

## **AUCKLAND GOVERNANCE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE SUBMISSION**

*on the Local Government (Auckland Council) Bill (2009)*

Submissions can either be emailed to [AGL@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:AGL@parliament.govt.nz) or mailed in paper form. Two copies are required of submissions sent in paper form.

Committee Secretariat  
Auckland Governance Legislation  
Parliament Buildings  
Wellington

If you send your submission via email please do not also send paper copies.

### **Submission format**

You can just write your submission as a letter including:

1. Name: **SavePapakura.com**
2. Address: (Please refer to our cover letter)
3. Daytime phone number: (Please refer to our cover letter)
4. E-mail Address: (Please refer to our cover letter)
5. Do you want to appear before the Select Committee? Yes
6. Who do you represent?

We represent **SavePapakura.com**, a steering group of people formed from a public meeting of at least 1,000 concerned Papakura citizens who met on 04 May 2009. All except three people in the audience indicated by a show of hands that they were opposed to the Super City and the changes it would mean for Papakura residents. This group was formed at the end of the meeting and has remained in two-way consultation with the people of Papakura since that time via internet, e-mail, face to face discussions in the street, workshops, public meetings, and media.

SavePapakura.com is a community action group connecting residents, businesses and organisations to Save Papakura.

7. Are you in favour or against the Bill overall? Against.

## **Executive Summary:**

We believe that the region-wide Council only needs to have specific financial and decision-making powers for what the ARC does now. It does need to have a slightly greater rates share and teeth than the current ARC, and its purpose should be to manage the major transport corridors, water/sewage and conservation tasks. The Resource Management Act already has increased the powers to enable regional projects to proceed, so there is no need for this Bill. Strengthening specific regional functions can be undertaken without making any significant changes to the current services and structures which exist in the local communities. We oppose most clauses of the Bill, the lack of mandate for the Bill's existence, and the manner in which it has been rushed into existence.

For people in Papakura, if this Bill is passed, it will reduce their access to local decision making, and will almost certainly reduce the quality and quantity of services which their current Council provides. We want decisions about Papakura rates made by a Mayor and Council elected from Papakura residents, who understand Papakura issues, and have the power to plan, finance and implement decisions affecting the people of Papakura. This was the overwhelming message conveyed at the public meeting of the 1,000 residents on 04 May 2009, and has been reaffirmed in all our consultations with Papakura residents since. Papakura wants to retain its proud identity as an independent and self-sufficient community.

## **Clause by Clause Comments:**

### ***Background to Bill***

The background to the Bill states that there is a concern that local issues and regional issues get tangled up with the current structure of local councils and regional councils. We believe that lumping these competing issues into one Council will lead to less transparency of how decisions are made and money is spent. Strengthening and clarification of the regional issues can occur without dismantling all the benefits of local councils – being accessible to the people, having local decisions made locally by people who live locally and know their local people and local area. This is the essence of community. The proposed Super City does not have a natural community, Papakura does. Leave it as it is. If you want to strengthen local communities – which research shows is good for issues like reducing crime, increasing people supporting each other etc. then break up the existing large councils so that smaller communities like Clevedon have their own voice again. The local level succeeds only when empowered.

### ***Commencement Date (Clause 2)***

We oppose the enactment of this legislation by 1 November 2010. While that may be a tidy date because it coincides with the next local body elections, it has not given adequate time for communities to fully participate in the discussions and decision making processes about major changes to the governance of their local and regional issues. People in Papakura have expressed concern to us about the lack of democratic process, and are angry that a handful of people are dictating how their town will be managed in the future.

### ***Meaning of Auckland (Clause 5)***

To those of us who live outside the current Auckland city, there is a great deal of difference between Auckland city and Auckland Region. Calling the new council Auckland automatically alienates two-thirds of us who live outside of Auckland city's current boundaries. Positioning a Council in Central Auckland does the same, and is not at all user friendly. Manukau City set the precedent. When they came into being, they did not call or position their centre in any of the existing towns, but created a new Council office and city hub with a name which reflected its position in the Manukau Harbour area.

