>Support</b></p>	<p>The majority of submitters supported or supported most of the plan.</p> <p><b>Rates Increases &amp; Affordability</b> - Many submitters oppose rates rises, citing financial hardship, falling property values, and increased water charges. Some support it if linked to clear community benefits, but overall, there were strong calls for leaner, results-driven budgeting and reduced waste.</p> <p><b>Public Transport &amp; Infrastructure</b> - Ongoing frustration with unreliable public transport, poor traffic planning, and lack of parking at stations. Residents want smarter design, safer roads, and better access — particularly in neglected areas like Papakura and Takanini.</p> <p><b>Underinvestment in South Auckland</b> - Papakura residents feel overlooked. There's strong demand for fairer investment in local parks, footpaths, community safety, and amenities. Some oppose what they see as overfunding of cultural projects at the expense of essentials.</p> <p><b>Spending Priorities &amp; Transparency</b> - Criticism of excessive consultancy, lack of contractor oversight, and a perception of inefficiency. Many want funds focused on essentials (roads, water, waste), not "nice-to-haves." There's a call for clearer communication on where money goes and why.</p> <p><b>Support for Core Investment &amp; Resilience</b> - Many back investment in water, transport, and resilience—if spending is transparent and outcomes are visible. Equity in funding and climate readiness are seen as important, especially by younger voices.</p>
<p><b>Destination management and major events</b> Introducing a bed night visitor levy on short-stay commercial accommodation, to fund destination management, marketing and major events</p>	<p><b>Support</b></p>	<p>The majority of submitters support the introduction of a bed night visitor levy.</p> <p><b>Support for a User-Pays Model</b> - Many agree that visitors should contribute to events and infrastructure they use, easing the burden on local ratepayers. This approach is seen as standard globally and a fair way to fund destination initiatives.</p>

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
		<p><b>Concerns About Tourism Impact</b> - Some fear the levy could deter domestic and international visitors due to already high accommodation and travel costs. Industry voices warn it could harm recovery for hotels still stabilising post-COVID.</p> <p><b>Fairness &amp; Equity Concerns</b> - Submitters raised issues around the levy's potential to disproportionately affect lower-income families hosting relatives, as well as small operators like Airbnb if not applied evenly.</p> <p><b>Lack of Trust in Council Spending</b> - There is scepticism about how the levy would be managed. Submitters want transparency, clearer oversight, and potential involvement of private providers to ensure funds are used effectively.</p> <p><b>Targeted &amp; Transparent Implementation</b> - Suggestions include limiting the levy to large commercial operators, setting rates carefully, and ensuring all tourism platforms (like Airbnb) are included. Some propose diverting existing council funds instead of introducing a new levy.</p>

**Changes to other rates, fees and charges**

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
<p>3% increase to the overall waste management targeted rate for a typical household</p>	<p><b>Do not support</b></p>	<p>Papakura Local Board does not support a 3 percent increase in the waste management targeted rate until after the rubbish bin roll out has been completed in Papakura.</p> <p><b>Support for User-Pays System</b> – In Papakura many prefer the current bin tag model, seeing it as fair and cost-effective for low-waste households.</p> <p><b>Financial Pressure</b> - Strong opposition to increased rates and fees due to rising living costs, especially among vulnerable groups.</p> <p><b>Loss of Waste Reduction Incentives</b> - A flat rate may discourage recycling and composting, as there's no cost benefit for producing less waste.</p> <p><b>Fairness and Equity Concerns</b> - Submitters want consistent rules across Auckland but flexibility for smaller or low-waste households. Some feel Papakura is being unfairly treated.</p> <p><b>Opposition to Fortnightly Collection Trial</b> - Concerns about health risks, hygiene issues,</p>

Proposal	Support / Do not support	Local board input
		and illegal dumping due to reduced collection frequency.
Introduction of the refuse targeted rate to the former districts of Rodney and Franklin.	<b>Neither support or oppose</b>	The Papakura Local Board defers to the Rodney and Franklin Local Boards for their position on this matter.
Animal management fees: increase dog adoption fee from \$350 to \$450	<b>Support</b>	The board supports the increase but feels it could result in an increase in the number of animals not being adopted.
Animal management fees: increase vet fee from \$75 to \$150.	<b>Support</b>	The board supports a cost recovery approach.  Roaming dogs are a problem in the Papakura Local Board area and the board would welcome the increase in animal management fees to help deal with this issue as well as covering animal welfare costs.
Changes to some cemetery fees	<b>Support</b>	The board generally support the increases to cemetery fees but feels there should be some flexibility for demonstrated hardship.
Realign bach fees into pricing tiers based on occupancy levels, capacity and location	<b>Support</b>	
Align staff charge out rates with staff pay bands for services in regional parks	<b>Support</b>	

**Other matters**

Proposal	Local board input
Takanini Business Improvement District (BID)	The Takanini BID ballot was unsuccessful.
Opposition to Rates Increases	Many residents feel the proposed rate hikes are unaffordable and unfair, particularly given the rising cost of living. There is strong resistance to these increases without visible improvements in local services and infrastructure.
Public Safety Concerns	A significant number of submitters expressed concerns about increasing crime and safety in their communities. Calls for better police response, installation of security cameras, and improved lighting in public areas were common.
Neglect of South Auckland	Many submitters feel that Papakura and South Auckland are being neglected, with insufficient investment in infrastructure, amenities, and services compared to other regions of Auckland.
Efficient Spending & Accountability	Residents urged the council to focus on eliminating wasteful spending and ensure value for money. They want the council to prioritize essential services and ensure transparency in how funds are allocated.