### ***Relationship between Local Government Act 2002 and Local Electoral Act 2001 (Clause 6)***

We disagree that this Bill should supercede the Local Government Act 2002 which applies to all other local communities in New Zealand. We believe the Local Government Act should continue to take precedence in Papakura, and is an Act which has proven over time to be effective for local body governance. Papakura is an independent local body and should remain so. A few regional tasks may continue to be managed regionally, but that is not a good enough reason to remove local planning, decision making, and financing of any of the tasks that the Papakura District Council currently undertakes. Local rates should be spent locally by elected representatives who live locally and understand local needs and issues.

### ***Auckland Council established (Clause 7)***

We reject this clause.

- (1) We reject the Super City notion completely. But if it were to go ahead, naming it Auckland effectively alienates all those people in the region who currently proudly do not consider themselves Aucklanders.
- (2) The Auckland Regional Council as it currently stands could be strengthened in its powers and financial responsibilities, without the need to create a new regional Council, and without the need to restructure the local bodies in the region.

### ***Governing body of Auckland Council (Clause 8)***

Our position is that this Council is unnecessary.

We believe the proposed structure is unwieldy and unworkable. It will be extremely difficult to maintain the quality of communication when local decisions are not made locally to address local needs. The current system of a regional Council and local Councils may make regional decision making more difficult, but the structure does provide checks and balances.

We are concerned that the proposed Council with no other decision making bodies to temper its decisions, is open to takeover by particular interest groups who may not represent the

majority of citizens in Auckland, let alone the unique viewpoints of the people of each community.

There is a real lack of accountability built into this Bill to the citizens of the Auckland region, individually or collectively. Twenty-one people will have unbridled power over hard earned resources. People in Papakura have already told us they are dismayed at their money being spent on a party in Auckland. When did we get to choose this priority? How will it benefit the people or businesses of Papakura? What will the next fanciful project be? What is to stop the proposed Council from spending a disproportionate amount of the collective rates on central Auckland projects at the expense of smaller communities? We believe that local and regional rates must remain separated, and regional roles and functions need to be very specifically defined.

If the proposed Bill goes ahead, full consultation (eg by survey questionnaire) should be implemented for any item being considered for 'targeted funding'. The survey should be carried out for all affected citizens ie a region wide survey for a regional targeted rate, and all people in Papakura for a Papakura targeted rate.

We believe regional Councillors should represent no more than 50,000 people each and should attend all Local Board/Papakura Council meetings to ensure they are accessible to the people they represent, have heard the debates, and can genuinely represent the issues raised. This would still leave the people of Papakura with about a tenth of its current representation, and should therefore apply **only to regional matters**. All local planning, decision making and financing of services and local projects should continue to be made locally by a Council and Mayor in Papakura as at present.

All regional Councillors should be elected by ward. At large councillors are by necessity likely to be from (and therefore subconsciously represent) more affluent suburbs or big business interests in the Super City. Having at large councillors diminishes the representation for ordinary citizens. At present, Papakura citizens vote for one mayor (at large) and 8 councillors by ward for 45,000 people (1:5,000 people). The councillors live (and many work) in Papakura. They are easily accessible and are accountable to their neighbours and fellow residents. This clause will effectively reduce the representation for people in Papakura drastically. If only 12 councillors are elected by ward, that gives Papakura people less than half of one Councillor (1: 116,000 people). Given the financial resources to be elected at large and the income levels in Papakura, it is unlikely that any of the at large candidates will come from Papakura, whereas wealthier suburbs are likely to have more than their share of representation. This is undemocratic. This clause is based on a false assumption that 'at large' regional Councillors will have a more regional rather than local focus.

The regional Council should have a number of councillors based on a population formula, with an additional weighting for the large rural areas (if included). This would ensure that as the population grows, the proportionality of representation for individual citizens is maintained, and rural areas have their special needs represented.

We support Maori representation on the regional Council. The nature of this representation should be determined in close consultation with Maori. This is an important issue for the people of Papakura, 27% of whom identify as being Maori. We recognise that good working relationships have been built up between the Kaitiaki group and the Mayor and Council of Papakura. Any changes to the structure or functions of governance in Auckland need to ensure these relationships are strengthened.

Regional parks and Conservation. The best way to care for these areas is to keep the current ARC Parks and Heritage Committee, with whatever name is appropriate. This body already balances the need between conservation, eco-systems, cultural heritage and appropriate recreational access. It integrates the same policies across the region, and works well. This is as important as the transport structure and certainly will last more generations than any super highway or super rail system. It should be managed and funded in keeping with its crucial importance to the sustainability of the community. When we are in recession or struggling with our daily lives, having natural places to view or visit is a cornerstone to helping us cope. We now know that preserving nature helps to preserve our planet. It is therefore vital to ensure our natural heritage is managed from a heritage perspective not a monetary profitability perspective.

### ***Mayor of Auckland (Clause 9)***

The Deputy Mayor and regional Council committee chair people should be elected by the Council members. This is an important check/balance to complement the considerable powers of the regional leader, whether he/she is called Regional Mayor or Chairperson.

### ***Local Boards (Clause 10)***

We reject the creation of local boards without full consultation of the citizens of each current local council area. Within Papakura, the vast majority of the hundreds of people we have spoken to (whether one on one or in groups) have indicated that they wish to retain their own Papakura Mayor and Councillors. They want local rates spent locally. They value the fact that many know their local representatives, that their representatives know first-hand about Papakura issues, and are both easily accessible and accountable. Feedback and consultation happen both formally and informally. The Council is able to be respond quickly and effectively to changing needs.

If Local Boards proceed:

- They should be responsible for all the same range of local activities and have similar financial powers as the current local Councils do. Local Boards competing for the same pot of resources from a central Council will only serve to divide the Auckland region further, not create the community of interest the Bill seems intent upon.
- There is no point in having a Local Board if their only purpose is to recommend to a third party. We want direct and easy access to those who have the power to plan, finance and implement local decisions. The easiest way to do this in Papakura is to retain the current structure of Mayor and Councillors with all their existing powers.
- Efficiency of planning and implementation of local projects and transparency of financial accountability is more likely to occur if Local Boards retain responsibility for local decision making and services. Combining regional and local rates will lead to an inability to respond to local needs promptly, and reduce financial clarity and accountability.
- Each Local Board should represent no more than 50,000 people each, and boundaries should take into account natural communities.

- Local Boards should be subject to the requirements of Local Government legislation in terms of consulting with their residents and being accountable to them for their actions.

### ***Status of Local Boards (Clause 11)***

Local Boards should have the same status as local Councils in other areas of New Zealand. Papakura has a similar population to Wanganui; its local governing body should have similar powers and representation for its people. It is undemocratic for people to have their enfranchisement diminished simply because of their geographical position.

In the Local Government Act 2002, Clause 10 it states that the purpose of local government is *(a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and*

*(b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities, in the present and for the future.”*

But the provisions under clauses 11-13 reduce the democratic decision making powers which the residents of Papakura currently enjoy – so those clauses will not achieve the Bill’s intended purpose.

### ***Membership of Local Boards (Clause 12)***

Once again, if a Local Board system is created, the membership should be elected by wards as our current councillors are. Board members who live in the ward they represent ensure local accountability. However, a degree of unity within the local area is ensured if the Board leader is elected at large, and so enjoys the support of citizens from the entire Local Board area. As this is what happens currently with a Mayor and Council, and has a longstanding history of working not only in Papakura but throughout New Zealand communities, why change it? We have seen no evidence or research that replacing a Mayor and Council with the Community Board system enhances the representation or services for local areas. The anecdotal evidence we have heard from neighbouring cities in the Auckland region which have been subject to amalgamation and changes such as these in the past are more negative than positive.

### ***Functions, Duties and Powers of the Board (Clause 13)***

We are concerned that by centralising local decision making and services, and removing local decision making, decisions will become unwieldy, unpopular and unworkable.

Currently Papakura’s decision makers live and often work in the community. They and their families participate in Papakura’s social and recreational activities alongside the people they serve. Under the current proposal, we may have unequal access to members of the Local Board. The difference is that now our Councillors can see an issue firsthand, take it to the Council, and have the decision making and financial power to do something about it. We do not have confidence that a Local Board making recommendations to a central Council on which Papakura has less than one representative will prioritise or fund issues which have relevance to Papakura. The whole point of local government is that it is local. Situating

decision making 30km away and reducing the voice of Papakura people does not benefit the people of Papakura in any way. We want local rates collected in Papakura spent in Papakura. Local Boards must have the power and finances to make local decisions on the range of matters which the current Council and Mayor do.