Proposal	Local board input
Infrastructure & Transport Issues	There were repeated concerns about inadequate public transport, especially in new developments, as well as traffic congestion and poor road maintenance, all of which residents felt the council should address more effectively.

### Papakura Local Board key advocacy initiatives

Initiative	Description
Growth	<p>Growth occurring in neighbouring boards, particularly Franklin, impacts on the Papakura Local Board infrastructure. However, Papakura Local Board is not funded to respond to the growth pressures.</p> <p>Funding received in response to growth in the Papakura area needs to also come with consequential opex that is adjusted on an annual basis to cover the new assets.</p> <p>Papakura has experienced significant growth with high density housing which is evidencing social issues and pressure on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>The board does not have available funds to cover inflationary pressures for the new growth assets.</p>
Inflationary pressures for future years	<p>The Papakura Local Board does not receive additional funding under the “fairer funding” model.</p> <p>The Papakura Local Board has not yet received advice around strategic opportunities to deliver differently to allow the board to respond to inflationary pressures in future years.</p> <p>The board advocates strongly for additional funding to cover inflationary cost pressures on an ongoing basis. Without this additional funding the board is concerned that existing service levels will need to be significantly reduced.</p>
Joint advocacy: Drury Sports Park (Papakura Local Board area)	<p>Significant growth in wider Drury will generate pressure on Drury Sports Park (on the border of Papakura and Franklin Local Board areas).</p> <p>Request that funding for the delivery of the Drury Sports Park concept plan be scheduled to enable Papakura and Franklin Local Boards to make complimentary investment for the benefit of local communities i.e. rather than wait for new land to be acquired through the Drury development process. Franklin has started discussion on asset optimisation to partly fund this project.</p>
Joint Advocacy - Opaheke Sports Park concept plan (Papakura LB area)	<p>Opaheke Sports Park is an asset that has unrealised potential to deliver to new and growing communities on the border of Franklin and Papakura,</p> <p>Request that growth funding for sportsfield sand carpeting, drainage and irrigation be brought forward from 2028/2029+</p>
Joint advocacy: Karaka Sports Park, Karaka (Franklin Local Board area)	<p>Request allocation of discrete (unallocated) project funding to the Karaka Sports Park and Community Hub project, noting that this project is shovel ready (noting that Auckland Council investment business case was completed in 2020).</p>

Initiative	Description
	<p>This project responds to greenfield development in Hingaia (Papakura), Karaka, Clarks Beach and Drury. The Franklin Local Board is investing in elements of this plan with local capex as budgets allow.</p>
<p>Papakura and Franklin Local Board Joint Advocacy - Support to deliver equitable enforcement outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roaming dogs and animals</li> <li>• Consent compliance</li> <li>• Freedom camping</li> <li>• Noise</li> </ul>	<p>Enforcement and compliance not equitably delivered across the region despite additional 16 positions in LTP</p> <p>Deprivation of service in outer areas of Auckland, service doesn't seem to be allocated based on need</p> <p>Request additional attention from the Governing body on this issue i.e. request that staff provide advice on how to address this service deficit noting this may mean more funding in the short term while regulation is reviewed to support practical and enforceable regulation, or a diversion of resource from the city centre, particularly in summer where visitation to coastlines and poor behaviour increases.</p>
<p>Papakura and Franklin Local Board Joint Advocacy - Continue to recognise and enable Local Boards' governance over community facilities, and enable effective as well as efficient service delivery</p>	<p>The Community Facilities Network Plan is being planned as a regional policy refresh.</p> <p>Parks and Community Facilities Maintenance Contract (project 27) is also imminent.</p> <p>Local boards both govern and fund community facilities (with exceptions being regional parks).</p> <p>Asking for Governing Body support to ensure that local boards are at the forefront of any planning, policy or delivery of community facilities, including setting the scope and endorsing the approach for this sort of work.</p> <p>Note that the recent Pools and Leisure facilities management contracts, and Golf Facilities Network Planning projects have been poor examples of Local Board empowered decision making.</p> <p>The board is asking for Governing Body advocacy to the organisation on this point.</p>
<p>Papakura and Franklin Local Board advocacy - prioritise growth funded development of parks in greenfield development areas i.e. areas where land has been acquired, but play and recreation services remain undeveloped due to local funding capital funding constraints. Recommend those parks that have been waiting longest are prioritised.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opaheke Stage 1&amp; 2 – water and wastewater connections and sand carpets fields 3 and 4</li> <li>2. Kuhanui Reserve – develop playground</li> <li>3. Awakeri Wetlands – develop playground</li> <li>4. Drury Sports Complex – deliver concept plan</li> <li>5. Hingaia Park – stage 2 of concept plan</li> <li>6. Karaka Sport Complex - supporting Franklin Local Board advocacy</li> <li>7. 158A Park Estate Road – develop playground</li> <li>8. Opaheke stage 3 – develop remaining sports fields</li> </ol>