### ***Delegations to Local Boards (Clause 15)***

Local Boards should be responsible for all local planning, financial decision making and implementation of local plans. These should be set in statute to ensure continuity of annual, 3 year and 5 year plans. It will be very detrimental to communities to have local board powers fluctuating with every regional election cycle. Setting powers in statute ensures that local decisions and decision makers can respond to local needs, and be accountable to local people. Once again, as this is what Papakura Council currently does, why change it?

### ***Council to provide administrative facilities to Local Boards (Clause 16)***

We reject this clause. Local Board offices/Local Council offices need to exist to enable people to pay and query their rates in person, view their property files, pay their dog license fees and deal with the range of enquiries and issues which they currently do. Many elderly Papakura people in particular have expressed concern about the loss of their local Council office and staff. They do not have computers, have problems making themselves understood on the phone and are unable to travel to Auckland to sort out their problems face to face. At present, Papakura residents are within a few minutes drive of their Council Office. To remove the Council office facilities is to remove an easily accessible and user friendly service. It will alienate citizens further.

### ***Expenses of Local Boards (Clause 17)***

We reject this Clause.

Under the proposed Bill, all financial delegations are to be made by the proposed regional Council with no checks and balances in place to ensure that every Local Board community gets an equitable share, or to ensure that local issues receive an appropriate portion of funding compared with regional issues. Many Papakura people we have spoken to believe their rates will be spent on developments in the Queen Street/waterfront area of the current Auckland city to the detriment of Papakura.

We understand that to an accountant having a number of Council offices throughout the region may seem an unnecessary expense, but governance is not just about money. It is also about meeting cultural, environmental and social aspects of the community. Having the presence of locally elected representatives and administrative functions in Papakura enables not only individuals but also community groups to have quick and direct consultation about the cultural, social, and environmental issues which affect them. We have asked repeatedly for details regarding cost/benefit analysis of the proposed changes. The Royal Commission estimate is that savings with the new structure will be minimal. We believe that the social costs to the Papakura community will be huge.

This Bill seems to have come into being because of concerns about developing business in central Auckland. We are not anti-business or anti-development. We are pro families and communities coming first, and from this, social infrastructure and sustainable commerce will develop. This Bill seems to have set out to destroy social infrastructure throughout the region in the hope the changes will promote commerce in central Auckland. There is no point in developing central Auckland, if no-one anywhere else in the region wants to be a part of it. Tourists come and go. If central Auckland wants to flourish in the region, it needs to provide what the region's residents want. How about asking us instead of destroying our communities?

We believe that Regional rates should be separate from local rates, and should be fixed by Local Boards/Papakura Council not a regional Council. This ensures transparency and accountability of regional versus local community spending. The priorities for regional spending should be as at present with the ARC, that is, responsibility for the major regional transport corridors, water supply, and the management of our natural heritage through the regional reserves.

### ***Boundaries of Auckland (Clause 18)***

- Most of the cities and districts in the current Greater Auckland area are working well, and meeting the needs of their local communities.
- The areas outside the 4 cities (North Shore, Auckland, Waitakere, and Manukau) should retain their current local government powers. Papakura has a proud separate identity as being the buffer between town and country.
- Changes in boundaries (18.3) do need to take citizens' views into account. If southern boundaries are to be withdrawn placing people under new local authorities (eg Waikato), the affected residents should be consulted, and have the opportunity to vote on this issue. A change in local authority has a direct impact on people's everyday lives.
- Changes in names should take citizens' views into account. Names matter a lot to the people affected and often have longstanding historical associations. There seems to be no logical reason to change Franklin to Hunua. Do not align the name of an area with National Election boundaries. The town of Papakura has been in three differently named electorates over the last twenty years (Papakura, Hunua, Clevedon). Papakura is Papakura, Franklin is Franklin, Hunua is where the Hunua Ranges are.

### ***Determinations of Local Government Commission (Clauses 19 & 20)***

This entire process has been undertaken without appropriate consultation with, and mandate of, the majority of those who are most affected by it, that is, the 1.4million citizens of the Auckland region. No determination of boundaries of wards or of the region should be made without the people having a vote on whether or not they want the restructuring, let alone 12 wards or any local boards. And voting of such a major change to local body enfranchisement should require more than a simple majority vote.



For the democratic process to take place, the proposed dates of 01 March 2010 for boundaries and 01 November 2010 for the proposed Auckland Council are unrealistic. Consultation and getting a mandate from the populace should happen first, followed by planning any changes (if any are deemed by the people to be necessary), followed by enactment of legislation. To do otherwise is to invite continuing opposition to the proposed changes, and alienation of the people the legislation is supposed to be benefitting.

## **The principles we are working from are:**

### ***Sense of belonging.***

Alongside family and friends, health research shows that a sense of belonging in a community is the fabric which contributes to an individual's health and well-being. When you take away decision-making power and finance from a community it ceases to thrive, and that sense of belonging disappears.

### ***Powerlessness***

Tends to lead to disaffection and alienation from society's norms and values. We are concerned that the structure in the Bill as it stands will cause more people in Papakura to drop away from participation in their community. There is deep suspicion among the people we talk to in Papakura about an all-powerful centralised Council. People are already saying "what's the point" of doing anything because no-one in Auckland will listen. We believe that the disenfranchisement of smaller communities like Papakura will lead to increased depression and crime as people get overwhelmed with the feeling that their basic rights and therefore they themselves are of no value.

### ***The democratic voice***

Of people who live in Papakura will be significantly diminished. We have about 45,000 people who currently vote for a Mayor and 8 councillors between us. In the proposed structure, we will only get to vote for part of one councillor and a mayor. The central Mayor will need to have a lot of money or celebrity to make themselves known to 1.4million people. He or she is most unlikely to come from Papakura which is among the financially poorer parts of Auckland. So our say is reduced from 9 people who reside in and therefore know the issues of people who live in Papakura and are dedicated solely to the interests of those people - to part of one councillor who may live in Manukau or Franklin, which are wonderful but very different communities. We do not believe Papakura priorities will ever be the proposed Super City priorities.

### ***Papakura rates should be set for the needs of the Papakura community and spent in the Papakura community.***

Papakura is not one of the wealthier parts of the Auckland region. Despite this, many projects have been successfully undertaken within the District. Our rates are comparatively low, which means they are affordable for those of us who live here. We can see how the money is

spent, and we can walk into the Council office and discuss with our local Mayor how we think the rates should be spent. Under the proposed structure, Papakura ratepayers may be paying off debts accumulated by other Councils, and for central Auckland's business development and major events which will take place there. We have not seen any evidence that major projects in central Auckland (eg the waterfront developments) will have any financial benefits for the citizens of Papakura. If we get no more benefit from these projects than Eketahuna or Kaiwaka, then we should not have to contribute to the cost of them any more than those communities.

***We agree that the Central Business District needs developing.***

That is, Papakura's CBD. The Papakura Council has already taken steps to improve the pavements, lighting and beautification of the main street, but we still need to attract new businesses. Many Papakura residents we talk to have little need or desire to go to central Auckland. We do not believe that a central Auckland Council will spend any of the region's rates on developing business in Papakura's CBD.

## Appendices:

### *Public meeting photo 04 May 2009*



**Monday 04 May 2009 Papakura public meeting on the Supercity plans, attended by over a thousand residents. Hon John Carter on the podium at the upper-left.**  
Photographer: William Mace, Papakura Courier

### *SavePapakura.com media releases*

Please find the attached SavePapakura.com media releases. We draw your attention to summaries of consultation activities in media releases two & three.

1. 24May2009: **Residents defend town**
2. 09Jun2009: **Two weeks for you to Save Papakura**
3. 23Jun2009: **Last chance for your Supercity submission**

### *Additional information at our website SavePapakura.com*

You are also welcome to visit our group's website for additional information.

<http://SavePapakura.com/>

Sunday 24 May 2009

## Residents defend town



Some of the SavePapakura.com steering group members  
L-R top row: Holly Putwain, Janet Phare  
L-R bottom row: Sandi Wirepa, Lesley Middleton, Flash Langley  
Photographer: Marissa Johns  
Copyright © 2009, SavePapakura.com

The people are rallying against the unpopular Supercity threat, to save Papakura.

"We urge you to save your town against the Supercity plans, and defend your rights for local democracy" says SavePapakura.com spokesperson Sandi Wirepa. SavePapakura.com is a recently formed action group of determined local residents, organisations and businesses.

"Your voice is very important, and needs to be heard loudly" Ms Wirepa said. So you can keep updated and get involved in simple effective actions, please register your contact details: using either the group's website [SavePapakura.com](http://SavePapakura.com) or through Papakura council.

"We are not prepared to let the unique identity of Papakura be lost" explained Ms Wirepa. The group also fears that locally suited services and amenities will be lost or compromised if the Supercity goes ahead.

At the recent public meeting in Papakura (with over a thousand in attendance) opposition to the Supercity was overwhelming, but the government is continuing to ignore the voice of our and other communities at their political peril. The Hon. Rodney Hide would do well to remember that unpopular policies backfire on governments.

The idea for the Supercity has been talked about for the past fifty years but has never been implemented because it's simply a bad idea. It strips away local democracy and leaves only one representative for every 70,000 people. "How accountable will one decision-maker in Auckland be to 70,000 constituents?" questioned Ms Wirepa.

We cannot roll over to a government that is railroading fundamentally anti-democratic legislation through parliament. We cannot let ourselves become politically powerless, our forefathers fought for democracy that helped make Papakura the great place it is today. Similarly we must take action against the Supercity legislation to retain a democratic Papakura, for us and future generations.

ENDs

*[Contact details removed from internet version]*

***Facilitation contacts:***

Holly Putwain and Flash Langley

***Spokespeople:***

**Ms Sandi Wirepa**

**Ms Chris Archibald**

Tuesday 09 June 2009

## Two weeks for you to Save Papakura

SavePapakura.com spokeswoman Sandi Wirepa says “Papakura’s future is in your hands. The time to act is now. Make your voice and your submission count. Let the government know whether you care about Auckland making decisions for Papakura, charging you Auckland’s high rates, owning Papakura’s assets, losing the Hunua Ranges to Waikato, taking Papakura’s identity? If this is not what you want then people have only two weeks to have their say by writing a submission to the Select Committee. Submissions close on Friday 26 June, 2009. “Unless we speak out, Papakura may not even have one person on the ‘new Council’, trying to fight for Papakura’s share of resources.”

According to a recent survey carried out by the Business Council for Sustainable Development only 18% of people in Papakura are in favour of the Supercity. “Some of the people we talk to have been very distressed at having their District Council removed at the stroke of a government pen. Others are really angry that there may be no local representatives to make local decisions about Papakura amenities, (libraries swimming pools, parks, sports grounds) or to decide how Papakura money is spent. One woman was particularly irate that the cost of the Transition Authority will be passed on to ratepayers. She, like many others, is someone who does not normally get involved in community action, but is concerned about how she will pay for this extra cost that she has no control over.

The proposed bill s delivers financial control and decision making into the hands of the few. The proposed Supercity council will Auckland council is an assault on democracy; and a very powerful mayor of the Supercity

“Many people we speak to in the street feel powerless about the proposed changes. We have heard some people say that it is too late, and that there is nothing they can do. I think it’s very important that they realise that they are not alone in their thoughts,” say Janet Phare. “After all 1,000 people turned up to the public meeting held in Papakura on the Supercity issues, and in a show of hands only 3 people supported the proposed changes.”

Writing a submission is not as difficult as it sounds. We are holding free submission workshops over the next two weeks which will provide the people of Papakura with some factual information and the opportunity to write their submission on the spot. SavePapakura.com would like as many people as possible to write to the Select Committee, so the government is in no doubt about what the people of Papakura think. “We’re the people saying we need representation, so come on Papakura Let’s do it not just for us but for future generations..”

Workshops details:

Saturday 13 June 2009 10am-noon or 1pm-3pm Selwyn Arcade (Gt South Rd)

Thursday 18 June 2009 6:30pm-8:30pm Accent Point Level 4 function room

Saturday 20 June 2009 10am-noon or 1pm-3pm Selwyn Arcade (Gt South Rd)

Monday 22 June 2009 9am-11am or 1pm-3pm 18 Smiths Ave (old netball courts)

Monday 22 June 2009 5pm-7pm Papakura Marae

Select committee submissions close 5pm Friday 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009

*either* by e-mail to [AGL@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:AGL@parliament.govt.nz)

*or* (if not e-mailed) send two copies and allow for at least three days delivery time.

No postage stamp required within NZ.

“FreePost Parliament, Clerk of the Committee,

Auckland Governance Legislation Select Committee,

Select Committee Office, Parliament Buildings, WELLINGTON”

[SavePapakura.com consultation results follow on the next page]

***Summary of concerns raised by Papakurians***

Rates will rise. Don't want to lose out to Auckland.

People less familiar with the detail of the government's Supercity plans and the impact for them.

In general (regardless of how aware of the detailed proposed changes) people are:

- overall opposed to the Supercity
- distrustful of government's handling of the issues including lack of engagement
- distrustful and cynical around the Supercity
- government's arrogant forcing through Supercity changes
- believe rates are sure to rise due to the changes
- unaware a Select Committee has called for them to make a submission
- most understand Supercity is about centralisation; and believe centralisation ultimately fails to deliver benefits and destroys communities; particularly those smaller communities farthest from the central Auckland
- believes Mr Banks (if he become the Supercity's mayor) doesn't understand nor care about Papakura

Those who have some awareness of the government's plans:

- don't see any benefit for Papakura of an Auckland Supercity
- don't want Auckland people deciding for Papakura, that don't live here and understand their community's needs
- see all benefits flowing out of Papakura, into Auckland or Waikato. Decision making, power, money, nature reserves, jobs and water
- concerned about having a say in how their rates is spent in Papakura
- identity and diversity of Papakura as a community. Town, residential, farming, Hunua Ranges, small business & industry. Those will not be honoured nor respected by Auckland
- not sure how to make their views heard and be counted
- want a referendum so the public is given the power to decide on a Supercity
- concerned about WaterCare's role

Those who are not aware of the detail of the government's plans:

- dislike the way the government is rushing to make changes; and feel powerless to stand in the way. Believe 'someone is pushing an agenda'
- are confused about what the government is proposing and what it will mean for them
- lack of information from government how the changes will affect them
- are not aware the proposed local boards are effectively powerless

SavePapakura.com is in contact with other groups, and wants to make it easy for you to take simple, effective actions that will stop the sham Supercity.



## Some specific comments received

On process and result:

“The way the Supercity is being foisted on the public, is the way the supercity will be run.”

On referendum:

“Whanganui had a town referendum on their name; yet the Auckland Council is a name change and a dramatic change to the way Papakura is managed. When will I have a say in a binding poll?”

Web comments on

<http://johnkey.co.nz/index.php/?archives/717-John-Carter-Your-role-in-Aucklands-success.html#c3441>

[relating to the context of <http://www.national.org.nz/Auckland.aspx> ]

*F Langley* says:

[#1](#) 2009-06-04 15:26

What National is saying vs doing is full of contradictions. The Auckland supercity select committee is so hasty, there's too little time for National MPs public meetings to encourage formal submissions. Does National seriously want to 'hear your views'?

John - I agree the public needs to lodge formal select committee submissions, and be encouraged to present at a nearby suburb hearing. Yet the select committee has allowed only three weeks for a third of NZ's population to be mobilised to make submissions – yeah right!

Very few of the National MPs 'Have Your Say' tour dates coincide with the 02-26Jun2009 submission timeframe. <http://www.national.org.nz/web/auckland3.pdf> That tour is equally important for the MPs profiles to engage with the public to encourage submissions. The submission timeframe was too short for my local MP (National's Judith Collins) to arrange a meaningful public meeting. She is conspicuously absent on this debate.

So how do you intend to effectively hear that many in the electorate are dissatisfied with National's lack of grassroots engagement; and complaints about the supercity not being addressed?

ENDs

*[Contact details removed from internet version of the media release]*

### ***Facilitation contacts:***

Holly Putwain and Flash Langley

### ***Spokespeople:***

**Ms Sandi Wirepa**

Ms Chris Archibald

Tuesday 23 June 2009

## Last chance for your Supercity submission



**Assessing supercity impacts at an information workshop.**  
L-R Whaitiaki member Ms Natasha Kendall,  
Papakura resident Mr Ryan Jack-Midgley,  
and SavePapakura.com steering group member Mr Ross Williams.  
Photo: SavePapakura.com

Papakura local groups SavePapakura.com and Whaitiaki have been very busy during the last fortnight discussing the Supercity plans with residents. Tens of thousands of Papakurians were encouraged to find out more information, and hundreds attended one of ten workshops for help in having their say with a submission to the Select Committee.

“I know Aucklanders are passionate about their local communities and their region and we want to hear their views” said Local Government minister Hon Rodney Hide. Your submission to the Auckland Governance Legislation Committee must reach Parliament (in Wellington) before 5pm this Friday, 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009. Late submissions will be rejected.

SavePapakura.com has revealed the government has not done their homework. “We asked what are the predicted impacts of the Supercity plans. The government’s official replies came back there has been no assessments” stated SavePapakura.com steering group member Mr Flash Langlely.

“I’m surprised the government has not done any relevant assessments, such as the economic or social impacts for Papakura, let alone the Auckland region. How will the Supercity plans impact Papakura’s ratepayers, residents, small businesses and the valuable work of community groups?”

Ms Janet Phare, who led recent SavePapakura.com workshops, offered some submission writing suggestions. “The select committee wants to know your views on how the government’s proposed changes impact you, your family and your community; and your constructive suggestions to improve the legislation are valued. Some people have summed up

their reasons in a few lines, and others in detail over many pages. The select committee also wants to know if you wish to discuss your views in person at a hearing. Some people have requested to appear so they can effectively communicate with the committee.”

“Mr Hide has mentioned his commitment to ‘promoting local democracy’; yet his plans show the opposite. It appears the local has been taken out of local government. If you value local democracy, you must speak up now to hold Mr Hide to account.”

Ms Phare summarised some of the frequent themes people expressed at the information workshops:

1. That the people:
  - a. Want Papakura to retain its identity
  - b. Want there to be a Mayor and Council of Papakura situated in Papakura
  - c. Want local rates spent in Papakura and those decisions to be made by people who live in and understand Papakura
  - d. Want to retain the personal accessibility that they have now with the local Council. People talked about many instances when they had dropped in to the Council to speak to the Mayor, or had a Councillor give them personal service about their particular concerns
  - e. Want to be able to lobby directly with the decision makers about community services
  - f. Want to retain Papakura’s Council office and staff – many older people especially stated how helpful it is to be able to speak face-to-face about their queries
  - g. Want a realisation from the Select Committee that Auckland is 30km and half a day away from Papakura – much the same as Hamilton and Thames. They do not feel they have anything in common with central Auckland or most other areas of the proposed Supercity
  - h. Are concerned that Papakura’s voice will be lost in a Supercity Council
  - i. Are concerned that money will be spent on events and facilities in central Auckland to the detriment of Papakura events and facilities
2. Most people wanted to have separate rates for regional activities (as happens currently with ARC) and local activities (as happens currently with Papakura District Council)
3. Many people acknowledged the need for a regional approach to regional transport and conservation activities, but did not want local democracy to be reduced or changed to enable the regional activities to be sorted out

Further information is available at the website [SavePapakura.com](http://SavePapakura.com) and at Papakura’s library.

Select committee submissions close 5pm Friday 26th June 2009.

Mention it is a submission on the *Local Government (Auckland Council) Bill*.

Address to “Clerk of the Committee, Auckland Governance Legislation Committee, Select Committee Office, Parliament Buildings, WELLINGTON”

Send by e-mail to [AGL@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:AGL@parliament.govt.nz)

or (if not e-mailed or already posted to Wellington) send a fax in fine mode to:

(04) 499 0486.

If you need to check with Parliament that your fax has been received OK, ring (04) 817 8090.

ENDs

***Attributions:***

Mr Rodney Hide

<http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/minister+calls+public+input+auckland+governance>

***Alternative attributions:***

Mr John Carter

<http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/taking+next+step+auckland039s+future+-+your+help>

[Detailed contact details removed from the web version of the media release]

***SavePapakura.com facilitation contacts:***

Holly Putwain and Flash Langley

***SavePapakura.com spokespeople:***

Ms Sandi Wirepa

Ms Chris Archibald